

bargaining agent, even where, as is usually the case, the employee has been for many years represented by a union under a system of collective bargaining with provisions for arbitration.

It would be my hope that this legislation can be amended to include provisions to protect public utility workers in the right to union recognition.

It is my further hope that some provision can be made which would give these employees of publicly owned mass transportation systems the right to enter into collective bargaining agreements and to negotiate with management. Certainly these provisions should include the right to agreements which would provide some channel for settling grievance disputes.

Mr. Chairman, if in the judgment of this committee you cannot agree on appropriate language to guarantee these rights to collective bargaining of employees working for publicly owned mass transportation systems, perhaps the committee would consider including in its report language which would make it clear that the intent of Congress on this legislation is not to deny in any manner or form, directly or indirectly, workers from exercising their right to collective bargaining if in fact the majority of the workers in a given union endorse such an action for collective bargaining.

A second shortcoming in this legislation which I hope will be corrected by the committee is its failure to provide protective conditions for employees who would be displaced or adversely affected as a result, at least in part, of the Federal financial assistance program.

One way in which transit employees of existing transit companies could be adversely affected is where a rapid transit operation is undertaken by a public agency with Federal assistance, and the private transit company continues in existence. It is inevitable, for example, that if a rapid transit line is erected which serves the same area as is presently served by a private bus line, that patronage will be attracted from the bus line, and employees of the bus line will be adversely affected.

Here, also, perhaps this problem can be resolved by language in the report establishing legislative intent that an effort should be made to absorb displaced workers from existing public transit systems to newly developed transit systems financed through Federal assistance. I would suggest that perhaps some reference should be made to the Manpower Retraining Act so that where employees are dislocated from their existing jobs because of new transit systems, these dislocated workers, if they need additional training, should get this

training under the Manpower Retraining Act and then be absorbed by the newly developed transit system.

Certainly if we are going to spend Federal funds to develop new mass transit facilities, it is not asking too much that we at least establish in the committee report a recommendation that displaced workers in existing facilities, wherever practicable, be given priority in applying for employment with the new facility.

I am reasonably convinced that the Federal assistance which urban areas could receive under this legislation would indeed create so impressive an expansion of mass transit facilities throughout America that the workers presently employed in this country would be absorbed into new job opportunities. However, I am sure that we can understand the concern of those presently employed in the transit industry that modernization and automation may eliminate their jobs. It is my hope that the committee will give serious consideration to this concern, and I am confident that reasonable men can work out reasonable solutions in this difficult field.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for giving me this time to appear before this committee, and I shall be very happy to answer any questions you might have.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

Rev. Harry W. Campbell, the Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, whose yearning is for noble men and nations, inspire us by Thy presence in these days. Let Thy spirit fill these venerable walls and touch our tempers and our words. Walk amongst us, and through these galleries, and across our land, we pray, and cover us all with the mantle of Thy protection.

Grant us to be so broad in vision as to be incapable of narrow prejudice. Teach us to aim so high that we can walk through mires of circumstance and remain clean. Protect us from too much trust in our skills, and grant us the grace to lean on Thee for guidance through the dark places. Make us, we pray, eager to reach for heaven, but able also to touch the oppressed of earth. And through all our deliberations, help us to be wise. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. BARTLETT, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 22, 1963, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of yesterday, the Vice President, on yesterday, signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on yesterday, April 22, 1963, the Vice President had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 5067. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 1159. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;

H.R. 1213. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc.;

H.R. 1267. An act for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird;

H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;

H.R. 1292. An act for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito;

H.R. 1428. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;
 H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart;
 H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;
 H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton;
 H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;
 H.R. 2179. An act for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.
 H.R. 2245. An act for the relief of Stella McKee;
 H.R. 2257. An act for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller;
 H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;
 H.R. 2302. An act for the relief of James M. Norman;
 H.R. 2326. An act for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner;
 H.R. 2327. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell;
 H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;
 H.R. 2699. An act for the relief of Victor L. Ashley;
 H.R. 2700. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;
 H.R. 2708. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas;
 H.R. 2736. An act for the relief of William C. Jessup;
 H.R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke;
 H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;
 H.R. 2798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak;
 H.R. 2859. An act to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;
 H.R. 3022. An act for the relief of Gene H. King;
 H.R. 3029. An act for the relief of Maj. Arnold M. Anderson;
 H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;
 H.R. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins;
 H.R. 3356. An act for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Bowtell;
 H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason;
 H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;
 H.R. 3545. An act to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968;
 H.R. 3574. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes;
 H.R. 3612. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act;
 H.R. 3623. An act for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force;
 H.R. 3624. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force;
 H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force;
 H.R. 3627. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others;
 H.R. 3755. An act for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock;
 H.R. 4214. An act for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri;
 H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act;

H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson;
 H.R. 5044. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes";
 H.R. 5081. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; and
 H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequola National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H.R. 1049. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);
 H.R. 1213. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc.;
 H.R. 1267. An act for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird;
 H.R. 1286. An act for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells;
 H.R. 1292. An act for the relief of Garmela Calabrese DiVito;
 H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.;
 H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;
 H.R. 1561. An act for the relief of Melborn Keat;
 H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton;
 H.R. 1876. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi;
 H.R. 2179. An act for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.;
 H.R. 2245. An act for the relief of Stella McKee;
 H.R. 2257. An act for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller;
 H.R. 2292. An act for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee;
 H.R. 2302. An act for the relief of James M. Norman;
 H.R. 2326. An act for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner;
 H.R. 2327. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell;
 H.R. 2364. An act for the relief of the Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.;
 H.R. 2699. An act for the relief of Victor L. Ashley;
 H.R. 2700. An act for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians;
 H.R. 2708. An act for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas;
 H.R. 2736. An act for the relief of William C. Jessup;
 H.R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke;
 H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;
 H.R. 2859. An act to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;
 H.R. 3022. An act for the relief of Gene H. King;
 H.R. 3029. An act for the relief of Maj. Arnold M. Anderson;

H.R. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins;
 H.R. 3356. An act for the relief of Josephine Marie (Bonaccorso) Bowtell;
 H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;
 H.R. 3623. An act for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force;
 H.R. 3624. An act for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force;
 H.R. 3625. An act for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force;
 H.R. 3627. An act for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others;
 H.R. 3755. An act for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock;
 H.R. 4214. An act for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri; and
 H.R. 4349. An act for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
 H.R. 1159. An act to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to authorize the establishment of hazardous duty pay in certain cases;
 H.R. 3545. An act to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for taking of the economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; and
 H.R. 3612. An act to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.
 H.R. 1428. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;
 H.R. 2798. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak; and
 H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason; to the Committee on Finance.
 H.R. 1492. An act to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart;
 H.R. 3574. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes; and
 H.J. Res. 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequola National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
 H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;
 H.R. 4330. An act to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act;
 H.R. 5044. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; and
 H.R. 5081. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the follow-

ing letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ACTUAL PROCUREMENT RECEIPTS FOR MEDICAL STOCKPILE OF CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of actual procurement receipts for medical stockpile of civil defense emergency supplies and equipment purposes, for the quarter ended March 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 28, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORT ON ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, for the period July 30, 1957, through June 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF EMPLOYEES' AIR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE WASHINGTON OFFICE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of employees' air travel authorized by the Washington office, Veterans' Administration, dated April 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 104(b) (5), TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CERTAIN COST ESTIMATES FOR COMPLETION OF THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 104(b) (5) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the submission of certain cost estimates for the completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

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:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution relative to itinerant offices for unemployment insurance benefits

"Whereas unemployment is not limited to the heavily concentrated population areas but extends into the suburban areas; and

"Whereas individuals who are unemployed are often required to go great distances in order to negotiate and claim their accrued State unemployment benefits; and

"Whereas the burden of the travel expense falls upon those who are in a position least able to shoulder such expense and this added expense tends to vitiate the objectives of the unemployment compensation program; and

"Whereas a program conducted in Anderson, Calif., has indicated that establishment of itinerant offices to handle unemployment benefits is administratively feasible and will result in only a small added cost; and

"Whereas this program at Anderson, Calif., has saved those claimants using the local unemployment insurance benefits office in 1962 a total travel mileage of 39,314 miles; and

"Whereas the above 39,314 miles saved represented an approximate 25 percent of those eligible to receive pay in the Anderson area and had the other 75 percent of those eligible received their pay in the Anderson office there would have been a total mileage saving of 167,000 miles at a cost to the unemployment insurance agency of only 600 miles. The other 75 percent of those eligible to receive pay in the Anderson office penalized themselves an additional 127,686 miles of travel in order to receive their pay weekly instead of semimonthly, as the Anderson office is on a semimonthly basis; and

"Whereas additional funds from the U.S. Government are necessary in order for the State of California to implement a regular program of itinerant unemployment insurance offices: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is urged to enact legislation granting additional funds which will enable the States to establish a system of itinerant unemployment insurance benefit offices, on a weekly payment basis, for suburban areas; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of the California delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Harvey W. Seeds Post No. 29, the American Legion, Miami, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation to name the new veterans hospital to be erected in Miami, Dade County, Fla., the Joe H. Adams Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 247

"Whereas the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, created by act of Congress in September 1961, has supported and promoted the "U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," which could result in complete disarmament in the United States in less than 10 years; and

"Whereas history has taught us that peace is only achieved when a free people stay militarily strong; and

"Whereas Khrushchev has sworn he will bury us, but he intends to bury our freedom, take our children and place us in slavery; and

"Whereas personal freedoms and economic security can be enjoyed only by those who possess the power to protect their citizens against the invasions of other systems of government; and

"Whereas an understanding of the disarmament policy of our administration, Congress, and the State Department is the most crucial issue facing our citizens today: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, That the house of

representatives of the 58th legislature wishes to go on record in opposition to the disarmament policy of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; provided, that the Congress of the United States is notified that, irrespective of Federal action, the sovereign State of Texas will never release her State military forces to any international organization, but will forever retain her right under the Constitution of this Republic and State to keep a militia for the protection of her citizens; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and sent to members of the Texas delegation in the National Congress and to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON as an indication of the views of this house concerning our present disarmament policy as proposed by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

*"BYRON TUNNELL,
"Speaker of the House.
"DOROTHY HOLLMAN,
"Chief Clerk of the House."*

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

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 229

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to more fully recognize that the impact of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees has created a substantial and persistent unemployment and social problem, which has and does exist in the heavily populated Dade County area and that further and immediate action must be taken and prompt remedies be found to alleviate the harmful conditions that do now exist and will continue to exist and become acute with the continuous heavy influx of these refugees among the residents of this State

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has heretofore given recognition to the existence of the large numbers of Cuban refugees in this State and to the problems caused thereby; and

"Whereas this large number of refugees who continue to flee from the tyrannical and oppressive conditions of the communistic Government of Cuba to seek a haven in a democratic country where human rights and dignity are recognized supreme; and

"Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees who, through no fault of their own, have become a burden on certain local areas of this State and that the local resources and facilities of these areas have been taxed beyond their capacities; and

"Whereas the education of Cuban refugee children is now pressing hard on the educational funds and facilities provided by the State of Florida; and

"Whereas the present existence of this large number of Cuban refugees has already placed tremendous and herculean economic burdens upon the local residents and the local governments of these areas in that the local labor market has been drastically affected to the detriment of the permanent working population; and

"Whereas many of these local residents are being displaced from their regular employment and thus becoming an additional economic burden to the local welfare bureau and in many instances causing the permanent residents in these areas to become a burden on their friends and relatives; and

"Whereas the charitable organizations in these areas have also had placed on them an unduly heavy economic burden arising as a result of the tremendous influx of Cuban refugees which has strained their resources to the breaking point; and

"Whereas it has become obvious that the needs of these refugees cannot be met from local resources and facilities which have been substantially depleted; and

"Whereas regardless of previous measures to alleviate this burdensome problem, the continued increase in the numbers of refugees to be found in the Dade County area, which is the major port of entry for these helpless and unfortunate refugees, due to the existing policy of the U.S. Government; and

"Whereas there is the ever-present danger that the problems created by this tremendous influx of Cuban refugees may spread to other areas of Florida and aggravate their problems; and

"Whereas this tremendous problem must be immediately alleviated in order to prevent irreparable harm, both to the economic and social well-being of the citizens of this State; and

"Whereas these helpless and unfortunate Cuban refugees and local residents who have been displaced from their places of employment because of these problems in these local areas now have more than doubled in number the unemployment in these local areas and have brought the unemployment situation in these areas to a critical stage; and

"Whereas there is pending legislation in the Congress of the United States with a definite purpose to alleviate the acute economic and social problems caused in these local areas by Cuban refugees feeling the tyrannical and oppressive pressure of the communistic government of Cuba: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully urged and requested to give full recognition to the fact that the Cuban refugee problem in this State is primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government and of national concern and ask that additional assistance and relief be provided to Dade County and any other counties similarly affected and that other Cuban refugee centers be established in the United States and other ports of entry be established for the entrance of these unfortunate and helpless refugees from Communist tyranny; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Secretary of Commerce of the United States; to the Secretary of Labor of the United States; to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the United States; and to each member of the Florida congressional delegation."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler (Rept. No. 143);

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding (Rept. No. 144);

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311) (Rept. No. 145);

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code (Rept. No. 146); and

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act (Rept. No. 147).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 787. A bill for the relief of Zofia Mielicela (Rept. No. 148).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Evanthia Haji-Christou (Rept. No. 149); and
S. 732. A bill for the relief of Antonio Zorich, Amabile Miotto Zorich, and Fiorella Zorich (Rept. No. 150).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 980. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. district court for the district of Vermont at Montpelier and Saint Johnsbury (Rept. No. 152).

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 102. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for additional commissioners of the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 151).

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20-26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week (Rept. No. 142).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Ex-

pensitures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of February 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, FEBRUARY 1963

INTRODUCTION

This is the 39th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of February 1963.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of February 1, 1963, totaled \$14,159,810,325, and as of February 28, 1963, they totaled \$14,025,156,888, a net decrease of \$134,653,437 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile ¹	\$5,879,281,200	\$5,870,072,100	-\$9,209,100
Defense Production Act.....	1,500,905,400	1,500,308,600	-596,800
Supplemental—barter.....	1,304,643,502	1,312,701,632	+8,058,130
Total, strategic and critical materials ¹	8,684,830,102	8,683,082,332	-1,747,770
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory.....	5,042,931,625	4,903,701,615	-139,230,010
Inventory transferred from national stockpile ¹	127,874,190	127,874,190	—
Total, agricultural commodities ¹	5,170,805,815	5,031,575,805	-139,230,010
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense.....	32,377,298	32,846,003	+468,705
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	177,403,810	182,862,548	+5,458,738
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment.....	209,781,108	215,708,551	+5,927,443
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act.....	2,230,800	2,230,800	—
National Industrial Reserve Act.....	92,162,500	92,559,400	+396,900
Total, machine tools.....	94,393,300	94,790,200	+396,900
Total, all inventories.....	14,159,810,325	14,025,156,888	-134,653,437

¹ Cotton inventory valued at \$128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net changes figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the originally acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

The appendix to this report, beginning on page 19, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

The stockpile inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail as follows:

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

TABLE 1.—Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective ¹	Excess over maximum objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	\$487,680,600	\$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,989	1,128,989			
Defense Production Act	430,717,600	431,622,100	+\$904,500	do	851,575	853,351	+1,776		
Total	918,398,200	919,302,700	+\$904,500	do	1,980,564	1,982,340	+1,776	1,200,000	782,340
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grains:									
Supplemental—barter	7,560,206	8,324,709	+764,503	do	25,476	28,035	+2,559	(?)	28,035
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short dry ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		200,000	178,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,488,000	20,488,000		Short ton	30,301	30,301			
Supplemental—barter	10,841,007	11,022,816	+181,809	do	18,858	19,136	+278		
Total	31,329,007	31,510,816	+181,809	do	49,159	49,437	+278	70,000	(?)
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	5,241,890	5,308,866	+66,976	do	21,246	21,247	+1		
Total	7,879,490	7,946,466	+66,976	do	32,951	32,952	+1	45,000	(?)
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,355,700	3,356,200	+500	Short dry ton	6,223	6,224	+1		
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	3,934,500	3,934,500		do	5,532	5,532			
Total	9,392,800	9,393,300	+500	do	14,103	14,104	+1	11,000	3,104
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		Short ton	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	5,620,877	6,151,100	+530,223	do	20,841	22,830	+1,989		
Total	6,322,977	6,853,200	+530,223	do	22,408	24,397	+1,989	(?)	24,397
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	85,249,134	85,987,508	+738,374	do	5,543,113	5,576,145	+33,032		
Total	117,342,134	118,080,508	+738,374	do	7,792,930	7,825,962	+33,032	2,600,000	5,225,962
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,572,500	78,565,600	-6,900	do	4,963,201	4,963,030	-171		
Supplemental—barter	45,873,603	45,667,300	-206,303	do	2,927,256	2,927,256			
Total	124,446,103	124,232,900	-213,203	do	7,890,457	7,890,286	-171	6,400,000	1,490,286
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton	299,279	299,279		137,000	162,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,770,200	9,770,200		Short ton	23,233	23,233			
Defense Production Act	1,425,800	1,425,800		do	2,543	2,543			
Supplemental—barter	22,739,500	22,739,500		do	11,821	11,821			
Total	33,935,500	33,935,500		do	37,097	37,097		23,100	13,997
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	9,441,032	9,814,950	+373,918	do	81	84	+3	(?)	84
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,001	22,001			
Supplemental—barter	5,515,200	5,518,400	+3,200	do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,241,900	8,245,100	+3,200	do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,000,000	871,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	21,260,000	21,260,000		do	10,829,640	10,829,640			
Supplemental—barter	12,310,663	12,311,000	+337	do	7,448,989	7,448,989			
Total	33,570,663	33,571,000	+337	do	18,278,629	18,278,629		6,500,000	11,778,629
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	55,243,900	54,452,700	-791,200	do	213,720,820	210,095,326	-3,625,494	68,000,000	142,095,326
Celestite:									
National stockpile	1,412,300	1,412,300		Short dry ton	28,816	28,816		22,000	6,816
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,286,800	12,286,800		do	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	20,200,996	20,650,447	+449,451	do	608,625	632,748	+24,123		
Total	32,487,796	32,937,247	+449,451	do	1,168,077	1,192,200	+24,123	475,000	717,200
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,765,600	264,765,600		do	3,799,176	3,799,176			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	224,615,366	224,615,366		do	1,543,114	1,543,114			
Total	525,260,866	525,260,866		do	6,327,936	6,327,936		2,700,000	3,627,936
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,047,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,820,800	5,878,370	+57,570	do	189,623	198,624	+9,001		
Total	30,470,100	30,727,670	+257,570	do	1,236,782	1,245,783	+9,001	1,300,000	(?)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity				
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective ¹	Excess over maximum objective
Cobalt:									
National stockpile.....	\$169,363,300	\$169,313,100	-\$50,200	Pound.....	76,788,587	76,768,118	-20,469		
Defense Production Act.....	52,076,600	52,074,600	-2,000	do.....	25,195,172	25,194,122	-1,050		
Supplemental—barter.....	2,169,000	2,169,000		do.....	1,077,018	1,077,018			
Total.....	223,608,900	223,556,700	-52,200	do.....	103,060,777	103,039,258	-21,519	19,000,000	84,039,258
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile.....	16,981,400	16,763,800	-217,600	do.....	112,057,733	110,630,853	-1,426,880	(?)	110,630,853
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter.....	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton.....	67,636	67,636		(?)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile.....	23,860,400	23,860,400		Pound.....	7,488,960	7,488,960			
Defense Production Act.....	50,255,500	50,255,500		do.....	8,222,684	8,222,684			
Supplemental—barter.....	799,000	799,000		do.....	388,877	388,877			
Total.....	74,914,900	74,914,900		do.....	16,100,521	16,100,521		1,900,000	14,200,521
Copper:									
National stockpile.....	522,204,700	522,308,400	+103,700	Short ton.....	1,008,351	1,008,351			
Defense Production Act.....	62,779,600	62,258,600	-521,000	do.....	112,064	111,116	-948		
Supplemental—barter.....	8,242,803	8,242,803		do.....	12,381	12,381			
Total.....	593,227,103	592,809,803	-417,300	do.....	1,132,796	1,131,848	-948	1,000,000	131,848
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile.....	38,198,900	38,148,200	-50,700	Pound.....	151,574,148	151,321,593	-252,555	150,000,000	1,121,593
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile.....	43,701,600	43,420,400	-281,200	do.....	323,078,769	320,346,127	-2,732,642	320,000,000	346,127
Corundum:									
National stockpile.....	393,100	393,100		Short ton.....	2,008	2,008		2,000	8
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act.....	8,197,000	8,197,000		do.....	29,685	29,685		(?)	29,685
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile.....	465,300	475,800	+10,500	Piece.....	15,313	15,464	+151	25,000	(?)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile.....	61,609,500	61,609,500		Carat.....	31,113,411	31,113,411			
Supplemental—barter.....	15,456,700	15,456,700		do.....	5,523,748	5,523,748			
Total.....	77,066,200	77,066,200		do.....	36,637,159	36,637,159		30,000,000	6,637,159
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile.....	100,501,500	100,501,500		do.....	9,315,183	9,315,183			
Supplemental—barter.....	186,159,160	186,160,100	+940	do.....	15,394,744	15,394,743	-1		
Total.....	286,660,660	286,661,600	+940	do.....	24,709,927	24,709,926	-1	18,000,000	6,709,926
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile.....	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece.....	64,178	64,178		(?)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile.....	38,797,100	38,563,800	-233,300	Pound.....	9,364,689	9,308,390	-56,299	8,800,000	508,390
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile.....	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton.....	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act.....	1,394,400	1,394,400		do.....	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter.....	33,465,200	33,465,700	+30,500	do.....	673,232	673,232			
Total.....	61,027,100	61,027,600	+30,500	do.....	1,155,981	1,155,981		280,000	875,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile.....	17,332,400	17,332,400		do.....	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter.....	1,508,100	1,508,100		do.....	42,800	42,800			
Total.....	18,840,500	18,840,500		do.....	412,243	412,243		375,000	37,243
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile.....	937,900	937,900		do.....	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter.....	341,200	341,200		do.....	1,428	1,428			
Total.....	1,279,100	1,279,100		do.....	5,883	5,883		3,000	2,283
Graphite, natural, Madagascar, crystalline:									
National stockpile.....	7,062,500	7,088,500	+26,000	do.....	34,410	34,390	-20		
Supplemental—barter.....	90,736	109,421	+18,685	do.....	826	938	+112		
Total.....	7,153,236	7,197,921	+44,685	do.....	35,236	35,328	+92	17,200	18,128
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile.....	1,896,400	1,896,400		do.....	5,487	5,487		2,100	3,387
Hydrochloride of quinine:									
National stockpile.....	1,400	1,400		Ounce.....	103	103		(?)	103
Hyosine:									
National stockpile.....	30,600	30,600		do.....	2,100	2,100		2,100	(?)
Iodine:									
National stockpile.....	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound.....	2,977,648	2,977,648			
Supplemental—barter.....	1,018,222	1,039,500	+21,278	do.....	996,958	994,920	-2,038		
Total.....	5,100,222	5,121,500	+21,278	do.....	3,974,606	3,972,568	-2,038	4,300,000	(?)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity				
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective ¹	Excess over maximum objective
Iridium:									
National stockpile.....	\$2,525,800	\$2,525,800		Troy ounce.....	13,937	13,937		4,000	9,937
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile.....	3,805,800	3,809,600	+3,800	Piece.....	51,037,267	51,088,611	+51,344	57,500,000	(?)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile.....	824,400	820,200	-4,200	Short dry ton.....	9,536	9,486	-50	4,800	4,686
Lead:									
National stockpile.....	319,298,100	319,298,100		Short ton.....	1,050,370	1,050,370			
Defense Production Act.....	2,461,800	2,415,900	-45,900	do.....	6,499	6,377	-122		
Supplemental—barter.....	78,225,100	78,279,300	+54,200	do.....	327,998	237,998			
Total.....	399,985,000	399,993,300	+8,300	do.....	1,384,867	1,384,745	-122	286,000	1,098,745
Magnesium:									
National stockpile.....	131,338,800	131,293,200	-45,600	do.....	180,921	180,858	-63	107,000	73,858
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile.....	21,025,500	21,025,500		do.....	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter.....	14,034,837	14,502,798	+467,961	do.....	137,671	142,322	+4,651		
Total.....	35,060,337	35,528,298	+467,961	do.....	282,156	286,807	+4,651	50,000	236,807
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile.....	3,095,500	3,095,500		Short dry ton.....	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act.....	2,523,600	2,523,600		do.....	3,779	3,779			
Total.....	5,619,100	5,619,100		do.....	25,051	25,051		20,000	5,051
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile.....	2,133,300	2,133,300		do.....	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter.....	7,127,300	7,160,300	+33,000	do.....	103,731	103,731			
Total.....	9,260,600	9,293,600	+33,000	do.....	133,038	133,038		30,000	103,038
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile.....	132,600	132,600		do.....	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter.....	6,826,200	6,834,800	+8,600	do.....	99,016	99,016			
Total.....	6,958,800	6,967,400	+8,600	do.....	100,838	100,838		53,000	47,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile.....	248,293,500	248,240,000	-53,500	do.....	5,851,828	5,851,264	-564		
Defense Production Act.....	176,710,500	176,710,500		do.....	3,056,771	3,056,771			
Supplemental—barter.....	225,835,908	229,013,199	+3,177,291	do.....	3,238,648	3,292,390	+53,742		
Total.....	650,840,308	653,964,099	+3,123,791	do.....	12,147,247	12,200,425	+53,178	6,800,000	5,400,425
Mercury:									
National stockpile.....	20,039,500	20,039,500		Flask.....	129,525	129,525			
Supplemental—barter.....	3,446,200	3,446,200		do.....	16,000	16,000			
Total.....	23,485,700	23,485,700		do.....	145,525	145,525		110,000	35,525
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile.....	27,644,200	27,644,200		Pound.....	11,626,674	11,626,674			
Defense Production Act.....	40,858,100	40,858,100		do.....	6,456,253	6,456,253			
Supplemental—barter.....	4,380,878	4,492,034	+111,156	do.....	1,334,753	1,370,313	+35,560		
Total.....	72,883,178	72,994,334	+111,156	do.....	19,417,680	19,453,240	+35,560	8,300,000	11,153,240
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile.....	9,058,100	9,058,100		do.....	1,733,083	1,733,083			
Defense Production Act.....	633,300	633,300		do.....	102,679	102,679			
Supplemental—barter.....	867,497	884,281	+16,784	do.....	88,988	90,512	+1,524		
Total.....	10,558,897	10,575,681	+16,784	do.....	1,924,750	1,926,274	+1,524	1,300,000	626,274
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile.....	40,598,300	40,598,300		do.....	40,040,294	40,040,294			
Supplemental—barter.....	6,225,800	6,225,800		do.....	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total.....	46,824,100	46,824,100		do.....	44,866,551	44,866,551		21,200,000	23,666,551
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile.....	303,600	303,600		do.....	223,126	223,126		17,000	206,126
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile.....	2,580,500	2,580,500		do.....	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter.....	1,975,335	1,981,635	+6,300	do.....	1,690,678	1,690,678			
Total.....	4,555,835	4,562,135	+6,300	do.....	4,769,740	4,769,740		1,700,000	3,069,740
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile.....	89,184,400	89,184,400		Pound.....	84,063,203	84,063,203		59,000,000	25,063,203
Nickel:									
National stockpile.....	181,996,600	181,996,600		do.....	334,329,580	334,329,556	-24		
Defense Production Act.....	105,029,200	104,542,400	-486,800	do.....	112,005,021	111,494,958	-510,063		
Total.....	287,025,800	286,539,000	-486,800	do.....	446,334,601	445,824,514	-510,087	323,000,000	122,824,514
Opium:									
National stockpile.....	13,661,700	13,661,700		do.....	195,757	195,757		172,800	22,957

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity				
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective ¹	Excess over maximum objective
Palladium:									
National stockpile.....	\$2,079,000	\$2,079,000		Troy ounce.....	89,811	89,811			
Defense Production Act.....	177,800	177,800		do.....	7,884	7,884			
Supplemental—barter.....	12,170,200	12,170,200		do.....	648,124	648,124			
Total.....	14,426,600	14,426,600		do.....	745,819	745,819		340,000	405,819
Palm oil:									
National stockpile.....	5,148,200	5,074,200	—\$74,000	Pound.....	28,604,089	28,192,569	—411,520	(?)	28,192,569
Platinum:									
National stockpile.....	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce.....	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter.....	4,024,500	4,024,500		do.....	49,999	49,999			
Total.....	60,904,400	60,904,400		do.....	766,342	766,342		165,000	601,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile.....	415,000	415,000		Pound.....	66,188	66,188		66,000	188
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile.....	69,625,500	69,625,500		do.....	5,647,292	5,647,292			
Supplemental—barter.....	3,128,684	3,128,684		do.....	232,252	232,252			
Total.....	72,754,184	72,754,184		do.....	5,879,544	5,879,544		650,000	5,229,544
Quinidine:									
National stockpile.....	2,103,200	2,103,200		Ounce.....	1,823,377	1,823,377		1,600,000	223,377
Quinine:									
National stockpile.....	4,765,200	4,765,200		do.....	7,533,732	7,533,732		(?)	7,533,732
Rare earths:									
National stockpile.....	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton.....	10,042	10,042			
Supplemental—barter.....	5,555,379	5,585,161	+29,782	do.....	6,183	6,384	+201		
Total.....	12,690,279	12,720,061	+29,782	do.....	16,225	16,426	+201	5,700	10,726
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act.....	657,800	657,800		Pound.....	6,085,570	6,085,570		(?)	6,085,570
Rhodium:									
National stockpile.....	78,100	78,100		Troy ounce.....	621	621		(?)	621
Rubber:									
National stockpile.....	795,887,000	790,437,400	—5,449,600	Long ton.....	1,029,234	1,022,187	—7,047	750,000	272,187
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter.....	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce.....	15,001	15,001		(?)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile.....	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton.....	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act.....	2,725,100	2,725,100		do.....	17,592	17,592			
Supplemental—barter.....	1,061,300	1,061,300		do.....	11,632	11,632			
Total.....	5,856,500	5,856,500		do.....	47,823	47,823		65,000	(?)
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile.....	190,000	190,000		Carat.....	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(?)
Selenium:									
National stockpile.....	757,100	757,100		Pound.....	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter.....	1,070,500	1,070,500		do.....	156,518	156,518			
Total.....	1,827,600	1,827,600		do.....	253,618	253,618		400,000	(?)
Shellac:									
National stockpile.....	8,850,500	8,850,500		do.....	17,654,298	17,654,298		7,400,000	10,254,298
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile.....	11,394,500	11,394,500		Short ton.....	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter.....	26,796,900	26,812,800	+15,900	do.....	131,805	131,805			
Total.....	38,191,400	38,207,300	+15,900	do.....	196,502	196,502		100,000	96,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile.....	3,033,000	2,749,500	—283,500	Pound.....	2,124,769	1,944,476	—180,293	970,000	974,476
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile.....	486,600	486,600		do.....	113,515	113,515		120,000	(?)
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile.....	4,775,400	4,775,400		do.....	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,000,000	442,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile.....	498,700	498,700		Short ton.....	1,279	1,279		300	979
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile.....	231,000	231,000		do.....	3,901	3,901		(?)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile.....	10,905,500	10,905,500		Pound.....	3,422,874	3,422,873	—1		
Defense Production Act.....	9,734,400	9,734,400		do.....	1,531,366	1,531,366			
Supplemental—barter.....	21,100	21,100		do.....	8,036	8,036			
Total.....	20,661,000	20,661,000		do.....	4,962,276	4,962,276	—1	2,420,000	2,542,276
Thorium:									
Defense Production Act.....	42,000	42,000		do.....	848,574	848,574			
Supplemental—barter.....	15,474,689	16,379,484	+904,795	do.....	7,285,212	7,874,725	+589,513		
Total.....	15,516,689	16,421,484	+904,795	do.....	8,133,786	8,723,299	+589,513	(?)	8,723,299

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over maximum objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity				
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 31, 1963	Net change during month	Maximum objective ¹	Excess over maximum objective
Tin:									
National stockpile	\$824,656,200	\$823,850,600	—\$805,600	Long ton	339,153	338,822	—331		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	841,060,200	840,254,600	—805,000	do	346,658	346,327	—331	185,000	161,327
Titanium:									
Defense Production Act	176,804,000	176,804,000		Short ton	22,456	22,456			
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	208,901,700	208,901,700		do	31,477	31,477		(?)	31,477
Totaquene:									
National stockpile	4,853,800	4,075,000	—778,800	Ounce	7,654,196	6,426,015	—1,228,181	(?)	6,426,015
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,129,300	369,129,300		Pound	120,072,509	120,072,509			
Defense Production Act	319,498,500	319,052,900	—445,600	do	78,367,948	78,276,833	—111,115		
Supplemental—barter	18,647,400	18,648,100	+700	do	5,765,752	5,762,319	—3,433		
Total	707,275,200	706,830,300	—444,900	do	204,206,209	204,091,661	—114,548	50,000,000	154,091,661
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,604,200	31,604,200		do	15,758,802	15,758,801	—1	2,000,000	13,758,801
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	11,967,700	11,953,800	—13,900	Long ton	42,895	42,845	—50	30,000	12,845
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	49,374,900	49,262,500	—112,400	do	199,557	199,103	—454	180,000	19,103
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,992,400	9,959,900	—32,500	do	39,678	39,489	—129	39,000	489
National stockpile	364,131,100	364,131,100		Short ton	1,256,012	1,256,012			
Supplemental—barter	79,587,900	79,588,100	+200	do	323,896	323,896	+1		
Total	443,719,000	443,719,200	+200	do	1,579,907	1,579,908	+1	178,000	1,401,908
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(?)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	372,700	333,800	—38,900	do	6,300	5,641	—659	(?)	5,641
Total:									
National stockpile	5,879,281,200	5,870,072,100	—9,209,100						
Defense Production Act	1,500,905,400	1,500,308,600	—596,800						
Supplemental—barter	1,304,643,502	1,312,701,632	+8,058,130						
Total, strategic and critical materials	8,684,830,102	8,683,082,332	—1,747,770						

¹ Maximum objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98b). The present objectives represent quantities of materials estimated to be necessary in the event of a 3-year war in which overseas sources would not be available.

² No present objective.

³ Not in excess of maximum objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)

Commodity	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity		
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	\$1,148,076,131	\$1,049,159,564	—\$98,916,567	Bushel	987,136,997	900,855,639	—86,281,358
Cotton, extra-long staple	4,350,336	4,350,336		Bale	15,865	15,865	
Cotton, upland	809,815,726	809,749,800	—65,926	do	4,684,629	4,684,254	—375
Peanuts, farmers' stock	4,068,801	3,262,460	—806,341	Pound	37,764,836	31,308,766	—6,456,070
Peanuts, shelled	5,061,378	5,976,620	+885,242	do	25,354,191	31,275,746	+5,921,555
Rice, milled	637,773	183,616	—454,157	Hundredweight	64,364	18,580	—45,884
Rice, rough	95,130	8,816	—86,314	do	18,641	1,762	—16,879
Wheat	2,016,161,189	1,997,916,537	—18,244,652	Bushel	1,085,889,588	1,026,529,213	—9,272,375
Wheat flour	435,539	435,539		Pound	7,807,300	7,807,300	
Bulgar	1,338,638	1,299,128	—39,510	do	24,418,900	22,090,600	—2,328,300
Total, basic commodities	3,990,070,541	3,871,816,877	—118,253,664				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	24,263,065	24,188,417	—74,648	Bushel	28,197,621	28,102,033	—95,588
Grain sorghum	575,561,312	548,599,276	—26,962,036	do	543,172,505	519,449,294	—23,723,211
Honey	139,868	129,950	—9,918	Pound	1,045,076	1,037,746	—7,330
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	197,728,332	221,013,237	+23,284,905	do	335,843,465	376,412,964	+40,569,499
Butter oil	35,081,437	34,210,797	—870,640	do	43,587,172	42,508,633	—1,078,539
Cheese	39,158,314	34,143,407	—5,014,907	do	104,412,680	91,357,129	—13,055,551
Ghee	369,883	369,883		do	455,322	455,322	
Milk, dried	97,761,792	102,642,815	+4,881,023	do	655,273,510	689,608,924	+34,335,414

TABLE 2.—Agricultural commodities inventories, February 1963 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity		
	Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1962	End of month, Dec. 31, 1962	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Dec. 1, 1962	End of month, Dec. 31, 1962	Net change during month
Price-support inventory—Continued							
Designated nonbasic commodities—Continued							
Oats.....	\$9,188,763	\$9,152,015	—\$36,748	Bushel.....	15,297,460	15,241,310	—56,150
Rye.....	865,352	801,282	—64,070	do.....	833,710	763,113	—70,597
Total, designated nonbasic commodities.....	980,109,118	975,251,079	—4,858,039				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible.....	5,107,651	4,248,621	—859,030	Hundredweight.....	772,442	657,125	—115,317
Cottonseed oil, refined.....	1,014,923	1,014,923		Pound.....	8,339,556	8,339,550	—6
Flaxseed.....	4,270	358,256	+353,986	Bushel.....	1,574	107,703	+106,129
Soybeans.....	42,534,889	20,780,846	—12,754,043	do.....	17,873,419	12,528,178	—5,345,241
Turpentine.....	609,451	545,596	—123,855	Gallon.....	1,275,814	1,039,776	—236,038
Vegetable oil products.....	23,420,782	20,685,417	—2,735,365	Pound.....	127,362,724	112,632,915	—14,729,809
Total, other nonbasic commodities.....	72,751,966	56,633,659	—16,118,307				
Total, price support inventory.....	5,042,931,625	4,903,701,615	—139,230,010				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: ¹							
Cotton, Egyptian.....	103,913,705	103,913,705		Bale.....	123,001	123,001	
Cotton, American-Egyptian.....	23,960,485	23,960,485		do.....	47,638	47,638	
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile.....	127,874,190	127,874,190		do.....	170,639	170,639	
Total, agricultural commodities.....	5,170,805,815	5,031,575,805	—139,230,010				

¹ Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. (See Appendix, p. 6739.) Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)

Item	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity		
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings).....	\$9,994,073	\$9,999,941	+\$5,868	10-mile units.....	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment.....	1,930,667	1,852,401	—78,266	(1).....			
Radiological equipment.....	20,452,558	20,993,571	+541,013	(1).....			
Total.....	32,377,298	32,846,003	+468,705				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.....	132,244,022	137,822,102	+5,578,080	(1).....			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations.....	5,449,502	5,449,502		(1).....			
Civil defense emergency hospitals.....	38,057,291	37,944,067	—113,224	Each.....	1,930	1,930	
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other than hospitals).....	1,652,995	1,646,877	—6,118	(1).....			
Total.....	177,403,810	182,862,548	+5,458,738				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment.....	209,781,108	215,708,551	+5,927,443				

¹ Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—Machine tools inventories, February 1963 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)

Item	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity		
	Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Feb. 1, 1963	End of month, Feb. 28, 1963	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
In storage.....	\$43,600	\$43,600		Tool.....	11	11	
On lease.....	2,144,300	2,144,300		do.....	103	103	
On loan.....	42,900	42,900		do.....	7	7	
Total.....	2,230,800	2,230,800		do.....	121	121	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage.....	84,244,100	84,214,800	—\$29,300	do.....	7,721	7,739	+18
On lease.....	27,500	27,500		do.....	1	1	
On loan to other agencies.....	1,865,300	1,965,000	+99,700	do.....	187	195	+8
On loan to school programs.....	6,025,600	6,352,100	+326,500	do.....	1,420	1,489	+69
Total.....	92,162,500	92,559,400	+396,900	do.....	9,329	9,424	+95
Total, machine tools.....	94,393,300	94,792,200	+398,900	do.....	9,450	9,545	+95

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

APPENDIX

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V-7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—Barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V-4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191-2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—

and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgage collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursement for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations

in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OEP stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OEP warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to preposition emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462).

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of February 28, 1963, totaled \$14,025,156,888. This was a net decrease of \$134,653,437 as compared with the February 1 total of \$14,159,810,325. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, February 1963	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Strategic and critical materials.....	-\$1,747,770	\$8,683,082,332
Agricultural commodities.....	-139,230,010	5,031,575,805
Civil defense supplies and equipment.....	+5,927,443	215,708,551
Machine tools.....	+396,900	94,790,200
Total.....	-134,653,437	14,025,156,888

These figures are from the February 1963 report on Federal stockpile inventories, compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 95 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Maximum objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 95 materials. Of the 76 materials having maximum objectives, 65 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of February 28, 1963.

Increases in cost value were reported in 30 of the 95 materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 21 materials, and 44 materials remained unchanged during the month of February 1963.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of February 28, 1963, totaled \$5,870,072,100. This was a net decrease of \$9,209,100 during the month. The largest decrease was \$5,449,600 in rubber.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of February 28, 1963, totaled \$1,500,308,600. This was a net decrease of \$596,800. The largest decreases were in copper and nickel, partially offset by an increase in aluminum.

Supplemental-barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of February 28 totaled \$1,312,701,632. This was a net increase of \$8,058,130. The largest increases were in manganese, thorium, aluminum oxide, and chromite.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report, the largest is \$5 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during February were reported for corn, grain sorghum, wheat, and soybeans in the price support inventory.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed increases in radiological equipment and medical stocks; and the machine tools inventories showed a net increase during February.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis M. Janelle, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney for the district of New Hampshire;

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire; and

Frank Udoff, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maryland.

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

Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Chad;

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federal Republic of Germany;

Roger, Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank;

Edwin M. Martin, of Ohio, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; and

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 18th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1343. A bill providing for the improvement of public education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1344. A bill to provide for the precise determination of the southern boundary of the Salt River Indian Reservation, Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1345. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DOMINICK, and Mr. MECHEM):

S. 1346. A bill to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BURDICK:

S.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of railroad freight rates applicable to shipments of grain in carload lots from States in the Midwest region of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION**BACK PAY FOR CAPTIVE ARMED SERVICES PERSONNEL**

Mr. DOMINICK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38); which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Whereas many naval and Marine Corps officers were captured by the enemy during World War II, and, although selected for promotion to higher rank by ALNAV or block promotion lists, were not promoted because of their captivity; and

Whereas many of these officers, upon repatriation, received one or more promotions by means of appointments predicated to show appropriate dates of rank, but received pay for the higher grades only from the dates on which the promotions were actually made; and

Whereas, despite the language of section 2 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, 144), as amended, commonly called the Missing Persons Act, that such person shall "be entitled to receive or have credited to his account the same pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the beginning of such period of absence or may become entitled thereafter", these officers have consistently been denied increases in pay and allowances from date of rank to the actual date these promotions were made: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is affirmed that it is the intent of Congress that those officers of the Navy and Marine Corps whose promotion was authorized by ALNAV or block promotion lists during the periods when they were prisoners of the enemy during World War II but not effected because of such imprisonment, and who were promoted after repatriation with dates of rank relating back to the dates on which they would have been promoted but for their captivity, shall by authority of section 2 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, ch. 166), be entitled to pay, allowances, and precedence from the date of rank stipulated in the later appointing orders.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has announced that the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will begin hearings on aid to education and related bills beginning Monday, April 29.

I know that the members of the committee will want to consider all possible approaches to this controversial subject. For this reason, I am introducing today a bill based on principles recommended by the bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers. A distinguished educator of my State, A. W. Ford, State Commissioner of Education, is president of the council.

This is a companion bill to H.R. 5344 which was introduced by Representative CARL PERKINS on April 1. I do not necessarily endorse every detail of this bill, but I did want to assure that the proposals recommended by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the bipartisan citizens committee, composed of many distinguished individuals of all walks of life, were considered during the Senate committee's study of education bills. This bill expresses the composite views of the State school officers and, in view of the continuous controversy about Federal control in connection with aid to education, their views should be considered very carefully by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a series of questions and answers and a State-by-State tabulation pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1343) providing for the improvement of public education, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 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,

TITLE I—SURVEYS OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS BY THE STATES*Statement of purposes and policies of act*

SEC. 101. The Congress finds that Federal financial assistance to the States for the further improvement of public elementary and secondary education is necessary in the national interest, and declares that its policy requires that allocation of Federal funds for this purpose shall be made after assurance by each State that the Federal funds can and will be allocated among its local education agencies according to their relative needs and for purposes that have been carefully determined by the State educational agency to be relatively most important in improving the scope and quality of public education.

The Congress finds that data adequate to enable each State educational agency to make such assurances require that each State educational agency desiring to participate in the allocation of Federal funds as authorized

by title II shall make a survey of the educational needs of all local education agencies within the State prior to application for such funds.

Guidelines for State surveys

SEC. 102. It is the intention of the Congress that State surveys made under the provisions of this title shall ascertain the relative needs among the local education agencies of each State for Federal financial assistance for the improvement of public elementary and secondary education, expressed in terms of relative priorities among the needs specified in this section, and other similar needs in each State. In undertaking the survey, the State educational agency shall agree to establish and to describe educational priorities in a manner that will form a reasonable basis for a practicable formula under which commingled State and Federal funds may be allocated among local education agencies to meet these needs according to their respective priorities. Each State educational agency in making this survey shall take into account the following factors, among others, in determining relative need in each local education agency within the State:

(a) Adequacy of the scope of the curriculum and the quality of instruction in the elementary schools; (b) adequacy of the scope of the curriculum and the quality of instruction in the secondary schools, with particular reference to basic subjects such as English, history, government and other social sciences, mathematics, natural and physical sciences, modern foreign languages, fine and industrial arts, and vocational education; (c) provisions of school programs giving special attention to particular problems of education such as opportunities for gifted, retarded, mentally or physically handicapped, prospective dropouts, and other exceptional or underachieving pupils; (d) guidance and other personnel services for all pupils; (e) provisions for vocational and technical education suitable for modern society; (f) school plant and equipment suitable for housing of an improved educational program and the relative financial ability of local education agencies to supply the same; (g) special situations in local education agencies that can be improved by the use of additional funds, such as overcrowding, teachers having insufficient preparation and experience or inadequate laboratories, equipment, materials, supplies, teaching aids, or library services; (h) the relative cost of current operation per pupil in average daily attendance; and (i) the relative economic ability of local education agencies to finance public education, including funds available from the State and other sources.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 103. In order to enable the States to carry out the purposes and policies of this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended. The sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to State educational agencies whose applications for funds for carrying out such purposes and policies have been approved under section 104.

Applications for funds

SEC. 104. The Commissioner shall approve any application from a State educational agency for funds to carry out the purposes of this title, provided such application: (a) designates the State educational agency as the sole agency for carrying out such purposes; (b) provides for making a survey under the general supervision of a committee composed of not fewer than five or more than ten persons skilled in public school work and an equal number of lay citizens broadly interested in education, and the members of the committee shall be appointed for the term of the survey by the State board of education or, in States having no such board, by the chief State school officer, and the chairman shall be the chief State

school officer or a staff member of the State educational agency appointed by him; (c) provides that the State educational agency will make such reports, in such forms, and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require, and, to assure verification of such reports, give the Commissioner, upon request, access to the records upon which such information is based; (d) meets all other requirements of this title necessary to qualify a State for allocations of Federal funds under title II of this Act.

Allocation of funds

SEC. 105. Of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 103, \$175,000 shall be allotted by the Commissioner to American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs and upon the basis of agreements made with their respective State educational agencies, and the remainder shall be allotted to the other States in the same proportions as their respective school-age populations bear to the total school-age population of such other States; except that no such allotment to any State (other than to American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands) shall be less than \$20,000.

The Commissioner shall from time to time estimate the sum to which each State will be entitled under this section during such ensuing period as he may determine, and shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Commissioner finds that his estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount to which the State was entitled for such period. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amount so certified.

Survey report and distribution plan

SEC. 106. Upon the completion of the survey provided for in this title, each State educational agency shall file with the Commissioner ten copies of the survey report, together with ten copies of a practicable plan, approved by the State educational agency and based on the survey report, for the distribution to local education agencies within the State of the funds authorized by title II of this Act. The plan for distribution of funds shall include, in addition to the distribution formula, a description of the administrative processes to be used by the State educational agency in supervising the use of such funds in local education agencies and of the accounting procedures to be used by the local education agency in accounting to the State educational agency for the use of such funds.

Certificate of eligibility under title II

SEC. 107. The Commissioner shall approve the distribution plan of each State eligible to receive funds under title II of this Act if such distribution plan has been formulated according to the provisions of title I and is certified by the State educational agency to the Commissioner as the distribution plan of the State.

The final refusal of the Commissioner to approve any State distribution plan certified by a State educational agency under this title, and the Commissioner's final action, shall be subject to judicial review on the record, in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

TITLE II—GENERAL ASSISTANCE

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 201. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for making grants under this title for the fiscal year beginning July

1, 1964, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as Congress shall determine.

Allotments to States

SEC. 202. (a) For each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall make a basic allotment to each State that has qualified under title I of this Act, to be paid from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201, equal to 2 per centum of the public school expenditures of the State during the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available.

(b) In the case of each State whose per capita personal income for a fiscal year is below that of the State having the highest per capita personal income for that fiscal year, such State's basic allotment under this section for that fiscal year shall be increased by an amount equal to the product of such State's basic allotment and six times the percentage by which the State's per capita personal income is less than the per capita personal income of the State having the highest per capita personal income for that fiscal year.

Payments to States

SEC. 203. Subject to the provisions of section 205, upon certification of the allotment for each State by the Commissioner to the Secretary of the Treasury not later than the first day of the fiscal year for which the allotment is made, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State one-fourth of its allotment on or before the following July 31, one-fourth on or before the following October 31, one-fourth on or before the following January 31, and one-fourth on or before the following April 30 of that fiscal year.

Purposes for which Federal funds may be expended

SEC. 204. Upon receipt by the State, funds received under this title shall be added to State funds appropriated for public elementary or secondary education and shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds. The commingled funds from both State and Federal sources shall be distributed or expended under State law for the benefit of local education agencies in the State in accord with the provisions of the distribution plan of the State educational agency approved by the Commissioner under title I of this Act.

Maintenance and improvement of State and local support for public school financing

SEC. 205. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 202 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 202 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1964. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, if any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 202, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2) if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to

any State for any year for which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort for such year or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

State matching contributions

SEC. 206. (a) The Commissioner shall determine for each State for each fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1964, the amount (if any) by which such State's contributions (derived from State sources) to its local educational agencies for the support of public elementary and secondary schools exceeds such contributions of that State for the preceding fiscal year. The Commissioner shall also determine, as provided in subsection (c), a State percentage for each such fiscal year for each State.

(b) If for any fiscal year the product determined by multiplying the State percentage of a State by the amount determined for such State for such year under the first sentence of subsection (a) is less than the State's allotment under section 202, after any reductions under section 203, then the State's allotment shall be reduced to the amount of such product.

(c) The "State percentage" for any State shall be 100 times the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita personal income of the State by the per capita personal income of the Nation.

Reporting

SEC. 207. Each State educational agency receiving and distributing funds under this Act shall make a complete report to the Commissioner on how the Federal funds have been distributed and expended not later than the October 31 following the close of each fiscal year. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to accept for these purposes the normal accounting procedures used by each State for State funds allocated to local educational agencies for public elementary and secondary school purposes. Not later than the January 1 following the close of each fiscal year the Commissioner shall transmit all such State reports to the Congress, together with his recommendations for the next fiscal year.

Prohibition of Federal control

SEC. 208. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

TITLE III—DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

SEC. 301. Definitions for purposes of this Act:

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the (United States) Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "State" means a State, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(c) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

(d) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary and secondary education in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; and includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains public elementary or secondary schools.

(e) The term "public elementary and secondary schools" means schools providing education in the kindergarten and in the first twelve grades beyond the kindergarten, under the public supervision and control of a local educational agency and without tuition charge to resident pupils.

(f) The "public school expenditures" of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments received under Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, and other payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources).

(g) (1) A "State's effort" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the State's expenditure per public school pupil in such fiscal year by (B) the income per such pupil for the State for such year; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(2) A State's "base effort" for the fiscal year means the average State effort over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

(3) The "income per public school pupil" for a State or for all the States for any fiscal years means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(h) (1) The "national effort" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (B) the income per such pupil for all such States for such year.

(2) The average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five-fiscal-year period beginning July 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1964, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, by four.

(i) (1) The "expenditure per public school pupil" for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public school expenditures in such year by the number of its public school pupils for such year.

(2) The "national expenditure per public school pupil" for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (A) the public school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (B) the number of public school pupils in all such States for such year.

(j) The "per capita personal income" of the State and of the Nation for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of the latest data available from the Department of Commerce, except that the per capita personal income of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be deemed to be 75 per centum of the Nation's per capita personal income, and the Nation's per capita personal income shall be computed without regard to persons residing in such areas.

(k) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, per capita personal income, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public school

pupil, per capita personal income, shall be conclusive for purposes of this Act, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

The questions and answers, and tabulation presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, are as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE PUBLIC EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963

1. What organizations are making this proposal available?

The proposal follows the basic principles of the Bipartisan Citizens Committee for Federal Aid for Public Elementary and Secondary Education and the policies of the Council of Chief State School Officers. It is substantially within the policies of numerous organizations interested in public education.

2. What are its major purposes?

To achieve further improvement of public education in the national interest. The proposal would authorize allocation of Federal funds among the States on the basis of need and State effort. It would enable each State to allocate commingled funds from State and Federal sources among local school districts according to their relative educational needs, fiscal abilities, and economic capacities for purposes determined, after a careful statewide survey, to be relatively most important for the improvement of public education (sec. 101).

3. What would be the term and cost of the proposal?

It suggests a 4-year bill, with a complete district by district survey report and State proposal for fund distribution, supervision of expenditures and reporting during the first year (secs. 102, 106). The surveys would be made by the State educational agencies under the general supervision of a committee composed of public school authorities and lay citizens, and the cost would be \$6 million of unmatched Federal funds for all of the States (including American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) (secs. 104, 103, 105, 301(b)). The U.S. Commissioner of Education would certify the eligibility of each State to participate in the final 3 years of the program if such distribution plan has been formulated according to the provisions of title I and is certified by the State educational agency to the Commissioner as the distribution plan of the State (sec. 107).

The Federal cost would be on the order of \$500 million annually for the final 3 years (secs. 201, 202).

4. What is the formula for Federal allotments to the States?

The basic Federal allotment during each of the last 3 years is 2 percent of public school current expenditures in each State. In addition, each State except the one having the highest average per capita personal income would receive 6 times the percentage by which its average income falls below that of the State having the highest average income, multiplied by the 2 percent basic allotment. To illustrate, a State 50 percent below the average income of the State with the highest income would receive the basic 2 percent increased by 6 by 50 percent or 300 percent of its basic allotment. Thus the total allotment of this low income State would be 2 percent plus 6 percent, or a total of 8 percent of its current expenditures. A State with income falling 25 percent below that of the highest State would receive 2 percent plus 150 percent of 2 percent, or a total of 5 percent of its current expenditures; a State with average personal income 10 percent below that of the highest State would receive 2 percent plus 60 percent of 2 percent, or 3.2 percent of its current public school expenditures.

If more equalization among States is desired, an equalization factor of 7, 8, 9, or even

10 could replace the factor of 6 suggested here; if less equalization among States is desired, the factor could be reduced from 6 to 5, 4, or 3. This formula would give cumulative financial improvement of from 2 percent, 8 percent, 9 percent, 10 percent or more each year for the poorest State, after the fashion of a growth stock investment in educational improvement. It removes stumbling blocks of the past, such as counting pupils according to average daily enrollment, average daily membership, school-age population, total enrollment, etc. Current expenditures are substituted for pupil counting in the formula (sec. 202).

5. Purposes for which Federal funds may be expended.

Public elementary and secondary education purposes as defined by the State, but limited to the distribution plan of the State as approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education (sec. 204).

6. Matching by State appropriated funds.

The proposal includes variable State matching through State appropriations for this purpose. A State of average per capita personal income would match Federal funds dollar for dollar; a State 25 percent below the national average per capita income would match each Federal dollar with 75 cents; a

State 25 percent above the national average per capita personal income would match each Federal dollar with \$1.25 (sec. 206).

7. Maintenance of State and local financial effort: reward for effort.

The proposal penalizes reductions in State and local financing of schools by reducing the amount of Federal funds allotted. The policy is that the State shall not use the Federal public school funds to reduce State and local financial effort. On the other hand, the States would receive financial rewards for State and local financial effort because increased State and local expenditures would provide a larger base for computation of the Federal share in future years (sec. 205).

8. Payments to States and reporting on use of Federal funds.

Payments to the States would be made quarterly by the U.S. Treasury, after certification of the amounts for each State on an annual basis by the U.S. Commissioner of Education (sec. 203). Each State would make a complete report to the Commissioner annually according to the normal accounting procedures used for the State funds (sec. 207), but the distribution plan approved by the Commissioner would furnish guidelines for local-State and State-Federal accounting (sec. 106).

