



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 27, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1951)

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

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

Our Father God, fountain of all life, source of all blessing, Thou who art behind the shadows and in the shadows and whose heart of love pulses beyond the stars: At this noontide altar of a nation's faith we seek Thy guidance and a sense of Thy nearness. Facing the cares of today and the burdens of tomorrow we are bewildered by the perplexity and the confusion of the world.

In such an hour, when appalling human needs make this a time for greatness, save us from the devices and the duplicity of cowardly compromise, as entrenched evil lies in wait to silence our consciences. Deliver us from the sophistries of the cynical and the inclinations of our own hearts to self-deceit. Grant that our hearts may be shrines of prayer, our homes nurseries of virtue, our personalities centers of contagious good will, and our Nation an inspiring bulwark for the oppressed and a flaming beacon of hope whose beams shall battle the darkness in all the world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. STENNIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 22, and Monday, March 26, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 19, 1951, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to continue for a temporary period the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] be excused from attending sessions of the Senate for the next 30 days on official business. The Senator from Washington will

XCVII—163

visit Japan and other parts of the Orient representing the following committees: The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators who may so desire may be permitted to present routine matters for the RECORD, without debate.

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

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators who would like to present routine matters and insertions for the RECORD are not present at this time. I wonder if the request would cover any period of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, after this so-called morning hour expires it requires unanimous consent during the remainder of the day to present matters of that kind, when a Senator has been recognized to speak.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I understand that if Senators who are not present now may wish to present matters for the RECORD later in the day, that can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. STENNIS. It will be so understood.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that, pursuant to the order of the Senate of the 22d instant, he signed on March 24, 1951, the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 207) making additional appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, vice former Senator Virgil Chapman, deceased.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY—MES- SAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying

report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the One Hundred-First Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 27, 1951.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

LOANS TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN WHO SUFFER LOSSES FROM PRODUCTION DISASTERS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 6, 1949, so as to further define the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and stockmen who suffer losses from production disasters, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his semi-annual report, including the semiannual reports of the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, July 1 to December 31, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO SUBMIS- SION OF POSTMASTERS' ACCOUNTS UNDER OATH

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain laws relating to the submission of postmasters' accounts under oath, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY IN AREAS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES BY DEPARTMENT OF AIR FORCE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the disposal of Air Force excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the calendar year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2899

AUDIT REPORT ON INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Inland Waterways Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ACQUISITION OF SITE FOR CIVIL DEFENSE TECHNICAL TRAINING SCHOOL, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, Md.

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure 260 acres of land, together with all improvements thereon, located in Montgomery County, near Olney, Md., known as the Longwood School for Boys and to construct buildings thereon for one civil defense technical training school (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States immediately to appropriate such funds as may be necessary for national civil defense for the guidance of the States in making available matching funds

"Whereas the primary purpose of civil defense is to maintain the productive capacity of this country by limiting damage due to enemy action; and

"Whereas both the National Security Resources Board and the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force have stated publicly that it is impossible to prevent an effective air attack against the critical target areas of the United States by a strong and determined enemy; and

"Whereas the United States can lose a war to such an enemy if any substantial portion of the industries supporting our defense economy is knocked out by air or other enemy attack, including sabotage; and

"Whereas civil defense against atomic or other enemy attack, including sabotage, in order to minimize the effect of enemy and subversive action is as essential to national survival before and during a war as the armed services; and

"Whereas the September 1950 report of NSRB—United States civil defense—urged prompt action for organizing the civil defense of the United States in order that the Federal Government might exercise strong and effective leadership in this vital branch of the national security program; and

"Whereas administration recommendations to the Congress contemplate very substantial Federal support for such items as fire, rescue, communications, medical, and warden's equipment, and for mobile support units, items obviously of first importance to the whole national civil defense system; and

"Whereas the State of California will be required to match, on some basis, Federal funds made available for the civil defense of critical target areas; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has failed to declare the national civil de-

fense policy or to make available Federal funds to pay the proposed Federal civil defense costs as allocated and recommended by the National Security Resources Board: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate immediately such funds as may be necessary to pay the Federal costs of completing the civil defense portion of the national security program; and be it further *"Resolved,* That the Members of Congress from California be urged to use all means within their power to accomplish the purpose of this resolution for the immediate guidance of the Legislature of the State of California in meeting its civil defense responsibilities; and be it further

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

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 16

"Resolution relative to the immigration of Basque sheep herders pursuant to Public Law 587 of the Eighty-first Congress

"Whereas there exists a serious shortage of skilled sheep herders which is jeopardizing the survival of the sheep-raising industry in the United States to the detriment of our national defense effort; and

"Whereas in recognition of this shortage which cannot be met on the domestic labor market, the Eighty-first Congress passed Public Law 587, permitting the entry of 250 Basque sheep herders; and

"Whereas the entry of such persons pursuant to Public Law 587 has been barred by an interpretative ruling of the United States Department of Justice that the Internal Security Act of 1950 prohibits the entry of such persons because of their former membership in the Falangist Party of Spain, which was declared by the Attorney General of the United States to be a totalitarian party; and

"Whereas the American consul at Bilbao, Spain, has already determined that the Basque sheep herders desiring admission have never joined, and have never taken part in any of the activities of, the party, and it appears the basis of the alleged membership was due solely to a declaration by the Government of Spain that anyone who was in the army or attended public schools, or who resided in Spain during the civil war was a member of the Falangist Party; and

"Whereas the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which handled the Internal Security Act of 1950 has declared that the act does not prevent the entry of such persons, and that the interpretative ruling of the Department of Justice should be changed; and

"Whereas on January 29, 1951, Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, introduced S. 728 to specify that the aliens to be excluded are those whose memberships and affiliations with totalitarian organizations were voluntary: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Attorney General of the United States be memorialized to amend his interpretative ruling so as to authorize the entry of the Basque sheep herders pursuant to Public Law 587; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact S. 728 at the earliest possible date to reiterate and to emphasize the true intent of Congress in the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this

resolution to the President, to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the chairmen of appropriate congressional committees, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Resolution 96

"Resolution relating to the memorializing of the Congress of the United States to reject H. R. 2982; relative to second-class mailing matter

"Whereas the second-class department of the United States Post Office was established more than a century ago for the purpose of providing a means of conveying news and intelligence concerning its government to the electorate in the most economical manner; and

"Whereas in H. R. 2982 now pending before the Congress it is proposed to increase second-class postal rates as much as 300 percent; and

"Whereas it is most desirable to protect this historical concession to the reading public, and that post-office deficits be met in accordance with accepted and recognized business procedure in line with already recommended reforms: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to reject H. R. 2982; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the California delegation thereof."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial to the Congress and the President of the United States to declare the State of New Mexico a drought-distress area, and to expedite Federal appropriations for construction of public works already authorized by the Congress

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas intense and prolonged drought threatens the State of New Mexico and its citizens with destitution and privation; and

"Whereas three-fourths of New Mexico's limited share of the water of the Rio Grande is now lost to marshlands and useless vegetation; and

"Whereas New Mexico is required, under terms of the Rio Grande compact, to deliver to water users in Texas and in New Mexico below Elephant Butte Dam, more water than it has had available to deliver, and New Mexico accordingly owes water debts in excess of its ability to pay; and

"Whereas continuance of this condition will force out of cultivation in the Rio Grande Valley some of the most heavily productive farm lands of the Nation—at a time when national defense calls for all-out agricultural production; and

"Whereas the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has declared the Middle Rio Grande Valley a "sick area;" and

"Whereas Congress in 1948 authorized construction of the Middle Rio Grande flood-control and reclamation project to relieve this condition; but

"Whereas continued curtailment of appropriations has made construction impossible: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress and the President of the United States be and hereby are memorialized to declare the State of New Mexico a 'drought-distress area,' and appropriate funds, in accordance with the authorization of the Congress in the Flood Con-

trol Act of 1948, for immediate construction of those portions of the Middle Rio Grande flood-control and reclamation project necessary to preserve the agricultural production of the Rio Grande Valley.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"CALVIN HORN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"SANTOS QUINTANA,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States relating to old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children

"Whereas there has been a tremendous drop in the value of the dollar during recent years; and

"Whereas recipients of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children under the laws of New Mexico, the money which is matched by money furnished by the department of Social Security of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the purchasing power of such assistance has reached such a low point as to make it next to impossible for the recipients of such aid to purchase sufficient food and other necessities of life to live on; and

"Whereas it is the spirit of this legislature that the Congress of the United States should pass legislation to relieve this situation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation liberalizing the present laws governing old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, so that Federal aid may be granted to States which have laws allowing such recipients to take employment and earn up to and including \$50 per month, to retain any paid-up insurance policy payable only at death to the beneficiary of any insured recipient and also burial insurance without jeopardizing their right to receive such aid.

"2. That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of New Mexico.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk.

"CALVIN HORN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"SANTOS QUINTANA,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
"Approved:

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

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

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Memorial by the Twentieth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to recognize United States Highway 85 as a defense highway, and to officially declare it to be the Pan-American Central Highway

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas United States Highway 85 (being that portion of the Pan-American Central Highway, extending from Guatemala to Fairbanks, Alaska, which is within the continental limits of the United States), is the

longest international highway in the Americas; and

"Whereas its recognition as a defense highway is essential to the internal and external security of the United States of America, its neighbors and Territories: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to enact adequate legislation recognizing United States Highway 85 as a defense highway and declaring its official name to be the Pan-American Central Highway; be it further

"Resolved, That an enrolled and engrossed copy of the memorial be forthwith sent, respectively, to the President of the United States of America, the Prime Minister of Canada, the President of the Republic of Mexico, the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Governor of Alaska, and to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President, Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"CALVIN HORN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"SANTOS QUINTANA,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Rosewood Mothers' Club, Bayside, N. Y., signed by Florence Kulick, corresponding secretary, relating to the smuggling of narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of A. Fred Roberts, of Westerly, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an increase of old-age pension payments; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Shirley Holmes, of Estill Springs, Tenn., relating to the furnishing of surplus grain to India; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Department of Michigan, the American Legion, at Detroit, Mich., commending the activities of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Mrs. James Kilpatrick, of New York, N. Y., praying for the continuance of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the General Conference of the North American and Canadian See of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church outside Russia, of New York, N. Y., signed by Archbishop Vitaly, president of the conference, expressing the thanks of the conference for religious freedom in the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

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. LODGE:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gulsum Muserref Turnaoglu Nazme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1207. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution providing for implementation of the North Atlantic

Treaty; to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, jointly.

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

TRANSPORTATION OF GRAIN BY CANADIAN VESSELS ON GREAT LAKES DURING 1951.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill. The purpose of the bill is to permit the United States to use Canadian vessels to transport grain on the Great Lakes for the shipping season of 1951. My reason for introducing the bill is that we are obviously short of transportation facilities in the Northwest to move grain and other freights which it is necessary to move. Many elevators in the Northwest are already congested with grain. Much of it is high-moisture grain which is threatened with deterioration. Unless we can bring some manner of relief to the Northwest by providing additional means of transportation, we are going to have a very serious congested elevator situation in the Northwest when we commence the harvest in the year 1951. For that reason I have introduced the bill.

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

The bill (S. 1207) authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951, introduced by Mr. THYE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

STUDY OF PROBLEMS INCIDENT TO TELEVISION OR RADIO BROADCASTING OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. WILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study of the various problems which have arisen or which might arise in connection with past or proposed televising or radio broadcasting, or motion picture or other photographing, of proceedings of the Congress and its respective Houses and committees. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study together with its recommendations.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO DUTY IN THE EUROPEAN AREA—MOTIONS

Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. CORDON) submitted a motion intended to be proposed by them jointly to the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. CORDON) also submitted a motion intended to be proposed by them jointly to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN BY JOHN W. JONES

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late Senator Chapman, of Kentucky, by John W. Jones, president of the Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INVESTIGATION OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND OF ORGANIZED CRIME

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time To Study the Next Move," published in the Washington Star on March 25, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRACY IN TURKEY—ARTICLE BY FARNSWORTH FOWLE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democracy in Turkey," by Farnsworth Fowle, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEAKERS AT TEMPLE OHABEI SHALOM, BROOKLINE, MASS.—ARTICLE FROM BOSTON TRAVELER

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Army Secretary Pace at Brookline Temple," written by Bill Schofield, and published in the Boston Traveler of March 22, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEM

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to an address delivered by Senator KEM, published in the News Press of Nebraska City, Nebr., on February 21, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

ASSISTANCE FOR DISABLED VETERANS—ARTICLE BY J. M. HAZLITT

[Mr. MONRONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column relating to disabled veterans, entitled "Sounding Off," written by J. M. Hazlitt, and published in the Daily Democrat of Pauls Valley, Okla., of November 26, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUANCE OF KEFAUVER AND FULBRIGHT COMMITTEES—EDITORIAL FROM OHIO STATE JOURNAL

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Committees Must Not Die," published in the Ohio State Journal of March 27, 1951, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS BY WALTER WINCHELL ON RESPONSIBILITY FOR GAMBLING

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the column by Walter Winchell, taken from today's Washington Post, relative to the activities of the Kefauver committee investigating interstate crime and commenting on the subject of responsibility for gambling, which appears in the Appendix.]

TELEVISION PROCEEDINGS OF COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Associated Press news story regarding a statement issued by him relative to televising the proceedings of committees of Congress and a press release issued by him on the same subject last Sunday, which appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 27 the Senate Labor and Public

Welfare Committee filed with the Senate Report No. 139 on Labor-Management Relations in the Bell Telephone System. Together with that majority report there was filed certain minority views. In the interest of completing the record, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD some comments by me on the report and the minority views.

There being no objection, Mr. HUMPHREY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE TELEPHONE INDUSTRY

The Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee last year conducted an intense investigation and even more intensive hearings on the problems of collective bargaining in the Bell Telephone System. I was a member of that subcommittee, and I am now the chairman of the subcommittee.

The problem of peaceful relations in this most crucial public utility is of special importance to us because a disruption of service for any period of time cannot help but have extraordinarily disastrous consequences for our economy. We therefore studied this problem with care and, I believe, with complete objectivity.

It seems to me that one large conclusion inescapably emerges from the substantial record: With respect to its union relations, the Bell Telephone System management has pursued a policy of containment. The evidence is certain that the Bell System bargained with the union only to the extent to which it thought it was compelled to do so by law. It was a policy of reluctant bargaining with the certified representatives of its employees and never one of genuine collaboration of the sort which characterizes mature collective bargaining in good faith.

Containment has a place as a strategy in our dealings with Soviet Russia, but a containment policy followed either by unions or by management can result only in bitterness and strife. Certainly, it does not create the kind of climate in which the union and the management can plow new fields of amicable labor-management relationships.

The record shows three main ingredients of this containment policy. First, it consisted of holding the lines of policy control tightly in the hands of the top system management and an unwillingness to allow the affiliated companies to bargain and to make commitments with the representative union groups. Not only did the top management of the system refuse to delegate authority, it also refused systematically to deal with the union on behalf of the affiliated companies.

I am perfectly willing to believe that the realities of corporate management in a system which is as integrated technologically and economically, as is the Bell System, make it extremely unfeasible to permit subordinate corporate units each to formulate their own bargains on wages, hours, and working conditions. Be that as it may, the top Bell System management did not delegate the authority to make final commitments to its subordinate groups, and at the same time it refused to deal with the union on a system-wide basis in any clearcut fashion.

A second factor in the containment policy of the Bell System with respect to the union was the strategy of harassing the union at every turn and seeking to undermine the loyalty of its members to the organization. One illustration will illuminate this aspect of the company's containment policy. When the Communications Workers of America became affiliated with CIO the Bell System undertook to withhold the dues which it had collected under a check-off scheme on the ground that the membership of CWA had had no fair opportunity to approve the affilia-

tion. The effect of withholding the proceeds from the check-off was, of course, to weaken the union's capacity to function as a union. Furthermore, the grounds for withholding the check-off proceeds were very weak indeed, as the National Labor Relations Board ultimately found when it refused to find that a question of representation existed as a result of the new affiliation. I find it hard to believe that the Bell System's skilled legal talent would not know that there was no legal footing for the withholding of dues. The record will bear out the conclusion that the purpose was to weaken and harass the union. Collective bargaining in good faith must be based on mutual trust and on management's recognition of the integrity of the union as a union.

Against this very summary background I would like to make some observations about the minority report entered by my distinguished colleagues from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and California [Mr. NIXON]. Let me consider the issues in the order in which they raise them. First, the free-speech issue. It seems to me that the minority report misses completely the issue of free speech in an industrial relations context. It simply is not accurate to equate the right of the employer to be free of all restraint in his statements against the union to his employees with an abstract right of free speech. To be sure, the Taft-Hartley law says that the employer may say anything he wishes subject to the qualification that he may not say or write anything which contains a threat of coercion. But anybody who has ever worked for a living must know there needs to be no specific threat in an employer's statement for its effect to be coercive and to frustrate the workers' right of self-organization.

We all know that in many instances all a supervisor or an employer needs to do is to raise his eyebrow in order to convey his displeasure with his employees' attempts to organize themselves. Our record is full of instances of the sophisticated and unsophisticated ways in which the company made it amply clear to its employees that it was not friendly to the union. Even though this unfriendliness was stated in a way that was presumably legal within the language of the Taft-Hartley law, it is hard for me to believe that the effect of these techniques, like the captive audience, was not designed to discourage union organization.

The minority next discusses the duty to bargain. What has happened to the duty to bargain in the telephone industry? In December 1945 telephone management and employees met to bargain about wages and working conditions. The negotiations continued almost unbrokenly until March 1946, when a national strike was averted only by the intervention of the Secretary of Labor. In 1947 bargaining was opened at the beginning of the year and continued until April 7, when the employees struck. The strike continued for approximately 7 weeks and our whole economy was imperiled by it. As mayor of Minneapolis, I had personal experience with the effects of the strike and knew its seriousness. Not until June 1947 was a settlement reached. In 1948 negotiations commenced in March and no agreement was reached until after the middle of September. Most of the year 1949 was consumed in negotiations, which were stalemated in December when, in order to avoid a national catastrophe, the governors of six States proposed arbitration, which was accepted by the union but rejected by the company. These negotiations continued through January 1950. A strike was announced to commence February 8 but was postponed first for 30 days on the request of the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and then for 60 days at the request of the President of the United States. No settlement was reached until

April 24, when a meeting between the President of the CWA and the vice president of A. T. & T. resulted in a compromise agreement. Thus, meetings and conferences regarding wages and working conditions have occupied the management and union leadership in the telephone industry almost without cessation since the end of World War II. Yet, there has never been and isn't yet an agreement in the telephone industry which is mutually acceptable to employers and employees.

The minority raises the issue of Nation-wide bargaining as if it were central to the majority recommendations. The majority report does not seek to impose any pattern or mold of collective bargaining. It is the objective of the minority, and the stated objective of the Taft-Hartley law, that the area of bargaining take the form which will best effectuate collective bargaining in good faith. We have seen that the system management does not permit its subordinate groups to commit themselves to any firm bargain. As I have said, there may very well be compelling reasons why this is the practice. Contrary to the minority's unproved assumption that Nation-wide bargaining is responsible for Nation-wide strikes in the telephone industry, we find that the reverse seems to be true. The refusal to develop and evolve a workable area of collective bargaining has in fact been responsible in large part for several Nation-wide strikes in this important industry.

A union has no choice but to accommodate the structure of its organization and the scope of its bargaining to the realities of management's structure. The Bell System has itself set the tone for this controversy by the concentrated character of its control. How else can the union meet its responsibilities to its membership and to the community except by seeking to bargain with those who have the authority and the power to bargain?

The minority disputes our conclusion that labor relations in the Bell System are bad by pointing to the esteem in which workers hold employment in the system. The industrial history of the United States is replete with illustrations of paternalistic corporations which are good to their employees but do their best to weaken and destroy the unions of their employees. It should be said again and again that the CWA is the elected representative for collective bargaining purposes of the largest group of workers in the Bell System. It was so designated in duly constituted elections certified by an agency of the United States Government, the National Labor Relations Board. The habit of distinguishing between a union and its members is frequently the hallmark of the employer who wants to have nothing to do with the union. It is this distinction, incidentally, which is at the bottom of many of the unwise provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. Every employer who has learned to value mature collective bargaining has also learned that he cannot fruitfully think of his employees and their union as different groups.

It is my judgment that this policy of union containment is a phase in the evolution of collective bargaining in the Bell System, just as it has been a phase in the collective-bargaining history of all of the mass-production industries which have ultimately come to accept the worthwhileness of collective bargaining in good faith. In the last 13 years we have seen many employers who first dealt with the union only under the pressure of law coming ultimately to the conclusion that collective bargaining in good faith is an indispensable adjunct of sound management.

I don't pretend to be a prophet, but it occurs to me that a company like the Bell System which has shown great technological ingenuity will ultimately display the same

kind of ingenuity and creativeness in dealing with the unions of its employees. It will ultimately, I am confident, recognize, as many other employers and corporations have, that a cultivation of the art of collaboration with the union is far more fruitful for the stockholders, the management, and the community than is a state of continual belligerence. It is in the hope that we can contribute to such a development that I offer these remarks.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor to make a speech.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to have floor for about 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any further routine business to be transacted? If not, without objection, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO DUTY IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as I said in January, the field of agreement among us here is very broad and the disagreements are rather minor in nature. I would like to take a few minutes to try and clear away a few more cobwebs. One of these relates to France and the French effort.

There is certainly no doubt that any Senator who wants to take counsel of his fears and who wants to look constantly on the dark side can find plenty to talk about in France. Maybe a man with such an outlook can find plenty to talk about in any country and in any State or in any city or in any group of his friends, or perhaps even in himself. But as France is such a key member of the North Atlantic Pact, let us admit that France is not as strong as we would like her to be. If she were that strong we would need to do nothing. We could stay over here and let France carry the whole load alone. So obviously nobody is proving anything very novel when he says that France needs help.

One question is: Is France making its full effort—an effort comparable to ours—to rearm itself? Another question is: Is France getting stronger or is she getting weaker?

There is no doubt that France is making an effort that is thoroughly equivalent to our own effort insofar as appropriations of funds are concerned and insofar as drafting of manpower is concerned. There is no doubt in my mind, too—and I speak as one who has tried to keep closely in touch—that every year that goes by since the end of World War II sees an impressive growth in the strength of France. I wish that the French Communist Party would shrivel up quicker than it is shriveling up, but I have no doubt that it is diminishing. I could wish that France had an election law in which proportional representation did not play such a large part, but I am confident that French elections are getting better. I wish that the French Government looked as strong and as

stable as I believe the French Nation actually is. But I am not deluding myself into thinking that the changes in government which take place in France represent anything very fundamental. The President of France does not change all the time; the administration of government in France does not change; and the basic policies of government do not change as they have in Britain or as they did with us in the 1930's. The changes in ministries are much more superficial than real.

When people ask, "Will the French fight?" I should like to refer to what General Eisenhower said about this in his book, *Crusade in Europe*:

The French position in the war was, of course, not an easy one. Once known as the foremost military power of Europe, their army as well as their pride had been shattered in the great debacle of 1940. * * * All this tended to make them peculiarly sensitive and therefore difficult to deal with when they could find in any question, no matter how trivial, anything that they thought involved their national honor. Nevertheless, America's investment in the French forces paid magnificent dividends.

In the African campaign the French were helpful but extremely weak. So far as heavy fighting is concerned they first took a significant part in the war in Italy. In late 1943 and early 1944 the French corps in that theater did excellent work. Moreover, they performed brilliantly in the invasion of southern France, in the penetration of the Vosges Mountains, and the advance to the upper Rhine. Their efficiency rapidly fell off with the arrival of winter weather in late 1944 because of the large proportion of African native troops in their army, who were unable to endure the cold and exposure incident to campaigning in a European winter. In the spring of 1945, however, during the final operations of the war, the French Army advanced gallantly and effectively to occupy great portions of southern Germany. At the same time they conducted a ground and air campaign against the Germans on the Bay of Biscay that resulted in the liberation of Bordeaux and the island of Oleron. This operation had been repeatedly postponed since the autumn of 1944 because of more urgent demands elsewhere. The battle commenced on April 14, a week later the Gironde had been cleared to the sea; by May Oleron had fallen. When inspired the French are great fighters.

There is one more misapprehension which I should like to correct, and then I am done. That is the notion which still keeps cropping up that we would be better off in a "fortress America," standing here in the Western Hemisphere all alone—that we should let go of the industries, the shrines, and the peoples of the Western World to be taken over and organized and used by the masters of the Kremlin. If we did try to do this, we would be deliberately putting our Nation into the worst possible position that it could be put into—a position in which 87 percent of the world's manpower and more than half the world's productive capacity would be arrayed against us. I can understand how, by a series of misadventures, errors, and misfortunes, we might arrive at such a pass; but I cannot understand how any American can advocate that we deliberately seek to place our nose under the conqueror's heel.

I realize that the idea of a fortress has an appeal for some people. Throughout

history, men have been attracted by the idea of building big stone or concrete bunkers and crawling into them. Those in the bunkers and concrete dugouts which I saw in World War II usually had a most unpleasant death.

The other day I was reading a book by Robbin Fedden entitled "Crusader Castles." It dealt with the great castles in the Middle East which were built by the knights during the wars of the crusades in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In this book, Mr. Fedden had this to say about castle mentality:

Castle mentality: The great castles engendered a defensive mentality and imposed a psychological strain on the defenders. The latter were always one move behind, always countering, yet never initiating, action. The passive vigil, the watching, the waiting, the listening, must have induced, in a man whose lifetime was spent behind battlements, a peculiar nervous instability. Mewed up through long days and nights, defenders must have been subject to panics and irrational fears. Rumors would pass like wind along the curtain; the postern had been treacherously opened; sappers had been heard working beneath the vulnerable corner-tower; the water supply was tainted; disease had broken out; the relieving army had been annihilated. Even the military orders with their sense of dedication could hardly be proof against prolonged suggestion. As the thirteenth century drew on and the ultimate break-up of the Latin kingdom seemed only a matter of time, castle morale must have become an even more serious problem. It explains such events as the capitulation of Antioch in 1268, after a 5-day siege, though heavily fortified and fully garrisoned.

Mr. President, it would be fatal for the United States—as it was for the knights in the Middle Ages—if we were to develop a "castle mentality."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he advocates the invasion of Russia by American troops.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no. The Senator knows very well that I advocate no such thing. That would be the height of folly.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Massachusetts advocate a defensive warfare in Europe? We have two alternatives, either to invade Russia or to defend the river Elbe or the river Rhine.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator from Missouri thinks those are the two alternatives, but my whole argument is that he is in error in thinking such a thing. We are not on the horns of a dilemma, in such a position that we face the choice between two alternatives, both of which are bad.

Mr. KEM. I agree with the Senator. I do not believe that we have to take either horn of that dilemma. I think we can utilize the advantages we have in the air and on the sea, without taking either of those choices.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I think America today is a sea power and an air power, fundamentally and basically. I believe that history shows that in the case of great sea powers it is often advantageous to make a limited land commitment, so

that other nations will make a far larger land commitment. Of course, that is what the British did at the time of the Battle of Waterloo.

It is my hope that we shall be able to regain the initiative, so that the arrow of political, military, economic, and diplomatic pressure will be pointing from us to them instead of pointing from them to us. Once we have regained the initiative, we can organize a durable peace. We can have real disarmament, and do many of the things which we want to do. But one place where we must first build a dam is in Western Europe.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Then the Senator agrees that there is a line which we shall want to defend somewhere; and he says that that line is in Western Europe.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think there is a line for the whole free world. I believe that Western Europe is one place where we must be able to hold. I think we can regain the initiative through political and diplomatic means when our diplomacy is supported by the power of our Air Force and our Navy.

The thing is not so simple as sometimes it is made out to be. In the military field we confront a triphibious type of warfare nowadays. All war is now triphibious—air, land, and sea. Because we hold in one place and take the initiative in another place does not mean that we are engaging in a Maginot line psychology at all. All the great offensives of history have shown that the offensive was taken in one place while the side conducting the offensive was on the defensive, or holding, somewhere else.

MEETING OF FOREIGN MINISTERS OF AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I know that at a time in the history of our Nation when there is great question in the minds of all of us as to just what countries there are in the world who would stand loyally and strongly by our side in the event of a great emergency, we experience a warm and hopeful feeling when reading of the meeting of the foreign ministers of the American Republics, which started here in Washington yesterday. It is an undeniable fact that the bonds which tie the United States together with the republics to the south of us are genuine bonds of friendship, understanding, and cooperation. We know that there exists in the minds and hearts of the people of South America, as well as the people of the United States, a sincere desire to improve and strengthen those bonds of friendship and cooperation.

Our friendly relationship is understandable, because it was the fight for independence by our Thirteen Original States, led by the incomparable George Washington, which lit the torch of freedom in the hearts of the people of South America. As a matter of fact, the great

liberator, Simon Bolivar, at the time when he was leading the people of Venezuela to independence wore around his neck a locket containing a picture of George Washington. That locket had been presented to him by the family of George Washington; and Simon Bolivar stated in his autobiography that the locket was his greatest inspiration and most cherished possession.

There are many problems which face the Fourth Conference of Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, but I am confident that each of these men, motivated by a sincere desire to understand the nature of and cooperate in solving the problems of all the other countries at the conference, will achieve real progress toward improving the economic, social and political conditions of the people of the Americas.

If there is such a thing as a community of nations—and I am sure there is—the republics which make up the Association of American States are indeed a community of nations. All of us recognize that if we stand together, work together, and pull together, we can together grow strong economically, militarily, and politically, and thereby preserve the freedoms of our peoples.