The Commissioner would submit the State reports to Congress not later than the January 1 following the close of each fiscal year, together with his recommendations for the next fiscal year (sec. 207).

9. Proposal concerning Federal control of education.

The draft contains a standard statutory prohibition of such controls (sec. 208).

The Federal funds are specifically commingled with State funds upon receipt by the State, and thereafter are deemed to be State funds to be distributed to local districts and their use reported upon under provisions of State law (secs. 204, 207). During the first year, carefully guarded discretionary authority has been given to the U.S. Commissioner of Education to approve State distribution, supervision, and reporting plans that meet Federal fiscal requirements (sec. 107). Subsequently, Federal administrative discretion is absent. The Congress reviews the annual State reports directly rather than having to rely entirely upon generalized Federal administrative reports based on Federal forms to which each State must have adapted its system of accounting as best it could.

State and local autonomy in education is completely protected in this proposal, and Federal control of State and local educational programs is made both illegal and impossible.

Official data—Estimated allotments to States under title II based upon total expenditures for public elementary and secondary education¹ and per capita income,² fiscal year 1963

State	Allotments to all States (2 percent of total expenditures, 1959-60 ³)	Percent that each State is below the national average per capita income in 1960	Additional allotment to States below national average per capita income ⁴	Total State amount	Total allotment percentage	State	Allotments to all States (2 percent of total expenditures, 1959-60 ³)	Percent that each State is below the national average per capita income in 1960	Additional allotment to States below national average per capita income ⁴	Total State amount	Total allotment percentage
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
50 States, District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	\$315,323,780		\$122,535,750	\$437,859,530		Mississippi	\$2,893,560	47	\$8,150,838	\$11,053,398	7.64
50 States and District of Columbia	314,015,060		120,572,670	434,587,730		Missouri	5,964,420	1	357,864	6,322,284	2.12
Alabama	3,817,300	34	7,787,292	11,604,592	6.08	Montana	1,276,720	9	689,430	1,966,150	3.08
Alaska	483,300		483,300	483,300	2	Nebraska	2,239,080	5	671,724	2,910,804	2.60
Arizona	2,795,120	10	1,677,072	4,472,192	3.20	Nevada	650,080			650,080	2
Arkansas	2,006,020	40	4,814,448	6,820,468	6.80	New Hampshire	821,940	7	345,216	1,167,156	2.84
California	40,413,380		40,413,380	40,413,380	2	New Jersey	11,916,880			11,916,880	2
Colorado	3,692,400		3,692,400	3,692,400	2	New Mexico	1,771,740	19	2,019,786	3,791,526	4.28
Connecticut	4,602,120		4,602,120	4,602,120	2	New York	34,464,780			34,464,780	2
Delaware	1,112,580		1,112,580	1,112,580	2	North Carolina	5,922,800	22	10,304,802	16,227,102	5.48
Florida	7,252,000	11	4,786,320	12,038,320	3.32	North Dakota	1,192,380	22	1,573,944	2,766,324	4.64
Georgia	4,870,040	28	8,181,666	13,051,706	5.36	Ohio	16,848,520			16,848,520	2
Hawaii	964,980			964,980	2	Oklahoma	3,706,720	17	3,780,852	7,487,572	4.04
Idaho	1,050,540	19	1,197,618	2,248,158	4.28	Oregon	3,704,580			3,704,580	2
Illinois	16,893,700			16,893,700	2	Pennsylvania	17,746,500			17,746,500	2
Indiana	8,553,180	2	1,026,384	9,579,564	2.24	Rhode Island	1,057,460			1,057,460	2
Iowa	4,680,080	10	2,808,408	7,488,128	3.20	South Carolina	2,711,160	37	6,018,774	8,729,934	6.44
Kansas	4,186,340	7	1,758,264	5,944,604	2.84	South Dakota	1,076,160	17	1,097,682	2,173,842	4.04
Kentucky	3,192,580	31	5,938,200	9,130,780	5.72	Tennessee	4,282,700	30	7,708,860	11,991,560	4.60
Louisiana	5,916,880	28	9,940,356	15,857,236	5.36	Texas	14,701,280	13	11,466,996	26,168,276	3.56
Maine	1,199,800	15	1,079,820	2,279,620	3.80	Utah	1,934,180	14	1,624,710	3,558,890	3.68
Maryland	5,668,380			5,668,380	2	Vermont	561,780	16	539,310	1,101,090	3.92
Massachusetts	7,345,460			7,345,460	2	Virginia	5,303,720	17	5,409,792	10,713,512	4.04
Michigan	16,196,060			16,196,060	2	Washington	6,262,440			6,262,440	2
Minnesota	6,969,880	8	3,345,540	10,315,420	2.96	West Virginia	2,435,440	25	3,653,160	6,088,600	5
						Wisconsin	6,740,840	2	808,902	7,549,742	2.24
						Wyoming	936,880			936,880	2
						District of Columbia	1,028,700			1,028,700	2
						American Samoa	5,200	25	7,800	13,000	5
						Guam	90,300	25	135,450	225,750	5
						Puerto Rico	1,178,280	25	1,767,420	2,945,700	5
						Virgin Islands	34,940	25	52,410	87,350	5

¹ Total expenditures within each State for public elementary and secondary education are assumed to be the total expenditures reported for public elementary and secondary day schools. They are for current expense, interest, and capital outlay including expenditures of public school building authorities. Expenditure data are obtained from preliminary statistics for 1959-60, and are for total revenue from all sources.

² Based on per capita income data for 1960. Per capita income for the territories is assumed to be 75 percent of the national average.

³ Allotments to all States were computed as the product of (1) 2 percent and (2) total expenditures within each State for public elementary and secondary day schools.

⁴ Additional allotments to States below the national average in per capita personal income were computed as 6 times the product of (1) the percentage which the State is below the national average per capita personal income and (2) the State allotment based upon total expenditures.

⁵ Expenditures for summer schools and adult education and community colleges are included with current expenditures for elementary and secondary day schools.

STEEL SHIPPING CONTAINER IDENTIFICATION ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is

marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel.

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

The bill (S. 1345) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel

unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the intended purpose of the Steel Shipping Container Identification Act is to (1) permit the buyers of steel shipping

containers to know when foreign steel is used in the manufacture of the containers, and (2) promote the use of steel produced in this country.

Customs laws in the United States do require that a foreign product be marked plainly with the country of origin in which it was produced. However, the courts sustain the fact that the authority and jurisdiction of the Bureau of Customs ends when the product has been released from its custody. In other words, while the bundles or coils of foreign sheet steel are marked with the country of origin, no agency of the United States under present regulations has any further jurisdiction over the marking or identification of products such as drums and pails which are ultimately manufactured from the imported sheet steel.

The proposed bill would require that drums and pails made of foreign steel be plainly marked with the country of origin of the steel and would place enforcement of the act under the jurisdiction of the Federal Trade Commission and would include their usual penalties for noncompliance. The act is not otherwise punitive and asks no special favors, tariff protection, or increased duties.

The Steel Shipping Container Institute believes that this bill, if enacted, will be of substantial value to the fabricators and purchasers of steel shipping containers. It would in turn benefit the basic steel industry and its employees through increased use of domestic steel, thereby curtailing unemployment resulting from the use of imported steel.

As a matter of information, here are the latest available hourly employment costs of American versus foreign steel workers, which include direct and all supplemental wage costs: Japan, 63 cents, European Coal & Steel Communities, \$1.25, and United States, \$3.99.

In the State of Pennsylvania, in addition to the basic steel producers, there are six members of the Steel Shipping Container Institute:

Manion Steel Barrel Co., Rouseville, Pa., U.S. Steel Products, division of U.S. Steel Corp., Sharon, Pa., Standard Can Corp., Leetsdale, Pa., Virginia Barrel Co., division of the Greif Bros. Cooperage Corp., Eddystone, Pa., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., container division, Lancaster, Pa. and Philadelphia, Pa., U.S. Barrel Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

In conclusion, the Steel Shipping Container Institute believes that this legislation will be of great benefit to the steel industry, the steel shipping container industry, and to the general public in the State of Pennsylvania.

COMPACT BETWEEN NEW MEXICO AND COLORADO GOVERNING COSTILLA CREEK

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. MECHEM], my colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and myself, a bill to give the consent of Congress to an amended interstate compact entered into by the States of New Mexico and Colorado governing Costilla Creek.

Costilla Creek arises in Colorado, crosses the Colorado-New Mexico boundaries three times above its confluence with the Rio Grande in New Mexico. The original compact between the two States was entered into in 1944 for the purpose of apportioning the use of Costilla Creek waters between the two States and for resolving jurisdictional conflicts in regard to the appropriation, diversion and use of water from the creek to irrigate lands on both sides of the boundary.

The amended compact permits the Colorado users to change their point of diversion to a different interstate delivery point. This change, agreed to by both parties to the compact, is permitted on condition that a stated fraction of water be diverted at the original point in order to compensate for losses.

Neither the original nor the amended compact establishes any general principle or precedent in respect to any other interstate stream.

I would hope, Mr. President, that action can be taken on the bill soon. The legislatures of the States of Colorado and New Mexico have ratified this amended compact and the consent of Congress is the final step.

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

The bill (S. 1346) to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STUDY OF FREIGHT RATES FOR SMALL GRAINS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, a serious maladjustment in freight rates for small grains exists in many areas of the Midwest. A thorough investigation is needed and corrective action should be taken.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make a full and complete investigation of the situation and to recommend remedial measures.

My State of North Dakota faces a particularly bad problem, because the costs of shipping grain to markets are disproportionately high, putting the State at a serious competitive disadvantage. Adjustments would benefit not only farmers but also shippers and common carriers.

Not since 1934 has the ICC made a comprehensive, general investigation of freight rates on grains in the West. It is time for a complete analysis of the situation to eliminate discriminatory rates.

The North Dakota State Legislature took cognizance of the problem in approving House Concurrent Resolution R-1. The joint resolution that I am introducing today is aimed at relieving an unfair situation not only for my State but for other areas in the Midwest, as well. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed at this point 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. 70) to provide for an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of railroad freight rates applicable to shipments of grain in carload lots from States in the Midwest region of the United States, introduced by Mr. BURDICK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, 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, That the Interstate Commerce Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study of freight rates charged by carriers subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act for the shipment of grain in carload lots from the various States in the Midwest region of the United States, for the purpose of determining whether any such rates are discriminatory in any way. The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Congress as soon as practicable. Such report shall include a description of any action taken or proposed by the Commission to remove any discrimination determined to exist, and any amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act which the Commission recommends, as a result of such investigation and study.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 915, to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects, and that it be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the reasons for the request be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The senior Senator from New Jersey, who introduced S. 915, and the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee have agreed to this move. Transferral is requested because of the broadly similar objectives of S. 915 and S. 855, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and subsequently to the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. S. 915 seeks to encourage planning and programing of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require the Housing and Home Finance Administrator's approval of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal financial assistance. S. 855 seeks to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local grant applications. Both measures, then, deal with the general topic of metropolitan planning prob-

lems. Wisdom would seem to indicate that they should be analyzed in conjunction with one another.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 200) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee. This relates to the "muster-out payments" section of the veterans laws which is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON SENATE COMMITTEE STAFFING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year the majority leader and I, after an understanding, caused a study to be made by the Library of Congress with respect to the staffing of the Senate. I believe a similar study was made by the House of Representatives. Only a few copies have been made available, but I think the study should be made available to all Members of the Senate. I have discussed this proposal with the distinguished majority leader. I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to the majority leader and to me, together with the report from the Library of Congress, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.

The Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: Enclosed herewith is a report on committee staffing in the Senate, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service in response to the joint request of Senator MANSFIELD and yourself.

The report is based on information obtained in interviews with committee and subcommittee chairmen and ranking minority members, and with staff directors and a number of minority staff members. The interviews of necessity were of varying duration, were informal in nature, and were conducted with the understanding that neither individuals nor committees would be identified by name.

Members of the Service staff participating in the interviewing included Gustav Peck, James P. Radigan, and John Kerr Rose, senior specialists; and Mary Louise Ramsey, legislative attorney. Lester S. Jayson, Deputy Director, was closely associated with the study at all stages. He and Mr. Radigan were chiefly involved in the drafting of the report, with assistance from the others named. Dr. George B. Galloway, with whom Senator MANSFIELD and you had some discussions preliminary to our undertaking the study, was unable to participate in its preparation because of his commitments during recent months as executive secretary to the U.S. delegation to the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union.

We are forwarding also a compilation entitled "Statistics on Senate Committee Staffs, 1947-59," prepared in our American Law Division by Margaret Fennell. This is a bulky document, but it may be useful for reference purposes. Differences of opinion

have frequently arisen over the extent to which the size of committee staffs has increased since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Comparisons based on the total number of persons employed within a given period, or on the payroll on a given date, may, of course, be misleading. The accompanying compilation, drawn from committee reports which were required to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from 1947 through 1959, shows not only how many persons were employed by each committee in each reporting period, but also the nature of their positions and just how long they were employed. The compilation could not be extended beyond 1959 because of a change in the reporting procedure in January 1960.

May I take this opportunity to express, on behalf of the members of our Service who participated in this study, our appreciation for the cooperation and time which so many Senators and committee staff members gave us.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH L. ELSEBREE,
Director.

SENATE COMMITTEE STAFFING

(A study prepared at the request of the Honorable MICHAEL J. MANSFIELD and the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN by the Legislative Reference Service, February 19, 1963)

This survey of Senate committee staffing was undertaken in response to the request of Senator MANSFIELD and Senator DIRKSEN and with the cooperation of the committees themselves.

Through informal interviews by members of the Legislative Reference Service staff with committee and subcommittee chairmen, ranking minority members, staff directors, and minority staff members, information was sought on the development of staffing by the different committees, the policy and practice with reference to minority staffing, and suggestions from the members as to how staffing might be improved.

Interviews were held with 15 of the 18 chairmen and 12 of the 14 ranking minority members of the 18 standing and select committees; and with 13 of the 16 chairmen and 9 of the 12 ranking minority members of 20 subcommittees having separate staffs. Many of the chairmen and ranking minority members of subcommittees that do not have separate staffs were also interviewed. In all, interviews were held with 53 Senators, 27 majority and 26 minority.

Interviews were held also with 18 staff directors of the standing and select committees, and with 19 staff directors of subcommittees having separate staffs. Eight minority staff members were interviewed on committees and subcommittees where there was a definite separation of staff between majority and minority. In all, 45 interviews were held with staff members.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMITTEE STAFFING

The pertinent statutory provisions applicable to committee staffing are contained in section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a, Senate Manual, secs. 275.1, 275.3):

"(a) Each standing committee of the Senate * * * (other than the Appropriations Committee) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members * * * on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office;

¹ The number of interviews sought was less than the total number of positions because in several instances one Senator occupied more than one position. In a few instances a Senator designated one of his staff to represent him in the interview with the member of the Legislative Reference Service.

and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned them.

"(c) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable; * * *. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work."

Information obtained in the interviews and summarized herein shows that as a result of established practice and the adoption of special resolutions, present staffing organization and procedures differ in a number of respects from those outlined in the act.

Size of committee staffs

Excluding the Appropriations Committee, the Legislative Reorganization Act authorizes a maximum of 170 employees (68 professional and 102 clerical) for the 17 standing and select committees. At the time of the interviews, there were 255 employees (116 professional and 139 clerical) on the committee staffs, not including employees of subcommittees having separate staffs. This is 85 employees (48 professional and 37 clerical) over the number authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act. The additional employees are accounted for as follows: Two committees, Foreign Relations and Judiciary, have had a total of 6 additional positions (3 professional and 3 clerical) authorized on a permanent basis; 90 employees (50 professional and 40 clerical) were authorized by special resolutions. As against these additions, staff directors of 5 committees reported having altogether 11 positions less than the full number authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act.

A breakdown of the relative size of committee staffs as reported is as follows:

Number of committees:	Total number of employees
6.....	10 or less
1.....	11
2.....	12
2.....	14
1.....	15
1.....	19
1.....	20
1.....	27
2.....	31

The number of employees classified by staff directors as professional and clerical on these committees is as follows:

Number of committees:	Total number of employees
6.....	4 or less
3.....	5
1.....	6
1.....	7
3.....	8
1.....	13
1.....	15
1.....	18

² The interviews covered a period of over 3 months. There have been variations in the total number of employees during this period, and since that time. The staffs of the joint committees are not included in this study.

Clerical employees

Number of committees:	Total number of employees
7.....	6 or less
4.....	7
3.....	9
1.....	13
1.....	14
1.....	16

Subcommittee staffing is not circumscribed by any statute or Senate rule. Many subcommittees are staffed with staff members of the full committee. Twenty subcommittees, however, have separate staffs, authorized by special resolutions. According to figures furnished during the interviews, there are a total of 196 employees (116 professional and 80 clerical) on these subcommittees. A breakdown of the relative size of subcommittee staffs and of the number of employees classified as professional and clerical on these subcommittees is as follows:

Total subcommittee staffs

Number of subcommittees:	Total number of employees
14.....	10 or less
1.....	11
1.....	14
1.....	15
1.....	27
1.....	28
1.....	35

Professional employees

Number of subcommittees:	Number of employees
12.....	4 or less
2.....	6
2.....	7
1.....	8
1.....	17
1.....	18
1.....	21

Clerical employees

Number of subcommittees:	Number of employees
16.....	6 or less
1.....	8
2.....	10
1.....	14

Staffing of the Committee on Appropriations is treated separately here because it is separately provided for in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Under that act, 2 U.S.C. 72a (b), the number of professional and clerical employees is determined by a majority vote of the committee. At the time of the interview the staff comprised 33 employees (24 professional and 9 clerical).

The total number of Senate committee and subcommittee employees, according to the information submitted during the interviews and summarized above, is indicated to be 484, of whom 256 are classified professional and 228 clerical.

It is evident from the interviews that practice is not uniform in classifying employees as professional or as clerical. Since the act does not provide definitions nor establish classification standards, it is natural that there should be varying interpretations. There seems to be no difference of opinion as to the classification of economists, engineers, lawyers, political scientists, etc., as professional, and as to the classification of stenographers, typists, or minor clerks as clerical. Different practices do obtain, however, in the classification of chief clerks, assistant chief clerks, administrators, and investigators.

Differing opinions were expressed in the interviews concerning the extent to which staff had grown since enactment of the Reorganization Act. Because the facts in this regard have frequently been in issue over the years, it seemed desirable to gather as precise information as was available. The accompanying report, "Statistics on Senate

Committee Staffs, 1947-1949," shows the development in the size of each committee and subcommittee staff for the period covered.³

Opinions expressed in the interviews by Senators and staff members differed as to the adequacy of the size of present committee staffs. (Minority staffing will be discussed separately, below.) A frequent comment was that the Reorganization Act's limitation of 10 staff members for each committee was unrealistic in view of the wide difference in committee workloads. Several Senators expressed the opinion that the use of special resolutions to provide for employees in excess of the 10 authorized in the act gives better control over the size of staffs than would be likely to result from amendment of the act.

Some of those interviewed thought that committee staffing was still inadequate in spite of enlargement by special resolutions. Views were expressed that paucity of staffing had led to the proliferation of special investigations and subcommittees; to a shift in the initiative in policymaking from the Congress to the Executive; to legislating in the dark; to legislating without a basis of real research; to placing much of the burden of committee work on the members' office staffs; to foreclosing the possibility of any real help for the minority; and to precluding any but the senior members of some committees from obtaining significant staff assistance. Some spoke of the need for separate or larger subcommittee staffs.

While each of the above views was expressed by more than one or two Senators, it should be emphasized that the Senators generally, although not always, were referring to committees with smaller staffs, and also that a substantial number of Senators regarded existing staffs as generally satisfactory as far as size is concerned. Many placed greater importance on the need for competency of staffs than on their enlargement.

Appointment and tenure

The Legislative Reorganization Act provides that the professional and clerical employees of the committees shall be appointed upon a vote of the majority of the committee. This provision does not apply to employees appointed under authority of special resolutions, a category which includes some standing and select committee employees and all employees of subcommittees having independent staffs.

It appears from information obtained in the interviews that staff appointments generally are made by committee chairmen rather than by vote of the majority of the committee. Minority employees are usually appointed by the chairmen after consultation with, or on the recommendations of, the ranking minority members. A number of Senators expressed the view that the selection of staff employees was too dependent on the chairmen, or ranking minority members in the case of minority staff.

No attempt was made to examine in detail the tenure of committee staffs. Of the staff members of the 18 standing and select committees, approximately 62 percent occupy

³ The data were compiled from the personnel reports which every Senate committee was required to make semiannually to the Secretary of the Senate under the Legislative Reorganization Act as implemented by S. Res. 123, 80th Cong., 1st sess. (1947), and which had to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This form of reporting procedure was terminated in January 1960 when S. Res. 123 was repealed by S. Res. 213, 86th Cong., 2d sess. (1960), because it was believed to be substantially duplicative of other types of reports filed by the committees. Since the latter reports do not provide some of the detailed data which are the basis for the accompanying statistical breakdown, the tabulation could not be extended beyond 1959.

so-called permanent positions authorized by the Reorganization Act and approximately 38 percent occupy positions authorized by special resolutions enacted on an annual basis. Information supplied in the interviews indicated that in general staff members of both types have had tenure in the sense of continued employment over many sessions and Congresses. This has apparently been the case also with respect to subcommittee staffs. There was little comment pertaining to tenure made in the interviews.⁴

Types of staffing

Section 202 of the Reorganization Act provides that the professional members of committee staffs are to be appointed "without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. * * * Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them." With respect to clerical staff, the act provides that they shall "be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable." The act states further that the clerical staff "shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work."

Information obtained in the interviews disclosed that committee staffs differed widely in respect to the above matters. At least three different types of staff are now to be found: (1) staffs commonly referred to as nonpartisan, the members of which are selected solely on the basis of merit and without regard to political affiliation, and none of whom are designated either formally or informally as "majority" or "minority" staff members; (2) staffs whose members are sponsored by majority or minority but who work together as a team serving members of both parties, in varying degrees; (3) staffs whose members are divided, in varying ratios, between majority and minority not only as to sponsorship but as to working relationships as well.

While these three general types of staffing may be observed, it is also apparent that each committee staff differs in some respects from others even in the same group. Most of the staff directors interviewed tended to place their staff within the second type.

There were among the Senators and staff members interviewed strong supporters for each of the above types of committee staffs. Most of those who supported a particular type of staffing qualified their support by stating that this type would not necessarily be the best type for all committees. There was a reluctance to prescribe any across-the-board principle or formula in this regard.

STAFFING FOR THE MINORITY

Interviews with Senators and staff directors revealed a highly complex situation as to the facts, considerable disagreement as to which members of the committee staffs should be counted as minority employees in any enumeration of such employees, and a variety of views as to what ought to be done on the subject of staffing for the minority.

To begin with, there is no uniform understanding as to the meaning of the term "minority employee." On some committee staffs there are positions specifically labeled

⁴ The permanency of tenure of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations bears mention. Of 24 professional staffers, all except 1 have service ranging from 6 to 50 years. All except 4 have over 10 years service and of these 4, 3 have 8 years and 1 has 6 years.

"minority," for example, "minority clerk," or "minority counsel." There was substantial agreement that the number of minority employees would be understated if only those so labeled were included. Some thought that staff members known to have been sponsored by minority Senators ought to be included, along with those specifically designated minority employees. Others would include both of the above plus staff members known to be affiliated with the minority party. Members of the minority generally were of the opinion that the latter two definitions were too broad. They stated that many staff members, although originally minority sponsored or affiliated, could not, after years under the control of the majority, be considered minority employees.

Another possible basis would be to classify employees in accordance with the manner actually employed, designating each one "majority," "minority," or "nonpartisan" depending upon where his time was primarily devoted. While the manner in which staff members were actually employed was obviously given some weight by those interviewed, no precise or comprehensive data of this nature existed or could have been developed without elaborate investigation.

In light of these difficulties and divergences in terminology, it was not practicable to lay down an arbitrary definition. Each staff director did, however, report the number of professional and clerical employees on the staff of his committee or subcommittee who, in his best judgment, should be classified as "majority," "minority," and "nonpartisan." It should be emphasized that the figures below are drawn from the data furnished by the staff directors. It is obvious that other figures could be produced, depending upon the concepts of the compiler and the intimacy of his knowledge of the background of staff members and their appointments and the nature of their actual employment.

Full committee staffs

Of the 116 professional employees on the 17 standing and select committees (the Committee on Appropriations being excluded), 33 were reported to be nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 59 as majority, and 24 as minority. Of the 139 clerical employees on these committees, 78 were reported as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 46 as majority, and 15 as minority.⁵

(a) Professional employees: The 59 professional employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 13 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as majority	Total
Number of committees:		
2.....	1	2
3.....	2	3
1.....	3	3
2.....	4	12
1.....	5	5
1.....	9	9
1.....	10	10
1.....	12	12
Total (13).....		59

⁵ The Committee on Appropriations with a staff of 33 employees (24 professional and 9 clerical) were reported to have 20 majority and 4 minority employees on the professional staff, and 8 majority and 1 minority on the clerical staff. It is generally recognized, however, that this committee staff functions on a nonpartisan rather than a partisan basis.

The 24 professional employees reported as being minority employees were distributed among 12 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as minority	Total
Number of committees:		
7.....	1	7
3.....	2	6
1.....	5	5
1.....	6	6
Total (12).....		24

The 33 professional employees reported as being nonpartisan were distributed among 8 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows: a total of 24 of them were reported to be with 4 committees all of whose staff members were reported as nonpartisan; the remaining 9 were distributed among 4 committees, 3 committees having 2 each, and 1 committee having 3.

The ratios of professional employees reported as being majority to those reported as being minority on the 13 standing and select committees which reported one or more employees as being majority or minority (the 4 nonpartisan committees being excluded) were as follows:⁶

Ratio of majority to minority professional employees

Number of committees:		
3.....	1:1	
1.....	2:0	
3.....	2:1	
2.....	3:2	
2.....	4:1	
1.....	5:1	
1.....	12:1	

(b) Clerical employees: The 46 clerical employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 9 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Clerical employees reported as majority	Total
Number of committees:		
1.....	2	2
3.....	3	9
2.....	4	8
1.....	5	5
1.....	7	7
1.....	15	15
Total (9).....		46

The 15 clerical employees reported as being minority employees were distributed among 11 of the 17 standing and select committees as follows:

	Clerical employees reported as minority	Total
Number of committees:		
7.....	1	7
4.....	2	8
Total (11).....		15

The 78 clerical employees reported as being nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation were distributed among 10 committees as follows: a total of 58 of them were re-

⁶ In some instances committees reporting majority and minority employees also reported employees as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation.

ported to be with 6 committees all of whose clerical staff members were reported as nonpartisan; the remaining 20 were distributed among 4 committees, 1 committee having 2, 1 having 3, 1 having 6, and 1 having 9.

The ratios of clerical employees reported as being majority to those reported as being minority on the 11 standing and select committees which were said to have both majority and minority clerical employees (the 6 committees whose entire clerical staff were reported as nonpartisan being excluded) were as follows:⁷

Ratio of majority to minority clerical employees

Number of committees:		
1.....	1:1	
1.....	2:1	
2.....	3:1	
1.....	3:2	
1.....	4:1	
1.....	5:2	
1.....	7:2	
1.....	15:1	
2.....	0:1	

Subcommittee staffs

Of the 116 professional employees on the 20 subcommittees with separate staffs covered by interviews, 9 were reported as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 76 as majority, and 31 as minority. Of the 80 clerical employees on these subcommittees, 35 were reported as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation, 32 as majority, and 13 as minority.

(a) Professional employees: The 76 professional employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 19 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as majority	Total
Number of subcommittees:		
7.....	1	7
4.....	2	8
1.....	3	3
2.....	5	10
2.....	6	12
1.....	7	7
1.....	11	11
1.....	18	18
Total (19).....		76

The 31 professional employees reported as being minority employees were distributed among 16 of the 19 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

	Professional employees reported as minority	Total
Number of subcommittees:		
13.....	1	13
1.....	3	3
1.....	6	6
1.....	9	9
Total (16).....		31

The 9 professional employees reported as being nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation were distributed among 2 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees, 7 such employees being with 1 subcommittee and 2 with another.

The ratios of professional employees reported as being majority to those reported as

⁷ See footnote 6.

being minority on the 20 separately staffed subcommittees were as follows: *

Ratio of majority to minority professional employees

1.....	0:1
4.....	1:0
3.....	1:1
4.....	2:1
1.....	3:1
2.....	5:1
3.....	6:1
1.....	7:9
1.....	11:6

(b) Clerical employees: The 32 clerical employees reported as being majority employees were distributed among 11 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

Number of subcommittees:	Clerical employees reported as majority	Total
5.....	1	5
2.....	2	2
2.....	3	6
1.....	4	4
1.....	7	7
1.....	8	8
Total (11).....		32

The 13 clerical employees reported as being minority employees were distributed

* See footnote 6.

among 8 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

Number of subcommittees:	Clerical employees reported as minority	Total
6.....	1	6
1.....	2	2
1.....	5	5
Total (8).....		13

The 35 clerical employees reported as being nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation were distributed among 9 of the 20 separately staffed subcommittees as follows:

Number of subcommittees:	Clerical employees reported as nonpartisan	Total
2.....	1	2
1.....	2	2
1.....	3	3
2.....	4	8
1.....	5	5
1.....	6	6
1.....	9	9
Total (9).....		35

The ratios of clerical employees reported as being majority to those reported as being

minority on the 12 separately staffed subcommittees (those subcommittees whose entire clerical staffs were reported to be nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation being excluded) were as follows: *

Ratio of majority to minority clerical employees

Number of subcommittees:	
1.....	0:1
1.....	1:5
2.....	1:0
2.....	1:1
1.....	2:0
2.....	3:1
1.....	4:0
1.....	4:1
1.....	7:1

Summary

The foregoing information indicates that at the time of the interviews there were a total of 484 committee and subcommittee employees comprising 256 professionals, of whom 155 were reported as majority, 59 as minority, and 42 as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation; and 228 clericals, of whom 86 were reported as majority, 29 as minority, and 113 as nonpartisan or of unknown political affiliation.

A breakdown of the composition of each of the committee and subcommittee staffs covered by the interviews, in terms of reported majority, minority, and nonpartisan or unknown political affiliation, follows:

* See footnote 6.

Committee staffs

	Professional	Clerical	Professional				Clerical			
			Majority	Minority	Non-partisan or unknown	Total	Majority	Minority	Non-partisan	Total
Total staff:										
33.....	24	9	20	4		24	8	1		9
31.....	15	16	9	6		15	15	1		16
31.....	18	13	10	5	3	18	2	2	9	13
27.....	8	19			8	8			19	19
20.....	6	14	5	1		6			14	14
19.....	13	6	12	1		13			6	6
15.....	8	7			8	8			7	7
14.....	7	7			7	7			7	7
14.....	5	9	2	1	2	5	5	2	2	9
12.....	8	4	4	2	2	8	3	1		4
12.....	5	7	4	1		5			6	7
11.....	2	9	1	1		2	7	2		9
10.....	5	5	4	1		5	4	1		5
9.....	4	5	2	2		4	3	2		5
9.....	5	4	3	2		5	3	1		4
8.....	4	4	1	1	2	4			4	4
7.....	2	5	2			2	4	1		5
6.....	1	5			1	1			5	5
Total (288).....	140	148	79	28	33	140	54	15	79	148

Subcommittee staffs

	Total staff	Professional	Clerical	Professional				Clerical			
				Majority	Minority	Non-partisan	Total	Majority	Minority	Non-partisan	Total
Subcommittee:											
1.....	35	21	14	18	3		21	8	2	4	14
2.....	28	18	10	7	9	2	18	1	5	4	10
3.....	27	17	10	11	6		17		1	9	10
4.....	15	7	8	6	1		7	7	1		8
5.....	14	8	6		1	7	8			6	6
6.....	11	7	4	6	1		7	3	1		4
7.....	9	6	3	5	1		6			3	3
8.....	8	4	4	3	1		4	3	1		4
9.....	8	4	4	2	1		6			2	2
10.....	8	5	3	2	1		3	4			4
11.....	7	3	4	2	1		3	1		1	2
12.....	5	3	2	2	1		3	1	1		2
13.....	5	3	2	2	1		2	2			2
14.....	4	2	2	1	1		2	1	1		2
15.....	4	2	2	1	1		2			1	1
16.....	3	2	1	1	1		2				1
17.....	2	1	1	1			1	1			1
18.....	1	1					1				
19.....	1	1					1				
20.....	1	1		1			1				
Total.....	196	116	80	76	31	9	116	32	13	35	80

While the statistics concerning minority staffing present in themselves a complicated issue, the interviews with the Senators made it clear that much more far-reaching issues than that of numbers are involved. The overwhelming number of minority Senators interviewed expressed in various ways the opinion that in a two-party legislature, each party should have staff assistance possessing that party's political philosophy and available to help minority members present the party's views on issues before the committees. To these Senators, the staffing needs of the minority are not met merely by virtue of the fact that committee staff assistance is available to majority and minority alike for development of background information, research, and general assistance of other kinds. Nor is it, according to them, met by the presence on the committee staff of employees originally sponsored by members of the present minority party but who are now under the control and influence of chairmen of the present majority party. What most of these minority Senators contended for was an extension of the principle of minority staff representation, recognized to some extent in the provision contained in nearly all special resolutions since 1957 to the effect that the minority shall be authorized to select one person out of those paid under authority of the resolutions.

While a few of these Senators suggested that there should be a fixed ratio across the board for committee staffs, such as 60 to 40, others thought that greater flexibility was desirable, on the grounds that the need for partisan staff assistance probably varied from committee to committee.

A substantial number of the minority Senators also expressed the view that the need for minority staffing was not met by the practice of having a member of the staff assigned to the ranking minority member, or to some other minority member. The powers of appointment, control, and dismissal of minority employees, most of these Senators believed, should be vested in the minority, in contrast to the practice of having "the ranking minority member's man" or "Senator X's man." A number of minority members noted that where only one professional staff position is assigned to the minority, the ranking minority member or other Senator who sponsors the minority staffer may demand all or most of his time, leaving the other minority members with little or no help. Ranking minority members interviewed rarely expressed dissatisfaction with the staff assistance they received, but at the same time the majority of them thought that assistance available to the rank and file of the minority might be inadequate.

Many minority Senators indicated that they receive satisfactory service on certain committees which have professional staff and on which there is no sharp difference of opinion along party lines. It was also said that on some committees having separate majority and minority staffs minority members do request and receive highly satisfactory service from the majority staff. On such committees majority members sometimes seek and receive help from the minority staff. This may be done because of the special competence of a staff member on a particular subject, or because he happens to be available at the time. On rare occasions, it reflects a preference for the service of a staff member assigned to the opposite party.

However, it appears from the interviews that many minority members ordinarily do not call on majority staff for anything more than routine information. Some minority members indicated that even when a majority staff member would be available to undertake their work, they are not convinced that a staff member controlled by the majority could give them the service they need on

controversial matters without jeopardizing his tenure.

Of the majority Senators interviewed, a substantial number opposed separate majority and minority staffing, and, on the whole, seemed to be satisfied with the existing makeup of the staffs of their respective committees. Some expressed the view that the function of the staff is to prepare background and factual material and to analyze problems thoroughly to bring out the facts upon which the committee must act, and that partisanship could not serve this purpose. These Senators personally favored nonpartisan staffing but noted that the principle had not been consistently practiced on most committees; there were comments that while nonpartisan staffing is ideal in principle, it is not easy to apply. A number of majority Senators thought there were some committees which, because of the controversial nature of the issues within their jurisdiction, probably could work better with separate majority and minority staffs.

A smaller number of the majority Senators interviewed favored partisan staffing, on the same grounds put forward by the minority Senators.

The majority Senators interviewed, whether proponents of nonpartisan or partisan staffing, felt that staffing assistance should be available to the minority, and, while very few expressed any definite opinion as to the adequacy of staff available to the minority at the present time, most chairmen, and staff directors interviewed stated that the service of the entire committee staff is available to minority members, even on committees, and subcommittees which have a separate minority staff.

Some Senators commented that the real minority on some committees or subcommittees is the conservative or liberal group, as the case may be, rather than the minority party group. These Senators felt that such committees should have experts representing different shades of opinion in their respective fields.

LIST OF SENATORIAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

The comments and suggestions set forth below are not isolated statements by individual Senators, but rather a paraphrasing of views expressed by at least several Senators and considered of real importance by them. Most of these comments and suggestions have been referred to in the earlier parts of this report, in the discussion of the particular matters to which they relate. It may be useful, however, as emphasizing the large number and wide variety of views expressed, to bring them together in summary form.

Paucity of staffing of committees has led to shifting the initiative in policy making from the Congress to the Executive.

Paucity of staffing of standing committees has led to a proliferation of special investigations and subcommittees.

Lack of staff specialists in a field often leads to legislating in the dark.

Some committee staffs are so small they cannot do any real research.

Adequate technical staffing for both the majority and minority is necessary for good government.

Competence of staff is more important than numbers.

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 gives a better control over size of staffs than would increasing staffs generally on the basis of projected workloads.

Subcommittees generally are not as well staffed as standing committees.

Some committees or subcommittees are overloaded with patronage appointees.

Some subcommittees are used to obtain extra help for senatorial offices.

The small size of many committee staffs, regardless of the good intentions of the majority, forecloses any real help for the minority.

Worthwhile committee staff assistance on both the majority and minority side is available only to senior members.

The selection of personnel and the operation of committee staffs at the present time are too dependent upon personalities of the chairman and the ranking minority member.

A central roster of qualified persons should be maintained from which staff members might be drawn.

The present practice of having: "the chairman's man;" "the ranking minority member's man;" or "Senator X's man" should be abolished.

A nonpartisan staff is the proper setup for a committee as the function of a staff is to supply factual information on issues.

There is no such thing as a neutral nonpartisan staff.

A nonpartisan staff is too often nothing more than a funnel for the views of the departments over which the committee exercises oversight.

In a two-party legislature each party should have staff assistants who possess the same political philosophy.

Minority staff members should be allowed more participation in the setting-up and conduct of hearings and in questioning witnesses.

Committee staff members should work for the committee.

The appointment and dismissal of minority employees of a committee should be under the control of the minority of the committee.

Minority staff should work for the minority primarily but should work as part of the whole staff.

The smaller the minority the greater the need for staff.

Many longtime employees appointed or sponsored by Republicans have, over the years, adopted nonpartisan or Democratic viewpoints.

Representation of minority on staffs should be on some formal basis, possibly 40 percent.

There should be no fixed rule as to committee setups; flexibility in meeting the needs of each individual committee should be permitted.

The minority on a committee is not necessarily Republican, it may be conservative or liberal.

In staffing, recognition should be given, when it exists, to different points of view in the same party.

Competent staff to serve all shades of political opinion would be ideal.

Committees should have experts of different points of view available in their respective fields.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Will not it be desirable also to have it published as a Senate document, so it will be more easily accessible for distribution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I adopt the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon; and I ask that, in addition, the staff report be printed as a Senate document.

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

FALSE ADVERTISING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 1249, which I introduced on April 1, 1963, to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and

false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products.

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

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 1274, the Area Redevelopment Act, introduced by me on April 4, 1963.

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

"OPEN ARMS" CAMPAIGN IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the proclamation, last week, by President Ngo Dinh Diem, of an "open arms" campaign is a commendable and significant political contribution to the effort to bring about peace and stability in South Vietnam. It has been under consideration for some time; and now that it has been announced, it is to be hoped that it will be pursued down the line with faithfulness and dedication, for they constitute the key to its potential effectiveness.

Similar efforts, ably pursued, went a long way in helping bring about internal peace in Malaya and in the Philippines, under President Magsaysay.

A campaign of positive amnesty to all except the hard-core Communists—and that is what the "open arms" announcement adds up to—could have similar results in Vietnam. President Ngo Dinh Diem has shown the way; and it is certainly in the interest of all concerned—Vietnamese and Americans—that the statesmanlike campaign he has announced should succeed.

RECLAMATION PAYS 5 TO 1 IN 61 YEARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Reclamation Pays 5 to 1 in 61 Years." The article was published on April 21 in the New York Herald Tribune.

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

RECLAMATION PAYS 5 TO 1 IN 61 YEARS

DENVER.—In the 61 years since President Theodore Roosevelt signed the Reclamation Act, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation has spent about \$4.5 billion, less than 10 percent of what the Defense Department spent last year. And it got its money back.

This comparatively modest figure for Government spending has accomplished what man has dreamed of for centuries. It has transformed wastelands into rich, useful areas and made the desert bloom.

Since President Roosevelt put his signature to the Reclamation Act on June 17, 1902, more than 8.2 billion unwatered acres have been reclaimed and put to use. More than 400 billion kilowatts of electricity have been generated by dams that store and release water and millions of dollars have been saved by flood preventive measures connected with reclamation projects.

HUGE WATER PROJECTS

The largest of these is the 10-State Missouri River Basin project. Running a close second is the vast Colorado River storage project, scheduled for completion in 1969, and covering 110,000 square miles in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Reclamation officials hasten to point out that the \$4.5 billion investment since 1905 has brought back \$21.2 billion in repayment of construction costs, value, and Federal tax payments. Water and power sales pay 92.6 percent of project costs, and the bureau does not begin construction of a project without signed contracts for water sales.

The Bureau, headed by Commissioner Floyd Dominy, is eyeing future projects, mainly in Idaho and Oregon.

KEYED TO PROGRESS

"Since water is the only physical ceiling on future progress in the West, the productive past considered only as a prologue to future resource development under the urgent pressures of lowering water tables and present and imminent water shortages," he said.

If reclamation plans for the future are far reaching, then so are the accomplishments. Reclamation Bureau facilities now of reclamation projects must be in operation include 216 multipurpose dams and reservoirs, 131 diversion dams, 27,810 miles of canals and lateral water ways, 9,767 miles of drains, 48 powerplants capable of producing 6,396,085 kilowatts of electricity, and 11,087 miles of transmission lines.

CHOOSING OUR ALLIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the plight in which our country finds itself denies us the luxury of choosing our allies to fight the ever-growing menace of communism. We direly need the friendship and association of people and governments unwilling to live side-by-side with the Communist regime of Moscow.

Too often there has been repetition of the statement that the purpose of the Communist bloc is to destroy our Nation and participate in its burial. I, of course, have a disbelief in dictatorships; however, if a foreign people are to have a dictatorship, I would want it friendly to the West, not allied to the Communist bloc.

As for Cuba, we should not be laboring with the idea that Castro, our enemy, should be removed, not by a friendly right-wing dictatorship, but only by a democratic form of government favorable to our cause. The latter situation, of course, would be the preferable one; but if that is not attainable, it will be to our advantage to have a government, whatever its form, that is hostile to the Communist bloc and friendly to the West.

We have helped to knock out Diefenbaker, weaken Macmillan, jar De Gaulle, and to be indifferent to Adenauer. Ultra leftwingers of our country want Franco of Spain and Salazar of Portugal eliminated, even though they are friendly to the cause of the West. We helped in the eradication of Batista and the establishment of Castro. As between Batista, who was friendly to the West, and Castro, who is hostile to it, it would have been far better for the Western Hemisphere and the people of the world to have continued Batista in power.

Finally, if we are to continue destroying our friends, our problems will grow more dangerous as time goes on. This we cannot endure. Manifestly, if we are to serve the best interest of our country, we must quit insulting and quit weakening the nations which wish to be friendly to our cause.

THE ADVOCATES OF FISCAL INTEGRITY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently many of us who have been discussing the need for fiscal integrity in this country and for reducing the unnecessary spending at the present level have been accused of having old-fashioned Puritan ethics and outmoded concepts of government. We have been told that the only way to move the country forward is to spend more of the people's money that we do not have and will not have for many, many years to come.

Recently, Mr. President, I came on a very thoughtful and entertaining article, published in the Wall Street Journal, which comments on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 13, 1963]

HOW TO PICK A POCKET OR TWO

To a smalltown fellow come to the big city it was bound to happen sooner or later, and finally it did. On the way to Wall Street, that den of iniquity, our pocket was picked in the subway, that haunt of the huddled masses.

Along with a couple of credit cards, an unfilled prescription for the drug store, and a shopping list from the lady of the house, this skillful disciple of Fagin made off with \$100, which for years we've kept secreted in the back of our wallet against such grave emergencies as running out of expense-account money in San Antonio or St. Paul.

Now being imbued with a Puritan ethic, we do not approve of pickpockets, especially those who pick our own. But in all honesty we must confess that purely from the standpoint of the Nation's economic balance sheet there was no net loss to the country. Indeed, if some of the economic theories bruited about today are correct, it could be argued that the Nation's economy had been helped thereby.

For our loss of \$100 was somebody else's gain of \$100, the one canceling out the other insofar as economic statistics are concerned. Furthermore, since there was a transfer of funds from one party to another there was a gain in the gross national product as well as the national income. The fact that we paid an exorbitant price for the service received; namely, a lesson in personal finance management—is no concern in abstract economics.

Finally, we suspect the unknown artist of the subway is less well endowed with worldly goods than we are, less likely to keep the money out of circulation as idle savings for a rainy day. So this transfer of our funds to his pocket probably resulted in an increase in the Nation's consumer spending.

Whatever our personal feelings, then, the result represents a consummation devoutly to be wished by the influential thinkers of the day. The whole object of current economic policy is to increase the transfer of funds, raising the statistics of national income and the gross national product, and especially such transfers of funds as may increase consumer spending. The sociologi-

cal objective is called the "redistribution of income."

Hence the great emphasis on Government spending, which has gotten to be a large part of the gross national product. There's no surer and more efficient way to transfer huge sums than to take taxes from citizens of, say, New York and spend them in New Mexico or Mississippi. According to this thinking, it's a further help if the dollars can be transferred from corporations and rich folk, who might have a proclivity toward savings, to the hands of those who will inject it more quickly into the spending stream.

We are told that the good effects of all this are enhanced if the Government, unlike our friend on the subway, can spend more than it takes or at least seem to. Big deficits, especially those arising from tax cuts, allow more dollars to be put in some people's pockets without appearing to take quite so much out of other people's pockets.

True, this is illusory; what the Government spends it must take away from somebody in some form. Nonetheless, there's no denying it's less painful to steal a bit from everybody's dollars by inflation than to take the money away from them in immediate taxes.

On the subway we had a blissful ignorance of being plucked until, much later in the day, we found ourselves less well off than we thought. And even now we think there must be many a helpful pickpocket who wishes that policemen understood the ethics of the new economics.

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, over a period of years we have been told by many persons that the liberals have the only true concept of government and are the only ones who understand what government is all about, and that somehow or other all conservatives are but a few centuries ahead of Louis XIV, and that is about all.

I hold in my hand an entertaining article, published on April 22 in the Washington Star, which goes quite clearly into the concept of liberals in government and what they are trying to avow, insofar as the concept of government is concerned. It seems to me the article is both timely and extremely pertinent to many of the debates in the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS—SOME ACCUSED OF CHAMPIONING LIBERTY WHILE FAVORING CREEPING COERCION

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Self-styled liberals are generally nicer people than sour-puss reactionaries.

It would be better to be cast away on a desert island with an outgoing and outgoing liberal than with a guy who's against everything including the construction of a raft. But this doesn't mean that liberal government is a good recipe for equity or human happiness. Many liberals suffer from smug assumptions about human behavior and political theory that simply don't jibe with reality.

They are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma. They honestly believe themselves to be champions of liberty while they favor creeping coercion as long as they can

be the authors of the coercion. They are so sure their theories are good for you that they think they are only doing you a favor when they tie you to a post, pry open your jaws, and pour their nostrums down your throat.

Willie Howard, the late great Jewish comedian, had a skit in which he impersonated a Communist holding forth in Union Square. "Comes da revolution," shouted Willie, "you'll eat strawberries and cream."

"But," protested someone in his stage audience, "I don't like strawberries and cream."

Willie assumed a contemptuous sneer, "Comes da revolution and you'll eat strawberries and cream."

This is not a bad description of the liberal formula for human happiness.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. Every time he sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually and with the best intentions he weaves a net of verbotens and must-do's that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible injustice, eventually you arrive at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes a contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation. When mulish taxpayers balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the sound theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. The argument: "If Oklahoma doesn't take the money, Maine will" is a potent one.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite logically at his advocacy of centralized power. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his greed. Federal aid to schools will provide more teachers without raising school district taxes. Ninety percent Federal highway money means that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Increased Federal relief means that local responsibility can be shirked. And so supergovernment grows and the liberal is delighted.

He is delighted because he questions whether local government will ever have adequate social vision. But he will see to it that the supergovernment has. There will be plans, bold plans of new frontiers entered into with vigor.

The liberal also seems to hold a double standard in the matter of human behavior. He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But the mugger in the park who stabs for \$20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong if there had been enough social legislation.

The liberal can't believe that removing the penalties for misbehavior or lack of performance could increase human cussedness and sloth. Instead, according to his theory, what we need are more social workers, more public housing, more youth clubs. And with them we keep getting more chiselers, more illegitimate children, more delinquency and crime.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He looks at labor-management problems as though the Pinkertons were still shooting the strikers at Homestead. The significance of Jimmy Hoffa eludes him. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing capabilities of the United Steel Workers. He is still chasing Commodore Vanderbilt and the beef trust.

The liberal thus deludes himself with the comfortable assurance that he is far-seeing,

a progressive, a man of the future. In his effort to cure injustice by piling on more government he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of government.

He has, with minor interruptions, been in power in America for 30 years. He is getting gray, and even a little quaint. He won't admit error or consider pragmatic results. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy. He is loving us to death.

CUBA FAILURE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many of us have been reporting, from all over the country, to our colleagues and to members of the administration, the complete confusion on the part of the American public as to what we are doing or what we are not doing in terms of trying to regain for the Cuban people, themselves, the control of their own government.

I have been among those who have felt that the policy of indecision has been so extreme that we have been left in a position of failure insofar as concerns the protection of other countries in Central and South America. The prestige of the United States has gone down sharply. We must develop a policy which will afford some assurance of success over the next few years. Such policy should include a process of giving to the Cubans themselves the right to control their own government.

In the New York Post for April 11, a columnist, Mr. William V. Shannon, who is rather noted for his support of the present administration, wrote an analysis of the Cuban situation under the title of "Cuban Failure." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

CUBA FAILURE

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration's rupture with Jose Miro Cardona, coming on the second anniversary of the mismanaged Bay of Pigs invasion, brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance, and moral confusion in America's relations with the Cuban revolution. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor, and we have no policy nor recourse save to wait for whatever good or bad tidings the future may bring. Events have passed out of our hands.

It is instructive to recall the state of affairs when Mr. Kennedy took office. Castro, having been in power for 2 years, had already allied himself with the Communists, broken with the liberal elements in the revolutionary coalition, and was far advanced in transforming an indigenous radical uprising into a self-shackled Communist dependency.

A brave and active underground movement against the dictator was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow. The United States which had encouraged Batista to depart and which had originally extended a sympathetic tolerance to the Castro government, was in a strong position to influence the course of events, both in its own national interest and in the interest of the freedom of the Cuban people. There were then no Soviet troops and no short-range Soviet missiles in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration took office seemingly committed to a clear and sound policy that this country would not permit a Communist Cuba. Since the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, the United States had taken the consistent position that we would not allow foreign countries to establish new colonies or export alien systems of government to this hemisphere. Since Castro had turned out to be only a stalking horse for the Communists, we had no alternatives except to force his departure or compromise our historic position.

There were only two ways to get rid of Castro. One was to organize a mixed invasion of Cubans and Americans under the aegis of a government-in-exile which we would recognize. The other was to organize sabotage, political subversion and economic pressure. This program could only have succeeded if the administration had been willing to make bold political decisions. In a revolutionary situation, the most effective alternative is usually a group only a shade less radical than the faction one is trying to overthrow. What was wanted was a political leadership for the Cuban underground-and-exile movement that shared most of Castro's original radical social and economic program but disavowed his terrorism and his links to Moscow. We shall never know if a left-of-center alternative, properly supported by the United States, could have brought Castro down. The President and his brother, Robert and their CIA and State Department advisers lacked the political sophistication and imagination to attempt it.

President Kennedy chose the more direct alternative of an invasion. Since the Cuban exiles ranged from radicals to reactionaries, a temporary coalition was pasted together under the presidency of Miro Cardona, an honorable man of centrist sympathies. But this coalition was not recognized as a government in exile. The administration also held back from providing the U.S. troops and planes necessary to bolster the exile force. Moreover, the CIA, with extraordinary political obtuseness, placed most of its reliance on the sons of the wealthy and on the supporters of the fallen Batista. In short, the White House policymakers avoided the political choices and the CIA made the wrong ones.

There was nothing wrong, in my judgment, with a mixed Cuban-and-American military intervention to throw out Castro except that once embarked upon, it could not be allowed to fail. President Kennedy did allow it to fail.

But there was no reason, after that single defeat, for panic or despair. The political alternative could still be attempted, although now under less favorable circumstances, or a second successful invasion could be properly planned and carried out. Instead, the administration did nothing. The 18 wasted months from April 1961 to October 1962, are in my opinion, a worse offense on the administration's record than the defeat of the Bay of Pigs invasion. What had appeared to be a firm resolve to get rid of Castro proved, after only one setback, to be made of jelly.

The only conclusion drawn from the events of April 1961, was that clandestine operations are impossible in a democracy. The exiles and the underground were simply written off as too divided and unmanageable. Micawberism—"Maybe something will turn up"—reigned.

What turned up were the Russian missiles. Khrushchev had not wasted those 18 months. Mr. Kennedy was able to force the Russians to withdraw the missiles by going to the edge of nuclear war. We are all grateful to him that his resolute firmness in October succeeded, but he is scarcely entitled to any credit for handling Cuban affairs in such a way that they produced a nuclear crisis. The introduction of the Soviet missiles com-

pletely exposed the shallowness of those, in the administration and in the general public, who thought we could happily co-exist with a Communist Cuba. Because we permitted Castro to stay in power, Khrushchev very nearly outflanked us on our defenseless southern border.

The long-range missiles are presumably gone, but Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was 2 years ago. We cannot get rid of Castro because his safety has now become linked with Khrushchev's prestige. Cuba has become like Berlin, a hostage in the cold war. The suppression of the Cuban raiders and the dropping of poor Miro Cardona constitute the final admission that we have met total defeat on the Cuban front. The Cuban people have been left to the mercies of their bearded tyrant.

DEATH OF DR. A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD, PRESIDENT OF YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, died on Friday, April 19, at New Haven, Conn. I knew him, served under him as a member of the Yale Council, respected him and held him in deep affection. But there are thousands of Yale students and graduates, members of the faculty, associates in the profession of teaching, and people in every walk of life who came in association with him, who were moved by his teachings and writings, and who felt his influence. His influence in thought and action moved far beyond the confines of Yale University, and had its bearing upon our Nation.

He has been described as an eloquent defender of academic freedom—and that description is correct. He was a strong believer in the fundamental soundness of our system of government and our political philosophy, and therefore he was not fearful of academic freedom, and freedom of inquiry throughout our Nation. He defended freedom, and advocated it, courageously and joyfully.

There is so much that he said to choose from, but I would like to quote the following:

The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths are of little value compared to the devotion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, "knows what he fights for and loves what he knows."

It is sad that his great abilities, his courage, his joyful spirit are lost to the Nation at the early age of 56 years. Our thoughts go out to his wife and family.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a number of editorials and articles relating to Dr. Griswold.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

YALE'S GRISWOLD—A LEADER OF MEN
NEW HAVEN, CONN.—A. Whitney Griswold, Yale's sixth president and a leading spokesman for higher education and academic

freedom, died of cancer yesterday in his home on the Yale campus.

The 56-year-old educator had been seriously ill for many weeks. The cancer had been first detected on January 19, 1961, when Dr. Griswold underwent an abdominal operation.

Dr. Griswold was the embodiment (although, if taxed, he would have denied it) of the "educated man" in whose behalf he devoted the greater part of his life. His wide-ranging interests encompassed music, student rows with the New Haven police, American policy in the Far East.

Alfred Whitney Griswold could say: "The strength of higher learning derives more directly from the liberal arts than from any other source. Take it away and you have the ruin of higher education."

He could, and did, after his first tussle with the university budget, write:

"Some insolvent evening,

"We will find an oil well

"Right under Woodbridge Hall * * *

Dr. Griswold was scholar and wit, administrator and author, stone-faced adherent to principle and gay social companion. He was one of Yale's youngest full professors and one of its youngest presidents. He became one of the world's most respected educators.

His selection to succeed Dr. Charles Seymour in the presidency was just as much a surprise to him as it was to a great part of the academic world. He and his wife, Mary, were in New York that February day and lunched with Dr. Roswell Ham, then president of Mount Holyoke College. Dr. Ham expanded on the worries and frustrations of such a post.

"Thank God," Dr. Griswold is reported to have said after their friend had left, "that we're not in that racket."

Moments later, he got a phone call informing him of his appointment by the Yale Corp. He returned to New Haven next day and accepted one of the most difficult posts in the world of education.

A colleague once called him "a very sudden man."

The then Secretary of State Dean Acheson (Yale 1915) and the late Senator Robert Taft (Yale 1910) were fellows of the corporation at that time and joined in the unanimous selection of the almost unknown history professor. Said Mr. Acheson: "Pull up your socks, boy, and get on with it."

Whether or not Dr. Griswold needed this admonition, the record shows that he did "get on with it." When he assumed the presidency of Yale, the endowment fund was just above \$121 million. By now it is more than \$375 million.

Under Dr. Griswold's leadership the faculty pay scale was more than doubled. As a result, there was assembled at Yale one of the finest university faculties in the English-speaking world.

His success in putting through salary increases was one of the accomplishments which gratified Dr. Griswold highly. He had campaigned for a higher scale long before he became president. While still an assistant professor, he had a rubber stamp with which he marked all the menu cards at Mory's. It read: "Raise faculty salaries."

THE MCCARTHY ERA

That, plus a thousand lesser problems, was the administrative side of the job, but this Yale president was much more than administrator and fundraiser. In 1952, when the McCarthy investigations had thrown many Americans into near hysteria over the supposed threat to civil liberties, Dr. Griswold remained the calm history scholar.

"Books won't stay banned," he said. "They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and

the inquisitor have always lost. The only sure weapon against bad ideas is better ideas."

On the other hand, in 1953, Dr. Griswold took a dim view of teachers who invoked the fifth amendment when questioned by congressional committees. He signed a report, by the Association of American Universities, which said that faculty members have a duty to cooperate in official investigations even when the "powers of legislative inquiry are abused."

"Above all, a scholar must have integrity and independence," the report said. "This renders impossible adherence to such a regime as that of Russia and its satellites * * * such membership extinguishes the right to a university position."

Six years later, and still very much concerned with Yale's finances, he withdrew the university from a part of a Federal program making money available for loans to needy students. Among the requirements was one that students seeking such loans should not only swear allegiance to the United States but also file an affidavit disclaiming membership in or support of any organization advocating the overthrow of the Government by violence.

ROOTS IN CONNECTICUT

"The negative affidavit," said Dr. Griswold, "partakes of the nature of the oppressive religious and political test oaths of history which were used as a means of exercising control over the educational process by church or state. The universities of the free world * * * have taken the lead in resisting and doing away with such oaths."

Like Yale itself, his roots were in Connecticut, although he was born on October 27, 1906, in Morristown, N.J. One ancestor was a colonial Governor of Connecticut. He was a direct descendant of two Governors of Connecticut, after it became a State, and a collateral descendant of two others. He was also a collateral descendant of Eli Whitney, inventor of the cotton gin.

He was graduated from Yale in 1929, dubbed by his classmates the "wittiest" and "most original" member. His first job, which lasted until the stock market crash, was with a Wall Street brokerage house. He commented later that "ours was probably the last class in history to leave New Haven on a magic carpet. Every one since 1929 has taken a day coach."

After the crash, he returned to Yale to teach freshman English and, except for studies abroad, never left that campus.

In 1930, he married Mary Morgan Brooks, of Scranton, Pa., a marriage that was to span 33 years and produce three daughters and a son, who survive him.

He had aspired early to be a writer but changed his major line of study from English to history and received his doctorate in that field in 1933. He began as an instructor and became a full professor 14 years later, at the age of 40.

During World War II, he directed two Army training schools at Yale. One was that which taught Americans how to handle civil government in occupied territories. The other was the foreign area and language study known as the Army specialized training program.

Dr. Griswold was a prolific writer. His articles on a wide variety of subjects appeared in periodicals as diverse as the New York Times magazine and Sports Illustrated. His books included "The Far Eastern Policy of the United States," "Farming and Democracy," "Essays on Education," "In the University Tradition," and "Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal."

He received honorary degrees from Trinity College, Princeton, Harvard, Jewish Theological Seminary, Columbia, Brown, University

of Pennsylvania, Wesleyan, and Johns Hopkins.

Dr. Griswold was an officer of the French Legion of Honor.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 20, 1963]

THE MEASURE OF A WARM AND MANY-FACETED MAN

(By Terry Ferrer)

There are those who say that Whit Griswold was the greatest college president in the East. There are those who say he was, above all, the finest history professor they ever had. There are those who insist he was the best essayist and writer in the academic world.

There are also those who know that Whit Griswold was a warm, witty, and generous man who every day did his utmost to raise the quality of whatever crossed his path, be it an academic program at Yale or a fresh defense of the academic freedom which he cherished so deeply.

Whit Griswold liked to open the door himself when a visitor came to the imposing president's house at 22 Hillhouse Road on the Yale campus. He would smile and crack a joke with his welcome. But always, he would thank you for bothering to come to see the president of Yale University.

A reporter recalls a day a few years ago when Dr. Griswold sent a car halfway across Connecticut to pick her up at the end of a meeting and bring her to New Haven. He wanted to make sure that a point in a forthcoming story was clear.

The point was minor, except that to Dr. Griswold nothing was minor. Every detail of a story, a fundraising drive, a speech, a decision, was vital, and he gave it his undivided attention and his driving energy.

We sat over tea in his living room as darkness fell. Thin and frail as he always was, he was not sitting in one of the deep armchairs, but was perched on a straight chair, the legs tilted back. Rocking precariously back and forth, his eyes burning with concentration, he talked of plans for Yale, to make it better, to make it more useful to society, to devise ways that the university could better prepare excellent teachers, could offer its undergraduates a true liberal arts education.

I asked him if he still had time for his music. When we had first met in 1951, the year after he became president, he had spent most of one evening at the piano, singing songs and parodies of his own making, singing songs usually heard at Mory's (where women are barred).

Quite typically, he answered that he was then taking flute lessons for relaxation.

Also quite typically, when he learned a few weeks ago that his cancer was inoperable, he left the hospital to go home—to do some work.

During his 13 years as Yale's president, Dr. Griswold changed the physical face of the campus as well as bolstering its academic climate. In 1960, he boldly embarked on Yale's first capital-funds campaign in 34 years. The goal: to raise the equivalent of \$69.5 million in new capital in 2 years. The money was in before the 2 years was over, and with \$5 million to spare.

Two new residential colleges, designed by the late Eero Saarinen, were built and opened, bringing the university's residential colleges to 12. Their soaring towers have added new beauty to the whole city of New Haven.

Last May, Dr. Griswold broke ground for a \$10 million science center. On that occasion, he said: "I am sick and tired of the use of the disparaging, not to say pejorative, term 'brick and mortar' as if these things were beneath the dignity of universities."

"Is it not remarkable," he continued, "that man throughout the ages has used

brick and mortar to express his highest ideals, his purest and noblest aspirations and that these structures are treasured by archaeologists and historians of art as among the most accurate measures of the progress and dignity of the human race?"

Dr. Griswold always reserved the right to give the baccalaureate address at Yale's commencement exercises. Each year he spoke movingly of God and man, his broad face solemn, his thinning sandy hair brushed straight back, his lanky frame straight and still. If he was not very tall, he seemed tall when he gave these sermons.

He was a man who did not scare easily. When the first Russian Sputnik went up in 1957, he refused to be drawn into the general panic and rush toward more science and mathematics. He insisted that a well-rounded, liberal arts education was the key to man's survival on this planet. Education, he maintained clearly and publicly, must aim for a triple competence, in the sciences, in the political and social fields, and in the arts.

When a "disclaimer" affidavit was required of students who wanted to participate in the student-loan program of the National Defense Education Act of 1953, Dr. Griswold was one of the first college presidents to declare that Yale would not participate in the program.

The negative affidavit required that, in addition to a loyalty oath, students sign an affidavit declaring that they did not believe in and were not members of an organization seeking the overthrow of the U.S. Government. Dr. Griswold likened the affidavit to "test oaths" through the centuries which had persecuted Catholics, Protestants, Quakers, and Puritans.

He lived to see the affidavit repealed and Yale in the Federal program.

Undergraduate, graduate student, instructor, professor and president—Whit Griswold was all of these at Yale, spanning 38 of his 56 years of life.

He once wrote: "Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled. If men are born loyal, the only kind of loyalty that survives infancy in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticism and even doubt."

This was the kind of loyalty Whit Griswold, gave to his university, the academic community and the society of all men.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald-Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

GRISWOLD WIT AND WISDOM

A. Whitney Griswold had a way with words, sometimes winning, sometimes withering, always to the point. He wrote and spoke with good humor, wit, and wisdom. Here are some selections from the Griswold record:

Intercollegiate football: "Undue deference to spectators has led the colleges to default to a certain extent on their professional competence * * *. This was tantamount to a surrender of academic freedom on the athletic field while (academic freedom) was being defended in the classroom." Athletic scholarships were "one of the greatest educational swindles ever perpetrated on American youth."

Society: "Conversation in this country has fallen upon evil days * * *. It is drowned out in singing commercials by the world's most productive economy that has so little to say for itself it has to hum it. It is hushed and shushed in dimly lighted parlors by television audiences who used to read, argue, and even play bridge, an old-fashioned card game requiring speech."

Cold war: "We are the world's greatest salesmen, but can't even talk intelligently about our greatest product—democracy."

Rule of law: "I think that law in the United States has suffered some retrogression

of recent date (1950's) * * *. I do not think that the full meaning and value of law are communicated to society through the law's own formal processes * * *. To be effective, the rule of law must be comprehended by society, not as an esoteric concept, but as a working principle comparable to regular elections and the secret ballot; and the plain fact is that it is not so comprehended. This, I think, is an educational deficiency."

Old-fashioned alumni: "We must take a hammer" to the popular image that pictures the American college alumnus as "the irascible member of the old guard who neither dies nor surrenders, fuming with rage (and perhaps a little bourbon) at his football tickets, or the coach, and dashing off sulfurous letters to his university beginning, 'I was shocked to discover that' and ending 'unless something is done about this at once I shall no longer contribute or remain, sincerely.'"

Race issue: "Among our many faults we have in particular a race problem; until we pluck that beam from our own eye we shall have a hard time getting rid of the mote in anybody else's."

Teacher training: "The whole teacher training curriculum has been frozen into law in many States. There are certification requirements, and if you will examine them you will find that many are the icicles of the old system of pedagogy."

Loyalty oaths: "The affidavit cannot create loyalty. Loyalty cannot be coerced or compelled. If men are born loyal, the only kind of loyalty that survives infancy in any thinking person is the kind that survives curiosity and withstands criticism and even doubt. Such loyalty may and usually does have an instinctive base; but if the opportunity to satisfy curiosity and answer criticism is limited, or qualified, or made conditional upon the acceptance of restraints, the instinctive base of loyalty is undermined."

"The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths are of little value compared to the devotion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, 'knows what he fights for and loves what he knows.'"

U.S. world role: "All the Russian earth satellites, all the Yankee-go-home legends chalked on walls of foreign cities, all the rocks thrown at our Vice President, have not disproved the fundamental soundness of our system of government and our political philosophy."

U.S. trivialities: "We have become too much a nation of lookers and listeners, a nation of spectators. Amidst the easy artificiality of our life, the plethora of substitutes for learning and thinking, the innumerable devices for avoiding or delegating personal responsibility for our opinions, even for having any opinions, the fine edge of our faith has been dulled, our creative powers atrophied."

Creativity: "Could 'Hamlet' have been written by a committee, or the 'Mona Lisa' painted by a club? Could the New Testament have been composed as a conference report? Creative ideas do not spring from groups. They spring from individuals. The divine spark leaps from the finger of God to the finger of Adam, whether it takes ultimate shape in a law of physics or a law of the land, a poem or a policy, a sonata, or a mechanical computer."

Congressional investigations: "Congressmen and Senators are not magistrates with roving commissions to go about the length and breadth of the land hailing people before them to respond to what they will. Congressmen and Senators are legislators, entitled to make inquiries and examine facts in support of their work as legislators. They

can readily get all the information they need about any topic without asking any person about his own past thoughts, beliefs or associations."

Destiny: "We would all like to know more perfectly our mortal destiny in order that we might steer more perfectly our mortal course. It would do us all good to understand more clearly the world of science as it would the world of humanities, for both are essential to an understanding of the true nature of the world in which man lives. We do not gain this unity of knowledge and understanding by delegating it to others. We shall not gain it from statistical measurements of our own inadequacies, or by inoculating one another with expedient doses of science and humanism."

[From New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 21, 1963]

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

The cause of freedom had no more devoted champion than Dr. Alfred Whitney Griswold. He brought to the presidency of Yale University a view of academic responsibility that ranged far beyond the broadening of the curriculum, the strengthening of the faculty or the augmentation of endowments. His concern was the advancement of man and the repelling of every assault on human liberty and dignity. Wit and good humor were part of his arsenal in that task, but so was a courage that scorned the cautions of more timorous colleagues.

He condemned loyalty oaths and all other efforts to legislate conformity. "Books won't stay banned," he once said. "They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost." The vigor and articulateness he marshalled against the suppressors of freedom contributed much to building a stronger America. His death of cancer at the age of 56 is a loss to the Nation, even more than it is a loss to Yale.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1963]

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

The motto of Yale University—"Lux et Veritas"—was upheld with honor by A. Whitney Griswold, president since 1950 of New Haven's great seat of learning. Early in his tenure, he resisted pressures intended to protect Yale undergraduates from the dangerous world of ideas. He felt that man and God could endure at Yale without limitations on the spirit of free inquiry—a conviction that was reflected in an influential statement on academic freedom prepared in 1953 by a committee of university presidents that Dr. Griswold headed.

A teacher and historian of international relations, Dr. Griswold proved a vigorous administrator as president. The endowment and physical plant grew at Yale—and, notably, so did faculty salary scales. Dr. Griswold had the belief, considered eccentric by some, that teachers should be generously paid as one measure of the country's esteem for learning. Now dead at a premature 56, Dr. Griswold's legacy is a flourishing university providing more light than ever before in the quest for truth.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1963]

GRISWOLD OF YALE

In the all-too-brief span allotted him, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold left an imprint neither time nor change will erode. His eloquent voice carried the message of freedom far beyond the elms of Yale University, whose presidency he filled for 13 years.

Judged as an administrator alone, Dr. Griswold made a remarkable record. His relentless work on behalf of faculty members nearly doubled their pay in a decade. Un-

suspected of money-raising skills, he nearly tripled the endowment fund. But he also more than tripled the budget for sciences, and in so doing, attracted such gifts as the \$10 million grant of C. Mahlon Kline for a new science center.

He championed free academic expression at Yale and elsewhere. He believed that no one who cares should be denied a liberal arts education as a means "to expand to the limit the individual's capacity, and desire, for self-education, for seeking and finding meaning, truth, and enjoyment in everything he does."

Most notably, through example and precept, Dr. Griswold elevated individual effort above "sterile and stultifying" committee action. He taught that neither Hamlet, nor the Mona Lisa, nor the New Testament could have been wrought by committee. Rather, he said, "the divine spark leaps from the finger of God to the finger of Adam."

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky in memorializing, as he has, the life of the president of Yale University. Dr. Griswold was one of our most gifted educators. I knew him personally. He made significant contributions toward American public and educational life. I join the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and all other Senators in an expression of sadness on hearing that he has been cut off at the most fruitful point in his life by the dread disease of cancer. If we needed anything to stir us to Herculean efforts to deal with the terrible scourge of cancer, we see in Dr. Griswold's passing an impressive example of what the disease has cost our world.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

RESEARCH GRANTS AND SALARIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the administration of federally sponsored research grants and contracts, including salary charging practices of academic institutions is receiving increased attention and study. To obtain factual background information on this situation, the Committee on Sponsored Research of the American Council on Education conducted a survey of 60 universities which are most heavily involved in Government research projects. On the basis of the information thus obtained, the committee has made a number of recommendations which it believes should be very helpful to colleges and universities in improving their relationships with the Federal Government. Members of the committee are Fred R. Cagle, vice president, Tulane University; Lowell T. Coggeshall, vice president, University of Chicago; Lee A. DuBridge, president, California Institute of Technology, chairman; Milton S. Eisenhower, president, the Johns Hopkins University; Clifford C. Furnas, president, State University of New York at Buffalo; T. Keith Glennan, president, Case Institute of Technology; Virgil M. Hancher, president, State University of Iowa; Laurence R. Lunden, vice president, business administration, University of Minnesota; and Logan Wilson, president,

American Council on Education, ex officio.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the summary entitled "Recommendations on Faculty Salaries Charged to Government Contracts," issued by the Committee on Sponsored Research, American Council on Education, April 1963.

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON FACULTY SALARIES
CHARGED TO GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS**

The Committee on Sponsored Research of the American Council on Education has been aware for some time of the growing concern in certain universities, and in a number of Government agencies, about the lack of uniformity in policies relating to the billing of the Government for a portion of the salaries paid to regular faculty members for their work on sponsored research grants and contracts.

The committee believes that it is sound policy to regard the prorated portion of the salaries of faculty members working on such grants or contracts as a proper direct cost of research, and we believe that the Government should pay the full costs of the research work it sponsors in colleges and universities.

Nevertheless, such a wide variety of procedures and practices has developed among universities and various Government agencies that misunderstandings have arisen—and some abuses may have arisen—causing certain Government representatives to propose more uniform and rigid regulations covering salary reimbursement. Such rigid or uniform regulations would not recognize the differing situations present in various institutions, and would partially destroy the flexibility essential for good relations between the universities and the Government.

On the other hand, the universities themselves must recognize that there must be one overall guiding principle that is rigidly adhered to—namely, the Government should not be billed for more than that share of the total annual salary of a faculty member that is represented by the effort actually expended on the sponsored research project or projects. Careful adherence to this principle will avoid abuses and misunderstandings, as well as unreasonable intrauniversity salary competition for support by Government funds.

Specifically, the committee proposes the following recommendations:

1. It would be ideal if the salaries of all faculty members carrying on scholarly work throughout the calendar year were on a 12-month basis, including 1 month paid vacation. Such a salary basis simplifies the identification of the percent of effort charged to extramural sponsors. Thus, if a faculty member devotes 50 percent of his effort during the 12-month period to a project, the university should be reimbursed for 50 percent of his total 12-month base salary. Thus, no portion of a faculty member's salary is contingent on Government support of his research.

2. Wherever it is not feasible for the salaries of faculty members to be converted to a 12-month basis, the percent of effort devoted to sponsored projects should be determined for the academic year and the university should request reimbursement for the corresponding portion of each salary.

3. The additional amount requested by the university for summer salary should be determined by the percent of effort and period the faculty member devotes to a project. Thus, if a faculty member devotes 100 percent of effort to research during certain summer months, the university should claim the appropriate one-ninth, two-ninths, or three-

ninths of the base salary, depending on whether the faculty member works 1, 2, or 3 months. Other ratios may also be justified, but a claim of 3 months' salary for less than 3 months' 100 percent effort must be avoided, as should arrangements which charge the sponsor for more than a properly prorated share of the vacation allowance. Faculty work schedules allowing for no vacation should not be regularly permitted.

4. If the sponsors of projects require periodic reports on percent of effort, they should be called for only at the end of each academic period (for example, quarter, semester, trimester).

5. In consonance with the principles expressed in the foregoing paragraphs, universities should avoid extra compensation (compensation above the full-time base salary) for work on special projects during the academic year. The base university salary should include compensation for all university duties (for example, teaching, research, administration, intrauniversity consulting). Exceptions to this rule should be made only for very compelling reasons and in unusual cases.

**A SOUTHERN CAMPAIGN MANAGER
SPELLS OUT THE PROPER PROCEDURE
FOR WINNING BY REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES FOR CONGRESS**

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, there has recently come to my attention a remarkable letter written by a southern campaign manager to his Republican candidate for the U.S. Congress. I consider this to be one of the most interesting, impressive, and informative documents in many years of political evolution and development. It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent to place it in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the review and consideration by historians as well as for the possible guidance and inspiration of other current political leaders desirous of establishing effective two-party government in every State and section of America.

The fact that this significantly different letter was written by a former colleague of ours—former Senator Harry Cain of Washington—not only adds to its interest and effectiveness but guarantees to its readers that it is written by one of the most proficient practitioners and most careful students of American political activity.

This letter was deemed of such significance that several weeks after the campaign was over, both of the great Sunday newspapers of Miami, Fla., asked and received permission to print the letter in full even though the Cain-managed candidate had been defeated and the election was long since over. Senator Cain's candidate, while losing, gathered up about 45 percent of the vote in the fall election in a campaign where earlier polls and estimates indicated he would receive less than 20 percent of the vote since he was running not only against an able and experienced candidate for Congress—former Senator CLAUDE PEPPER—but in an area which previously had given scant if any encouragement to Republican candidates for Congress.

All of these developments lend real and realistic encouragement to candidates and citizens of the so-called one-party areas of the Deep South who may have

come to realize that only by developing an effective Republican organization and honorable and effective Republican candidates and procedures of campaigning can the Southland once again come to be considered sufficiently independent or unpredictable in its election behavior so that it will once more be able to play an important part in shaping our national policies and in selecting and electing our national leaders. Until the fine and cultured citizens of Dixie develop this necessary unpredictability in our national campaigns for President and for Congress, I greatly fear they will continue to be considered "in the bag" by the Democrats and "out of reach" by the Republicans. Until and unless these great Southern States with their vast resources of sound judgment and high purpose develop a political mechanism which will indicate alike to the Republican and Democratic national campaign committees that they are indeed not really the "kept voters" of Democratic politicians but that they, too, have both the desire and the means at hand to "reward their friends and punish their enemies" at the polling places each election year in November, I fear that for many years into the future the traditional South will be as ineffective and unheeded in national campaigns as it has been, increasingly, ever since the abrogation of the two-thirds voting rule in the 1936 Democratic National Convention.

I urge all who cherish the preservation of our great American ideals to read carefully and to file for future reference this remarkable letter of a distinguished campaign manager to his capable and high-minded candidate for Congress.

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

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 25, 1962]

THE LETTER, ITS BACKGROUND, AIMS

The following letter was written by Harry P. Cain, for 7 years the State of Washington's Republican Senator and for many, many more a student of American politics.

It was sent to his candidate, Robert A. Peterson, who battled unsuccessfully against former Senator CLAUDE PEPPER for the congressional seat in Greater Miami's new Third District.

This is a memorandum prepared by Cain and delivered to Peterson 2 days after he agreed, at the urging of mutual friends, to take on the task of directing an admittedly hopeless campaign.

Cain is proud of the results. So is Peterson and so, Cain says, are those "upon whose toes I stepped hard during the 5 weeks we worked so hard to give the party and the moderates in the district a foundation on which they could build future victories."

When the campaign was over, and Peterson's skimpy 2,800 votes in the May primary had been parlayed into almost 43,000 in November's election, Cain agreed to release his memo or "declaration of war against a campaign that was going full speed backwards."

Cain, a Miami resident since 1957 and a vice president of First Federal Savings and Loan Association, sent a copy to the Herald's publisher, John S. Knight, "because I wanted him to know how rough and rugged the job really was."

"My desire to help Peterson had two sides," Cain said. "First to build the foundation I spoke of, and second because I was afraid that CLAUDE PEPPER would win by such a landslide

that no man would run against him for the next several campaigns."

PEPPER polled approximately 58 percent of the vote and Peterson 42 percent.

As for Cain's goal that all his candidate's campaign bills be paid by election night: "We beat our deadline by 24 hours."

"We took in a bit more than \$19,300," Cain said, "and almost all of it after October 15 as the campaign gained steam. We ended up with a balance of \$98.15."

[From the Miami News, Nov. 25, 1962]

INTIMATE VIEW OF FLORIDA POLITICS

(By Morris McLemore)

We have here a rare document.

It is an unique revelation of the inner works of American politics—the relationship between a candidate for public office and a friend who dedicates himself to his cause.

The candidate, Robert Peterson, was the Republican opponent of CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, in the November 6 voting that resulted in Mr. PEPPER's election to Congress from the new, Third District, in North Dade County.

It was a bitter contest. CLAUDE PEPPER claims he was the object of smear tactics and the Federal Bureau of Investigation reportedly is looking into the matter.

The letter herewith was written well before the balloting but apparently at a date considered late in the campaign of Mr. Peterson.

Its author, Harry P. Cain, is a veteran of political campaigns at many levels. He was for 7 years a Republican U.S. Senator from the State of Washington and for 3 years a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, appointed by President Eisenhower. He also lectured on political matters at Yale University.

Since 1957, he has lived in Miami, and is a vice president of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association.

An excellent speaker, as we discover in the letter, Senator Cain also is a facile writer. More important, he also is a man who believes in knowing his place in a political campaign—and making certain in advance that others know it and their places, too.

Senator Cain made the letter available to me in an effort to clarify his own attitude and that of Mr. Peterson toward the latter's candidacy and the possibility that militantly anti-Pepper elements would attempt to inject their influence into the Republican effort.

"This declaration was, to the best of my knowledge, observed by Robert Peterson and those men and women who constituted his official family," says Senator Cain.

Thus, he makes clear his posture toward all who might attack the patriotism of the Democratic opponent of Mr. Peterson.

More than this, the letter etches for us the relationship of candidate and manager, of the image and the man who draws the image, of the fighter and his handler.

It is an intensely interesting and meaningful document.

[From the Miami News, Nov. 25, 1962]

SEPTEMBER 29, 1962.

Memo to: Robert A. Peterson.

From: Harry P. Cain.

Subject: Terms and conditions of agreement with candidate.

Since meeting with you and your executive committee on Wednesday, September 27, I have agreed to assume responsibility for your political affairs, beginning with Monday, October 1, until the election is concluded on Tuesday, November 6.

You and your executive committee have accepted my terms, which are listed next below, for the services I shall earnestly seek to render:

1. Such decisions as I may find it necessary to make will be accepted by the Peter-

son campaign organization without argument or debate. When convenient, I will gladly explain the reasons for a given decision.

You would not tolerate nor would I insist on this condition except that you have become aware that your campaign which has been going nowhere for several months is presently moving backward. We agree that only the most drastic actions can result in a respectable showing for your splendid candidacy.

2. No person, including your good self, will be permitted to commit your campaign for any goods or services without my oral or written approval.

Since June, your campaign has received just over \$4,900 in contributions. The information I have is that your bills payable presently amount to just about \$3,500. As of this morning the balance in your operating account was \$360.16.

It does not bother me that a sizable portion of your income has been wasted or thrown away. What does bother me is that your credit standing has been impaired; some of your bills payable are more than 60 days overdue.

Until further notice, I will use \$0.50 from each new dollar of income to apply on past due obligations. As soon as your income posture permits, all of your bills payable will be satisfied.

From now on no commitment for goods or services will be made unless there is money actually in hand to satisfy it. My ambition for you is that every bill that is owed by your campaign will be paid by the evening of election day, November 6.

If money enables your campaign to present you in the next 5 weeks to the public by means of newspaper, radio, and television, this will be done. Unless the money is available, none of this will be done.

You will understand, please, that you will make no further money contribution of your own to the campaign unless I permit it and I very much doubt if I will. It is quite enough that you have offered yourself as a first-rate candidate.

(3) If any person violates a decision of mine or disregards it in any meaningful manner, I shall summarily separate that person from your campaign organization or I will feel free to separate myself from your service without notice to you or anyone else.

(4) Neither you nor the executive committee will think of or refer to me as being Peterson's campaign manager. I will be known as your friend who willingly undertakes to accomplish what you ask.

For planning purposes my day in support of your campaign will begin at 4 o'clock or later each afternoon. Campaign workers and leaders will soon learn to accommodate themselves to this schedule. It will rapidly teach them to know what they want to talk about when they show up.

YOUR CAMPAIGN

You have no campaign at this time. What has posed as a campaign has had neither purpose, direction, workers, nor money.

The several so-called professional political staff members are doing you and your campaign more harm than good. This is as much your fault and that of the others who hired them as it has been their fault. They have been employed improperly and in consequence you and the executive committee have been working for them rather than the other way around.

These several individuals will be retained for as long as it takes to determine what they know. This will not take long. They will be gone in several days' time.

THE CAMPAIGN TO BE EXPECTED

Your campaign for the Congress from the newly established Third District of Florida will begin during the Cramer fundraising dinner that is scheduled to take place in the

Carillon Hotel on the evening of Saturday, October 6. Between Monday and Saturday of next week, what has been done to this date will be undone and then we shall be prepared to go to work. This means that your campaign for the Congress will cover a period of 30 short but extremely precious days.

THE CRAMER DINNER

The only changes in present plans for the Cramer dinner are these:

(a) The head table will consist of three places to be occupied by Mr. CRAMER, you, and myself. The purpose is to direct the focus of attention on you. Other important officials, functionaries, and distinguished guests will be seated at a longer table on a lower level.

(b) I will act as the master of ceremonies and not because I am anxious to speak in public. The purpose is to control the evening and to make those in attendance more aware of the seriousness of the campaign which will then be launched.

In addition, I anticipate that Congressman CRAMER, a fine fellow, will make a speech as though he were a candidate for some statewide office. This is a laudable ambition but it could lead to difficulties and misunderstandings we shall want to avoid. As the toastmaster, I can precede then follow him with such remarks as may then be needed.

The dinner will mark your first public appearance of any importance. I suggest that you prepare yourself carefully to speak between 5 and 10 minutes. I would urge you to refrain from any attack on your opponent. Your need is to convince others that you are sincere, attractive, reasonable, and that you are possessed of convictions which you want to share with others should you be elected on November 6.

YOUR ROLE AS OUR CANDIDATE

As a mature person, you will speak as you think proper on any occasion. When in doubt about issues, developments, or trends, you will confide in me.

If you are to make a good showing by the time the course is run, it will be because individuals, in every section of your district, have grown to know, admire, and believe in you. If we were adequately financed, as we are not, this could be achieved in large part through the public media. It will be necessary for you to largely do for yourself what money could do for you in a different manner. You will not regret this advice and you will enjoy meeting many different kinds of people whom you have had no previous knowledge about.

MY RELATIONSHIP WITH YOU

I shall be at your service day and night but you will see remarkably little of me.

Within a week's time, I shall have relieved you of every possible detail. In return, you will feel completely free to refer every detail that your friends bring to you to me.

Following the Cramer dinner, you will not be expected to attend any meeting of campaign leaders or workers. You will be welcome whenever you care to appear but it will be my job to convince others that they must work for you in your understandable absence. I strongly urge that you restrict your conversations with people in your organization to a minimum. Unless you are careful, these conversations will disturb you, for they deal with many things you know nothing about, and they will consume your energies that ought to be exercised in other ways.

My main obligation is to do for you what you could do but haven't the time for.

YOUR FRIENDS AND YOUR ENEMIES

The most difficult lesson to learn in politics, and it is generally learned the hard way, is that your friends will often cause you much more trouble than your enemies. The latter

is openly out to do you in and this enables you to prepare your defenses and to launch your counterattacks against his assaults. A friend, however, does not always know what he is doing and you may naturally assume that he is working and contributing when he is doing nothing at all.

Your friends, not your enemies permitted or persuaded you, as an example, to establish an executive committee which is weak and lopsided on its face. Conspicuously absent from it are Jewish, Negro, and labor elements. I will call for a meeting of the committee. If 80 percent of the members show up, the membership will be promptly enlarged. If fewer members appear, the committee will not be formally disbanded but will not be relied on again.

Beware of friends who address you as Mr. Congressman or tell you that you are certain to win. Successful politicians are those who gather together men and women who share the same goals and points of view. When a friend has these political qualifications, his friendship becomes a real asset. But any friend who is lacking in this area will probably become either a troublemaker or an obstacle.

CAMPAIGN THEMES

There are only two primary issues to be developed and exploited in the campaign. They are—

(a) The contrast and differences between you and your opponent: This must largely be developed by having the public become aware of you as a person. We will work together on this goal from this time forward.

(b) Moderation versus extremism: Here the differences are clearcut and obvious. Our intention will be to make your position of moderation appealing to both Democrats and Republicans.

The first thing to understand and the last thing to forget in this campaign is that it will be fatal and futile for you to appeal for support on the grounds that you are a Republican who insists on waging war against the Democrats. I will have a set of figures in a few days' time that will justify this premise.

It is apparent that you are a Republican and proud of being one. Beyond that, the issue stated above is much more important than any party affiliation.

DECLARATION OF INTENT

(a) On Monday, I shall write to Senator Pepper to advise him of my decision to support you as best I know how. In having served with him, I would expect him to do as much for me were the shoe on the other foot.

(b) By Wednesday of next week, I will write and forward an "estimate of the situation" to Mr. Thomas Brown, the Republican State chairman in Tampa, with copies to prominent Republican officials and some Democrats in Washington, D.C. This letter will include a request for assistance in several ways, including financial. We must determine immediately what, if anything, we may expect from outside sources. We shall not again ask any assistance in the area stated above. By October 10 we ought to know what we will have available from the above sources to work with.

RELATIONSHIP WITH REPUBLICANS IN THE THIRD DISTRICT

You must avoid letting them formulate or dictate any policy. This is not being disrespectful. It will take the Republicans, particularly in official positions, a little while to appreciate that it will remain for moderate Democrats and independents to elect Robert Peterson. In the beginning this is not likely to occur to them and they will feel something of a shock when they first are confronted by the declaration. In our part of Florida, Republicans know too little about campaigning. You must become their teacher. When the campaign is over, most of the Republicans will applaud your wisdom.

RELATIONSHIP WITH RIGHTWING ELEMENTS AND BIRCHITES

These interesting groups of people will either remain at home on election day or they will vote for you, however reluctantly. They will be treated with every consideration but no concessions will be made to them at any stage in the campaign. Some of your refreshing moderation will rub off on them and they are likely to feel better for having voted for you. On occasions, some among them will become furious and walk out. They will be made welcome should they care to return but we shall not change the course of your campaign in any effort to get them back.

SMEAR TACTICS AGAINST YOUR OPPONENT

These can be expected from a variety of unknown quarters. Your position is and will continue to be that you will not tolerate any of these activities from or by anyone who has any known connection with your campaign. I will make this clear, in your name, to your workers at the first opportunity. As for myself, I consider Mr. Pepper's loyalty to our country to be as positive and certain as is my own.

ENDORSEMENTS BY THE MIAMI HERALD AND THE MIAMI NEWS

Don't worry about them and don't seek them. In my judgment the Herald may be inclined to endorse you if they grow to believe, in several weeks' time, that your candidacy is deserving of their interest. I would guess that the News will endorse your opponent even though they endorsed his opponents in his two previous unsuccessful attempts to return to the U.S. Senate. In any case, there is nothing you can do or should do about endorsements. I will make known your ready availability should the board of editors in either or both papers wish to exchange views with you.

YOUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE WEEKLIES AND THE METROPOLITAN PRESS

(a) If you have not done so, I encourage you to personally visit and meet the editor or publisher in each of the weekly papers within the Third District. It is important that they know you as a person. After the initial visit, your agents can speak for you effectively.

(b) You may see one or both of the political editors of the Herald and the News at the fund raising dinner on October 6 but otherwise it will be surprising if you see them within the Third District at any time during the campaign. They are talented, knowledgeable writers but, for a variety of reasons, they are not inclined to follow political campaigns in person.

Were I you, I would rely on them to write as they like without any suggestions or requests from you. They will not, in my opinion, be unfriendly but they are not likely to be very helpful. It is well for you to remember that these gentlemen are products of their environment. They have long taken Democratic victories for granted and I would not have you seek to persuade them that a new day is dawning. This is an appreciation they will come to realize but I think they should figure this out without any attempted guidance from you or me.

FROM ME TO YOU

At no time during the campaign will I discuss with you the chances of your being elected. I commit myself to you not because I think you can win, for at this time I do not, but because I think it possible for you to make a good showing and this will be of real benefit to what I believe the needs of our time require. We will plow forward each day on the conviction that we are doing better than we did yesterday.

I shall make some people very mad and step on many toes but there will be a sound reason for all of this. I will not be made unhappy by those who, perhaps and I

hope temporarily, dislike me intensely, providing they love and admire "My Tiger." I will give you the best I have because in return I possess a strong feeling that you will give to the people many reasons why they should have confidence in your aspirations and hopes for the future.

For the next month I shall be your second self. Let this second fellow be the guy who takes on your worries, frustrations and alarms. This will free you to be your own man, unafraid and challenging. On election night, you will derive the greatest satisfaction from your travels and meeting life head on in the previous 30 days.

HARRY P. CAIN.

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Yale University, Connecticut, and the Nation have lost a distinguished leader, A. Whitney Griswold, the 16th president of Yale University. Distinguished scholar, able administrator, profound philosopher, Dr. Griswold was a stouthearted defender of the rights of freemen and an advocate of learning in the broadest sense. He will be sorely missed. There have been many editorials about A. Whitney Griswold in recent days.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several of the most outstanding be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New Haven Register, Apr. 21, 1963]

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD, 16TH PRESIDENT OF YALE

A. Whitney Griswold, the 16th president of Yale University, was relatively young in years when he assumed that distinguished office and his tenure was short in terms of his alma mater's illustrious age. But in the 13 years of his presidency the impact of his leadership, his enterprise, and his service was impressive.

His death at 56 of cancer, following periods of failing health but unflagging devotion to the interests and welfare of the university, is being mourned by all Yale men, faculty and administration associates, students and alumni; by the New Haven community of which he was so conscientiously a member; and throughout the educational world which recognized his work and contributions so well and so widely.

A graduate of Yale in 1929, and a member of the university's faculty in 1933, Griswold was a professor of history when named president in 1950, succeeding Charles Seymour. His academic attainments and his championing of the liberal arts speak for themselves, as did his efforts toward improvements of education at Yale. On the business side, the university experienced under him one of its greatest building periods, supported by successful fundraising impetus.

The world is apt to think that great institutions like Yale University live and move, and even prosper, of themselves. And so they do, perhaps, in a certain sense; for other forces and personalities are at work beside those of Whitney Griswold to make the university what it is today. But no one who knows the delicacy of such an operation, the forethought and sincerity of purpose, and the intellectual stimulus that are required will be tempted to underrate the value of Mr. Griswold's contribution.

Cheerful and courageous to the end in the face of an incurable disease, his life personified the striving for excellence tempered with the humanity of a man who had the

remarkable ability to wear his education lightly. To the Yale community and to his family we offer our deep sympathy, secure in the knowledge that his mark upon the university will provide an enduring inspiration to all.

[From the Hartford Courant, Apr. 21, 1963]
ALFRED WHITNEY GRISWOLD

A distinguished leader has been lost to a great university and to the academic world spreading far beyond its campus. The tragedy will seem the more because A. Whitney Griswold has died in the full flush of life. As he became one of Yale's youngest presidents at the age of 43 in 1950, so he has been taken at the age of 56 which is woefully early compared to the venerability of many university heads.

Venerability however is a word that probably never would have fitted President Griswold. His nature was far from any such mossy implications. He practically vibrated with drive, his mind was surcharged with ideas and the energy to force them to fulfillment. And he had a salt wit and pungency of speech that made it impossible he should ever become a university *Polonius*.

Some heads of great institutions of learning have achieved distinction as administrators, others as scholars, others as philosophers of academic purpose. President Griswold, with characteristic force, bundled all three attributes in his single nature. He had the management of a Yale community numbering some 11,000 persons in one way or another. He provided for them well, with bulging endowments, a thriving alumni fund, worthy faculty salaries and ample new buildings. And as a historian, he was a ranking scholar in his own right.

After three decades from undergraduate to president, Dr. Griswold was as rooted in Yale as the elms and the ivy. But his concern was for all the academic world and the university ideal. In the uneasy days when witchhunting was beginning to invade institutions of learning, President Griswold was a champion of academic freedom and the courage and right to speak out. In more recent days, when a new threat—the domination of a scientific age—has been narrowing men's outlook, President Griswold fought parity for the liberal arts, so that a whole and steady philosophy should keep universities from ever becoming the birthplace of new Frankenstein.

It remained a touch of lifelong disappointment in him that he was not able to write as much as he had hoped in earlier years. Yet what he has written in achievements for Yale, and the world of immeasurable value to which it belongs as a university, can only be a rich legacy to present and future.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1963]
A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

The cause of freedom had no more devoted champion than Dr. Alfred Whitney Griswold. He brought to the presidency of Yale University a view of academic responsibility that ranged far beyond the broadening of the curriculum, the strengthening of the faculty or the augmentation of endowments. His concern was the advancement of man and the repelling of every assault on human liberty and dignity. Wit and good humor were part of his arsenal in that task, but so was a courage that scorned the cautions of more timorous colleagues.

He condemned loyalty oaths and all other efforts to legislate conformity. "Books won't stay banned," he once said. "They won't burn. Ideas won't go to jail. In the long run of history, the censor and the inquisitor have always lost." The vigor and articulateness he marshaled against the suppressors of freedom contributed much to building a stronger America. His death of cancer at the age of 56 is a loss to the Nation, even more than it is a loss to Yale.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1963]

A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD

The motto of Yale University—"Lux et Veritas"—was upheld with honor by A. Whitney Griswold, president since 1950 of New Haven's great seat of learning. Early in his tenure, he resisted pressures intended to protect Yale undergraduates from the dangerous world of ideas. He felt that man and God could endure at Yale without limitations on the spirit of free inquiry—a conviction that was reflected in an influential statement on academic freedom prepared in 1953 by a committee of university presidents that Dr. Griswold headed.

A teacher and historian of international relations, Dr. Griswold proved a vigorous administrator as president. The endowment and physical plant grew at Yale—and, notably, so did faculty salary scales. Dr. Griswold had the belief, considered eccentric by some, that teachers should be generously paid as one measure of the country's esteem for learning. Now dead at a premature 56, Dr. Griswold's legacy is a flourishing university providing more light than ever before in the quest for truth.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 21, 1963]

A GREAT LOSS FOR EDUCATION

Fortunately, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold came to the presidency of Yale relatively young; tragically, he died at an age when, in the normal course, he might have been expected to contribute many more years to American education. Cut short as it was, however, his tenure at Yale marked an era at the university and made a significant mark upon American higher learning.

Dr. Griswold faced and conquered the great dilemma of all university heads: to administer a vast enterprise while infusing it with the challenge and excitement of genuine scholarship. His practical work at Yale, and his example, were immensely valuable for a nation which is wrestling with the complexities of democratic education in a world of suddenly expanding horizons; he upheld the great tradition of liberal learning, of the humanities, at a time when there are mounting pressures toward narrow specialization and mechanistic philosophies.

For Dr. Griswold had always a deep sense of the value of the individual. He acted on the conviction that, as he told the Herald Tribune Forum in 1951, in his first public address as president of Yale, "for 9,000 years society has depended upon its members as individuals for those creative achievements of mind and spirit that have guided it along the road of civilization."

Dr. Griswold took his responsibilities seriously, but wore his talents lightly. His manner cloaked, but did not conceal, moral courage of a high order, and his last years called for physical courage to match it. Yale, and the whole academic community, will remember him with affection, pride, and grief.

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE SLOVAK SISTERS OF THIRD ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS IN AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, training their children to be good citizens is one of the greatest responsibilities of the citizens of this Nation. Fortunately there are many educational and fraternal organizations which can ably assist parents in this vital task.

In my State of Pennsylvania and neighboring States, the Slovak Sisters of Third Order of St. Francis in America have performed this important function

for the past half-century. Not only has the order educated thousands of good citizens, but it has also provided teacher-training so that there would always be individuals with the ability to teach the art of citizenship. It did the job without any form of Government assistance. It relied for aid only on its loyal supporters, who gave generously even during the trying years of the great depression.

The Slovak Sisters are observing their golden anniversary during 1963. I commend the Slovak Sisters for the excellent job they have done. They have my warm encouragement for the future years.

In connection with the anniversary, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. John C. Sciranka, a noted American-Slovak journalist, a native Pennsylvanian, and a former student of the Slovak Sisters.

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

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE SLOVAK SISTERS OF THIRD ORDER OF ST. FRANCIS IN AMERICA

(By John C. Sciranka)

This year, in which the Slovaks and the Slavs are observing the 11th centennial of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to the country of their ancestry—Slovakia—is also a Golden Anniversary of the Slovak Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, who have two large motherhouses in Pennsylvania, one at Mt. Assisi Academy, Bellevue, the suburb of Pittsburgh and the other at Monacacy Manor, Bethlehem, Pa.

As one of their first pupils in the newly established Slovak Parochial School of St. Gabriel, North Side Pittsburgh, Pa., I recall most vividly the arrival of these first Sisters to our parish a half century ago. Our pastor, the late Reverend Ferdinand Prikazky, greeted them in the church filled to capacity. For many of us it was the first time that we came so close to the nuns and were curious about them and their life.

However, before their establishment of the first parochial school in Pittsburgh, there was a great more to their arrival in this country, about which we learned later.

The writer has been in constant touch with them for the half century and besides myself, my two brothers and two sisters were also taught by them in the old home town of Pittsburgh.

A half century ago there was a great need for the Slovak priests in this country and even a greater need for Sisters to teach in parochial schools. Two orders were already established and especially the Vincentian Sisters came here in 1902 and settled in Brad-dock, Pa. About that time the late Father Matthew Jankola was seeking permission in Rome for the establishment of the Congregation of the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius which was founded 54 years ago and celebrated its golden anniversary at Danville, Pa., in September 1959, where Bishop Andrew G. Grutka pontificated by celebrating a Mass in Old Slavonic Rite.

Prior to these three orders, Sisters of other non-Slovak congregations taught in Slovak parochial schools and encouraged their girl pupils to join their orders, thus enriching the much needed teaching staffs.

FIRST SLOVAK PAROCHIAL SCHOOL

In order to appreciate the endeavors of our pioneers in this educational field, we must go back to the first Slovak Parochial Catholic School in the Western Hemisphere, which was established in 1889 in Streator,

Ill., at St. Stephen Slovak Catholic Parish by Rev. Erwin Gellhof, pioneer Slovak priest and fraternalist who was born on October 26, 1859, in Spis County, Slovakia, ordained to the priesthood in September 1883 and came to Streator, Ill., where he assumed his pastoral duties on September 22, 1887.

Father Gellhof engaged the Sisters of St. Francis from Joliet, Ill., to teach in his first school. The first teachers were Sister M. Mary of Irish descent and Sister M. Magdalena of Czech (Bohemian) descent. The Slovak language was taught by Father Gellhof and Edward Schwartz-Markovic, editor of the *Nová Vlast* (New Country), second Slovak newspaper in America and first published in the literary language.

These St. Francis Sisters of Joliet, Ill., also trained the first American Slovak nun of their order, Miss Mary Simko, who chose a monastic name of Sister M. Erwin in honor of Father Erwin Gellhof, who is known as one of the first American Slovak Fraternalists. From Illinois he moved to the bituminous coal and coke region of New Haven and Connellsville, Pa., where he established several Slovak parishes in the Pittsburgh diocese.

These St. Francis Sisters also established the first parochial Slovak school of St. Stephen Parish in Johnstown, Pa., at the invitation of the late Rev. John Martvon, who died at the age of 96. One of their former pupils came to Johnstown school as Sister Superior.

However, these were not Sisters of a Slovak order, although they did gigantic service and are still carrying on with a new generation of teachers.

BISHOP JOSEPH M. KOUDELKA

A half century ago a need for Slovak Sisters as teachers was so great, that priests of various parishes, namely, Rev. Ferdinand Prikazky whom I served as altar boy for close to 10 years, sought aid from all over. In 1912 the late Bishop Joseph M. Koudelka, who was an American of Czech origin but mastered the Slovak language and gave many missions to the Slovaks, suggested to Father Julius Vrana of McKees Rocks, Pa., that he introduce the visiting Sisters in 1912 from Bohemia, who taught in schools in Slovakia, to Father Prikazky, which bore rich fruit. Bishop Koudelka was the successor as Czech bishop in America, the Venerable Joseph Nepomuk Neumann, fourth bishop of Philadelphia, whose beatification will be held in Rome in June 1963. He was elevated to the dignity of bishop by the late Pope, now St. Pius X in 1907 and became auxiliary bishop of Cleveland, later auxiliary bishop of Milwaukee, which was followed by being an ordinary of the diocese of Superior, Wis., where he built with the help of American Slovaks, especially the late Rev. Andrew E. Komara of Bridgeport, Conn., a beautiful orphanage.

Rev. Mother M. Hyacintha, who made the original plans, died here in March 1912. Her associate, Sister M. Georgia, whom the writer knew personally as an altar boy, remained to complete the plans and in September 1913, the first parochial school was opened at St. Gabriel's in Pittsburgh, also St. Clement's, Tarentum, Pa., where Rev. Edmund Kitz was pastor and St. John's, Barnesboro, Pa., where Rev. Victor Frankovsky was pastor.

The Sisters established their temporary convent and motherhouse at St. Gabriel's and soon received candidates for their order to be trained as Sisters and teachers.

In a period of two decades they had established parochial schools in the following cities: St. Mark's, McKees Rocks, 1917; Holy Family, Erie, Pa., 1920; Holy Redeemer, Ambridge, Pa., 1920; St. Anna, Farrell, Pa., 1929; St. Michael, New Castle, Pa., 1929; SS. Cyril and Methodius, Clifton, N.J., 1929; St. Mary's Assumption, Jersey City, N.J., 1931; Holy

Rosary, Clarksburg, W. Va., 1931; SS. Peter and Paul, Phillipsburg, N.J., 1935; SS. Cyril and Methodius, Charleroi, Pa., 1935, and later at SS. Cyril and Methodius, Boonton, N.J. and other cities.

In 1938 when they observed their Silver Jubilee the Sisters, whose official name is the Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, had over 125 teachers and some 4,000 pupils in these parochial schools.

GIRLS ACADEMY

On May 30, 1930, the late Bishop Hugh C. Boyle of Pittsburgh dedicated their new motherhouse at Bellevue, Pa., where on September 17, 1928, they opened a high school for girls under the name of Mount Assisi Academy, which was granted all privileges and faculties as a school of higher education by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on February 8, 1932. This Academy turned out several hundred of most capable young women, who are an asset to our American way of life.

After the death of Rev. Ferdinand Prikazky on November 10, 1927, who was their great benefactor with other Slovak priests and laity, his successors, the late Reverend George Mallnack, great promoter of war bonds during World War II and present pastor of St. Gabriel's, Rev. Joseph Straka aided the Sisters in their great work for the education of youth.

In 1947 with the approval of General Superior in Rome, the Sisters established a new motherhouse at Monacacy Manor, Bethlehem, Pa., known also as the Retreat Home of St. Francis for Women. They also teach in the parochial schools of Allentown diocese, where they staffed schools at St. Mary's, Northampton, Pa., St. Theresa's, Hellertown, Pa., and later SS. Cyril and Methodius, Bethlehem, Pa.; St. Ann's, Emmaus, Pa., and St. Stephen's, Shenandoah, Pa.

On October 12, 1947, the late Dennis Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia dedicated the new motherhouse and expressed his happiness that the Sisters are working in his archdiocese. After his death, his successor, the late Cardinal O'Hara also was pleased with their work. In the Pittsburgh diocese all the bishops, starting from the late Archbishop J. Regis Canevin, who granted them permission of stay and his successors, Bishop Boyle, Bishop Dearden, now archbishop of Detroit, Mich., and the present bishop and a great friend of the Slovaks, Most Rev. John J. Wright are happy with their work and commend them on various occasions.

Similar praises were offered from other bishops and especially Bishop McShea of Allentown and Bishop McNulty of Paterson, N.J.

The writer is very happy that one of his teachers, Rev. Mother M. Methoda, former Superior, living now in retirement at Monacacy Manor, often remembers him with a note about some of his articles which have special interest to her. My sister Betty Kuziel named her only daughter Constance in honor of her former Sister. At our family reunions we all recall the first Superior, Rev. Mother M. Louisa, who was an excellent organist and a choir director. Also, Rev. Mother M. Aloysis, who lives in retirement at Shenandoah, Pa., and Rev. Mother M. Clotilda. The present Rev. Mother M. Mildred is a daughter of the late Charles Zaremba, one of the leading members of Holy Rosary Society, who led the prayers in our church of St. Gabriel for over a half century. We often mention Sister M. Boleslava of Ambridge, who observed her golden jubilee last year.

The Slovak Sisters of Third Order of St. Francis, on this their golden jubilee, can look back with great pride at the progress they made for God and Nation. Thousands of their pupils, friends and admirers, will commend them on the half century of progress with a proverbial: *Ad multos annos*.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE CARL ALBERT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, we in Oklahoma are proud of Congressman CARL ALBERT.

Born the son of a coal miner in eastern Oklahoma, he has built a great career on his way to his present position as majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Debating champion, Rhodes scholar, and soldier are but a few of the roles CARL ALBERT has played, and always with the profound honesty and sincerity that earns the respect of all who know him.

Recently, the people of Oklahoma had an opportunity to learn more about CARL ALBERT's work as House majority leader through a series of articles in the *Tulsa Tribune*. Written by Jenk Jones, Jr., the *Tribune's* Washington correspondent, the articles not only give insight into the majority leader's job but also present a good description of the legislative process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the *Record*.

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

[From the *Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune*, Mar. 20, 1963]

CONGRESSMAN ALBERT'S NO. 1 DUTY IS REPRESENTING PEOPLE IN HIS DISTRICT

(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—If Representative CARL ALBERT, of McAlester, ever decides to quit his post as House majority leader, he can take up a more relaxing line of work—like taming tigers.

The job that ALBERT holds is one of crushing responsibility, especially as his Democratic Party holds the presidency as well as the edge in both Houses of Congress.

Much of the success of his party is dependent on whether ALBERT and his aides can get the Democratic program, or at least those parts of it which seem valuable and proper, through Congress.

Yet a majority leader cannot exist just to do the bidding of his President and his party. He has an even more important job—to represent the people in the district which sent him to Congress.

These different roles can often conflict. ALBERT wears several hats. His "top hat" is that of representing his own district.

He said his second most important function is to represent his party "constituency" in Congress, the Democratic Members of the House who elected him majority leader.

Third, he must represent his national party, headed by the President in times when a Democrat occupies the White House.

Although this loyalty comes third, ALBERT said "it is to the interest of the majority leader's party that the President is successful."

The views and desires of the three different groups that he represents can clash. That is why the "priority list" is so important to ALBERT.

The majority leader is chosen from among the members of his party, just as the minority leader is done on the other side of the aisle.

The majority leader is not an official of Congress. Nor is he his party's leader in the House. The Speaker of the House, Representative JOHN MCCORMACK of Massachusetts has that role.

But because the Speaker cannot both run the House and his party business, the latter is turned over to the majority leader.

ALBERT's tasks are manifold.

He must program legislation, trying to decide which bills shall be taken up at what time and what must be done to speed the House business along.

He must contact committee chairmen to see what measures they have ready to report to the House as a whole.

He must urge members of his party to support the party's views on key issues.

He must be responsible for the maintaining of decorum on the House floor.

It is a job of constant responsibility—even when he is not on the floor—and often little reward.

"If a committee gets a bill through easily, the chairman gets credit," ALBERT said wryly. "If it gets 'mussed up' the leadership gets the blame."

The hours are tough—10½ to 11 hours 5 days a week, 6 hours on Saturday and 2 or 3 hours or more on Sunday. ALBERT last year went many months without missing a day at the office.

Daily meetings are held before the House session starts at noon. And there are usually more sessions after the day's work on the floor is done.

The tangible rewards? A Cadillac and a chauffeur, more telephone, telegraph and office expense allowances than normal and the traditional large office with a good view sum up the total benefits. There is no pay increase.

These—and the chance that the 54-year-old ALBERT may someday succeed the 70-year-old McCORMACK as Speaker. Only once in this century has the majority leader failed to advance to Speaker, ALBERT said.

A man has to seek the majority leader's job—it does not seek him. He must run, often against strong opposition, for the post. And when he gets it, he is saddled with many pressures.

None of this deters ALBERT.

"I like it personally," he said. "Sometimes I'm frustrated, but I wouldn't swap it for any job I know of."

He explained that although the majority leader takes more "heat" he has more to do with the formation of issues and their ultimate success or failure than do the vast majority of Members of Congress.

ALBERT had his eye on a House leadership post from his first day in Congress in 1947.

He said, "I spend as much time on the floor as any Member." Not only did he concentrate on learning how the House work was done, but he learned the name and face of every Member of both Houses.

ALBERT stepped up to the post of House whip, directly under the majority leader, in 1954. And on the death of Speaker Sam Rayburn in 1961, both he and McCORMACK moved up a notch last year, although ALBERT had an election opponent.

ALBERT's job runs into many a rough path. But he's not despairing.

A native of Oklahoma is used to standing lots of heat.

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Mar. 21, 1963]

TIMING IS KEY TO HANDLING OF LEGISLATIVE BILLS

(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—The timing in the passage of a bill can be as critical as that in a trapeze act—just the tiniest error can drop you right on your head.

One of House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT's tasks is to see that key bills come up at just the right time to get the maximum chance of passage.

The McAlester Democrat used the following example:

Three bills are ready of top priority for the majority party. The second is one which could stir extreme controversy. The third is one which needs bipartisan help to be passed.

Which one would come first? The latter, before a fight over the controversial bill or minority coolness toward the priority bill could stir tempers.

Last week Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, told ALBERT that he was ready to report the military pay raise bill out of his Armed Services Committee.

But another of VINSON's bills, one providing funds for the RS-70 bomber, had just passed Congress over the Kennedy administration's objections. It had caused a lot of ill will and the legislative sea was troubled.

So ALBERT told VINSON to hold the pay raise bill off for a couple of weeks so things could quiet down.

The majority leader, by virtue of his position, generally is in favor of administration measures when his party holds the Presidency. So he is careful about bringing them to a vote.

"I never program a bill unless I know I have an excellent chance of passing it—unless the national interest demands that the matter be disposed of," ALBERT said.