I am confident that every other Senator joins me in my humble, simple, but nonetheless sincere, wish that the Fourth Conference of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics will become an important milestone on the road to greater hemispheric solidarity. We wish for each of the Ministers visiting us in Washington a most pleasant and productive stay.

THE INVESTIGATION INTO THE OPERATIONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, when the Subcommittee on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation undertook its study, more than year ago, I anticipated the development of little more than the usual issues which grow out of an investigation of the executive branch of the Government. I expected just another case study of an agency, with a finding of facts to be made and an orthodox legislative remedy recommended.

Before we had proceeded very far, however, it became evident that we were dealing not simply with a legal or legislative problem but with a moral problem. The first case to which my attention was called was one involving the employment, by a borrower, of an RFC employee who had recommended the granting of the loan. The Board of Directors of the RFC thought this practice quite proper. I thought it improper. So from the beginning we were confronted with a difference in ethical standards. It presents a very difficult problem. It is difficult because the evils to be dealt with are so seldom amenable to the processes of law. When confronted with an evil, we Americans are prone to say, "There ought to be a law." But the law does not and cannot apply effectively over wide fields of men's activities. It cannot reach those evils which are subtle and impalpable.

Generally speaking, it reaches only the overt and the blatant acts of the wicked.

Much of the evil of the world is beyond the reach of the law. The law cannot prevent gossip. It cannot prevent men from bearing false witness against their neighbors. It cannot restrain men from avarice and gluttony. It cannot restrain a man from betraying his friends. In short, it cannot prevent much of the evil to which men are, unfortunately, too prone. The law being inadequate, men long ago supplemented the law courts with courts of equity, where the spirit of the law, rather than its letter, is paramount. Underlying the law are the codes of ethics promulgated by the great religions and recognized by all civilized men as being essential to a humane and enlightened existence.

As our study of the RFC progressed, we were confronted more and more with problems of ethical conduct. What should be done about men who do not directly and blatantly sell the favors of their offices for money and so place themselves within the penalties of the law? How do we deal with those who, under the guise of friendship, accept favors which offend the spirit of the law but do not violate its letter?

What of the men outside Government who suborn those inside it? They are careful to see that they not do anything that can be construed as illegal. They operate through lawyers—men who are known as clever lawyers; a cleverness which is like the instinct of the rat that knows how to get the bait without getting caught. Many businessmen, ostensibly reputable businessmen, employ these knavish lawyers to circumvent the law and enrich themselves at Government expense. Too often the law cannot touch them.

Who is more at fault, the bribed or the bribers? The bribed have been false to their oaths and betrayers of their trust. But they are often relatively simple men—men of small fortune or no fortune at all—and they weaken before the temptations held out to them by the unscrupulous.

Who are the bribers? They are often men who walk the earth lordly and secure; members of good families; respected figures in their communities; graduates of universities. They are, in short, of the privileged minority, and I submit that it is not unreasonable to ask of them that high standard of conduct which their training ought to have engendered. Is it too much to ask of them that they do not use a Government lending agency as a dumping ground for their own mistakes in judgment? Is it too much to ask of them, the favored few of our country, that they behave with simple honesty; with that honesty which looks, not to the letter of the law, but to its spirit?

Mr. President, the essence of what we have been studying in our committee is but a reflection of what may be seen in many other phases of our national life. The Government and its activities are, in a very real sense, a mirror of our national life. The inquiry into the RFC has revealed conditions which unfortu-

nately may be found in other activities of our people.

Let us consider what has developed in our colleges where the characters of our young men and women are being molded. Our colleges, under extreme pressure from the alumni, have become so intent upon winning football and basketball games that they use any means to gain their ends. They hire players who are not bona fide students and thus make a mockery, a farce, of the whole concept of amateur sport for the health and entertainment of our young men. They corrupt not only the hired players, but also the entire student body, who learn from their elders the cynical, immoral doctrine that one must win at all costs.

A byproduct of this doctrine, this necessity for big money, led naturally to betting and to the shocking episode of the widespread bribery of basketball players in New York. I find it difficult to blame the players. They are but following a logical sequence of influences, beginning with the corruption of the sport at its source by pressure from the alumni.

This question of the moral strength of our people is not just an internal domestic matter. It has grave implications in our international relations. Without confidence in their Government, the people will not make the sacrifices necessary to oppose Russia successfully. Professor Toynbee, in his well-known historical study, demonstrated clearly how the vast majority of great civilizations have been destroyed, not as a result of external aggression, but as a consequence of domestic corruption. A democracy can recover quickly from physical or economic disaster, but when its moral convictions weaken it becomes easy prey for the demagogue and the charlatan. Tyranny and oppression then become the order of the day.

I wonder whether in recent years we have unwittingly come to accept the totalitarian concept that the end justifies the means, a concept which is fundamentally and completely antagonistic to a true domestic society. Democracy is, I believe, more likely to be destroyed by the perversion of, or abandonment of, its true moral principles than by armed attack from Russia. The evil and insidious materialism of the Communists is a greater danger to us than their guns.

One of the most disturbing aspects of this problem of moral conduct is the revelation that among so many influential people, morality has become identical with legality. We are certainly in a tragic plight if the accepted standard by which we measure the integrity of a man in public life is that he keep within the letter of the law.

Mr. President, the growing size and complexity of our Government, as much as we may deplore it, only emphasizes the need for a clarification, a restatement of the moral standards of governmental conduct. When our Government was small, when it took only 10 percent of our earnings in taxes, we could afford a certain amount of official boodling. Today, it has become too important. We

simply can no longer afford moral obtuseness in our public officials.

Scandals in our Government are not new phenomena in our history. What seems to be new about these scandals is the moral blindness or callousness which allows those in responsible positions to accept the practices which the facts reveal. It is bad enough for us to have corruption in our midst, but it is worse if it is to be condoned and accepted as inevitable.

Mr. President, is there anything we can do here in Washington to help our country reaffirm or reestablish a higher concept of public conduct?

Some weeks ago, I suggested, informally, that it would be beneficial to have a commission of eminent citizens designated by the Congress, to consider the problem of ethical standards of conduct in public affairs. I renew that suggestion now, and I have a resolution which will be ready for presentation to the Senate tomorrow.

Such a commission should be composed of private citizens of outstanding achievement and character, whose integrity is beyond question. As examples of the type of men who should serve, I suggest the following: former Justice Owen Roberts, of Pennsylvania; former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin; Judge Learned Hand, of New York; Mr. Walter Reuther, of Detroit; Mr. Paul Hoffman, of the Ford Foundation; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary; Dr. Theodore Greene, of Yale; Dr. Hutchins, of Chicago; President Clinchy, of the Conference of Christians and Jews; Father Parsons, of Catholic University. Such a list could be extended indefinitely, but I think I have adequately indicated the type of person I have in mind.

Such a commission, as I conceive of it, would be a catalytic agent, stimulated by public indignation, to draw forth meaning from the mass of data revealed by the several current investigations. The commission would evaluate the conditions which have been exposed, and drawing upon its combined wisdom would restate again, or formulate anew, principles which, it is to be hoped, would strengthen the faith of all decent men in our democratic society.

Too many people in our Nation do not believe anything with conviction. They question the precepts of God or of man, indiscriminately. The values of life which were clear to the Pilgrims and the founding fathers have become dim and fuzzy in outline. False propaganda and the "big lie" of demagogues have created doubt in the minds of men. Professional political hucksters, imported from afar, without local responsibility or restraint, corrupt our free elections and poison democracy at its source. The principal objective of the study I suggest is the restoration of the faith of our people in the validity of the traditional precepts of our democratic society. It is not a job for politicians; it is not a job for the inexperienced; it is a job for the wisest of our citizens under a mandate from the Nation.

Mr. President, in making this suggestion, I am quite prepared to be dubbed

naive. It will not be the first time. As I look back upon our history or upon my own experience, nearly every progressive or fruitful move, especially if it was novel, has been considered naive. To expect, or even hope, for an improvement in the moral climate of Washington, is, in the eyes of the boys who know, I am sure, thoroughly utopian.

I confess that I do not know what should be done. If I knew, I would not call upon the wisest men of our country. I would suggest it myself. But, Mr. President, I am unwilling to accept the view that nothing can be done, that the moral deterioration, which is so evident to all, must continue, to its logical conclusion, which is the destruction of our free democratic system. Mr. President, I think something can be done. This may not be the right thing; but, if anyone has a better suggestion, let him step forward.

I submit, Mr. President, that further investigations, as instructive as they may be, are not nearly as important as an understanding of what has already been exposed and action, to remedy the situation.

EIGHTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE FOUNDING OF NEBRASKA — SPEECH BY SENATOR WHERRY, AND RESOLUTIONS OF REPUBLICAN FOUNDERS' DAY ORGANIZATION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the eighty-fourth anniversary of the founding of the State of Nebraska was appropriately observed by nearly 1,000 Republicans in their traditional State-wide Nebraska Founders' Day. At this meeting, I had the honor and privilege of delivering a speech at the women's luncheon. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech be printed in the RECORD herewith.

The Republican Founders' Day organization also adopted resolutions on vital pending issues, and I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of these resolutions be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR WHERRY AT THE WOMEN'S LUNCHEON OF THE NEBRASKA REPUBLICAN FOUNDERS' DAY CELEBRATION, LINCOLN, NEBR., MARCH 21, 1951.

It is good to be back in Nebraska and to join in this commemoration of founders' day.

If ever there was a time when we needed to rededicate our lives to the principles of the founding fathers that time is now. Only through adherence to the spirit of the pioneers and the unbroken line of builders of our great State can we face with confidence the grave problems that confront our country today.

I did not bring any mink coats along for your ladies, no deep freezers.

While this is said in jest, I am sure that the women of Nebraska and all the States bitterly resent the kind of government that thrives on paternalism, favoritism, and squandering of the taxpayers' money.

We Nebraskans are a frugal people. We believe in solid progress based on thrift and living within our incomes. We adhere to the pay-as-you-go policy in our State government, because we do not think it is fair

to our children for us to mortgage their future.

We Nebraskans believe in honesty and morality in government; and we can boast of a long record of administrations in Nebraska that have brought that kind of government to the people of our great State.

If we had that kind of government in Washington the United States would not be in the terrible situation that it is today.

And, it is up to you women, all patriotic Americans, to bring to bear the weight of public opinion for restoration of the virtues of thrift and morality in Government at Washington.

It is my first duty as junior Senator from Nebraska to be on the firing line in Washington, giving my best effort for sound principles in Government. It is also necessary that I come home from time to time to discuss with you issues that confront our State and Nation, to learn your views, and express them as your Representative in the Congress.

As minority floor leader of the Senate my responsibility spreads over the country, and when opportunity affords I try to get into other States and learn what the people there are thinking.

In my travels, and judging from my mail and telegrams, which come from all parts of the country, the evidence is abundant that the American people are worried over national and international conditions.

If the wide variety of ways in which this concern is expressed were summed into one word, perhaps "morality" would cover all of them.

For when you boil down the latest exposure of callous disregard of the people's interests, the revolting revelations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation investigation, it becomes a matter of morals in government.

Almost every day, there is a new discovery of security agents, secrets of the atomic bomb, that have been leaked into the Communist spy ring.

There can be no greater betrayal of one's country than to transmit its national security secrets to a potential enemy, no greater immorality in government, for without security and peace there can be no progress.

Is there any one now so blind to the dangers of communism who would call the Alger Hiss case a red herring?

Again we see shocking disclosures of widespread syndicates in gambling and vice, another manifestation of moral depravity.

To tax and tax our people for spendthrift ventures in Government is immorality in a most outrageous form, because with every increase in taxes our freedoms are whittled away. We are deprived of our freedom to do what we choose with the fruits of our labors. The self-annointed bureaucrats take over.

But add to all of this taxation without representation and what becomes of the rights assured to the people under the Constitution?

Why, you know James Otis said, way back in 1761, that "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

We could go on and on with this picture of immorality gnawing at the vitals of the Republic: featherbedding of the offices of Government with partisan political hacks and cronies to administer wage and price controls and allocation of materials, and immorality in our politics abroad as well as at home.

Oh, yes, fellow Nebraskans, the time has come when we must rededicate our lives to the spirit of the founders, because the freedoms of the American people are in peril.

The underlying, fundamental issue before our country today, with its ramifications reaching into the homes, the schools, the offices, the factories, and the mines throughout the land, is whether the Congress, representing the people, shall deter-

mine the national defense policies or whether the President shall be allowed to usurp this tremendous power and establish a military dictatorship.

Congress must assert its constitutional rights and prerogatives, if the Republic is to survive and not be supplanted by a military dictatorship controlling the lives and activities of our people, through determination of national defense policies, with their tremendous impact upon the national economy.

The American people are confronted today by this awful threat, usurpation of congressional prerogatives in the troops-for-Europe issue. It is just that serious, just that far-reaching. It strikes at the very essence of morality, honesty, and integrity in government, government by law and order.

Don't be misled by those propagandists who would fasten the yoke of a military dictatorship upon the American people. These propagandists, some of them sincere in their groping for the right, have lost faith in the principles of the Republic. They have lost faith in the wisdom of the people.

They have invented a theory that challenges the basic concepts of the Constitution, with its division of power and checks and balances among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

One by one, leaders of the administration, its "me-tooers," and administration lap poodles among the press and radio offer their hush, hush lullabies to the people.

To them the President and the dominant voices in the Pentagon are supreme, the final arbiters of national defense and its impact upon the lives and activities of the people.

Fellow Americans, arise. Smite these alien-minded plotters and planners within our Nation's borders. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. Time is running short. You are walking the last mile.

Listen to Lincoln, and where could it be more appropriate to quote the great emancipator than in this city named in his honor.

This is what Lincoln wrote in a letter to William H. Herndon on February 15, 1858:

"The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally if not always, that the good of the people was the object.

"This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us."

This quotation from Abraham Lincoln is rarely heard, but it is most timely, and should ring in the ears of every mother and father in the land.

It should be heeded by President Truman. We Americans don't believe in divine rights for kings or presidents.

Fellow Nebraskans, that is why I introduced Senate Resolution 8, the Wherry resolution, into the Senate. It reads as follows:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no ground forces of the United States should be assigned to duty in the European area pending the adoption of a policy with respect thereto by the Congress."

This resolution has been garbled and twisted by the advocates of a military dictatorship when it neither approves nor disapproves the sending of ground forces to Europe for purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty. It simply says that no such forces shall be committed until the Congress adopts a policy on the matter.

After the President had stated over and over through the press and radio that he alone possessed absolute power to assign American Armed Forces anywhere in the world, and for any purpose he alone deemed to be in the national interest, the junior Sen-

ator from Nebraska introduced this resolution to serve as a red light against the President's vaulting grab for dictatorial power over the military and national defense policy.

The sole purpose of the resolution is to see that the Congress becomes a full-fledged partner with the President in the determination of national defense policy. When this is done the whole purpose of the Wherry resolution will have been accomplished and your rights as citizens and masters of your Government will be protected.

I am opposed to sending a single American foot soldier to join an international army in Europe and to serve under foreign flags and foreign officers in preparedness for a land war with Russia, if the tyrants of Russia are so foolish as to start a war with us.

But the question of whether or not our boys shall be drafted into such an army is of such tremendous importance that the people should have a right to determine it through their representatives in Congress.

Despite the vicious smear campaign waged against the Wherry resolution by the advocates of a military dictatorship we are making some progress toward restoration of the rights and duties of the Congress to determine national defense policy as representatives of the people who furnish the troops and pay the taxes.

The resolution approved by the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees as a substitute for the Wherry resolution adopts the substance of the Wherry resolution by asserting congressional jurisdiction in the determination of whether ground forces should be assigned to the international army in Europe for purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty.

While I am opposed to the part of the resolution approving the sending of four more divisions, and their assignment with the two divisions already over there in occupation duty—to the international army—the committees and the Congress will make the decision.

That complies with the Wherry resolution. The committees' substitute gives notice to the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty that they must contribute their "fair share" of troops for the land army. This is a condition attached to the sending of our troops and therefore complies with the Wherry resolution.

I contend that the phrase "fair share" is nebulous and subject to dispute over what is a "fair share," but the substitute also says that the "bulk" of the troops should be furnished by the other parties to the Treaty.

There is another provision in the substitute which is extraneous and open challenge. This is a provision approving all that President Truman has done in the interest of national security.

This might be construed as a blanket legalization of countless things that he has done—which neither the Congress nor the American people know about.

Before acting on such an over-all endorsement of the President's operations around the globe—under his assumed mastery over the national defense policy—the Congress and the people should have a detailed report by him on what he has done.

And it is my humble opinion—and I think the opinion of a majority of the Senators—had it not been for the introduction of the Wherry resolution—troops would have already been assigned to the international army in Western Europe—without limitation—without condition—and with the Congress and the American people left completely in the dark as to what the national defense policy is to be.

The Wherry resolution was limited to ground forces—because if the land war approach for defense of the free world is adopted—it will set the pattern for our whole defense effort—a ghastly mistake.

Senator CONNALLY, and other explainers of the North Atlantic Treaty told the Senate when it was up for ratification that all action to implement the Treaty must be submitted to the Congress for its determination, not after the action but for authorization.

We don't want any more Yalta. They are the root cause of all our major ills today, drafting of your boys, the taxes you pay, and the price and wage controls now being clamped on you.

Until the sins of Tehran and Yalta—all ratified and reaffirmed by President Truman at Potsdam—are washed away there can be no durable peace.

The Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees reported two resolutions.

One is a Senate resolution and calls for action by the Senate only; the other is a concurrent resolution and requires action by both the Senate and House of Representatives.

I see no reason for reporting two resolutions identical in language, unless it be that the President intends to start sending ground troops to the international army immediately after the Senate acts, assuming it approves the sending.

Certainly, on this great issue the voice of the House also should be heard, because the House, too, should be a full-fledged partner in determining the national defense policy.

Considering the resolutions of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees as a whole, they would approve the assignment of four more divisions to Europe and reserve to the Congress power to stop any further assignments.

This whole venture into preparedness for a land war with Russia is a colossal blunder. It is a gamble with the lives of American boys.

What it amounts to is—the United States contributes six divisions for a virtually non-existent Western European defense and then waits to see whether the other parties to the treaty put up their fair share of troops.

Russia has 175 divisions poised and ready to strike. All of the North Atlantic Treaty countries in Europe combined have fewer than 20 effective divisions and most of these will be needed within the borders of the various countries.

The North Atlantic Treaty is now nearly 2 years old, and there has been no springing to arms in Western Europe in all this time. Obviously, they are waiting for the United States to begin pouring its youth into Western Europe.

The four-division proposal is a foot-in-the-door proposition. Commit one division and the pressures will mount to send more and more to help them.

In World War II two-thirds of all the allied soldiers in Western Europe were from the United States.

We are told that all General Eisenhower wants is a treaty army, strong enough to prevent the Russian hordes and their satellites from overrunning Western Europe, and thereby prevent the destruction and occupation of Western Europe by the Russian armies.

There is little comfort in this assurance to the mothers and fathers of American youth.

There are thousands upon thousands of tear-stained pillows in America as a result of the venture into Korea.

The casualty list rises and rises, and we don't know when the end will be or how great the toll.

And, yet, the mothers and fathers are asked to send their boys to Europe as morale builders.

Prudence dictates that America be careful not to spread its substance so thin around the world that we are strong nowhere. We had better win the war in Korea, and not

offer our sons as morale builders in Western Europe.

But Dean Acheson says we need to send four divisions as morale builders, and that Western Europe will prepare a defense adequate to defend herself.

Already we have approved the British loan, the International Bank, UNNRA, ECA, the arms implementation bill, and, today we are furnishing money to provide 85 percent of the armament for Western Europe.

We have poured more than \$50,000,000,000 in cash and goods into Europe since World War II ended.

On top of this, we ratified the North Atlantic Treaty, which provides the moment a member country is attacked, we go to her aid.

Now, if all of this has not improved Europe's morale, what more morale building can you do with four more divisions in Western Europe?

And how do the foot soldier generals intend to win the war with Russia, if God forbid, it comes?

They make no claim they can win the war with a hold-the-line defense army in Western Europe. They talk and talk and they suggest other means with a modest reference to air and sea power.

General Marshall testified before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees at least 300 divisions would be necessary to hurl the Russians back and march on to Moscow.

Why, this whole idea of trying to defeat Russia on the ground is sheer stupidity and anyone with reasoning ability can see that it is.

Napoleon tried. He failed.

Hitler hurled 250 divisions against the Russians. He failed.

Air power is the answer.

The dominant voices in the Pentagon, General Marshall, General Bradley, and General Collins, all ground officers by training, have their eyes glued to the ground, when they should wake up to the aeronautical facts of life.

Our air power is the chief deterrent to world war III.

Air power, supported by an invincible navy and ground troops to occupy Russia after, repeat after, Russia's war industrial potential has been destroyed, is the best insurance for victory if war comes.

To commit American boys to ground warfare with Russia's hordes before Russia's war industrial potential has been pulverized, would be tragic and needlessly cost the lives of many of our young men.

The sound, sensible thing to do is to build an adequate air force to protect our own homeland and destroy Russia's war industrial potential.

It is mandatory that we have sufficient air power to protect the United States. But we cannot afford the kind of an air force it is going to take to do that job, if we provide the kind of a standing army the Pentagon wants and the invincible navy that has to back up the Air Force.

That is why I voted for the selective service manpower bill on March 9. We must provide for strengthening our Air Force and Navy, and provide the necessary land forces. This is the simple explanation: Having voted to eliminate the unsound features of the bill, but appreciating the necessity of passing the sound provisions, though the unsound remained, my judgment was the importance of the sound outweighed the evil in the unsound.

But, I shall continue to do my utmost for revision of the unsound. The House has yet to pass its manpower bill, which differs in many sections from the Senate bill. In time the two bills will go to conference between the two bodies, giving more opportunity for sensible revision.

Certainly we have to provide an air force which will prevent the Red air force from flying over the North Pole to the United States, which they can do in 5½ hours and bomb our industrial centers into ashes.

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of the United States Air Force, has stated that 70 percent of an enemy attack in force upon the United States, could now get through and bomb us.

The highest-ranking officers of the Air Force have testified before the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees that our present air power is inadequate. They have given warning.

Lt. Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, commanding general of the Strategic Air Command at Omaha, testified on February 21, 1951. I asked him, and I quote from the official record:

"Senator WHERRY. If you commit one division (that is ground troops to Europe) do you agree with General Eisenhower that we must be prepared to go the whole way on the ground?"

"General LEMAY. Well, sir, I do not believe that we need to match Russia division for division fighting a full-scale war on the ground. I do not believe we should conduct a war against Russia in that manner.

"Senator WHERRY. How would you conduct it?"

"General LEMAY. I would use the weapons at which we are more proficient and better capable of providing. We are not capable of fighting the Russian Empire by matching their manpower.

"Senator WHERRY. I want to thank you. Would it be better for Western Europe, after the statement you just made, to take temporary occupation, occupation by the aggressor while our air power is destroying Russia rather than to engage the Red army on the ground?"

"General LEMAY. I think that would be the more efficient way of doing it.

"Senator WHERRY. What would happen to the armies of Russia in the field if her war potential, the industrial war potential, were destroyed at home?"

"General LEMAY. An army in the field becomes impotent when it is not resupplied.

"Senator WHERRY. So with the destruction of Russia's war potential, the Russian Army would disintegrate?"

"General LEMAY. If they could not be resupplied they would become ineffective.

"Senator WHERRY. If you had to choose between defense dollars, and I would like to say that I accept the figures of Senator BYRD that the expenditures of budgets for the balance of this fiscal year and next will reach approximately \$144,700,000,000, if you had to choose defense dollars, what would you choose to spend to build the deterrent which you think would stop a Russian invasion?"

"General LEMAY. I would choose the weapon of air power."

Fellow Nebraskans, that was General LeMay speaking, the man who delivered by air the knock-out blows that paved the way for victory over Japan—blows that made it unnecessary to land foot soldiers on the soil of Japan.

Ladies, these are some truths that even the so-called wise men overlook because of their training and attachments.

Among those who testified before the Senate committees on the Wherry resolution, was Mrs. William A. Becker, of New Jersey, chairman of the Twenty-fifth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense.

This council, representing millions of women, adopted a resolution in support of the Wherry resolution.

She told the Senators:

"We know there is a great difference of opinion among experts—whatever they say—concerning how wars ought to be fought. As women, we value human life above everything else, especially American life. We believe we should follow those experts who say war can be fought with machines better

than it can be fought by sacrificing troops on the ground the way they are being sacrificed in Korea."

Twenty years ago the military was reluctant to give up the cavalry. They said that you couldn't conquer a people unless you used horses.

Remember how the ground fighters and battleship admirals fought the late Billy Mitchell, when he pointed out the tremendous advantage of air power? The American people were with Billy Mitchell and his spirit marches on—but the bayonet generals still dictate Pentagon strategy.

Must we suffer more and more casualties and back-breaking debt, tears, pain, and misery through failure of the Truman Administration to grasp the potentialities of air power? God forbid.

Great Britain for hundreds of years dominated the world by ruling the seas. Today air power is the dominant weapon. Control the air and you control the ground under it for no nation can long withstand a siege by air.

But unless you and all other patriotic Americans get busy the foot-soldier generals, with their antiquated methods of warfare and their reliance upon winning, as General Bradley put it in a recent address in Boston, over the dead bodies of ground soldiers, again will make the Infantry the spearhead of our national defense.

America must be strong, strong militarily, strong financially, strong economically, and strong spiritually.

The free-handed spenders in the Government and their me-too-ers are full of ideas for building morale around the world, everywhere at the expense of the American taxpayers.

What about the morale of the American people? We better do something for their morale and the best thing right now would be to cut the outrageous cost of government, and develop a sound national defense policy.

With the people discussing the great issues involved and Congress recapturing its prerogatives and duties as the policy-making branch of the Government—there can be hope for sound solutions in the American way—the way of the founders and builders of our beloved State.

In this Eastertide our thoughts turn more than usual to God for guidance. With firm reliance upon the Almighty, the ship of state will weather the storm and our country—all free people—will find peace and contentment.

RESOLUTIONS, FOUNDER'S DAY, 1951

Whereas we are again in annual meeting of Republicans on founder's day assembled to celebrate the anniversary of Nebraska's statehood, to honor our forefathers and their achievements in the development and preservation of State resources, in continued governmental progress, in their foresight by constitutionally setting a pattern for economical and efficient government, in the development of a philosophy of unselfish public service, in their courageous advancement of a type of local government providing, by progressive action, for the welfare of our Nebraska citizenry; and

Whereas our State of Nebraska has progressed under Republican leadership, and has, under Governor Val Peterson and other constitutional officers received sound and able leadership and excellent government; and

Whereas the State of Nebraska has given much to America by the presence of Senators BUTLER and WHERRY, and Congressmen STEFAN, CURTIS, MILLER, and BUFFETT in the halls of Congress during the 20-year period of Democratic created and perpetuated crises; and

Whereas the fundamental principles of the Republican Party are to establish and maintain peace with and for all mankind,

to perpetuate a country in which it is possible for every citizen to earn a good living with the promise of real progress for himself and family, to uphold as a beacon light for mankind everywhere the inspiring American tradition of liberty, opportunity, and justice for all, to insure individuality, to preserve local government, to continue government as a servant, to administer government by economical and constitutional means, to conserve America's resources, to strengthen and unify our defense, to advance a foreign policy dedicated to preserving a free America in a free world of freedom, to cooperate with our peace-loving nations, and by comparison; and

Whereas weak and vacillating international policies were fostered by Communist sympathizers in the State Department through illegal secret agreements greatly strengthened and encouraged Communist dictatorships, which accomplished betrayal of the Chinese Republic and resulted in the Korean war; and

Whereas Russia has since World War II obstructed plans for world peace, has failed to cooperate with the peace-loving nations of the world, has aided and abetted tyrants adhering to a philosophy that might makes right, has procured the assistance of satellite nations in its drive toward communistic world domination, has caused and fostered hatred in the world and against all freedom-loving mankind, has actually furnished material assistance to aggressor nations and peoples, and has made fantastic claims of untold benefits to all people embracing communism; and

Whereas the administration, by a tax and spend, borrow and bankrupt, rule and ruin philosophy has unnecessarily burdened the American taxpayer and mortgaged the future welfare of our country and its citizens and has, by faulty Government policies and by indifferent neglect failed to assume its responsibility for current cruel high prices and continually pleads with the citizenry for cooperation, patience, sacrifice, economy, and faith; and

Whereas the administration has, by the vicious practice of package presentation, repeatedly violated sound principles of representative legislation, thereby depriving Congress of the right to legislate and consider the merits of individual proposals as evidenced by the present War Manpower Act; and

Whereas during 20 years of Democratic national administration, the American people have observed promises being broken, the Treasury looted by devious schemes, taxpayers burdened with confiscatory taxes, people regimented under sugar-coated bribery, private enterprise paralyzed, individual initiative penalized, State's rights overridden, local government subdued, browbeaten, and misled, class set against class, foreign policy determined by illegitimate secret agreements, commitments, and understandings, Congress ignored, the judiciary attacked, and innumerable shocking revelations and scandalous disclosures of governmental corruption, brazenly and indifferently shrugged off; and

Whereas during the Eightieth Congress, the representatives of the Republican Party proved that they can, and will, stop this orgy of spending, and balance the Federal budget, if given the opportunity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we commend Gov. Val Peterson and other State officials—

1. For improved administration of State institutions.
2. For a much-needed 10-year building program of institutional buildings.
3. For continued development, preservation, and improvement of roads and highways.
4. For effective law enforcement.
5. For prompt and efficient handling of State emergencies.

6. For local advancement in the field of resources, flood control, reclamation, and soil conservation.

7. For placing Nebraska during the past 4 years in the envious position of taking the lowest tax percentage of the total income of its citizens for State government of any other State.

That we commend Senators BUTLER and WHERRY and Congressmen STEFAN, CURTIS, MILLER, and BUFFETT, who while serving in Congress have shown a high quality of leadership, thus bringing honor to their native State of Nebraska and who, during turbulent times, by their courageous stand for the principles of Americanism and the American way of life have earned the respect of the people of this great State.

That the principles and ideals to which the Republican Party stands dedicated represent the true philosophy of Americanism and the desires and ideals of liberty-loving Americans; that the Democratic Party does not represent the will of the majority in the United States.

That Russia be branded as a tyrannical dictatorship, engaged in an aggressive communistic conspiracy against all free government and against all freedom-loving peoples of the world; that immediate action be taken by the United Nations so that no strategic war materials be furnished by any member nation to any country termed an aggressor by the United Nations; that no member of the United Nations shall furnish strategic war materials to any nation assisting a nation termed an aggressor; that economic sanctions shall be invoked against any aggressor nation or nations and against any nation aiding or assisting such aggressor; that Russia be prevailed upon to lift the iron curtain so that the people of the world, including Russians, by freedom of travel, may compare the alleged communistic benefits to the certain benefits of free government, and that America fight communism at home, eliminate communism in Government, condemn communism abroad, and aid all other countries in their struggle to preserve their governments against all and further communistic encroachments; and

That legislative action be taken so that the three principles of the War Manpower Act, namely (1) universal military training, and (2) drafting of 18-year-olds, and (3) selective service, can be individually and separately considered.

That we condemn the complacent attitude of the present administration toward racketeers in high public positions, which has resulted in a continual increase in the sale of influence and the moral degeneration of those placed in positions of public trust.

That the administration set the example by now reducing nonessential and nondefense spending to an absolute minimum; by adopting a pay-as-you-go policy; by living within its income instead of on borrowed credit; by encouraging a minimum of dependence upon the Federal Government; by recognizing local government as the responsive and responsible government; by insuring all our citizens a decent living at decent wages and return, after taxes, and thereby eliminate much that today constitutes the basic causes of inflation.

That the present foreign policy as formulated by Dean Acheson is the exclusive responsibility of the Democratic administration and that we take pride in the divergent views expressed by the several great leaders of our party on foreign policy; that we commend the free expression of free speech that does exist within our party. We further believe that this free expression aids in the presentation of all sides of the issue to the American people, and they as the sovereign power will decide as to the policy ultimately to be formulated and accepted.

That no doubt can now remain as to the tragic incapacity of the Democratic Party

in international affairs; that there should be no further hesitancy on the part of the Senate of the United States in recovering its constitutional treaty-making powers and end the usurpation of its powers by the executive branch of the Government, and more particularly, the State Department; that the United States is not to be bound by secret agreements, commitments or understandings with foreign nations unless the same shall be subsequently and expeditiously submitted to the Senate of the United States for open consideration and approval to the end that the American people will be completely informed and advised, that there should be close cooperation between Congress and the President in matters of defense, and that Congress shall be a full-fledged partner in the determination of our national defense policy as correlated with any international program of defense or supplemented by foreign defense commitments.

That the Democratic administration by its power politics, sale of influence, and its political selfishness, has clearly, throughout nearly two decades, demonstrated its ineptitude and inability in matters of administration; has through its irresponsibility intentionally failed to constitutionally administer the American form of government; has by its lack of foresight utterly failed in domestic and foreign affairs to sensibly plan for the future; has by its flagrant, overbearing usurpation of local government become top heavy with centralized power; has by emphasizing class distinction in America rendered a disservice to all citizens of the United States; has by secret foreign agreements, commitments, and understandings jeopardized the safety of the American people; has now become so stagnant, impotent, and corrupt that it cannot further be entrusted with affairs of state. Thus, we indict and inform against the Democratic administration, and therefore, in order to preserve the United States, said Democratic administration must be removed from power and a Republican President and Republican Congress elected in 1952.

Respectfully submitted.

Frederick H. Wagener, chairman, Lincoln; Mrs. Alice Amend, Hastings; Charles E. McCarl, McCook; Mrs. Carl Fleming, Columbus; Art Gardner, Crete; Edson Smith, Omaha; Lynn D. Hutton, Norfolk; William A. Stewart, Lexington; John Wagoner, Grand Island; Chauncey Barney, Lincoln; resolutions committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

CONVENTION WITH CANADA RELATING TO OPERATION OF CERTAIN RADIO EQUIPMENT, ETC.—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive C, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada relating to the operation by citizens of either country of certain radio equipment or stations in the other country, signed at Ottawa on February 8, 1951. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention between the United States of America and Canada relating to the operation by citizens of either country of certain radio equipment or stations in the other country, signed at Ottawa on February 8, 1951.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention above-mentioned.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 27, 1951.

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Secretary of State; (2) convention with Canada relating to the operation of certain radio equipment or stations, signed at Ottawa February 8, 1951.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the Secretary will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James J. Wadsworth to be Deputy Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to express my satisfaction at the opportunity of voting for the confirmation of the nomination of James J. Wadsworth to be Deputy Federal Civil Defense Administrator. "Jerry" Wadsworth and I although of different political faiths worked very closely together for a great many years, when I was Governor of New York and when he was a member, and a very influential one, of the assembly. He is a worthy son of a former distinguished Member of this House who has shown great courage and high patriotism throughout a long and very useful career. I am very confident that Mr. Wadsworth will serve with distinction and credit to himself in the performance of the very important work which will be assigned to him.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will automatically resume the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the minority leader whether he knows of any other Senators who may wish to address the Senate at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. I may say to the distinguished acting majority leader that there is at least one Senator who would

like to speak today, in addition to Senators who have already spoken. I refer to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is present. I know of no other Senator who desires to be heard this afternoon. However, the distinguished Senator from Utah has prepared, in accordance with his custom, a detailed speech, which deals with the legality of the pending resolution. I am satisfied that it would be well to have as many Senators as possible hear him. Even though it is Tuesday afternoon and apparently there are not as many Senators on the floor as we should like, yet I am confident that the speech which has been prepared by the Senator from Utah will mean much to all of those who will read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to inquire whether the Senator from Utah desired recognition.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure the Senator from Utah desires to be recognized, and I should like to have the Chair recognize him; but before that is done I should merely like to express my appreciation to the Senator for having his speech ready for delivery this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement regarding the order of business to be followed tomorrow?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I think it timely that we call the attention of Senators to the fact that on Wednesday, March 28, we shall operate under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, and that the time for debate will be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

ASSIGNMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO DUTY IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 99) approving the action of the President of the United States in cooperating in the common defense efforts of the North Atlantic Treaty nations.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, at the appropriate time in the consideration of the resolutions which are pending before the Senate, I shall make a motion to recommit them to the joint committees which reported Senate Resolution 99 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, with instructions to these committees to study, prepare, and report a bill or joint resolution implementing the provisions of the Atlantic Pact, if any, having to do with furnishing armed forces by the United States for the garrisoning of the European area or of placing its armed forces within that area for the purpose of aiding in its defense, prior to an aggression by any other power or powers. The motion will also contain an instruction that the committees report within 2 weeks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it the intention of the Senator to make his motion prior to

Monday, or is it his intention to make it at that time?

Mr. WATKINS. My present intention is to make the motion after—

Mr. WHERRY. After the debate is concluded?

Mr. WATKINS. After the debate is concluded on the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, after the hour of 10 o'clock, Monday, at which time the limitation of debate starts. At that time, of course, the motion would be in order, and I suppose it is now in order. That is why I desired to ask the Senator whether he felt that the opportune time for making the motion would be between now, and, let us say, Friday of this week, or on Monday, April 2, having in mind that on that day, at the hour of 10 a. m., there will be a limitation of debate upon any amendment or motion. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, debate will be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, or 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. WATKINS. I so understand.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether it is true that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the debate, starting on Monday, must be concluded on that day, and a vote had?

Mr. WHERRY. No. As I understand, the unanimous-consent agreement provides that consideration of the two resolutions shall proceed on Monday, until they shall have been disposed of. That would involve the disposition of any amendment or motion, as well as disposition of the two resolutions. Whether that can all be accomplished on one day, I do not know; but the consideration is to be continuous, it is to be without interruption. As to whether the consideration of the two resolutions shall be completed on Monday, I do not know what would be the sense of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is contended by some Senators that the meaning is, there must be a continuous session until we get through.

Mr. WHERRY. It is true that the agreement provides for a continuous session.

Mr. CONNALLY. That might mean day and night.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, if the Senate wishes to proceed in that manner. It is my understanding of the unanimous-consent agreement, that the Senate is to continue in session until both resolutions are disposed of. Whether the Senate will wish to have a night session, in the event of a failure to conclude debate and consideration of the resolutions earlier would be a matter for the Senate to determine. But, in the absence of further action, by motion or otherwise, to the contrary, the Senate is to remain in continuous session until both resolutions have been voted upon.

I may suggest to the distinguished Senator from Utah that other Senators have contemplated making a motion similar to that described by the Senator, though possibly not the exact motion, since the instructions of the Senator

from Utah may differ from those contemplated by other Senators. But I understand that the motion is in order, and that it may be made at any time the distinguished Senator desires to make it. I merely wished to bring to the Senator's attention the fact that, if he waits until Monday to make the motion, the Senate will then be operating under a limitation of time of 1 hour—30 minutes to a side.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for calling the matter to my attention. I do not wish to be precluded from making the motion earlier as the debate proceeds, if I so decide. However, I think the questions I intend to raise today are so important that Senators ought to have the outline in ample time, in order that they may study the matters I shall call to their attention.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to compliment the Senator for the position he has taken in this matter. When the original resolution was offered, it was then my thought that the Senate should consider but one phase of the subject, namely, the question of whether the Congress should make the determination. Since then, the merits of this subject and many other very important questions have been brought into the debate, causing me to be firmly of the opinion that whatever action is now taken should be through joint action of the two Houses, and it should have the complete effect of the enactment of organic law.

So I wish to say now that, whether the Senator makes the motion or whether it is made by some other Senator, I shall favor a recommittal of the two resolutions to the two committees, sitting jointly, at least for one purpose, namely, that whatever measure comes before the Senate shall be in the form of a Senate joint resolution, in which both Houses shall become full partners; and, what is more, which shall require the President of the United States to make his determination regarding the signing of such a measure, or the vetoing of it. I feel that whatever legislation is passed now requiring congressional determination of whether troops shall be sent to Europe, should have the force and full effect of organic law.

The Senator may have more in mind than that, but I think it is a very constructive step to take, in view of the debate and the many far-reaching questions which have been brought into the discussion, the responsibility for determining which I think both Houses and the President should share and assume.

Mr. WATKINS. One of my reasons for presenting the matter to the Senate today in connection with the fact that I intend to make this move has been occasioned by the great degree of confusion in the minds of the people, of Government officials, and even of the Senate itself. I have taken a fairly good look at the resolutions which are now before the Senate, and I have come to the conclusion that they mean absolutely nothing except the expression of a pious hope

and some advice to the President of the United States; and I am very much afraid that when he gets the advice he will not know what we intended by it or what to do with it. I think our veteran leaders should have remembered what was done a little more than 5 years ago when there was under discussion a question almost identical with the one we are now considering. In connection with another pact, the President made commitments and the leaders made commitments and they worked out together a situation identical with that which is before us now. It seems to me, under the circumstances, it is time to take a look at our situation to see if we cannot proceed in an orderly, constitutional manner to enact a law which will authorize the President to do the proper thing, rather than to go along piecemeal with resolutions which mean very little, and which, at the same time, may mean a great deal, because we do not know what they mean.

I should like to invite the Senate's attention to the fact that there has been a studied effort to place certain powers in the hands of two committees of the Senate, to give them information, and to permit them to speak for the Senate without other Members of the Senate knowing what is going on. I think we should not countenance any longer such a state of affairs. There should not be an elite group in the Senate of the United States which can get information which other Senators cannot obtain, on the theory that it is not safe to trust them with such matters involving activities affecting the national defense.

Mr. WHERRY. Especially is the observation made by the Senator true if amendments are not adopted. Paragraph 6, when it was written, carried the intent of the two committees, but it is contradicted in three or four different places in both resolutions as they now appear. Furthermore, if certain amendments should be agreed to, would not the result be to completely bypass the Congress and leave it to the discretion of the two committees and the President of the United States to determine the national defense policy of the United States?

Mr. WATKINS. I think that is correct. That is one of the main reasons why neither one of the resolutions should be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. I completely agree with the Senator, and I hope that in his speech he will deal with that question.

Mr. WATKINS. I may not deal with it in my prepared speech, but I have been in the Senate sufficiently long to know that there are certain Senators to whom such matters are entrusted. I do not believe they consider it any safer to entrust such things to them than it is to entrust them to any of the others of us, but, somehow or other, we have permitted this group to develop, and the State Department entrusts to them matters which it will not trust to the other Members of the Senate.

I do not know whether I have been picked out as one who cannot be trusted, but we have to make our decisions on the same problems without information.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that when the Senate does hear about what has been done and has been advised of the recommendations, the whole thing has been accomplished, and all the Senate has to do is to refer the matter to committees?

Mr. WATKINS. We are told that we shall be made to appear foolish before the world and to be the laughing stock of the world if we do not agree to the recommendations, and therefore we have to follow along. I object most strenuously to that, as I have done ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. If there is any Senator who cannot be trusted with secret matters with which other Senators are entrusted, he should be called on to resign.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the distinguished Senator from Utah, who in years gone by has been a lawyer and an able jurist in his own right, intend in the course of his statement to give an interpretation of what the resolutions mean to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WATKINS. No; I do not intend to spend too much time on the resolutions. I intend to invite the attention of the Senate and of the country to a path which was marked out in full cooperation between the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States in a similar situation which I think is binding in this instance. It would end all the confusion and turmoil, and it should end the debate if the President and the Congress would follow the course which was taken approximately 6 years ago. I do not intend to go into the resolutions at this time, for the simple reason that I could spend the whole afternoon trying to figure out what they mean.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington will listen with real and thoughtful interest to what the Senator from Utah has to say during the remainder of his remarks, but I am wondering if now the Senator would give his interpretation, in brief, of what Senate Resolution 99 actually would do. The reason why I ask the question is that Americans by the millions are curious and uncertain as to what it is we have before us and what the Senate is attempting to do. If the Senator from Utah can tell us what he thinks the resolution will do or will not do, it would be of benefit to the Nation.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall make a short answer to that question. I want to have the resolution recommitted to the committee and let the committee report a measure which would have some meaning and effect, because I do not think these resolutions are anything more than the expression of a hope on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. I share the Senator's view in that respect. The purpose was that the committee would have an opportunity to report an instrument of one kind or another, which in due time the President would sign. But does the Senator from Utah think that if the resolutions should be adopted by the

Senate they would have any binding effect whatever on the President of the United States, the Chief Executive of the Nation.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not think they would bind the President in any way whatsoever.

Mr. CAIN. In the opinion of the Senator from Utah, then, Senate Resolution 99 merely expresses the opinion of the Senate that with reference to the future the Senate hopes the President of the United States will do this, that, or the other thing. Is that correct?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. It approves a certain act either done or contemplated. It does not have the force of law; it is merely an expression of opinion. We might change our opinion tomorrow if occasion should require it.

Mr. CAIN. When the Senate of the United States approves a course of conduct which the President either has pursued or intends to pursue, the resolution amounts to nothing more than some encouragement by the Senate for the Chief Executive to do what he was going to do anyway.

Mr. WATKINS. I think that is a fact. He has already said he was going to do something and we would approve it. I may say to the Senator from Washington that I am one of those who believe we have before us a real constitutional crisis. I say that in view of what happened in Korea. I made some study of that situation and of the law, and I say now that the President of the United States and the United Nations itself, the two groups acting together, absolutely violated the written charter of the United Nations. I do not know of anything to go by except that charter, which is a grant of power to the United Nations. They violated their own procedure, and the President of the United States violated the procedure which he himself and the Congress had agreed on with respect to questions of that kind. I have not heard the matter discussed on the floor and I have not seen anything in the newspaper columns or magazines with reference to it, but I saw what happened in 1945 when the debate was taking place with reference to the ratification of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. CAIN. I deeply hope, then, that the Senator from Utah will continue his remarks for quite a long time this afternoon for the benefit of all who are interested and concerned.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not know how long I shall continue. I have other subjects to discuss. I felt it was fair to the Senate and to the country to bring up at this time the question I have raised so that we could see the trail which has been blazed along that line, and the precedents which have been set. The administration was bound to consider the Atlantic Pact wholly within the United Nations Charter, and it should proceed in the same way today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Without laboring the point, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah whether or

not the main reason for making the motion which the Senator has stated he expects to make, namely, to recommit the resolutions, is that he finds in his own mind that whatever is done by the Senate and the House, acting jointly, under their constitutional prerogatives, should be done either in the form of a Senate joint resolution or a bill, which would, if passed, have the legal effect of organic law.

Mr. WATKINS. That is exactly what I believe, and that is why I intend as my next move to ask unanimous consent to introduce, for reference to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, a joint resolution, so that it, or one like it, may be reported to the Senate within 2 weeks, if my motion prevails.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Regardless of the contents of what the committees report to the Senate, am I correct in assuming that what is uppermost in the Senator's mind is that the committees shall report a Senate joint resolution?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. I am introducing a joint resolution, which if passed, would be the law of the land. Its purpose would be along the line of the United Nations Participation Act, in the passage of which all parties joined and on which everyone agreed. The passage of that act blazed the way. I am amazed by the fact that someone has not held it up as the course to follow at this time. By doing so we could have saved a great deal of confusion. I am particularly amazed that the President should have overlooked it, because he not only approved the act but sent a letter to the Senate approving of what had been done. We are faced with a similar situation today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services a joint resolution, which I hope the two committees, sitting jointly, will consider in their joint capacity, inasmuch as they have already considered the resolutions now pending before the Senate. I ask that the joint resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Is there objection to the joint resolution being received and referred as requested by the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The clerk will read the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) providing for implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was read, and referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, jointly, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of Armed Forces, and their degree of readiness and general location, to be made available by the United States for the purposes of such treaty; and no Armed Forces in addition to the Armed

Forces provided for in such special agreement or agreements shall be made available by the United States for such purposes.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I realize that by reason of the parliamentary situation I cannot offer my joint resolution as a substitute for either of the two resolutions which are now pending before the Senate. Therefore, I have had to make an outright introduction and to ask that the joint resolution be referred to the proper committees. The joint resolution, or a similar one, should be considered by the two committees sitting jointly, in order to help solve the problems which now confront the Senate and the country. I may say now, for fear that I may forget to say it later, that the joint resolution which I am introducing, except for changing some names, such as "United Nations" to "Atlantic Pact," and making other necessary changes, is almost identical with section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act, which was passed by Congress in 1945, as I recall, almost unanimously. It would authorize the President to negotiate agreements with Atlantic Pact nations.

In view of what I shall hereafter say I think it will appear that there is considerable doubt, in view of the statements of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Secretary of State during the debate on the Atlantic Treaty, that the Atlantic Pact contemplated in any way, shape, or form the sending of armed forces to Europe prior to an aggression. To be liberal about it, let us say that at least there is some doubt. If there is some doubt, we should authorize the President to negotiate agreements, such agreements would not be treaties, but would come under the constitutional power of Congress to provide the armed forces in order to do whatever must be done to fulfill our pledge under the Atlantic Pact.

I wish to emphasize the fact, Mr. President, that I am trying to make a constructive move. I am not attempting to hinder or delay matters. It is the kind of move that should have been made in the very beginning. I am frank to say again that I cannot understand why the problem was not approached in this way, particularly when so many Senators who worked out the details of the pact are still Members of the Senate.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the committees, sitting jointly, a joint resolution was considered, which some Senators supported, but a larger number of Senators voted against, and that the decision of the majority is the primary reason why a simple Senate resolution and a concurrent resolution are now before the Senate?

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I understand from what I have heard. I have heard by way of the grapevine that there was such discussion in the committees sitting jointly. I do not know whether it is mentioned in the report of the committees.

Mr. CAIN. I think it should be stated for the RECORD that there is no secret about the fact that a number of Senators were in support of a joint resolution. Just prior to the time that we had hoped to have a vote taken on the joint resolution an amendment was offered in the form of a concurrent resolution. The concurrent resolution prevailed, if I am not mistaken, by a vote of 16 to 8. From that moment on the joint committees never had an opportunity to consider an instrument such as the Senator from Utah expects to present to them in the future. I congratulate the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator. In my discussion today I shall attempt to give good and substantial reasons why Senate Resolution 99 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 should be resubmitted to the committee for further study and action.

I intend to show that the action of the President in ordering four new divisions to the European area, under alleged powers granted in the Atlantic Pact, is a complete reversal of policy and assurances given by the President and his legislative leaders in the Senate during the consideration of the approval of both the United Nations Charter and of the Atlantic Pact.

I also intend to show that the Atlantic Pact was sold to the Senate on the theory that it was within the terms and principles and procedures of the United Nations Charter, and in nowise in conflict with the basic objectives and provisions of that document.

I hope to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the present stand of the administration and its legislative supporters is a complete reversal of the position taken during the UN Charter debate in the Senate. It has already been demonstrated that the administration, through Secretary of State Acheson and administration Senate leaders, gave assurances to the Senate and to the country that the Atlantic Pact in nowise authorized or included within its terms the use of the Armed Forces of the United States in an international force in the European area prior to an aggression against pact nations.

It has already been stated on the floor of the Senate in the current debate that many Senators voted for the ratification of the Atlantic Pact because of these assurances. It has been indicated by some Senators that the present reversal by the administration on these points approaches a breach of faith. This is clearly an understatement, in my opinion.

WHY HAS THE ATLANTIC PACT NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED?

There is a welter of confusion which has only been increased by much of the discussion which has taken place recently with respect to the so-called troops-for-Europe issue. Much of this confusion need never have happened had the administration proceeded promptly to implement the Atlantic Pact as it did in the case of the implementation of the United Nations Charter.

The Atlantic Pact was approved by the Senate July 21, 1949, and went into effect

immediately thereafter. Twenty months have passed since that time; and up to the time the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee reported out these two resolutions, one a simple Senate resolution and the other a concurrent resolution, there was no official move on the part of the administration to implement the pact, to furnish troops for Europe, by any type of congressional action.

I may interpolate here that an implementation move was made and carried out by congressional action, in the furnishing of arms and armaments to our allies in the pact; but there was nothing with respect to troops.

It is difficult to understand why the administration should have neglected for so long to cooperate with the Congress in implementing this important treaty, with respect to assistance with armed forces prior to an aggression, except on the premise that the treaty did not cover this kind of assistance.

There may be some who will say that the move I am suggesting is for the purpose of delay; but I reply that we have had 20 months' delay. The administration has had 20 months in which to implement the Atlantic Pact by providing troops; and much of the information which has now been brought forth could just as easily have been brought forth 20 months ago. I remember distinctly that during the Atlantic Pact debate we were told not only once, but many times, that it was necessary for us to proceed with dispatch because time was of the essence, and that the plans and the program for the defense of the free nations of the earth should go forward immediately, without delay. There is grave question in my mind now as to why there was such a long delay in trying to implement the pact, if the administration sincerely believed that it provided for the sending of armed forces to Europe to aid in the defense, prior to an aggression, as set forth in article 5 of the Atlantic Pact.

Even though I voted against the Atlantic Pact, I realize that it is the law of the land. It set forth a policy which this country intended to pursue with respect to aggressions against ourselves or any of our European allies in the North Atlantic area. When a debate is over and a decision has been made, any good loyal American will support the program authorized. I undertake to do so now, and I feel that it is my obligation to do so. However, the great difficulty is in trying to determine, from that rather nebulous instrument called the Atlantic Pact, just what the program was intended to be.

I voted against the Atlantic Pact principally because reservations which would have cleared up the matter now under debate were defeated in the Senate, and, to my mind, that left a situation which could only mean trouble in the future. I do not know whether we can designate as trouble our current discussions and the delays involved, but it seems to me that the situation has developed pretty much as I anticipated.

Without the reservations I proposed, which reserved the right of Congress to declare war and send our Armed Forces to foreign lands, it seemed to me the pact

violated the Constitution, and made possible numerous misunderstandings which might be more harmful than the pact itself would be helpful.

I announced shortly before the vote was taken that if the reservations were adopted I would vote for the pact.

There are those who advance the view that a prohibition against the sending of troops to Europe prior to an aggression is actually contained within the meaning of the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty itself, and that the treaty pledges that troops will not be so committed without the consent of Congress. If that interpretation of the treaty and the legislative history of the related ratification is correct, then of course the administration is bound, and the President cannot go outside the terms of the treaty for authority to sustain him in his proposal to send troops to Europe without the approval of Congress.

Inasmuch as there is substantial doubt that the treaty must be interpreted as containing such a prohibition, Congress should, by legislative act, by joint resolution, pass on the question of authority to send troops to Europe under the provisions of the treaty. That is the only sound and logical way to implement this treaty and resolve the doubt. That is the purpose of the joint resolution which I have introduced.

My personal judgment is that those who take that view are correct, and for that reason I propose that we go ahead with strong language in the proposed joint resolution making it clear that the Congress, and not the President of the United States, is attending to the implementing of the treaty.

The real question now before the Senate and the House is not whether we shall send troops to Europe. It is the question as to how we are going to implement the pact. That is the question which ought to be decided in this immediate proceeding. Later, when the President has made the agreements authorized by my joint resolution, we can discuss and decide upon the reasonableness of the agreements which he presents to us, and for which he seeks our approval.

The decision on this basic question should not be glossed over again or ignored, as it was during the North Atlantic Pact discussions. As I pointed out, the proponents of the North Atlantic Pact were blowing both hot and cold. In one breath they said to our people that we were not committed, and in the next breath they said to the people of Europe that we were committed. By reason of such double talk many people in this country were fooled. It came to them as a great shock that the President of the United States should claim authority, as he did in the case of Korea, to order our troops into military action without the approval of Congress. The American people were shocked when they discovered that a so-called police action in Korea was in fact intervention in a large-scale war between two nations, even though the status of one of them was doubtful at the moment.

It is true that at first many of our people thought that the Korean intervention was a great action by our Presi-

dent. It seemed to show a great deal of courage and determination. It never occurred to our people, in their elation over an action that seemed to signify an end to a long history of appeasement, that the President's action was not entirely proper in point of law and that it was a mistake both in policy and in fact.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. As I understand, the President ordered American troops into Korea in the interest of peace, as he says; we went to war in Korea in order to make peace. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah this question: What does he think the reaction would be in the United States if the Soviet Union should order large bodies of troops into Canada, along our northern border, and into Mexico, across the Rio Grande, with the apparent intention of maintaining them there for an indefinite period of time?

Mr. WATKINS. Would the Senator further say "for the purpose of preserving peace"?

Mr. KEM. For the purpose of preserving peace.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the people of the United States would not believe that they intended to preserve the peace; and I believe there would be such an upheaval of public sentiment that whatever administration was in power at the time it happened would have to move immediately to bring about the withdrawal of such troops.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator agree with me that it would be rather difficult to convince our people that such a move by the Soviet Union was in the interest of peace, and with peaceful intent?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Senator's question answers itself. I doubt if it would be so considered.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Utah has recently been discussing the question of reservations. The Senator from Washington is keenly aware that the question of reservations was discussed during the debate on the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty. I am hopeful that the Senator from Utah will give us now his best memory as to the character and nature of the assurances given a year and a half ago, which led a great many Senators, in the best of good faith, to support a treaty which did not contain the reservations to which the Senator from Utah made reference a few minutes ago. Why, may I ask, is it necessary for us today to be listening to the Senator from Utah plead for the adoption of an instrument which is binding on the executive branch of the Government when a year and a half ago, as I, at least, remember so clearly, we were told that no one need have any fear of any kind, because all acts implementing the North Atlantic Treaty would be within the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. WATKINS. I may say to the Senator from Washington that the assurances which I recall were made by not only one Senator, but various Senators who were proponents of the pact and supporting it; and it was all summed up, as I recall, in the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that everything done in connection with the treaty would be in accordance with our constitutional processes. Such language was used in article 11 of the Atlantic Pact, and incidentally the same language was used in article 43 of the United Nations Charter. I recall the assurances which were given.

As the Senator will recall, I proposed a reservation. Its exact language I cannot repeat, but in substance it was to the effect that, notwithstanding anything contained in the pact, either in article 5 or in any other part of the pact, no assistance or armed forces would be sent to Europe unless it was directly authorized by a joint resolution of the Congress. In other words, the whole implementation with respect to war and the sending of armed forces rested squarely, in the end, with Congress, where I felt the Constitution placed it. I was told repeatedly that it was not necessary to have such a reservation adopted, simply because the pact itself left the decision to the Congress, because it said the provisions of the treaty had to be ratified and enforced under our constitutional processes, and those constitutional processes meant that the Congress of the United States would have the final word and say in respect to how the provisions of the pact were to be carried out.

I will say to the Senator from Washington that I intend to show, before I conclude, that that is exactly the interpretation which was made in the days when the United Nations Pact was before the Congress. It was the interpretation then, and it was felt when the debate was proceeding with respect to the Atlantic Pact that reservations were not necessary, and I was told they would not be necessary to carry it into effect.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Utah may find it interesting that the junior Senator from Washington was one who thought there was real merit in the reservation which the Senator from Utah offered a year and a half ago; but the Senator from Washington opposed it, not because, in his opinion, it was not good, but because distinguished Members of the Senate of the United States, speaking in support of ratifying the treaty, rose, and on their own responsibility said, "Senators, we hope you will not approve of these reservations, because the North Atlantic Treaty is not self-implementing, and the question of implementing it lies within the responsibility and the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States." The Senator from Washington must state publicly that he is full of distress and sorrow that he has lived to see a day when he could not rely on the assurances which dictated the course of action followed a year and a half ago.