But he doesn't have to rely on "guesstimates" of a bill's chances. "Ninety-nine times out of a hundred I know if a bill will pass," he said.

The reason for this is the House whip and his assistants, who work under ALBERT. The whips take polls of the membership.

In a close race the leadership then will try to persuade those on the fence or even those leaning away from the measure to go with them.

On many bipartisan measures, both the majority and minority leaders will poll their members, then get together to decide what they must do to obtain passage.

Often compromises are worked out that will make it easier for members of both parties to support a bill.

But even so, some members aren't always swayed. "We've got some who are really team members and some who are strongly independent," ALBERT said.

Also, in an issue that is not razor close a Member may be given the green light to vote against the administration's measure if to vote for it would hurt him in his district, ALBERT said.

That permission is given more readily if the member has voted with the administration on other tough votes.

But even in the case of mavericks who frequently buck the party leadership, ALBERT said, "We never take punitive action."

He said a Member is elected to represent the beliefs of his home district, not those of his party as a whole.

ALBERT prefers the gentle touch with party members if it can be used profitably.

"My view is that you get further with people if you work in a cooperative manner and get them to go along willingly rather than by putting on the heat."

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Mar. 22, 1963]

CONGRESS' SENIORITY PLAN A BRAKE

(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—It may seem odd that the man charged with the responsibility of getting new legislation through Congress should revere the system which often makes his job more difficult.

But House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT of McAlester lauds the seniority system which gives the heads of committees extraordinary power in Congress.

For despite the fact his job is to effect many changes, ALBERT favors the evolution rather than the revolution of our laws.

"It was never intended that our Government should change drastically" after each election, he said.

There has long been criticism, especially from liberal circles, that present system thwarts attempts to pass legislation for new programs.

ALBERT, however, sees the committee system, based as it is on seniority, as an effective brake against runaway legislation.

He said the committee chairmen, who are generally Southerners or members of big city machine politics, usually have a traditional view of matters.

On the other hand, the "demands of the last election" are expressed in the choice of the President and the congressional leadership and in the new Member of Congress.

The merging of these opposites frequently results in progress without reckless speed, ALBERT contends.

"The response (of Congress) should be to the deliberative will of the people and not to snap judgments."

Even when the President advocates a major change, the interactions of Congress work in an atmosphere that slows down the proposal and "demands major justification" for its acceptance, ALBERT added.

He listed two major benefits derived from the existing system:

1. "It brings stability to the House, and makes the direction it takes more important than the speed."

2. "Men become experienced in legislative areas. The system enables legislators to become professionals in their fields."

ALBERT acknowledged there has been a strong trend in recent years toward a larger Federal Government and a more powerful executive department.

The former is inevitable, he said, because of "the shift from an agrarian to an industrial population."

There is now more interdependence of people on one another, ALBERT added. This has necessitated the Government playing an increasingly important role in citizens' lives.

WEST VIRGINIANS PARTICIPATE IN 33D NATIONAL 4-H CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.—NEARLY 2,286,000 YOUTH BELONG TO 94,707 CLUBS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the worthwhile activities of 4-H Clubs are part of the national educational system of cooperative extension work in agriculture and homemaking in which the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State land-grant colleges, and counties participate.

More than 2,285,592 young Americans, chiefly in rural areas, between the ages of 10 and 21 years, belong to the more than 94,707 local 4-H Clubs located in every agricultural county in the United States and Puerto Rico. Additionally, there are approximately 307,745 adult leaders and 114,959 junior leaders lending guidance to these useful activities. And, the 4-H Club idea is now worldwide, the plan having been adapted to fit widely varying conditions in some 70 different countries.

The 33d National 4-H Conference is being held here in the Nation's Capital from April 20 to 26, and attended by delegates from each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

During a week of inspiration, learning, and fellowship the young people will have an opportunity to attain an insight into the individual and group responsibilities of the American citizen. They will achieve a deeper and keener appreciation of our rich heritage. They will meet national leaders who are responsible for determining major policy, and discuss with them areas of particular interest. Throughout, the delegates will

be encouraged to express their own ideas and to ask questions, thereby bringing to the conference the benefit of their own background of experience in 4-H work and community service.

This morning it was my privilege to attend the breakfast with Congress' portion of the conference, attended by many Senators and Representatives. We enjoyed a meal in a congenial and informal atmosphere designed to provide the young citizens an opportunity to meet the legislators from their own State.

On this occasion, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON expressed greetings, and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, brought a helpful message.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS and Hon. KEN HECHLER were at our table with the 4-H Club delegates from West Virginia, as well as adult leaders from the Mountain State who are attending the conference. Present were delegates Jorene Butcher, Glenville, W. Va.; Rose Lee Matthews, Monongah, W. Va.; Richard Steven Hannah, Mount Clare, W. Va.; and Edwin Hill, Chesapeake, W. Va. During the conference Miss Butcher serves as a member of the speakers committee, Miss Matthews is on the hospitality committee, Mr. Hannah on the recreation committee, and Mr. Hill is a representative on the vesper committee.

Also representing West Virginia were Miss Mildred Fizer, State extension 4-H programs leader, and C. P. Dorsey, State extension 4-H Club leader. These devoted citizens commented on the success of the 4-H movement in West Virginia, pointing out that there is representation in each of our 55 counties, and that membership now exceeds 35,000 and is growing rapidly. They also paid deserved tribute to the efforts of the late T. P. Kendrick, the first State extension 4-H leader for West Virginia. I, too, was privileged to know and work with this good and great 4-H organizer.

Two other responsible and civic-minded Americans were with the West Virginians during the breakfast program: Miss Gertrude Warren, an energetic pioneer at the national level in 4-H work; and Miss Bonnie Rollins, representing the Farm Journal magazine. It was valuable to our youth to share the thinking of these two ladies, and to discuss with them the impacts of 4-H programs.

Mr. President, the 4-H Clubs are making a significant contribution to the mental, physical, and moral growth of young people the world over. The members of this purposeful organization, and their dedicated adult leaders, are deserving of our highest praise for their devotion to principle and patriotism.

FIRE IN STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a tragic fire, swept by high winds, has devastated hundreds of homes in Staten Island, N.Y. Almost 300,000 acres of land have been blackened in a fire which involved more than half of New York City's fire department who fought this fire with great courage and diligence.

Staten Island is a community of homeowners and small businesses populated

by hard working, prudent citizens. Our sympathy is extended to them over the severe and heart-rending losses they have suffered.

In an effort to be of assistance to these people, I have communicated with John Horne, the administrator of the Small Business Administration, asking that this county be declared a disaster area for purposes of receiving emergency Federal aid. I have also contacted Borough President Maniscalco, expressing my extreme concern for the people of this community and offering to do everything possible to help them through this crisis.

I take this opportunity to express my support for the efforts of the people of Staten Island to rebuild their homes and businesses after this tragedy, and I assure them that the Federal Government—as is true, I am sure, of all their Representatives in Congress—is working to obtain help for them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with my colleague from New York in the sympathy extended to the people of Staten Island, whose homes have been devastated by fire. This also is true of the people in the parts of New Jersey similarly affected.

I join also in paying tribute to the heroism and high sense of duty of the New York City fire department. As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I join with my colleague in the request that this be declared a disaster area.

I assure the people of Staten Island of the indefatigable efforts I know we shall make—and which I know the whole New York delegation will make—to see to it that the resources of the Federal Government give to them such aid in this disaster as is practicable and possible.

It is not often, Mr. President, that we think of New York City in terms of a disaster. It is a great, populous city. Nonetheless, there are some rather open areas in Staten Island, the county of Richmond.

This is one time when New York needs the Nation. I am confident that the Nation will respond, as it does to disaster wherever it occurs.

I appreciate the privilege of joining with my colleague, so that we may do all we can to alleviate the impact of this misfortune.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today my colleague, Mr. JAVITS, and I referred to a communication we had addressed to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in which we called attention to the tragic fire on Staten Island, and requested that that county be declared a disaster area.

I am very happy to state at this time that I have just received a telephone call from the Small Business Administration in which I was informed that Staten Island has been declared a disaster area. That means that Federal loan programs will be extended to homes, businesses, churches, and charitable institutions there which have been so badly ravaged by the fire, and that the New York office of the Small Business Ad-

ministration will begin promptly to handle loan applications.

I wish to express publicly to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration my appreciation for the prompt action taken to alleviate the great distress suffered by this important area of my State. I am deeply grateful.

SOVIET STRENGTH IN CUBA—ANALYZED BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished military affairs analyst of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, offers some very perceptive comments on the Soviet forces in Cuba. Mr. Baldwin reports in his column that:

There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them.

Mr. Baldwin's views are backed by years of experience and proven accuracy. I know that his analysis will be of interest to many Senators and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his 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:

SOVIET STRENGTH IN CUBA PUT HIGH—SOME EXPERTS BELIEVE COUNT MAY BE 30,000 TO 40,000

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

A recent reassessment of Soviet forces in Cuba has convinced some intelligence experts that there may be 30,000 to 40,000 Russian military personnel on the island.

Many experts believe the number has not actually changed greatly since last fall; the upward revision of past figures stems from a close study of all available intelligence facts. The experts believe, too, that the Russians are rotating troops to Cuba, not withdrawing them.

These interpretations provide the background for the recent assertion by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, New York Republican, that Russian strength in Cuba, despite withdrawals announced by the President, was still about 17,000 men.

At a news conference April 3, the President estimated that a 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn in recent weeks. He did not estimate the number that remained, but left the impression that about 13,000 were still there.

CAPITAL'S OPINIONS VARY

There is no consensus in Washington about how many Soviet troops are in Cuba. In fact, some of the highest Government officials and many intelligence officers admit that they do not know how many are on the island.

It is far easier to estimate tonnages of equipment and numbers of guns than numbers of personnel. Last fall, emphasis in the intelligence community was fixed on the Soviet medium-range missiles in Cuba and there was a tendency, until after the crisis had passed, to neglect the details of the ground forces and of conventional equipment.

Moreover, it has been possible to estimate approximately the numbers of Soviet troops withdrawn from the island in recent weeks, but not how many have been brought in.

Many officials are convinced that the total number has not changed greatly and that the Russians are replacing the troops they have withdrawn in a rotation plan similar to those the United States uses for its overseas units.

SOVIET UNITS LISTED

Details are lacking on what some Pentagon officials now call the "Soviet expeditionary force" in Cuba. But some experts believe the Russians are maintaining the equivalent of a heavily reinforced motorized rifle division. Such a division normally numbers about 13,000 men.

The four principal tactical ground units, identified in the past as battalion size units, are still on the island and have made no attempt to conceal their identity.

Other units of field artillery, antiaircraft, infantry, and so on, are said to be somewhat harder to pinpoint, and a large number of the Russian forces are crews for the antiaircraft and coast defense missiles and provide communications, maintenance, and specialist services for their own and Cuban forces. An unknown number wear civilian clothes and blend into the population.

Though many intelligence experts and some Government officials say they do not know how many Russian troops are in Cuba, one said he would bet a year's pay that the number was closer to 30,000 than to 17,000, and a month's pay that it was closer to 40,000 than to 17,000.

There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them.

The purposes of the continued presence of so large a Soviet force in Cuba could be multiple.

VARIOUS FUNCTIONS SERVED

It was undoubtedly intended originally to provide protection for the long-range missiles that Premier Khrushchev attempted to install there last fall, which have now—in the opinion of most intelligence experts—been withdrawn. Since the withdrawal of all or part of these missiles, the troops appear to have a number of functions:

To help protect the island against any invasion by the United States or by exile forces aided by the United States.

To perpetuate Premier Fidel Castro's rule and to secure the Communist government there against internal revolt.

To train Cuban forces and other Communist Latin American cadres.

To provide small infiltration and subversion units capable of exporting armed communism to other areas of the Western Hemisphere.

To maintain a base of Soviet Communist military power in the Western Hemisphere for psychological and political purposes and as a bargaining gambit in the world conflict.

Some experts believe the President may not have known of the revised estimates of some intelligence experts when he implied a few weeks ago that Soviet troop strength in Cuba had been reduced to 13,000.

Some observers have been concerned that official intelligence estimates that have reached some of the highest officials during and since the Cuban crisis may have been shaped—perhaps unconsciously—to conform with policy rather than evaluating the Russian capabilities baldly.

NAVAL COURT OF INQUIRY AND THE SUBMARINE "THRESHER"

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I deplore the exaggerations and emotional distortions surrounding the naval court of inquiry into the disastrous loss of the submarine *Thresher*.

The purpose of the naval court of inquiry into the loss of the nuclear attack submarine *Thresher* is to draw from the disaster all possible knowledge of future benefit to the nuclear submarine program. Our naval shipyard workers have

consistently demonstrated their mastery of the painstaking and intricate techniques required for the development of modern weapons systems.

The modern submarine reactor plant is a marvel of safety and power. Our Navy command and combat personnel have consistently shown skill and enterprise in the operation of these vessels. I am confident that the record of the court of inquiry will establish beyond doubt the overall quality of shipyard work and skill of Navy submarine personnel.

I deplore the misleading sensationalism of some reports of isolated details of testimony before the court of inquiry. It is worth pointing out that its purpose is neither recrimination nor the reckless fixing of blame. I have the utmost confidence in the court and its staff, to produce not only fair, but permanently useful findings.

No one should ignore the constructive aspects of the inquiry and its positive disclosures of meticulous inspection and competent naval management and command.

The public has a right to know about the inquiry proceedings. The doors of the hearing room should not be closed to the press, yet the importance of this inquiry imposes a responsibility upon all news media to review the whole record instead of sensational details. In that way we will meet our obligation to the men who went down with the *Thresher* in learning the truth and making of it an instrument for improving the submarine service.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am increasingly disturbed over the reception which the President's tax program has been receiving. While I am not necessarily in agreement with all the specific reform proposals contained in the original message, I am convinced of the importance of reducing our present level of unemployment, stimulating industrial investment, and raising our rate of economic growth.

While I am pleased with the recent report of the Department of Labor which indicates a significant drop in the unemployment figure from a high of 6.1 percent of the labor force in February, this is only a beginning. Much more must be done in this area and in the area of industrial expansion referred to above. In this latter connection, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appearing in the *Baltimore Sun* on March 11, indicating the importance of personal and corporate tax cuts, be printed in the *Record* at this point.

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

TWO KINDS OF SPENDING

One of the arguments in the tax debate is that the main thing we need to promote economic growth is expanded consumers' demand. People who talk this way would concentrate projected tax reductions in the lower brackets. The extra spending made available to a maximum number of householders would stimulate all the heavy investment the economy needs, according to this view. Up-

per-bracket and corporate tax reductions are criticized as smacking of old-fashioned theories about prosperity trickling down from the top.

One way to test these arguments is to see what the actual figures of spending and investment have been since the most recent business peak, which was in 1957. Total personal consumption expenditures in 1957 were \$285.2 billion. They totaled \$356.7 billion in 1962. To be sure, population had also grown—from 171,278,000 in 1957 to 186,591,000 in 1962. However, personal income growth kept well ahead of population gains. Per capita disposable personal income in 1957 was \$1,803 and in 1962, \$2,052.

Over this same stretch key trends in industrial investment were quite different. Expenditures for new manufacturing plant and equipment were \$15.96 billion in 1957. They were \$14.80 billion in 1962 and in the first quarter of 1963 had risen to a rate of only \$14.95 billion. The term economic growth has many meanings, but one of the main ones is certainly expansion in manufacturing plant and equipment.

What the figures suggest then, is that a gain of \$71.5 billion in annual personal consumption expenditures from 1957 to 1962 was accompanied by a drop of just over a billion dollars in annual plant and equipment expenditures in the same period. The figures are crude, of course, and the comparisons are subject to many qualifications. They do suggest that there is something less than a direct booster effect between consumers' spending and plant growth. That, undoubtedly is why the administration tax plan provides for high-bracket and business tax cuts as well as for low-bracket reductions.

FEDERAL CAREER SERVICE AWARDS OF 1963

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on March 26 the National Civil Service League honored 10 outstanding Federal career employees for their major contributions to the Nation through Government service. The recipients of the league's 1963 Career Service Awards were cited "in recognition of a distinguished career in the U.S. Government which has exemplified in an outstanding manner the highest characteristics of public service."

On this occasion, the President of the United States recognized the achievements of these individuals with the following message:

To the 10 winners of the Career Service Award of the National Civil Service League, I send warm expressions of gratitude. The Nation has good reason to be proud of the exceptional abilities you have applied in your productive years of service and your vital roles in shaping and moving our Government programs. All citizens should be reassured to know that the demanding problems that confront our Government are being met with knowledge, imagination, and leadership. The wide range of your achievements exemplifies the great variety of opportunities for a challenging career in the Federal service.

The National Civil Service League has again, by its selection and acclaim of outstanding award winners, made a valuable contribution to better public understanding of our career service. My best wishes for continued success in their endeavors go to Graeme C. Bannerman, Capt. Hewlett R. Bishop, August C. Hahn, Dr. G. K. Hartmann, Arthur C. Lundahl, Nicholas J. Oganovic, Dr. Hildrus A. Poindexter, James J. Rowley, Frank A. Taylor, and William H. Weathersby.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

On meeting with the award winners the following day, President Kennedy said:

I want to commend the league for its long history of spotlighting the dedicated public service of our civil servants. I think it made an unusually appropriate selection this year. I think it reminds us as citizens how much we owe some people who work quite anonymously for the people of the United States. So, I want to congratulate the league and the winners this year.

I think it very commendable of the National Civil Service League, an organization of private citizens dedicated to improving the Federal career service, to stimulate this recognition of excellence in Government service. I invite the attention of my colleagues to these outstanding individuals and the achievements for which they were honored. The award winners are—

Graeme C. Bannerman, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, oversees procurement activities of the Department of Defense involving approximately \$25 billion annually—some 30 percent of the total Federal budget. In carrying out his duties, he has achieved national stature as a recognized authority on Defense procurement policy, systems, and practices. Through Mr. Bannerman's leadership, the procurement elements of the armed services have been drawn into a cooperative and cohesive group thus paving the way for significant improvements in purchasing policy and techniques and the consequent saving of millions of dollars in Defense appropriations.

Capt. Hewlett R. Bishop, of the Department of Commerce, is responsible for the effective management of all Maritime Administration programs and operations in the large and complex Atlantic coast district. During World War II he conceived and developed several extremely effective and widely adopted cargo-loading innovations that permitted maximum utilization of our shipping resources. He has made important contributions to the safety of ships at sea and in port. He was instrumental in providing the efficient and rapid reactivation of ships from the Reserve Fleet when vitally needed during the Korean emergency. Captain Bishop has also provided strong leadership in organizations dedicated to achieving cooperation and coordination of Government and industrial efforts toward a stronger public service.

August C. Hahn, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, in carrying out his responsibility for functional direction of post office operations and activities—including the collection, distribution, and delivery of mail—has demonstrated distinguished leadership and expert technical knowledge in improving postal management and administration. He has played a key role in the Department's modernization and decentralization program. He has provided gifted direction to the implementation of the accelerated business collection and delivery program, and to the strengthening of local management skills in post offices throughout the Nation. Mr. Hahn's

imaginative leadership has been instrumental in the development of postal innovations which have permitted budgetary savings of \$20 million in 1 year alone.

Dr. Gregory K. Hartmann, Technical Director, U.S. Naval Ordnance Laboratory, has provided leadership, both as a scientist and as an administrator, in accomplishing scientific work of the most advanced nature and vital significance for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy Commission, and other Government agencies. He pioneered in the study of nuclear-weapon effects and has been responsible for the work of scientific groups at several nuclear test operations. His brilliant work and tireless efforts have led to immeasurable contributions in the field of underwater-explosives research. As the first chairman of the Undersea Warfare Research and Development Planning Council, Dr. Hartmann played an important role in the successful development of our vital Polaris weapons system.

Arthur C. Lundahl, Assistant Director for Photographic Intelligence, CIA, serves as the Government's highest photographic-intelligence officer and has, consequently, been intimately involved in the most important problems affecting national security. Over the course of the last 10 years, he has organized and developed our photographic intelligence system thus bringing about a significant advance in America's intelligence resources. Through his extensive experience and his appreciation of national strategic problems, Mr. Lundahl has developed means to insure the efficient exploitation of new and unique types of photography of the greatest importance and the highest priority.

Nicholas J. Oganovic, Deputy Executive Director, U.S. Civil Service Commission, has made an outstanding contribution to better public service through his forceful and imaginative administration of Civil Service Commission activities, particularly in its field operations. Primarily through his efforts, major reorganizations have been accomplished creating new, more effective patterns of service and having significant impact on Federal personnel management. Especially notable is his concept of on-the-spot service through assignment of Civil Service representatives to more than 50 metropolitan centers outside the Commission's regional office cities. Mr. Oganovic was responsible for the administrative measures establishing the Federal Executive Boards to improve the efficiency and economy of Government field operations and has been prominently identified with the Government's quest for quality in recruiting. He has also won recognition for the new vitality he brought to the program for selective placement of the handicapped in Government service.

Dr. Hildrus A. Poindexter, Chief Public Health Adviser, Agency for International Development, scholar, teacher, healer, administrator, in 31 years of Government service, has made outstanding contributions to medical research and public health both in the United States and abroad. His foreign-duty assign-

ments have taken him to Liberia, Vietnam, Laos, Surinam, Iraq, Libya, and he is currently serving in Sierra Leone. His efforts have provided and encouraged training for doctors, dentists, pharmacists, and nurses in this country and for laboratory technicians and nurses now holding positions of major responsibility in Liberia, Vietnam, and Laos. Dr. Poindexter directed the public-health measures associated with the evacuation of over 600,000 Vietnamese from North Vietnam when the Communists overran the country. His leadership has been instrumental in the adoption of public-health legislation by many of the countries in which he has served.

James J. Rowley, Chief of the U.S. Secret Service was for 15 years special agent in charge of the White House detail and was personally responsible for establishing, developing, and maintaining security techniques and procedures necessary to assure the protection of the first families of the Nation. During the period of his responsibility several serious attempts were made to harm the first family; yet none was successful. Since becoming Chief he has assumed still greater responsibilities in instituting protective planning and research, developing new methods for the investigation and detection of counterfeiting activities, and dealing with other important Secret Service assignments.

Frank A. Taylor, Director of the U.S. National Museum, Smithsonian Institution, currently bears what may well be the heaviest responsibility of any museum official in the world. Among his achievements are the planning, organization, and administration of a highly successful program of exhibit modernization throughout the Smithsonian and the initiation of a vital new program of research and scholarly publication within the Museum of History and Technology. In addition to this work, he is responsible for the general administration of a museum that has important departments of anthropology, zoology, botany, geology, the history of science and technology, the cultural history of the United States, and Armed Forces history. Possibly his greatest contribution has been in his leadership in the planning and development of the new \$36 million Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution.

William H. Weathersby, Country Public Affairs Officer for India, USIA, currently directs a critically important and USIA's largest operation abroad. He serves in a dual role as public-affairs adviser to the Ambassador and the Embassy and as operational chief of a large information and cultural program throughout India. In addition to the major contribution he has made to the attainment of American informational objectives in the Near and Middle East, his abilities have made a strong impact on the management and operation of the Agency itself. As personnel director, Mr. Weathersby has developed a Foreign Service career system, revised the Agency's examination system, improved and accelerated the recruiting process,

and instituted a number of other significant improvements in personnel management and policy.

DISCRIMINATION BY CERTAIN EUROPEAN NATIONS AGAINST AMERICAN FRESH FRUITS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the discriminatory practices levied by certain European nations against imports or our American fresh fruits are continuing in substantial degree.

I am convinced that the European countries who practice this discrimination, particularly France, will cooperate only if retaliatory measures are taken against them. I have communicated with the Honorable Christian H. Herter, special representative for trade negotiations, advising him of my view on this subject and requesting appropriate action by him. I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, at this point of my remarks, a copy of my letter of April 22 to Mr. Herter.

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

APRIL 22, 1963.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations,
Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: During a recent visit to the State of Oregon, I had the opportunity to discuss with leading growers and shippers of Oregon pears and apples the very difficult situation with which they are confronted due to nontariff trade barriers imposed against American apples and pears by France and other European nations. The situation that prevails with respect to France is particularly acute and is becoming increasingly difficult for Oregon growers and shippers as the months go by.

In a letter addressed to me, under date of December 19, Under Secretary of State Ball wrote to me as follows:

"I agree with you that the progress we have made thus far in opening the French market for our apples and pears has been negligible. I am concerned at this lack of success.

"It was this combination of factors—our concern and our lack of progress—that led us to bring our formal complaint against France under article XXIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The contracting parties to the GATT at the 20th session recently completed in Geneva agreed that the French restrictions were inconsistent with the GATT, that benefits to which we were entitled were being nullified or impaired, and that the United States was entitled to exercise its right to suspend equivalent concessions which France enjoys in the American market.

"The contracting parties also recommended that the U.S. Government refrain from exercising its right of retaliation 'for a reasonable period' in the hope that further bilateral discussions between the United States and France might lead to the expansion, rather than the retaliatory contraction, of trade. It would not be appropriate or beneficial to us for the United States to retaliate immediately and ignore this international recommendation.

"If the French fail within a reasonable time to take significant steps to reduce unjustifiable restrictions against our trade, we are prepared to resort to our rights under GATT for compensatory action."

It is my opinion and the opinion of many other Senators that a reasonable time for the French to reduce unjustifiable restrictions

against our trade has long since passed. In this connection, Mr. Ray Reter, of the Reter Fruit Co., of Medford, Oreg., one of Oregon's leading pear growers and shippers, stated in a recent letter:

"It may well be we will never gain access to the French market for our fruit and fruit products, but I am convinced we will get no consideration unless we take prompt action and go through with retaliatory procedures under article XXIII. We were originally told by Under Secretary Ball that action would start in late January if the French did not correct the situation. The French did not take corrective action and after De Gaulle wrecked the United Kingdom's entry into the Common Market and made clear his complete protectionist agricultural policy, we are again to defer action because it might be construed as a retaliation against De Gaulle.

"Mr. Herter should indicate clearly why action has not been instituted against France and should also tell us when the Government definitely expects to take action against France. Also, what does the Government plan to do to secure access for 1963 on pears and apples?

"If we do not promptly proceed against France in this matter, there is little hope that any country or the Common Market will pay any attention to us in the future."

The somewhat pointed language that I have just quoted is typical of the comments I receive from fruitgrowers throughout the State of Oregon. These growers ask me when our Government plans to end the discriminatory action that is practiced against our American fresh fruit exports—especially by France—and I simply do not have the answer.

To give you a further idea of the comments I am receiving on this general subject, I enclose the following:

1. The report of Mr. Frank Elliott of the U.S. Fruit Export Council, dated March 27, 1963.

2. A letter, dated April 6, addressed to Mr. Ray Reter by Mr. Roger Capgras, the representative in France of certain fruitgrowers.

3. The minutes of the meeting of the National Fruit Export Council, February 8, 1963.

Because of the seriousness of this problem, I would appreciate it very much if you would advise me as to whether the Government intends to proceed against France and against other European nations that have imposed nontariff restrictions against American fresh fruit imports, under article XXIII of GATT. In addition, I would appreciate information as to what can be done under existing laws and treaties to effectively bring to an end these discriminatory barriers against our American fresh fruits, particularly apples and pears.

Your assistance in this matter at an early date would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

TRIBUTE TO HEROES OF THE WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, 20 years ago, from April 19 to May 8, 1943, the Jews of the Warsaw ghetto carried on a heroic and hopeless fight against the overwhelming power of the Nazi troops bent on their extermination.

While each of us would probably rather forget that humanity is capable of acts of extermination such as those carried out by the Nazis, I think it is well for us to look back on this tragic event, perhaps the most tragic event in recent history. For a new generation has grown up since 1943 which might otherwise never fully realize that acts such as this took place during their childhood.

Reflection on the Warsaw uprising will remind us, too, of the valor of the human spirit, as well as the need to prevent any recurrence of the depravity of which man is also capable. With a little sharper awareness of the danger of mass murder, our country might long since have ratified the Genocide Convention, signed by our Government at the United Nations in 1948.

In 1943, Wolf Zyto, now a dental technician living in London, was a young man in his early twenties who had escaped from the Warsaw ghetto and who was living outside it, with some members of his family still confined within the ghetto. He is one of the few escapees from the ghetto who witnessed the valiant Warsaw uprising and who lived to record his memories of it.

Mr. President, on Sunday, April 21, the Washington Post republished some memories by Wolf Zyto of this period, written in diary form and sent to the London Observer. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD part of the Washington Post's introduction to these published memories and part of Mr. Zyto's entry for Tuesday, April 20, 1943, the day after the Nazi troops began their campaign of annihilation.

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

TUESDAY, APRIL 20, 1943

(This is the diary of a Jew who watched his family and his people dying in the ghetto. Wolf Zyto was one of the Polish Jews who survived with the help of their Christian neighbors. In April 1943, he was living in Warsaw under an assumed name, working in a factory and sheltered by a friendly Polish family. Earlier, Zyto had lived in the ghetto itself. He acted as one of the couriers who smuggled in food. Some of his family managed, like him, to escape from the ghetto. But his mother and a brother were still there when the Germans launched their attack. At the time, Zyto was 21. He now lives in London and is a dental technician. He recently wrote down his memories in diary form, to exorcise the past, and sent them to the London Observer on the off-chance that it might publish them.)

I haven't slept all night, but have met by arrangement my elder brother, and we go to a friend's family at Okopowa Street opposite the Feifer leather works. From their second-floor window, looking through the curtains, I can see German soldiers. They have an anti-tank gun in position behind the leather works and are firing away at dead and apparently empty houses, setting them on fire.

Then the figure of a man appears at one of the top windows of a six-story house that is burning, and after a moment's hesitation he jumps.

Henry and Janina S. and their father, Stanislaw S., all are in tears and have been praying silently. My brother takes me in his arms and tries to stop my sobbing, but he cannot keep back his own tears.

What a courageous man Stanislaw S. is. One of the lights that shine in this dark age. He is about 60 years old and until today worked in Przytulski leather works, which are in the ghetto. He had a special permit, but instead of entering the ghetto through the gate in Dzika Street, as was marked on his card, he would pretend he had made a mistake and walk through the gate at Gesia Street, so that he passed the house where we lived—and where my moth-

er and little brother are still hiding because old people and children are no longer allowed. Stanislaw S. would pass on a loaf of bread, already specially thickly buttered, and sometimes even a bottle of milk.

This was supposed to be his own lunch, and he would then go hungry all day because the Germans checked everything they carried in their pockets. If he had been caught he would have been shot on the spot. We hoped that one day we might find a place for my mother and little brother, and ways of getting them out, but now all hope is gone.

The spring sun is still shining, but thick clouds of smoke hang over the rooftops. From time to time there is machine-gun fire, and single explosions of cannon shells and grenades.

What can I do? The wall is surrounded in such a way that a mouse could not get through.

I go out into the street and into a church. Unbelievable quiet. I can't think, but I look at a figure of Christ, and I ask inside me, "How many times have You been crucified? * * *

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, and State universities to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business having been concluded, the unanimous agreement entered into yesterday with respect to the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research, controlling time, becomes effective.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to intrude a quorum call for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes without the time being charged to the bill, and that in addition I may proceed for as long as it is necessary to yield to my friend and colleague the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me.

REPEAL OF THE SILVER PURCHASE ACTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the administration has proposed to repeal the silver purchase acts and the silver transactions tax and to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to issue \$1 and \$2 Federal Reserve notes. Questions have been raised as to whether this proposal would be inflationary or would be a step in the direction of devaluation of the dollar. This question will loom large in the minds of the Committee on Banking and Currency next Monday when it hears testimony on H.R. 5389, the House-passed administration bill.

I am particularly concerned because of my interest in a sound economy and a sound Federal financial position. I have expressed many times my concern over current inflationary trends, including particularly those relating to Federal tax and spending policies and our national balance of payments.

Consequently, if I thought the purpose or effect of H.R. 5389 was inflationary, or if I thought that its purpose or effect was to devalue the dollar, I should oppose it vigorously.

However, from everything I have heard about this bill so far, including the strong support given to this administration proposal by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon and Federal Reserve Board Chairman Martin, the bill does not seem to me to be inflationary, nor does it seem to be a step in the direction of devaluation of the dollar. On the contrary, it seems to me that the threat of inflation and devaluation of the dollar comes from other sources.

As I see it, the principal danger of inflation—aside from imprudent price and wage policies, which injure our balance of payments as much as they injure our domestic situation—comes from constantly unbalanced Federal budgets, which would cause immediate and uncontrolled inflation, if the Federal Reserve Board were not extremely cautious in exercising its existing monetary authority.

At the present time, demand deposits in commercial banks—by all odds the largest and most important form of money in the country—amount to about \$115 billion. This amount is limited and controlled in large part by the Federal Reserve Board's power over reserve requirements. The Federal Reserve Board now requires reserves on demand deposits of 16½ percent for Reserve city banks and 12 percent for country banks. The Board has power, under existing law, to reduce these requirements to 10 percent and 7 percent, respectively. This action would immediately release about \$6.25 billion in reserves, which might be expected to generate up to \$50

billion in demand deposits. In other words, the Federal Reserve Board today could, if it chose, increase demand deposits by about \$50 billion, or almost 50 percent.

At the present time, we have some \$3 billion in free gold. The Federal Reserve Board could use this \$3 billion to support new bank reserves through Federal Reserve purchases of Government securities. This would increase bank reserves by about \$12 billion, and, even at present reserve requirement levels, could generate up to \$80 billion in demand deposits. In other words, the Federal Reserve Board could today, if it chose, increase demand deposits in this fashion by up to \$80 billion, or about two-thirds.

If the Board should at the same time reduce reserve requirements, demand deposits could rise as high as \$300 billion, about 2½ times the present figure.

Or the \$3 billion in free gold could also be used to increase by \$12 billion the supply of Federal Reserve notes outstanding, now almost \$30 billion, an increase of more than one-third.

The existence of these authorities in the Federal Reserve Board at the present time means, of course, that we now have a managed currency. We accomplish nothing if we deny this or try to conceal it. We would do better to recognize it frankly and to rely on managing it well and responsibly, as I believe the Federal Reserve Board is now doing.

I believe it is equally important for the executive branch and the legislative branch to act responsibly with respect to Government revenues and expenditures. Permitting the Government budget to be unbalanced on the upside of a business cycle is not, in my judgment, acting wisely or responsibly. And a deficit of the nature which would result if taxes are cut \$10 billion, without a corresponding reduction in expenditures, would not, I am convinced, be consistent with sound fiscal management and responsible monetary policy.

The proposed change from silver certificates to Federal Reserve notes would, however, not have any bearing whatever on our financial stability. A comparison of the quantity of \$1 and \$2 silver certificates—the only certificates affected by the bill—makes clear the relative unimportance of these certificates, of which only \$1.5 billion were outstanding on March 31, 1963. At the same date, \$2.4 billion in subsidiary silver and minor coins were in circulation; almost \$30 billion in Federal Reserve notes were in circulation; and demand deposits amounted to \$115 billion.

Fluctuations in the price of silver mean that the value of the security behind a silver certificate varies greatly from time to time. A \$1 silver certificate is backed by 371.25 grains of pure silver, or just over three-fourths of an ounce. In 1932, the price of silver sank as low as 25 cents and ounce. At that rate the silver in a silver dollar was worth something less than 20 cents.

For virtually all of the period covered by the silver purchase acts, the price of silver has been 91 cents an ounce or less. At that price the silver in a silver dollar was worth no more than 70 cents.

For 10 years—from 1935 to 1945—the price of silver was below 50 cents. At that price the silver dollar contained less than 40 cents worth of silver.

The \$1 and \$2 Federal Reserve notes which would be authorized under the bill would be backed up, like all other Federal Reserve notes, by 25 percent gold and 75 percent in Government bonds and other eligible paper.

Federal Reserve notes and silver certificates, and U.S. notes too, are legal tender for all debts, public and private. All of these notes and certificates are completely interchangeable, and they are, as we all know, equally acceptable to the public.

The Government stopped selling silver in November 1961. At that time the market price was approximately 91 cents, the Government's selling price. This was an artificially low price kept down by the Government's sales from the amounts it had previously been required to buy under the silver purchase acts. Over the 15 years preceding the Government's decision to stop selling silver, consumption in the United States for industrial uses and coinage had risen from the 1947-49 average of 119 million ounces to 161 million ounces in 1961, while the aggregate of net imports and American production had sunk from a 1947-49 average of 77 million ounces to 68 million ounces in 1961. The deficit was made up by Treasury sales, which began to be substantial in 1959 and rose to 62 million ounces in 1961, not counting 55 million ounces used for coinage.

As soon as the Treasury stopped selling silver, the price rose sharply. It now is at about \$1.27½ an ounce. With silver at this price, a \$1 silver certificate is backed up by about 98 cents in silver.

The break-even point comes when the price of silver is \$1.29-plus an ounce. At that price, each silver certificate will be backed up by exactly \$1 of silver.

If the price of silver should rise substantially above \$1.29 an ounce, it would be worth while for holders of silver certificates to present them at the Treasury and to demand silver dollars or silver bullion. The resulting reduction in \$1 bills would have serious effects on business and trade, but it would not be inflationary.

The mint, of course, will have to continue to obtain silver for subsidiary coins. It could buy silver on the open market, either from domestic production or from foreign sources, with the resulting effects on the price of silver and on the balance of payments, or silver could be made available by withdrawing Treasury-held \$1 silver certificates from circulation, which would decrease further the number of \$1 silver certificates.

The new \$1 and \$2 Federal Reserve notes which would be authorized under the proposed bill would, of course, impose an additional burden on our gold reserves because they, like other Federal Reserve notes, would have to be covered by 25 percent in gold certificates. The Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board state that they intend to make these transfers gradually, at a rate which, allowing for increases in the number of

\$1 bills needed, would require only about \$35 million of gold certificates a year. This would not have any appreciable impact on our gold reserves.

In any event, of course, the balance of payments situation must be squarely faced and must be solved on its own merits. Whether the administration proposal with respect to \$1 Federal Reserve notes is adopted or is not adopted, we will still have a serious balance of payments problem, and we must solve it.

H.R. 5389, in my judgment, has no connection with devaluation of the dollar. Repealing the silver purchase acts and issuing \$1 Federal Reserve notes would not help to devalue the dollar, and it is not a necessary step in the devaluation of the dollar. This can only be accomplished by changing the price of gold from \$35 an ounce to some higher figure.

Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin have assured us that the administration does not intend to undertake devaluation. And it seems appropriate to point out in this connection that section 5 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act provides as follows:

Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States . . . (b) propose or agree to any change in the par value of the United States dollar under article IV, section 5, or article XX, section 4, of the articles of agreement of the fund, or approve any general change in par values under article IV, section 7—

Sound and responsible fiscal policies and responsible and competitive price and wage policies are vitally important to the Nation and to our position of world leadership. We must concentrate our efforts in support of such policies.

Mr. President, again I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am taking this time today to report to the Senate on what I consider to be something critically important—what I hope will prove to be a major help in respect of the development of Latin America and, incidentally, of the solving of the problems with respect to Cuba, because everybody agrees that inherent in our problems with respect to Cuba is the need for satisfactory economic and social development of Latin America. If this development can be accelerated, if the Alliance for Progress can be buttressed and supported in order to do the job which we had planned it should do, then—for both critics of or supporters of the administration policy—this will represent a major contribution in respect to dealing with the grave danger that Cuba poses. The danger, of course, is that this example may permeate others of the American States. Therefore, Mr. President, I make this report within that frame of reference.

I am today announcing the organization of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, an or-

ganization privately financed by grants from foundations, including a substantial grant from the Ford Foundation, and by United States, Western European, and Latin American businessmen.

The purpose of this organization is to encourage Western European investment in Latin America in coordination with indigenous and U.S. private capital, and to recommend a permanent mechanism which will serve as a medium for continued private investment in Latin America.

Mr. President, I emphasize it is proposed that the governments shall back private enterprise, and that this is where the governments will come in; but that the fundamental purpose of this plan is to induce tripartite private investment under congenial conditions in individual Latin-American countries which are willing and able to create those conditions.

Three executive directors to carry on the activities of the group are being appointed for the United States, West Europe, and Latin America and will be formally announced soon. They have actually been chosen and named.

Over the past 9 months a new intent and willingness has become apparent on the part of Western Europe to look beyond the confines of its own present economic growth. There is a growing revival of Western European interest in Latin America. This healthy trend has cut through the discouraging and divisive forces unleashed by the failure of the United Kingdom's application for Common Market membership. It has become increasingly clear that the resources available to the United States and to Latin America do not reach far enough to achieve the vast goal of Latin American economic progress in freedom—and, I emphasize, in time, since I believe the time is one of our greatest problems in respect of Latin America. The human and capital resources available to members of the whole Atlantic Community clearly must be marshaled in order to achieve success soon enough and effectively enough.

The genesis of this effort, Mr. President, was in November 1962 when the NATO Parliamentarians Conference in Paris adopted a resolution pursuant to a recommendation of its economic committee, of which I have the honor to be the chairman. The resolution urged that "the private and public sectors of the member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development OECD—be enlisted in an accelerated development program with Latin America in coordination with the Alliance for Progress."

It will be remembered that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consists of 18 western European countries and the United States and Canada; and it is designed for the economic coordination of the Atlantic Community. Within its context is also the Development Assistance Committee, consisting of the nine principal countries giving foreign aid in the world, and including as an additional member, Japan.

Between April 5 and 7 of this year in Paris, I participated in what I believe to be a highly important and concrete de-

velopment in Western Europe's new-found identification with the problems of Latin America—meetings toward the establishment of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America.

This group, Mr. President—I hasten to add—is based upon the efforts of a working party of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference consisting of the Parliamentarian representatives of delegations of seven NATO countries; and I have the honor to be chairman of that working group.

The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America is an action committee with the purpose of pulling together over the next 6 to 12 months immediate-impact, private-investment projects on a tripartite basis—utilizing Western European, United States, and indigenous Latin American capital and managerial and technical know-how. In addition this group, headed by a tripartite directorate from Latin America, Western Europe, and the United States, will formulate recommendations for a permanent mechanism to bring together United States, Western European, and indigenous Latin American capital for specific development projects.

It is believed that arrangements for suitable indigenous governmental acceptability of such an effort will greatly help private enterprise participate in Latin American development all along the line.

The basic concept behind the establishment of this group develops from the fact that in Latin America, the United States needs Europe now and that Europe should come forward to help in the same spirit as did the United States in 1947, 1948, and 1949 under the Marshall plan.

By September of this year we believed that sufficient progress will have been made to submit an action plan to the Parliamentary Working Party of the interested Atlantic Community nations; that is, the working party I described of which I am the chairman. Within 2 months from now—or in June or July—it is expected that a high level conference of public and private officials from Western Europe, the United States and Latin America will convene to make policy recommendations with respect to this work, first to the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and then to a broad international conference which is contemplated by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference resolution.

The ultimate aim of our work is to have it taken over and actually put into effect by existing organizations such as the OECD, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Organization of American States, cooperating with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and other international agencies.

At this very moment our distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is participating in the meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank at Caracas, Venezuela, where he is furthering and explaining the purposes of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, in the creation of which he has, at my invitation, taken

an active part with me, and as to which I am honored to state he is my full associate.

Next week I hope that we shall have here in the Senate a report from the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as to what took place in Caracas. In the meantime, however, I should like to discuss the significance and some of the details of what has taken place in Western Europe and in the United States with respect to this Atlantic Community effort.

Two events occurred in November of 1962, both following some months of preparation, one of which took place in Paris and the other of which took place in Brussels.

In Brussels, about a week after the NATO Parliamentarians Conference of November 1962, the International Association of Christian Employers held a forum to discuss and make recommendations on the role of Europe in Latin American economic development.

Out of this forum has grown the European Committee for Cooperation with Latin America. Both of these actions, that is, that of the parliamentarians and that of the International Association of Christian Employers, are beginning to bear fruit this spring.

I have described the establishment of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America. This group is now working in close liaison with the UNIAPAC secretary, who is undertaking preparatory work for the first full meeting of CECAL expected to take place late this month.

At the same time, there have been increasing indications that the European Economic Community—EEC—and individual member nations of the EEC are taking hold of their responsibilities to freedom and economic progress in Latin America. The EEC has made a start by agreeing to finance, in cooperation with the Inter-American Development Bank, certain projects under the Alliance for Progress.

Although exact terms of this assistance have not been formulated and there are indications that much more must be done to make the necessary credits available on terms and at rates consistent with Latin American needs, a definite start has been made.

One further development: The Government of France has recently entered into a long-term, \$150 million agreement to back its private investors in Mexico. This is an important step.

Thus, by a remarkable consensus, the why, what, and where of Western Europe's participation in Latin American development have been settled. This consensus has come at a critical point in history and has emanated from divergent sources.

It is not unique in historical terms for responsible men and nations to recognize and act upon the necessities of history when the time is ripe. Obviously the time for the Atlantic Community to act in Latin America is ripe. The resources to meet responsibilities now exist in a vital Europe—a Europe which can act in partnership with the United States at the very moment—with time so short, and I emphasize this again—when there

is grave danger in Latin America of severe losses to freedom.

The question remaining is, How?

We have answered the why, what, and where. The remaining question is, How? That is the question to which this group will give the answer. The support for this group has been so widespread that I am confident we shall have an answer, and that very likely, it will be the right one.

I may say we have really worked very hard and have enlisted the total resources of the three areas involved, the United States, Europe, and Latin America, in an effort to find the right plan.

Last September 1962, and again in February 1963, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I were co-hosts for groups of leading Latin American and U.S. businessmen interested in Latin America. They were leaders in their respective fields. We received from them the strongest confirmation of the need for the kind of work that has been undertaken by the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America.

I traveled to Europe three times and to Latin America twice during the past half year for the specific purpose of gathering opinion, information, and advice on the "how" of Atlantic Community assistance for Latin American development. Individually and collectively leaders in Europe and Latin America have expressed support for a tripartite effort in ventures which bring the imagination, know-how, resources and incentives of private capital together with the basic public investments in economic development.

Especially important, it was, and is now felt, is the partnership of all Atlantic Community nations and their private and public sectors together with the private and public areas of those Latin American nations willing to undertake the commitments needed to assure sound economic growth.

I think it is only fair and proper to say I have received indispensable encouragement and valuable assistance from our State Department and other levels of the U.S. Government.

Finally, upon my return to the United States from the Paris meetings early this month, the newly established group met with me and with heads of those international organizations most profoundly concerned with Latin American development: The Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These meetings have produced far-reaching results in terms of cooperation and coordination.

Over the next months I believe that we can look for concrete achievement in Atlantic community partnership in an area of the world second to none in importance for the survival and expansion of human freedom and dignity.

This is a matter of the greatest magnitude, one we are thinking of now on the order of \$1 billion in investment with respect to the project I have described.

A start has been made—perhaps it has been long overdue—and the impetus of

this beginning augurs very well for the future.

In closing I pay my tribute to the President of the United States, to the State Department, to our colleague, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to our colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who is chairman of our delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Conference, to Representative HAYS in the other body, who is a leading figure in, and our representative on the steering committee of the NATO Parliamentary Conference, and to all those who have helped bring this situation to its present pass.

It is financed, it is staffed, it is an excellent idea to sponsor—the bringing of Europe into the development of Latin America. It has every augury for success.

As I reported when I returned here from Paris in April, I am convinced it can be done. It remains for us to do it. If we can do it, and I believe we can in association with the leaders of America, European, and Latin American business, labor, and government, then it can prove to be the difference between magnificent success and perhaps an inadequate success or even a failure in the development of Latin America, which is so crucial not only to the freedom of this hemisphere, but to the freedom of the world.

I thank the Senator for yielding me time.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have been attending a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, and I have come into the Chamber just now. I understand the Senator is speaking about the recommendations which he made to the North Atlantic Parliamentarians' Conference. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask that I be granted 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from New York be extended for 2 additional minutes, without it being charged to either side.

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

Mr. JAVITS. In response to the question of the Senator from California I would say that we have actually organized the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America. It has been financed. It is enthusiastically backed by all elements of the economy in Western Europe, the United States, and Latin America. We are at work on drafting a plan under which this kind of investment from Europe, in association with the United States and Latin America, may be forthcoming. We have a target of a billion dollars a year. As I said a moment ago, I know it can be done. The only question is whether we can do it. I know it can be done.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to pay a deserved tribute to the Senator from New York. The Alliance for Progress is of importance to the people of

the United States, because a part of our destiny is historically and naturally intertwined with our neighbors in Latin America. It is also of supreme importance to members of the Atlantic Community. I well remember, because I was a delegate to that conference with the Senator from New York, the enthusiasm with which his original recommendations were received by our parliamentary colleagues representing the nations of NATO.

What he has said means that the NATO nations will share our own interest in keeping the South American countries free and share the burdens which the U.S. Government have undertaken.

I salute the Senator from New York for his excellent statesmanship in the fruition of the recommendations which he made last fall in Paris.

Mr. JAVITS. I express my gratitude to the Senator from California and also my thanks for his indispensable help in Paris and here in the continuing development of this project.

I also wish to add my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have kept him informed on what we were doing. He was most generous in helping me with respect to this subject.

I am indeed grateful to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for his fine support and for the splendid endorsement which he has given to this work.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the senior Senator from Oregon may be permitted to proceed for 25 minutes and that at the conclusion of his statement the junior Senator from New York, [Mr. KEATING], may proceed for about 3 minutes, without any of this time being charged to either side on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MR. NIXON AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Saturday night the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the American public were treated to a replay of the old Nixon theme song. It made use of all the same old techniques of forensic deceit that have come to be so closely associated with Mr. Nixon. "If only I were the 'partisan type,'" he began, "what a field day I could have." One cannot help wondering whether Mr. Nixon

meant the chuckles to come at his characterization of himself or at his characterization of the administration's record. Certainly Mr. Nixon holds some kind of unofficial title in this country as a champion partisan infighter, and it is unbelievable that he meant the description of himself to be taken seriously.

But just in case anyone might have any question of this man's ability to deceive himself with words, even when his audience remains undecieved, we are then treated to the shopworn and transparent tactic of making a charge by denying that the charge is being made. "Nor do I charge that this administration is trying to appease Mr. Khrushchev," says Nixon. "Nor do I charge that because of the failure of the economy to grow as fast as was predicted when the administration came into office we are in deadly peril of being outproduced by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc."

How often we have heard in years past that old verbal technique. It carried Richard Nixon a little further than it carried Joe McCarthy, but not much further. I would have more respect for the man if he made these charges honestly and straight out, instead of disguising them with pious semantics.

But the old refrain from this speech of Saturday that really strikes a chord of memory is the Nixon prescription of how to deal with Cuba. Nixon on Cuba in 1963 is nothing more nor less than the 1952 Republican prescription for dealing with China. "The more things change, the more they are the same," according to the French proverb. Richard Nixon is the living proof of the truth and applicability of that axiom to the policies of the modern Republican Party.

The Nixon prescription for Cuba, like the 1952 Republican prescription for China, consists largely in big talk and easy promises of liberating both these victims of communism. The "activist" quality in both cases is remarkably similar. Eleven years ago, we heard about how China would be freed by "unleashing" Chiang Kai-shek; Saturday night, we heard that Cuba is to be freed by "unleashing" the Cuban exiles.

During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, it must be presumed that Chiang Kai-shek was indeed "unleashed." One cannot be sure because not much of anything happened, except that after a few years, all expectation that Chiang's forces would actually invade the mainland of China disappeared.

Those expectations disappeared when it became evident that the forces to be unleashed were not to be the real forces which would have to carry the brunt of the battle. It finally became perfectly clear even to the most gullible that putting Chiang's forces into battle against the Chinese Communists would require vast American air and sea support, and that unless those Nationalist forces were to be abandoned to their fate, a full-scale American invasion in support of them would be necessary.

The question that Mr. Nixon raises in my mind is whether this is not what he really has in mind in Cuba. The principal element of his Cuban policy is that the Cuban exiles in this country not be

"leashed." Instead, he calls for open support of what he calls, but fails to define, "forces of freedom." It is his recommendation that we openly support forces organized to overthrow a Communist-controlled government in the Western Hemisphere.

On the face of it, Mr. Nixon is calling for official violation by the U.S. Government of its laws against participation by residents in this country, either citizens or noncitizens, in attacks, raids, or invasions of any kind aimed at nations with which we are not at war. Perhaps Mr. Nixon had it in mind that he believes those laws should be changed and just did not spell it out.

But even so, what he is really advocating is a program of aid to the Cuban exiles that would bring the military power of the United States into play sooner or later on their behalf. It would be either that, or repetitions of the Bay of Pigs, because financing, organizing, and training the Cuban exiles was not enough even in 1961.

The Cuban exiles were unleashed for some 3 years. The results were nothing more than nuisance raids that were followed by attacks on U.S. shipping. The following is a résumé of the raids by the Cuban exiles and their results:

August 24, 1962, First raid, Revolutionary Student Directorate Group shelled hotel on Havana waterfront causing minor damage.

September 10, 1962: Five-man crew from Alpha-66 group fired on a United Kingdom vessel and a Cuban vessel near Cayo-Francia causing slight damage to both vessels.

October 8, 1962: Estimated 10-man party representing Alpha-66 staged raid on harbor installation at Isabela de Sagua causing undetermined number of casualties.

October 12, 1962: A six-man party under the direction of Manolo Quiza machinegunned a Cuban vessel in the sea area off the port of Cardenas. The vessel was reportedly sunk and two of the four crew members were injured.

December 4, 1962: Several dozen raiders, representing the second front of the Escambray, in two small craft fired on installations in the port of Caibarien.

March 17, 1963: Vessel carrying small number of raiders representing Alpha-66 and the second Escambray front raid the harbor at Isabela de Sagua causing minor damage to the Soviet freighter *L' Gov*. There may have been casualties.

March 26, 1963: An estimated six raiders representing the L-66 group attacked the Soviet vessel *Baku* in the harbor of Caibarien. Substantial damage was caused to the Soviet vessel.

SUMMARY

Cuban exiles have carried out seven hit-and-run pinprick raids against Cuba beginning with the attack on a Havana waterfront hotel in late August 1962. These attacks in the main were improvised and with the exception of the last attack on a Soviet vessel caused virtually no damage.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield when I finish my speech; then I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. President, is this Mr. Nixon's idea of how Cuba is to be liberated? Surely he knows it would require not merely U.S. sea and air support, but the presence of large numbers of U.S. troops to make any invasion of Cuba a success.

Mr. Nixon thinks he has shrewdly avoided making that bald assertion to the American people. His speech to the editors is carefully worded to give the promise of freeing Cuba without giving the price in American blood that would have to be paid for it under his policy. "Unleash the Cuban exiles," cries Nixon. But there is an unspoken corollary that is fully known and appreciated by Mr. Nixon, even if it was not uttered by him. It is that a continuation of the exile raids and eventual landings of exiles in Cuba would require massive American participation to make them successful.

The American Nation has registered its rejection of these intellectual dishonesties of Richard Nixon. I suspect that the disillusionment with the unleashing of the Chinese Nationalists will put this newest "unleashing" shell game into its proper perspective. For the plain truth is that in either case, the unleashing would be nothing more than a vanguard to full-scale U.S. invasion. I think the American people know that. They did not want any part of that kind of policy toward China, and I do not believe they are any more interested in such a policy toward Cuba.

"UNLEASHED" POLICY HAS ALREADY FAILED

They might be, were it not for the very fact which Nixon brings up in support of his own case. It is that the Cuban exiles cannot be expected to carry alone the brunt of opposition to the Soviet power which has been planted in Cuba.

Mr. Nixon says this is why we should openly support the exiles. But it also means that only the U.S. military power can successfully challenge the Communist power in Cuba. The exiles have already had the benefit of U.S. open support extending to financial aid, training, weapons, and transport. The Bay of Pigs was the result. Even if Soviet troops were not still present in Cuba, the Cuban exiles could not do any better now than in 1961 without American troops to help them. In my judgment, they could not do it nearly so well. If Nixon is advocating a U.S. invasion, why does he not say so to the American people with intellectual honesty? The policy he outlined must eventually bring about American military involvement in Cuba. He knows that. Why does Nixon persist in believing that all the American people can be fooled all of the time?

I have said many times from the Senate floor that I do not rule out the possibility of American military involvement in Cuba. We saw it occur last October, when there was a direct threat to American national security. We may again have to protect the security of the Western Hemisphere from the Cuban threat with the use of our military power.

I repeat again, as I have said several times from this desk and many times from the platforms of America, that the

American people have every reason to place complete confidence in the purpose of the President of the United States to proceed immediately, at any critical moment, to protect the security of this Republic whenever its security is challenged or endangered by either Castro or Khrushchev or both acting jointly.

The President has also made it clear that he intends to keep this Republic within the framework of international law. However, the speech by Richard Nixon the other night was a warmongering speech which would have taken us outside the framework of international law had we carried out Nixon's proposal.

I thank my God that sitting in the White House is a man who recognizes the sacred, solemn responsibilities of being President of the United States, and the duty to keep this Republic within the framework of international law. This President recognizes that an aggressor course of action or a violation of American-signed treaties or a violation of our responsibilities to international law cannot be justified in maintaining our efforts in the realm of freedom around the world.