Mr. WATKINS. In reply to what the Senator from Washington has just said,

let me say that I disliked very much to disagree with the very distinguished and amiable gentlemen who were proponents of the treaty, when they said that the provisions of the pact itself protected fully the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress, and that everything would have to be done in accordance with constitutional processes. The reason why I finally disagreed with them and did not accept their assurances, which most Senators accepted—I remember only a few voted with me—was that when I got through making my arguments for the reservations, which I felt were good, they said, "It is not necessary to take the action proposed to be taken under the reservations. That is a matter which is all taken care of." I said, "If that is true, if that is the meaning of the pact, why not say so in so many words, in clear-cut language, so that the European peoples who have an entirely different view"—as I demonstrated at that time by quoting from statements made by European statesmen and other statements which appeared in the press—"will have the same interpretation of the pact we have, so there will be no difference of interpretation; so that the language will have the same meaning here in Washington as it has in Denmark, in London, or in the capital of any of the other participating nations?" Senators replied, "If we do that it will cut the heart out of the treaty."

Then I immediately became suspicious. The Senators said the situation was protected, that it was not necessary that a reservation be adopted. I said, "Why not make the statement in plain English." I said further, "If that is the stand you take, if you do not agree to the reservation, it will result in cutting the heart out of the Constitution of the United States." I am taking the same position today and making the same request I made then.

Mr. CAIN. Let me say that the Senator from Utah at this minute is making a real contribution to the record, for the day is certain to come again when we shall be considering a course of action, and taking a course of action, based on the assurances of those who speak for the administration, and whether it be Republican or Democratic makes no difference. What the Senator from Utah is telling in my opinion presents a picture which is sad and tragic and lamentable. With reference to the question before us, he says it is before us today only by reason of the fact that assurances given 18 months ago are not to be relied on.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Washington. I quite agree with the observation he has just made.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. WATKINS. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah if it is not true that the Secretary of State also appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and gave assurances similar to those to which the Senator has referred as having been made by Senators who were urging the adoption of the treaty.

Mr. WATKINS. I believe that to be true. Especially did he make the statement with respect to the use of troops to garrison Europe as an implementation of the treaty. Representatives of the administration said categorically, that that was not the purpose; that that was not the intent of the treaty. I think that is the statement of representatives of the administration and of members of the Foreign Relations Committee. They absolutely interpreted out of the treaty any such purpose. The construction of the treaty they gave at that time is now binding upon the administration.

Mr. KEM. When Mr. Acheson appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and made such statements and gave such assurances, he was appearing there in his official capacity as Secretary of State, was he not?

Mr. WATKINS. He was appearing in that capacity, and as the spokesman for the administration, and the man who helped in or was responsible for the negotiation of the pact on the part of the United States, who was supposed to know what it meant, what it was intended to do, and likewise what it was not intended to do.

Mr. KEM. The reference to Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State brings this to mind, if the Senator will permit me to say so. A week or so ago the Senator from Utah made a powerful speech on the floor of the Senate when introducing a joint resolution proposing to relieve Italy of the restrictive provisions of the Italian peace treaty in order that Italy may do her part, may contribute her share to the defense of Europe. I will ask the Senator if the Italian peace treaty to which he referred in that speech was not also presented to the Senate by the Department of State through Mr. Acheson, and its adoption urged at that time.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say to the Senator that I do not recall whether Mr. Acheson was then Secretary of State. That was in 1947. He may have been Undersecretary at that time, and he may have presented the matter as Undersecretary. I do not recall that detail. But I do recall that the administration presented the treaty as having been signed by the parties, urged the Senate of the United States to ratify it, and whoever was the spokesman from the State Department presented all the arguments he could assemble to persuade the Senate to ratify it. I recall they said it was a bad treaty; they admitted it was a bad treaty; that they would like to have a better one, but that it was all they could get under the circumstances, and that the Senate ought to ratify it.

Mr. KEM. And the Senate ratified it at the urging, the request, and instance of the State Department.

Mr. WATKINS. That was the procedure. And the State Department was responsible for that. I did not happen to be in the majority. I voted against it. I was 1 of 10 who voted against it. I thought it was a bad treaty then, and I think it is a worse treaty now.

Mr. KEM. What has been the reaction of the administration and the State Department to the joint resolution in-

produced by the Senate from Utah in seeking to denounce this treaty?

Mr. WATKINS. I have not had any direct word from the State Department about it, but I have seen letters to other Members of the Congress in which the State Department has said, in effect, that this is not the time to set aside that treaty; in other words, generally the State Department was opposed to the passage of such a joint resolution.

Mr. KEM. How does that fit in with the present demand that large bodies of American troops be sent to Europe?

Mr. WATKINS. The treaty strips Italy of any defense forces of adequate size. As I recall, under the provisions of the treaty, Italy can have an army of only 185,000 men and can have only a few tanks and a few old-fashioned airplanes and some patrol boats to patrol the Italian Peninsula, but cannot have any battleships or any modern pursuit planes or any large bombers. In the over-all view, I think 250,000 is the size of the armed forces which Italy can have, under the provisions of that treaty. However, Mr. President, 250,000 men are not sufficient, in the judgment of military men, even to police Italy in case of a Communist insurrection or uprising. When we consider the situation, it is ridiculous to say to a nation which, during World War II, was able to raise a total of 8,000,000 men, either directly in the armed forces or in the reserves; that today 250,000 men is the maximum size of all the armed forces it may have.

Such a requirement has a direct effect upon the morale of the Italian people, for we know that in the event of trouble between Russia and Italy, or in the event of a Russian attempt to invade Italy, for every Italian who, because of the restrictions imposed by the Italian peace treaty, would be required to sit on the side lines, an American soldier would have to be sent there to defend the Italians. In that event we would have the ridiculous situation of having Italians sit on the mountainsides, watching American soldiers fight to defend them. In such a situation, American soldiers and American funds would have to be used to defend the Italians. Certainly the treaty should be denounced, and certainly an end should be put to the restrictions imposed by its provisions. When that is done, the Italians will be able to prepare in an adequate way to defend themselves.

Let me also emphasize that today there are many Italians who are unemployed, and thus have difficulty in obtaining sufficient food and clothing. If Italy is allowed to maintain an adequate defense force, the consequent increase in the size of her armed forces will provide employment for many Italians who today are unemployed, and the result will be that many Italians will thus have sufficient food and clothing, while at the same time they will be preparing to defend their own country, in case of invasion. Certainly the Italians should be allowed to prepare to defend their country.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. On the floor of the Senate we have heard considerable discussion

in regard to implementing the North Atlantic Treaty. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah whether it is his understanding that the present administration intends to implement the plans of Mr. Acheson by continuing to draft the young men of Utah and Missouri and Idaho and Texas, and send them to Europe, to help prepare to defend the homes of the people in Europe, while at the same time the young men of Italy are restricted or prevented from serving for the same purpose?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I fear that the Senator from Missouri is correct in his observation and in his conclusion.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In referring to plans to send American troops to Europe to help implement the North Atlantic Treaty, is it not well for us to recall that we are also facing the huge burden and responsibility of sending arms and munitions of various kinds to help rearm the Western European countries, whereas 3, 4, or 5 years ago, Members of the Senate endeavored to terminate the dismantling of industrial plants in Germany?

I recall that during the brief special session in November 1947 assurances were given by the State Department, through Members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, that the dismantling of German industrial plants and the sending of them behind the iron curtain to satellite countries, as a part of the reparations, would be discontinued, although following that time more than 600 industrial plants in Germany were dismantled, to that extent depriving the people of Western Germany of the facilities for self-help and self-armament.

Today not only are we requested to send troops to Europe, as the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Utah have pointed out, with particular emphasis upon the possibility of obtaining available manpower in those countries, but likewise we are compelled to send armaments and munitions to Western Europe and to Germany, presumably, when today we realize that it was a tragic mistake to have permitted the State Department to continue for several years the dismantling of the industrial plants, which now would prove so vital and so valuable in helping those countries to rearm themselves.

Will the Senator from Utah comment on that situation as constituting an additional blunder and further bungling on the part of the State Department because of which today a dilemma faces the United States in our desire to adhere to commitments in implementing the North Atlantic Treaty?

Mr. WATKINS. To be liberal with any criticism of the State Department for its errors, let me say that at least the members of that Department were shortsighted; they did not seem to be able to know what was likely to take place, although they had all the evidence before them, whereas the general run of the public in the United States had only what little information the State De-

partment would allow to come through to us.

It seems to me that the entire program was actuated at the time by a spirit of revenge, and there was a failure to have in mind the idea of protecting the liberties of the peoples of the world. Our State Department was taking far too many chances with Russia. Many of the plants and industries which were dismantled were shipped from Germany to Russia. Not only did Russia get the plants and industries which were removed from Eastern Germany, which was the zone of Germany controlled by Russia, but Russia also got many of the plants and industries which were dismantled and shipped from the western zone of Germany. The idea was to cripple Germany completely, so as to deprive her even of her method of making a living in the way in which she had been accustomed to make it. That was the so-called Morgenthau plan. That plan was adopted only in part; but the idea was to turn the Germans into farmers, herders of cattle, and so forth, rather than to leave them an industrial nation. Those who did that were playing directly into the hands of the Communists.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the industrial plants in Germany had not been dismantled under a program put into effect by our State Department, would not it now be possible for steel and other plants in Western Germany, thus making it much easier for the Western European countries to procure armaments for their own rearming, instead of having to depend almost entirely upon the production of such armaments in the United States?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. It now appears that in the United States there will be a shortage of the steel needed for our own defense purposes, and we are being urged to build new steel factories and steel mills, whereas if we had been wise in looking ahead and seeing the storm which was coming—and we had ample notice of it; we were having trouble with Stalin, behind the scenes, even before President Roosevelt passed on—if we had had any foresight whatever, we would have seen that the destruction of the steel mills and industrial plants in Western Germany might redound to our own detriment.

Today there is a question whether the other nations of Europe will permit the Germans to prepare to fight to defend themselves, by operating their mills at full capacity, although it now seems that those mills will be allowed to produce both iron and steel. However, the irony is that Germany, our former enemy, is now being wooed by us to help us fight one of our former allies. To an observer on the outside, the present situation must seem both ridiculous and absurd.

The eyes of the American people have been opened by recent events to the great danger which has come to our liberties by the impulsive action of the President of the United States in the Korean intervention. If I read aright

the sentiment of the people of this country, they are overwhelmingly against the President's claim to the power to make war or to make peace according to his own will, and without consultation with Congress.

INTERNATIONAL FORCE IDEA NOT NEW—
PREVIOUSLY REJECTED

Mr. President, the idea of an integrated international force to preserve the peace of the world is not new. It was much discussed after World War I. There were many who thought such a force should be established as an arm of the League of Nations. The American people rejected that idea when they rejected the League of Nations.

At the San Francisco Conference in 1945, following World War II, the U. N. was born. The proposal for the establishment of an integrated international force was revived and was again discussed. Later, the Military Staff Committee of the U. N. Organization, which was established pursuant to article 47 of the Charter, met in New York City and undertook a general study of the proposal for the purpose of making a recommendation to its parent organization. The United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and China were represented on this Committee. In their report, the U. N. Military Staff Committee recommended the creation of an international force composed of separate national contingents.

There was much discussion of the "International Force" provisions of the U. N. Charter, both at San Francisco and in the Senate of the United States. On July 11, 1945, Mr. John Foster Dulles, of New York, who had been one of the advisers to the United States delegation at the San Francisco Conference, appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As I recall, the Charter of the United Nations was at that particular time before the Senate for ratification and approval. Mr. Dulles sought especially to allay apprehensions that the power of the United States representative on the Security Council might involve a surrender by Congress of its control over the Armed Forces of the United States. It was feared that congressional agreement to United States participation in the United Nations might be construed as an advance authorization for the use of American troops in warlike activities which might be conducted in the name of the Security Council. At that time, Mr. Dulles—I refer to Mr. John Foster Dulles, now a roving ambassador for the State Department, representing the United States in the Far East—pointed out:

Under our Constitution, the President, and the President alone, directs the current conduct of foreign affairs. But there can be no declaration of war except by the Congress. That is our internal procedure, it will remain our internal procedure, and all the world knows that fact.

Mr. Dulles, speaking of the use of American military contingents in an international army, then went on to say:

It may or it may not hereafter become useful to decide by legislation whether or not the use of our military contingent to

enforce peace is the equivalent of a declaration of war.

If I may interpolate at this point, Mr. President, it would seem to me that Mr. Dulles is beginning to look in the direction of what we are now considering. I resume the quotation:

But surely we can better determine that when we know what it is that we are talking about. Today there is no military contingent. After the organization is established the organization may negotiate with the members for military contingents. That agreement for military contingents, so far as the United States is concerned, will be subject to the ratification and consent of the Senate.

Again, that was with reference to a military contingent to provide the aid and assistance necessary to maintain peace under the United Nations Charter. The international army of which Mr. Dulles was speaking was the same kind of international army which is now to be established under the North Atlantic Pact. The difference is that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization "international army" is the army of a group of 12 nations consisting of the United States and her friends and dependents in the North Atlantic area, whereas the United Nations Army was to be an arm of the whole membership of the United Nations, which was, as I recall, comprised of about 50 nations. The North Atlantic Pact comprises 12 nations. I desire to repeat that sentence from Mr. Dulles' statement:

That agreement for military contingents, so far as the United States is concerned, will be subject to the ratification and consent of the Senate.

Let us see what happened afterward. Mr. Dulles' statement makes it clear that in respect to the contribution of military contingents to the international army which was to be created under the U. N. Charter, there was no doubt in his mind that the agreement for the commitment of such military contingents by the United States was subject to the ratification and the consent of the Senate.

It is pertinent to note at this point that no such ratification and consent was asked of the United States Senate when the President committed our troops to the so-called international army in Korea, yet he claimed it was under the request and under the authority of the United Nations that he sent the troops there. Now it is said that no such ratification and consent is necessary to the commitment of troops to the North Atlantic Pact international army.

Mr. Dulles then went on to say—and I continue quoting from his statement of July 11, 1945:

When the Congress knows what will be proposed concerning the size, the character, and the area of possible use of an American military contingent then we will know what we are talking about, and then it may be desirable by statute to fix the relative responsibility of the President and the Congress. On the other hand, it may not seem desirable. The President and the Congress have got along pretty well for 160 years without any statutory definition of their respective responsibilities in that area.

At the conclusion of his remarks, Mr. Dulles was questioned by several members of the committee. The quotations I am about to read are taken directly from the Foreign Relations Committee hearings of 1945, at which time it had under consideration the United Nations Charter. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] questioned Mr. Dulles, as follows:

If I understood you correctly, Mr. Dulles, I thought you said that the Senate will have an opportunity to ratify the special agreement having to do with our contribution of force and material.

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is that your opinion?

Mr. DULLES. That is not only my opinion, but it is expressly stated in the charter that the agreements are subject to ratification by the states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

I may add that the states to which he is referring are, of course, the member states of the United Nations. I continue the quotation:

Senator MILLIKIN. Then it is your opinion that to comply with our constitutional processes, that separate agreement would have to come to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. DULLES. It is, and that was the view of the American delegation. I think there is no doubt whatever about that.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is there any doubt about that, Mr. Dulles?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. And no disagreement of opinion on that?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Later in the questioning Mr. Dulles stated:

It is clearly my view, and it was the view of the entire United States delegation, that the agreement which will provide for the United States military contingent will have to be negotiated and then submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] thereupon addressed the following question to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]:

I should like to ask if that is the opinion of the chairman of the committee?

In response to the question of the Senator from Colorado, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] replied:

It is most certainly the opinion of the chairman of the committee. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that article 43, section 2, specifically provides as follows:

"Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided."

In other words, we in the agreement stipulate what we will do. Section 3 is as follows:

"The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

Our constitutional process is for us here at home to decide. There is no question in my mind that that means that the agree-

ments must be ratified just like treaties are ratified, because they are with foreign countries. They are vital, they affect our Military Establishment, so they would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Dulles that there was no question ever raised, so far as I know, in the Conference as to that effect.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas had just returned from San Francisco in connection with the conference on the United Nations Charter.

I should like to point out and stress to the Senate that in 1945, when the question of contributing American Armed Forces to an international army was under discussion in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the chairman of that committee, the Senator from Texas, stated that international agreements, even though they be executive agreements as distinguished from treaties, involving the commitment of American Armed Forces to an international army, "would have to be ratified by the United States Senate."

The Senator from Texas seems to have changed his mind since 1945. He has completely reversed himself. In 1945 it was his view that agreements for the commitment of American troops to an international army required the ratification of the United States Senate. Today he assumes the position that no such ratification is required.

Mr. Dulles' views were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and were thereafter discussed on the floor of the Senate in the course of the debate on the U. N. Charter.

On July 24, 1945, former Senator Wheeler, of Montana, pointed out that Mr. Dulles had made the statement which I have just quoted, in the presence of both the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas, and in the presence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], both of whom had been members of the U. N. delegation at San Francisco in 1945.

In the course of the discussion on this floor on July 24, 1945, to which I refer, the Senator from Texas left no doubt that in his opinion agreements for the commitments of troops pursuant to the U. N. Charter should come before the Congress and the people for approval. He stated that it was immaterial to him whether such agreements were by treaty or by joint resolution so long as it was understood that congressional ratification was necessary. In that respect I wish to quote as follows from his remarks on July 24, 1945:

I do not entertain the fears which have been expressed from Senators that we must not do it by treaty but that we must do it by joint resolution.

That was the argument then. It was not that we did not have to do it at all, but whether it should be done by treaty or joint resolution which involved the House of Representatives. I continue quoting:

Either method would satisfy me so long as it was an expression of the views of the Congress and of the people.

The then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, now the Vice President of the United States, agreed in 1945 with the Senator from Texas. He stated that he was not greatly concerned whether ratification of agreements for the furnishing of armed forces be made by the Senate only or by joint resolution by both Houses of Congress, and placed himself on record as agreeing with the view that congressional ratification was essential.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] placed himself on record as agreeing with the statement made by Mr. Dulles, and remarked as follows:

I can understand how there might be advanced a perfectly legitimate argument as to whether or not constitutional process at that point referred to a joint resolution of Congress or a treaty action by the Senate, although it is the latter which I prefer. But I cannot understand how there ever could be any possible defense of the suggestion that this could be done by an Executive agreement which denied a partnership authority on the part of the representatives of the American people.

That was the statement of the Senator from Michigan, whom we all respect and admire. It came from his heart, and has been followed by him in his public attitude toward this question.

I quote from the remarks of the Senator from Michigan as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 6, page 7992:

I want to make it plain, first, that I agree with the Senator from Montana, with the Senator from Texas, and Mr. Dulles that this specific agreement covering the use of force must be ratified either by the Congress as a whole or by the Senate before it can meet the expectation either of the authors of the San Francisco Charter or the language of it.

I quote further from the same statement by the Senator from Michigan:

Then when we finally come to the next and last problem with reference to where the authority shall lie, whether in the President or in the Congress, to agree on our behalf to use armed forces for cooperative international action, I assert again that it is a problem the solution of which properly waits the ultimate action of the Senate at a later time instead of at the present time in connection with the ratification of the Charter.

In other words, they were not going to pass on it then, because they were then approving the Charter, and the question as to its implementation would come up later.

It seems to me that our problem is simply one of reducing to text the rule of years which recognizes that there are two separate ways of calling the Armed Forces into external use; one, by action of the President of the United States, under certain circumstances with reference to Congress; second, by reference to Congress under a contemplated declaration of war.

Again, I think it will be possible for us to find language which will protect the spirit of the Constitution precisely in the way in which the Senator from Montana and I, too, want to protect it. We wish to protect it in a fashion which will meet the necessity for the President of the United States, whoever he may be, to make this international force available in a summary, preliminary, policing way, under circumstances which I am perfectly sure we could all agree it should

be used. I think those problems are for tomorrow unless we proceed on the premise that the Senate of the United States does not mean in good faith what it says it means when it adopts this Charter. I decline to indict the Senate in such fashion.

I wish to reemphasize to the Senate that portion of the Senator's remarks which indicate that United States forces would be made available to an international force, organized pursuant to the Charter, in a "summary, preliminary, policing way." The Senator from Michigan thus emphasizes the point that the pledges for the furnishing of American forces to an international army under the terms of the Charter of the U. N. was not an extension to the President of the control by Congress over the Armed Forces of the United States. Neither was it an advance authorization to wage war. The forces were to be used "in a summary, preliminary, and policing way."

For the benefit of Senators who have entered the Chamber since I started my speech, I call attention to the fact that section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 deals with the question of supplying Armed Forces to the Security Council. It authorizes the President to negotiate a military agreement or military agreements with the Security Council for the purpose of providing American contingents to the U. N. international army. From a strict constitutional sense no authorization from the Congress to the President is necessary to enable the President to negotiate an international agreement. That is on the theory that the President has the power to negotiate an international agreement, but it is up to the Senate to ratify and approve it. Apparently, at that time there were two schools of thought. Some Senators thought the whole Congress should act, and others felt that it could be done only by a treaty ratified by the Senate. Under the Constitution the President has the power to negotiate international agreements.

The incorporation in the United Nations Participation Act of an authorization to negotiate an agreement for sending troops to the U. N. was an indication that on the important matter of contributing troops to the U. N. international army, the Congress wished to record its views in advance. Thus, in the United Nations Participation Act, the Congress recorded in advance its consent to the negotiation of such agreements by the President. I may say that in the act itself it was provided that when such agreements were negotiated they should then be submitted to the Congress for approval.

The Congress did not, however, abdicate its authority in respect to the ratification of such agreements. In fact, section 6 of the United Nations Participation Act contains a specific and clearly worded reservation retaining to the Congress the right to approve such agreement or agreements.

Thus section 6 provides:

The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate

act or joint resolution providing for the numbers and types of Armed Forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said Charter.

I want to repeat and reemphasize the point that section 6 of the U. N. Participation Act says in specific language that agreements for the contribution of troops and matériel and assistance to an international army formed under the provisions of the U. N. Charter "shall be subject to the approval of Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution."

That was a blazing of the trail under an international agreement. Later on I shall show that the Atlantic Pact was supposed to be the child of the United Nations Charter. It was supposed to be constructed and to work within the framework of the Charter, and to be guided by it.

The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which accompanied the U. N. Participation Act when it was brought before the Senate in November 1945, contains the following statement in respect to the question of congressional approval of troop commitment to the U. N. security force by treaty or executive agreement. This quotation is from the committee report. The chairman of the committee was the senior Senator from Texas.

The committee believes that it is desirable to determine the question once and for all, and that it is appropriate to specify that the military agreement or agreements should be submitted for approval to the Congress.

Not only to the Senate, Mr. President. They should be submitted for approval to Congress.

That was the committee's stated reason for having included in the participation act the specific requirement that agreements for the commitment of American troops and matériel "shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution."

Mr. President, I come now to a statement which I think ties the President into the whole subject under discussion. It has to do with more than his mere signing of a measure after its passage by Congress.

THE PRESIDENT'S POTSDAM PROMISE

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee report No. 717, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, was a report to accompany the U. N. Participation Act. In that report the committee pointed out:

On the last day of debate in the Senate, July 28, the President, then attending the Potsdam Conference, sent a message to the Congress, in which he stated that: "When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated—

An agreement to furnish forces to the U. N.—

it will be my purpose to ask the Congress—

Not the Senate alone—
for appropriate legislation to approve them.

Thus, when the U. N. Charter was under debate in this body in July 1945

the President himself promised that agreements for the commitment of American Armed Forces under the terms of the U. N. Charter would be submitted to the Congress for approval.

As I have said before, and now repeat, I cannot understand the reason for the President's complete reversal of position on that important point.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not correct to say that the message to which the Senator has referred was sent in response to the debate which was then being held on the floor of the Senate on the question of whether the President had to obtain congressional approval under the treaty? A long line of argument had been made to the effect that the President had constitutional power to send troops anywhere he pleased. Finally, in order to clinch the matter, the President late that day sent the message that, regardless of any constitutional power, when any agreement was negotiated it would be his purpose to ask Congress to make a determination.

Mr. WATKINS. I think the President was fully cognizant of what had been going on in the Senate with respect to ratification. In order to hasten ratification, he was willing to state unequivocally that any agreement for implementing the pact would be subject to the approval of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Congress would be asked to approve.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; not the Senate alone.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the present issue parallel to the one which was decided at that time, namely, that, regardless of whether he has the constitutional power, Congress shall be called upon to implement the treaty or ratify any agreement which the President makes?

Mr. WATKINS. I think I shall be able to show that the Atlantic Pact was presented by its proponents in the State Department, by the President, and by the administration's leaders on the floor of the Senate, as a part of the United Nations. I remember the great length to which Senators went on the floor of the Senate in stating how completely the pact was within the United Nations Charter. It was stated that it was not something outside the Charter of the United Nations. Ratification of the pact was not intended as a means of killing the United Nations. On the contrary, the pact was to be wholly within the United Nations Charter. I think that as a matter of law the interpretation of what the Atlantic Pact was to be is binding on the administration. The interpretation is a part of the legislative history. The legislative history is always taken into consideration when any doubt arises as to the intent of any legislation. Certainly there is no doubt so far as the legislative history is concerned.

It is significant to note that almost exactly 5 years later the President departed from his specific promise and ordered American troops to Korea in a United Nations action without consulting Congress. Nor has he since

sought congressional approval of his action.

Let me say at this point that the question is not academic, as some persons have claimed, and as the administration has stated. It is not academic when boys are giving up their lives in Korea. It is not academic when 10,000 American boys are lying dead in Korea, and when American forces have suffered more than 50,000 casualties. It is far from academic. It is something which affects the homes of our people.

Now the President claims the right to commit American troops to an international army in Europe without consultation with Congress and without congressional approval. The fact is that since he made the claim public opinion has expressed itself on the subject. Apparently the President has heard it, because he is backing down and is now willing to have Congress consult with him and cooperate with him, without admitting, of course, that Congress as a matter of right, has something to say about it.

The President's promise that he would seek the approval of Congress to such agreements as might be entered into for the contribution of matériel and a United States military contingent to an international security force under the U. N. Charter was contained in a letter to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. A copy of the letter was sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

I have already read a portion of the letter, but in order to document the subject fully, so that there can be no question about the facts involved, I shall read the full text of the President's message:

During the debate in the Senate upon the matter of the Senate's giving its advice and consent to the Charter of the United Nations, the question arose as to the method to be followed in obtaining approval of the special agreements with the Security Council referred to in article 43 of the Charter. It was stated by many Senators that this might be done in the United States either by treaty or by the approval of a majority of both Houses of Congress. It was also stated that the initiative in this matter rested with the President, and that it was most important to know before action was taken on the charter which course was to be pursued.

When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask the Congress by appropriate legislation to approve them.

The President's message was placed before the Senate on Saturday, July 28, 1945, at the close of the debate on the U. N. Charter. It was the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] who brought the message into discussion on that date in order that its meaning might be clearly established and made a part of the record. The Senator from Missouri was never one to let that kind of point go by without having it cleared up.

In the close of the discussion on that date, the then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, now Vice President of the United States, remarked as follows in regard to the commitment of Armed Forces under agreements with the U. N.:

Without commenting upon the necessity for the letter or statement made by the

President, and without in any way intimating whether I disagree or agree with the Senator from Missouri as to his alternative interpretations, does not the Senator from Missouri agree that in view of the President's letter, whatever may be his interpretation on other forms or ratification, it certainly indicates that he will not attempt to bypass Congress by putting it on the ground of an executive agreement?

The then Senator from Kentucky further said, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 6, page 8186:

I feel that that was the purpose of the letter. There was some fear that the President might undertake to bypass Congress altogether by an executive agreement, and I think the object of this letter is simply to disabuse anyone's mind of any fear or suspicion that he would pursue that course.

I believe at that time there were some executive agreements of unpleasant memory which had aroused considerable discussion and some apprehension in the United States. The subject was somewhat "hot" at the time.

The quotations I have just read point out that in 1945 the present Vice President of the United States interpreted the President's letter from Potsdam as a clear-cut statement by the President that he would not attempt to bypass the Congress in the matter of committing troops to an international force to be organized under the U. N. Charter. I could quote other statements along the same line.

In the course of the debate on July 28, 1945, the former Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lucas, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a press release which he had issued on that date in regard to the President's message from Potsdam. I quote from the press release as it appears at page 8188 of volume 91, part 6, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. President, the President, with forthright candor and in advance, has sent to the Senate a message in which he advises that supplemental military agreements to the Charter will be sent to the Congress for appropriate legislative action.

His message is timely and constructive.

First. It definitely eliminates any possibility that these military agreements for troop contingents to be used in the future will be implemented by executive agreement.

It seems that Mr. Lucas was not such a good prophet.

Second. It advises the Senate that the agreements will be sent to the Congress for joint action.

Third. It adds tremendous strength to the position that so many Senators have taken, namely, that these supplemental agreements are not treaties.

Incidentally, that was one of the arguments. Many thought it had to be done by congressional action rather than by the Senate alone as in the ratification of a treaty.

Fourth. That frank and open declaration of the President will help remove fear and doubt among the United Nations with respect to what is the proper constitutional process.

We are going to let the people of the other nations know exactly what we have to do here when it comes to implementing the United Nations Charter.

Fifth. The declaration, along with treaty ratification, will materially strengthen the

President's hand in the remaining days of the Potsdam Conference.