If we sought to implement the aggressor course of action, which was the very essence of the Nixon proposal the other day, we would lose one ally after another in the United Nations, because we have a duty in this era of civilization to see to it that we do not follow a course of action of international outlawry. In essence, the proposals of Nixon the other night were proposals that this country should become a party to international outlawry. If he was aware of the treaties the United States has signed, he ignored them in the preparation of the speech he delivered the other day when he spoke to the newspaper editors.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of allowing the United States to be drawn into military involvement on behalf of or because of the Cuban exiles. Neither am I in favor of a U.S. policy which uses the Cuban exiles as a front, and as an excuse for American involvement. Let not the Cuban exiles forget that possibility, either. The refugees here in the United States account for only some 4 percent of the people of Cuba. Ninety-six percent of the Cuban people are still in Cuba.

I am not in favor of keeping this relatively small percentage of its people on a string to use as a convenient pretext for an American invasion of Cuba. After Cuba, what? British Guiana? Brazil? There are voices in America right now who will swear that the Government of Brazil and the Government of Venezuela are both Communist-dominated.

The extreme right in this country should leave no room for doubt on the part of the thinking people of the country that they want war. They represent the war party of America. I believe that the challenge of statesmanship these days is to try, first, to win the fight against communism on the basis of bloodless combat. We will shed our blood if it ever becomes necessary to do so to protect the security of this Republic. But I am one Senator who does not intend to sweep under the rug attacks

such as the one from Nixon the other night. I believe the people must be warned at all times against the dangerous propaganda of the warmongers, such as Nixon, who seek to poison the thinking of the American people by waving the American flag into tatters. As a patriotic American, I do not believe we pay due respect to the American flag by waving it into tatters.

I do not want to see any return to the unilateral American policy of deciding when a government of Latin America is to be overthrown in furtherance of U.S. interests. That is what Mr. Nixon is calling for. It would be a return to the 19th century diplomacy which made the United States a hated nation in the hemisphere and did damage which has required half a century to repair.

U.S. ALREADY AIDING NON-COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS

A part of Mr. Nixon's prescription for Latin America is for open U.S. support of those same "forces of freedom" in nations threatened by Communist activity. But we have such a policy in full force and effect right now. The Punta del Este conference of a year and a half ago, to which I had the honor to be one of the two Senate delegates, the other being the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], spelled out some of the steps to be taken by all our governments to curb Communist activities and influences in the nations of the hemisphere. A large part of that policy includes the careful and effective patrolling of the waters of the Caribbean by American forces to prevent the smuggling of arms, propaganda, and trained personnel from Cuba into other Latin American countries.

We send them large amounts of military aid to maintain internal security. Another large part of this policy is the Alliance for Progress itself.

In short, I simply do not know what Mr. Nixon is talking about when he says we should openly support the forces of freedom in countries where internal communism is threatening. We are doing it now. Let me say, parenthetically, that Brazil is one of the most important of these; yet Mr. Nixon derided our aid to Brazil. It is hard to see just what kind of "open support" he would have us extend to Brazil, to keep communism from advancing in that country, if he considers our present massive aid to be a mistake.

There is one more point in Mr. Nixon's Cuba policy which I should like to mention. It is that when asked for specifics of what action the United States should take to oust communism from that country, he declined to name any that are not already being undertaken. He thus left the exiles as the "front" for his American involvement, when he could have spelled out the desirability of supporting their invasion of Cuba with American forces—which in my judgment is the proposal that is concealed and imbedded in his program. But he was not intellectually honest enough to tell the American people what he really meant. The specific actions mentioned by Nixon are now being taken by the Kennedy administration, to remove the

Soviet presence in Cuba, and eventually the Communist presence—political methods, political pressures, and economic pressures.

We should, said Mr. Nixon, begin with the minimum steps, and see what result they bring, before stepping up what we do. It is too bad that Nixon is not willing to find out what results these methods bring. It will surely take many more months before we know whether they are effective or not. But he wants to unleash the exiles, too, with all that implies.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Latin-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and as one who for years has been steeped in the problems of the United States vis-a-vis Latin America, let me say, that in my judgment the proposals made the other night by Mr. Nixon would cause catastrophe throughout Latin America and would end in war. As I have said before, in my judgment, statesmanship calls for us with honor to do everything we can to win a bloodless victory over communism in Latin America, although ready at all times to shed our blood in whatever amounts may be necessary in order to protect the security of our country in case Castro and Khrushchev follow an aggressive course of action against the Western Hemisphere. We must not forget the Act of Punta del Este pledges all the free nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States and our Latin American neighbors, to support each other whenever there is a violation of international law by an aggressive course of action on the part of Cuba and its master, Khrushchev.

It is always hard to tell whether Mr. Nixon advocates a move of this kind because it sounds like a good, cheap way of gaining something all Americans desire without ever having to put it to the test, or whether he advocates this particular policy with the full knowledge that effectuating it would bring about tremendous consequences for the American people, consequences he deliberately fails to mention or discuss.

Fortunately, the American people have decided that they do not want to find out what he has in mind. They made that clear in November 1960.

EUROPEAN POLICY COSTLY, DANGEROUS

In some ways, Mr. Nixon's outline of a policy toward our NATO allies was much more far-reaching and ominous than his Cuban policy, and deserved more attention in the press, than what he said about Cuba. Mr. Nixon would, in Western Europe, have us fall back on the Republican theory of diplomacy which calls for arming every nation to the teeth as a means of avoiding war. That was the Dulles policy, and Nixon is apparently ready to carry it to a fatal extreme.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I opposed the Dulles program during the last 3 or 4 years of his leadership in the State Department. In my judgment, we are still suffering terrible consequences because of the misconceptions inherent in the Dulles program.

The way to repair the Atlantic alliance, says Mr. Nixon, is to give our NATO partners nuclear weapons. He calls for a change in the Atomic Energy Act that would permit "the transfer of a limited number of nuclear warheads for the appropriate use of our European allies."

Is General De Gaulle unhappy because France does not have its own national nuclear forces? Then give him some, says Mr. Nixon. What interest of the United States this conceivably could serve, Nixon does not say. From the context of his remarks it appears that he simply wants to give our allies in Europe anything they want, to keep them happy and quiet. I do not see where Nixon even expects Europe to pay for those nuclear warheads, since he calls for their "transfer," not their sale.

I find it especially surprising that Nixon should offer such a proposal when he also calls for a move toward greater political unity within NATO. He urges, in fact, a "confederation" to permit unified political control of the NATO organization. Giving France, Britain, and Germany—to start with—nuclear weapons of their own is exactly the opposite of leading them toward greater political unity.

Mr. President, here is one Senator who never will vote a dime to a NATO country for the development of a national atomic, nuclear-weapons program. Here is one Senator who will insist that, for the preservation of civilization itself, we continue to maintain control of nuclear power, under international agreements with our allies. Here is one Senator who repeats his statement made from this desk on January 16—namely, that he does not intend to see the United States help or aid De Gaulle in any way in his program to make France an independent nuclear power.

We cannot run the risk of encouraging individual nations to develop individual national nuclear weapons programs, if we are still to have any hope of preserving the peace in our time. Certainly we have great moral obligations to the next generation and to future generations of Americans.

If Mr. Nixon were genuinely interested in a closer political unity and control over the NATO military forces, I cannot imagine that he would also propose to destroy that unity by setting up each member as an independent nuclear power. The kindest thing I can think of Nixon's proposal is that he is resorting to the practice of trying to "buy off" unwilling or recalcitrant partners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time available to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am flatly opposed to any amendment of the Atomic Energy Act which would permit the transfer, the sale, or any other placing of nuclear warheads in the hands of other nations, for their own use. If Mr.

Nixon is sincere in seeking a closer political relationship with our European allies, let him begin talking about changes in the Atomic Energy Act that would release to a purely NATO organization some degree of American control.

There is plenty of room for negotiation and maneuvering over how to bring about better relations within NATO. But, by and large, I believe that among nations which are basically friendly, basically democratic, and have the same basic objectives, a reasonably straight line is the best one to follow in trying to reach agreement. There may be some complex rationale behind his idea that the way to move toward unity is to fractionalize. If so, Mr. Nixon has a lot more explaining to do.

Mr. President, I close by saying, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that in my judgment the balance between war and peace in the world today is a very delicate one; and, in my judgment, there will not be any little wars. If we start a war in Cuba, we shall very likely start a world war. I think the leaders of all nations should recognize that.

Therefore, whenever the warmongers seek to spread their poisonous propaganda of war—as Mr. Nixon did the other day, before the newspaper editors—irrespective of the political consequences, I will take to this floor in defense of trying to reach an honorable peace and in defense of the great foreign policy program of a great President, President Kennedy.

The time has come to make perfectly clear to the warmongers that the American people are entitled to the facts. They are entitled to intellectual honesty. They are entitled to be protected from the kind of deceit in which Mr. Nixon engaged in his shocking speech to the newspaper editors.

I say to the newspaper editors, You, too, have a patriotic obligation to keep faith with the first amendment of the Constitution, and, in the exercise of your precious guarantee of free speech, to present to the American people the facts about foreign policy, and not permit warmongers to give to the American people the big dose of intellectual poison and war propaganda that Mr. Nixon gave to your conference when he spoke the other day.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the fine analysis of the Cuban policy by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

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

THE KENNEDY-KEATING CUBAN POLICY
(By Walter Lippmann)

Cuba got a good airing last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator KEATING was that there is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do. It is hard to say what Mr. Nixon's Cuban policy would be. He sounded like a man who was ready to go to war. But all he actually said was that he

wanted the Cuban exiles to make hit-and-run raids.

Senator KEATING, who is the most conspicuous of the critical opposition, began by saying that it is foolish to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem. He did not pretend. Then in the course of his speech he admitted that he agrees with the main theses of our present Cuban policy. He is opposed to an invasion. He is opposed to a blockade. He is opposed to hit-and-run raids mounted from American soil. He is in favor of greater stress on nonmilitary measures, and he wants to exert increasing economic pressure so that the Soviets will be driven to the conclusion that the price of maintaining a base in Cuba is too high.

This is the same story which the administration is telling. Senator KEATING's differences are not in the substance of the text but in the editing, the typography, the layout, and the captions. The Senator, like the President, excludes in present circumstances the resort to war—invasion, blockade, and raiding; like the President, he, too, would deal with Cuba by surveillance, containment, isolation, economic pressures, and propaganda.

There is no doubt that at least for some time to come the Kennedy-Keating policy will leave the Soviet troops 90 miles from Florida. This is an affront to our pride. Not since Napoleon III put French troops into Mexico to enthrone and support the Emperor Maximilian has anything like this happened so close to us. In the end the French troops went away. But, because there was no prudent alternative, Lincoln put up with the Bonapartist troops for several years.

How long must we put up with the Russian troops? The honest answer is that we must put up with them until they can be gotten rid of by measures short of nuclear war. Here is the sticking point in the argument with Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon. They sound, they intend to sound, as if they know a way to get rid of the Russian troops promptly without waging nuclear war.

What is this prompter way to make the Russians go away from Cuba? They do not tell us, but the most reasonable interpretation of what they say is that the prompter way is not to make war but to threaten war. Both Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon have avoided saying plainly what they do mean. But if what they sound like has genuine meaning it is that they believe the United States can deliver an ultimatum which the Soviet Union will bow to.

If this is not what they mean, what in the name of common sense do they mean with all their big words? If they are prepared to be so bold with the Russians, they ought to be bold enough to talk plainly to their fellow Americans.

The Rockefeller-Nixon position appears then to be that Cuba can be liberated by ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw from this hemisphere, and to stand by passively while we blockade Castro and arrange for a replacement of Castro's government. If this is what they have in mind, they are making an enormous guess. For nobody can possibly know that the Soviet Union would surrender its whole position in Cuba as it surrendered its offensive weapons last October. It is the supreme folly in the nuclear age to drive a nuclear power into a corner. And if the Soviet Union refused to bow to the ultimatum, all this would do for us would be to make us look like fools.

The President of the United States cannot play with an ultimatum to a government like that of the Soviet Union. He cannot use an ultimatum unless he is prepared to go through with it and begin a war. If he is not prepared to go to war, an ultimatum is a bluff and everyone will soon see that it is.

While the present policy does not promise a quick withdrawal of the Russians or the fall of Castro, it is surely not true to say that it is complacent do-nothingism. To a degree which is just short of war Cuba is being photographed, patrolled, embargoed and squeezed, and isolated. If Cuba were a great power, we would be at war with her for what we are already doing. I doubt whether there is any precedent where we have exerted such strong measures short of war on any other country.

However much we are impatient and frustrated we have to grasp the fact that Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America. The worst of Castro is his example and a long way after that such agents as he is able to train and infiltrate into the Latin American countries. He is an affront to our pride, he is a nuisance, he is a mischiefmaker. But he is not a mortal threat to the vital interests of the United States, and therefore, in this age of thermonuclear war, we must deal with him by measures that are short of war.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the American people are a peace-loving people. The Government of the United States joined the United Nations because we believe in peace. We continue to seek peace with justice and with honor in this world.

I believe the American people understand the ugly and dread hazard to the free way of life which is posed by international communism. For that reason again this year the representatives of the American people will vote to spend, in round numbers, approximately \$100 billion to perfect our Defense Establishment and further to sophisticate the defensive weapons of obliteration which modern science and technology have brought not only to the free nations, but also to the nations under the yoke of international communism.

The American people are bitter. They object to the transformation of Cuba into a Communist satellite. Their own feelings were reflected only a year ago on the floor of the Senate when it adopted the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States is determined—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

That resolution was approved by the Congress and likewise by the President of the United States. I think it fair to say that it represents basic American policy. Our country will never permit Cuba to become a nuclear or an offensive launching pad; and, to the everlasting

credit of the President of the United States, the action which he took last October indicated that our Cuban policy was to be vindicated on that occasion.

But the American people continue to be bitter. They continue to urge the American Government to take any action that can be taken to isolate and, under the very terms of the resolution, to extirpate from the Western Hemisphere communism in any form.

I receive letters from people in California upon occasion demanding action. I have written replies to those letters in which I have said, "What do you mean when you say 'action'? If you are demanding that I use my vote and my voice upon this occasion now, immediately, to demand a military invasion of Cuba, you are wrong, because I will not do that."

Neither will the American people. The President of the United States has said, "We have fought wars before." And now we face, God forbid, a continuing hazard of an obliterating nuclear war. Nevertheless the American people intend that they and their Government proceed with honor and courage and vigor, and firmness with respect to communism in this hemisphere and in any other clime around this globe. "Deeds not words," was the Eisenhower phrase. It still goes.

Mr. President, I did not read the text of the comments of former Vice President Nixon, and therefore I cannot comment very well upon the points which my able friend from Oregon has raised.

There is no more vigorous advocate in the Senate than my colleague the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. When I propose a measure which is controversial, I am always happy when my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is on my side and agrees with me.

I take the floor of the Senate on this occasion to say that from the newspaper accounts of former Vice President Nixon's speech, I do not consider it a "shocking" speech. In my judgment his speech reflected the uneasiness of the American people with respect to the continuing presence in Cuba, 90 miles off our shore, of a Communist ideology. They hope and pray—I go further than that when I say they demand—that our Government do everything that can be done to isolate and eventually to eliminate that hazard from our way of life.

Former Vice President Nixon is an American. He did not attack President Kennedy as an appeaser. He simply presented his views with vigor to an audience of newspaper editors which extended an invitation to him to speak on the occasion of their convention.

I say very frankly to my friend from Oregon that, when the President of the United States the other day approved a loan to Brazil I did not denounce that loan. But I say to him most sincerely that I desire more facts with respect to the reasonableness of that loan before I place my own personal stamp of approval upon it. We must remember that a few weeks ago the State Department publicly said that Communists were working their will in the government of Brazil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. A couple of days later the State Department said that Communists did not dominate Brazil. As an American citizen I say that if Brazil went down the Communist drain, it would be another body blow to the cause of freedom. We do not want our hemisphere to go Communist. For that reason, I shall continue to support the Alliance for Progress. I desire that our ties with our Latin American neighbors be strong. I wish to see us go forward in helping those countries eliminate many of the causes for communism—ill health, poverty, illiteracy, poor housing, lack of widespread individual landownership, sickness, and disease. But I do not consider the comments of the former Vice President last week to be susceptible of the interpretation which my able friend has placed upon them, as he has a perfect right to do. I merely believe that he reflected the feeling of the American people that we desire peace with justice and honor. We seek it. For that reason, we wish to continue to negotiate with the Soviet Union for a dependable and realistic test ban. That is why we hope and pray that the Atlantic Alliance may continue strong.

I generally share my colleague's views with respect to the problem of the nuclear deterrent. Quite aside from that, the American people want our country and our Government, as I say, to be united, to continue a policy of firmness toward our unyielding, unalterable American goal—to protect our own security, to eliminate communism from this hemisphere, and eventually to give to the people on this earth an opportunity themselves to determine how their own society shall conduct their own business.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The water resources bill, known as S. 2, is before the Senate. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time for calling the role not be charged to either side.

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

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. 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. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 9, after the word: "advisable", to add the following: "by the institute or center."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I think the purpose of this particular amendment is clear. It is an exceedingly simple amendment. It is a perfecting amendment. The purpose of it is to keep the control of the research in the hands of the institute or center. It is an amendment to certain language in section 100(a) of the bill, which provides for research at the land-grant colleges and institutes.

The bill now reads: "as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States and Puerto Rico."

In my opinion, that language makes the bill uncertain. I do not know what is meant by "as may in each case be deemed advisable." I do not know who determines what is advisable. So the purpose of my amendment is to be certain that the institution in the particular State where the problems are being studied is the judge of what the problems are and what is advisable, and in what case it is advisable.

I felt certain that this was merely a perfecting amendment and that the author of the bill would be willing to accept it. I am sure it would not be his idea that, for example, in the State of New Mexico the decision as to what was to be deemed advisable would be made here in Washington. I know that for the State of Colorado I would have no desire to see the Secretary of the Interior have control of money or a project where he has the say as to what is advisable. Because of the many ramifications of this subject, I think it is for the States to say which ones are advisable and which ones are not.

I may ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico as to whether he has objection to this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the able Senator from Colorado that I do have opposition. It is not the objection which the Senator probably thinks I have, but I will discuss it shortly.

Mr. ALLOTT. That being the case, and having stated my reasons for the amendment, I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to yield some time to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be in Michigan yesterday, and I was thus unable to join in the

opening discussion of the pending bill (S. 2) and in the compliments paid its chief sponsor, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. But as a co-sponsor of this bill, and also as one of the "minority of four" who had urged a more forceful report from the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, I am delighted and gratified that the Senator from New Mexico is forcefully pursuing the recommendations of our committee. He is not letting them die on the shelf. He is proceeding promptly, thoughtfully, and thoroughly to see that they are implemented. It is clear that he intends to see that we take all possible actions to meet the Nation's water needs of the future as envisioned by our committee.

This particular bill has been most warmly received in Michigan. Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, was given a draft of the bill last summer. He endorsed the concept, and said:

"The draft bill takes cognizance of the fact that the use of water constitutes one of the most complex and pressing problems confronting almost every State in the country.

We in Michigan will put this program to good use. I commend the Senator for his initiative in the drafting of the legislation and for his leadership in bringing it to the floor of the Senate. I hope it will be supported overwhelmingly.

I support the Senator in his opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska wanted to speak on the bill. I thought this would be the best time for him to do so, and I yield him some time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we are witnessing a historical change in our national thinking, as we find citizens becoming increasingly aware of the value—indeed of the preciousness—of our water resources. The bill we are considering, S. 2, provides that, in addition to the land-grant colleges and State universities, other universities and research institutions may also be aided in water resources research.

Our water resources are not by any means inexhaustible. Nor are they at present well tended. The cosponsors of S. 2 heard testimony outlining the severity of the water shortage which our country faces. Some States have already experienced the fears and frustrations arising from inadequate water reserves. I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation which should help solve some of our water resource problems.

President Kennedy's task force on water resources reported that water is being used at an alarming rate. The issue, of course, is how do we best utilize our water? How can waste be eliminated? How can reuse methods for water be found? How can the waters of the sea be desalinated at the least cost? How can water pollution be ended? How can we assure adequate water supply for the future?

As I have had occasion to say before, water conservation cannot be the goal and responsibility of the States alone. The language of S. 2 makes available to our great State universities and colleges

funds with which to establish within each State a water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency.

In my State of Alaska a water pollution research laboratory is being located at the University of Alaska at College, near Fairbanks. It will be seek to establish how the waters of the far north can be best put to work. The environmental studies planned within our State will have far-reaching effects in this country and in other lands.

Strange as it may seem to men and women unfamiliar with Alaska and its vast regions, our usable water supply is limited. I remember when U.S. Public Health Service employees examined our water supply and found, in amazement, that many of the streams within the State were polluted with glacial flour. This type of pollution could and does impede the usability of other Alaskan streams.

I doubt if the extent of Alaska's ground water resources will be known in even the near future. Possibly the State will depend upon its surface waters for most of its water requirements, but certainly these questions cannot be answered until the proper research has determined some of the answers.

In years ahead Alaska will have the industry it seeks today. It will have the investment capital so needed today. It will have increased population. And it will have all the problems these improvements bring.

Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska, has examined S. 2 as have members of his faculty. They strongly support this proposed legislation. They believe, as do I, that the program envisaged will complement the work of the U.S. Public Health Service in the Arctic research program which is being developed in the 49th State.

Mr. President, many groups have testified in support of S. 2. I will not attempt to relate their findings in detail, but I do want to mention the statement of Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, director of the League of Women Voters of the United States, who said:

Efficient utilization and protection of our water supply is so important to national well-being that we think the Federal Government has a responsibility to encourage research in this field, research the need for which has been supported by many eminent scientists and politicians.

The League of Women Voters is non-political. The league does a good job in presenting the pros and cons of important issues to its membership, and it does a responsible job. I applaud the work of the league in the important area of water conservation, and I urge the favorable enactment of this legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this amendment directly poses the question of whether the paramount authority is in the Federal Government or the local institutions or centers. It happens that Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and the Bureau of the Budget, supported an exactly opposite position to that being proposed by the Senator from Colorado. They sought greater Federal authority.

The Hatch Act and this bill both contain sections providing that nothing

within the act shall change the relationship between colleges or universities and their States. This act carries that language. The States are jealous of their prerogatives. They should not be over-ridden. But there must be some Federal participation in decisions.

A good many years ago, perhaps in 1945 and 1946 and 1947, the senior Senator from New Mexico worked on an agricultural research bill, which was adopted in 1947. We found at that time, by using a punchcard system, that literally millions of dollars was being spent on projects by States who had no idea that their neighboring States were spending money on similar projects.

We had the problem of dye affecting cotton, not only in the rain belt, but also in other places. Research laboratories were working on the problem of how dye worked on cotton grown in desert areas. My State was one of those States. They included New Mexico, Arizona, and California. We were dealing with irrigation cotton, and found that this problem existed there.

These various agencies were not working together, but independently.

As a result of the passage of the Agricultural Research Act of 1947 we were able better to program the money appropriated. We did not interfere with the State programs. We called their attention to what was going on in other areas to solve this problem, and in the solution of which they could participate.

The Hatch Act has been on the books for a long time. By using the language of the Hatch Act in S. 2, we attempt to carry over to the water field the same mutually satisfactory relationship which exists in the agricultural field, which involves a sharing in the decisions as to "advisability" of projects and policies rather than a sharp granting of ultimate authority to one side or the other.

I know that some feel it is advisable to grant this final authority to the States. I believe it would be preferable to have the States and Nation work together, as they have done under the Hatch Act. Furthermore, I do not know of any objection being made to our proposal by any land-grant colleges.

We have not stopped any land-grant college by the exercise of blind authority here in Washington.

There are many examples of how this has worked. The language in the bill is a compromise between two extremes. We have, as Dr. Edwin West Allen has said, set forth a "unique example of national administration in which influence, rather than coercion, is the policy."

That is what should exist. That is why I find myself unable to accept the amendment.

We have had a long history in this field.

This matter has been under the administration of many Secretaries of Agriculture. So far as I know, no land-grant college has ever objected to it, and no land-grant college has suggested that this proposed change should be made. We worked up this bill with the people from land-grant colleges to be sure they were satisfied. As I have said, no land-grant college has suggested that

this change should be made. They are satisfied with the way the Hatch Act has worked. They are satisfied with our language in the water resources bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I had considerable difficulty in hearing the Senator from New Mexico because of the noise in the Chamber. However, I should like to say that his arguments in behalf of his position are not persuasive, to me, at least. They add up to one thing, that we are drafting a bill which is purposely vague, and we are being vague because we do not want to be tied down.

Congress has taken similar action many times, and far too many times in the past few years. Citing the Hatch Act is somewhat analogous, but not completely, because we are dealing here with completely different areas, the areas of water. I believe we have a different type of problem to deal with.

All I want is to be sure of what we are doing when we write this particular sentence:

It shall be the duty of each such institute or center to plan and conduct—

This refers to colleges—

as may in each case be deemed advisable—

And so forth. All I wish is to have language set out in the bill so that we know, from reading the act, who is going to decide whether the action is advisable or not.

If the author of the bill wants the Secretary of the Interior to be the judge of that, let us say so in the bill. I do not want him to be the judge of that. Neither do I want to leave it so vague that the Secretary of the Interior may, by a temporary or permanent withholding of funds, put enough pressure on one or another of the land-grant colleges, so as to dictate the kind of research in water that is going on at a land-grant college.

I spoke at some length yesterday about the importance of the kind of research provided for. It is important. It is particularly important to our States in the West at this particular time. As we progress along in this century, it will be important to every State in the country, except perhaps Alaska, which is not going to be hard pressed on its water problems for some time, and every State will be under the necessity of taking action.

My argument boils down to this: Let us put in the bill what we mean. If we mean that we want the Secretary of the Interior to make the decision, let us put that language in the bill. If we mean that we believe, as I believe, that our land-grant colleges can do a better job of determining the direction of our water research than can the Secretary of the Interior, then let us follow that plan, as I have suggested, that it be left to the decision of the institute or center which has done the job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. 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. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I cannot help agreeing in theory with many of the statements made by the Senator from Colorado. I merely point out that I base my objection to the amendment on the actual operation of the Hatch Act, which is the principal act under which agricultural land-grant colleges have cooperated with the Department of Agriculture. I have never known an instance when the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges have found themselves in really serious opposition on this question. I should like to continue the same basically friendly, cooperative arrangement with the land-grant colleges, and I believe the proposal will work out in that way. I know that the Secretaries of Agriculture, without exception, have cooperated with the land-grant colleges. I hope that the Secretary of the Interior, whenever he may be, will have the same good sense to do so. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a typographical error on page 4, line 23. The first word in line 23 should be "been" instead of "them." The error was made in the printing of the final document. I ask unanimous consent that the first word in line 23, page 4, be changed from "them" to "been."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 49 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, beginning at line 7, it is proposed to strike out all through line 20.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to clear away any fuzziness or haziness with respect to the language of the bill. On page 10, line 7, the bill provides:

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish in the Department of the Interior a Water Resources Service for the purpose of administering programs authorized in this Act.

The subsequent section, section 303, provides, in part:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to employ a director of the Water Resources Service at civil service grade 18 and, if necessary to obtain personnel competent to administer a program involving scientific knowledge and highly trained staffs, he may employ not to exceed five employees above

civil service grade 15 in addition to the number otherwise authorized by law.

The purpose of the amendment is to strike out section 302, which provides for the establishment of a new agency within the Department of the Interior. It also would strike the proviso for the personnel which would staff the proposed agency.

Rarely do I have the support for an amendment which I have for this particular amendment; but I do have good support for it. I refer Senators to page 23 of the report, which was written by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I shall read in part from a letter written by Philip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, to the then chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]:

Finally, we believe that provisions of title III with respect to establishment of a Water Resources Service within the Department of the Interior are unnecessary and undesirable. The Secretary of the Interior now has adequate reorganization authority to take future action if and when he so decides. Furthermore, in view of the general authorization provided in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, special personnel provisions should not be required to staff new constituents of the Department.

That is the position taken by the Bureau of the Budget in its letter to the former chairman of the committee. I believe that in this day and age it is undesirable to continue to add agencies and bureaus to the Department of the Interior. If the Department, with its thousands and thousands of employees, cannot administer a program such as that envisaged by the bill without adding a new agency within the Department, then it had better take a good look at its own organization and do some needed reorganizing. I believe that the Department of the Interior can perform this function with personnel which is either available or can be made available for this work.

I hope the amendment will be accepted, although I have had no indication from the Senator from New Mexico concerning his intentions.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Bureau of the Budget, in its reports on S. 3579 and S. 2, recommended the deletion of what are now sections 302 and 303 of S. 2, authorizing a Water Resources Service in the Department of the Interior and five extra-grade jobs for the administration of the water resources research program. This is what amendment 49 would do.

The Bureau of the Budget assures that the Secretary of the Interior has adequate authority to establish such a service, and states that there is sufficient authorization of super-grade jobs in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 so the special provision is not required to provide adequate competent staff.

It is important that we have a single, broadly based, independent office in the

Department of the Interior to direct this new program.

The Select Committee on National Water Resources pointed out that many sciences, or disciplines, are involved in the solution of our water problems and urged a broadly based approach to them. The Water Resources Committee of the National Academy of Sciences called for a multidisciplinary approach to water research, and the training of hydroscien- tists with a broad understanding of the many sciences involved. This was also emphasized in the report of the Council for Science and Technology.

There will be both internal and external pressures to assign this new program to one, or several, existing agencies. Each has a limited mission in the water field. They would quite naturally incline any program they can capture toward their own mission. I am not critical of the existing agencies, for if they are worth their salt, they miss no opportunities.

The external pressure to segment the program among several mission-oriented agencies is exemplified in the chamber of commerce recommendation that:

Existing bureaus or services within the Department of the Interior should be assigned the responsibility of administering the program that would be authorized by this legislation.

Such fragmentation would, of course, be a serious mistake. Colleges, universities, and other research agencies would have to shop among the limited-objective agencies with research projects. The multidisciplinary approach we seek would not be attained.

It is equally important that the new agency have a highly competent staff. There is no activity where results from an investment is more directly related to the competence of the men who run the program than in research.

I am reluctant to insist upon statutory provision for a particular service, or office, in the executive branch. The Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch recommended that organizational structure of the various departments be left to the Secretaries. Congress has gone along with that recommendation.

In view of this precedent, and the assurance that has been given that there will be a competently staffed independent office under existing authorities—I will accept the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

I will yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from Colorado will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his willingness to accept the amendment. I believe the amendment is in the best interests of all concerned.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read. The amendment has not been printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 7, after "ascertain," it is proposed to insert "whether the requirements of section 101 have been met."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the language of this paragraph has bothered me considerably. I have not been quite certain as to how to attack this particular question. On page 7, commencing with line 5, the bill reads:

On or before the 1st day of July in each year after the passage of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain as to each State whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriations for water resources research under section 100(a) of this Act and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive.

What bothers me is that the Secretary of the Interior is required to determine two things: First, he must determine whether any State is entitled to receive its share; and second, the amount.

The language of my amendment would really place in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior the power to decide whether a land-grant college will receive money; and second, the amount it will receive.

Particularly in view of the fact that in connection with the amendment I offered a few minutes ago—that in regard to who would determine the type of research to be carried on—the Senate purposely decided, I say, to leave this matter vague, therefore I believe it wise that we try to pin down, on page 7, whether we are going to leave in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, without adequate safeguards, the power to determine whether the colleges will get these funds and the amounts they will get.

My amendment simply inserts in line 7, after the word "ascertain," the following: "whether the requirements of section 101 have been met."

That will subject the Secretary of the Interior to the use of definite criteria for the determination of whether the money shall be given to the colleges, and in what amounts it shall be given. In my opinion, the amendment will greatly strengthen the bill. It will protect the land-grant colleges, and will assure them that there will be definite guidelines—those set out in section 101—which must be followed before the Secretary can determine whether they are entitled to receive the money, and in what amounts.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from Colorado that the amendment takes me a little by surprise, for I did not have a chance to study its language.

I state frankly that I do not know what position I would take in conference, after having a chance to study the amendment. However, on first glance, the language appears to be satisfactory.

So I am inclined to accept the amendment; but I hope the Senator from Colorado will not hold me to insisting on the amendment after we get into conference and confer about the amendment with the other conferees.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. As he knows, I have been worrying about this provision; but until now I have not been able to draw up the necessary language. I think he recognizes, as I do, that a problem does exist.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before I yield back the remainder of the time available to me, let me say that I had some language drawn up, as follows:

When it shall appear to the Secretary of the Interior from the annual statement of receipts and expenditures that any portion of the preceding annual appropriation allotted to a State institute or center under this act remained unexpended at the end of the fiscal year, such amount shall be deducted from the next subsequent annual allotment made to the State concerned.

I am told that such a provision is unnecessary, because the Appropriations Committee will do that very thing. I thought that was what the Senator from Colorado was aiming at.

However, I believe the amendment he proposes is satisfactory; and I will accept it, and hope it will be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). All remaining time on the amendment is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 53, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11 beginning at line 3, it is proposed to strike all through line 13, and to insert in lieu thereof:

SEC. 305. Within two years following enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Senate and House of Representatives a comprehensive report on progress and accomplishments under the Act, together with his recommendations on revisions of the Act, and with the independent recommendations of the governing authorities of the State colleges and universities on desirable revisions.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, we may be able to accomplish a little here. The amendment is a very simple one. It provides that section 305 be amended so that within 2 years after the enactment of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare, and shall submit to the President, for transmittal to Congress, "a comprehensive report on progress and accomplishments under the act."

The original bill provides that shall be done within 6 years. I think that is too long a time for us to wait to find out what progress is being made under this open end authorization. So it is my purpose to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall make the report within 2 years.

I am told that the objection to the amendment is that the program will not proceed that rapidly. I realize that it will not proceed overnight. However, although we may be able to wait 1 year to see how the program is going, I certainly think that by the end of the second year it should be possible for the Secretary of the Interior to report to us in regard to how the program is going, what progress is being made, what amounts are being spent, what research is being done, and where the research is being done, so that Congress will have a comprehensive picture in regard to all such matters.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me on this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not particularly like the amendment, because many of the State legislatures will not meet for 2 years; and, therefore, the only report the Secretary could make would be that nothing had happened. On the other hand, there would be States as to which he could report what was happening.

I am not opposed to having the reports made. The Secretary of the Interior will have to report. If the Senator from Colorado insists on his amendment, I shall accept it. I say frankly that 2 years is a very short period of time for the land-grant colleges to get tooled up and be able to report. My colleague from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] is well acquainted with our State's land-grant college and its president. He and I frequently visit it. It is a fine institution; it has a fine president; and it has a fine faculty and a fine program. But it cannot get tooled up on this program within 2 years. Therefore, a report would be that in less than 2 years nothing significant had been done.

I want the reports made regularly and I want Congress to know all about the work being done and all about the program; and I find that I cannot maintain my desire to have the reports made and still oppose this amendment. Therefore, if the Senator from Colorado insists upon the amendment, I shall accept it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 3 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from New Mexico that I did not offer the amendment facetiously.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that.

Mr. ALLOTT. As the Senator from New Mexico has said, I realize that some of the State legislatures will not meet for 2 years. On the other hand, many of the State legislatures are now considering this matter, and many of the

legislatures meet each year. Certainly by the end of 2 years the report should be made.

So I am happy to have the Senator from New Mexico accept the amendment; and I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 53 of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, beginning at line 9, it is proposed to strike all through line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof:

Sec. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$5,000,000 in fiscal year 1964, and in each of four fiscal years thereafter, from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with recipients such as educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, or Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems indigenous to the area where such recipient is located and not otherwise being studied.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I can discuss the amendment in the same context as I would two other amendments that I have offered. One relates to section 100(a) and the other relates to section 100(b).

Section 200, to which the amendment relates, should be in the RECORD at this point, so I shall read it:

Sec. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$5,000,000 in fiscal year 1964, increasing \$1,000,000 annually for five years, and continuing at \$10,000,000 annually thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with private firms and individuals; and with local, State, or Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied.

My amendment provides as follows:

Sec. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$5,000,000 in fiscal year 1964, and in each of four fiscal years thereafter—

Otherwise, the limitations of the section remain the same.

What is the basic difference between the amendment and the bill? There are two simple, basic differences. First, we would give the Secretary of the Interior, not \$10 million at this time, but \$5 million. We would give him \$5 million for undertaking research, grants, and matching research grants with private

funds and individuals and, in fact, with anyone with whom the Secretary might wish to make a contract.

This sort of thing has gone pretty far. We are now at the place at which any activity which has the word "research" tacked onto it can receive almost any amount of money that is needed. I have seen all sorts of activities entitled "research" which required no more ability or energy than a man with an adding machine and a pair of eyes with which to read.

The issues are as follows:

First, we would reduce the amount authorized from \$10 to \$15 million.

Second, as written, the bill would be an open end authorization. We would start at \$5 million, adding \$1 million a year until we reached \$10 million, and then we would authorize the appropriation of \$10 million, not for 1 year, not for 5 years, and not for 10 years, but forever.

Research into water problems is a sensitive area. It is extremely important to some of us. But as a principle of legislation I do not believe that there should be an open end authorization in this type of activity.

I said yesterday, and I repeat today, that I believe the best results from any provision of the bill will come not from the Department of the Interior or any contract that it might make, but from the work which is done by those in our land-grant colleges who are skilled in water research matters. The bill would provide an open end authorization, until Congress should decide to act otherwise, authorizing the sum of \$10 million, starting with the sum of \$5 million for the first year, and increasing by \$1 million each year for 4 years thereafter to \$10 million, and from then on the authorization would be \$10 million a year.

We shall receive reports. I believe that the best way to approach the question of research is to limit the time that we would appropriate the money. At the end of 5 years, if the program is paying off in real research and accomplishments, we shall have no trouble in Congress in passing another authorization bill, not for \$10 million, but for \$20 million, if that amount is needed. If the population explosion continues, and pressure is exerted against the people who require water, it will have to be obtained, no matter what the cost. So let us take a look at the program.

This is an argument of sound reasoning. Let us authorize an appropriation of \$5 million to the Secretary of the Interior for 5 years, and at the end of 5 years let us examine the situation and decide what we want to do. I am sure that if the money is used wisely and if the research program pays off, there will be no difficulty in passing a new authorization bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, the amendment would do three major things:

First, it would reduce the title II program to a straight \$5 million a year;

second, it would terminate the program in 5 years; and third, it would change the limitation on research projects from water problems "related to the mission of the Department of the Interior" to problems "indigenous to the area where such recipient is located."

I cannot accept the amendment because of the damage it would do to the bill. All three of the changes would have extremely undesirable results.

First, water resource problems are so pressing and urgent, and the need for training hydrosciences so great, that no one has previously questioned the sums provided in S. 2. This includes the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which has stated in a letter to committee members:

Additional research, investigations and experiments in the field of water and related resources are needed to help meet the water demands of future generations. The training of additional scientists to conduct such activity is vital. The stimulation of more effective research at industrial, State and local levels and the training of additional scientists by the State and other agencies are the most satisfactory methods of achieving greater knowledge about water because they would minimize unwarranted Federal research activity * * *

The chamber did recommend amendments—but a reduction in the sums proposed in S. 2 was not suggested.

It is anticipated that a large portion of S. 2 funds will be matched. The appropriations authorized in S. 2 were set at a modest original level, moving upward for 4 or 5 years to keep pace with available matching funds. The appropriation of a flat sum for 5 years will deter and put a lid on the potential flow of matching funds. In agricultural research, matching funds very considerably exceed Federal appropriations.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment on that basis.

Second, the inclusion of a termination provision in the bill would kill its most important value.

As evidence in support of that point, I shall read a portion of a letter which I received from Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo., dated April 18, 1963. It is a letter from the president of the college, commenting on chamber of commerce suggestions, in which he said:

The proposal to put a termination date on section 100 programs would defeat the very purpose of the bill. Sections 104 and 305 insure periodic review of the programs. Surely these requirements plus the continuing concern of the Congress as it considers appropriations annually will provide ample safeguard against deterioration of value of the research undertaken by section 100 funds.

Further, colleges and universities cannot afford to build and equip laboratories and rearrange curricula to accommodate a short-term program. Top scientists in disciplines related to water resources—physics, engineering, geology, botany, silviculture, meteorology, economics and many others—are not easily persuaded to specialize in water problems if there is the threat of early termination of the principal program in the field. They look for specialties in which they may find a lifetime career. Neither can students be persuaded to spend many years in graduate training for work which may be stopped before they complete their training. The

assurance of continuity which S. 2 provides is one of the basic strengths of the bill. Provision is made at section 305 for a comprehensive review at the end of 5 years. Congress can itself review the results of the program whenever it deems it appropriate. The adoption of this suggestion would, in our judgment, be especially injurious to the bill.

Dr. Morgan is as right as he can be in his appraisal of the proposal. I think it would completely kill the bill.

Colleges and universities cannot tool-up—they cannot afford to build and equip laboratories, for a short-term program. Faculty members looking for a field in which to specialize are not looking for an odd-job business, but something in which they will find a lifetime career, worth years of study and preparation. Students would not spend years in training for work that may be terminated before they graduate. Congress may review and reenact the program.

The bill provides for a 5-year review, and we have amended that to 2 years. But schools and scientists are not going to commit their assets and their lives to a program authorized on a short-term basis.

S. 2 originally handled the situation by providing at section 305 that within 1 year after the 5th year of operation, the Secretary of the Interior shall make a review report and submit it to the President and Congress, together with the independent views of college and university heads. Those are to start in 2 years now.

Reviews will be made. Everyone is under notice that results are expected. But there is no threat of termination in S. 2 and there should not be. Water problems will be with us for a long time to come and we must have a water research program just as long as water is necessary to human existence on the planet.

Therefore, because of this second provision I must oppose the amendment.

The limitation of research projects to "mission of the Department of Interior" was to keep, and to reassure other Federal departments that the Department of Interior would be kept, in its own water fields. That is needed and should not be stricken from the bill.

The substitute limiting phrase, "indigenous to the area where such recipient is located" would have a very serious effect.

The phrase has a definite implication that the local agencies are to work on the practical problems in their locality. Perhaps some will involve basic research, but the whole pressure of the phrase will be away from fundamentals toward practical research.

This tendency became a serious problem at one period in the development of the agricultural research program and led to the enactment of the Adams Act of 1904, broadening the language of the original act and providing an extra \$15,000 annually of funds. Federal Director A. C. True of the Office of Experiment Stations wrote, in 1902:

Under present conditions it is useless to expect that * * * our stations will discover many of the new principles on which permanent improvement of our agriculture must rest. But unless the way is opened for them

to seriously attack these fundamental problems their future work will necessarily be comparatively fragmentary and inconclusive. They may, as in the past obtain many results which can usefully be applied in practice, but they will not be able to furnish solid foundations for the enlargement of our agricultural industries.

Harvard University is doing a tremendously big job of setting up a computer system to analyze multiple-purpose river basin plans, and thereby speed the adoption of plans that maximize benefits. Once perfected, the computer system could be used over and over at Harvard for the many river basins of the Nation—but not if Harvard were limited to work indigenous to its area.

The Corps of Army Engineers has a big experimental laboratory at Vicksburg which builds scale models of dams, spillways, and even rivers to test engineering plans and dam designs. They have a model of the Mississippi River, of New York Harbor, and dams to be built all over the Nation. They could not concentrate in this one station—at great savings—this sort of research and experimental work if limited to problems "indigenous to the area."

The scientists now tell us that Texas droughts are the result of the fact that storms which develop in the Aleutians and Bay of Alaska and sweep south to cross the United States from east to west, remain too far north for an extended period to cause rainfall in the Lone Star State. They are studying ways to coax these storms, or major weathermakers, to go over areas where water is needed. The problem becomes how Texas—and New Mexico—can do research on weather problems of utmost importance to the Southern States up in Alaska, or Montana.

These examples are not necessarily in the fields with which Interior Department could or should concern itself, but they illustrate the danger of the "indigenous problems" limitation proposed by the amendment.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, which has been under discussion.

By way of preface I wish to say that I am a cosponsor of the measure. I spoke at length upon it here on the Senate floor and I testified before the committee in favor of the bill.

I again congratulate and commend the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for the splendid job which has been done on the bill. It is a constructive piece of legislation. It follows a proven procedure and will prove to be easily workable.

I do endorse the legislative principle involved here, which is to have as important a piece of legislation as this returned to the Congress periodically, not for affirmative action, but for review and reconsideration, so that we may make such changes as may be indicated after 4 or 5 years of experience.

I think that would have a salutary effect upon those who are granted funds to administer this bill. It would make them a little more alert. It would cause them to be more vigilant and more determined to develop proper programs, and more responsive in their efforts to get from their programs the maximum benefit.

It is just good legislative procedure, it seems to me, to provide for congressional review.

The point has been raised that it is necessary to have a permanent program. Otherwise, it is contended, technicians and faculty would not agree to commit themselves to something that is not assured to last forever and a day. It seems to me there is nothing in the provision for a 5-year review which would militate against the permanence of this kind of work for teachers, professors, or technicians. While they may not be pursuing their work under the particular auspices set up by this bill, there is in this country, and there will continue to be, wide demand for that type of development and achievement.

I wish to say again that the legislation is good. It is sound, and it should be approved. But I think it would be improved if we added an amendment, providing for review by the Congress, which would follow if the Allott amendment were adopted. I hope it will be.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his support of the amendment. I am sure everyone in this body is aware of the great sincerity with which he approaches this type of problem. His own State is as aware of water problems as my own.

I can see that there are persons who want to see the present provision for the money kept in the legislation and see it go on and on, but it seems to me that as legislators the only sensible thing we can do is place this legislation in a position where we know Congress is going to have a review.

It is estimated that there will be 250 million people in this country before 1970. The pressures for an adequate supply of water are going to get greater and greater all the time. The problem is not going to be solved overnight. Of all the problems we have, the problem of water is probably going to be the greatest and the one which is going to be with us the longest. It may get worse. There may come a time when people may have to move to other places, and perhaps outside the bounds of this country, in order to find water. I do not know. Nobody can foresee. But one thing is sure, and that is that the pressures for water use are going to increase, and we are going to have to make better use of that commodity.

With such a situation facing us, nobody under heaven could keep the research program from being continued 5 years from now, if the research people made good use of the money appropriated, if the money was used correctly, if real research was being performed, and not merely a bunch of boondoggling con-

tracts. If research was being done, there is no question that the law would be reenacted. Let us provide legislation so that Congress can reevaluate it at the end of 5 years, instead of starting off on a program that will go on and on, and, by reason of the fact that it will go on and on, Congress would have to repeal the law in order to do anything about it. We should limit the law now, rather than later.

I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico proposes to speak further at this time.

I yield to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] 3 minutes.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am in hearty accord with the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. It is a worthwhile amendment. I am sure if the money is spent wisely, under the amendment before the Senate, Congress will continue the program and reenact this legislation.

As a cosponsor of S. 2, I am pleased and privileged to give wholehearted endorsement to this important proposal. It is a measure that has been carefully studied and drafted to cope significantly with a national problem.

S. 2 is designed to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research. The bill authorizes funds starting at \$75,000, and increasing to \$100,000 annually, to a land-grant institution of each State for a water research center. In addition, other appropriations would be authorized to match State funds and to provide the Secretary of the Interior with money for expanded water research.

Exhaustive studies have amply confirmed the acuteness of water supply needs. We are facing, not a theoretical problem, but a real and growing crisis across the Nation. Projections of available water resources and anticipated needs in the coming decades underscore the already developing seriousness of water shortages in many areas today. They foretell a far grimmer picture for the future.

So we are not discussing now the reasons for this legislation. The need for it is plain for all to see; the record is clear on this score. We are, or should be, concerned more with the means and methods for achieving the broad purpose of S. 2: to assure an abundance of water, both in quantity and quality. The question is, to help achieve this end, How can we best stimulate research, investigations, and experimentation in the field and also encourage the training of needed scientists through assistance to colleges and universities?

S. 2 is soundly patterned after the very successful agricultural experiment station program, the Hatch Act of 1887. The outstanding results of this time-tested program enhance the desirability of having land-grant institutions administer water resources research, as provided in S. 2. Through this Federal-State approach, needed Federal support can be made available for water research by land-grant institutions, and other designated research institutions—re-

search that would be responsive to both local and national needs.

Speaking for the State of Hawaii, I can state emphatically that we place great importance upon water research. Like the Nation as a whole, Hawaii has experienced an increase in demand for water from the greater per capita demand as well as the greater number of people. We are intensifying our efforts to expand and diversify our island economy. Both urban and suburban development, and the agricultural potential of Hawaii, will depend heavily upon our ability to increase and conserve our water resources.

Dr. Thomas Hamilton, president of the University of Hawaii, has described our water research needs as pressing and requiring local research. We have been limited by lack of funds rather than by lack of interest or lack of problems to work on, according to Dr. W. J. Holmes, dean of the University of Hawaii, College of Engineering. Dean Holmes points in Hawaii's problem when he states:

If anything serious happens to our basal water supply, the population that Hawaii can support will be most seriously reduced.

There are other facets of a total water research program beyond that encompassed by S. 2, but this bill goes far toward coming to grips with a national problem.

Time is on our side if we move aggressively toward the objective set forth in S. 2. I urge my colleagues to act promptly and decisively to approve this important measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I find it somewhat difficult to oppose the pending amendment, for I think, as a general rule, the Congress of the United States ought, by the type of legislation it writes, provide for periodic scrutiny of the intent for which legislation is passed and the manner in which the administrative or executive branch in the Government has performed its duty.

In this instance, however, I make an exception. I come from a State which I think deserves the applause of the people of the country for what it has done to try to set its own house in order with respect to an adequate water supply. California does not have within its borders sufficient water to meet its growing needs. The people of my State at the local level and at the State level have sought to remedy this deficit. Two years ago, the people of California bonded themselves in a statewide election for the first phase of the State water plan for an extraordinary amount of money, some \$1,750 million.

There has hardly been a year when I have not come before the Senate asking for additional assistance in an effort to help the people of my State, now and hereafter, to have a continuing water supply. True, the money is repayable into the U.S. Treasury by the water users.

The outlook for an adequate supply of water is somewhat bleak. Here we not only have an opportunity to enlist the

aid of educational institutions in all 50 States, but, as was said by one of our State's leading educational and research administrators who testified before our committee on behalf of the University of California, it is quite possible that breakthroughs with respect to the problems of an adequate supply of water could take place in your State, Mr. President, or in one of the Eastern States, where the problem of an adequate water supply is not so acute.

I believe, therefore, in this instance, if I make a mistake, I wish to make a mistake on the side of giving the educational institutions of America a greater opportunity to study and to conduct research and to try to find ways and means by which potable water in this country can cope with the population explosion which we face in the days to come.

Therefore, having placed my name on the bill as a coauthor, and having been very glad to accept some of the amendments that have been offered by my very able colleague in the Senate from Colorado, in this instance I feel that by remaining silent I would not discharge my duty if I did not say to the Members of the Senate that I believe the continuing policy of the Government of the United States as enunciated in the proposed legislation is in the public interest. For that reason I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that under the terms of the bill the Secretary of the Interior will have to return to Congress every year for an evaluation. The Senator from Nebraska said that he should return to Congress for an authorization. He will have to do so, in effect, at every appropriation hearing.

We know what would have happened if Congress, when it passed the Hatch Act of 1877, had written in a provision for the filing of a report every 5 years. Does anyone undertake to say how long it would have been before someone would have come in with an antidiscrimination rider and destroyed that act, as they have destroyed housing?

The Hatch Act was originally drawn to permit schools to do experimental work as long as they were doing useful work.

Reference was made to boondoggling contracts. I have examined hundreds of contracts in person—perhaps thousands of them—submitted by land-grant colleges, and I have never seen one boondoggle contract of a land-grant college.

The Senator from Colorado has referred to Chancellor Aldrich, of the University of California, who testified before our committee in favor of the very things that we propose. I should like to read from a letter which has been sent to me by the president of the University of Florida, Dr. J. Wayne Reitz. He wrote to me on April 15, 1963. He says, in connection with amendments to be proposed by the chamber of commerce, including the very amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado:

3. It is suggested by the chamber of commerce that title I should provide a definite termination date of the program of annual grants of funds to the States. Here again the basic assumption is made in S. 2 that

water research is going to be a continuing and increasingly important area of investigation if we are to meet the needs of our ever-growing population for personal as well as agricultural and industrial consumption. To establish a definite termination date would mitigate against a State developing sound and farsighted programs of research in this important field. Had termination dates been provided for agricultural research we would never have made the progress that has been made.

I agree with him a thousand percent.

Then, at the end of the letter he says:

I fear that the chamber of commerce in attempting to amend the bill is in effect trying to kill it, notwithstanding its announced support. Certainly if the bill were amended as suggested by the chamber it would be so far from the mark that it might as well be killed.

I appeal to the Senate not to destroy a longstanding piece of work, of negotiations between land-grant colleges, and departments of Government and Congress, because it may well result in killing a good bill that would work. I believe it would be a workable act. These people would have to come back regularly for appropriations. There would be provision for review, just as there is now provision for review under the Hatch Act, which has stood since 1877.

I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his remarks. Both he and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska realize the importance of the bill, and are cosponsors of it. Therefore, their support of the principles of the bill and the principles of my amendment are indeed encouraging.

I particularly wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, because we are prone to think of the State of Hawaii as one of those lush paradises in which water is never a problem. Yet of my own personal knowledge I know that that distinguished Senator from Hawaii carried through in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and also through the Senate, and through the Congress, a reclamation project which will add greatly to the total agricultural wealth of Hawaii, and enable it to stabilize its agricultural economy.

Few people could see the necessity of this in a place like Hawaii, because their ideas are entirely different. However, as the result of his foresight and his thinking, the agricultural economy of one area of his State is going to be stabilized by more advantageous use of water.

I should like to say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico, first, that he has taken two things out of context in my remarks; at least there is the implication that they are out of context. I wish to get the record straight about that first. He quoted from a letter from Dr. Morgan, who is the very capable and distinguished head of our Colorado State University. In that letter, Dr. Morgan referred to the program under section 100.

The amendment I am proposing has nothing whatever to do with section 100. It has nothing to do with grants to land-

grant colleges. Let us make that clear. That problem does not exist.

The Senator from New Mexico also said that we should never consent to a land grant college boondoggling on its research grants. No one on this floor has said that they did. Since I am the only one that I know of who has used the word "boondoggle" on the floor in the last hour or two, I must separate the word "boondoggle" from anything having to do with land-grant colleges.

However, I am not afraid to say on the floor of the Senate that we have department after department in the Government of the United States who are boondoggling with so-called research contracts.

I documented that on the floor of the Senate last year. I documented one instance in which the National Science Foundation had done just such a thing, and had made a hopeless shambles out of what should have been one of the great primary basic research projects of this age.

I shall document it again within the next week on the floor of the Senate, to show exactly what is happening. It is no secret any longer that the National Institutes of Health have so far outgrown so-called research programs, that many of them would be strained to have them called research programs.

A man with a pencil or an adding machine could do most of the research involved, so far as most of it being carried on in this country is concerned. When I see research being carried on by research teams, under the National Institutes of Health with respect to small indigenous tribes, I wonder what we are spending our money for, especially when we are chalked up with a \$12 billion deficit this year. I want to keep the record straight.

I am sure the Senator from New Mexico did not mean to imply that I thought colleges were boondoggling. However, I wish to make it perfectly clear that in my references I meant to say that I do not have the confidence in the Secretary of the Interior that I have in our colleges and universities throughout the country so far as conducting research in water is concerned.

Perhaps the Senators are ready to give the Secretary of the Interior \$5 or \$10 million forever in the hope that he will conduct a meaningful research program. I am not willing to do so. I do not have that much confidence in the present Secretary of the Interior, and I doubt whether I would have that much confidence in any Secretary of the Interior.

The statement has been made in the Senate that Congress would review the program when appropriations for it were under consideration. But the review should not be made by the Committee on Appropriations; it should be made by those who, day after day, year after year, work in the areas of water resources, land utilization, reclamation, and conservation, in the legislative committee, which is the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That is the committee in which policy should be made as to whether this program shall be continued forever and ever, ad infinitum, or whether it should be limited. If

that is not a reasonable suggestion, then I know of no suggestion that could be reasonable.

Congress should place a limitation on the amount of money which the Secretary of the Interior can contract with land-grant colleges for research, or so-called research. Therefore, I have suggested that the amount be limited to \$5 million, and the duration of the act be limited to 5 years. I believe that is a wholly reasonable suggestion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call not to be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. 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. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico is prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to him on the amendment, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time available to me, inasmuch as I have not received requests for further time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is paired with the Sen-

ator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Allott	Fong	Pearson
Bennett	Goldwater	Prouty
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Carlson	Javits	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Simpson
Cotton	Keating	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Tower
Dirksen	Mechem	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Miller	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—61

Aiken	Hartke	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Muskie
Bartlett	Hill	Nelson
Bayh	Holland	Neuberger
Brewster	Inouye	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Randolph
Cannon	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Case	Kuchel	Russell
Church	Long, Mo.	Scott
Clark	Long, La.	Smathers
Douglas	Mansfield	Smith
Eastland	McCarthy	Sparkman
Edmondson	McGee	Stennis
Ellender	McGovern	Symington
Engle	McIntyre	Talmadge
Ervin	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gore	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Morse	
Hart	Moss	

NOT VOTING—9

Beall	Humphrey	Magnuson
Bible	Jordan, N.C.	McClellan
Dodd	Kefauver	Morton

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,000,000" each time it appears and insert in each case "\$800,000".

On page 3, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000".

On page 8, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000".

On page 8, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$800,000".

On page 8, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000".

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the amendments would merely reduce the authorizations, with the exception of the authorization for land-grant colleges, by 20 percent, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

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

from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to himself?

Mr. COTTON. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the amendments considered en bloc would merely reduce by 20 percent—by one-fifth—the authorization in the bill, with the exception of the authorization for research in the case of land-grant colleges. They would not in any other respect affect the planning, the term, or the bill.

On a long-term basis S. 2 would authorize a \$20-million-a-year program of water research activities under the supervision of the Department of the Interior. The amendments would reduce the total scope of the program to \$17 million a year on the long-term basis, and make corresponding reductions in the earlier phases of the program.

There are several reasons for the amendment:

First, this is a new program. The extent of State participation, the ability of the States to finance additional water research, and the availability of research personnel are all relatively unknown factors at this time. A modest reduction such as this proposal will not thwart the program, nor will it hamper it in any way.

I ask the attention of Senators especially to the following point:

Second, the Federal Government is already spending sizable sums on water research. The Federal Council for Science and Technology has calculated that eight major agencies of the Federal Government are already engaged in this research. They are: Agriculture, Commerce, Defense—chiefly Corps of Engineers—HEW, Interior, AEC, National Science Foundation, and TVA. In fiscal 1963, these Federal water research programs will involve expenditures of more than \$66 million, and the budget requests for fiscal 1964 exceed \$74 million. Thus a modest cut in the amounts in S. 2 will not reduce the Government's efforts in this field, but only slow down the rate of increase by a small amount. Its chief effect would be simply to channel the research efforts into the most important and most productive fields.

Mr. President, this is a good bill. The purpose of the bill is good. It has long been the position of the Senator from New Hampshire that our water resources and our water supplies represent the unfinished business of our generation.

Simply because we in my section of the country are not faced with quite the same emergency faced by other sections does not lessen my enthusiasm for this program, which is a thoroughly legitimate Federal activity.

But, Mr. President, the general fiscal and budget picture of the Government urgently demands at this time the utmost economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator yielded has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from New Hampshire may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. **COTTON**. Mr. President, the committee in its report indicated it did not attempt to coordinate the activities; that that was to be left to the executive branch of the Government—and no doubt properly so.

We are conducting all these activities simultaneously. The bill would add a new one. I think the people of this country—who are watching with care the efforts of the Congress to show its disposition to hold down, so far as can be done without serious damage to vital programs, the authorizations for expenditures in the coming years—would look with favor upon this modest reduction.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. **COTTON**. I yield with pleasure to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Since the amendment offered by the Senator is not printed, do I correctly understand the effect of the amendment would be not to cut the amounts to be available to land-grant colleges under section 100(a), but only to cut those amounts in subsection 100 (b) and section 200 which would go to the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. **COTTON**. The Senator from Colorado is completely correct in his analysis of the amendment. I repeat that the amendment would leave untouched the authorization of amounts available for research for land-grant colleges. It would cut all along the line by 20 percent the other authorizations in the bill available to the Secretary of the Interior, and to be expended in accordance with the terms of the bill.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. With that answer I wish to tell the Senator I shall be much pleased to join him in his amendment, particularly since the Senate did not adopt the amendment offered a few minutes ago to limit the authorization to 5 years.

Mr. **COTTON**. I thank the Senator for his support of my amendment. I am disappointed that the Senator's amendment was not agreed to; but this would be a more modest reduction, and I hope the Senate will act favorably upon it.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. President, I have no wish to detain the Senate on this amendment. It is a question of seeking to reduce a carefully worked out bill, a carefully worked out proposal, passed upon by educators all across the country. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. **COTTON**. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. **COTTON**]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **DIRKSEN** (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished assistant majority

leader [Mr. **HUMPHREY**]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. **SMATHERS**. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. **BIBLE**], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. **DODD**], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. **HUMPHREY**], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. **JORDAN**], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. **KEFAUVER**], the Senator from Washington [Mr. **MAGNUSON**], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. **MCCLELLAN**] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. **BIBLE**], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. **JORDAN**], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. **KEFAUVER**], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. **MAGNUSON**] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. **DODD**] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. **DOMINICK**]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. **DOMINICK**] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. **MORTON**] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. **BEALL**], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. **CURTIS**], and the Senator from California [Mr. **KUCHEL**] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. **CURTIS**] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. **BEALL**] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. **KUCHEL**]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. **DOMINICK**] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. **DODD**]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Allott	Hruska	Robertson
Bennett	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Boggs	Keating	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Simpson
Carlson	McIntyre	Talmadge
Cooper	Mecham	Thurmond
Cotton	Miller	Tower
Fong	Pearson	Williams, Del.
Goldwater	Prout	

NAYS—58

Anderson	Gore	McGovern
Bartlett	Gruning	McNamara
Bayh	Hart	Metcalf
Brewster	Hartke	Monroney
Burdick	Hayden	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Moss
Cannon	Holland	Mundt
Case	Inouye	Muskie
Church	Jackson	Nelson
Clark	Javits	Neuberger
Douglas	Johnston	Pastore
Eastland	Kennedy	Pell
Edmondson	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Ellender	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Engle	Manfield	Russell
Ervin	McCarthy	Smathers
Fulbright	McGee	Smith

Sparkman
Stennis
Symington

Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—13

Beall
Bible
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd

Dominick
Humphrey
Jordan, N.C.
Kefauver
Kuchel
Magnuson
McClellan
Morton

So Mr. **COTTON**'s amendment was rejected.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. It is proposed, on page 2, line 23, to change the period to a colon and add the following:

Provided, That a State may designate both a college (or university) established in accordance with said Act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503) and one or more other institutions of higher education for this purpose.

Mr. **MILLER**. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to make absolutely clear what the proponents of the bill intend. The way the bill reads now, it seems it could possibly be interpreted that a land-grant college could receive the program, or, if a land-grant college was not designated by a State, then one or more institutions of higher learning within the State could be determined upon by the State.

It seems to me we ought to leave it up to the State legislature whether it wanted to have both a land-grant college and one or more universities or institutions of higher learning in the State so designated. This amendment provides that a State will have that power.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MILLER**. I yield.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. Will the Senator specify an instance of what he is referring to? Is there an institution in his State involved?

Mr. **MILLER**. This matter came to my attention as a result of information from one of the presidents of one of the institutions of higher learning in Iowa. In Iowa we happen to have a land-grant college which is no longer a college. It is now designated a State university. We also have the State University of Iowa. I would like to have the bill provide that discretion is given the State of Iowa as to whether it may wish to have this program carried on both at Iowa State at Ames and at the State University of Iowa at Iowa City.

I can see where other States might have a similar problem.

As I interpret the bill as it is now written, if it should be determined by the State that it should be Iowa State at Ames that will handle the program, then it cannot go into another institution of higher learning within the State.

The amendment will give the State that choice. I am quite sure the Senator from New Mexico would like a State to have that choice.

Mr. **ANDERSON**. We think the language of the bill is abundantly clear. But we want the Senator from Iowa to be satisfied. I know of the situation in

Iowa, having been a neighbor to that State for many years. I do not believe the amendment changes the intent of the bill.

Therefore, I am prepared to accept the amendment, and do so.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time for debate has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 55 which is offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 5, strike all of section 103 and substitute in lieu thereof:

SEC. 103. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 4152(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking the word "and" at the end of subparagraph (E) and by adding the following at the end of subparagraph (F): "and

"(G) Any institute or center engaged in activities authorized by the Water Resources Research Act consisting of bulletins, reports, periodicals, reprints of articles, and other publications necessary for the dissemination or results of researches and experiments within the scope of the Act, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, mailed from the principal place of business of the institute or center, or from an established subunit of the same."

(b) Section 4156 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) The Department of Interior shall transfer to the Post Office Department as postal revenue out of any appropriation made to it for that purpose the equivalent amount of postage, as determined by the Postmaster General, for penalty mailings under section 4152(a)(1)(G) of this title."

Mr. JOHNSTON. The only purpose of the amendment is to provide that the Postmaster General shall determine the amount of postage for penalty mail used under the terms of the bill, in the same way in which he now determines such postage. The bill provides a new item, and there is a possibility that the refund to the Post Office Department for penalty mail will not be included under the language of the bill as it now reads.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that this involves merely a bookkeeping transaction, in reality. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. A bookkeeping matter between the two Departments. Penalty mail is involved already, but we feel that under the language of the bill the new penalty mail might not be considered in determining the total amount of penalty mail.

Mr. ANDERSON. For the sake of legislative history I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service if it is true that this does not involve the operation of the colleges themselves, or where the money is to go, or anything of that nature.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. It involves only penalty mail. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It involves only the penalty mail that would be included in the grand total. The Postmaster General would make up the estimates.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no objection to the amendment. I accept it. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as No. 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following new section:

SEC. 305. No part of any appropriated funds may be expended pursuant to authorization given by this Act for any scientific or technological research or development activity unless such expenditure is conditioned upon provisions determined by the Secretary of the Interior, with the approval of the Attorney General, to be effective to insure that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from that activity will (with such exceptions and limitations as the Secretary may determine after consultation with the Secretary of Defense to be necessary in the interest of the national defense) be made freely and fully available to the general public. Nothing contained in this subsection shall deprive the owner of any background patent relating to any such activity of any right which that owner may have under that patent.

On page 11, line 3, strike out "Sec. 305", and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 306".

On page 11, line 14, strike out "Sec. 306", and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 307".

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment seeks to assure that the result of the research done under the program authorized in the pending bill would be made available in general to industry, States, cities, and other communities throughout the entire country, by assuring that the Government would retain patent rights to the inventions that would result from research performed with Government money.

The present policy in the Department of the Interior, we are assured, is to that effect. We have been told that the same result would come under the present policy of the Department as would be assured by the adoption of the amendment. However, we do not know what could happen under a future Secretary of the Interior, or whether at some future time pressure would not be brought to bear upon the administration to permit private patents to exist from developments in this field.

The amendment provides that the Department could not yield to such pressures.

The amendment is identical to the amendment which was added to the

saline water research bill, which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That amendment carried out the same purposes with respect to saline water research. We do not want a private contractor to obtain a patent as a result of research being done with Government money, and thus deny cities, States, and other communities of something that has been developed with such Government money.

I know that the chairman of the committee is sympathetic to this amendment, having added such an amendment to the saline water research bill. He also had something to do with the Helium Gas Act, now the law, and which also contains such a provision. He also approved of it when it was made a part of the Coal Research Development Act.

The amendment I am offering seeks to carry out the policy that was approved by Congress on several occasions. We want to make sure that the public gets the benefit from any inventions that might result, and that no private patents will be obtained as a result of Government research.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As a cosponsor of the bill, I agree with everything the Senator from Louisiana has said. I hope the chairman will see fit to take the amendment to conference.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I know what the Senator from Louisiana has been trying to do for a long time in this field. I see absolutely nothing wrong with the amendment. As the Senator from Oregon has suggested, I will take the amendment to conference. I accept the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I merely wish to point out that on page 19 of the committee report the Secretary of the Interior states that he feels the amendment would be appropriate on the bill. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. ANDERSON. I know that the Senator from Colorado has another amendment to offer. We have discussed it.

Mr. ALLOTT. There is so much noise in the Chamber I cannot hear what is being said. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 22, it is proposed to insert after the word "Act" the words "with an educational institution or nonprofit organization." On page 11, line 1, it is proposed

to strike out the words "such payments" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "advance payments of initial expense."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. The purpose of the amendment is to enable initial payments to be made to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations when they are unable to do so.

The real reason for the proposed change is that the language in the bill is not satisfactory. The amendment will make it conform to the principles which we worked out under S. 20 since the first of the year. I have discussed the amendment with the author of the bill. I believe it is entirely satisfactory to him.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say that the Senator from Colorado did help us materially with S. 20. This is an attempt to follow the same principle in the pending bill. I commend him for his efforts. As far as I am concerned, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to add that this is not the exact language, but it follows the same principle.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I subscribe to what the Senator has said. It is not the exact language. I did not mean to say it was. The Senator from Colorado was helpful in connection with S. 20 in working out the language. The language he suggests now will accomplish the same purpose under the same principle. I am glad to accept the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Water Resources Research Act at maturity would make available \$100,000 each year to every State for water research; would make an additional \$5 million available each year to these research centers on a matching basis, dollar for dollar, for money supplied by the States or by other non-Federal sources; and would make another \$10 million available annually to be directed by the Secretary of Interior through arrangement with the States or other qualified organizations for needed water research not otherwise being studied.

The Great Plains and the West have been aware since settlement of the significance of water. Development there has been guided by and has been limited to the availability of water.

These limitations on development potential become more discernible every year, and further development is feasible largely to the extent that water is available and to the extent that available water is more prudently used.

And now in recent years responsible studies are giving notice that the eastern half of the country will be facing the same problems before the expiration of the 20th century. Until recently the

East has considered itself secure against problems of water scarcity.

So obviously it is time for a national implementation of a purposeful, expansive, coordinated, and determined continentwide scientific pursuit for better methods of water acquisition and utilization. The Water Resources Research Act would begin such a pursuit. I support it enthusiastically.

The program adopts the same kind of decentralized and diversified effort that the United States has used for 75 years in striving toward better and more productive agricultural methods. And this approach is very likely the most promising one we could take toward reducing the water problem.

One essential reason for the success of agricultural research and for the success in our having its findings adopted in translating good research into better farming practices has been its widely decentralized attack. Federally encouraged agricultural research has been done by each State, each one directing its own efforts at problems peculiar to its own area, which has resulted in a solid betterment of agricultural practices in every segment of agriculture.

The effort to utilize this same system for water research is well grounded. There is no one single problem in water research. Nor is there merely a half-dozen or so problems that could be farmed out to a half dozen high prestige university research centers for investigation.

We are here approaching a many-faceted problem far more fundamentally in establishing a procedure whereby the States are free to adapt the water research program however it best fits their needs.

And in their doing this, each State will be able to develop a substantial number of cooperating water experts whose availability to the States will continue. The States will not be dependent on a body of expert knowledge developed at Federal expense but available to the States only at high cost from a center of learning perhaps half a continent away.

Passage of this bill will position us from the beginning to meet a continental water shortage squarely, looking for solutions to as many facets of the problem as there are facets which demand attention.

I think it is appropriate, too, in discussing this most promising piece of legislation, to recall the work of my late colleague from South Dakota, Francis Case, during his 25 years in Congress.

Water was his basic campaign concern in 1934, when he was defeated, and again in 1936, when he was first elected to Congress, and from then until his death. He worked continuously on water legislation during his generation in Congress. Much of the existing water legislation has the imprint of his work, right up to the recent saline water programs and the futuristic interest in weather modification.

Throughout those more than two decades of effort on the problems of water conservation and utilization it was my privilege and purpose to work closely with former Senator Case in promoting

and developing these programs. In the House, when we served together there he was on the Appropriations Committee and I was on a legislative committee enabling us to operate a "one-two punch" in support of constructive water projects. We worked together for example on the first effective water pollution control bill to pass the House in the form of a measure which I authored. We advanced so-called Wheeler-Case water projects. We cooperated on other water development programs including the Pick-Sloan plan and many Missouri River development projects including both those on the main stem and dozens of water-conservation area and local projects. In the Senate, in turn, I served on the Appropriations Committee and Francis Case served on a legislative committee again enabling us to work jointly in authorizing programs and projects and in securing the needed money to implement them.

With the death of Francis Case last year I picked up where he left off promoting unfinished projects which he had started and initiating and supporting others in this wide area of constructive activity. I shall continue to concentrate my time and effort in this important area of public service.

As much as with the work of any person, enactment of this bill will be the logical outgrowth and natural extension of Francis Case's efforts for adequate water.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Alaska.

WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT VITAL TO ALASKA'S FUTURE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is today taking final action on S. 2, a bill to establish water resource research centers in the several States in cooperation with State and educational authorities.

This bill is a beginning step in the development of a more adequate national program for water research and water resource conservation.

As such, it is badly needed.

The bill before us today is a modest measure designed to meet what will become one of the major problems to face our Nation in this century. Our rapidly growing population and our vast industrial complex are making heavier and ever heavier demands on our Nation's water supply. It has been estimated that by 1980 the south Pacific, the Colorado River Basin, the Great Basin, the Upper Rio Grande-Pecos, and the Upper Missouri River Basins will be unable to fulfill the water demands placed upon them. Our Nation needs new sources of water and comprehensive plans on how to use them.

This bill, S. 2, is not intended in itself to offer solutions to our water shortage problems. It is intended to provide the skilled scientific personnel and the laboratory facilities and techniques which will be needed if the solution is to be found.

My own State of Alaska has great need for such research facilities as are envisioned by S. 2. Alaska's water problems are not of scarcity, they are of utilization. We have in our State vast

resources of water which are unused and wasted. Millions of kilowatts of power run unused into the sea. As, in the coming years, Alaska's economy expands and develops the State will have need of this power and of this precious resource.

This bill will assist the State to plan the development of a research center in conjunction with the State university. Such a center will be able, in a coherent and ordered manner, to map the development of Alaska's water resources.

I am pleased, Mr. President, to be a cosponsor of this measure. I urge its early and wholehearted adoption by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I addressed to the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and enclosures will be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to be a cosponsor of S. 2, a bill to assist the establishment of water resource research centers at State universities; to promote a more adequate national program of water research; and to provide for the training of research personnel.

This bill is important to my State of Alaska and to all the States. I congratulate you and your committee, Mr. Chairman, for giving this measure the priority consideration it so clearly deserves.

The bill before the committee is a modest proposal concerning a major problem. The problem, of course, is how efficiently to utilize our water resources and how best to provide for their proper conservation. The proposal is not a solution to this problem—nor is it intended to be. When solutions are found, however, they will be found by personnel trained under the provision of S. 2, utilizing techniques and equipment developed in S. 2 laboratories.

The research centers which this bill provides for are modeled after the wholly successful program of State agriculture extension services. Funds—not more than \$100,000 per year—would be provided to the several States for use in the establishment of a State water center. This bill also provides for specific grants in aid for particular research projects. It is the hope of the sponsors of this legislation that it will encourage and develop the training of scientists and personnel equipped to work in the area of water research.

I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will make very clear that S. 2 will not conflict with—but will rather complement—research programs already undertaken by the Federal Government in water use and conservation. It should also be made clear that it does not interfere with studies now underway, with Federal, State and local participation, into the economic needs and development of river basins.

For example, under the terms of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, seven water pollution laboratories are to be constructed at sites across the country. Alaska is fortunate to have been selected as one of the sites and the fiscal 1964 budget now before the Congress includes funds for the construction of this laboratory. It is clear, I believe, that should the University of Alaska undertake to set up a water resource research center using S. 2 funds there would be ample opportunity for coordination and cooperation between the two facilities.

The Alaska congressional delegation has been working closely with the executive branch in an effort to establish a joint Federal-State Planning Commission to attempt a coherent projection of the economic development of Alaskan resources. Such a study would, of course, include water use and would have ample reason to work closely with, and to profit from, a State water research center.

The University of Alaska is greatly interested in S. 2. Enclosed you will find expression of this interest, a letter from the president of the university, William R. Wood, I would appreciate your making it a part of the committee record on the bill.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

FEBRUARY 12, 1963.

HON. E. L. BARTLETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have read with much interest the copy of S. 2, "a bill to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities," which as a cosponsor you sent to my office. The bill has been reviewed in detail by a number of our faculty, including Dr. Kenneth Rae, director of the Institute of Marine Science, Dean Earl Beistline, of the College of Earth Science and Mineral Industry, and Dr. C. T. Elvey, vice president for research and advanced study. All of us are keenly interested in the intent of S. 2 and are in strong support of its several provisions. We believe that a program such as the one proposed would complement the work that is in prospect in water pollution studies by the U.S. Public Health Service, and could become an important part of the total Arctic research program which we are attempting to develop.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Dr. Elvey to Senator ANDERSON concerning the interest of the University of Alaska in water resources research. These, I am certain, you will find of interest.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM R. WOOD,
President.

JULY 5, 1962.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: With reference to your letter of May 31, 1962, requesting information on water research, we have only a few projects supported by various governmental agencies which have a bearing on the subject.

One project entitled "Glaciological Investigations in Central Alaska" is partially supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation. As you know, a glacier is an index of climatic conditions: hence, understanding of the glaciers gives us a long history of climatic conditions. Another line of attack on past precipitation is furnished by studies of the snow and ice fields at the heads of glaciers. We have one project supported by the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory of the U.S. Army to study the snow field at the top of Mt. Wrangell, an approximate 14,000-foot elevation. Studies of the stratified layers in the snow fields give important data on the amount of precipitation.

In certain regions of Alaska water precipitation is small and mostly in the form of snow. It is very difficult to measure the amount owing to the shifting of the snow by the winds. Studies of snow fields will provide the only method of measuring the amount of precipitation on the north coastal slope of Alaska as well as certain areas in the interior. In connection with this work, we have a grant supported by the National Science Foundation entitled "A Reconnaissance Snow Survey on the Arctic Coast of

Alaska." A similar project surveying the snow of the Yukon Valley will be supported by the Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory of the U.S. Army.

The projects we have underway, as listed above, are only scratching the surface as far as research pertaining to water resources in Alaska.

The problem of water resources in Alaska varies greatly across the State. On the Arctic slope north of the Brooks Range there is permafrost which extends to a depth of 1,000 feet. This produces a serious limitation on the supply of water and upon the disposition of sewage and other waste products. In the interior of Alaska the permafrost is intermittent and often the underground water is associated with boggy areas, therefore of poor quality. The winter frosts reach to a depth of 7 feet, consequently upsetting water supplies during the winter months. In the southern parts of the State where the annual precipitation is high we have extensive glaciers. Streams which originate with glaciers are "milky" with finely ground rock.

I hope this gives you a feel for the problems in connection with water research in Alaska. If I can be of any further service to you please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

C. T. ELVEY,
Vice President for Research
and Advanced Study.

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota.

LET'S TAKE ACTION TO PREVENT WATER
SHORTAGE

Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. President, I believe that Senate bill 2, the Water Resources Research Act, of which I am a cosponsor, is one of the most important measures before the 88th Congress. All human activity is affected by the availability of pure water. We must know more about the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources. We have a great deal to learn, and S. 2 will enable us to speed up the acquisition of knowledge by complementing and coordinating Federal, State, and private research now in progress.

Under title I of the bill, funds would be authorized for distribution by the Secretary of the Interior to land-grant or other State-designated institutions for the purpose of establishing water resources research institutes. Additional funds would also be authorized which the Secretary could use to match funds made available to the institutes by the States or by other sources.

Title II of the bill would authorize additional appropriations to the Secretary from which he could make grants, contracts, or other arrangements with Government or private agencies and institutions.

Title III contains certain miscellaneous provisions related to the administration of programs under the bill, including authority for the Secretary to establish in the Department a Water Resources Research Service.

According to the study made by the President's Special Task Force on Water Research, vast areas of the Nation face serious and even critical water shortages. In the Southwest underground water is being mined at an alarming rate, and new sources must soon be found to supply even the present population. In several humid areas the amount of wa-

ter needed to dilute sewage approaches, and in some places already exceeds, the amount of water in the rivers during times of low flow." By the year 2000 the use of water probably will exceed supplies in the Upper Missouri, Rio Grande-Pecos, Colorado, Great Basin and southern California regions and may exceed supplies in the western gulf areas.

According to the report, the increasing demand for water can be met by increasing the efficiency of water use. The report goes on to point out that in many parts of the Nation new and undeveloped sources of surface water are extremely limited. Some areas may have to reduce their rates of industrial and population growth or shift to crops demanding less water if something is not done. Much research needs to be undertaken in the conversion to human use of presently unusable water supplies, including salt water. The report also urged that every effort be made to use and conserve the existing local water supplies.

In South Dakota we are well aware of the need for research in water resources. Water has long been the economic lifeblood of our State. The northern plains have traditionally been a water-shortage area, limiting the economic growth of the region and the opportunities for young people. All of our State is within the area designated by the President's Committee as facing a serious water shortage by the year 2000.

In a recent letter Dean Orville G. Bentley of the Division of Agriculture of South Dakota State College made an incisive analysis of the reasons why South Dakotans are interested in this legislation. He wrote:

Our problems are characteristic of those indigenous to the Great Plains area and include the variability of rainfall as it threatens the economic stability of the region's major industry—agriculture. Besides an inadequate supply of water, the quality of water available to municipalities is poor and frequently hampers urban and industrial growth. Fluctuating water supplies interfere with the State's future development of recreational areas and profitability of converting land from agriculture to other uses such as recreation. We look at water resource development as one of the tools for increasing the employment opportunities for young people within the State. For these reasons South Dakota State College has committed resources to research, teaching, and extension programs that are related to water resource development. We are limited in funds and personnel but, given additional support, we could expand our research into such areas as evaporation reduction, desalinization of water, the development of small-scale water treatment facilities, and expanding studies on the improved utilization of water in agriculture.

Mr. President, the bill before us today calls for a comparatively modest expenditure, but it can make a very large contribution to the life and progress of our Nation. Currently, we are using more than 300 billion gallons of water daily and this amount will double in the next 20 years. Scarcely any measure in the 88th Congress will have a bearing on so many facets of the lives of our citizens as S. 2. Continued progress in industry, agriculture, recreation, and pub-

lic health, to mention only a few areas of our national life, is dependent on a continuous and expanding supply of good water.

The passage of this bill, like the TVA 30 years ago, will be, in the words of George Norris, "emblematic of the dawn of that day when every rippling stream that flows down the mountainside and winds its way through meadows to the sea, should be harnessed and used and made to work for the welfare and comfort of man."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators wish to yield any of their time, or do they desire to yield back the remainder of their time on the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2) was passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, a short time ago the Senate took a voice vote on the question of the passage of the water resources bill. I disapprove of the bill. For years, Ohio has been doing the work which is contemplated in connection with the bill. I cannot believe that the States are financially incapable of doing the job envisioned by those who support the provisions of the bill which the Senate passed this afternoon. Moreover, I believe this bill is but the forerunner of huge expenditures by which the Federal Government will, after the studies are made, finance projects which should be financed at home.

Hence, Mr. President, I desire to state that if a yea-and-nay vote had been taken on the question of the passage of the bill, I would have voted against it.

DEATH OF IZHAK BEN-ZVI, PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the death of the President of Israel, Izhak Ben-Zvi, at the age of 78. Mr. Ben-Zvi had been President of Israel since 1952. He was a great friend of the United States.

I had the privilege to know him and, together with my wife and children, to visit with him in his official residence.

Mr. Ben-Zvi was a great hero in the establishment of the State of Israel. He helped to organize the Jewish Legion, and returned to Palestine with the conquering army of British General Allenby. He was a great force, even at that time, in laying the basis for an independent state.

Mr. Ben-Zvi was a distinguished scholar and writer. He was the closest friend of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion,

throughout his active days in the work for the establishment of Israel and took part, in the formation of the country's leading institutions, the Histadrut, the country's labor federation; and the Hashomer, the forerunner of the Haganah defense organization, which ultimately brought about Israel's independence.

Mr. Ben-Zvi was in the great tradition of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the first President of Israel. He had numerous friends among members of this body and of the other body, many of whom visited with him personally. I know that we all mourn with Israel the loss of this eminent statesman and scholar. I feel certain that the next President of Israel will be worthy of the example set by this distinguished man.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep regret over the loss suffered by our Nation and by the entire world in the death of President Izhak Ben-Zvi, of Israel. His career as the head of this friendly and courageous nation—Israel—has been a great asset to the free world, as well as to Israel; and I join with the people of Israel in mourning his death.

President Ben-Zvi will long be remembered for his leadership in behalf of his people. Renowned for his scholarship and writing, he took a leading role in the formation of the Histadrut, Israel's labor federation, and the Hashomer, the forerunner of the Haganah defense organization which battled for Israel's independence.

A distinguished successor to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Israel's first President, President Ben-Zvi will long be remembered—along with his close friend and ally in forging freedom for the people of Israel, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion—as one of the principal architects in creating the Jewish State.

As a great admirer and friend of the people of Israel in their struggle for national recognition, I join in the great sorrow the whole world feels in being deprived of the services of this great humanitarian and distinguished statesman.

UNITY IN THE TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRIES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, one of the outstanding personalities in the field of transportation in the United States is Morris Forgash, a distinguished citizen of New York. Mr. Forgash is president of the U.S. Freight Co.

Yesterday the New York World Telegram and Sun published an article about Mr. Forgash entitled "U.S. Freight Head Champions Unity," written by Mary C. Stokes. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun, Apr. 22, 1963.]

U.S. FREIGHT HEAD CHAMPIONS UNITY

(By Mary C. Stokes)

One trouble with many leaders in the transportation industries—railroads, truckers, airlines, and steamship lines—is they

are not to familiar with that old saying of Benjamin Franklin:

"If we don't all hang together, we'll all hang separately."

This is particularly true of the railroads and truckers, which have been fighting a bitter battle.

Meanwhile a huge proportion of the freight of both has been carried off by unregulated carriers known as "gypsy" or "private" truckers.

While the two modes of transportation have been slugging it out and not combining to cut costs, many corporations have decided it's cheaper to buy their own truck fleets to carry their own products.

A VOICE FOR UNITY

On the illegal side, farmers and private owners who truck their own goods to market have been renting out their vehicles for the return trip at prices below those allowed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and charged by truckers and railroads regulated under it.

One of the strongest voices raised in favor of coordinated action to take advantage of the economies of all types of transportation and give the buyer the cheapest service is that of Morris Forghash, president of U.S. Freight Co.

He heads a freight-forwarding firm, which does just that. It puts together carloads of freight from different shippers and routes them the cheapest way, he says:

"A shipper does not buy the mode of carriage. He only buys time in transit and price. He couldn't care less if you put the freight in a wheelbarrow or rolled it with your nose on the highway."

WANTS CONGRESS TO ACT

One of Forghash's key recommendations for relieving the transportation dilemma is getting Congress to pass a new definition of "private carriage" so action against private truckers who lease out their vehicles would be easier and more cut and dried.

He has plugged for this to congressional leaders.

He also looks for great things for piggybacking, carrying truck trailers on flatcars as well as behind truck tractors to speed deliveries and cut cost.

U.S. Freight's use of piggybacking has grown from 10 percent in 1958 to 34 percent in 1962 and it continues upward.

Another of his themes is "standardization" of transport equipment. With others, he has worked for universal containers which could be used on land, sea, or in the air.

Dimensions of 5, 10, 20, and 40 feet long and 8 by 8 feet in width and height have been adopted by the National Defense Transportation Association, but implementation is slow.

FAST WRITEOFF

To step up the process Forghash recommends fast tax writeoffs for piggyback equipment and universal containers.

"We must also provide for interchangeability," he points out. "We must get the manufacturers together to agree on uniform clasps and tiedown equipment."

In his own company he has acted to help solve the problem of "imbalance of traffic" and advocates more action along these lines.

The problem stems from the fact many perishables, fruits, and vegetables are shipped east from California in refrigerator cars. Solid freight of the nonperishable sort is more apt to move West.

This means a lot of empty refrigerator cars are going one way and boxcars the other.

U.S. Freight was one of the first to start using convertible cars which are refrigerated one way and not the other.

It is this kind of thinking which makes Forghash the transportation man of the year.

CONSTANT PURCHASING POWER BOND LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I noted with pleasure that my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], reintroduced on April 18 his constant purchasing power bond bill.

Under Senator McNAMARA's able leadership the Special Committee on Aging has done extensive research on the problem of finding fiscally sound solutions for the retirement needs of this Nation. We all know from the mail that we received and talking to our constituency the disappointment of those who have invested in Government bonds for their retirement and found the value eroded by the rising cost of living.

This bill will provide the means for investing in safe Government bonds without fear that the investment will be diminished by inflationary pressures. It would not only give our citizenry an opportunity to plan for a secure retirement, but will also serve as an impetus for investment in U.S. Government bonds. I, therefore, congratulate my distinguished senior colleague and heartily endorse the bill.

TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNUAL NATIONAL TROUT FESTIVAL, KALKASKA, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we who have angled a fly into a gentle stream and watched a trout flop over a rock for a sharp moment before disappearing into a dark pool know that to capture the fish is not all of the fishing.

There are many sides to fishing, and a truly outstanding one can be found this week in Kalkaska, Mich. It is the 27th annual National Trout Festival, being held April 26 through 28.

The hosts—the Kalkaska County Chamber of Commerce—are well schooled in the ways of the trout from Michigan's endless miles of fishing streams. And they know how to plan an outdoor event for fishermen.

Many Senators will join me, I know, in wishing we could be in Kalkaska this week to swap a story or two with fishermen from throughout the country. In fact, I have been asked to extend an invitation to any Senator who would like to wet a line in our Michigan trout streams. I am sure the Kalkaska Chamber of Commerce would be delighted to show them all the good spots, and I am delighted to extend this invitation.

PRIORITY TO ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST TO ENERGY GENERATED AT HYDRO-ELECTRIC PLANTS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of S. 1007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on elec-

tric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. JACKSON. 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. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, today marks the 150th anniversary of the birth of Stephen A. Douglas, one of the most famous and outstanding political figures in the history of the United States.

While Stephen Douglas belonged by birth and ancestry to New England, as he was born in Brandon, Vt., April 23, 1813, he belonged to the Mississippi Valley and the State of Illinois by the circumstances of his adult life wherein he served the great State of Illinois in many capacities as a young lawyer, judge, U.S. Representative, and then U.S. Senator, until his death on June 3, 1861.

Douglas' fame in history probably is marked by the Lincoln-Douglas debates, which preceded the senatorial campaign for the U.S. Senate in Illinois in 1859 and in which election Douglas defeated Lincoln; and these same debates projected Abraham Lincoln into the national spotlight culminating in his election as President of the United States in 1860.

The Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois adopted a resolution on April 8, 1963, paying homage to the memory of Illinois "Little Giant" Stephen A. Douglas, upon the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the State senate be made a part of my remarks.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 44

Whereas, on April 23, 1963, the people of the State of Illinois will be celebrating the 150th anniversary of the birth of one of the State of Illinois most illustrious former residents, Stephen A. Douglas, the "Little Giant"; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas was one of the most famous and outstanding political figures in the history of the United States; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas showed marvelous energy, adroitness and resourcefulness, and a genius for leadership as both an Illinois and Federal legislator; and

Whereas the "Little Giant" had few equals in American history and his generosity in defeat, his courage and capacity for inspiring warm personal friendships, were among his most attractive qualities; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas is particularly remembered for the famous debates he participated in with Abraham Lincoln and for his victory over President Lincoln for the Senate; and

Whereas Stephen A. Douglas displayed during his eventful lifetime a continuing example of selfless service to his country, and his memory will live on with all Americans as being one of the heroes of a great nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we join the citizens of this State and Nation in paying homage to the memory of Illinois "Little Giant," Stephen A. Douglas, upon the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Adopted by the senate April 8, 1963.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE STEEL PRICE POLICY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "The Steel Price Policy," which was published on April 16 in the Peoria Journal Star.

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

THE STEEL PRICE POLICY

President Kennedy's continued interest in the price of steel is a case of treating a cut on the finger by brain surgery—using Ben Casey as the surgeon instead of a real doctor, to boot.

The present national policy on steel emerged from a couple of hours conference between a busy President of the United States and his economic advisers.

So now all Government experts in the broad field of world economics, political budgets, and new theories about the collection of taxes are discussing the pros and cons of pricing certain items of steel by certain companies. So are, of course, politicians and commentators.

Everybody seems to be in the operating room except the doctors—the steel men themselves, the only people who have worked with the problems involved day in and day out and proven their proficiency over the years.

And, the debate is half-political as well as half-economic—and all generalizations.

That's the way, of course, when you get away from the guys who really know their subject and who have to make it work by an intimacy with all of its complicated details.

This is the trouble we get into once we take the road of Government intervention, no matter how fetching the particular circumstance was that justified the original breakthrough.

In the long run you wind up taking decisions out of the hands of those most experienced and most competent to make them, and turn them over to first-rate theorists and eventually to fourth-rate bureaucrats.

But what is developing in our steel industry is not really much different than if we had turned our Armed Forces in World War II over to a Harvard professor with a special interest in military history, or turned the AFL-CIO over to some top theorist in the college ranks on the grant principles of labor-management relations.

There is a lot more to running large, effective working organizations than broad

general principles, lovely theories, and high level paperwork.

It looks to us like we are more and more tossing the doctors out of the case of steel, calling in the quacks, and, as we said, beginning to operate on the very brain of the whole mechanism as a means of curing a cut finger—and somebody else's finger at that.

Then, too, immobilizing this patient, as we seem determined to do, is likely to have a devastating effect on his family.

PRIORITY TO ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST TO ENERGY GENERATED AT HYDRO-ELECTRIC PLANTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time let me state, in regard to Senate bill 1007, in support of which I testified on April 1 of this year before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that this afternoon I find myself in a position in which I can support the bill; and I wish to congratulate the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] on his leadership in connection with the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the statement in support of Senate bill 1007 which I made on April 1, 1963, before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE BEFORE SENATE INTERIOR COMMITTEE ON S. 1007, APRIL 1, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to submit this statement in support of S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. The following factors are of great importance and I trust they will receive serious consideration by the committee:

1. The Pacific Northwest's economic growth—past, present, and potential, is inseparably linked with the development of Federal hydroelectric power. In his statement to this committee last year, Bonneville Power Administrator Luce most adequately delineated the importance of Federal power in our region. He stated:

"For years industries in the Pacific Northwest have been important customers of the Federal system. Their purchases have varied from more than 60 percent of the energy sold by Bonneville Power Administration in 1945 to an average of approximately 36 percent during the past 4 years. Their original plant investment is more than \$350 million. Their plant replacement cost would be double that figure. They employ 15,000 Pacific Northwest citizens directly and another 30,000 indirectly. The utility of those plants and the thousands of jobs which they have made possible are directly dependent upon the maintenance of a low-cost power supply. If Pacific Northwest Federal power—and that area has no low-cost alternative—is diverted to other regions, many of these industries would have to stop production. The Nation would not gain by shutting down

these plants in order to export the power from the Pacific Northwest, and the impact on that region would be catastrophic."

2. Prime income-producing activities in the Pacific Northwest are lumber, agriculture, and tourism. All three are subject to the whims of weather. All three exhibit severe seasonal fluctuations and are highly sensitive to business cycles. Lumber and agriculture are presently confronted by serious problems and are subject to drastic fluctuation due to demand in elasticity and international marketing problems. Electro-process industries provide stable payrolls. Low-cost power compensates for our long distances from major markets and supplies industrial incentive for creation of new jobs.

3. Water is the source of our electricity. We have no proven reserves of gas or oil, and known coal resources are limited. Approximately 96 percent of our firm energy capability is hydro and about 62 percent of this hydro is owned and operated by the Federal Government. No other area in the country is so dependent on hydropower and, only the Tennessee Valley exceeds this region in percentage of federally owned generation.

4. The people of the Pacific Northwest are paying off the Federal Government's power investment there—with interest. To date they have returned to the Treasury over three-fourths of a billion dollars.

5. An electrical interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and California was outlined as early as 1935 by the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, which included a representative of the State of Oregon. With the knowledge that such transmission link is technically and economically feasible, the Department of the Interior has this year requested \$24 million to begin construction of this extra-high-voltage line.

6. A common-carrier, high-capacity interconnection linking the electrical systems of the two regions will provide enormous benefits to both areas. With public and private electric systems participating and with optimum facilities, it is currently estimated benefits would exceed costs by a ratio of more than 3 to 1. The economic benefits which would accrue to BPA would restore Bonneville's surplus repayment picture, open a market for nonfirm, dump power, and provide a means by which the Pacific Northwest could obtain additional firm power when needed in the future.

7. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has long recognized the need for proper protection of the interests of power consumers in any energy or capacity interchange involving Federal power. In a resolution of June 21, 1960, the committee requested that no contract be made for transfer of BPA power to California pending completion of further studies and consideration of legislation to preserve the position of BPA customers in the Northwest. I joined with other Northwest Senators in asking the then Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to act in accordance with that resolution.

8. Interconnection of the Northwest and Southwest by major transmission facilities will soon be a reality. Already the Bonneville Power Administration has received six offers to build all or part of the extra-high-voltage line. A Federal request for an appropriation of \$24 million to begin construction of a Federal intertie is now before Congress. New technology has made it possible to use such lines to transmit power from northern Washington to southern California.

A solution to the problem pointed up by hearings held by your committee in 1959 and 1960 should insure two things: It must (a) protect against raiding the resources of one region to make rich another and (b) provide for an orderly and equitable share of

benefits between regions. I believe that maximum mutual advantage can be achieved without Balkanization and without doing violence to traditional power marketing policies.

Integrated operation can produce benefits for individual electric systems which are impossible with isolated operation. Power pooling in the Northwest provides a practical demonstration of this fact. Coordination has produced benefits impossible of achievement by power producers operating singly, and this has been accomplished without infringement upon the basic rights and responsibilities of particular utilities. Technology has increased the opportunities for mutually advantageous cooperation. Organization and operational patterns must keep pace.

In 1962 similar legislation was considered by this committee and passed by the Senate. At that time, Mr. Luce informed the committee of the exhaustive review which preceded the submission of this proposal by the Department of the Interior. The bill has wide support, including the general backing of private and public utilities throughout the Northwest, and has received bipartisan support in Congress. The committee in its study of this legislation gave full consideration to the comments of residents of the Northwest last year when S. 3153 was acted upon favorably. I know that the committee will reiterate its positive position of last year, and act favorably on S. 1007 in recognition of the vital stake of the people of the Northwest in the ultimate decision of Congress on this matter.

The good of the Northwest, Southwest, and in fact the whole Nation will be served by establishing ground rules which will permit cooperation and coordination in use of our surplus electrical energy resources for the maximum benefit of all.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in opposition to Senate bill 1007, ordinarily referred to as the Pacific Northwest power bill. I say that, instead, it is a Pacific Northwest power steal, and should be designated as such.

Last year I spoke at considerable length about this matter; so I do not intend to say a great deal about it today.

In connection with this matter, we find that we are in a situation in which the people of the Northwest are putting around the electricity generated in that area an unjustified fence, by means of completely new criteria and new standards for the distribution of electricity in the United States.

I do not know whether a yea-and-nay vote will be taken on the question of the passage of the bill. I do not intend to request a yea-and-nay vote on that question; but I desire to make clear my own position, which is that regardless of whether a yea-and-nay vote is taken on the question of the passage of the bill, I wish to be recorded as being opposed to the bill; and I shall never vote for the bill or for any conference report based on such a measure.

Mr. President, the facts are that, because of two factors, the people of the Northwest are receiving electricity which to a great extent is being subsidized by the people of the United States. Many years ago Congress established what is known as the preference system, so that in the public hydroelectric power projects built by the Federal Government on rivers, the people who were members of the municipalities and of the cooperatives would receive what is known as a prefer-

ence right. So our communities which had publicly owned systems, and all the people who had cooperative systems, were able to purchase electricity under what is known as a preference right. This principle has been established for many, many years, and it is accepted by everyone I know. I do not know of one member of an REA in the United States who is not completely wedded and devoted to the principle of preference rights. I, myself, have supported them ever since I first had to do with questions involving power.

But the net effect of Senate bill 1007—which, I am sorry to say, was passed last year by the Senate—is to upset completely all preference rights in the United States.

Last year the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] offered an amendment to extend the same rights to the Upper Colorado River. Actually, Mr. President, I do not think it makes any difference to us whether that is done or is not done; but, certainly, what is sauce for the goose should also be sauce for the gander, and it is just as logical to apply the principles of the bill to the Upper Colorado as it is to apply them to the Pacific Northwest.

Some of my friends in the Senate are very happy about the bill. My friends from Montana ought to be reasonably happy with it because they are in the geographical area of the country referred to in the bill. Idaho has been taken into the geographical area of the bill. But now a fence has been placed around the Northwest.

The power of the Northwest is cheap for two reasons:

First, there is the unusual geographical situation of the rivers, mountains, and gorges, which permit the development of large amounts of hydroelectric power.

Second, the Federal Government has put about \$3 billion into the development of electricity for the people of the Northwest.

Consequently, in the Northwest electricity is not only being produced, but the Bonneville Administration is selling it even to private customers at less than 2 mills. If I remember correctly the testimony of Mr. Luce, electricity is being sold in that area to private customers for 2 mills or less per kilowatt. In the short time we have had available since the bill was called up for consideration I have not been able to locate the testimony, but I believe I have stated the correct amount. In almost every other part of the country it is almost impossible to produce electricity for much less than 5 or 6 mills. So with that extremely favorable situation, which has been financed by the Federal Government, what is proposed? If the bill ever becomes law, first, it would permit sales of electricity to preference users in the Northwest.

Then comes the catch. A letter fence is placed around the northwestern corner of the United States, and the rest of us who have helped to finance the development for them will not be able to participate in the development. We are told, "If our preference customers cannot use all the electricity, then it must

be sold to private customers in the Northwest. If there is anything then left over, we shall allow it to go outside to the preference customers outside of our fenced-in area, and then if there is anything left after that, it may go to the private customers outside of our fenced-in area."

There can be no question that that would be the net effect of the bill. There can be no question that what I have stated would result. There can be no question that it would upset the concept of preference rights as they have been established in this country, for I believe, almost 50 years.

So in S. 1007 we have an upset of a long-established principle of preference rights.

I do not know whether or not the measure would be the first foot in the door to completely upset preference rights. If they can be upset in the Northwest, I can see no reason they cannot be upset in other places. So the proposal looks to me like a foot in the door for upsets in other places, which would be a very unsatisfactory situation in view of the development of power in our country, and would be a situation with which I personally could not agree.

I do not intend to discuss all the ramifications or the technical aspects of the bill. They were developed at the hearings last year and the present year. But in order that my own position may be clear, I merely wish to say that I feel about it as I felt last year. I am opposed to the bill. I hope that it will not pass. It should never become law. The measure would do an injustice to thousands of electrical cooperatives in our country and would upset completely the system of preference law in the United States.

Whether the bill is voted on by voice vote or by a yea-and-nay vote, I wish my position to be clear. I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, last year when the bill S. 3153, which is essentially the same bill that we now have before us in S. 1007, was before the Senate for consideration, I outlined in some detail the reasons for my opposition to that measure. In order to save the time of the Senate, I shall not reiterate at length my views stated at that time. However, since I desire to have my views again in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I made last year, which are found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 12, page 15795, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, the proposed legislation, the so-called regional preference bill, S. 3153, is deeply disturbing to me. It has major implications for the entire Nation which cannot be overlooked.

Initially, I was inclined to regard this bill as a kind of back-fence argument on the west coast between the Pacific Northwest, where tremendous quantities of electric power are generated cheaply at federally built dams, and southern California, which must rely on the more expensive steam generation of electricity. But much more, in fact, is involved, and I want to address my comments to the effects that the principle of

this legislation would have on the rest of the country.

Behind this bill lies recent technological advances which now make it possible to transmit large blocks of electric power economically over very long distances. The Bonneville Power Administrator, Mr. Charles Luce, indicated that the economic transmission distance may extend for 2,000 miles. Under these circumstances, low-cost hydro-power could be made available over a substantial region of the country, giving citizens some direct benefit from the billions which they have paid for the Federal power developments in the Northwest and elsewhere. We ought to be free to do this, provided that these benefits can be made available to all with sufficient safeguards to make sure that we do not exclude isolated islands in distant or sparsely settled areas that will thereby be forced to pay even higher electric rates or to compete against even greater odds than now.

The bill turns its back on this possibility. It is not designed to spread the benefits of low-cost power, but instead to confine them.

As I understand the bill, it draws a line around and in some cases through portions of half a dozen States, reaching as far east as Montana and Wyoming, and defines that area as the Pacific Northwest. Then it provides that all present and future Federal power produced in that region shall belong to that region exclusively, that it shall be used for present and future private industry as well as for public purposes, and that no power can be exported across the region's border, even for public purposes, unless the Northwest permits it, and then only on a severely restricted basis.

On that point, let me declare it bewildering from any national point of view, and certainly from a New Englander's view, that Federal power which has been developed and paid for by all the people, could thus be reserved for only a privileged few and denied to all others. In my State of New Hampshire, in fact in all of New England, there are no Federal powerplants. Many other States share with us this "have not" status. Under the precedent which this legislation would set, no "have not" States or regions could ever get any firm Federal power from any of the Federal plants located in the "have" regions, even though their tax dollars helped build them.

According to data in the hearings, half of all the hydroelectric power developed by the Federal Government is in the Northwest. The bill would restrict all that power to an area comprising less than six States. That power would be locked up tight in a Northwest power preserve.

To date, the Nation's taxpayers have invested \$1.7 billion in Federal power facilities in the Northwest. The Bonneville Power Administration, which runs the Federal system there, is operating in the red and is losing millions of dollars each year. Thus, the power is being sold to privileged northwesterners at below-cost rates. No wonder they want to keep it to themselves—all of it.

The determination as to what power is available for export, when it may be available, who can have it, where the exact borderlines of the preserve shall be located, and many other powers, would be left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. The bill would give the Secretary virtually dictatorial power over half of the Federal hydroelectric power in the Nation, and would usurp much of the control over the Federal power policy which now properly resides in Congress.

This is what Senate bill 3153 proposes.

It is important to point out that the Bonneville Power Administration, which markets the Federal power in the Pacific Northwest, is not the sole source of power in the region. More than 150 non-Federal generating plants also serve the area, and

provide about 40 percent of the region's total power supply. This is more than a statistic. It means that the Bonneville Power Administration does not have a utility responsibility for the area. It is under no legal or moral obligation to provide 100 percent of the region's needs for electric power now and into the future. It operates solely as a wholesale supplier of large blocks of power.

The role of Bonneville is thus in sharp contrast to the role of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has a complete utility responsibility for its area, and is the sole source of electric power for its service area. In the case of TVA, Congress has limited its service area by statute in much the same way as most public utilities have limited and defined service areas under their franchises. As an original proponent of an area limit for TVA, I can state that its purpose was to define the area in which it was to be the sole supplier of power so that TVA could plan, budget, and build efficiently to meet the growing demands for power within its area.

The TVA area limitation—16 U.S.C. 831n-4—clearly and expressly permits the sale and transmission of blocks of power to other utilities outside the service area. It thus permits TVA to do what the bill would bar in the Pacific Northwest, and the TVA area limitation is, in fact, a sound precedent for the defeat of the bill.

I should like to call upon my colleagues in the Senate to search their souls as they contemplate what such a proposal as this could do to the Nation. In full conscience, we must consider how such a bill would affect all of the United States. We must rise above local interests; we must look beyond the administration's nose as it tries to satisfy conflicting demands among Federal power supporters; we must regard the proposed legislation from the viewpoint of all the people of all our 50 States, and we must look to the future welfare of the Nation.

With these obligations in mind, the bill poses many questions which call for answers based on equality, justice, and the general welfare. The conflicting and contradictory nature of some of these questions reflects the confusion and contradictions in the bill itself.

First, Why should the United States set aside tax-subsidized power that belongs to all the people and reserve it exclusively for just a few people?

Second, When it is economically feasible to transmit electric energy 2,000 miles, why should not the power from all Federal generating installations in all sections of the country be made available to all the people within reach?

Third, Why should Congress lock up all present and future Federal power in the Northwest, permitting the Northwest to lure more industry and payrolls from other areas with its below-cost electric power?

Fourth, Why should the Senate fall prey to the contention that somehow and for some reason the situation in the Northwest is unique and therefore deserves a special handout? We must bear in mind that the bill not only reserves present Federal power for present Northwest customers but also applies to all future Federal power and all future Northwest customers. Nor are the provisions limited to Federal hydroplants. Coal-fired steamplants and maybe even Federal nuclear plants also would be reserved in the privileged sanctuary of the Northwest.

Fifth, Why should the Senate Interior Committee have to adopt an amendment to the bill with regard to power from Hungry Horse Dam on the basis that "existing rights, established by prior legislation should not be infringed upon" when this very bill itself infringes upon the existing rights of customers outside the fences which would be erected by this bill?

Sixth, Why should Congress permit a Chinese wall to be erected around one region in the Northwest and not permit similar Chinese walls around every other region in which a Federal electric plant is located?

Seventh, Why should Congress give any Secretary of the Interior the discretionary power of a czar over half the Federal hydroelectric power in the Nation?

Eighth, Why should Congress create economic or marketing regions which would ignore State borders, and could form super States under the control of an executive department of the Government?

Ninth, Could the Senate allow the Northwest to have its way, and then reject the similar demands for regional protection, or for exclusive regional rights? These demands are now before us in amendments. They come from the State of Montana, from the State of Arizona, from the Missouri River Basin, from the northern California region of the Central Valley project, and unquestionably will come from many other regions of origin of Federal power.

Tenth, Why should the law of preference be abrogated in just one region, for the purpose of satisfying purely local special interests?

Eleventh, Why should the Congress consider any bill that penalizes the great majority of the people, to give more special privileges to an already privileged few?

I submit that in reaching responsible answers to these questions, we can make no finding with respect to this bill except that it is highly dangerous to the national welfare.

The principle of the bill is vicious.

The use of Federal money and Federal power would be confined to certain States and regions. States and regions, like my own, that do not have and are not blessed with the potentiality for power development, would find themselves completely starved by the creation of special privilege facilities whose benefits would be confined to more fortunate sections of the country, despite the fact that they are paid for by our people. Such a situation would be so monstrous that it would compel only one solution: Complete Federal power over the entire Nation. Make no mistake about it, that is what this bill aims at. That is why it must be defeated.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show in 1963 as it does in August of 1962, that I am still unalterably opposed to the concepts of S. 1007 just as I was to the concepts of S. 3153 a year ago which granted a superpreference to electrical consumers who happen to be fortunate enough to reside in the Pacific Northwest.

May I point out once again that I consider that by enacting this type of legislation granting preference to one section of the country on the sale of electricity generated by Federal installations, Congress is going back on its word to cooperatives, municipalities and other designated preference customers that generation capacity built with taxpayers' funds shall be available to preference customers to meet their needs before making it available to other potential consumers.

This is unfair legislation and it is wrong in principle. There are pertinent basic reasons why this legislation should not be acted upon by the Senate or the Congress. The concept of regional preference is incompatible with the best use of the Nation's power resources, and this incompatibility will continue to grow as we increase our technological ability to transmit energy for greater distance. Further, if we enact this type

of legislation then Congress will have a precedent to enact similar legislation granting a similar priority for other areas of the Nation. The principle of this type of legislation is wrong in that it would reserve all present and future Federal power for all present and future consumers in the region of origin to the detriment of those outside the region.

As I pointed out in the debate on S. 3153 as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 12, page 15699 through page 15945, this type of legislation tends to "Balkanize" the power grids of this country for the first time. It proposes to start in the Northwest by establishing around the Northwest a Chinese wall. It provides that none of the power which is generated from the dams in which Federal funds have been employed—and I think that even includes private generating plants in this instance—shall be transmitted beyond the boundaries of the areas into other areas not located in the area in which the power is generated. I believe it is undesirable to start "Balkanizing" the great power systems of this country which are brought about by the expenditure of public funds or by money borrowed from the Public Treasury.

Further, I am fearful of the effect which this concept of regional preference rather than user preference will have on REA people living outside of the preferred area. The prevailing preference criteria concept has done much to develop, build, perpetuate, and expand REA. I have always supported the user-preference concept and I am disturbed by the thought that enactment of this type of legislation could well sound the death knell to the preference customer criteria and regulations in America.

Mr. President, in the act of 1937 authorizing the Bonneville project there is a section designed to protect the taxpayers. Let me read it to you so that it will be a part of the Record:

In order to encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated and marketed and to provide reasonable outlets therefor, and to prevent the monopolization—

Note the word "monopolization"—thereof by limited groups, the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such electric transmission lines and substations, and facilities and structures appurtenant thereto as he finds necessary, desirable, or appropriate for the purpose of transmitting electric energy, available for sale, from the Bonneville project to existing and potential markets, and, for the purpose of interchange of electric energy, to interconnect the Bonneville project with other Federal projects and publicly owned power systems now or hereafter constructed.

In another section of the act it states:

In order to insure that the facilities for generation of electric energy at the Bonneville project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public, and particularly of domestic and rural consumers, the Administrator shall at all times, in disposing of electric energy generated at said project, give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives.

Thus, Mr. President, it is clear that when the Congress enacted the authoriz-

ing legislation it rightfully protected the claim of preference customers to the power generated under the auspices of this project. Therefore, I cannot understand the reasoning behind the Department of Interior when in its release of March 29, 1963, it states:

A preference applicant or customer outside the Pacific Northwest will not have a priority over a nonpreference applicant or customer in the Pacific Northwest.

This is a recitation of a new category of preference customers. It is creating an elite within preference groups. It substitutes geographical location for user designation as the basic reason for establishing preference customers.

In South Dakota, Mr. President, we as you know, have Federal installations generating power which we are sharing with our neighboring States. In fact, we are sharing so broadly that preference customers in the area served are only receiving about 80 percent of their needs from the Federal hydroelectric facilities on the Missouri River. The farmers and cooperatives of the Plain States are banding together in cooperatives and borrowing money from the Rural Electric Administration to build thermal plants to meet their power needs.