Incidentally, what we do here now, following the pattern set by the President of the United States and the Congress in those days under the leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and former Senator BARKLEY as majority leader, will strengthen the hand of General Eisenhower. It cannot hurt him. The President needed strengthening when he was at Potsdam, and it was said this would help. We have to thank former Senator Lucas for that statement, I think it is a good one.

Sixth. It assures to the American people that the President believes the San Francisco Charter is one of substance and strength and not one of form and futility.

It will be noted that the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Lucas, said in 1945 that the President's message definitely eliminated any possibility that military commitments pursuant to the U. N. Charter would be made without the approval not only of the Senate, but of both Houses of the Congress.

The record is clear. Armed force commitments pursuant to the U. N. Charter were to be made pursuant to specific agreements, and such agreements, whether in the form of treaties or executive agreements, were to be subject to the approval of the Congress. The Congress so understood; the President so understood; the people of the United States so understood; and, I may add that I think the governments of Europe so understood—at least the governments of the countries which were coming into the United Nations.

That was in 1945. Now, not quite 6 years later, the picture has changed. The President has forgotten the promise he made from Potsdam, and now claims the right to commit American Armed Forces to an international army without consulting the Congress or asking its approval.

THE ATLANTIC PACT AND THE UN

I wish to discuss the Atlantic Pact and the U. N. together for a moment. In a way I feel like apologizing to the Senate for so much repetition, but it is important to bring out the various phases of the argument so that there may be no question as to its validity and persuasiveness.

The U. N. Charter was ratified in 1945 by a Senate vote of 89 to 2: 53 Democrats, 35 Republicans, and 1 Progressive voted for it; and 2 Republicans voted against it. More Republicans would have voted for it if they had been here; but we were a little short of Republicans in those days, as we are now.

Let me emphasize that to date no agreements between the United States and the Security Council for the commitment of American troops to an international force of the U. N. have been submitted to the Congress. To my knowledge no such agreements were negotiated by the executive branch of the Government prior to June 1950, when the President intervened in Korea. In any event, none were submitted to the Congress prior to June 1950, nor have any been received by the Congress since June 1950. I refer to agreements to im-

plement the U. N. Thus, the intervention in Korea is a direct violation of the spirit of the President's Potsdam assurances.

It would be interesting to analyze completely the legal position of the United Nations and the United States and the other participating nations. Our boys are in Korea as a part of a de facto U. N. force. We must support them. They are our boys. I think we made a terrible mistake, from the standpoint of military defense, and that the armed services and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were sound in their decision that Korea was not the place to fight to win the independence of Korea. It has been pointed out that we cannot kill the Communist dragon by beating him on the tail with a baseball bat. We must get at its vital organs, and they are not in Korea.

Early in 1949 the North Atlantic Pact was negotiated. On March 7, 1949, I sent a telegram to the President of the United States pointing out that the North Atlantic Pact, which was then in the process of negotiation, was such a momentous departure from traditional American foreign policy that it should be submitted to the Senate 60 days before the date set for signature in order that it might be put before the people for open and free discussion before signature.

The President answered my telegram but rejected my proposal for a 60-day interval between publication and signature. However, he did give us 17 days. I was always grateful for the 17 days, but it was hardly time to air the provisions, the implications, and the meanings of this great and important document. The President pointed out that the proposed treaty had been discussed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and that there had been close collaboration between the Department of State and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from the very beginning.

I cite this to show that the President had been working with the Foreign Relations Committee through his Secretary of State and others, so he knew exactly what was being done. He had fully in mind, I am sure, the arrangements which had been made under the U. N. Pact. At least, he should have known. He should not have forgotten it.

In the last paragraph of his letter to me the President stated that the proposed North Atlantic Treaty was intended to make it clear in advance that any armed attack affecting our security would be met with overwhelming force.

The North Atlantic Pact was brought before the Senate and the people of the United States as a military alliance pursuant to which the signatory powers agreed that in the event of an attack on one the other signatories would come to its assistance.

The Secretary of State assured the Congress and the people that the proposed North Atlantic Military Alliance was not a rejection of the United Nations or a sell-out of the principles of the U. N. Charter. The Secretary of State emphasized over and over again that it was the intent of the signatories of the North Atlantic Pact to adhere to the framework

of the U. N. and to the spirit of the U. N. Charter.

The preamble of the pact declares that—

The parties to this treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

The first article of the U. N. Pact contains a specific reaffirmation of the obligations of the signatory powers under the United Nations Charter to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means, and to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

The American people were told that by entering the North Atlantic Pact the United States would be reaffirming its determination, expressed in the United Nations Charter, to participate in effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression.

Official Department of State publication No. 3462 states that the North Atlantic Pact is a joint effort in keeping with the spirit and obligations of the Charter of the U. N. to insure peace and prevent war.

The pamphlet further states:

The Atlantic Pact is a collective self-defense arrangement among countries of the North Atlantic area who, while banding together to resist armed attack against any one of them, specifically reaffirm their obligations under the Charter to settle their disputes with any nations solely by peaceful means. It is aimed at coordinating the exercise of the right of self-defense specifically recognized in article 51 of the United Nations Charter. It is designed, therefore, to fit precisely into the framework of the United Nations and to assure practical efforts for maintaining peace and security in harmony with the Charter.

I hope that Senators and others who read the RECORD will note that—

It is designed, therefore, to fit precisely into the framework of the United Nations and to assure practical efforts to maintaining peace and security in harmony with the Charter.

That becomes important, because the United Nations Charter contains a provision that the agreements called for by it between the Security Council and the member nations should be ratified in accordance with the constitutional processes of the member nations. The identical language appears in the Atlantic Pact in article 11.

I may be repeating later on, but it came to my mind, and I wanted to bring it to the attention of those present.

In an address before the Conference of Mayors here in Washington, D. C., on March 22, 1949, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] spoke of the relationship of the Atlantic Pact to the United Nations. This is what he said:

I wish to say at the outset that, although reserving my position regarding the details of any subsequently disclosed administration plans for military aid to Western Europe, I endorse—not only in letter but in spirit—I endorse the North Atlantic Pact as the best possible peace enterprise in

which the United States can engage in the self-interest of its own national security; in the practical support of the aims of the United Nations within which the new pact will scrupulously operate—

“In support of the aims within which the new pact will scrupulously operate”—and in the prevention of another intolerable world war in which we would be inevitably involved, no matter how anxiously we might wish to keep out. In my opinion, it is the best bet to keep the present cold war from getting hot. . . .

In assessing our own responsibilities under the pact, I ask my fellow citizens to remember that they are already under this same general pledge when they joined the United Nations; that the U. N. Charter specifically recognizes in article 51 the right of individual and collective self-defense until the U. N. Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security; that the pact ceases to apply whenever the U. N. Security Council thus does its duty—

If the United Nations took over tomorrow, it would end the pact, according to that interpretation—

that the pact ceases to apply whenever the U. N. Security Council thus does its duty; but that if it fails to do its duty, the North Atlantic community can defend itself inside the Charter but outside the nullifying veto.

That is the end of the quotation from the Senator from Michigan. Keep in mind that one of the reasons why we had to have the Atlantic Pact was that the action of Russia in vetoing every effort to have the United Nations Security Council formulate agreements for a police force among the United Nations. I never thought at the time, and I never thought the Senator from Michigan thought at the time he mentioned it, that somebody else wanted to avoid the veto. What veto? Apparently the way things have gone in recent days, the veto of the Congress of the United States. I am led so to think from what has happened in Korea and from what is happening today, when the administration has completely reversed its position. I do not think the Senator from Michigan had anything of the kind in mind, but apparently now somebody wants to act outside of any control by Congress.

The Senate will notice that the Senator from Michigan specifically reserved his position regarding the details of any subsequently disclosed administration plans for military aid to Western Europe. It appears from his statements that he regarded the North Atlantic Pact as within the spirit of the U. N. Charter.

It seems to me that if the North Atlantic Pact was within the framework and spirit of the Charter, the President's Potsdam promise is applicable today. The pact is only the child. It is within the framework of the United Nations Charter, it has been said time and time again.

The President's promise in 1945 that agreements with the United Nations involving the commitment of armed forces would be submitted to Congress for approval—and again I call attention of the Senate to the word “Congress”; not the Senate—was accepted in good faith, and helped to secure prompt passage of the United Nations Participation Act.

In 1949, when the Atlantic Pact was before the Congress, the administration hastened to assure the Congress and the American people that the North Atlantic Pact was not the end of the U. N., but in reality a strengthening of the U. N. They insisted over and over again that the pact was within the framework and the spirit of the U. N. It was assurances of that kind which influenced popular acceptance of the North Atlantic Pact and helped secure its ratification by the Senate.

The view that Congress does not have anything to do with it certainly is not strengthening the Charter or the U. N. because they were based on the principle that agreements which would be entered into should be ratified in accordance with the constitutional processes of the various nations, and we followed that principle by our action in Congress, in the legislation we passed, and in the statements made by the executive branch. If there could be anything more binding I do not know where it could be found. I do not know what more could have been done to make it binding.

For the life of me I cannot understand why the President has not come forward in an open and direct manner and requested congressional approval of the agreements which have been made for the sending of American Armed Forces to Europe. An honestly presented and straightforward request for such approval probably would have received favorable action long ago. He could have made it immediately after the pact was ratified, just as he did in a way when, through his departments, he asked for the bill implementing the program of arms for Europe.

One Senator has asked why it was necessary to have the arms side of the pact implemented by the action of Congress, and yet the more important thing to the men and women of the country, the sending of troops to Europe, was accomplished without implementation. Why there should be discrimination against the one in favor of the other is more than I can understand.

It is the combination of political sharp practices and broken Presidential promises which is at the core of the present resistance to the resolutions now before the Senate, and which precipitates this constitutional crisis.

The most terrible action any Government can engage in is war. The commitment of troops to Europe is part of our preparation for possible war. So long as our Constitution and our system of government endure, the people, either directly or indirectly, through their elected Representatives in Congress, must keep control over the issue of war or peace. That is why I believe the present question should be honestly presented in straightforward legislative form. That is the purpose and intent of my joint resolution.

Mr. President, I did not anticipate I would speak so long on the subject to which I have addressed myself today. I desire to speak on another subject, which is very important to the people of my State and the people of the Inter-mountain States.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question before he begins his new subject?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question relative to the subject matter the Senator has just been discussing. The distinguished Senator from Utah has already stated that he could not understand why the administration had not brought to the Senate or to the Congress, both Houses, recommendations for the implementation of article 3, so far as troops are concerned. Did not the Senator, as he listened to the assurances of the treaty explainers during the debate on the North Atlantic Pact, hear them say that if and when implementation was made of the provisions of the pact, either under article 3 or article 5, recommendations would be made by the advisory council under article 9, wherein a program would be submitted to the respective governments, who individually would then determine, through their constitutional processes, the character of aid that would be furnished? Is that not correct?

Mr. WATKINS. It is, as I remember. Those assurances were made time and time again. I read from article 11 of the Atlantic Pact, as follows:

This treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

The latter part of that sentence "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes" is exactly the same language that occurs in the United Nations Charter in subsection 3 of article 43. As I remember the debate, both before the Foreign Relations Committee and in the Senate itself, it was called to our attention that whatever constitutional methods were provided for by the United Nations Charter would apply with respect to the treaty, because the language was identical.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield. I do not know whether I have answered the Senator's question, but I wished to make the observation I have just made.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has answered my question in the affirmative, and of course I am glad to have his observation.

I wish to ask him whether it is true that time and time again a number of Senators, including myself, have asked to see the report of the advisory committee to the United States, appointed under article 9, and have asked to see the recommendations which, under that article, are supposed to be submitted to the Congress, for determination. At the committee hearings I asked almost every witness, especially the military witnesses, "Where is the report, and what are the recommendations?" However, up to this time I have not seen them.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me point out that the newspapers have carried a story that an agreement known as the Brussels

agreement was reached at Brussels, Belgium. I think announcement was made by Secretary Acheson, after he returned to the United States and conferred with the President, that an agreement had been made there. However, so far as I know, no report on the agreement has ever been made to the Congress, in order that we may know what is intended to be done by the use of armed forces, and so forth, as detailed under article 43 of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the Senator believe that if a Brussels agreement was entered into by the Secretary of State, under instructions from the executive branch of the Government, the Congress should know what that agreement is?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; if we are still to preserve America, I think we should know. If we were in Russia, perhaps we should not know. However, being in the United States, I think we should definitely know. I am making this effort in an endeavor to make certain that we shall know, so that such information will come to all of us who serve in Congress, not merely to the members of certain committees of the Senate, as Senate Resolution 99 provides.

Mr. WHERRY. So it will be the idea of the Senator from Utah, will it not, in making the motion to recommit the resolutions to the two committees, that whatever is done shall be done under the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact; that under article 9 the report shall be made; and that under article 11 both Houses of Congress shall determine what is to be the character of the aid to be given under the provisions of the treaty?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct. I think that would be a very fine way for us to proceed. It is the way provided in the United Nations Pact, after a long period of consideration by men who spent a great deal of time in developing the program. The only reason why it has not worked is because Russia vetoed the proposals made. I do not see any reason in the world why the President cannot send the reports to us. Then we shall be able to say to the President, "When you make the report to us, we shall determine whether the measures you have taken are proper ones." Then we can have debate on the question of whether troops should be sent to Europe.

However, under the present circumstances, in my opinion we are simply wasting our time, because when we act on the resolutions, if they should be adopted, they will be utterly inconclusive, so that finally we shall have to go through this process all over again, unless we are to ignore the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of the United Nations Charter, under which we are supposed to be operating in connection with the Atlantic Pact.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

ECHO PARK AND SPLIT MOUNTAIN DAMS IN DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to a situation which affects the States of Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and other Western States on the upper Colorado River.

A misleading and insistent campaign is being carried on to defeat the development of the upper Colorado River storage and reclamation project. This campaign uses the guise of conservation to accomplish its purpose.

I refer to articles by well-known authors whose works have been printed in leading magazines such as the Saturday Evening Post, Reader's Digest, and various conservationist publications. In each instance these articles attack the proposal of the Bureau of Reclamation, concurred in by all parties who have factual knowledge of the situation, to build two dams within the confines of the Dinosaur National Monument, in Utah and Colorado.

These two dams, Echo Park and Split Mountain, are the key to the success of the development and control of the Colorado River. They must be built in order to insure fulfillment under the commitments of the Colorado River compact of 1922, the Mexican treaty, and the upper Colorado River compact.

It is the contention of the opponents of this development that such a construction would desecrate a magnificent wilderness area; that the people of the Nation would be deprived of the opportunity to see this magnificent scenery in all its pristine glory; that it should be preserved in its wilderness state for all posterity; that these two dams are not essential to the development of the Colorado River because alternative sites which exist will accomplish the same purpose; that to permit the construction in the Dinosaur National Monument of these dams would establish a precedent whereby all National Parks and Monuments would be open to what they call commercial development.

As a result of this campaign, I know that many Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are receiving mail from their constituents protesting the building of these dams. In order to give Senators and Representatives the facts, thereby providing them with information with which to answer letters from their constituents, I have prepared certain data.

Mr. President, let me say that I have gone over the engineering records and the planning records of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the Federal Power Commission. Among the ones I have gone over are their old records going back at least 50 years. I have done that in order to get these data together. I think I can vouch for their accuracy. The compilation contains much information which the Members of Congress should have. I have been told that to a certain extent the offices of Members of Congress have been flooded with protests from women's organizations throughout the country and from conservationist societies, including wildlife groups, sporting groups, and others having to do with fish and wildlife and the enjoyment of nature. So I wish the Members of Congress to know the truth about these important developments in the intermountain West.

Those of us who live in that area cannot continue to live there without having water for irrigation, for industrial use, and for power. We have many millions

of acres of the finest land in the world which never will be tilled because of a lack of sufficient water with which to irrigate it and to produce crops.

So I wish to have these data appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent that my statement on this subject may be printed in the RECORD, following the remarks.

I also ask that a letter relating to the archaeology of the Echo Park, Split Mountain Reservoir sites within the Dinosaur National Monument, addressed by Mr. G. E. Untermann, of the Utah Field House of Natural History, to the Secretary of the Interior, an affidavit by Mr. David H. Madsen, and a statement by Mr. Untermann be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. WATKINS and the other matters referred to by him were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

First, I direct attention to the claim that the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams in the Dinosaur National Monument will establish a precedent endangering all national parks and monuments.

It has been known since before the Dinosaur National Monument was enlarged from the original quarry site of 80 acres to include over 200,000 acres up the Green and Yampa Rivers in 1938 that reservation of the dam sites was a specific condition precedent to the extension of the boundaries.

As early as 1924 the potentialities for dam sites on the Echo Park and Split Mountain areas on the Green were considered and well known. In 1930 a United States Geological Survey by Ralph Woolley suggested a series of dams in this area.

In the Presidential proclamation of 1938 enlarging the monument is the following language:

"This reservation shall not affect the operation of Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Browns Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project."

This power reservation and withdrawal are still in effect. While the withdrawal of Browns Park Reservoir site does not specifically refer to the Echo Park and Split Mountain sites, there is other material contained in letters between Utah Senators and Department of Interior officials and between Department of Interior and Federal Power Commission which shows that the entire area of the Green and Yampa Rivers were considered to be within the terms of the withdrawal.

In fact, in 1934, 4 years before the monument boundaries were extended to cover these rivers the Federal Power Commission wrote to Department of Interior as follows in refusing to vacate the power reservation on these streams:

"It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economic power development on a large scale. * * *

"The Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme." This had reference to Echo Park and Split Mountain sites. "The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted." A subsequent request was

again made by the Department of Interior for relinquishment, but the Federal Power Commission still refused to release these sites.

David H. Madsen of Utah was for many years an employee of the National Park Service and acting superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument during much of the period prior to and during the extension of boundaries. He conducted hearings in Utah and Colorado to secure approval of the people of the area to the proposed extension of the boundaries of the park. Mr. Madsen has prepared an affidavit of his activity in this matter.

Mr. Madsen's affidavit reads in part:

"I was authorized to state and did state as a representative of the National Park Service: That in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development."

I shall include all of the affidavit at the end of this statement.

Let me repeat, all this was before and during the consideration of extension of the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument from its original quarry site of 80 acres to over 200,000 acres surrounding the Green and Yampa Rivers.

Following a public hearing in Washington on April 3, 1950, at which both proponents and opponents of the plan to build the two dams at the Dinosaur National Monument were given ample opportunity to present their views, the Secretary of the Interior issued his decision. He said "The order establishing the extension of the monument in the canyons in which the dams would be placed contemplating use of the monument for a water project and by action, therefore, will not provide a precedent dangerous to other reserved areas."

This is a unique situation. The proclamation and history plainly show that it was intended that the dams would be built.

I think this adequately answers the argument that the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain would constitute a dangerous precedent to conservation interests.

Next, let's analyze the allegation that these two dams are not essential to the development of the Colorado River because alternative sites exist outside of the monument which would accomplish the same purpose.

Perhaps the outstanding article on this aspect of the problem has been prepared by Gen. U. S. Grant III. General Grant is a recognized engineering authority. He is also one of the more vocal exponents of conservation. I am informed, however, that General Grant's engineering experience has not extended to the Colorado River, and a careful reading of his article will substantiate this point.

General Grant proposes some alternative sites for the two sites, Echo Park and Split Mountain, in the Dinosaur Monument. Of course, one of his reasons is that the monument will be flooded. Now it is interesting to note that one of his proposed alternatives, the Moab site, would back water up into the Arches National Monument. Apparently he isn't aware of this result; at least he makes no mention of it.

General Grant just isn't being consistent. He proposes on the one hand that no dams be constructed in Dinosaur because he wants to preserve it in its natural condition. Then, on the other hand, he proposes to build a dam at another site which will, according to his standards, desecrate another national monument.

General Grant's proposal of alternate sites shows a further lack of factual information in connection with the development program of this river. He suggests as one of the alternatives to the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams, the Bluff site on the San Juan River. But he also proposes to build

at the Navajo site on the same river. The Bureau of Reclamation's surveys of this river tributary to the Colorado had the Navajo and Bluff sites as alternatives to each other. Since either one would control the San Juan River, only one is needed, not both. Therefore, General Grant's suggestion fails to conform to facts.

The Desolation site suggested as an alternate by General Grant would provide too small a reservoir and was never seriously considered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Another item, showing lack of information in the project, is in connection with the tables contained in General Grant's article. I call attention to the cost factor. General Grant has used some current cost figures and some 1940 cost figures, which prevent a factual picture being presented.

But this is not all. He has said that by use of the alternate sites he suggests, the silt and evaporation losses will be higher but that an increased storage capacity will compensate for this loss.

This is typical of the lack of factual information these propagandists have. The fact is that there is only so much water which can be stored. We are planning to use all of it. We can't increase the amount by merely increasing the storage capacity.

More than this, the sites proposed by General Grant would have a larger surface. This would increase the evaporation loss.

The upper basin States cannot afford the loss of one single drop of water through the added evaporation at the alternate sites.

General Grant recognizes this fact when he states:

"Moreover, there is a very real doubt as to whether waste water enough will be available in the upper Colorado River Basin to fill all the reservoirs proposed after meeting the year to year local requirements."

General Grant is right in the fact that there might be a shortage of water. This is recognized by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in the report on the Colorado River as follows:

"The States of the upper division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years.

"Examination of the 10-year estimated natural flow at Lee Ferry shows the 10-year drought period, 1931 to 1940, as outstanding. During that very severe drought period only 118,000,000 acre-feet of virgin flow would have arrived at Lee Ferry. Allowing for a 10-year delivery of 75,000,000 acre-feet to the lower basin, an average annual use of only 4,300,000 acre-feet or somewhat in excess of half its apportioned 7,500,000 acre-feet annual use would have then been available to the upper basin. Ultimate development to full apportioned use of 7,500,000 in the upper basin could not be justified with shortages and curtailments approaching 50 percent being imposed year after year for a 10-year period.

"On the other hand, prior to 1930, 10-year natural flows at Lee Ferry in excess of 170,000,000 and 180,000,000 acre-feet were prevalent in every recorded period. With sufficient hold-over capacity in reservoirs, it would be possible to carry over the high-flow discharges for later release during drought periods. Storage thus is of vital necessity in planning future actions on the upper river. The hold-over waters would be released in exchange for upstream uses up to 7,500,000 acre-feet annually. In this manner a complete, uncurtailed use of apportioned water could be accomplished in the upper basin without any violation of the obligations imposed by the Colorado River compact."

The Commission then said this:

"After inspecting the characteristics of a number of reservoir sites in the upper basin, a system consisting of 10 dams with reservoirs, power plants, an interconnected trans-

mission system was selected on the basis of producing the desired river regulation and a maximum amount of hydroelectric energy, with a minimum cost and charge to evaporation.

"The units proposed for first construction under the Colorado storage project plan are Echo Park Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, Martinez, and Bridgeport."

These few examples should adequately rebut the unfounded and unsubstantiated misconceptions contained in General Grant's article.

Mr. Devereux Butcher, an outstanding conservationist writer, wrote an article attacking the proposal to build Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams which has received wide publicity. He quoted part of a letter he received from Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation. Mr. Butcher apparently was more interested in securing information to justify his thesis that alternative sites would provide a satisfactory development of the river than in presenting the picture. Commissioner Straus was well aware of the organized campaign carried on by these conservationist authors. Here is the rest of the letter from Commissioner Straus to Mr. Devereux Butcher:

"Reclamation is perfectly willing to provide these answers in writing regardless of the fact that all these facts have been disclosed repeatedly in public hearings over the years, from the time the Colorado River compact was agreed to under the auspices of Herbert Hoover some 28 years ago.

"It is recognized that by procedures of omission, distortion, and plain fake statement, there has been much misrepresentation in the debate on the Dinosaur National Monument. Whether this written reply will be used to compound such offenses will develop in the future."

The entire tone of Mr. Butcher's article substantiates the fear expressed in Commissioner Straus' letter.

This should answer the specious argument that alternate sites are available to adequately develop and control the Colorado River. The Bureau of Reclamation is not being obstinate in this matter. They have selected the only logical sites available. These sites were contemplated for this purpose as early as 1904 and at the time the Monument was enlarged. It is not something unexpected.

We must not be distracted by the campaign of misinformation and emotion now being carried on.

Mr. President, I now analyze the factious claims of the conservationists that the construction of Echo Park and Split Mountain dams would desecrate magnificent wilderness area and deprive the people of the country an opportunity to see its magnificent scenery in its primitive state. Nothing could be farther from the truth. All of these aspects were thoroughly discussed at a hearing in Washington on April 3, 1950, before the Secretary of Interior. Over 700 pages of testimony were taken. Both proponents and opponents of the program to build these dams were given notice and ample opportunity to present their views.

That record makes interesting reading. The Bureau of Reclamation was represented and set forth data in support of the proposal to use these two dam sites. The States involved appeared in support of the proposed construction. Other citizens and groups also appeared and gave evidence to support the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal.

The National Park Service was represented and registered opposition to the construction of the dams. Representatives from almost all conservationist groups supported the National Park Service in its opposition. It is interesting to note that many of those groups have no chapters or segments in the States involved and where such were present the local groups contrary to the announced

view of their national organization favored the use of the proposed damsites within the monument.

It is also interesting to note that most of those who appeared in opposition to the construction of the dams had no first-hand experience within the monument. The few who did have such first-hand experience admitted the difficulties of the trip. In scenic wonder they compared it with Bryce and Zion National Parks.

I lived in this area for some years. I have seen the canyons from the mountains above. I can confirm the opinion of the conservationist. It is a beautiful and majestic area. I want all people to be able to enjoy it. I want to be able to enjoy it. At the present time I am unable to do so. You are not able to do so. Even with the development as proposed by the Park Department, only an insignificant part will be accessible to most people.

To see it all, even if the Park Department's full plan of development is brought to completion would necessitate a hazardous and grueling boat trip of hundreds of miles with competent guides.

If the dams are constructed, everyone can see all the wonders of the canyons in all their splendor—not from the rim looking down, but from the bottom looking up. It is then that the majesty of the scenic area is really appreciated.

Right now, however, let me make this point clear—I support the ideals of the conservationist program. I am a firm believer in the need and value of preserving our natural wonders for this and future posterities. But I want to make these areas available to all the people, not a favored few.

Let me explain what I mean. Only a few courageous, hardy individuals have seen this area. Why have not more people seen it? The answer is simple. It is so rugged that it is accessible only by air or hazardous boat trips. Also it is a very expensive trip to make. The conservationists would have it believed that it is due to lack of funds in the Parks Department. I grant that this is part of the trouble, but even with appropriations for development of the area in almost unlimited amounts, only a small part of the area would be accessible to the general public. Even the most sanguine of us will admit that with our present and future budgetary commitments there will be little if any appropriation for development of these recreational areas.

On the other hand, when these dams are built and the reservoirs available, everyone can enjoy the beautiful scenic attractions of this otherwise inaccessible wilderness area.

Dr. J. E. Broadus of Salt Lake City, Utah, can certainly not be considered a foe of conservationists. It was he who initiated publicity for such scenic areas as Bryce Canyon National Park, Cedar Breaks National Monument, Timpanogos National Monument, and Capitol Reef National Monument. He has taken the perilous boat trip down the Yampa and Green Rivers. He says that in his opinion there is more magnificent scenery in Dinosaur than any other equal area in the world.

Here is what he has to say:

"The possibility of building roads in the bottom of the canyons of Dinosaur is impractical and nearly impossible. To suggest to the Middle West or the East the building of a road along a river such as the Mississippi or the Potomac does not entail a vision of difficulty; but to visualize roads along the Green or Yampa Rivers in Utah and Colorado where for mile after mile the rivers fill completely between cliffs that are from hundreds to thousands of feet steep, presents another viewpoint.

"Roads in these places would necessarily be blasted from the solid walls. In other words, they would be a three-sided tunnel

which would afford but little in view and in the tortuous windings of the rivers would be terrifying to the average automobile driver.

"Side roads could be constructed in a dozen places in the one hundred and twenty-six miles at great expense. These would touch the rivers on small alluvial fans and would be extremely limited in scope.

"The construction of the Echo Park and Split Mountain dams would furnish a logical answer to the development of Dinosaur National Monument by providing access for the entire distance by navigation.

"Utah does not need to add to her wilderness area—it has 37,000,000 acres of it now, plus 244,000 acres in the High Uintah Primitive area in the Ashby and Wasatch National Forests.

"The waters backed up by Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams, in my opinion, would not submerge any valuable scenery. On the contrary, they would make available a phenomenal natural bridge; also the glory of Ladore Canyon. By boat, every loop of these rivers, about 45 in number, running to every point of the compass, would furnish incomparable changing panoramas of color and form. It would make available the great fold on the Yampa River, now called Castle Rock, which rises on both shores in a series of uplifted, broken, multicolored strata to a height of 2,000 feet.

"It would make it possible for the people of our great Nation, and for the people of the world, to enjoy the majesty of the many miles of Yampa Gorge, where one views a scene so sublime, and so awe-inspiring, that a new meaning is given to the music of the universe.

"These colored, sandstone walls, as smooth as the walls of our National Washington Monument, rise in an unbroken mass to four times its height.

"I have not been able to figure how a connecting road could be built to the bridge, the great fold, or to Yampa Gorge. Surely, this great scenic area, visited by a mere handful, should be made accessible to our present generation.

"In addition to supplying much-needed water and power, I believe that Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams would be the logical solution for the development of Dinosaur National Monument."

Mr. G. E. Untermyer, formerly a park ranger in Dinosaur Monument and a geologist, testified in support of the use of the park for reservoir sites. His wife was born and raised in the monument area. She also is a geologist. Together they have more first-hand knowledge of the area than any other person or groups of people. They have the only known complete geological maps of the area. I shall include, at the end of this statement, his testimony as given at the aforementioned hearing. I should like to summarize part of his remarks. They should carry weight because of his many years' association in the park department with conservationist groups and ideals.

He states that no fossils of any type will be lost in the construction of the dams. He claims that all examples of geological areas exposed by the cutting action of the streams which will be flooded by the reservoir can be seen at other sites within the monument. He assures us that what few items of interest as will be lost by the dam construction will be more than offset by the increased value. This value comes from the accessibility via the reservoir of areas otherwise not accessible except by hazardous boat trips through rapids and whirlpools.

He admits that an area called Potts Hole will be partially submerged, but claims that the unaffected Jones Hole area is more spectacular and carved from the same formation and that the Jones Hole area is the only clear-water trout stream in the monument.

In connection with the claims of the conservationists that alternative construction sites are available, he says that we should not lose sight of the fact that we have alternates in scenery also and that this is the case here. According to his figures, 80 percent of the entire area will be absolutely unaffected by the dams and reservoirs. The benefits will justify the offsetting detriments.

He further says that lack of water in the monument itself is an inhibiting factor in its development.

Mr. Untermyer then discussed the detrimental effect of silt, ice jams, and fluctuating flow of streams and other items to clinch his thesis that the dams should be built in order to make these areas a poor man's playground and not a rich man's reserve.

Mr. President, the conservationist writers have been urging that no action be taken on these projects until the President's Water Resources Commission completed its study and made its report.

The study is made and the report published as the Ten Rivers in America's Future. The Commission devotes about 180 pages to the contemplated development program for the Colorado River.

They find it feasible. I should like to quote a few pertinent paragraphs from this report as it relates to this conflict between recreation and conservation storage.

After citing a number of recreational opportunities as at Lake Mead, where more than 1,000,000 people a year take advantage of the facilities in an area formerly almost unvisited, the Commission says:

"Attractions of similar magnitude can be anticipated at many sites yet to be developed, such as Marble, Bridge, and Glen Canyons, Echo Park, Split Mountain, and Flaming Gorge."

The Commission then discusses the advantages of recreation as a major industry:

"There are instances where the raising of water behind dams would submerge areas of scenic and scientific value or archeological importance. In such cases it must be decided whether a reservoir in that location is more desirable than the preservation of these existing features.

"An example of the conflict of interest is the recent controversy relating to the Echo Park and Split Mountain Reservoirs planned for construction within the Dinosaur National Monument. It has been the contention of the National Park Service and many conservationists that these project works, by destruction of the natural scene including the combination of sheer canyon walls and white-water stream, would greatly impair the nationally significant cultural and recreational values of the monument.

"The Bureau of Reclamation and other project proponents contend that through proper planning of recreation facilities, building the project will aid the general public in gaining access to scenic sections of the area. Access now is by trail or over rapids. After completion of the reservoirs, access by boat to scenic spots would be relatively easy, although the scene would be somewhat changed. Following a public hearing and investigation, the Secretary of the Interior, who is charged with planning and administering both phases, resolved the conflict in favor of permitting the projects to go forward. In doing so he stated:

"(a) I am convinced that the plan is the most economical use of water in a desert river basin and therefore is in the highest public interest; and

"(b) The order establishing the extension of the monument in the canyons in which the dams would be placed contemplated use of the monument for a water project, and my action, therefore, will not provide a precedent dangerous to other reserved areas.

"(c) I note that the fossils are not in the areas of the monument proposed to be flooded and that the creation of the lakes will aid the public in gaining access to scenic sections of the Green and Yampa River canyons. Much superb wilderness within the monument will not be affected, excepting through increased accessibility."

"The importance to the growth and development of the West of a sound upper Colorado River Basin program can scarcely be overemphasized.

"I ask the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation to cooperate fully in making plans that will insure the most appropriate recreational use of the Dinosaur National Monument, under the circumstances."

Various other conflicts are discussed in the report, at the end of which the Commission says:

"Not all of these proposals and adjustments are yet understood or accepted by spokesmen of recreation groups. Even after the secretarial decision on the Dinosaur National Monument, articles continued in periodicals with national circulation attacking the proposed plans in every detail."

The Commission recognizes the need of coordination, cooperation, and planning by the various interested agencies, but as I stated before, finds the project feasible.

No longer can this excuse be used by the conservationists to delay approval of the project.

The actual cold facts disprove the claims of those conservationists on this subject.

More than this, campaigns like the one now being carried on in the name of conservationists do irreparable harm to real conservation programs.

The facts are, that in the project planning report transmitted by the Secretary of Interior to the States, approximately 50 pages are devoted to the Park Service survey and report on the recreational aspects of the project. It is interesting reading. I commend it to all who have doubts as to ultimate benefits to be derived from these projects for all the people.

Everyone will have the opportunity to view the grandeur of this area from a safe boat ride. It will not be a private domain for a favored few.

But even more important is the fact that Echo Park and Split Mountain dams are the key dams in a vast storage program for conserving the water supply of the Upper Colorado River. In the desert mountainous country of the West, water is literally the life-blood of the country. Without it there can be no homes, farms or industries, no civilization, so it is highly important that every drop of water may be saved, because even when all of it is put to beneficial use for irrigation and other purposes, still the need for additional water is overwhelming.

The building of Echo Park and Split Mountain dams instead of the dams proposed at alternate sites mentioned so glibly by the conservationists will save an estimated 350,000 acre-feet of water per year. These reservoirs are deep water projects where the evaporation of water is very limited and hence the saving of water as compared with the more shallow reservoirs back of the alternate dams. For the uninitiated, let it be said that the water saved would cover 850,000 acres one foot in depth.

To realize what 350,000 acre feet of water actually represent, let me state that this is enough water to cover with one foot of water a 20-foot wide highway running six times around the earth at the equator or a highway which is 144,375 miles in length.

From the standpoint of the humid sections of the United States, that amount of water would be of very little importance except the necessity of getting it off the land into the rivers and finally drained into the ocean.

Three hundred and fifty thousand acre-feet of water will provide for many farms, homes, and industries. There are numerous reclamation projects in Utah and in the West where not nearly that amount of water is conserved for use. The average small project doesn't have a water supply as large as 350,000 acre-feet. There are literally millions of acres of excellent tillable ground of high fertility in the upper Colorado River Basin States that with water would become some of the most fertile sections in the United States, but without water are utterly useless except for the limited grazing that grows as a result of the natural rainfall, which is always too small to produce ordinary cultivated crops.

An eternal controversy in the West is that over water. The great battle between California and Arizona is over the limited supply of water in the lower Colorado. The upper Colorado River Basin States which include Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico are not quarreling over the amount of water available because they have entered into a cooperative agreement for its allocation. However, each of these States could use much more water than the entire amount allocated for the use of all of them.

In my own State, the water allocated to Utah from the Colorado River is the last supply of water available for the State's development. All other supplies are completely used. No new homes or industries or farms can be established without this additional water. For many years, thousands of Utah's young men and women have been compelled to go to other States to find opportunities and there make their homes. If the upper Colorado River development, of which Echo Park is the key dam, is completed, Utah will have ample opportunities in industries and agriculture and for home building to approximately double its population; that means it would be able to furnish the opportunities for our young men and women for many years to come in the State of Utah. This should weigh heavily in favor of the reclamation program and particularly it should be conclusive in deciding in favor of the building of Echo Park and other dams along with the rest of the development. It would provide for the great development of the upper Colorado States and at the same time make available to the masses of the average people of this Nation's awesome and wondrous scenery of the great canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers.

Without the projects, there will be no development, and only a few men with means and with physical stamina and courage to endure dangers will ever be able to see and appreciate the grandeur of these Rocky Mountain canyons.

The combination of the programs of reclamation and conservation will benefit everybody in the United States, the people of the West, and the ordinary citizen who wants to enjoy the great out-of-doors and the beauties of the yet remaining wilderness of the West.

The proposed report of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects has just recently been submitted to the States of the Colorado River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. The views and recommendations of the States will be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior within the next few weeks. Shortly, therefore, the report should be ready for transmission to the Congress. It is the intention of the Senators from the States of the Colorado River Basin to join in the bill authorizing the construction of this project. We hope to have the support of all Senators when the bill comes up for consideration. We sincerely trust that the campaign of misinformation which I have just pointed out will not be controlling when this matter comes before the Senate for investigation.

UTAH FIELD HOUSE OF

NATURAL HISTORY,

Vernal, Utah, March 20, 1951.

HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I respectfully call your attention to a misstatement in the National Park Service report which forms a portion of the report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, Upper Colorado River Basin, December 1950, which has just come to my attention?

On page 47 of the NPS report, under Geological program, section 4, article (a), is the following: "To excavate two important dinosaur sites in Echo Park and Split Mountain Canyon, respectively; recovery, preservation, and storage of artifacts and plan for subsequent public exhibit."

I am willing to grant that the misstatement was not intentional, but its possibilities for confusion are just as great nonetheless. I assume that it was intended to say "archaeological sites" instead of "dinosaur sites." It has been with great difficulty that we have finally been able to refute the misinformation that Echo Park and Split Mountain dams would inundate dinosaur fossils, and the above misstatement could very easily revive this unfounded bugaboo. Also the uninformed will jump to the conclusion that I purposely misrepresented things when I stated at the April 3, 1950, hearing, and elsewhere, that no dinosaur fossils would be affected by either dam. It is easy to visualize the "wilderness people" seizing upon the misstatement with fanatical glee and sponsoring another avalanche of frenzied invective against the proponents of the dams.

As a geologist who has mapped the whole of Dinosaur National Monument I repeat that no dinosaur fossils will be inundated by either Echo Park or Split Mountain dams. Split Mountain canyon is formed of Paleozoic rocks and the Echo Park area is Paleozoic or older. In either case the rocks of these regions antedate the dinosaurs of the monument by more than a hundred million years. Even the Wilderness Societies cannot find dinosaur bones in an area which was laid down millions of years before there were any dinosaurs, although some of their statements have been about as illogical.

The archaeology of the Split Mountain area has little promise and prehistoric material consists mainly of cliff murals, (pictographs and petroglyphs) in the vicinity of McKee Spring. In our humble opinion, the cliff murals of northeastern Utah and northwestern Colorado have been elevated to a position of exaggerated importance. Archaeologists agree that they have no narrative significance. Attempts to correlate them with Aztec, Mayan, or Egyptian writings have led nowhere. Photographic records of these, and numerous other Indian drawings in the monument and on the outside, are already in existence. The Yampa sites, as you know, have been a subject of study for a number of years by the University of Colorado Museum. Publications on this work date back as far as 1948, although field work was begun in 1939-40. While the dams may flood certain archaeological sites, (already subject to study) they will make others, 600 or more feet above the river, easier to approach. It is sheer nonsense for any group to attempt to create the false impression that the dams will destroy an ancient civilization. Too much of this prehistoric culture is preserved elsewhere in the monument itself and on the outside.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend you for your rational and logical attitude toward the Dinosaur National Monument controversy. It can only be seen in its true light through the eyes of realism.

Very sincerely yours,

G. E. UNTERMANN.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF UTAH,

County of Utah, ss:

David H. Madsen, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says: That he is over the age of 21 years and a citizen of the United States, and a resident of Utah County, Utah. That at the time the area of the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the Canyon Unit I was employed by the National Park Service under the title of Supervisor of Wild Life Resources for the National Parks. Among my other duties I was acting Superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument and in that capacity was ordered by the National Park Service to arrange for hearings at Vernal, Utah and Craig, Colo., for the purpose of securing the approval of the citizens of that area for the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument to include the Canyon Unit. Meetings were accordingly held at Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936 and Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936. A large representation of the citizens of the area were present at these two meetings.

Among other questions which arose was the question of grazing and the question of power and of irrigation development which might be deemed essential to the proper development of the area at some future time. I was authorized to state, and did state as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development.

The first part of this agreement with reference to grazing has been carried out and the residents of the area involved are entitled to the same consideration with reference to the development of power and irrigation at the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, and any other development that may not unduly interfere for the purpose of the establishment of the monument and which is necessary for the proper development of the area.

DAVID H. MADSEN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
27th day of March A. D. 1950.

KARL H. BENNETT,

Notary Public, residing at American
Fork, Utah.

My commission expires December 25, 1950.

STATEMENT OF G. E. UNTERMANN, DIRECTOR,
UTAH FIELD HOUSE OF NATURAL HISTORY,
VERNAL, UTAH

MR. UNTERMANN. Mr. Secretary, I represent the State of Utah, the Colorado Development Committee of 21 counties of the State, and also the Upper Colorado Basin Commission, which in turn represents the four upper basin States.

In order to give the background to show you why we are making this particular type of factual presentation, I might state that I have lived in the vicinity of Dinosaur National Monument and in the monument since 1919. Periodically from 1943 to 1946 I was ranger at the monument, and Mrs. Untermann, also a geologist, was ranger-naturalist in 1946 and 1947. She has lived in the monument and in the immediate vicinity since 1906. In fact, she was born and raised at Island Park in Dinosaur National Monument. Together from 1943 to 1948 we have mapped the geology of the entire monument area, and it is the only geological map of the monument in existence. It hasn't been published as yet.

I would like to say at the very outset that I haven't any quarrel with conservationists or nature lovers, and I certainly have no objection to sentiment, because it would be a very callous world without it. However,

when sentiment is no longer tempered with reason and the facts are entirely ignored, it is time for someone to come forward with a bit of realism.

I will illustrate what I mean. There are certain groups who have rather volubly publicized what were purported to be the facts, that Hole in the Wall and Robbers' Roost, two historical bandit rendezvous, would be flooded by the dams in Dinosaur National Monument. For the information of those of you who may not know where these places are, you will be interested to know that Hole in the Wall is in the Powder River country of northern Wyoming at least 150 miles from the nearest boundary of the monument. Robbers' Roost is in the San Rafael swell of southern Utah, at least that far to the south.

One might properly question the wisdom of glorifying the bandit, cattle rustler, and horse-thief hangouts in the first place, and on that same basis I wouldn't be at all surprised if someone doesn't propose setting Chicago and its suburb, Cicero, aside as sacred cities because Al Capone and Dillinger operated there.

The geology of the area or rather, let us say, the fossil values of the area, it has already been conceded, will not be disturbed by the flooding of the monument, so we won't go into that. However, I would like to review that fossil situation for the record very briefly.

Fossils not affected: Dinosaur Quarry and headquarters area are downstream and miles away from the nearest dam or reservoir. Formations principally involved in reservoirs are either millions of years older or younger than the dinosaur beds. A small area of Morrison beds will be inundated in the Rainbow Park area. Morrison beds are the ones which contain the dinosaurs. The Rainbow Morrison, however, is principally clay, instead of sandstone in which the fossil occur, so there is no material jeopardized in that area. But these are barren of fossils. A few marine invertebrates will be covered in carboniferous formations in Split Mountain, Whirlpool, Lodore, and Yampa canyons but are abundantly represented in the canyon walls, rims, and elsewhere in the monument and on the outside.

The gist of what we have to say here is to try to show that the values about which the conservationists and the nature lover are so gravely concerned will not be jeopardized to the extent that he feels they will be.

We make the statement, and we hope we can prove it, that neither Echo Park nor Split Mountain Dams will endanger the natural values of Dinosaur National Monument. There are two reasons for this. First, only minor values are affected by either dams or reservoirs in the canyon. Second, all such values are adequately and abundantly represented elsewhere in the monument itself and in the immediate vicinity outside. No irreplaceable losses will occur. It is not a case of submerging ancient civilizations, scientific rarities, or great educational or inspirational values. A detailed and realistic examination of the actual facts pertaining to these values reveals that undue concern is being felt for them.

With reference to the geology, no more geology will be inundated than is already covered by the Green and Yampa Rivers. I will enlarge on that in a moment. The beds of these streams now partially cover the formations they flow across. However, all this same geology is well represented in the canyon walls, rims, elsewhere in the monument, and outside. It should be borne in mind that nature, the sculptor, in creating the scenic features of Dinosaur National Monument did not know that at some future date man would build a wall around a specified area designated today as the boundary of Dinosaur National

Monument, with the inference that this enclosure contains features which are not represented elsewhere. Not knowing this, 15,000,000 years ago nature began establishing the present pattern of the Colorado River drainage, and in carving the features of Dinosaur National Monument, it also carved in the same formations very similar features on the outside. I think one could safely say that the only difference between scenic material within the monument and on the outside is principally that of the depth of canyons concerned, because you have identically the same forces using the same material, forming the same type of scenery inside the monument and outside.

Interpretation of the geology, structure, and so forth, will not be harmed by the reservoirs because of the excellent exposures everywhere in the area. The geology of the entire monument has been mapped and all this information recorded. There is far more geology represented by the areas outside the monument than by that within, and it is more accessible. One may drive over Uintah Mountains by car and pass through a geological sequence which exceeds anything within the monument. In addition, we have attractive markers placed on the formations, giving their names, age, and other pertinent information.

This map isn't well shown in this light. However, I would like to point out, taking one illustration, first, that your drainage pattern is toward the bottom of the map and to the west. This is the site of the Echo Park Dam. Here is where your Dinosaur headquarters area lies and where the Dinosaur material is principally concerned. Right here, a few miles up the river, but going in this way, about 11 miles by river, is the site of the Split Mountain Dam. Right at the Echo Park Dam site the dam will be constructed in Uintah quartzite.

One might make a point of the fact that a misinformed person would say there you are covering the Uintah quartzite and there won't be any evidence of it in the monument or on the outside and it is going to be lost for all time. All right, this is Uintah quartzite, all of this is Uintah quartzite. These other areas, the red areas, are Uintah quartzite. Your principal geology on the Yampa River is Weber sandstone, which is this brown, and the Madison limestone, which is this purple. Those areas are the two formations involved in the carving of that canyon. You certainly can't say that you aren't going to have any Weber sandstone exposed anywhere because in the areas away from the canyons you have it well represented. Over here in this area again this is Steamboat Rock, incidentally, just up the river from the Echo Park Dam.

Then you have Weber in all this area through here and again up here and up on top of the mountain here all the way from the river.

The point we are trying to make, briefly, is that any given geology is duplicated everywhere out of the canyon area. It is not a case of submerging from a point of geology anything that would be irretrievably lost. It just doesn't happen.

Archeology. This is another sore point. The archeology of the Castle Park area, which is the area in the Yampa Canyon just about midway on the map, on the Yampa River in Dinosaur National Monument, has been the subject of study and field expeditions for several years. Sizable collections have been made and publications written by the University of Colorado Museum covering this material.

Here is the preliminary publication, University of Colorado Studies, the Archeology of Castle Park, Dinosaur National Monument. That is the initial recording of the material from that area, and further publications will follow.

Studies and field work by the University of Colorado will continue this year and probably longer. The archeology of this area will have been recorded. On the benches 600 to 1,000 feet above the river are several other sites which will not be disturbed by the proposed reservoirs. I didn't say that. The University of Colorado says it in this book and they are doing the work.

Jones Hole, approximately 3 miles below the Echo Park Dam site, due to its high elevation above the Green River, will not be affected by either dam.

In addition to artifacts this area has also produced mummified skeletons of prehistoric peoples. Castle Park site has so far produced only artifacts but no skeletal remains of the people who made them. Petroglyphs, or cliff murals, whatever you want to call them, are common throughout the monument and are not confined to the Castle Park area. Their value as present historical material has been overrated. They apparently have no narrative significance and have no relationship to Mayan, Aztec, or Egyptian writings. For instance, the cliff murals, petroglyphs, or pictographs, whatever you want to refer to them as, are not a written language of prehistoric peoples. They represent the artistic endeavors of the people of that time. They represent primarily ceremonials, hunting scenes, and rather disconnected items. There isn't any attempt on the part of the people to say "the spring is over the hill," or "Mable is right around the corner," or anything like that. You can't get a distinct sequence narrative out of them.

Outside the monument a few miles to the west in Dry Fork and Ashley Canyons are what have been called the finest petroglyphs in America. These canyons have also produced exceptionally well-preserved mummies. Dams and reservoirs in Dinosaur National Monument will not submerge archeological values which are not well represented within the monument and outside.

Biotic values. The fauna and flora of the canyon area and the small, open parks between are of little consequence because of the affected areas are very limited and also because both plant and animal life are well represented elsewhere in the monument and outside.

With reference to biotic life I don't know whose pictures these are, but I suspect this is my friends of the Park Service. Because I have seen them before. You will notice the character of the vegetation and so on in these areas, which is typical of the canyons in the little parks or flats between the canyons. You do have quite a vegetative stand, but the area affected is relatively small. Wildlife in these pictures is not illustrated by the horse. That man is a whole lot wilder than that horse ever thought of being. Incidentally, he has lived in Pats Hole area all his life. Three such areas will be inundated. That happens to be my wife's old home. That will be inundated. That will also be inundated here in the Steamboat Rock Pats Hole area. He will be washed out. Here in the Castle Park area is the Mantle family. They will be submerged. Rile Chew, who was born and raised in Pats Hole, said he has had such a hell of a time making a living over there that any time anybody wants to compensate him for the land and kick him out, he just can't wait for it to happen.

Economic minerals. Someone said you had better bring up the question of oil. No economic minerals of commercial value occur in Dinosaur National Monument. This includes oil. There is only one place that I can refer to having oil in the Dinosaur National Monument, and fittingly enough it is in Weber Sandstone which produces it in the area. That is a boulder of Weber Sandstone on the road that leads down to Pats Hole where we high centered and knocked

a hole in our crankcase. That oil is still there. [Laughter.]

This includes oil. The formations which produce oil at Rangely, Colo., and Vernal, Utah, are from 4,000 to 6,000 feet beneath the surface and occur on structures which are favorable for trapping oil. In the monument these same formations are exposed on the surface and any oil they may have contained has been lost by erosion. All that brown there that you see through there is the oil-producing area of eastern Utah, western Colorado, and it wouldn't be on the map and exposed if it were underneath the surface. It is shown there because it is on the surface.

Inspirational value or, if you want to call it, spiritual values of canyons will not be lost. Due to the high rate of fall in the river canyons, any given depth of water is not long maintained. Consequently, the minor reduction in the height of canyon walls resulting from even the deeper waters, which would be at Echo Park, of course, rapidly decreases upstream until the zero point is again reached. Many people in thinking of these reservoirs assume that the height of the dam represents the depth of the reservoir, which of course it does not. It does at a dam, but that is all. From there on, they gradually taper off. Even the modification of the Pats Hole area is not an irreparable loss, for the unaffected Jones Hole area is even more spectacular and carved from the same formation. From the nature lover's point of view, Jones Hole is the more desirable. It can be reached only by horse or on foot, and no motorcar can intrude upon this isolated section. The reason it hasn't had a greater visitation is that it invokes a saying attributed to Confucius to the effect that the outside of the horse is good for the inside of a man. It sort of stirs up your liver and it also teaches you that it isn't always necessary to eat sitting down.

Jones Hole contains the only clear-water trout stream in the entire Dinosaur National Monument. Jones Creek has two clear-water tributaries. The abundance of good water in this area makes it ideal for exploration by the visitor. It is so outstanding in area that it has been justified as a national monument by itself alone.

I would like to read a quotation of that justification. I didn't swipe this from the file, Mr. Drury. We were boosting for Jones Hole as an area which should be seen by more people and we said in this report to the National Park Service in May 1945:

"Lest it be thought that we are too enthusiastic over Jones Hole, I quote from a report by Herbert Evison to Edmund Rogers, then Superintendent of Rocky Mountain National Park, under date of July 16, 1936."

Notice that date, 1935.

"This report, submitted as a result of boundary studies, presented the enlargement of the monument to its present size. The quotation follows:

"Until just before our saddle party left on its trip, I had never heard of Jones Hole. It was a great surprise to me, and I am sure to the other members of our party. From both a scenic and geological standpoint, I consider that it ranks very high among the features of the proposed area. As in the case of Split Mountain, it has qualities which would justify creation of a national monument to include it alone."

I would like to point out that area in relation to the present monument. It is in the monument. Here is the Pats Hole area, Steamboat Rock. You go on down the river, and here is the mouth of Jones Creek. You have the same geology as is involved here. You go up the creek, and you go up into this area which in our estimation is far more spectacular. There may be a difference of opinion there. Some may like Pats Hole area better than Jones Hole. Nevertheless,

It is a very, very spectacular area, and because of the tremendous fall of Jones Creek, only the mouth will be submerged by Split Mountain Dam. At present it is accessible from the Island Park area by a trail of 7 miles. They also come in from the top over here on Wild Mountain. You can drive to within 4 miles of the area if you have a compound gear, and then walk down into the creek. If the dam is constructed you will also have access to the Jones Hole area by water here just at the mouth and then go on up on foot.

The thing again is that we have been speaking of alternates here. We have alternates for scenery as well as dams. Vast areas in the monument far greater than those in the immediate vicinity of the canyons themselves are entirely undisturbed by anything which may take place in the stream bottom.

How much western wilderness do the wilderness people want? There is no justification for the anguished outcry of the conservationists every time a new western development is proposed. If all the projects on the drawing boards today were built tomorrow, there would still be hundreds of thousands of square miles of untrammelled wilderness and solitude in western America, Canada, and Alaska. Even in Dinosaur National Monument 80 percent of the entire area will be wholly unaffected and unchanged by stream activity.

Of the seven fastest-growing States in the Union, five are Western States which, while they appreciate natural beauty, have long ago concluded they cannot live on scenery alone. This fast-growing region badly needs the substance of its undeveloped resources in order to survive and keep pace with its accelerated growth.

Rim drives and overlooks are a poor substitute for the canyons themselves. This assumes that the Park Service's program of development of having overlooks and rim drives is carried out. I certainly don't presume to speak for the Park Service. That would be a little out of character. Only in a relatively few places are glimpses of the streams themselves to be had from the rim. The canyons in which the streams flow may be readily seen but not the actual stream itself. If access—and here we make it, if the condition—if access to the wilderness area of Dinosaur National Monument were confined to the canyon rims, it would little matter what happened to the streams below because for the most part they would not be visible. As long as the canyons are to remain as they now are, they will continue to be accessible to only a very few individuals who risk their lives running the rapids in special boats.

Reservoirs, on the other hand, would make the canyons safely available, on still water, to every one, a majestic playground of national importance would be created.

Lack of water hampers monument development. The National Park Service is forever plagued by an inadequate water supply in most areas of Dinosaur National Monument. When funds finally become available for making some of the wilderness portions of the monument accessible, this lack of water will remain a troublesome problem. Even the Dinosaur Quarry headquarters has a water problem when this section is fully developed. It must be remembered that the monument is not a lush region of jeweled lakes, silver streams, and evergreen forests. Rather, it is a colorful land in large part consisting of sagebrush and sand, rocks, and juniper, a very picturesque country, but difficult to travel because of no water, trails, or roads.

Stockmen of the area build earth dams in a suitable wash to catch the spring runoff, but this water is not fit for human consumption. The traveler must carry his own water to play safe.

Someone has asked me, is the Green and Yampa Rivers water fit to drink. I can't properly answer that question for the simple reason that my wife's grandmother, who has lived on the Green River all her life, is only 92 years old and it hasn't killed her yet. Maybe it will, but I am going to have to wait to answer that until later.

Such a handicap will have a limiting effect upon the use of many portions of the monument even after they are made accessible to the public. The river canyons, on the other hand, offer no such problems. Man-made lakes resulting from the dam provide boating, fishing, and so forth, which may be enjoyed by every one. These same lakes would attract water fowl creating a natural bird refuge.

Incidentally, there would be wonderful bass fishing in the reservoirs and trout fishing below it in the clear water, just as at Boulder. Thus, the reclamation service in building the dams would make possible the development of Dinosaur Monument for which the Park Service has no funds and for which no funds have been made available in the 35 years since its establishment in 1915. Nor has any provision been made at this late date even for the development of the Quarry area. The still water lakes would also facilitate the ease of administration, transportation, and fire protection by Park Service personnel. Dinosaur National Monument probably would not find itself on the defensive today had conservation groups spent as much time and energy in the past in efforts to obtain funds for the development of the monument under park service supervision as they have expended in their opposition to this development by the Reclamation Service.

I earnestly urge that these groups immediately use their influence to aid in securing funds for the Dinosaur Quarry in-place exhibit. The Park Service will be glad to appraise the program of its supporters and needs. If something is not done there soon, public resentment over the inability of the Park Service to act will be greater than its resentment over the present general inactivity or the prospect of any activity in the near future.

I would like to make it clear, as it already has been pointed out this morning, that is no condemnation of the Park Service. You can't do anything without money. I happened to be at one time one of the frustrated personnel at Dinosaur National Monument, and every biennium you submit your program and your request for funds, and nothing happens. You go back and you are just a fire guard and one of those glorified fellows that they call a ranger. Actually you are a dressed up garbage collector, but that is all right. That is no reflection on the ranger, however.

Silt: The accumulation of silt and mud and quicksand is not a phenomenon confined to reservoirs. It is an unpleasant feature of nearly every natural stream, and the Green and Yampa Rivers are no exceptions even in the canyon portion. With an average fluctuation of only 5 to 10 feet—these are reclamation figures—in the level of the reservoir water, this is comparable to the natural condition which exists on these streams today. Quicksand banks are numerous and treacherous. Stockmen of the area build miles of fence to keep their stock away from the river. Only on the widely separated gravel bars is it safe for the animals to come down and drink. Stock losses in quicksand are common. In addition to mud and quicksand, there are unsightly tangles of driftwood tossed aside at the high-water mark or left stranded in the middle of low, sluggish streams. One must not fall into the habit of feeling that something ugly is beautiful merely because it is natural, or going to the other extreme of thinking that something beautiful is ugly because it is artificial.