Mr. President, with transmission techniques developed as they are today, I am firmly convinced it is wrong to abrogate commitments to preference customers regardless of their locality. Throughout America today we see many Federal projects generating power. Let us make absolutely sure that before we legislate permission to sell this power to nonpreference customers that all our REA users demands are satisfied. Let us maintain Federally generated power for preference customers and induce private utilities to expand to meet the needs of nonpreference customers. Let us not through a "gimmick" such as S. 1007 find a way for the Government to circumvent its long-standing commitment to the preference customer. I therefore hope that before the Congress finally places a stamp of approval on this type of legislation that the millions of preference customers throughout America will have their day in court and that in the final analysis the Congress and the Department of Interior will wisely decide to continue to honor its long-standing commitment to preference customers everywhere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1007) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and particularly to the chairman of that committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], for the expeditious way in which he has handled the bill, and for the amount of work which has come out of that committee.

Of all the committees in the Senate, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been the most diligent up to this time. If the Senate has any kind of record, much of the credit must go to that committee.

I also wish to pay my tribute once again to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for what he, along with the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], has been able to do this year.

The committee has reported and has obtained the passage of the following major bills: S. 20, the outdoor recreation bill which will give a statutory basis for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; S. 4, the wilderness bill; S. 2, the water resources research bill; and now S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

My distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I have a very special interest in the bill just passed by the Senate because of the part that the Hungry Horse project will play in it. It is a project which means a great deal to our State. We are delighted that, once again, as it did last year, the Senate has passed the measure.

So for the RECORD I merely wish to extend my thanks to the distinguished chairman of the committee, my old friend and colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and also to the former chairman of that committee, who is now chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. They have both served their area and the Nation well.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I merely wish to observe that we have been able to move quite rapidly in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs because of the fine support from all members of that committee and particularly the assistance of the ranking member on the Democratic side, the former chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

We have also received the full cooperation of the majority leader. He has been invaluable in expediting the proposed legislation that has been brought into the Senate. I know I speak for all members of the committee in expressing our appreciation to the distinguished majority leader for his help.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also wish to extend my thanks to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who indicated that he thought the last two bills considered should be amended in certain ways. The Senator from Colorado has fought cleanly and with vigor. I know personally that he has been subject to great pressure, but he has shown a tolerance and understanding for which I am deeply grateful.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention to have the Senate consider tomorrow the nominations of the persons to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, according to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 24, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations which were received by the Senate and omitted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 22, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, vice Joseph V. Charyk resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) or section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, [REDACTED], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of General.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Abbott, Elmond H., [REDACTED]
Abraham, Bruce H., Jr., [REDACTED]
Adams, John H., [REDACTED]
Addis, Darwin R., [REDACTED]
Adkins, Harold F., [REDACTED]
Adler, Bernard R., [REDACTED]
Amalt, Roy M., Jr., [REDACTED]
Akin, Elisha G., Jr., [REDACTED]
Alden, John E., [REDACTED]

Alderson, Sam W., [REDACTED]
Alexander, Glenn R., [REDACTED]
Alger, Leroy, [REDACTED]
Alkonis, Stanley J., [REDACTED]
Allen, Charles D., [REDACTED]
Allen, John R., [REDACTED]
Allen, Kenneth L., [REDACTED]
Allen, Leroy E., [REDACTED]
Allen, Robert C., [REDACTED]
Allen, Robert W., [REDACTED]
Allen, Wilfred H., Jr., [REDACTED]
Alven, Harold F., [REDACTED]
Alvestad, Russell C., [REDACTED]
Ambrecht, John F., [REDACTED]
Amick, Roy W., [REDACTED]
Amos, William J., [REDACTED]
Anderson, Gene C., [REDACTED]
Anderson, George O., [REDACTED]
Anderson, Howard W., Jr., [REDACTED]
Anderson, Ingvar E., [REDACTED]
Anderson, John J., [REDACTED]
Anderson, Norman C., [REDACTED]
Anderson, Raymond I., [REDACTED]
Anderson, Russell G., [REDACTED]
Andrews, Gordon J., [REDACTED]
Anglin, Harold D., [REDACTED]
Anthony, Richard P., [REDACTED]
Apperson, Edward B., [REDACTED]
Arbogast, Filbert E., [REDACTED]
Archer, Lee A., [REDACTED]
Armogost, Edgar R., [REDACTED]
Arnold, William A., Jr., [REDACTED]
Askelson, Howard S., [REDACTED]
Aswad, Saleem, [REDACTED]
Atherton, Jack, [REDACTED]
Atherton, John W., [REDACTED]
Austin, George E., [REDACTED]
Bach, Charles E., [REDACTED]
Baller, Harold W., [REDACTED]
Baillie, Robert W., [REDACTED]
Baker, Marshall E., [REDACTED]
Baldwin, Robert C., [REDACTED]
Ballinger, Philip R., [REDACTED]
Banias, Bill B., [REDACTED]
Bard, Paul F., [REDACTED]
Barr, Thomas A., [REDACTED]
Bartlett, Edward J., [REDACTED]
Barzee, Kenneth G., [REDACTED]
Bashor, Owen H., [REDACTED]
Baskerville, Robert D., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bathurst, Raymond J., [REDACTED]
Batsel, Lee H., [REDACTED]
Baulch, Warren, [REDACTED]
Bauman, Ray W., [REDACTED]
Baumann, Robert P., Jr., [REDACTED]
Baumgardner, Haynes M., [REDACTED]
Baydala, Edward T., [REDACTED]
Beachum, Graham C., [REDACTED]
Beaty, Edward E., [REDACTED]
Beavers, James L., 2d, [REDACTED]
Beckham, Dwight S., [REDACTED]
Beckman, Kenneth N., [REDACTED]
Behrens, William C., [REDACTED]
Bell, Robert B., [REDACTED]
Benedict, George J., [REDACTED]
Bennett, Charles I., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bennett, George A., [REDACTED]
Beno, William G., [REDACTED]
Benoit, Eugene J., [REDACTED]
Bergendahl, Harley C., [REDACTED]
Berkley, John W., [REDACTED]
Berman, Samuel D., [REDACTED]
Berodt, Howard H., [REDACTED]
Berry, Erskine G., Jr., [REDACTED]
Berry, James E., [REDACTED]
Bessant, Aaron Z., [REDACTED]
Best, William H., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bethe, Kenneth E., [REDACTED]
Bettis, Howard E., [REDACTED]
Beveridge, Andrew L., [REDACTED]
Bird, Everett L., [REDACTED]
Bird, Joseph M., [REDACTED]
Birdsall, Otis S., [REDACTED]
Birdsong, Samuel E., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bischoff, Hans M., [REDACTED]
Blackburn, Thomas W., Jr., [REDACTED]
Blackler, Jack A., [REDACTED]
Blaha, Roy C., [REDACTED]
Blakeney, Charles M., [REDACTED]
Blessing, Samuel E., [REDACTED]
Bluhm, Roy B., Jr., [REDACTED]

Boggs, Kenneth S., [REDACTED]
Bolint, Michael J., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bolyard, John W., [REDACTED]
Bonitz, George E., [REDACTED]
Boone, Herbert D., [REDACTED]
Borchert, David W., [REDACTED]
Boss, Amos L., [REDACTED]
Bosworth, Wallace C., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bourassa, Henry L., [REDACTED]
Bourus, George J., [REDACTED]
Bowden, William W., [REDACTED]
Bower, James A., [REDACTED]
Bowlin, Sidney J., [REDACTED]
Bowman, Gordon Y., [REDACTED]
Bowman, William H., Jr., [REDACTED]
Boyd, Henry L., [REDACTED]
Bradley, Charles H., [REDACTED]
Bradley, Lewis L., Jr., [REDACTED]
Brame, George F., [REDACTED]
Brandt, Charles A., [REDACTED]
Brannon, Raymond T., [REDACTED]
Brazie, Charles L., [REDACTED]
Breed, Tracy S., [REDACTED]
Breninger, Louis H., [REDACTED]
Bridges, Wyman M., [REDACTED]
Bright, William, [REDACTED]
Brinkman, Edward A., [REDACTED]
Britting, Wesley E., [REDACTED]
Broff, Robert E., [REDACTED]
Brooks, William D., Jr., [REDACTED]
Broughton, Richard N., [REDACTED]
Broughton, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
Brower, Charles F., 3d, [REDACTED]
Brown, Ben R., [REDACTED]
Brown, Dale L., [REDACTED]
Brown, Frederick I., Jr., [REDACTED]
Brown, Joseph, Jr., [REDACTED]
Brown, Russell S., [REDACTED]
Brown, Donald V., [REDACTED]
Brownlee, Gordon L., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bruce, Joe B., [REDACTED]
Brunner, Arnold C., [REDACTED]
Bryant, James A., [REDACTED]
Buchert, Anton F., [REDACTED]
Buck, Alvin B., [REDACTED]
Buckingham, Kent O., [REDACTED]
Buckley, Cornelius E., [REDACTED]
Budnik, Eugene J., [REDACTED]
Buerger, Delbert E., [REDACTED]
Bull, Daniel H., [REDACTED]
Bullen, Howard R., Jr., [REDACTED]
Bulli, Dante E., [REDACTED]
Bullinger, Rollin R., [REDACTED]
Buls, Milton R., [REDACTED]
Burch, Nolan E., [REDACTED]
Burgandine, Phillip N., [REDACTED]
Burnette, Charles E., [REDACTED]
Burningham, Haven R., [REDACTED]
Burton, Carmen W., [REDACTED]
Busch, Robert E., [REDACTED]
Bush, William B., Jr., [REDACTED]
Butera, Alfonso H., [REDACTED]
Butler, James J., Jr., [REDACTED]
Butler, John E., Jr., [REDACTED]
Butler, Raymond D., [REDACTED]
Button, Louis H., [REDACTED]
Buzze, Frank C., [REDACTED]
Byrd, Neal A., [REDACTED]
Cadden, James J., [REDACTED]
Cadenhead, John O., Jr., [REDACTED]
Cahelo, George, Jr., [REDACTED]
Callahan, Ellsworth D., [REDACTED]
Callahan, John A., [REDACTED]
Callam, William K., [REDACTED]
Campbell, David D., [REDACTED]
Campbell, Earl J., [REDACTED]
Campbell, Warren E., [REDACTED]
Campbell, Warren G., [REDACTED]
Canning, Douglas S., [REDACTED]
Cannon, Harry E., [REDACTED]
Carder, Orval B., [REDACTED]
Carey, Gates C., [REDACTED]
Carey, Russell J., Jr., [REDACTED]
Carmichael, Donald L., [REDACTED]
Carney, Francis M., [REDACTED]
Carpentier, Joseph H., [REDACTED]
Carris Roy B., [REDACTED]
Carroll, George B., [REDACTED]
Carroll, Thomas F., [REDACTED]
Carson, Clarence L., [REDACTED]
Carson, Luther D., [REDACTED]

Carter, Robert F., XXXXX
 Carter, Wilbur D., XXXXX
 Cartwright, Richard H., Jr., XXXXX
 Cary, Thomas I., XXXXX
 Casbeer, Roy N., XXXXX
 Casey, George W., XXXXX
 Casey, Robert W., Sr., XXXXX
 Cason, Edgar P., XXXXX
 Cassidy, Richard H., XXXXX
 Casto, Lloyd L., XXXXX
 Cather, Robert M., XXXXX
 Cathey, John W., XXXXX
 Catts, William G., XXXXX
 Caulfield, John G., XXXXX
 Cecil, Thomas J., XXXXX
 Chacey, David D., XXXXX
 Chaffee, William A., XXXXX
 Chamberlain, Clarence N., XXXXX
 Chambers, Thomas L., XXXXX
 Chambers, Wayne C., XXXXX
 Chavez, Manuel J., Jr., XXXXX
 Chenault, Charles J., XXXXX
 Chew, John C., XXXX
 Childress, Rollin D., XXXXX
 Chiodo, Vincent R., XXXXX
 Christensen, Douglas H., XXXXX
 Christensen, Richard D., XXXX
 Christner, Winton, XXXXX
 Clark, Don O., XXXXX
 Clark, Edward R., XXXXX
 Clark, John F., XXXXX
 Clarke, John S., Jr., XXXXX
 Clarke, Russell C., XXXXX
 Claybaugh, K. Wayne, XXXXX
 Cleary, John E., XXXXX
 Clemence, Charles J., Jr., XXXXX
 Cleveland, Lewis A., Jr., XXXXX
 Cloaninger, Francis A., XXXXX
 Clowry, John P., XXXXX
 Coats, Wilbur L., XXXXX
 Cobea, Mitchell A., XXXX
 Cochran, Robert G., XXXXX
 Cole, Dick T., XXXXX
 Coleman, Patrick E., XXXXX
 Coleman, Robert G., XXXXX
 Collette, Robert W., XXXXX
 Collings, Buford E., Jr., XXXXX
 Collings, Kenneth L., XXXXX
 Collins, Glenn R., XXXXX
 Connally, Hulon L., XXXXX
 Connelly, John T., XXXXX
 Conner, Preston E., XXXXX
 Cook, Walter E., XXXXX
 Cook, Warren G., XXXXX
 Coon, Elmer D., XXXXX
 Coon, Robert E., XXXXX
 Cooper, Ernest G., Jr., XXXXX
 Cooperman, Harold, XXXXX
 Copeland, Phillips J., XXXXX
 Copher, Paul D., XXXXX
 Cordes, Harry N., XXXXX
 Cory, Ward E., XXXXX
 Cote, Richard D., XXXXX
 Cotton, Allen B., XXXXX
 Cotton, J. W., Jr., XXXXX
 Council, Robert R., XXXXX
 Courson, Lewis E., XXXXX
 Covell, Dwight W., XXXXX
 Covert, Wayne L., XXXXX
 Covey, John L., XXXXX
 Cowan, George O., XXXXX
 Cowan, Leslie W., XXXXX
 Cowart, Robert P., XXXXX
 Cowgill, Wayne J., XXXXX
 Cox, Rufus A., Jr., XXXXX
 Cox, Samuel J., Jr., XXXXX
 Craft, Jacob F., XXXXX
 Craig, Robert P., XXXXX
 Crain, Robert N., XXXXX
 Crans, Robert E., XXXXX
 Crawford, Franklin A., XXXXX
 Crawford, Wayne S., Jr., XXXXX
 Creedon, Jeremiah, XXXXX
 Crego, John C., XXXXX
 Crews, Sidney W., XXXXX
 Cribbs, Thomas J., XXXXX
 Cridland, William C., XXXXX
 Crockett, Woodrow W., XXXXX
 Crosby, Samuel E., Jr., XXXXX
 Crosby, Warney L., XXXXX
 Crose, Leonard, XXXXX

Crosland, Daniel, XXXXX
 Cross, Richard G., Jr., XXXXX
 Crowder, Leon L., Jr., XXXXX
 Crowe, Donald A., XXXXX
 Crozier, Gordon W., XXXXX
 Crum, Glenn, XXXXX
 Crum, Leroy A., XXXXX
 Cude, Willis A., Jr., XXXXX
 Culbertson, William W., XXXXX
 Culet, Ralph S., XXXXX
 Cummings, Robert D., XXXXX
 Cummins, Timothy, XXXXX
 Curran, Francis E., XXXXX
 Currie, Alexander D., XXXX
 Curry, Deane G., XXXXX
 Curton, Warren D., XXXXX
 Cushman, Gene M., XXXXX
 Cusic, William D., Jr., XXXXX
 Cutler, William M., XXXXX
 Dalley, John G., XXXXX
 Dale, Howard H., XXXXX
 Dale, Manley H., Jr., XXXXX
 Daly, John P., Jr., XXXXX
 Daly, Robert P., XXXXX
 Damewood, Lawrence D., XXXXX
 Daus, Nelson C., XXXXX
 Davidson, Jerrold K., XXXXX
 Davidson, Ross, XXXXX
 Davis, Beverly E., Jr., XXXXX
 Davis, Clayton E., XXXXX
 Davis, Loyal S., XXXXX
 Davis, Onner D., 2d, XXXXX
 Davis, Ruby E., Jr., XXXXX
 Day, Joseph D., XXXXX
 Dean, John J., XXXXX
 Dearey, Ralph H., XXXXX
 Deaton, Clarence J., XXXXX
 Decoster, James V., XXXXX
 Dehaan, Benjamin F., XXXXX
 Deleo, Hector J., XXXXX
 Delgiorno, Anthony M., XXXXX
 DeLong, Robert F., XXXXX
 DeLorenzo, Claude A., XXXXX
 DeLosier, Bernard C., XXXXX
 Denning, Charles W., XXXXX
 Dennis, Gordon A., XXXXX
 DePalma, Frederick A., XXXXX
 DeSandro, Louis J., XXXXX
 Desutter, Ralph B., XXXXX
 Desvoigne, Melvin C., XXXXX
 Dethman, Ivan H., XXXXX
 Dewey, Charles J., XXXXX
 DeWitt, Robert L., XXXXX
 Dezonla, Lawrence E., XXXXX
 Dick, Wagner W., XXXXX
 Dieck, Theodore F., XXXXX
 Dieckman, Jack D., XXXXX
 Diehl, Kenneth C., XXXXX
 Distler, Jack L., XXXXX
 Dixon, Dick, XXXXX
 Dixon, Robert J., XXXXX
 Dodge, William L., XXXXX
 Dodson, Claude B., XXXXX
 Donaldson, Glenn H., XXXXX
 Donnelly, James E., Jr., XXXXX
 Donnelly, Leonard F., XXXXX
 Donnelly, William E., XXXXX
 Dotson, Verl D., XXXXX
 Dougherty, John E., XXXXX
 Douglas, Louis R., XXXXX
 Douglass, James R., XXXXX
 Douglass, Richard B., XXXXX
 Douglass, Walter A., XXXXX
 Dow, Hugh D., XXXXX
 Dow, Norman C., XXXXX
 Dow, Robert, XXXXX
 Dowdell, James N., XXXXX
 Dowless, James R., XXXXX
 Downey, Frank A., XXXXX
 Downey, Russell A., XXXXX
 Downie, Currie S., XXXX
 Downie, Wilbur R., XXXXX
 Downing, Elijah M., XXXXX
 Downs, Richard J., XXXXX
 Doyle, Jesse M., XXXXX
 Dreesen, Victor L., XXXXX
 Dreller, Karl E., XXXXX
 Drew, John C., XXXXX
 Dubose, Robert C., XXXXX
 Dufault, William F., XXXXX
 Duff, Robert T., XXXXX
 Duke, Robert H., XXXXX

Duker, Orlo F., XXXXX
 Dukes, Ernest F., Jr., XXXXX
 Dunaway, Kenneth D., XXXXX
 Dunbar, Neal B., Jr., XXXXX
 Duncan, Wayne M., XXXXX
 Dunlap, Glen R., XXXXX
 Dunlap, Hendricks M., XXXX
 Dunnire, Floyd T., XXXXX
 Dunn, Donald A., XXXXX
 Dunn, James M., XXXXX
 Dunn, John H., XXXXX
 DuPont, Charles G., XXXXX
 Durante, Anthony R., XXXXX
 Durbin, Robert F., XXXXX
 Durell, Alger E., XXXXX
 Dvorak, Edward H., XXXXX
 Dvorak, Edward R., XXXXX
 Dwyer, George T., XXXXX
 Dyer, Eugene N., XXXXX
 Dyer, James T., Jr., XXXXX
 Dyer, John C., XXXXX
 Dyke, Samuel E., XXXXX
 Dykes, Leo M., Jr., XXXXX
 Dysart, Brian P., Jr., XXXXX
 Eaglen, James A., XXXX
 Eanes, Fred T., Jr., XXXXX
 Earhart, Pat H., XXXXX
 Early, John S., XXXXX
 Easley, Preston W., XXXXX
 Eckles, William H., XXXXX
 Edge, William C., XXXXX
 Edmonson, Richard W., XXXXX
 Edwards, Gerald B., XXXXX
 Edwards, Leland V., XXXXX
 Ehorn, Merle A., XXXXX
 Ehrlich, Albert, XXXXX
 Elder, James A., Jr., XXXXX
 Ellington, Bertrum E., XXXXX
 Elliott, John W., XXXXX
 Elliott, William P., XXXXX
 Ellzey, J. Murray, XXXXX
 Emig, John W., XXXXX
 Engelbreit, Joseph C., XXXXX
 Erickson, Donald H., XXXXX
 Escue, Walter H., XXXXX
 Estes, Carl A., XXXXX
 Estes, Herman C., XXXXX
 Eubank, Graydon K., XXXX
 Evans, J. L., XXXXX
 Evans, Jack T., XXXXX
 Evans, Lawrence W., XXXXX
 Evans, Marvin F., XXXXX
 Evans, Wilbur L., XXXXX
 Evans, William R., XXXXX
 Evans, William S., XXXXX
 Everett, Hal W., XXXXX
 Fahrney, Richard L., XXXXX
 Fairburn, Craig H., XXXXX
 Fallon, Edward R., Jr., XXXXX
 Farmer, Marion L., XXXXX
 Farrar, Aubrey O., XXXXX
 Fasolas, James E., XXXXX
 Faulkner, Dwight L., XXXXX
 Feagin, Luther W., XXXXX
 Feeney, John W., XXXXX
 Feldt, Albert J., XXXXX
 Ferguson, James H., XXXXX
 Fernley, Aaron R., XXXXX
 Fetsko, Joseph R., XXXXX
 Petty, Randall L., XXXXX
 Fieker, Virgil E., XXXXX
 Findlay, Clayton, XXXXX
 Finlayson, James C., XXXXX
 Finnan, George A., Jr., XXXXX
 Fish, Bruce B., XXXXX
 Fish, Jules V., XXXXX
 Fisher, Alfred K., XXXXX
 Fitch, Edward S., XXXXX
 Fitjar, Raymond A., XXXXX
 Fitschen, Iver C., XXXXX
 Fitzgerald, Paul A., XXXXX
 Fitzwater, Charles E., XXXXX
 Flaherty, William F., XXXXX
 Flake, Alma R., XXXXX
 Flynn, Norman C., XXXXX
 Ford, John P., XXXXX
 Foreman, Benjamin A., XXXXX
 Foreman, Charles A., XXXXX
 Forman, Richard J., XXXXX
 Forseth, Vernon E., XXXX
 Fory, Garland V., XXXX

Foster, Charles R., XXXX
 Fowler, Robert R., XXXXX
 Fowler, Walter M., XXXX
 Fox, Edward J., XXXXX
 Fox, Harold L., XXXXX
 Fralley, Homer F., XXXXX
 Framsted, Kenneth G., XXXXX
 Franck, Lewis S., XXXXX
 Franklin, George W., XXXXX
 Franklin, Louie, XXXXX
 Franks, Charles H., XXXXX
 French, Johnson L., Jr., XXXXX
 Frese, Raymond J., XXXXX
 Friend, Robert J., XXXXX
 Fritsch, James E., XXXXX
 Fruit, Firman H., XXXXX
 Fullilove, Jacob F., XXXXX
 Gaenzle, Jay S., XXXXX
 Gagliardi, John, XXXXX
 Gaines, Edwin F., XXXXX
 Galentine, Paul G., Jr., XXXXX
 Gallagher, James G., XXXXX
 Gamble, Jack K., XXXXX
 Garden, Francis, XXXXX
 Gargan, Frank, Jr., XXXXX
 Garlick, Roy D., XXXXX
 Garlock, Karl H., XXXXX
 Garrison, Vermont, XXXXX
 Garrison, Vernon W., XXXXX
 Garvin, Charles T., XXXXX
 Gearhart, Fred Z., XXXXX
 George, Ellis P., XXXXX
 George, Robert L., XXXXX
 Gerber, Norris H., XXXXX
 Gibbs, Gordon M., Jr., XXXXX
 Gibney, Richard J., XXXX
 Gibson, Billy P., XXXXX
 Gibson, William J., XXXX
 Gill, Robert E., XXXX
 Gillaspie, Mark W., XXXXX
 Gillespie, George F., XXXX
 Gilmore, Charles J., XXXXX
 Gleason, Robert L., XXXX
 Goade, William R., XXXXX
 Godsey, Cephas Q., XXXXX
 Goetsch, Conrad W., XXXXX
 Goff, Theodore B., XXXXX
 Goldsberry, Francis R., XXXXX
 Goodlad, Harold G., XXXX
 Goodreau, James J., XXXXX
 Gordon, John H., XXXXX
 Gore, Granville L., XXXX
 Goss, Donald K., XXXXX
 Goudy, Jack B., XXXXX
 Grabber, Carl J., XXXXX
 Grant, Archie W., XXXXX
 Grantham, Douglas L., Jr., XXXXX
 Gravenstine, Donald J., XXXXX
 Gray, Lawrence U., XXXXX
 Green, Clifford N., XXXXX
 Greene, Julius P., XXXXX
 Greenhaigh, William H., Jr., XXXXX
 Grier, Robert K., XXXXX
 Griggs, Frederick M., XXXXX
 Grimes, Robert Z., XXXXX
 Groom, John F., XXXXX
 Grosse, William R., XXXXX
 Grosshuesch, Leroy V., XXXXX
 Grotenstein, Morton, XXXXX
 Grundmann, William J., XXXX
 Grunewald, Kenneth F., XXXXX
 Grunig, David B., XXXXX
 Gryskiewicz, Lawrence R., XXXXX
 Guerrein, Carl J., XXXXX
 Guffey, Herman F., XXXXX
 Guinn, Euin N., XXXXX
 Gunn, Charles D., Jr., XXXXX
 Gutekunst, Charles J., XXXXX
 Guy, George A., XXXXX
 Hackett, Wilbur M., Jr., XXXXX
 Hadden, Perry W., XXXXX
 Hagerty, Frederick J., XXXXX
 Haigler, Claude S., XXXXX
 Hall, Felton W., XXXXX
 Hall, Hubert E., XXXX
 Hall, Wilbur L., Jr., XXXXX
 Hall, William P., XXXXX
 Haller, Edward J., XXXXX
 Halm, Frank N., XXXXX
 Halsey, George E., Jr., XXXXX
 Hamby, Jesse M., XXXX

Hamill, Jimmy M., XXXX
 Hamill, Robert S., XXXXX
 Hamilton, Richard L., XXXXX
 Hancock, John J., XXXXX
 Hancock, Robert M., Jr., XXXXX
 Hanks, Dale J., XXXXX
 Hanna, Max E., XXXXX
 Hansen, Homer K., XXXXX
 Hansen, Paul K., XXXXX
 Hansen, Robert P., XXXXX
 Harbaugh, Howard C., XXXXX
 Harbula, Edward A., XXXXX
 Harden, Charles R., XXXXX
 Harkins, Walter C., XXXXX
 Harmon, George L., XXXXX
 Harper, Flamm D., XXXXX
 Harris, Daniel B., XXXXX
 Harris, Elsey, Jr., XXXXX
 Harris, George W. E., XXXXX
 Harte, Allan S., Jr., XXXXX
 Hartley, James R., XXXXX
 Hartzell, Connett F., XXXXX
 Hassel, Robert K., XXXXX
 Hathaway, Frank A., Jr., XXXXX
 Haupt, Fred J., 3d, XXXXX
 Havard, David J., XXXXX
 Hayen, Bernard N., XXXXX
 Hayford, Elbert D., Jr., XXXXX
 Hays, Raymond F., XXXXX
 Hayslip, Frank W., XXXXX
 Haywood, Vernon V., XXXXX
 Heft, Robert E., XXXXX
 Heintz, James E., XXXXX
 Heiser, Thomas F., XXXXX
 Held, Fred J., 3d, XXXXX
 Henderson, Jack J., XXXXX
 Henderson, Thomas W., XXXXX
 Hendricks, Howard F., XXXXX
 Hendrickson, Oscar S., XXXXX
 Henry, Patrick H., XXXXX
 Hensarling, Arthur L., XXXXX
 Hepler, Jesse B., XXXX
 Herbert, Floyd, XXXXX
 Hergenreder, Larry P., XXXXX
 Hermann, Wayne E., XXXXX
 Herschberger, George A., XXXXX
 Hervey, Robert E., XXXXX
 Hess, Walter N., XXXXX
 Hessler, Elmo B., XXXXX
 Hester, Henry E., XXXXX
 Heyroth, James W., XXXXX
 Hill, Harold L., XXXXX
 Hill, John P., XXXXX
 Hilttenbrand, John R., XXXXX
 Himes, David A., XXXXX
 Hirsch, Henry R., XXXXX
 Hodges, Hubert W., XXXXX
 Hodges, Robert M., XXXXX
 Hoey, William K., XXXXX
 Hof, Robert T., XXXXX
 Hoffmann, Leonard C., XXXXX
 Hogan, Miller E., XXXXX
 Holland, Gould K., XXXXX
 Hollis, Medford E., XXXX
 Hollis, William N., XXXXX
 Holman, Averill P., XXXXX
 Holman, Jack W., XXXXX
 Holmberg Herbert A., XXXXX
 Hooven, Francis V., Jr., XXXXX
 Hoover, Ferris E., XXXXX
 Horey, Raymond S., XXXXX
 Horgan, Michael C., XXXXX
 Horn, John D., XXXXX
 Hornick, George, Jr., XXXXX
 Horton, John N., XXXXX
 Hosack, Harold W., XXXXX
 Hosford, Lynn H., Jr., XXXXX
 Hoskins, Robert O., XXXXX
 Houser, Patrick B., XXXXX
 Hovey, Harold G., XXXXX
 Hovey, Marsh, XXXXX
 Howard, Ronald M., XXXXX
 Howard, Wilson W., XXXXX
 Howse, Benjamin M., XXXXX
 Huettig, Hans G., XXXXX
 Hughes, Alfred A., XXXXX
 Hughes, Claude A., Jr., XXXXX
 Hughes, Harson B., XXXXX
 Hughes, James E., XXXXX
 Hughes, John L., XXXXX
 Hughes, Robert E., XXXXX

Hughes, Robert L., XXXXX
 Hughs, William M., XXXXX
 Hugo, Frederick J., Jr., XXXXX
 Humphries, Buford M., XXXXX
 Hundley, Charles P., XXXXX
 Hurlbut, Byron A., XXXXX
 Hurley, Richard M., XXXXX
 Hutchins, Alfred G., XXXXX
 Hutchison, Joseph G., XXXXX
 Iles, George J., XXXXX
 Ingram, Stanford M., XXXXX
 Inks, Howard R., XXXXX
 Ireland, Paul J., XXXXX
 Irons, Victor E., Jr., XXXXX
 Ishmael, Chester C., XXXXX
 Jabbour, Nicholas, XXXXX
 Jackson, Duard Y., XXXXX
 Jackson, William C., XXXXX
 Jacobi, George A., XXXXX
 Jacobs, John W., XXXXX
 Jacobs, Robert A., XXXXX
 Jacobson, Richard K., XXXXX
 Jaeger, Frank J., XXXXX
 James, Daniel, Jr., XXXXX
 James, Robert H., XXXXX
 Janssen, Carl A., XXXXX
 Janssen, Jan W., Jr., XXXXX
 Jarman, Wallace J., XXXXX
 Jensen, Clayton E., XXXXX
 Jewell, Forrest W., XXXXX
 Johns, Gordon H., XXXXX
 Johns, Mervyn T., XXXXX
 Johnson, Alfred E., XXXXX
 Johnson, Charles G., XXXXX
 Johnson, Conrad L., XXXXX
 Johnson, Fon E., XXXXX
 Johnson, Gordon M., XXXXX
 Johnson, Jack D., XXXXX
 Johnson, Walter E., XXXXX
 Johnson, Warren D., XXXXX
 Johnson, William T., XXXXX
 Jones, Billy J., XXXXX
 Jones, David B., XXXXX
 Jones Donald O., XXXXX
 Jones, Ellis M., Jr., XXXXX
 Jones, Howard A., XXXXX
 Jones, Milton J., XXXXX
 Jones, Richard F., XXXXX
 Jones, Troy H., Jr., XXXXX
 Jorgensen, Kenneth B., XXXXX
 Julin, Donald D., XXXXX
 Julin, Harold S., XXXXX
 Junker, Harold R., XXXXX
 Justen, Eugene J., XXXXX
 Kaluta, William R., XXXXX
 Kammerlohr, Morton A., XXXXX
 Karr, William, XXXXX
 Karschner, Donald F., XXXXX
 Kaurin, Robert H., XXXXX
 Keeler, William J., XXXXX
 Keeling, Rufus K., XXXXX
 Kells, Walter A., XXXXX
 Kekoa, Curtis, XXXXX
 Keller, August N., XXXXX
 Kelley, George J., Jr., XXXXX
 Kelly, Joseph D., XXXXX
 Kemper, Othmar A. J., XXXXX
 Kennedy, William E., XXXXX
 Kensler, Thomas C., Jr., XXXXX
 Kepler, Paul H., XXXXX
 Kerstetter, Albert S., XXXXX
 Kettler, William H., XXXXX
 Key, Marvin E., Jr., XXXXX
 Key, Oran R., Jr., XXXXX
 Kidd, John B., XXXXX
 Killeavy, Francis T., XXXXX
 Kimball, John G., XXXXX
 King, Alfred N., XXXXX
 King, Donald B., XXXXX
 King, Edwin V., XXXXX
 King, Homer J., Jr., XXXXX
 King, Lonnie T., XXXXX
 King, Walter S., XXXXX
 Kinney, James F., XXXXX
 Kinsella, William E., XXXXX
 Kitchens, Ralph L., XXXXX
 Kleinheiter, Robert W., XXXXX
 Kleinwechter, Frank F., Jr., XXXX
 Klentzman, James F., XXXX
 Klerk, Jacob W., XXXXX
 Klingler, Djack, XXXXX
 Knight, Jack, XXXX

Knight, William T., XXXXX
 Knotts, James M., XXXXX
 Koehler, Carl J., XXXXX
 Kost, Stephen D., XXXXX
 Kovach, Michael M., XXXXX
 Krazina, Joseph J., XXXXX
 Kraus, Robert E., XXXXX
 Kreglob, Edwin R., XXXXX
 Kriehn, Norman A., XXXXX
 Kropenicki, John J., XXXXX
 Krug, Frederick C., XXXXX
 Kupersmith, Louis W., Jr., XXXXX
 Labbe, Erwin G., XXXXX
 Lacagnin, Leonard J., XXXXX
 Lacey, William H., XXXXX
 Lahren, Lawrence G., XXXXX
 Lamb, Bennett G., XXXXX
 Land, Cary J., XXXXX
 Lander, Jack D., XXXXX
 Landsperger, William J., XXXXX
 Lane, Thomas W., XXXXX
 Lange, Roy A., XXXXX
 Langebartel, Edward P., XXXXX
 Langley, Edwin W., XXXXX
 LaSalle, Harry S., Jr., XXXXX
 Lauder, Edmund, XXXXX
 Lawrence, Norman T., XXXXX
 Leach, Wayne, XXXXX
 Leavitt, Roy D., XXXXX
 Lee, Zaden O., XXXXX
 Leech, Richard G., XXXXX
 Legge, Leonard C., XXXXX
 Lehmann, Elroy C., XXXXX
 Leighty, Robert M., XXXXX
 Leigon, Charles W., XXXXX
 Lemes, Ralph, XXXXX
 Lemoine, Ray F., XXXXX
 Leo, Carl H., XXXXX
 Lester, Harry N., XXXXX
 Levesque, J. B. L., XXXXX
 Lewis, Charles H., XXXXX
 Lewis, Henry S., Jr., XXXXX
 Lewis, Jack M., XXXXX
 Lewis, William, XXXXX
 Light, Clifton F., XXXXX
 Lillard, David C., Jr., XXXXX
 Linden, Robert M., XXXXX
 Lindley, Wesley L., XXXXX
 Lindquister, David M., XXXXX
 Liniger, Vaun N., XXXXX
 Link, Charles H., XXXXX
 Linscheid, Gerald, XXXXX
 Lively, James R., XXXXX
 Livers, George M., XXXXX
 Livingston, Clyde M., XXXXX
 Locker, Bernard D., XXXXX
 Loflin, William A., XXXXX
 Loman, William T., Jr., XXXXX
 Loney, George A., XXXXX
 Long, Paul H., XXXXX
 Loudon, James L., XXXXX
 Loudermilk, James A., XXXXX
 Loughnan, Victor J., XXXXX
 Lowell, Charles L., XXXXX
 Lowell, Julius C., XXXXX
 Loyd, Robert O., XXXXX
 Lucas, Truman, XXXXX
 Lucchesi, Gene A., XXXXX
 Luckey, William J., Jr., XXXXX
 Ludwig, Charles A., Jr., XXXXX
 Lukeman, Robert P., XXXXX
 Lutkenhouse, Henry E., XXXXX
 Lutz, Raymond K., XXXXX
 Lyon, Moncure N., Jr., XXXXX
 Lyons, Horace C., XXXXX
 Macefield, James, XXXXX
 MacGregor, Jack M., XXXXX
 MacKenzie, Alexander S., XXXXX
 MacLaughlin, John T., XXXXX
 Macomber, Louis N., XXXXX
 Maggert, Donald W., XXXXX
 Maher, Philip J., Jr., XXXXX
 Mahon, Keith, XXXXX
 Mahoney, Daniel C., XXXXX
 Major, Stanley T., XXXXX
 Malkiewicz, Frank J., XXXXX
 Maloney, Robert F., XXXXX
 Mann, Edwin, XXXXX
 Mann, Harry A., XXXXX
 Manning, Simon W., Jr., XXXXX
 Manning, William J., XXXXX
 Manor, Leroy J., XXXXX

Marcum, Everette L., XXXX
 Marcum, Robert S., XXXX
 Markel, Carroll B., XXXXX
 Marlin, Roger T., XXXXX
 Marsden, William F., XXXXX
 Marshall, Wofford E., Jr., XXXXX
 Martin, Edward O., XXXXX
 Martin, James F., XXXXX
 Martin, Thomas W., XXXXX
 Mason, George I., Jr., XXXXX
 Masonheimer, Robert H., XXXXX
 Matlick, Benjamin M., Jr., XXXXX
 Matte, Joseph Z., XXXXX
 Mattson, Conrad E., XXXXX
 Maughan, Weston F., XXXXX
 Maurer, Homer F., XXXXX
 Maxwell, Sidney R., XXXXX
 Mayo, Francis L., XXXXX
 McAllister, Warren W., XXXXX
 McCambridge, Andrew J., XXXXX
 McCarty, Harold H., XXXXX
 McClure, Robert D., XXXXX
 McCorkle, George W., XXXXX
 McCormack, Robert, XXXXX
 McCormick, Robert R., XXXXX
 McCreary, Frank E., Jr., XXXXX
 McDaniel, Robert E., XXXXX
 McDonell, Roger W., XXXXX
 McFadden, Kenneth L., XXXXX
 McGehee, Harold F., XXXXX
 McGinniss, Robert H., XXXXX
 McGrain, Thomas W., XXXXX
 McGrew, Russell G., XXXXX
 McGugan, Charlie T., XXXXX
 McHugh, John F., Jr., XXXXX
 McIsaac, Lewis G., XXXXX
 McKay, Allen F., XXXXX
 McKeag, Charles M., XXXXX
 McKeane, William A., XXXXX
 McKendrick, Howard R., XXXXX
 McKenney, Earl F., XXXXX
 McKinney, Fred D., XXXXX
 McKinney, Isaac H., XXXXX
 McLaughlin, William A., XXXXX
 McLean, Richard Q., XXXXX
 McLendon, Robert A., XXXXX
 McManaman, Charles J., XXXXX
 McMichael, Lyle E., XXXXX
 McMunigle, Francis M., XXXXX
 McNary, Lawrence B., XXXXX
 McQuillan, David P., XXXXX
 McVey, William H., XXXXX
 McWilliams, Robert T., XXXXX
 Meacham, Chauncey W., XXXXX
 Meagher, Robert B., XXXXX
 Mealka, John C., XXXXX
 Mechling, James E., XXXXX
 Meholic, James J., XXXXX
 Melton, Carl M., XXXXX
 Melvin, Robert E., XXXXX
 Menninger, Charles J., XXXXX
 Merrill, Edward G., XXXXX
 Mersereau, Robert T., XXXXX
 Mertely, Frank, XXXXX
 Messer, Frank A., XXXXX
 Metcalf, John C., XXXXX
 Metheny, Frank W., XXXXX
 Meyer, Lloyd F., XXXXX
 Meyers, Oliver H., XXXXX
 Michael, Edward S., XXXXX
 Mickey, Harry F., XXXXX
 Miller, Cecil D., XXXXX
 Miller, Clair R., XXXXX
 Miller, Clarence M., Jr., XXXXX
 Miller, Earl D., XXXXX
 Miller, John W., XXXXX
 Miller, Luther J., XXXXX
 Miller, Paul R., XXXXX
 Miller, Robert A., XXXXX
 Miller, Robert L., XXXXX
 Miller, Robert L., XXXXX
 Miller, Roy A., XXXXX
 Miller, Sidney H., XXXXX
 Mills, Arthur J., XXXXX
 Mills, Thomas A., XXXXX
 Millsap, Frederick M., XXXXX
 Mims, Edwin T., XXXXX
 Mitchell, Clarence D., Jr., XXXXX
 Mitchell, Daniel B., XXXXX
 Mitchell, Howard C., XXXXX
 Mitchell, John W., XXXXX

Mitchell, Maurice S., XXXXX
 Mitchell, William L., XXXXX
 Moats, Sanford K., XXXXX
 Moench, John O., XXXXX
 Moffatt, Leo J., XXXXX
 Monroe, Ralph E., XXXXX
 Montague, Hal R., XXXXX
 Montoya, Patrick E., XXXXX
 Moody, Robert P., XXXXX
 Moore, Grover P., Jr., XXXXX
 Moore, Howard M., XXXXX
 Moore, Jerry P., XXXXX
 Moore, William P., XXXXX
 Moorhead, Chester D., XXXXX
 Moreman, Robert, XXXXX
 Morgan, Thomas W., XXXXX
 Morgan, Wayne D., XXXXX
 Morris, Frank G., Jr., XXXXX
 Morris, George W., XXXXX
 Morrison, Manley J., XXXXX
 Morrison, Maurice, XXXXX
 Morse, Oscar L., XXXXX
 Morton, William G., XXXXX
 Moseley, Nelson B., XXXXX
 Moseley, Walter S., XXXXX
 Mosher, Francis L., XXXXX
 Mosler, Walter M., XXXXX
 Mowat, John J., XXXXX
 Mozley, Claude D., Jr., XXXXX
 Muldoon, James E., Jr., XXXXX
 Mullen, Bernard N., XXXXX
 Mulligan, John L., XXXXX
 Mulvey, Gordon E., XXXXX
 Mumbower, Wilbur E., XXXXX
 Murphy, John E., XXXXX
 Murphy, Joseph J., XXXXX
 Murphy, Joseph L., XXXXX
 Murtha, Manus F., Jr., XXXXX
 Myers, Bill E., XXXXX
 Myers, George B., XXXXX
 Myers, Russell W., XXXXX
 Nabors, Jack, XXXXX
 Naftel, Stacy D., XXXXX
 Nanney, James T., XXXXX
 Nash, Charles E., XXXXX
 Navarro, Michael, XXXXX
 Nebughr, Raymond L., XXXXX
 Nelson, Carl A., XXXXX
 Nelson, Frances W., XXXXX
 Nelson, Hal J., XXXXX
 Nelson, Leslie D., XXXXX
 Nelson, Lyles B., XXXXX
 Nelson, Richard G., XXXXX
 Nesley, William L., XXXXX
 Neu, John J., XXXXX
 Neumann, Howard G., XXXXX
 Neundorff, Charles A., XXXXX
 Neville, Harry W., XXXXX
 Newman, Forrest D., XXXXX
 Newman, James E., XXXXX
 Newman, John C., XXXXX
 Newquist, Weldon D., XXXXX
 Neyland, Lewis J., XXXXX
 Nice, Albert T., XXXXX
 Nichols, Malcolm G., XXXXX
 Nixon, Lewis D., XXXXX
 Nixon, Stanley J., XXXXX
 Nolan, Bernard T., Jr., XXXXX
 Nolan, Robert A., XXXXX
 Norman, Isaac G., XXXXX
 Norman, James S., XXXXX
 Norris, Loy R., XXXXX
 North, Ernest J., XXXXX
 North, William H., XXXXX
 Northcutt, Carol R., XXXXX
 Norwood, James P., XXXXX
 Nowlin, David M., XXXXX
 Noziglia, Robert E., XXXXX
 Nuding, William F., Jr., XXXXX
 Nunneley, Clarence M., XXXXX
 Nurnberg, Malcolm L., XXXXX
 Obus, Louis J., XXXXX
 O'Connor, John C., XXXXX
 O'Connor, Walter B., XXXXX
 O'Donnell, Eugene B., XXXXX
 O'Dwyer, Phillip W., XXXXX
 Ogle, Sherman L., XXXXX
 Ogozaly, Leo E., XXXXX
 Olsson, Ward T., XXXXX
 Ong, Dong, XXXXX
 O'Reilly, Thomas P., XXXXX

Orton, George W., XXXXX
 Orton, Robert B., XXXXX
 Osborne, William F., XXXXX
 Ostendorf, Ted H., XXXXX
 Ousley, Carl A., XXXXX
 Owen, Robert C., XXXXX
 Pagozański, Ladislaus J., XXXXX
 Palmer, Garth C., XXXXX
 Palmos, Peter G., XXXXX
 Parker, William C., XXXXX
 Parmentier, Edgar M., XXXXX
 Parrish, James M., XXXXX
 Parrott, John H., Jr., XXXXX
 Parsonson, Ernest C., XXXXX
 Pascoe, Herschel T., XXXXX
 Patterson, Alfred K., XXXXX
 Patterson, John E., XXXXX
 Patterson, Joseph B., XXXXX
 Paul Charles T. A., XXXXX
 Pavlica, Pete, XXXXX
 Pawlowski, Thomas, XXXXX
 Pawlowski, William J., XXXXX
 Payne, Hugh A., XXXXX
 Payne, Joe W., XXXXX
 Peck, Donald A., XXXXX
 Pedersen, Harry P., XXXXX
 Pedigo, William E., XXXXX
 Penhall, Raymond D., XXXXX
 Pennington, Alvin L., XXXXX
 Pennock, Paul W., XXXXX
 Penton, Gordon K., XXXXX
 Perbetsky, George, XXXXX
 Perfetto, Albert J., XXXXX
 Perry, William E., Jr., XXXXX
 Pesacreta, Samuel, XXXXX
 Petersen, Nelson L., XXXXX
 Peterson, Eugene F., XXXXX
 Peterson, Richard B., XXXXX
 Petrul, Paul J., XXXXX
 Phifer, James H., Jr., XXXXX
 Phillips, Lowell G., XXXXX
 Phillips, Norman P., XXXXX
 Phippen, Charles D., XXXXX
 Pierce, Alfred L., XXXXX
 Pierce, Harry F., XXXXX
 Pierce, Milton R., XXXXX
 Pierce, Sammy A., XXXXX
 Pierson, Robert E., XXXXX
 Piggott, Myron G., XXXXX
 Plummer, Horace A., XXXXX
 Podonsky, Reuben, XXXXX
 Poerschke, Raymond A., XXXXX
 Pool, Fain H., XXXXX
 Pope, William K., XXXXX
 Porter, Clifford L., XXXXX
 Porter, John G., XXXXX
 Pouncey, William A., XXXX
 Prather, Jack F., XXXXX
 Preller, Gordon C., XXXXX
 Prewitt, Ernest L., XXXXX
 Price, Harry M., Jr., XXXXX
 Price, James L., XXXXX
 Price, Robert Y., XXXXX
 Priest, Royce W., XXXXX
 Primavera, Amadeo A., XXXXXX
 Prince, William H., XXXXX
 Pritchard, James B., XXXXX
 Purdum, James S., XXXXX
 Pusko, Stanley J., XXXXX
 Qualls, Melvin E., XXXXX
 Quinn, William H., XXXXX
 Rackham, Edwin J., XXXXX
 Raisor, Clifford E., XXXXX
 Raley, Theodore M., XXXX
 Ramer, Richard L., XXXXX
 Randle, Robert J., XXXXX
 Rankin, Hobart R., XXXXX
 Raschke, Wendell M., XXXXX
 Ratti, Emilio P., XXXXX
 Rauscher, Donald E., XXXXX
 Rayborn, Garland, XXXXX
 Records, Walter L., XXXXX
 Reed, Charles D., XXXXX
 Reed, Charles K., XXXXX
 Reed, Merlin L., XXXXX
 Reeves, Horace B., XXXXX
 Regan, Robert F., XXXXX
 Reger, Ted E., XXXXX
 Rehbein, Norman W., XXXXX
 Reiley, Philip F., Jr., XXXXX
 Reiley, Orville K., XXXXX
 Remmele, Frank M., XXXXX

Rettinger, Henry P., XXXXX
 Reusche, Robert L., XXXXX
 Reuther, Daniel, Jr., XXXXX
 Reynolds, Glenn A., XXXXX
 Reynolds, Herbert A., XXXXX
 Reynolds, James W., XXXXX
 Reynolds, Joseph F., XXXXX
 Reynolds, Richard F., XXXXX
 Rhodes, Donald F., XXXXX
 Richards, William W., Jr., XXXXX
 Richardson, Howard, XXXXX
 Richey, Albert L., XXXXX
 Richmond, Joe F., XXXXX
 Ridgway, Guy E., Jr., XXXXX
 Rigley, James D., Jr., XXXXX
 Rlordan, Daniel W., XXXXX
 Riseden, Jack W., XXXXX
 Risher, Edward H., XXXXX
 Ristau, Siegfried E., XXXXX
 Robertson, Harold E., Jr., XXXXX
 Roberts, Earl R., XXXXX
 Robeson, John C., XXXXX
 Robinett, Russell N., XXXXX
 Robinson, Charles J., XXXXX
 Rodriguez, Edward F., XXXXX
 Rogers, Donald K., XXXXX
 Rogers, William T., Jr., XXXXX
 Rogge, William A., Jr., XXXXX
 Rohloff, John F., XXXXX
 Rolin, Mitchell A., XXXXX
 Rondel, Albert O., XXXXX
 Rood, Eric W., XXXX
 Rooney, Gerard W., XXXXX
 Rose, Frank L., Jr., XXXXX
 Rose, John G., XXXXX
 Rosengrants, David E., XXXXX
 Rosser, Samuel E., XXXXX
 Roth, Martin E., XXXXX
 Rounds, Kenneth G., XXXXX
 Rowe, Mayron H., XXXXX
 Rowland, Keith C., XXXXX
 Rowland, Richard G., XXXXX
 Rubich, Edward M., XXXXX
 Rufener, Kenneth E., XXXXX
 Runyard, Gerald D., XXXX
 Russell, Demetrius H., XXXXX
 Russell, Irving J., XXXXX
 Russell, James W., Jr., XXXXX
 Ryan, John J., XXXXX
 Ryan, William A., Jr., XXXXX
 Sahl, Frederick H. G., XXXXX
 Samuelson, Dale L., XXXXX
 Sandacz, Victor L., XXXXX
 Sandberg, Howard A., XXXXX
 Sanna, Francis P., XXXXX
 Sansing, Virgal E., XXXXX
 Sarter, Lee A., Jr., XXXXX
 Sartori, Gerard A., XXXXX
 Sauers, Dale E., XXXXX
 Saunders, Earl R., XXXXX
 Saunders, Jackson, XXXXX
 Saunders, Maurice E., XXXXX
 Savidge, Dale E., XXXXX
 Scanlon, Thomas S., Jr., XXXXX
 Scarborough, Stanley E., XXXXX
 Schaaf, Robert A., XXXXX
 Schenker, Edward R., XXXXX
 Schlipf, Harold A., XXXXX
 Schmerbeck, David J., XXXXX
 Schmid, Donald E., XXXXX
 Schmidt, David J., XXXXX
 Schmidt, Fred J., XXXXX
 Schmidt, George R., XXXXX
 Schmidt, Karl F., XXXXX
 Schmitt, Hugh L., XXXXX
 Schreiber, Joseph, XXXXX
 Schuler, Paul J., XXXXX
 Schutt, George G., Jr., XXXXX
 Scott, Charles E., Jr., XXXXX
 Scott, James L., XXXXX
 Scott, Leonard B., Jr., XXXXX
 Scott, Richard E. J., XXXXX
 Scott, Robert A., XXXXX
 Scott, Thomas H., XXXXX
 Scribner, Orville E., XXXXX
 Scruton, Albert M., XXXXX
 Scurlock, Frank L., XXXXX
 Scurro, Vito M., XXXXX
 Seaman, Merrill H., XXXXX
 Seaver, Owen L., XXXXX
 Segler, Thomas F., Jr., XXXXX
 Seitz, Edwin A., XXXXX

Selkregg, James B., XXXXX
 Shaffner, Douglass D., XXXXX
 Shannon, James A., XXXXX
 Shaw, Dan L., XXXXX
 Shea, Robert B., XXXXX
 Sheehan, Douglas M., XXXXX
 Sheehan, Frank A., XXXXX
 Sheehan, Joseph B., XXXXX
 Sheldow, Robert G., XXXXX
 Shelton, Lenward A., XXXXX
 Shelton, Melvin D., Jr., XXXXX
 Shepherd, Arthur C., XXXXX
 Sher, Harry L., XXXXX
 Shewan, Clifford W., XXXXX
 Shick, Ira H., XXXXX
 Shipley, Fred D., XXXXX
 Shook, Abraham E., XXXXX
 Shotts, Bryan M., XXXXX
 Showers, Herbert C., XXXXX
 Shuck, John F., XXXXX
 Siebern, Vincent P., XXXXX
 Siebert, Raymond A., XXXXX
 Silva, Theodore D., XXXXX
 Simmons, Alfred C., XXXXX
 Simmons, John C., XXXXX
 Simmons, Roy D., Jr., XXXXX
 Simmons, Willis M., XXXXX
 Simokaitis, Frank J., XXXXX
 Simon, Bernard R., XXXXX
 Simpson, Robert F., Jr., XXXXX
 Simpson, Thomas L., XXXXX
 Sims, Lewis P., XXXXX
 Sims, Thomas J., XXXXX
 Singleton, Earl H., XXXXX
 Skinner, Ernest C., XXXXX
 Skoglund, Peter J., XXXXX
 Sloan, Howard M., XXXXX
 Slupe, Harold D., XXXXX
 Smallfield, George B., XXXXX
 Smith, Donovan F., XXXXX
 Smith, Edgar H., XXXXX
 Smith, Harry E., Jr., XXXXX
 Smith, Kenneth E., XXXXX
 Smith, Lewis R., XXXXX
 Smith, Norman H., XXXXX
 Smith, Orrin R., Jr., XXXXX
 Smith, Paul K., XXXXX
 Smith, Richard H., XXXXX
 Smith, William B., Jr., XXXXX
 Smolen, Michael, XXXXX
 Sokay, Leslie W., XXXXX
 Sommers, William J., XXXXX
 Sparrevohn, Frederic D. R., XXXXX
 Speed, Worth M., XXXXX
 Speer, Arthur E., XXXXX
 Spence, Ross E., XXXXX
 Spencer, Horace L., XXXXX
 Spiker, William O., XXXXX
 Spindler, Walter E., Jr., XXXXX
 Sprinkel, Milton D., XXXXX
 Sproul, Matthew, Jr., XXXXX
 Stahle, Paul J., XXXXX
 Stallsmith, Donald L., XXXXX
 Stanfield, Louis P., XXXXX
 Stanton, Charles E., XXXXX
 Stanton, Frank G., XXXXX
 Stark, Louis K., XXXXX
 Stauff, Oscar B., Jr., XXXXX
 Stearns, Seymour, XXXXX
 Steed, Cecil V., XXXXX
 Steele, Gordon H., Jr., XXXXX
 Steele, Ralph J., XXXXX
 Steelman, William D., XXXXX
 Steelnack, Einar H., Jr., XXXXX
 Steinberger, Alfred C., XXXXX
 Steinkraus, Lawrence W., XXXXX
 Stenger, Edward J., XXXXX
 Stephens, Joseph W., Jr., XXXXX
 Stevens, Blythe E., XXXXX
 Stillie, Edward O., XXXXX
 Stobie, William H., XXXXX
 Stockton, Floyd C., XXXXX
 Stockus, Leonard, XXXXX
 Stoepelwerth, Earl, XXXXX
 Stoker, Norman P., XXXXX
 Stokes, Arthur J., XXXX
 Stone, Leon, XXXXX
 Stoner, Charles W., XXXXX
 Stooksberry, Sam D., XXXXX
 Story, Harvey L., XXXXX
 Stowell, Frederick R., XXXXX
 Strand, George E., XXXX