Ice jams: This is one feature that hasn't been covered in any of these discussions to my knowledge, and I would like to point out that ice jams are a natural phenomenon which are causing a lot of unnatural damage. Ice jams on the Green River from Island Park in Dinosaur National Monument to below Ouray, Utah, outside the monument have been a periodic menace in years past. Early this March these jams climaxed in an emergency which brought out a United States Army bomber to blast the dams if the critical danger point reached any higher. The U. S. Highway No. 40 bridge at Jensen, Utah, the only Green River crossing on this route between Salt Lake City and Denver, was in imminent danger of going out. Had it done so, the nearest other winter crossing would have been at the town of Green River, Utah, 175 miles away. You can picture yourself there in a hurry and no bridge, and the closest detour 175 miles. I don't think anyone would be very happy over it.

In summer it would be possible to cross the Uintah Mountains to the north to a bridge at the town of Green River, Wyo., which is very much shorter, only 125 miles away. The ice jams of this spring, in addition to threatening the Jensen Bridge, the only life line crossing in and out of this area, also flooded ranches and other residents along the river and drowned some stock, and in all probability some wildlife which wasn't recorded. The Jensen Oil Refinery was threatened as well. Dams, such as Split Mountain and Echo Park, would make it possible to regulate stream flow, cutting down on the amount of water permitted at that time during periods of ice-jam emergency, permitting the ice to melt in place and go out normally, without destruction. These ice jams, which raise the water as much as 25 feet above normal, force the river out of its regular channel and cause new channels to be cut. This, along with the boulder-strewn flood plains formed along these new channels, produce an unsightly terrain, even though it is produced by natural causes rather than artificial ones. Trees and other growth along the stream banks are destroyed by the ice. I have seen them take cottonwood trees that were 18 inches through, and you would think it was a lawn mower operating. Those things go down the line there, and it leaves an awful tangled mess on those islands and along the river. It does a quicker and more efficient job than the beaver.

We are going to get to the end of this tirade in just a minute.

Economic security can also be beautiful. Natural scenery is a beautiful thing, but economic security can also be very attractive. Approximately 30 percent of the native-born population of Utah must seek employment outside the State after the State had educated and trained it in the art of making a living.

I would like to quote from a statement by a highly placed Park Service official whom I do not wish to embarrass by naming. I have a very high regard for this gentleman. He made an effort, which was quite natural, to determine how the local people felt about these dams. He wanted to report really what is the low-down here in the area where these things are going to happen. This was his statement, not to me, but to someone to whom it was absolutely safe to make. I heard it as a public utterance. I didn't rifle anybody's files.

"I have yet to find any one in the area but thinks the dams would be better than the monument as it is now."

Water and power would unlock many of Utah's natural resources and enable more of her people to find security at home. It is not a matter of choosing between river development or preservation. Nature has been so lavish in Dinosaur National Monument that it is possible to have both.

Mr. Secretary, I would like to offer my services and stand by and be available for questioning by any one if that meets with your approval.

Mr. WARNE. Thank you.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not know whether there is any matter which the Senator from Nebraska wishes to present to the Senate at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe not, but I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Then, Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 28, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27 (legislative day of March 26), 1951:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Paul C. Daniels, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Samuel B. Kemp, retired.

Ingram M. Stainback, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Edward A. Towse, elevated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Grover C. Richman, Jr., of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the District of New Jersey, vice Alfred E. Modarelli, elevated.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 10, 1951.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

George Peter Adamson	Burton Wayne Knise
Earl Alexander Baker	ley
Raymond Charles Bas-	Richard Lacy
sett, Jr.	Lambert John Larson
Henry Herbert Bell	Raymond Peter Litts
Wilfred Robert Bleak-	Joseph Louzon, Jr.
ley, Jr.	Phillip Charles Lutzi
Frank Raphael Bues-	Michael Joseph Mad-
seler	den
Donald Preston Court-	Richard Frank Malm
sal	George Edward
George Thomas Doyle	Maloney
Russell Harold Ferrier	Alfred Paul Manning,
John Howard Fournier	Jr.
Ted Lane Gannaway	Charles Edgar Martin
Robert Brown Grant	John Gazzo Martinez
Graham Hall	Kermit Ronald Meade
Richard Oliver	Phillip Blaine Moberg
Haughey	Norman Stewart
Joseph Paul Hratko	Morrill
Richard Leonard	Robert Arthur Moss
Jacobs	Daniel Louis Muir
Byron Waver Jordan	John Sidney Nuzum
David Murray Kaetzel	John Stephen Phillips
George John Kashuba	Sebastian Joseph Pias
Clement Henry Ed-	Robert Neal Pierce
ward Kerans, Jr.	Cortland Gerard
John Louis Klenk	Pohle, Jr.
Richard Joseph Knapp	Robert Charles Powell

James Polk Randle	Marion Long Weiss
Lewis Edwin Rhiver	Lawrence Arnold
George John Roy, Jr.	White
Robert Russell	Henry Wilks, Jr.
Frederick Paul	Swain LeRoy Wilson
Schubert	Robert William Witter
John Luther Stein-	Hugh Corbett Wyatt
metz, Jr.	Edward Franklin
Eugene Allen Stroup	Yost, Jr.
Richard Marvel	Paul Alexander Yost,
Thomas	Jr.
Karl Beresford von	Louis Locke Zumstein
Klock	

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Martin Yanishevsky	Alfred A. Rosenberg
Henry W. Beard	John A. Seigliano
Richard B. Sherwood	William M. Hanna

To be junior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Ralph K. Longaker

To be senior assistant veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Ladd N. Loomis

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Merlys E. Porter

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be captains

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Baker, Kemper Warren,	xxxxxx
Barnett, Willard,	xxxxxx
Barnhill, Robert Wallace,	xxxxxx
Becker, Marvin John,	xxxxxx
Beitman, Jesse Herman,	xxxxxx
Benkoski, Stanley Joseph,	xxxxxx
Boothe, Marvin Ray,	xxxxxx
Borgen, Dale Edward,	xxxxxx
Bouffard, Robert Edward,	xxxxxx
Bowers, James Brewer,	xxxxxx
Bradshaw, Harry Clifford, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Erinley, John Jayne,	xxxxxx
Buehler, Roger George,	xxxxxx
Burch, John Junior,	xxxxxx
Camblin, Roy William, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Cameron, George Edward,	xxxxxx
Cline, Leo, Edward,	xxxxxx
Coleman, Jack Wilbur,	xxxxxx
Coleman, Kenneth,	xxxxxx
Coloney, William Gordon,	xxxxxx
Davis, Hubert Ray,	xxxxxx
Davidson, David Truett,	xxxxxx
Dearien, James Nelson,	xxxxxx
Dixon, Claude Milton,	xxxxxx
Dye, L. A., Jr.,	xxxxxx
Ellis, George Vinton,	xxxxxx
Evans, James William, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Fall, Gerald Gerard, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Farmer, Owen Peter, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Flynn, John Peter,	xxxxxx
Folk, Drue Wilmer,	xxxxxx
Fulbeck, Charles Edward,	xxxxxx
Green, Alfred Laland,	xxxxxx
Guidotti, Alexander Francis,	xxxxxx
Gunn, Thomas Herbert,	xxxxxx
Halls, Robert Emmet,	xxxxxx
Hampton, Luther Pearson, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Harris, Paul Henry,	xxxxxx
Harris, Roy Elmore, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Hawkins, Malcolm Charles,	xxxxxx
Hedlund, Donald Charles,	xxxxxx
Hemphill, William Alfred,	xxxxxx
Hill, Otis Ray,	xxxxxx
Hogon, Dudley William, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Hughes, Emmett William,	xxxxxx
Hutchinson, William George,	xxxxxx
Ireland, Alfred Edward, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Johnson, Charles Warner,	xxxxxx
Johnson, Jules Orlando, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Johnson, Richard Irving,	xxxxxx
Jones, Robert William,	xxxxxx
Jordan, Doris Elizabeth,	xxxxxx
Kniss, Floyd William,	xxxxxx
LaMoine, Don Carlos,	xxxxxx
Langston, Jack Clarence,	xxxxxx
Leavitt, Pierce Rossetter,	xxxxxx
Littig, Goodwin Gordon,	xxxxxx
McConnell, Glenn Alexander,	xxxxxx
Metzinger, Dale James,	xxxxxx
Moschogianis, Peter Chris,	xxxxxx
Mosley, Alexander Thomas,	xxxxxx
Nave, John Thomas,	xxxxxx
Neuburg, Gerald Ernest,	xxxxxx
Newton, Earl Brook,	xxxxxx
Nix, Robert Clarence,	xxxxxx
Olson, Ordean Theodore,	xxxxxx
Paffenroth, Albert William,	xxxxxx
Parker, George Warren,	xxxxxx
Pierce, Locke Houston, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Plummer, John Sandy, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Pope, Charles Edward,	xxxxxx
Rackley, David Henderson,	xxxxxx
Ransbottom, Richard Otto,	xxxxxx
Rasmussen, Kenneth Weare,	xxxxxx
Ratchford, William Michael,	xxxxxx
Ray, Robert Lathem,	xxxxxx
Rhinehart, Philo Henry,	xxxxxx
Richardson, Bland Zeno,	xxxxxx
Riddling, William Pinkley,	xxxxxx
Robertson, James Paul,	xxxxxx
Scanlon, Robert Emmett,	xxxxxx
Sebring, Stanley Richard,	xxxxxx
Sellen, Alan Harry,	xxxxxx
Sherwood, John Richard,	xxxxxx
Slusher, Eugene Cameron,	xxxxxx
Smith, Donald Raymond,	xxxxxx
Smith, Joseph Wilson,	xxxxxx
Smyth, Delbert Ralph,	xxxxxx
Spaur, Melvin Johnson,	xxxxxx
Stairs, Robert Eldon,	xxxxxx
Stevens, Leonard John,	xxxxxx
Stroman, Christopher Fred,	xxxxxx
Sweatt, Fred Junior,	xxxxxx
Swegle, Wayne Floyd,	xxxxxx
Terry, Wendell Bradford,	xxxxxx
Thomas, William Lois,	xxxxxx
Thompson, Bill E.,	xxxxxx
Thompson, Marvin Preston, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Turner, Edward Milner, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Turner, Marion Reagan, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Uhman, William Frederick, 3d,	xxxxxx
Wagner, Elwood Milton,	xxxxxx
Walsh, Edward Francis, Jr.,	xxxxxx
Weatherwax, Dwaine Lavern,	xxxxxx
Williams, Jay Henry,	xxxxxx
Wilson, Ralph Wendell,	xxxxxx
Wintersole, Tom Joseph,	xxxxxx
Witten, Elmer Edwin,	xxxxxx
Woodstock, Raymond Earl,	xxxxxx
Young, Lee Roy,	xxxxxx
Zimmerman, John William,	xxxxxx

To be first lieutenants

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Hinton, John Richard, Jr., xxxxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE

Dunn, Charles Clinton, xxxxxx

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be captains

AIR FORCE NURSES

Merritt, Olive Josephine Boxa, [REDACTED]
O'Neill, Mary Catherine, [REDACTED]

NOTE.—All officers nominated for promotion to captain and first lieutenant are eligible for permanent promotion during the month of May 1951. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and sections 303 and 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. All medical, dental, and veterinary officers nominated for promotion have been found professionally qualified for promotion as required by law. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from October 19, 1950

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Dvorak, Edward August, Jr., [REDACTED]
McCrackin, Marion Riffle, [REDACTED]
Rowlett, Allen Benjamin, [REDACTED]
Perry, William Watson, [REDACTED]
Savage, Columbus, [REDACTED]
Kingsley, Earl Roster, [REDACTED]
Petersen, Lawrence Albert, [REDACTED]
Tootle, Columbus Edwin, [REDACTED]
Sammons, James Nile, [REDACTED]
Reed, James Franklin, [REDACTED]
Downey, Clyde Jackson, [REDACTED]
Hamilton, Edwin John, [REDACTED]
Ferguson, Howard Eastin, [REDACTED]
Perkins, Dale, [REDACTED]
Dalton, Charles D'orr, [REDACTED]
Barnett, John Anderson, [REDACTED]
Robinson, Robert Thompson, [REDACTED]
Maxwell, Donald Ward, [REDACTED]
Kiser, Edgar Lee, [REDACTED]
Workman, Robert Herndon, [REDACTED]
Friedman, Ivan Morton, [REDACTED]
McColpin, Carrol Warren, [REDACTED]
Toliver, Raymond Frederick, [REDACTED]
Preslar, Sanford Dee, [REDACTED]
Earle, Wilton Haynsworth, Jr., [REDACTED]
Harris, Alexander Everett, [REDACTED]
Martensen, John Kieth, [REDACTED]
Nash, Clifford, [REDACTED]
Sullivan, Charles Edward, Jr., [REDACTED]
Taylor, Roger William, [REDACTED]
Smith, Raleigh George, [REDACTED]
Eliker, Hadley Bures, [REDACTED]
Tortora, Bernardino Ornorio, [REDACTED]
Shayler, Walter Kenneth, [REDACTED]
Cosgrove, Charles Patrick, [REDACTED]
Hardman, Charles Franklin, [REDACTED]
Walther, Dale Lorraine, [REDACTED]
Branch, George Harrison, [REDACTED]
Mulligan, Martin Doyle, [REDACTED]
Gaffney, John William, [REDACTED]
Herrman, George Ross, [REDACTED]
Earthman, Henry Bivins, [REDACTED]
Growdon, Laurence Arlin, [REDACTED]
Smith, James Russell, [REDACTED]
Jones, Jarvis Parnell, [REDACTED]
Jones, William, [REDACTED]
Byrtus, Joe Robert, [REDACTED]
Campbell, Floyd Francis, [REDACTED]
Keller, William Dean, [REDACTED]
Brooks, Nelson Sisson, [REDACTED]
Ekstrand, Carl Vernon, [REDACTED]
Dickerson, Robert William, [REDACTED]
Storey, Thomas Barrett, [REDACTED]
Adams, William Brownlow, [REDACTED]
Masters, Robert Eugene, [REDACTED]
McCarter, Elmer Heath, [REDACTED]
Newbauer, John Alvin, [REDACTED]
Haggard, Van Buren, [REDACTED]
Morrill, Harry Eugene, [REDACTED]
Peters, Lester McCormick, [REDACTED]
Buckey, Loren Elbert, [REDACTED]
DeLapp, John Robert, [REDACTED]

England, James John, [REDACTED]
Price, Oran Oscar, [REDACTED]
Magness, Woodrow Wilson, [REDACTED]
Cronan, Robert Albert, [REDACTED]
Hart, Allen Gould, [REDACTED]
McCoy, Frederic Emerson, [REDACTED]
Bull, James Tryon, [REDACTED]
Walton, Victor Emanuel, [REDACTED]
Thornhill, John James, [REDACTED]
Gillespie, Joe Gill, [REDACTED]
Hughes, Harold Lee, [REDACTED]
Murray, Charles Edward, [REDACTED]
Ernst, Sol Eugene, [REDACTED]
McCracken, Austin Ralph, [REDACTED]
Worrel, Albert Alfred, [REDACTED]
Gremmler, Paul Edward, [REDACTED]
Kalberer, Klem Franklin, [REDACTED]
Hogg, James Arthur, [REDACTED]
Schloss, Jeremy Karl, [REDACTED]
Clark, Thomas James, [REDACTED]
Warren, William, [REDACTED]
O'Connor, Leo Nicholas, [REDACTED]
Tofaletti, Edith Margaret, [REDACTED]
Lowry, Leon Lloyd, [REDACTED]
Anderson, Lynden Roland, [REDACTED]
Dean, Charles Emmet, [REDACTED]
Wall, James William, [REDACTED]
Humbrecht, George William, [REDACTED]
Wessman, Everett Cornelius, [REDACTED]
Whitehouse, Bernard Patrick, [REDACTED]
Gatley, Edward Donald Jr., [REDACTED]
Sass, Edward John, Jr., [REDACTED]
Marley, Frederick Harold, [REDACTED]
Page, Harry Robert, [REDACTED]
Dame, Frederick Russell, [REDACTED]
Downey, William Gutes, [REDACTED]
Hoit, James William, [REDACTED]
LaPlante, Robert William, [REDACTED]
Steele, Donald Dale, [REDACTED]
Greco, Joseph Alfred Lowry, [REDACTED]
Zapponi, William Lawrence, [REDACTED]
Zaloudek, Charles Joseph, [REDACTED]
Fackler, Paul Henry, [REDACTED]
Whitsitt, Samuel Joseph, [REDACTED]
Prodanovich, George, [REDACTED]
Thorson, Paul Anthony, [REDACTED]
Armstrong, Frederick Martin, Jr., [REDACTED]
Pedrazzini, Harold Oliver, [REDACTED]
Cromer, Daniel Hagan, [REDACTED]
Shead, Carleton Gregory, [REDACTED]
Olson, Sylfest Lester, [REDACTED]
Chase, Linden, [REDACTED]
Swett, Raymond Dailey, [REDACTED]
Shulmistras, Joseph Andrew, [REDACTED]
Evans, James A., Jr., [REDACTED]
Topping, Raymond James, [REDACTED]
Bratton, Leslie Raymond, [REDACTED]
Harding, Frank Burkley, [REDACTED]
Alexander, Donald Martin, [REDACTED]
Purinton, William Robert, [REDACTED]
Cory, Albert Arnold, [REDACTED]
Ezzard, Richard Francis, [REDACTED]
Yurkanis, Paul John, [REDACTED]
Clinkscales, Theodore Ross, [REDACTED]
Wheeler, Warren Sanford, [REDACTED]
Cook, Earl Brown, [REDACTED]
Ola, George Joseph, [REDACTED]
Crabtree, Martin Perdue, [REDACTED]
Wilson, Keith Streeter, [REDACTED]
Itz, Milford Felix, [REDACTED]
Merritt, Ralph LeRoy, Jr., [REDACTED]
Wilson, Harold Frederick, [REDACTED]
Taylor, John Randolph, [REDACTED]
Mahon, James Eli, [REDACTED]
Fitzgerald, Maurice Joseph, [REDACTED]
Spratt, William Joseph, [REDACTED]
Randolph, Richard Louis, [REDACTED]
Campbell, Francis Wilson, [REDACTED]
Jamieson, Alex Cameron, [REDACTED]
Britt, Jimmie Weaver, [REDACTED]
Perry, Leland Dale, [REDACTED]
McChristy, Albert Jordan, Jr., [REDACTED]
Sogaard, Folmer Jensen, [REDACTED]
Pirruccello, Joseph Salvatore, [REDACTED]
Spurgeon, Raymond Robert, [REDACTED]
Kingen, Elmer Fred, [REDACTED]
Sowle, Donald Edgar, [REDACTED]
Driscoll, John Joffre, [REDACTED]
Fruett, Ernest Clinton, [REDACTED]
Friederichs, Gilbert Francis, [REDACTED]
Coats, James Harold, [REDACTED]

Daily, Edwin Bruce, [REDACTED]
Gunderson, Robert Stephen, [REDACTED]
Critchfield, Richard Earl, [REDACTED]
Wogen, Joseph Glenn, [REDACTED]
Weldon, William James, [REDACTED]
Bowers, Robert Dana, [REDACTED]
Gilliland, Gilbert Linzy, [REDACTED]
McFarland, Earl, Jr., [REDACTED]
Wynne, Edward Patrick, [REDACTED]
Verner, Edward, [REDACTED]
Prann, Bradley Foote, [REDACTED]
Lavell, Walter Wellman, [REDACTED]
Fisher, Sydney Gilbert, [REDACTED]
Deems, Paul Schroeder, [REDACTED]
McCartan, Arthur Austin, [REDACTED]
Esau, Charles Gillies, [REDACTED]
Colligan, Robert Leonard, Jr., [REDACTED]
Bunze, Harry Frank, [REDACTED]
Smith, John Joseph, Jr., [REDACTED]
Ruebel, Joseph William, [REDACTED]
Rasmussen, James Holland Stephen, [REDACTED]
Symroski, Leonard Edward, [REDACTED]
Marston, Morrill Elwood, [REDACTED]
Barnard, Milton Carlton, 2d, [REDACTED]
Davis, Mercer Patton, [REDACTED]
Horton, Franklin Wolfram, [REDACTED]
Shearer, Irvine Harrison, [REDACTED]
Hughes, Aquilla Ballard, Jr., [REDACTED]
Wagner, Frank Benjamin, [REDACTED]
Ferrill, Harlan Benton, [REDACTED]
Bethune, Albert Henry, [REDACTED]
Ross, Orville Bergier, [REDACTED]
Ellis, Lewis Nathaniel, [REDACTED]
Gibble, James Thomas, Jr., [REDACTED]
Neuman, Bernard Albert, [REDACTED]
White, Donald Bates, [REDACTED]
Fulcher, G. H., [REDACTED]
Erwin, William Horace Bruce, [REDACTED]
Lawson, LeRoy Franklin, [REDACTED]
Kent, Glenn Altran, [REDACTED]
Epperson, Elmer Harrison, [REDACTED]
Bearly, James Henry, [REDACTED]
Beauchamp, Willard Augustus, [REDACTED]
Moreland, Hugh Harold, [REDACTED]
Paul, Joseph Herbert, [REDACTED]
Hendrix, William Murray, [REDACTED]
Ambrose, Joseph Richard, [REDACTED]
Winingham, Rollin Murray, [REDACTED]
Breckenridge, John Preston, [REDACTED]
Murrell, Carrell Thurman, [REDACTED]
Romberg, Edgar Allen, [REDACTED]
Vosper, Stanley Richard, [REDACTED]
Kuhl, Philip John, [REDACTED]
Reeve, Ralph Amos, [REDACTED]
Linehan, John Royal, [REDACTED]
Sullivan, Frank Edward, [REDACTED]
Adams, William Carrolton, [REDACTED]
Zoeckler, John Lewis, [REDACTED]
Crum, William Bailey, [REDACTED]
Wolke, Gerard George, [REDACTED]
Stowell, Channing, Jr., [REDACTED]
Ehlers, Melville Virgil, [REDACTED]
Swanccutt, Woodrow Paul, [REDACTED]
Taylor, Aubrey Delbert, [REDACTED]
Nevins, Hugh Jean, [REDACTED]
Good, Robert Ogden, [REDACTED]
Klemovich, Joseph Thomas, [REDACTED]
Rowley, John Waterbury, [REDACTED]
VanDerHeyden, Edward Eugene, [REDACTED]
Duncan, William Fowler, [REDACTED]
Hickey, Sanford Wayne, [REDACTED]
Mantoux, Lopez Joseph, Jr., [REDACTED]
Mitchell, John William, [REDACTED]
Phillips, Arnold Thielens, [REDACTED]
Lambeth, Benjamin Shadarach, Jr., [REDACTED]
Hanford, Samuel Burton, [REDACTED]
Stripling, Coleman, [REDACTED]
Walker, Paul Kenneth, [REDACTED]
Wilson, Willard Wendell, [REDACTED]
Wintermute, Ira Francis, [REDACTED]
Miller, Warren Mahlon, Jr., [REDACTED]
Horras, Lawrence Edward, [REDACTED]
Moyer, Robert Franklin, [REDACTED]
Hadwin, Arthur James, [REDACTED]
Sullivan, Charles Peter, [REDACTED]
Dillon, John Michael, [REDACTED]
Johannes, John Michael, [REDACTED]
Walborn, George Shaffer, [REDACTED]
Ferry, James Paisley, [REDACTED]
Koontz, Ray Wilson, Jr., [REDACTED]
Hale, Russell Dean, [REDACTED]

Davis, Everett, [REDACTED]
 Richards, Edmund Burke, [REDACTED]
 Tudor, David Beemer, [REDACTED]
 Sherrod, Jesse Raymond, [REDACTED]
 Fincke, Robert Theodore, [REDACTED]
 Edwards, Edward Daniel, [REDACTED]
 Riley, Daniel Edward, [REDACTED]
 Randall, Wilmer Ammons, [REDACTED]
 Lewis, Archie Robert, [REDACTED]
 Creech, Robert Morris, [REDACTED]
 Gunther, Rodney Edward, [REDACTED]
 Adams, Joseph Varner, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Estrumse, Elmer Frank, [REDACTED]
 Banks, William McGowan, [REDACTED]
 Odell, William Charles, [REDACTED]
 Cole, Richard Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Airmet, Elliot Seaton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Arthur Edward, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Read, Elkins, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Egan, John Clarence, [REDACTED]
 Ball, Alfred John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Smith, Robert Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Lacy, Albert John, [REDACTED]
 Szaniawski, Edward William, [REDACTED]
 Marshall, Charles Sylvester, [REDACTED]
 Sams, Burton Kresge, [REDACTED]
 Murray, Robert Hugh, [REDACTED]
 Gorman, George Daniel, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Curtis, Richard, [REDACTED]
 Ewing, Clair Eugene, [REDACTED]
 O'Brien, John George, [REDACTED]
 Whitfield, Fitzhugh Allis, [REDACTED]
 Mundee, John Alfred, [REDACTED]
 Wilson, Grover Lee, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Johnston, Clifford Andersen, [REDACTED]
 Robinson, Gerald Graham, [REDACTED]
 Brown, Therman Devoise, [REDACTED]
 Norman, Roscoe Lee, [REDACTED]
 Downing, Leighton Ford, [REDACTED]
 Steadman, Beverly Earl, [REDACTED]
 Wilkinson, Robert Norman, [REDACTED]
 Moorhead, Jesse Jefferson, [REDACTED]
 Smyser, Willis Michael, [REDACTED]
 Stepp, Richard DeWitt, [REDACTED]
 Markham, Peter John, [REDACTED]
 McGehee, Thomas Kendrick, [REDACTED]
 Weatherly, Edison Carlyle, [REDACTED]
 Sluga, Emil Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Woods, Robert Alfred, [REDACTED]
 Hogan, Raymond Eric, [REDACTED]
 Gudjunis, Wasco Edward, [REDACTED]
 Willis, Benjamin Grant, [REDACTED]
 Buckholts, Paul Omar, [REDACTED]
 Cobb, Robert Hardin, [REDACTED]
 Warden, Clifford Vincent, [REDACTED]
 Vail, Carl Joseph, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ireland, Loren Elsworth, [REDACTED]
 Cleary, Edward John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Paul, Leo Francis, [REDACTED]
 Batten, Earl Edward, [REDACTED]
 Almand, Alexander James, [REDACTED]
 Alexander, David William, [REDACTED]
 Tenney, Frank Lee, [REDACTED]
 Keeling, Gerald Fay, [REDACTED]
 Soukup, Reynold Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Phillips, Eugene Wendell, [REDACTED]
 Smedley, Arthur Allan, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Mills, Robert Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Rosenfield, Walter Allan, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Crocker, John Powers, [REDACTED]
 Mengel, Herbert Osmer, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Kirk, Tyrus Howard, [REDACTED]
 Nowell, Robert Bolling, [REDACTED]
 Vandiver, Ray, [REDACTED]
 Cage, Phil B., [REDACTED]
 Magruder, Eugene Ross, [REDACTED]
 Summers, Thomas B., [REDACTED]
 Wood, Harold Holloway, [REDACTED]
 Bettinger, Sterling Peter, [REDACTED]
 Dibrell, Charles Frederick, [REDACTED]
 Martinson, John McClure, [REDACTED]
 Huntington, Edward Marshall, [REDACTED]
 Holmes, Robert West, [REDACTED]
 Newman, Neil Arnold, [REDACTED]
 Carter, Wendell Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Patterson, James Theodore, [REDACTED]
 Peters, Martin Fisher, [REDACTED]
 Martin, Vernon Paul, [REDACTED]
 Brandt, Forrest Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Hugos, Howard Francis, [REDACTED]
 Sparks, Harold Proctor, [REDACTED]
 Humfeld, Harold Emmett, [REDACTED]