Strange, Russell P., XXXXXX
 Stringfellow, Glassell S., XXXXXX
 Strong, Roy L., XXXXXX
 Strook, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Struby, Joseph R., XXXXXX
 Stubblefield, Lee E., XXXXXX
 Stuber, Harold B., XXXXXX
 Stump, Charles F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, Harold J., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, James E., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, Woodfin, M., XXXXXX
 Sumner, Charles D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sunderland, Lloyd E., XXXXXX
 Sunderman, Everett C., XXXXXX
 Suprenant, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Surowiec, Eugene L., XXXXXX
 Susong, Charles J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Suther, Fred L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Svenson, Wesley W., XXXXXX
 Swan, Frederic C., XXXXXX
 Swedberg, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Sweeney, Daniel J., XXXXXX
 Swisher, Keith D., XXXXXX
 Talbot, Philip B., XXXXXX
 Tarasko, Frank E., XXXXXX
 Tarwater, Benjamin W., XXXXXX
 Tate, Clark A., XXXXXX
 Tatslo, Theodore G., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Hubert J., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Liston T., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Ulysses S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tebbs, Merlin E., XXXXXX
 Tennyson, Allen R., XXXXXX
 Terry, Vernon P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Thomas, John B., XXXXXX
 Thomas, John H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Brian C., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Byron M., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Cary A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Edward L., XXXXXX
 Thompson, John, XXXXXX
 Thompson, John C., XXXXXX
 Thorn, James R., XXXXXX
 Thresher, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Tibbets, Oscar J., XXXXXX
 Tips, George R., XXXXXX
 Tiroux, Clyde B., XXXXXX
 Tittsworth, James H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Todd, Vernon R., XXXXXX
 Toler, Harold M., XXXXXX
 Townsend, George E., XXXXXX
 Trakowski, Albert C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Traverso, Normand H., XXXXXX
 Traylor, Alwyn W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tremblay, Armand L., XXXXXX
 Trimble, George L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Trout, Darvin L., XXXXXX
 Trueblood, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Trueblood, Roger W., XXXXXX
 Truitt, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Trumbo, Charles E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tucker, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Tucker, Ralph D., XXXXXX
 Tuel, Houston N., XXXXXX
 Tull, Gordon F., XXXXXX
 Turner, Howard D., XXXXXX
 Turnier, Walter C., XXXXXX
 Tychsen, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Tyldesley, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Tyler, Loren S., XXXXXX
 Umphress, F. E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Unger, Edward C., XXXXXX
 Ureke, George, XXXXXX
 Valentine, James W., XXXXXX
 VanBlaricum, Wilmer A., XXXXXX
 VanBloom, Jay C., XXXXXX
 VanBruggen, Richard, XXXXXX
 Vanhoy, Lonnie E., XXXXXX
 Vaughn, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Vella, Vito T., XXXXXX
 Verbeck, Ernest L., XXXXXX
 Verhagen, Kenneth W., XXXXXX
 Verhulst, Florent J., Jr., XXXX
 Versurah, Vincent V., XXXXXX
 Vester, Curtis P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Vilcek, Edward J., XXXXXX
 Vincent, Robert W., XXXXXX

Vizi, Joseph C., XXXXXX
 Vogel, James J., XXXXXX
 Voss, Clyde K., XXXXXX
 Vowell, Fred C., XXXXXX
 Vowinkel, Merlin J., XXXXXX
 Wack, Joseph H., XXXXXX
 Wagaman, Merle A., XXXXXX
 Waggener, Herman A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wagner, James M., XXXXXX
 Walker, Barton F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Walker, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Walker, Harold E., XXXXXX
 Walker, James C., XXXXXX
 Walker, John D., XXXXXX
 Walker, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Waller, Charles S., XXXXXX
 Waller, Roy E., XXXXXX
 Walsh, Edward M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Walsh, James J., XXXXXX
 Walters, William J., XXXXXX
 Wampler, Louis C., XXXXXX
 Ward, Albert T., XXXXXX
 Wardner, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Warner, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Warren, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Warren, Johnnie J., XXXXXX
 Waterfill, Eugene A., XXXXXX
 Waters, Olen L., XXXXXX
 Watkins, Doyce L., XXXXXX
 Watson, James A., XXXXXX
 Watson, Paul C., XXXXXX
 Watts, William A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Weaver, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Webb, Bert H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Webster, Louis A., XXXXXX
 Webster, Frederick L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Webster, John A., XXXXXX
 Weeks, Roy F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wehrman, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 Weidenbusch, Albert C., XXXXXX
 Weir, Gerald C., XXXXXX
 Weir, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Welborn, James E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wells, Mac C., XXXXXX
 Welsh, Stephen J., XXXXXX
 Wennergren, William A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wenzel, Lloyd M. N., XXXXXX
 Werber, William A., XXXXXX
 Wernette, Eugene C., XXXXXX
 Wertz, John C., XXXXXX
 West, Wielding F., XXXXXX
 West, James P., XXXXXX
 West, Sammy A., XXXXXX
 Westerman, Raymond S., XXXXXX
 Wheeler, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 White, Harry A., Jr., XXXXXX
 White, Jon E., XXXXXX
 White, Morris D., XXXXXX
 White, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 White, Robert G., XXXXXX
 White, Ross D., XXXXXX
 White, Victor M., XXXXXX
 Whittington, Curtis A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wholley, Francis G., XXXXXX
 Whye, Harry D., XXXXXX
 Wiechert, Stanley J., XXXXXX
 Wiese, Frank E., XXXXXX
 Wiggins, Leland R., XXXXXX
 Wilborn, William T., XXXXXX
 Wiley, John C., XXXXXX
 Wilhelm, Andrew C., XXXXXX
 Wilkins, Linus A., XXXXXX
 Wilkins, Paul H., XXXXXX
 Wilkowski, Ernie W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Will, William F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wille, Herman B., XXXXXX
 Wille, Thomas, XXXXXX
 Williams, Arthur F., XXXXXX
 Williams, Evan E., XXXXXX
 Williams, George M., XXXXXX
 Williams, Hubert L., XXXXXX
 Williams, James F., XXXXXX
 Williams, Lawrence, XXXXXX
 Williams, Paul R., XXXXXX
 Williams, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Williams, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Williams, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Williamson, Louis O., XXXXXX
 Wills, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Clifford A., XXXX
 Wilson, Elbert, Jr., XXXXXX

Wilson, James R., XXXXXX
 Wilson, John E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Lee V., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Merle E., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Roy E., XXXXXX
 Wilson, William, XXXXXX
 Wilson, Woodrow W., XXXXXX
 Wine, Paul H., XXXXXX
 Winfree, Douglas W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wise, John F., XXXXXX
 Wise, John W., XXXXXX
 Woda, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Wolfe, Charles S., XXXXXX
 Wood, Denver J., XXXXXX
 Wood, Edwin A., XXXXXX
 Wood, John B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wood, William A., XXXXXX
 Woods, George K., XXXXXX
 Woodward, John L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Woodworth, William C., XXXXXX
 Woody, Rufus, Jr., XXXX
 Woolridge, Ray E., XXXXXX
 Wozniak, Stanley E., XXXXXX
 Wright, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Wright, Noble D., XXXXXX
 Wright, Roy P., XXXXXX
 Wurth, Herbert L., XXXXXX
 Wylie, Billy C., XXXXXX
 Yentz, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Yorra, Arthur, XXXXXX
 Young, Barnett B., XXXXXX
 Young, Pete H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Young, William A., XXXXXX
 Younger, John P., XXXXXX
 Youngs, James R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Zedler, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Zerr, Bert R., XXXXXX
 Zimmerman, Pershing G., XXXXXX
 Zimmerman, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Zimmermann, Hugo, XXXXXX
 Zimmermann, John A., XXXXXX
 Zunker, Leroy O., XXXXXX
 Zweifel, Harold J., XXXXXX
 Zwinger, Herman H., XXXXXX

Line of the Air Force (WAF)

Casey, Florence B., XXXXXX
 Dion, Lucille B., XXXXXX
 Holm, Jeanne M., XXXXXX
 Knight, Carolyn G., XXXXXX
 Lucas, Ruth A., XXXXXX
 McAmis, Agnes W., XXXXXX
 McKim, Anna M., XXXXXX
 O'Connor, Ellen G., XXXXXX
 Sewell, Jane, XXXXXX
 Watt, Marion L., XXXXXX
 Wier, Peggy J., XXXXXX

Medical Corps

Baker, Benjamin R., XXXXXX
 Ballinger, Edwin R., XXXXXX
 Bashore, Sidney M., XXXXXX
 Berry, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Bittick, Paul, Jr., XXXXXX
 Burner, Alvin M., XXXXXX
 Caris, Timothy N., XXXXXX
 Coles, John E., XXXXXX
 Collins, Frederick G., XXXXXX
 Dawson, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Dobyns, James H., XXXXXX
 Fitch, Ray F., XXXXXX
 Flint, John S., XXXXXX
 Ford, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Gabby, Samuel L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Goltra, Evan R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hines, Henry L., XXXXXX
 Holcomb, Thomas M., XXXXXX
 Jones, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Kern, Sidney B., XXXXXX
 Livermore, David L., XXXXXX
 Lofton, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 McGrade, Hugh F., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Hugh B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Morese, Kenneth N., XXXXXX
 Nafis, Warren A., XXXXXX
 Preston, Rhea S., XXXXXX
 Reiner, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Robison, Jack R., XXXXXX
 Ryan, Arthur E., XXXXXX
 Shirley, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Smith, Edward P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, J. Lewis, Jr., XXXXXX

Spiro, Franklyn C., XXXXXX
 Starrett, Jack R., XXXXXX
 Streete, Billie G., XXXXXX
 Thompson, William W., XXXXXX
 VanVranken, Eugene E., XXXXXX
 Warren, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Weigel, Arthur E., XXXXXX
 Wesp, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Wheaton, Jerrold L., XXXXXX
 Whitsell, Wilber R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wolter, David F., XXXXXX
 Wrede, Henry F., Jr., XXXXXX

Dental Corps

Ambrose, James A., XXXXXX
 Ayres, Elmer V., XXXXXX
 Barale, Philip A., XXXXXX
 Bergmann, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Best, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Cole, James B., XXXXXX
 Davis, Edward E., XXXXXX
 Fritz, Jackson W., XXXXXX
 Funk, Edward C., XXXXXX
 Hill, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Hoot, Norman G., XXXXXX
 Hughes, Wilbur R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jamieson, Glenn W., XXXXXX
 Jones, Eugene H., XXXXXX
 Knoll, Oliver J., XXXXXX
 Kolodny, Stanley C., XXXXXX
 Kurth, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Leonard, Ovide R., XXXXXX
 Long, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Malloy, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Masters, William Z., XXXXXX
 McCall, Clarence M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Milbourn, Arthur L., XXXXXX
 Nicoletti, Joseph P., XXXXXX
 Potts, Henry R., XXXXXX
 Raab, Lester W., XXXXXX
 Reese, Robert T., XXXXXX
 Schilb, Ensile I., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sprague, William G., XXXXXX
 Staerkel, Julius G. R., XXXXXX
 Stillson, William T., XXXXXX
 Tarsitano, John J., XXXXXX
 Weaver, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Wyatt, James L., Jr., XXXXXX

Veterinary Corps

Hayman, William P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Thomas, George O., Jr., XXXXXX

Medical Service Corps

Adrounie, V. Harry, XXXXXX
 Burke, Charles S., XXXXXX
 Carter, Russell J., XXXXXX
 Conner, Ned F., XXXXXX
 Duquette, Louis F., XXXXXX
 Ehardt, Frederick, XXXXXX
 Henry, James E., XXXXXX
 Herrin, Daniel M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hill, Leonard D., XXXXXX
 Hjort, Arthur W., XXXXXX
 James, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 Johnson, John A., XXXXXX
 Jones, Thomas C., XXXXXX
 Laroocca, Eugene W., XXXXXX
 Lindsay, Charles W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Little, Herman I., XXXXXX
 Morden, Harold R., XXXXXX
 Morgan, Floyd E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Saul, Lee I., XXXXXX
 Schirmer, Walter D., XXXXXX
 Schult, Harold G., XXXXXX
 Schwartz, Seymour, XXXXXX
 Skewes, Kenneth W., XXXXXX
 Smith, Chauncey W., XXXXXX
 Smith, Stuart S., XXXXXX
 Smyth, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 Tayloe, Leon T., XXXXXX
 Washburn, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Weller, William E., XXXXXX
 Willett, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Woolf, Henry M., XXXXXX
 Zellers, Billy B., XXXXXX

Nurse Corps

Arrington, Agnes M., XXXXXX
 Carmine, Flora G., XXXXXX
 Clark, Leota H., XXXXXX
 Coats, Ada L., XXXXXX

Cook, Ruby, XXXXXX
 Dodson, Dorothy M., XXXXXX
 Dunsmore, Elizabeth M., XXXXXX
 Elam, Geraldine E., XXXXXX
 Fahrenkopf, Bernadette K., XXXXXX
 Gersema, Vivian M., XXXXXX
 Hoefly, Ethel A., XXXXXX
 Jernigan, Marguerite L., XXXXXX
 McNulty, Margaret J., XXXXXX
 Neese, Sara K., XXXXXX
 Respini, Ellen M., XXXXXX

Chaplain

Dickinson, James H., XXXXXX
 Minor, Earl W., XXXXXX
 O'Laughlin, John C., XXXXXX
 Penrod, Everett D., XXXXXX
 Smith, Meredith P., XXXXXX

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Acker, Michael W., XXXXXX
 Adame, Frederick P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Almanzar, Donald H., XXXXXX
 Altenhofen, William H., XXXXXX
 Anthony, Russell D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Austin, Roger J., XXXXXX
 Beatty, James D., XXXXXX
 Betz, John C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Biesiadecki, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Binkowski, Francis S., XXXXXX
 Blaker, Philip C., XXXXXX
 Blecha, Dennis L., XXXXXX
 Bloyder, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 Bondurant, Robert A., 3d, XXXXXX
 Bowers, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Bowles, James E., XXXXXX
 Boyer, George K., XXXXXX
 Bredahl, Myron D., XXXXXX
 Bria, Lawrence S., XXXXXX
 Brown, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Buchholz, Francis J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Buchner, Ronald H., XXXXXX
 Byerly, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Cable, Dick A., XXXXXX
 Cain, James E., XXXXXX
 Caldwell, William B., XXXXXX
 Callari, Walter C., XXXXXX
 Canter, Ronald M., XXXXXX
 Carlin, Jerry L., XXXXXX
 Carnes, Frederick E., XXXXXX
 Centala, Martin D., XXXXXX
 Chapman, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Cheney, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cheshire, Frank E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Clark, Chris W., XXXXXX
 Clarkson, Rolland F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Clink, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Cloutier, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Cobb, John T., XXXXXX
 Conrad, Theodore J., XXXXXX
 Corcoran, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Cornwell, William C., XXXXXX
 Couranz, George R., XXXXXX
 Cox, Samuel J., XXXXXX
 Crase, Harold V., XXXXXX
 Crockett, Richard H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dasenbrock, Frederick E., XXXXXX
 Davis, James R., XXXXXX
 DeBell, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 DeBellis, Leonard M., XXXXXX
 Degler, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Dellalibera, Gino, XXXXXX
 Dempsey, James C., XXXXXX
 Devin, Phillip D., XXXXXX
 Dillow, James D., XXXXXX
 Dimario, Michael F., XXXXXX
 Dixon, Reuben T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Doan, Larry R., XXXXXX
 Drew, Philip M., XXXXXX
 Dunlap, Frederic C., XXXXXX
 Dwell, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Eastlack, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Elsesser, Frederick L., XXXXXX
 Englund, David B., XXXXXX
 Entreklin, Herbert L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ewing, David L., XXXXXX
 Fass, Peter J., XXXXXX
 Felton, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Flaherty, George C., XXXXXX
 Foxwell, Vaughn M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Frost, Spencer C., 3d, XXXXXX
 Fuelling, Clinton P., XXXXXX
 Gahm, Philip S., XXXXXX
 Gamble, John E., XXXXXX
 Gardner, Carl B., XXXXXX
 Gardner, Maurice G., XXXXXX
 Giambri, Philip, Jr., XXXXXX
 Gieszelmann, Edward L., XXXXXX
 Gist, Phillip M., XXXXXX
 Glenn, Robert L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Glime, Douglas G., XXXXXX
 Gordon, Herbert D., XXXXXX
 Griffith, Gerald D., XXXXXX
 Grudl, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Gulliford, James P., XXXXXX
 Hansen, Lynn M., XXXXXX
 Harris, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Harriss, Winston R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hart, Paul W., XXXXXX
 Hartshorn, Gordon C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Harty, John R., XXXXXX
 Havey, James H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hawkins, John L., XXXXXX
 Healy, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Hein, James L., XXXXXX
 Heller, Jerome, XXXXXX
 Henderson, Donald T., XXXXXX
 Henderson, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Hill, Roger H., XXXXXX
 Hilliard, John R., XXXXXX
 Hiltner, John W., XXXXXX
 Hitt, Ellis F., XXXXXX
 Hoeting, Paul M., XXXXXX
 Holaday, James W., XXXXXX
 Holko, Andrew R., XXXXXX
 Huggins, Lawrence E., XXXXXX
 Hulet, Douglas G., XXXXXX
 Hullender, John R., XXXXXX
 Humphreys, Robert P., XXXXXX
 Hunsaker, John R., XXXXXX
 Hunter, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Hutchison, Daniel B., XXXXXX
 Jacobs, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Bruce W., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Howard R., XXXXXX
 Johnson, James D., XXXXXX
 Johnson, William P., XXXXXX
 Jones, Eugene J., XXXXXX
 Keesey, Michael S. W., XXXXXX
 Kelley, Gilbert F., XXXXXX
 Kimmell, Wayne E., XXXXXX
 King, Richard T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Klein, Carl J., XXXXXX
 Knecht, Marvin J., XXXXXX
 Koepke, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Krause, Frederick A., XXXXXX
 Kudriavetz, Stephen P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kunkle, Elmer E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lackey, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Laing, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Lapoit, Thomas, XXXXXX
 Lawhon, James B., XXXXXX
 Lawrence, William F., XXXXXX
 Leldolf, Emil J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lemon, Melville L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lester, Hugh H., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Samuel E., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Thomas H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Linden, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Lister, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Lott, Thomas M., XXXXXX
 Lux, Edward C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mabrey, Wayne E., XXXXXX
 Macon, John C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Magner, Stanley D., XXXXXX
 Manly, James H., XXXXXX
 Manske, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Matalucci, Rudolph V., XXXXXX
 Mauldin, Winford E., XXXXXX
 McClanahan, James R., XXXXXX
 McDonald, Warren R., XXXXXX
 McDonnell, John J., XXXXXX
 McGauley, Gerald M., XXXXXX
 McGlade, Charles J., XXXXXX
 McGrath, Denis P., XXXXXX
 McKinley, Howard L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Michel, Jerome A., XXXXXX
 Milan, William G. 2d, XXXXXX
 Miller, Carl M., XXXXXX
 Mims, George E., XXXXXX
 Mileynek, Roger G., XXXXXX
 Motley, Langhorne A., XXXXXX

Mundy, William E., XXXXX
 Murphy, Timothy J., Jr., XXXXX
 Napier, Alexander J., Jr., XXXXX
 Napier, Wilton K., XXXXX
 Neal, Robert D., XXXXX
 Nellans, William L., XXXXX
 Neubauer, Charles H., Jr., XXXXX
 Nielsen, Dennis E., XXXXX
 Nunez, Joe C., XXXXX
 Parker, Frederic C., XXXXX
 Paskin, Harvey M., XXXX
 Pehoushek, Joseph W., XXXXX
 Penick, Thomas E., Jr., XXXXX
 Perna, Louis C., Jr., XXXXX
 Phillips, Kenneth E., XXXXX
 Proud, James G., XXXXX
 Pryse, Zack D., 3d, XXXXX
 Puddy, Donald R., XXXXX
 Quay, Perry J., XXXX
 Reely, Robert H., Jr., XXXXX
 Regan, Thomas A., XXXXX
 Ridgway, Charles Z., Jr., XXXXX
 Roberts, Dennis K., XXXXX
 Robertson, Dennis C., XXXXX
 Rodgers, Thomas E., XXXX
 Rogers, Billy D., XXXXX
 Roth, John C., Jr., XXXXX
 Sabine, Paul B., XXXXX
 Sandberg, Robert, XXXX
 Sapp, Richard S., XXXXX
 Sawyer, Jerry A., XXXXX
 Schaff, William J., XXXXX
 Schneider, Donald A., XXXXX
 Schoepner, John P., Jr., XXXXX
 Schumacher, Leon B., XXXXX
 Semrad, Vernon V., XXXXX
 Senay, Robert A., XXXXX
 Sharp, Arthur S., XXXXX
 Shearer, Milo E., XXXXX
 Shilling, William M., XXXXX
 Shovein, Donald L., XXXXX
 Simaitis, Eugene, XXXX
 Slack, John L., XXXXX
 Slinkard, John D., XXXXX
 Small, Larry F., XXXXX
 Smith, Rodger W., XXXXX
 Snyder, Arnold L., Jr., XXXXX
 Sohmer, Elliot, XXXXX
 Sommerfeld, Dale A., XXXXX
 Songy, Edward J., XXXXX
 Spinler, Darrell J., XXXXX
 Stauber, Ralph O., Jr., XXXXX
 Steedly, James E., Jr., XXXXX
 Steeves, Richard A., XXXXX
 Steinmeier, James H., XXXXX
 Stogdill, Robert E., XXXXX
 Stokes, Ronald B., XXXXX
 Surette, Robert G., XXXXX
 Taft, Ronald H., XXXXX
 Tamura, Thomas T., XXXXX
 Tesoro, Salvador R., XXXXX
 Tetrault, Frank A., XXXXX
 Thomas, Weston D., XXXXX
 Tillander, John P., XXXXX
 Tolson, Joel A., XXXXX
 Townsend, Ralph D., XXXXX
 Troyer, Thomas G., XXXXX
 Turner, Robert F., XXXXX
 Turoff, Michael C., XXXXX
 Uhlig, George F., XXXXX
 Uliss, Alan M., XXXXX
 Vache, Floyd A., XXXXX
 Vegoda, Paul R., XXXXX
 Viola, John T., XXXXX
 Visnick, Arnold M., XXXXX
 Vitt, Jerry W., XXXXX
 Wagner, Thomas J., XXXXX
 Ward, Charles J., XXXXX
 Ward, Thomas M., XXXXX
 Ware, Philip K., XXXXX
 Weiss, David W., XXXXX
 Weisul, Charles J., Jr., XXXXX
 Wendland, Gustav E., XXXXX
 Werking, Dennis M., XXXXX
 Whelan, James F., 3d, XXXXX
 White, Craig M., XXXX
 White, Larry D., XXXXX
 White, Richard E., XXXXX
 Whitmire, Jack N., XXXX
 Widener, Warren H., XXXXX
 Wilhelm, Luther R., XXXXX
 Wilson, Bernard E., XXXXX

Wilson, Clifford B., XXXXX
 Wilson, Winfred A., XXXXX
 Wingert, Charles J., XXXXX
 Wittmaack, Charles S., XXXXX
 Wright, James E., XXXXX
 Wright, William B., XXXXX
 Wylie, Donald L., XXXXX
 York, John E., XXXXX
 Yorks, Robert A., XXXXX
 Young, Donald E., XXXXX
 Youngblood, James H., XXXXX
 Zaricor, Wayne M., XXXXX

Medical Service Corps

Bryant, John L., Jr., XXXXX
 Conley, Raymond P., XXXXX
 Coughlin, John J., XXXXX
 Fry, David A., XXXXX
 Gabriel, James E., XXXX
 Greene, Wendell J., XXXXX
 Hudock, Jack, XXXXX
 Mason, William M., XXXXX
 Robison, Bobbie S., XXXXX
 Schulz, John F., XXXXX
 Silliman, Charles L., XXXXX
 Smith, Michael F., XXXXX

Nurse Corps

Buksa, Beatrice J., XXXXX
 Smith, Alvin W., Jr., XXXXX

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald L. Abbey
 Terry A. Abell
 Charles E. Adams
 Gary R. Adams
 Phillip A. Adams
 Shelby O. Alcott
 John W. Alford
 Bruce D. Alitt
 George R. Allen
 John W. Almond, Jr.
 David M. Anderson
 Richard G. Anderson
 Ross K. Anderson, Jr.
 William G. Anderson
 William P. Anderson
 Richard L. Arvedlund
 John W. Asher III
 Lawrence I. Astor
 Larry R. Atkinson
 John P. Aucella
 Richard M. Augur
 Richard G. Bachmann
 Harold E. Bahr, Jr.
 David A. Baker
 Gary A. Baldwin
 Harry F. Ball, Jr.
 Lionel A. W. Banda
 Wayne C. Barlow
 William C. Barney
 Bart H. Bartlett, Jr.
 Creighton E. Barton
 Thomas J. Batzel
 Stephen W. Baumgart
 William J. Baumhofer
 George R. Baxter
 Travis N. Beard
 Robert F. Beckham
 Denis J. W. Bell
 Henry L. Bell, Jr.
 John C. Bender
 Franklin L. Bennett
 Robert L. Bennett
 Russell E. Berry, Jr.
 David A. Bingemann
 Michael R. Biro
 Cecil L. Blackwell, Jr.
 Carl M. Bohley
 John R. Boley
 C. Ward Bond, Jr.
 Michael R. Bonsignore
 Robert A. Borlet
 William E. Bowen
 Thomas E. Bowman
 III
 Ronald A. Boyd
 Michael B. Bracy
 William E. Bradford
 Thomas K. Brandt
 Harold A. Breard, Jr.
 Alfred L. Breen, Jr.
 Robert J. Bridgeman
 William S. Brinkley
 Richard W. Brown
 Peter A. Browne
 Vernon G. Browne
 Richard B. Bryant
 Earl F. Buck
 Duane W. Buckingham
 Thomas D. Buckley
 Kenneth R. Buell
 Richard W. Buelow
 Stephen M. Buescher
 Melvin I. Bunnell
 John P. Burke
 John P. Burns, Jr.
 William R. Burns
 Charles J. Bustamante
 Francis W. Butler
 David T. Byrnes
 Richard P. Byrnes
 John J. Calande, Jr.
 Ronald J. Calhoun
 Charles N. Calvano
 Brian F. Campbell
 Cletus L. Campbell
 Robert L. Campbell
 William H. Campbell, Jr.
 Lee B. Cargill
 Kenneth L. Carlsen
 William R. Carmichael, Jr.
 Lawrence A. Carpenter
 Joseph F. Carroll
 Peter C. Carrothers
 James O. Carter
 John Castro
 Anthony J. Celebrezze, Jr.
 Austin E. Chapman
 Richard B. Cherry
 Donald W. Christensen
 John B. Christie II
 Arthur D. Clark
 Dennis M. Clark
 Wayne A. Clarke
 Joseph S. Collins
 Michael G. Colston
 John M. Colyer, Jr.
 Dennis R. Conley

James B. Connaughton
 John D. Conroy
 John F. Cook, Jr.
 Joseph T. Cook
 Robert E. Cooper
 Michael T. Corgan
 William L. Coulter
 Landon G. Cox, Jr.
 Mark F. Crane
 Michael P. Cronin
 Robert R. Cronin
 George D. M. Cunha, Jr.
 Andrew J. Curtin
 James H. Czerwonky
 Eli Dabich, Jr.
 Thomas B. Dade
 Henry F. Dalton
 Nicholas T. Daramus, Jr.
 Shaun M. Daugherty
 Milo P. Daughters II
 Alexander B. Daunis
 Francis L. Davey, Jr.
 Philip W. Dean
 Victor E. Dean
 Felix E. de Golian
 III
 Charles E. Dehnert
 Theodore J. Del Gaizo
 James J. DeLong
 James A. Dennis, Jr.
 Antonio F. DeSantis
 Ernest M. Detrick II
 John H. Detweiler
 Peter T. Deutermann
 Charles C. DiBari
 Michael L. Dickerson
 Anthony P. Ditto
 Dennis C. Doherty
 Lawrence A. Doll
 Drake A. Donahue
 John J. Donegan, Jr.
 John O. Donelan
 Charles A. Donovan, Jr.
 Merrill H. Dorman
 Alfred F. Dougherty, Jr.
 Carl L. Doughtie
 James R. Duke
 Stephen M. Duncan
 Michael J. Dunn
 David L. Durfee
 William A. Earner, Jr.
 Robert L. Eastman
 David J. Ebert
 Jacob Edge II
 Frank R. Edrington II
 Frank E. Elissing III
 William T. Ellison
 George W. Emery
 James C. Farley
 Evan A. Evans
 George P. Farrin
 Peter A. Featherstone
 Steven H. Ferencie, Jr.
 James R. Fields
 Joseph H. Fields
 Mario P. Fiori
 John N. Fischer, Jr.
 John E. Fitzgerald
 William C. Fitzgerald
 Charles G. Fishburn
 George R. Fister
 Wayne A. Fogel II
 Roland G. Fontaine
 James D. Fontana
 Paul S. Forman
 Robert D. Forster
 Joseph F. Fossella
 Ted G. Franklin
 Charles D. Frazer
 Ernest R. Freeman
 Donald R. Freese
 Charles E. French
 David E. Frost
 Charles E. Galloway
 Abel A. Garcia
 James C. Garde
 Willard J. Gentile
 Raymond "O" Gibson, Jr.
 Robert G. Giddens, Jr.
 James E. Gill
 Vincent J. Gilroy, Jr.
 Roger B. Gläes
 Arnold Glassner
 Charles E. Gosnell
 Lawrence L. Graham, Jr.
 Donald E. Grant
 Wiley G. Grantham
 George W. Graves, Jr.
 Thomas R. Green
 David L. Greene
 Francis C. Gregory
 Richard O. Gregory
 Matthew M. Gretchen
 George W. Grider, Jr.
 Harold R. Grover
 Philip S. Gubbins
 George R. Guest
 Richard E. Guffey
 William T. Gunn III
 William C. Gustafson
 Stephen D. Guthrie
 Frederick P. Haeni
 William D. Hahn
 James R. Hall
 Thomas F. Hall
 William J. Hamilton
 IV
 James R. Hand
 Tom B. Haney
 Carl K. Hansen
 William L. Hansen
 Orville O. Hanson
 Jerry L. Harken
 Michael J. Harman
 Robert L. Harper
 Ben W. Harris
 Jon R. Harris
 Wilson F. Harris, Jr.
 Robert W. Harrison, Jr.
 Edward S. Hartford, Jr.
 John M. Harvey
 Timothy R. Harvey
 William J. Haslet
 Joel K. Heine
 Raymond R. Heins
 G. Alan Hellawell, Jr.
 Charles F. Helsper
 Don R. Hidy
 Francis W. Hilton, Jr.
 William A. Himchak
 Henry C. Hirsch
 Raymond A. Hoag
 William A. Hoefling III
 James J. Hogan III
 William R. Hollenack
 Frank C. Holmes
 David C. Honhart
 John M. Hood, Jr.
 Irvin G. Hopkins II
 Larry M. Hopkins
 Rodney Hopkinson
 Major K. Howe
 George C. Howell
 Stephen G. Hoy
 William C. Hughes, Jr.
 David N. Hull
 Jerry F. Huss
 James E. Hutcheson, Jr.
 James G. Hutchins
 George R. Hutter
 Richard J. Hyland
 Niles A. Iannone
 Albert A. Iager
 Marshall N. Jackson
 Donald E. Jacobs
 Michael R. Jacqmin
 Paul T. Jara
 Ronald A. Jarvis
 Joel B. Jaudon
 Arne E. Johnson
 Patrick W. Johnson
 William S. Johnson

Dennis R. Jones	Richard B. McKenna	John L. Parks	Charles F. Sell	Raymond E. Vaughan	Michael K. Whitmore
Thomas E. Jones	Russell E. McKenna, Jr.	Phillip E. Parotti	Stuart W. Settle, Jr.	David A. Vetter	Robert A. Wildman
Thomas H. Jones, Jr.	David M. McLean	Bernard L. Patterson	Norman J. Shackelton, Jr.	Vernon H. Von Sydow	Patrick W. Wilkes
Jerry W. Jordan	Michael J. McQuown	James K. Patterson	Richard J. Shanley, Jr.	Peter G. Vreeland	John G. Wilkinson, Jr.
Wesley E. Jordan, Jr.	Ronald R. Machens	William J. Pawlyk	Joseph D. Sharpe, Jr.	Kenneth B. Waide, Jr.	Richard Wilkinson
"J" Henry Kahrs III	Donald C. MacLaughlin, Jr.	John W. Pearson, Jr.	James A. Shaw, Jr.	Richard G. Wakefield	Theodore A. Willandt
Frederick H. Kaiser, Jr.	Charles S. Maclin	Rufus J. Pearson III	Robert "D" Shaw, Jr.	Michael T. Wallace	James C. Williams
John R. Kallestad	Lynn J. Madison	Raymond L. Pekary	John W. Sheehan, Jr.	Edward L. Walsh	Michael V. Williams
William J. Kaman	Robert A. Maier	William L. Penn	Michael H. Shelley	Ronald F. Walters	Richard H. Williams
Richard E. Kane, Jr.	David G. Maples III	Chad A. Pennington	Thomas R. Sheridan	Arthur E. Walther	James K. Williamson
Felix F. Karabasz	Charles W. Marik	James N. Penrod	Allan Sherman	Don H. Walton	Ronald J. Willis
Jack L. Karson	Phillip S. Marsden	Brian T. Perkinson	James M. Shull, Jr.	Robert E. Waples	Albert S. Wilson
Karl L. Kaup	Larry R. Marsh	Peter R. Peroni	David C. Shute	Trenwith R. Ward	Gary W. Wilson
Robert J. Kearns III	William L. Marsh	John T. Pessoney	Forrest N. Siburt, Jr.	Jon C. Warn	Richard A. Wilson
Robert W. Keeler	Glenn T. Martinsen	John C. Peterson	Walter F. Sichel, Jr.	Lawrence F. Warnken	Ronald K. Wilson
Walter R. Keen	Eddy J. Mascitto	John J. Pfeiffer	Richard L. Sidford	Roy D. Warren	William R. Witcraft
William J. Keffer, Jr.	Donald W. Mathis	Jerald L. Pinneker	Derek "J" Simmons	Joseph "H" Waterfall	Raymond L. Witter
Richard E. Kell	John W. Matton	Robert Polich	James C. Singer	Peter D. Waters	Talmadge A. Womble
Bernard J. Kelley, Jr.	Michael E. Mays	John E. Pollard	Jimmy R. Slaughter	Edward J. Weaving, Jr.	Paul F. Woods
Keith R. Ker	Gerald R. Mezitis	Joseph J. Polli	Terry R. Sloan	Bruce C. Webb	John B. Worcester
Albert W. Key	Roger W. Mahle, Jr.	Jerauld S. Prather	James A. Small II	Richard L. Weidman	Julian M. Wright, Jr.
Wilson D. Key	Denis C. Meredith	Richard E. Pratt, Jr.	Selden M. Small	Arthur H. Weidner	Malcolm S. Wright
James E. Killian	Alan N. Merkel	David B. Puckett	William E. Small	Roland L. Weidt	Patrick E. Wright
Ronald W. Kilmer	James A. Metcalfe	Thomas G. Puckett	Allan R. Smelley	John J. Wermuth III	Frank M. Wroblewski
George L. King, Jr.	Kenneth S. Metviner	Peter D. Quinton	Stanley K. Smiley	Carl T. Westgard	Richard H. Wytenbach
Max H. Kirkpatrick	Thomas E. Meyer	William D. Rabin	Gary Smith	Frank R. Whalen	Milton E. Yarbrough, Jr.
Ronald J. Klemick	David W. Meyers	Frank M. Radik	Homer F. Smith II	Chester G. White, Jr.	Douglas H. Zanzot
Daniel J. Koczur	Frederick E. Meyett, Jr.	James V. Ragano	Randall R. Smith	Donald M. White, Jr.	Sherwood R. Zimmerman
James R. Koehn	Andrejs M. Mezmalis	Roger L. Rahl	Wilton J. Smith, Jr.	Larry R. White	
Carl S. Kolon	Richard A. Miehle	Donald R. Raulston	Thomas E. Sollars	Peter R. White	
David W. Konold, Jr.	Thomas J. Mikulis, Jr.	James A. Rave	Peter W. Soverel	Jay N. Whiting	
Joseph E. Kotowski	Richard J. Miles	Benjamin D. Redd, Jr.	Michael J. Spear		
Robert A. Kottke, Jr.	Joel D. Millen	Thomas G. Redford, Jr.	James H. Spruance III		
Karl M. Kozak	George M. Miller III	John R. Reed	James H. Stagemon, Jr.		
Michael S. Krause	Robert G. Miller	Thomas E. Reemelin	Michael W. Stegenga		
Eugene G. Kreinik	Thomas H. Miller	Donald L. Reeves, Jr.	David G. Stephan		
Eric W. Krieger	Robert W. Mills	David C. Reif	James H. Stewart		
Theodore K. Krohne	Roger J. Milos	Kenneth G. Reinhardt, Jr.	William J. Stewart		
James E. Kuneman	Charles S. Minter III	Keith E. Reynolds	Howard S. Stoddard		
Richard L. Kuntz	Richard W. Mister	John J. Richards	Charles W. Stone, Jr.		
Raymond A. Kutch	David B. A. Moore	Stephen W. Richter	John F. Stone		
Donald M. Lachata	Robert B. Moore II	David R. Riley	Michael D. Stout		
Robert E. LaGassa	Daniel H. Moran, Jr.	James E. P. Ring	Ralph H. Stowell, Jr.		
Thomas V. LaMay	William P. Moran, Jr.	Charles B. Robbins	Joseph C. Strasser		
James J. Lamb	Thomas E. Morgan, Jr.	Walter S. Roberts	Kevin F. Sullivan		
Charles L. Lamberth	Clayton K. Morse	William J. Roberts, Jr.	Frederick H. Sutherland		
James B. Lasswell	Wayne O. Mosher	Thomas J. Robertson	Paul W. Sutton		
Glenn P. Laury	Lyle J. Mulholland	David B. Robinson	Robert N. Tanis		
David F. Leake	George M. Musick III	Donald T. Rogers	James A. Tate		
Joseph Lederhaas	Charles M. Musitano	Richard B. Rogers	Alan B. Taylor		
George R. Leever	Frank K. Mutch	Peter L. Rollosen	Thomas L. Taylor		
Richard J. Lennox	James B. M. Myers	Philip J. Rooney	Wade H. Taylor III		
John M. Lents	Michael E. Nadolski	William R. Rosenfelt, Jr.	Ronald D. Tebben		
Bruce B. Lenz	William A. Naiva	Benjamin F. Ross III	Grant R. Telfer		
John E. Lesko	Anthony J. Nargi	Raymond H. Ross, Jr.	Erwin B. Templin, Jr.		
Austin S. Lett, Jr.	David A. Nelson	Thomas J. Rossa	Ronald F. Testa		
Jary W. Lewis	John W. Nelson	Paul V. Roundy III	Roger E. Tetraut		
Colen R. Lindell	Nicholas J. Nerangis	Edward A. Ruckner, Jr.	Raymond T. Theep		
Larry E. Linn	James H. Newell, Jr.	Walter B. Ruland	Gary L. Thomas		
Robert D. Little	Charles R. Newkirk	William A. Runkle, Jr.	Lalle H. Thompson, Jr.		
Thomas B. Locke	John H. Newsom	Lars H. Runquist	Olen D. Thompson		
Jerry T. Lockett	Robert C. Newton	John E. Ryan	William H. Thompson		
Carl F. Logan	Robert G. Nickerson	Jerud W. Ryker	James C. Thorell		
Herman J. Long, Jr.	Robert J. Niss	Paul Saacke	John C. Thorn		
Samuel J. Lo Presti	Robert G. Nobbs	Gerald W. Saber	David W. Thornhill		
George P. Love III	George F. Nolan	Donald E. Saidman	James C. Thornton		
Charles E. Lueth	Richard L. Nutt	Harry P. Salmon, Jr.	Craig L. Thrasher		
David B. Lutes	Anthony J. Oakes, Jr.	Kenneth T. Sanger	Robert B. Tieslau		
Charles S. Lynch	William H. Oatway III	Ian H. Sargent	Martin J. Tillapaugh		
Jimmy S. Lynne	Terence J. O'Brien	Peter P. Savage	Frank L. Tillotson		
Robert W. Lyons	Thomas J. O'Brien, Jr.	James J. Scanlon	Paul E. Tobin, Jr.		
Donald L. McAlister	Michael P. Obsitnik	Carl E. Schafer II	Stephen S. Toth		
John A. McAnally	Daniel G. O'Claray	Hugh E. Schall	Charles N. Tozer		
Edward F. McBride, Jr.	Charles P. O'Leary, Jr.	John M. Schantz	Charles A. Trabant		
John S. McCabe	Gerald H. Olandzenski	Ferdinand M. Schery	George P. Tracy		
William R. McCann, Jr.	David R. Oliver, Jr.	Paul Schleifer	Frederick E. Trani, Jr.		
Charles B. McCarthy, Jr.	Richard E. Omohundro, Jr.	Charles M. Schmidt, Jr.	John M. Truesdell		
Michael J. McCarthy	William J. Optiz	Ronald O. Schowalter	Eric A. Turner		
Martin W. McCreary, Jr.	Winthrop B. Orgera	Emil M. Schwing	James R. Turner		
Donald L. McCrory	Richard M. Ortwein	Crawford W. Scott	Harlan K. Ullman		
Michael N. McDermott	Robert B. Otis	Jon P. Scott	Willard L. Umphrey		
John E. McDonald	Michael A. Owen	Lawrence A. Scott	Clyde J. Van Arsdall		
John J. McDonald, Jr.	Richard R. Pace	Austin M. Seay	Robert L. Van Buren		
Kenneth R. McGuire	Don G. Palen	Clarence W. Seay, Jr.	Robert L. Van Nice, Jr.		
	Alexander J. Palenscar	Thomas L. Selden	George D. Vaughan		

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy (engineering duty) subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David P. Greeneisen
Richard J. Kinnear

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Traian Benchea	John M. McClure
Chester B. Cole	John E. McDermott
Kendall R. Cook	John F. McIntyre, Jr.
Fredric C. Davis	Robert "R" Newell
James M. DeFrancica	Gerald T. Nomura
James D. Driskell III	Robert L. Norton
Howard A. Ginter	Robert F. Price
Frederick E. Goodwin	Sidney P. Revere, Jr.
David H. Green	Max V. Ricketts, Jr.
Kenneth L. Grover	Michael J. Rubel
William Gushue, Jr.	Paul J. Ryan
Drake C. Hawkins	Gary E. Shay
Theodore J. Healy	Edward J. Shields
Daniel K. Hennessy	George M. Singer
Thomas C. Heslop	Richard M. Smith
Dennis W. Hobbs	Robert D. Stiger, Jr.
David G. Johnston, Jr.	Earl M. Stockslager
John M. Johnston	Erwin F. Storz
Alfred W. Kenlin	Imants A. Straupe-nicks
William L. Kennedy	Jackson R. Terwilliger
Richard F. Kleinfeldt	David W. Unsicker
James E. Leeper, Jr.	David A. Wells
Alan L. Lutz	Thomas D. Yanness

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard E. Andrews	Michael A. Pero, Jr.
Stephen H. Coester	Walter C. Pierce, Jr.
James W. Eckert	Richard M. Rohrbach
Gary R. Hosey	Donald R. Sheaffer
Robert T. Hudspeth	Stephen E. Stewart

The following-named Air Force Academy graduates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard L. Bunce
James B. Kerley
Louis S. Matjasko

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy,

subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas B. Ackland	Vernon A. Kalshan
James M. Adell	Ronald L. Lindsay
Ernest L. Andrews, Jr.	Daniel J. Lynch II
Thomas A. Bailey	Gary L. McClung
Lawrence P. Beam	Warren C. Miller, Jr.
Max H. Beasley, Jr.	Paul W. Muench
William E. Bugg	Donald R. Nelson
Robert N. Burris	John P. Oakwood
Michael R. Carr	Thomas R. Peterman
Francis H. Dietz	Jason M. Pilalas
James F. Felte	George C. Priebe, Jr.
Joseph J. Gareffa	William C. Sammons
James H. Harmon	Michael A. Scully
George R. Hundelt	Gary D. Weale
Thomas D. Jackson	Robert T. Webber

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Joseph R. Fischenich
Dennis W. H. Wong

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert O. Beals, Jr.	Vincent J. McHugh
Richard K. Belmore	William P. Needham
Robert G. Bennett	Collin D. Nipper
Russell H. Bern	Paul W. Northrup
Rudolph A. Bezrutch	Vernon B. Paul
Monte J. Blankenship	Randolph M. Ridgel
Arthur E. Buck, Jr.	James R. Roton
Loran V. Brealand	Neil E. Sampson
Donald O. Burrell	William D. Spencer
Donald E. Deburkate	Orville L. Stevens
Willbur E. Holton	Claude J. Walters
Raymond Johnson	Mitchell L. Williams
Kenneth R. Lindstrom	

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard L. Abbott	Gail F. Linn
Dall H. Andrew	Guy B. Logan, Jr.
Robert H. Ball	Duane M. Longcore
David H. Bennet, Jr.	Kenneth J. Lynes
Fred J. Bice	Larry E. Miles
Charles W. Boak	John H. Morgan II
Charles R. Brady	Aubrey R. Monish
Jerry B. Brown	Harvey G. Nelson
Frederick W. Bruns	John R. Ostromecky
John E. Caler	Lawrence D. Overman
David R. Campbell	Gerald T. Parker
Robert A. Clair	Charles S. Payne
Jackie L. Clark	Fred G. Perry
Ralph B. Clark, Jr.	Victor L. Peters
Charles L. Christensen	Karl J. Phaler
James A. Collins	Brian R. Quanbeck
William N. Cushard, Jr.	John J. Reed
Alan L. Dahlvig	Bob G. Rees
Stephen W. Dallas	Richard E. Reumann
Jack L. Detrick	David P. Richardson
Kenneth D. Denbow	William A. Robbins
Leo G. Dillon	Richard P. Roy
William E. Downs	Donald R. Ruegg
James B. Edmiston	Kermit L. Sawyer
Robert D. Ferguson	William C. Schmidt
John C. Finley	Eugene W. Scott
John L. Fry	Gerald W. Scott
James D. Gilbert	William J. Scott
Girard H. Gilpin	Richard F. Schuerger
James W. Goodspeed	John P. Segen
George W. Graft	Leon T. Semeter, Jr.
James F. Helt	George D. Sheerer
Peter L. Hendricks	Robert J. Shields
Richard D. Hill	Charles D. Shires
Anders Hokanson	Edgar C. Soly, Jr.
Rudolph A. Horst	Joseph A. Sowers
Kenneth L. Janssen	Stephen W. Smith
Carl R. Jokela	Robert C. Spencer
Raymond J. Judd	David L. Sterner
Adolf W. G. Kunze	Dale F. Stoecker
David E. Lilly	Stuart L. Tenney
	Gary R. Thompson

Charles W. Turley
Charles R. Veeck, Jr.
Richard G. T. Welsh
Marvin J. Weniger

John C. Vincent
Joe L. Wilkins
Ronald L. Williams
Charles E. Wilson

Michael G. Simpson (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy (engineering duty) in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps, as previously nominated and confirmed, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Jan G. Kloeck (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Rolland E. Greenburg (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Robert H. Riordan (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Bythel D. Dutton (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John F. Caratti	Robert E. Stanell
Ned L. Mangelson	Francis W. Wachter

Lawrence Cooke, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a chief warrant officer, W-4, in the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 1211.

The following-named limited duty officers, to be limited duty permanent chief warrant officers, W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Stewart V. Buchanan
Charles C. Kauffman, Jr.
Arnold J. Scanzillo

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard S. Davidson
William R. Showacre, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John D. Alden, Jr.
Peter E. Bies
Joseph A. Camamo

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald E. Applegate
Alfred Billotte

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Calvin W. Borchardt	Robert M. Hoffman
Michael Brenyo, Jr.	Robert P. Jones
Hugh D. Burke	James C. Kelly, Jr.
Carmen A. Clardello	John H. MacPherson
Jr.	John G. Mather
Joseph Dupcak, Jr.	Joseph P. McMahon
Peter L. Eckerson	Sam J. Poldmore
Ronald D. Giordan	Jerome "J" Rudolph
Duane A. Hansen	Robert G. Switala
Ronald K. Harris	Richard A. Thibodeau
Richard A. Hesby	James E. Vaught
Leonard F. Hodes	Arthur R. Vernino

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the

Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald R. Berg	William G. Housley III
Charles A. Cooper	William R. Knehan
Roland P. Duprey	James M. Mathers
William B. Finagin	Robert B. McWilliams
Wayne J. Fitzpatrick	Donald R. Merryfield
Teddy L. Fullhart	Lionel C. Neilans
William S. Harrison	John W. Porter
John L. Heibel, Jr.	Siegfried J. Schaberg
Earl T. Holdsworth, Jr.	Robert G. Triplett

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) selected as alternates, to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Neal P. Davis	Albert S. Mowery, Jr.
David E. Cordoba	Larry G. Harris
Harry B. Elmes	William Benjamin, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David G. Amey	Kenneth P. Sympson
Richard T. Barker	Paul F. Kramer
Abraham Bevis	Jerry R. Weibel

The following-named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William B. Terrill	Daniel J. Ogle
Albert N. Wheeler	Lance V. Bevins
John A. Woggon, Jr.	

The following-named (U.S. Military Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John R. Ahern	David R. Little
Benjamin E. Benjamin	Laurence R. Medlin
Jack O. Eitel	Alexander W. Whitaker
James R. Herd	

The following-named (Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John M. Anderson	Michael A. Marra
Peter L. Barth	William S. Marshall III
Noel C. Bing	Ronald R. Matthews
Robert A. Black, Jr.	Harry M. McCloy, Jr.
Walter J. Breede III	Perry W. Miles III
Gary E. Carlson	Joseph G. Morra
Joseph B. Clancy	Christopher D. Munger
William E. Cole II	John L. Newton
Bernis B. Conatser, Jr.	Ken W. Nisewaner
William D. Davidson	Peter S. Optekar
John D. De Holl	Alison H. Parker III
John W. Dohrman	Joseph R. Pleier
Clay J. Dugas II	Dirck K. Praeger
Leonard M. Eaton	Daryl L. Rabert
Richard W. Elsworth	Kenneth R. Ramsey
Patric S. Enright	John A. Rank III
Holger G. Ericsson, Jr.	Donald J. Reynolds
Joseph M. Favar	John A. Roney
James D. Field	Ludwig J. Schumacher
James A. Fisher	David R. Shore
Joel R. Gardner	Louis L. Simpleman
Bernard Grabowski	Charles A. Spadafora
Alfred L. Griggs	Herbert H. Swinburne, Jr.
William W. Hillgaertner	Glenn Takabayashi
Daniel A. Hitzelberger	Richard D. Tomlin
Otis E. Howard III	Douglas O. Tozour
Harold C. Johnston, Jr.	Emilio E. Varanini III
Richard C. Jones, Jr.	Joel M. Warshaw
Charles G. Jordan	Dudley M. Weathers
John A. Kelly	Wyatt C. Whitworth, Jr.
Edward A. Kolbe	Thomas E. Williams, Jr.
Howard F. Langley, Jr.	James F. Lloyd, Jr.
Joseph S. Longo, Jr.	Willis C. Wilson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William B. Binch	Gary T. McAplin
Norman T. Berthussen	James P. Murray
Durk F. Buffington	Thomas D. Nelson
Thomas M. Carpenter	Clarence R. Price
James O. Carroll	Charles J. Pyle
Joseph M. Cavanagh	Lawrence E. Reed
Thomas W. Depretoro	Michael E. Rich
John T. Dolan	Edward F. Riley
George E. Fort	Ross D. Rosi
Richard A. Frindt	Thomas A. Scheib
Jackie W. Fraim	David C. Sikes
Richard L. Guinn	James D. Sparks
Billy C. Henry	Robert S. Starke, Jr.
Thomas E. Hopkins	Samuel D. Turner, Jr.
Jack C. James	Charles W. Van Horne
John K. Kangas	Fred W. Veil
Peter V. Marcoline, Jr.	Billy J. Widman
James E. Martin	Henry G. Williams, Jr.

The following-named (Air Force Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Larry A. Backus	George F. Holland III
Thomas V. Burns	Joseph G. Tkac, Jr.
John J. Dougherty	

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 23, 1963:

U.S. ATTORNEY

William A. Meadows, Jr. of Florida to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Florida for the term of 4 years, vice Edward F. Boardman, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 29: 18: *Where there is no vision, the people cast off restraint.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may our President, our Speaker, and all who hold positions of leadership and trust lay hold of their many difficult tasks with confidence.

May they continue to possess that soul of adventure and that strength of vision and faith which are often darkened by doubt but never eclipsed; delayed and disappointed by adversity, but never defeated.

Grant that the whole world may come to see that our Nation is rooted in spiritual realities and ruled by a passionate devotion to the ideals of liberty and justice, friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HOUSE BILL ENROLLED

Mr. BURLISON, from the Committee on House Administration, announced that that committee had on April 22, 1963, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, April 22, 1963, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

THE LATE DR. MEYER JACOBSTEIN

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a memorial service, conducted by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein of Temple B'rith Kodesh.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty that causes me to rise on this occasion, for I must report to my colleagues the death of a former Member of Congress.

Last Thursday—April 18—in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., death took Dr. Meyer Jacobstein. Dr. Jacobstein was 83 years old.

Dr. Jacobstein was the elected Representative of the 38th Congressional District—now the 36th Congressional District—of New York State for three terms. He served successively in the 68th, 69th, and 70th Congresses.

Today, only five men are in the House who served alongside Dr. Jacobstein.

As a Congressman, teacher, labor mediator, banker, publisher, and scholar, he impressed his vital personality on the scene of Rochester, N.Y., for more than half a century. His life was always one of service and concern for the public good and much of his effort was a community contribution.

During his 6 years of service in the House of Representatives from 1923 to 1929, Dr. Jacobstein became widely known and respected for the knowledge and understanding he brought to the many matters which were before the Congress. He represented his constituents with dedication and ability.

Dr. Jacobstein was a constant inspiration to those who knew him and came under the influence of his intellect.

Our condolences on this personal loss go to his widow and two daughters, Mrs. Harold Berlove, of Webster, N.Y., and Mrs. Joseph Thaler, of Spokane, Wash.

This past Sunday evening in Rochester, N.Y., a memorial service was held for Dr. Jacobstein. His longtime friend and spiritual leader, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Temple B'rith Kodesh, delivered a moving eulogy.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DR. MEYER JACOBSTEIN

Meyer Jacobstein was one of the stars, one of the luminaries, that swam into my horizon when I was a youth in Rochester. I thought of him then as a warm, colorful, extraordinary personality, and I have never had any reason to change that opinion. He was even at that time a poor Jewish boy who had made good. He was a professor of economics at the University of Rochester where Jews in those days were not very numerous. He lectured brilliantly in the community and was highly popular.

Then when I returned to Rochester as rabbi of this temple in 1926, a relationship developed which continued through the years and which meant much to me in my own life. On my part it was a feeling of affection, friendship, of respect, and I think he returned this feeling. Out of that relationship I speak of him today.

First let me talk about his accomplishments, the externals of his life. Here was the son of a poor immigrant family, one of nine children. He had to earn his way peddling newspapers. And out of this difficult background came his remarkable achievements. He was one of the boys in whom Dr. Gannett of the Unitarian Church took an interest, and which led to the founding of the Boys' Evening Home which meant so much in the lives of men like Meyer, and Ben Goldstein, Sol Appelbaum, and others. This broadened his horizon and led him on to new fields.

He became a brilliant economist and, after having taught for awhile in the Midwest, returned to Rochester where his students liked him very much for they found him progressive, intelligent, stimulating. He was interested in labor relationships and this was a comparatively early period in those relationships in the clothing industry. In due course he found himself a labor mediator and arbitrator, and handling labor relationships for clothing firms. He never ceased to be an economist. In fact he became a better economist as through involvement in public life as Congressman, banker, publisher, and the head of a business institute, he learned more intimately, more realistically, what makes the wheels go round. My brother Irving, among many others, is greatly indebted to Meyer for direction, counsel, stimulation, and information, which he received when Meyer was a member of the faculty of that great Brookings Institution in Washington. Subsequently Meyer became of invaluable help to his former colleagues when he served on the staff of the Library of Congress and gave help, guidance, information, counsel, to the Members of Congress as they sought to think through the economic problems that confronted our National Legislature.

Because personally Meyer was eager and ambitious and also civic minded with a strong sense of public responsibility, he decided to run for Congress. Everything was against him. He was a Democrat, and in Rochester Democrats then were very much in the minority. He was a Jew. He was a liberal and in those days a liberal might be regarded as a radical. A powerful political machine was lined up against him. Nevertheless, in spite of all these handicaps, by the sheer power of his personality, his good sense, his obvious usefulness, his hard work, he was elected to the Congress of the United States. There he remained for 6 years, and could have stayed on indefinitely if he had chosen. He was one of the best Congressmen this area has ever had with a very strong sense of responsibility not only to his own constituency but also to the country, and to its welfare. In those days I would talk with other Members of Congress who told me how highly regarded he was by his colleagues, which was understandable, because he knew more than most of them about the problems that were confronting the Nation. In that period it became clear that Meyer was loved by the common man, and respected by the uncommon one. The poor, the immigrant, the Negro found in him an understanding friend. The cultivated person saw something of extraordinary worth in Meyer's warm, multifaceted personality.

After a time he found the wear and tear of congressional responsibilities too much for him and his family. He also was concerned with building up his economic position for the future. So he returned to Rochester and before long this man who had