Peck, Gaillard Ray, [REDACTED]
 Sykes, Phillip Avery, [REDACTED]
 Davis, Howard Allan, [REDACTED]
 McLaughlin, John Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Lester James, [REDACTED]
 Bohan, Robert Emmett, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Goolsby, George Stokes, [REDACTED]
 Metz, Cecil Clyde, [REDACTED]
 Melcher, John Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Parkhill, William Henry, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Joseph Columbus, [REDACTED]
 Paulson, Robert William, [REDACTED]
 Knudson, Albert, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Herbert Elroy, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wynne, John Douglas, [REDACTED]
 Cobb, James Opal, [REDACTED]
 Keller, Ralph Waldo, [REDACTED]
 Fahy, Albert Francis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Williamson, Hugh Lamar, [REDACTED]
 McCown, Dean Augustus, [REDACTED]
 Warden, Henry Edward, [REDACTED]
 Humphries, Bert Willis, [REDACTED]
 Bleymaier, Joseph Sylvester, [REDACTED]
 Evans, John Lewis, [REDACTED]
 Mullins, William Pearlle, [REDACTED]
 Campbell, Thornton Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Brennan, Mortimer Campbell, [REDACTED]
 Moore, Lloyd Ewing, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Donald Tharpe, [REDACTED]
 Hamby, Henry Gordon, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Bland, Edwin Allen, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lewis, Robert Clayton, [REDACTED]
 Drum, Robert Craven, [REDACTED]
 Jones, Robert Herrick, [REDACTED]
 Cotter, Harold Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Pidgeon, Sidney Sherrod, [REDACTED]
 Thomas, Jay Paul, [REDACTED]
 Snaith, William Gardner, [REDACTED]
 Choniski, William John, [REDACTED]
 Fitzsimmons, Joe, [REDACTED]
 Mahon, Herschel Dar iel, [REDACTED]
 George, Walter Russell, [REDACTED]
 Leimbacher, Robert James, [REDACTED]
 Henry, Stephen Wetherell, [REDACTED]
 McCabe, Jerome Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Van Benthussen, Max Elliott, [REDACTED]
 Hoffman, Arthur Elkin, [REDACTED]
 Coyle, Gervais Gibson, [REDACTED]
 McGinnis, Edgar Max, [REDACTED]
 Baughn, Julius Henry, [REDACTED]
 Fry, Richard Jefferson, [REDACTED]
 McCrary, Robert Ryan, [REDACTED]
 White, Grover Cleveland, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Walker, Richard Lee, [REDACTED]
 Havey, James Halbert, [REDACTED]
 Russell, Edward Patrick, [REDACTED]
 Brooks, James McKinney, [REDACTED]
 Mehess, Gus John, [REDACTED]
 Curry, William Floyd, [REDACTED]
 Rasmussen, Edward Bernard, [REDACTED]
 Wood, Frank Preuit, [REDACTED]
 Welsh, Albert Michael, [REDACTED]
 Wilkerson, Steven Russell, [REDACTED]
 Price, Galen Barger, [REDACTED]
 Palmer, Miles Russell, [REDACTED]
 Juhasz, Andrew Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Briley, Joe Charles, [REDACTED]
 Lawrence, Rollo Charles, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Esmay, Carle Howard, [REDACTED]
 Conlan, Douglas Mansfield, [REDACTED]
 Kittel, Louis Richard, [REDACTED]
 Brauer, Lloyd Walter, [REDACTED]
 Exon, Arthur Ernest, [REDACTED]
 Vande-Hey, James Michael, [REDACTED]
 Clark, Walter Edwin, [REDACTED]
 Scott, Oliver McFarlane, [REDACTED]
 Griffith, Stebbins West, [REDACTED]
 Stanton, LeRoy Moore, [REDACTED]
 Piper, Preston, [REDACTED]
 Daly, William Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Hadfield, Edward Snuggs, [REDACTED]
 Wilds, Harry, [REDACTED]
 Simmons, Mabry, [REDACTED]
 Triolo, Jerome Manuel, [REDACTED]
 DeGroot, Peter, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Robert Dalton, [REDACTED]
 Bradley, Theo Drake, [REDACTED]
 Paulson, Gordon Leslie, [REDACTED]
 Sheppard, William Alan, [REDACTED]
 Leen, Gerald Adrian, [REDACTED]
 Vogt, John Edward, [REDACTED]
 Fickering, Ralph Martin, [REDACTED]

Mitchell, Samuel Andrew, [REDACTED]
 Hubbard, James Howard, [REDACTED]
 Podolak, Stanislaw Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Garrett, John William, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hearn, Bunn, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Daniel, Joe Rowan, [REDACTED]
 Jones, Richard, [REDACTED]
 Gell, Thomas Wesley, [REDACTED]
 Randolph, John Peyton, [REDACTED]
 Vitek, Richard Darius, [REDACTED]
 Martin, John Robert, [REDACTED]
 Burnett, John Coleman, [REDACTED]
 Bender, Frank Peter, [REDACTED]
 Gibbons, Robert Joseph, [REDACTED]
 James, Albert William, [REDACTED]
 Stenglein, Joseph Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Doddridge, David Edward, [REDACTED]
 Hallock, Judson, [REDACTED]
 Sutterlin, Howard Douglas, [REDACTED]
 Laven, George, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cox, Chester Charles, [REDACTED]
 Holstrom, Everett Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Hignett, Forest Edwin, [REDACTED]
 Miles, Joe Douglas, [REDACTED]
 Allen, Barnett Stanford, [REDACTED]
 Wells, Selmon Willard, [REDACTED]
 Risher, James Franklin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Easley, Horace Penrod, [REDACTED]
 Holt, Harold Norman, [REDACTED]
 Beckham, Walter Carl, [REDACTED]
 Rafferty, Patrick Hugh, [REDACTED]
 Dorsey, Robert Sears, [REDACTED]
 Watkins, George Frank, [REDACTED]
 Withycombe, Howard James, [REDACTED]
 Ellis, Richard Nat, [REDACTED]
 Mottern, Elmer McDowell, [REDACTED]
 Maxwell, Hugh Durwood, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Fickling, William Arnold, [REDACTED]
 Bridges, Lester, [REDACTED]
 Jones, Wingate Brewer, [REDACTED]
 Baccus, Donald Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Stovall, Jack Neil, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, James Kenneth, [REDACTED]
 Carter, George Albert, [REDACTED]
 Kneen, George Henry, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Watson, Ralph James, [REDACTED]
 Niccolini, Mario Edward, [REDACTED]
 Hussey, John Joseph, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Francis, Paul Hildreth, [REDACTED]
 McBrayer, James Roy, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Balle, Kenneth Rex, [REDACTED]
 Manchester, Richard Easley, [REDACTED]
 Thompson, James Herman, [REDACTED]
 Petersdorf, John Edwin, [REDACTED]
 Stephens, John Edward, [REDACTED]
 Miller, Donald Vernon, [REDACTED]
 Converse, William Winans, [REDACTED]
 Bennett, James Whitt, [REDACTED]
 Jamison, Marshall Verdine, [REDACTED]
 Harris, John Frederick, [REDACTED]
 Heaton, Donald Haynes, [REDACTED]
 Woods, David Seavey, [REDACTED]
 Seawell, William Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Ascani, Fred John, [REDACTED]
 Dessert, Kenneth O'Reilly, [REDACTED]
 Mayo, Ben Isbel, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Fisher, Thomas Legate, 2d, [REDACTED]
 Gould, Gordon Thomas, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Tuttle, Robert Merrill, [REDACTED]
 Locke, John Langford, [REDACTED]
 Osgood, Richard Margee, [REDACTED]
 Silk, Joseph Meryl, [REDACTED]
 Rhynard, Wayne Edgar, [REDACTED]
 McClure, Jack Curtright, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Richards, John Rose, [REDACTED]
 Kelsey, Straughan Downing, [REDACTED]
 Henschke, John Miles, [REDACTED]
 Stalnaker, George Winfield, [REDACTED]
 Easton, John Jay, [REDACTED]
 Watson, Leroy Hugh, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Kunkel, David Ernest, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hall, Max Woodrow, [REDACTED]
 Elder, Clarence Lewis, [REDACTED]
 Sawyer, Willis Bruner, [REDACTED]
 Brooks, John Adams, 3d, [REDACTED]
 White, Alpheus Wray, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cole, Clifford Elbert, [REDACTED]
 de Jonckheere, Eric Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Mitchell, William LeRoy, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Berger, Leon Herman, [REDACTED]
 Stillson, George Hamilton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Brown, Edwin Watson, [REDACTED]
 Travis, Richard Van Peit, [REDACTED]

Norton, Harold Wesly, XXXXX
 Willes, Charles Gleeson, XXXX
 Snider, Albert Howell, XXXXX
 Bentley, Jack Leith, XXXXX
 Evans, Andrew Julius, Jr., XXXXX
 Moore, Walter Leon, Jr., XXXXX
 Kline, Richard William, XXXXX
 Thompson, Clyde Arnold, XXXXX
 Pittman, George Henry, Jr., XXXXX
 Brier, William Wallace, 4th, XXXXX
 Ball, Clinton Field, XXXXX
 LaRocca, Gerard Anthony, XXXXX
 Peddie, Joseph Scott, XXXXX
 Parks, Samuel Wilson, XXXXX
 Cox, James Isaac, XXXXX
 Hayduk, Alfred George, XXXX
 Seamans, Charles Sumner, 3d, XXXXX
 Curtis, Gwynne Sutherland, Jr., XXXXX
 Meador, John William, XXXXX
 Brown, George Scratchley, XXXXX
 Aldridge, Richards Abner, XXXXX
 Hicks, George Luther, 3d, XXXXX
 Andrus, Burton Curtis, Jr., XXXXX
 Matheson, Charles Fuller, XXXXX
 Corbin, Thomas Goldsborough, XXXX
 Harvey, Harry Canavan, XXXXX
 O'Connor, Roderic Dhu, XXXXX
 Atkinson, John Earl, XXXX
 Harding, Edwin Forrest, Jr., XXXXX
 Cator, Bruce Campbell, XXXXX
 Banks, Wilson Harper, XXXXX
 McWhorter, William Arther, XXXXX
 Pfeiffer, George, Jr., XXXXX
 Riordan, Robert Polk, XXXXX
 Kodis, John William, XXXXX
 Perego, Frank Smith, XXXXX
 Stafford, Charles Leonard, XXXX
 Haveman, Allen Ernest, XXXXX
 Martensen, William Burke, XXXXX
 Connelly, Charles Hilton, XXXXX
 Lyle, Lewis Elton, XXXXX
 Odom, Archibald Douglass, XXXXX
 Christmas, Charles Horace, XXXXX
 Trachsel, William Henry, XXXXX
 Ebbeler, Harold Ray, XXXXX
 Downs, Bruce Charles, XXXXX
 Best, Everett William, XXXXX
 Harlow, Henry Maynard, XXXXX
 Richardson, Elmer Winston, XXXXX
 Pyle, Clifton, XXXXX
 Dade, Lucian Alexander, Jr., XXXXX
 Daniel, William Allen, XXXXX
 Emmens, Robert Gabel, XXXXX
 MacNaughton, Franklin H., XXXXX
 Henry, John Bailey, Jr., XXXXX
 Pike, Harry MacCulloch, XXXXX
 Northamer, Kenneth Walter, XXXXX
 Milne, Jack Gillespie, XXXXX
 Richmond, Luther Henry, XXXXX
 Savoie, William Frank, XXXXX
 Vereen, Lindsey Hartford, XXXXX
 Sonnkab, Charles David, XXXXX
 Newsome, James Wyatt, XXXXX
 Lyons, James Raymond, XXXXX
 Towler, Harry Hunt, Jr., XXXXX
 Brock, Russell Keith, XXXXX
 Guthrie, James William, XXXXX
 Burns, Robert Wiygul, XXXXX
 Amen, Henry John, XXXXX
 Brown, Grover Cleveland, XXXXX
 Sands, Harry James, Jr., XXXXX
 Michaelis, Ralph Leslie, XXXXX
 Perry, Arthur Clarke, XXXXX
 Nims, Frank Leslie, XXXXX
 McCutcheon, Robert Haynes, XXXXX
 Boyd, James Moore, XXXXX
 Jack, Jean Albert, XXXXX
 Olson, Robert Alroy, XXXXX
 Garrison, Edwin Herbert, XXXXX
 O'Neill, John William, XXXXX
 McCarthy, James Francis, Jr., XXXXX
 Splain, John Farley, XXXXX
 Mosse, Charles Edward, XXXXX
 Bostwick, George Eugene, XXXXX
 Bickell, George Ross, XXXXX

To be majors with rank from December 14,
 1950

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Laing, Eleanor Joyce, XXXX
 White, Frances Lanier, XXXX
 Johnson, Marguerite Adelaide, XXXXX

Hoffman, Kathleen Elizabeth, XXXX
 Bradspies, Katherine Frieda, XXXX
 Ellison, Frances M., XXXXX
 Hendrickson, Helena Christine, XXXX
 Armbruster, Martha Lois, XXXX
 Ryland, Elizabeth Owen, XXXX
 Krizanauskas, Anne Suzanne, XXXX
 Watt, Marion Lee, XXXX
 Buck, Jane Arline, XXXX
 Brinton, Rachel Williams, XXXX
 Embich, Leonora Elizabeth, XXXX
 Roux, Marguerite Lydia, XXXX
 Moeckel, Olive Lucille, XXXX
 Duncan, Lillian Willierob, XXXX
 Garrison, Dace Theodore, XXXX
 Johnson, Anita Engerborg, XXXX
 Eckerson, Olive Lillian, XXXX
 Bachman, Mildred Rose, XXXX
 Everett, June, XXXX
 Fritz, Marilyn, XXXX
 Temple, Charlotte E., XXXX
 Smith, Doris Marjorie, XXXX
 D'Acosta, Beatrice Tarnoff, XXXX
 Goodridge, Arlene Harriett, XXXX
 Berry, Kathleen Marie, XXXX
 Scafide, Frances Elizabeth, XXXX
 McConnell, Lhatt Ashley, XXXX
 Horton, Charles Wesley, Jr., XXXX
 Lambert, Floyd Aubrey, XXXXX
 Carlos, Lloyd Pearson, XXXXX
 Johns, Robert Gordon, XXXXX
 Webster, Frank Russell, Jr., XXXXX
 Graves, Irwin Lester, XXXXX
 Brigham, Jex Moulden, XXXXX
 Creger, Jack Joseph, XXXXX
 Kerr, Ernest Lee, XXXXX
 Martin, Meredith Tansil, XXXXX
 Terry, Melvin Paul, XXXXX
 Kaufman, John Eugene, XXXXX
 Lutton, Lyle David, Jr., XXXXX
 Souva, Raymond Francis, XXXXX
 Brewer, James Edward, XXXXX
 Stephens, Raymond Dee, XXXXX
 Tidball, Dale Richard, XXXXX
 Landry, Matthew Andrew, XXXXX
 Valusek, John, Jr., XXXXX
 Hoffson, Wilbraham Arthur, XXXXX
 Seemann, Karl Wilhelm, Jr., XXXXX
 Van Vliet, Charles Thrasher, XXXXX
 Sudbury, David Vincent, XXXXX
 Coker, Elmo Ace, XXXXX
 Shiffrin, Benjamin Hankin, XXXXX
 Stewart, Robert William, Jr., XXXXX
 Shay, Steve Cseh, XXXXX
 Petri, Fred Louis, XXXXX
 Beyer, Johnson, XXXXX
 Imig, Paul Jacob, XXXXX
 Greuter Herbert Edgar, XXXXX
 Martin, Robert Lynn, XXXXX
 Maritzen, Lyle Carl, XXXXX
 Dinwiddie, Robert Eddy, XXXXX
 Hinchliff, Edward Everett, XXXXX
 Curlee, Robert Burnett, XXXXX
 Adkins, James Carl, XXXXX
 Johnston, Henry Randolph, XXXXX
 Linkous, William Lafayette, XXXXX
 Ritter, James Harry, XXXXX
 Donnelly, William Allan, Jr., XXXXX
 McPherson, Donald George, XXXXX
 Rasberry, Dayle Howard, XXXXX
 Moyer, Morgan Bernard, XXXXX
 Mitchell, Ross Lynn, XXXXX
 Dorondo, John Frank, XXXXX
 Murphy, Robert Emmett, XXXXX
 Buckley, John Alden, XXXXX
 Bruce, Leroy James, XXXXX
 Trautt, Edward Ambrose, XXXXX
 Hodges, Charles Grady, Jr., XXXXX
 Jordan, James Emmett, Jr., XXXXX
 Cannon, Walter Gary, XXXXX
 Conway, Charles Elwood, XXXXX
 Keller, Stevens, XXXXX
 Davis, Edward Geurs, XXXXX
 Toon, Charles Maxwell, XXXXX
 Kegeles, Sidney Albert, XXXXX
 Robinson, Norman, XXXXX
 Cowan, James Hill, XXXXX
 Smith, Frank Joseph, XXXXX
 Cravey, John Thomas, XXXXX
 Proctor, Charles Nelson, Jr., XXXXX
 Krogh, Laurence Bertram, XXXXX
 Mothersbaugh, James Forest, XXXXX

Flanagan, Richard William, XXXXX
 Breathwit, Carl Edward, XXXXX
 Steele, Richard Andre, XXXXX
 Daly, Arnold Joseph, XXXXX
 Laitos, Jan Milan, XXXXX
 Rappaport, Jerome Melvin, XXXXX
 Richard, Delos E., XXXXX
 Thaler, David, XXXXX
 Owens, Verner Alva, XXXXX
 Kelso, Charles Wayne, XXXXX
 Walsh, James David, XXXXX
 Lind, Marcel, XXXXX
 Prenoveau, Emil Edward, XXXXX
 Manicom, William Caldwell, XXXXX
 Oskamp, Garry, XXXX
 Lynde, Glyndon Lloyd, XXXXX
 Rogers, Daniel Townsend, XXXXX
 Luts, John, XXXXX
 Hyslop, William Arthur, XXXXX
 Sagebiel, Louis Walter, XXXXX
 Allard, Charles Edward, XXXXX
 Ash, Allie Paul, XXXXX
 Payne, Dolford Franklin, XXXXX
 Hall, Charles E., XXXXX
 Hathaway, William Horton, Jr., XXXXX
 Hawkers, Edward Albert, XXXXX
 Reynolds, Harry Martin, XXXXX
 Alexander, Robert Barlow, XXXXX
 Battle, Clarence Leonard, Jr., XXXXX
 Pigue, Muncie Meadows, XXXXX
 Hutcheson, Jack, XXXXX
 Starr, Stephen Albert, Jr., XXXXX
 Reeves, Vernon Houston, XXXXX
 Roubal, Joseph William, XXXXX
 Lee, Orville Imonial, XXXXX
 McCoy, Charles Edwin, Jr., XXXXX
 Dobney, Harold William, XXXXX
 Roberts, James Robert, XXXXX
 Stiles, Richard Henry, XXXXX
 Eby, Robert Roy, XXXXX
 LaMarre, Francis Harold, XXXXX
 Schwikert, Frank Donald, XXXXX
 Pugh, William, XXXXX
 Green, Charles Haunest, XXXXX
 Sipper, Joseph Robert, XXXXX
 X Hamilton, Herbert Orton, XXXXX
 McCroskey, Joseph Lee, XXXXX
 Knight, Archie Joyce, XXXXX
 Watrous, Frank Taiman, Jr., XXXXX
 Hoover, Edward Franklin, Jr., XXXXX
 Knight, John Richard, XXXXX
 Diekmann, Paul John, XXXXX
 Tibbetts, Oscar Norland, XXXXX
 Conner, Alva Lewis, XXXXX
 Brinson, Milton Wilkerson, XXXXX
 Thayer, Arthur Linwood, Jr., XXXXX
 Forrester, James Randolph, XXXXX
 Kelakos, Charles George, XXXXX
 Anske, Ralph Dhelo, XXXXX
 Harrell, Mason Douglas, XXXXX
 Baxter, Clifford Frank, XXXXX
 Frick, William Frederick, XXXXX
 Skalak, Rudolph, XXXXX
 Macey, William Henry, XXXXX
 Wischmann, George Adolph, XXXXX
 Richardson, David McCoy, XXXXX
 Walsh, Henry Joseph, XXXXX
 Smith, Brandon Corder, XXXXX
 Gammon, Edgar Graham, Jr., XXXXX
 Morgan, Earl Adams, XXXXX
 Schmucker, George Cleland, XXXXX
 Feller, Frederick John, XXXXX
 Gallup, Edward Francis, Jr., XXXXX
 Gaylord, Lester Louis, XXXXX
 Zeidler, William Xavier, XXXXX
 McAllister, James Benedict, XXXXX
 Falzgraf, Bryan George, XXXXX
 Bonifant, Bern Monroe, Jr., XXXXX
 O'Connor, Virgil John, XXXXX
 Ramme, Ernest Lester, XXXXX
 Hawes, Emil Franklin, XXXXX
 Cross, Robert Douglas, XXXXX
 Pennywitt, Glen Edward, XXXXX
 Jemmott, Herbert Kitchner Burton, XXXXX
 Posey, John Cabell, XXXXX
 Nielsen, Woodrow Everett, XXXXX
 Filippone, Jack Carl, XXXXX
 Praul, Charles Lynville, XXXXX
 Swenson, Shirli H., XXXXX
 Little, John Preston, XXXXX
 Callaway, Roy Lavert, XXXXX
 Davis, Glenn Elmore, XXXXX

Peterson, Lee Lieske, [REDACTED]
 Gaston, Charles Crain, [REDACTED]
 Deppen, William Christian, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hass, John A., [REDACTED]
 Allen, Stanley Ernest, [REDACTED]
 Ray, Wilbur Richard, [REDACTED]
 Lemons, Joseph Pascal, [REDACTED]
 McCollom, Francis Norman, [REDACTED]
 Stines, Harrison Oberdorf, [REDACTED]
 Ceely, William David, [REDACTED]
 Feile, Clarence William, [REDACTED]
 Carstensen, Dale Lafayette, [REDACTED]
 Bruner, Frederick William, [REDACTED]
 Collins, Harold Colbert, [REDACTED]
 Lathan, Noel Olin Elder, [REDACTED]
 Morgan, Fred Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Ellis, Bythel Laurence, [REDACTED]
 Dickens, Thomas Nolan, [REDACTED]
 Mattie, John Duane, [REDACTED]
 Johnston, Charles Harvey, [REDACTED]
 LaRowe, John Simon, [REDACTED]
 McCullough, William Edward, [REDACTED]
 Sheehan, Roy Hampton, [REDACTED]
 French, Russell Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Heiler, Robert Austin, [REDACTED]
 Benson, Frank Tipton, [REDACTED]
 Royce, Clare Howard, [REDACTED]
 Spencer, Harold Melville, [REDACTED]
 Guider, Herbert Neal, [REDACTED]
 Morat, Charles David, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lanning, George Richard, [REDACTED]
 Wooster, Vernon Oliver, [REDACTED]
 Sharpless, Thomas Frank, [REDACTED]
 Kernan, Robert Mills, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Sidney George, [REDACTED]
 Burnett, Robert Leon, [REDACTED]
 Bear, George Harold, [REDACTED]
 X Swanson, Richard Walter, [REDACTED]
 Walter, Clarence Douglas, [REDACTED]
 Norton, William Nicolson, [REDACTED]
 Lawton, Kenneth, [REDACTED]
 Pash, Robert Norman, [REDACTED]
 Neff, Charles Laban, [REDACTED]
 Woinowsk, Russell Kenneth, [REDACTED]
 Abercrombie, John Woodrow, [REDACTED]
 Risher, John Randall, [REDACTED]
 Short, Howard Earl, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Everett Hensel, [REDACTED]
 Reeder, Vendor Harvard, [REDACTED]
 Beasley, William Dawson, [REDACTED]
 Simonetti, Lino David, [REDACTED]
 Merrill, Woodrow Taylor, [REDACTED]
 Whitelead, Chauncey Brownloe, [REDACTED]
 Jones John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lasly, Walter D., [REDACTED]
 Wiecks, Max Reid, [REDACTED]
 Thabault, George Bernard, [REDACTED]
 Hoke, Peter Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Crosson, Norman Robert, [REDACTED]
 McDowell, Glenwood, [REDACTED]
 Stewart, Carl W., [REDACTED]
 Bonnett, Donald Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Higginbotham, Harold Kenneth, [REDACTED]
 Dell Angela, John Andrew, [REDACTED]
 Reeder, D. M., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Forsblade, Kenneth Dave, [REDACTED]
 Adleman, Julius J., [REDACTED]
 McDonnell, Heston, [REDACTED]
 Hay, Frank Olmsted, [REDACTED]
 Reed, Henry George, [REDACTED]
 Reese, James West, [REDACTED]
 Riddle, Charles Lewis, [REDACTED]
 O'Bert, John James, [REDACTED]
 Creo, Andrew Bartholomew, [REDACTED]
 Burns, Robert, [REDACTED]
 Swanson, Theodore Benedict, [REDACTED]
 Drew, Troy, [REDACTED]
 Phaneuf, Eugene Oscar, [REDACTED]
 Long, Alan Guy, [REDACTED]
 Lumpkin, William Hiram, [REDACTED]
 X Knight, Perry Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Bray, Jack William, [REDACTED]
 Hefling, Robert James, [REDACTED]
 Camp, Joseph Benjamin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 MacGregor, Wallace Fletcher, [REDACTED]
 McFarlan, Frank August, [REDACTED]
 Habeck, Carl William, [REDACTED]
 Wright, Julian Carleton, [REDACTED]
 Preatte, James Osborne, [REDACTED]
 Moore, William Weatherly, [REDACTED]
 Deppe, Ralph William, [REDACTED]
 Ferrell, Frank Ellington, [REDACTED]
 Hart, Malcolm Detraz, [REDACTED]
 Sprawls, Philip Claudius, [REDACTED]
 Akins, Dudley Stephenson, [REDACTED]
 Sweigart, Bert LeRoy, [REDACTED]
 Stallings, Guy Harrison, [REDACTED]
 Chiarella, James Santo, [REDACTED]
 Mills, Thomas Harris, [REDACTED]
 Sanders, Roy Clifton, [REDACTED]
 Sensenbrenner, Ralph Debald, [REDACTED]
 Moore, George Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Driver, John James, [REDACTED]
 Dacko, William, [REDACTED]
 Strauss, William, [REDACTED]
 Jones, Hubert Ledyard, [REDACTED]
 Rudolph, Ray Harding, [REDACTED]
 Kerr, Jean Louth, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Weisbrodt, Charles Richard, [REDACTED]
 Sterne, Paul John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Snaider, Himey Jones, [REDACTED]
 Warthman, Jack Dussel, [REDACTED]
 Milholland, George William, [REDACTED]
 Salisbury, Stanley Gordon, [REDACTED]
 Rhode, Storm Charles, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hight, James Lester, [REDACTED]
 Ondo, Michael, [REDACTED]
 X Calof, Donald Robert, [REDACTED]
 Brzuska, Edmund Earl, [REDACTED]
 Christenson, Richard Andrew, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, William Melbourne, [REDACTED]
 Funk, Carl Franklin, [REDACTED]
 X Waugaman, William Ira, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Sullivan, Arthur Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Van Sickle, Wendell Mac, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Lycurgus Waldemar, [REDACTED]
 Douthett, Elwood Moser, [REDACTED]
 Taylor, Henry Weston, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hunt, Seaborn McDonald, [REDACTED]
 Cole, Edward Lee, [REDACTED]
 Elliott, Charles Robert, [REDACTED]
 Barret, Alfred William, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jacobson, James Louis, [REDACTED]
 Overdorff, Willard Boyd, [REDACTED]
 Bean, James Otto, [REDACTED]
 Tansel, Dave Collins, [REDACTED]
 Schold, George Bertie, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Harper, Harmon Hicks, [REDACTED]
 Edelen, Henry Hill, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Slough, James Carl, [REDACTED]
 Ireland, Melvin J., [REDACTED]
 Ofner, David Bernhard, [REDACTED]
 Elston, Ernest Woodrow, [REDACTED]
 Poole, George Irvin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Turbak, Chester, [REDACTED]
 Bass, Feris Achille, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cark, DeLair Aubrey, [REDACTED]
 Creyts, Harold George, [REDACTED]
 Campbell, William Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Gray, Leon Welton, [REDACTED]
 Nye, Richard Sadler, [REDACTED]
 Topper, Morse, [REDACTED]
 Gibson, Robert Duane, [REDACTED]
 Price, Andrew Henry, [REDACTED]
 Tilghman, Marvin Hugh, [REDACTED]
 Wagner, Wilfred William, [REDACTED]
 McLaren, William Aiden, [REDACTED]
 Kramp, Joseph John, [REDACTED]
 Bryan, William Tagg, [REDACTED]
 Fincher, William Walter, [REDACTED]
 Edwards, Kenneth Rhea, [REDACTED]
 Kremer, Harry Darwin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 X Zorka, Jack Carl, [REDACTED]
 Ellis, Ollie McLaurin, [REDACTED]
 Schobel, Sumner, [REDACTED]
 Blackman, Richard Orchard, [REDACTED]
 X Brown, Frank Lobdell, [REDACTED]
 Sirney, John Ashton, [REDACTED]
 Browning, John Robert, [REDACTED]
 Riggs, Carl Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Auldridge, Herbert Wendell, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Krause, Harris F., [REDACTED]
 Bradford, Carl Walker, [REDACTED]
 Dascombe, Charles Burr, [REDACTED]
 Boddie, James Warner, [REDACTED]
 Stringer, Robert Dillon, [REDACTED]
 Lindsay, Andrew Gowen, [REDACTED]
 O'Hern, Luther, [REDACTED]
 Manes, Maurice Edward, [REDACTED]
 Burt, Joseph Autry, [REDACTED]
 Bright, David Morgan, [REDACTED]
 Stallings, McLendon Montgomery, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Robert Elbert, [REDACTED]
 Hartwig, Robert Louis, [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Arthur John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Patterson, Warren Shaw, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Swindler, Harold, [REDACTED]
 Dehner, Joseph Harvey, [REDACTED]
 Saville, Wesley Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Deane, William Boyd, [REDACTED]
 Dennis, Larry Denton, [REDACTED]
 Buechner, William Austen, [REDACTED]
 Jarrell, Robert Edward, [REDACTED]
 Barber, James Luther, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Schulherr, Richard Modglin, [REDACTED]
 McCormack, Bailor Daniel, [REDACTED]
 Linko, George Andrew, [REDACTED]
 Parks, Bernard Grant, [REDACTED]
 Hunt, Earl Gilbert, [REDACTED]
 O'Donnell, John Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Carpenter, John Woolsey, [REDACTED]
 Shipley, Edward Vail, [REDACTED]
 Boselli, Theodore John, [REDACTED]
 Riddick, James Walter, [REDACTED]
 Gaylor, Don Gordon, [REDACTED]
 Yoder, Harry David, [REDACTED]
 Chauvet, Jack Sydney, [REDACTED]
 Robinson, John Henry, [REDACTED]
 Hoyt, Zane Moses, [REDACTED]
 Andrews, John Albert Cornelius, [REDACTED]
 Suta, Nicholas Henry, [REDACTED]
 Nevling, Gilbert, [REDACTED]
 Murphy, Robert Marshall, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Tattini, Leno, [REDACTED]
 Quattlander, Frank Paul, [REDACTED]
 Wilson, Irl Donaker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Fontana, Robert Edward, [REDACTED]
 Porter, Lester William, [REDACTED]
 Crutchfield, James Oscar, [REDACTED]
 Turk, Laurel Agee, [REDACTED]
 Castle, Vernon Henry, [REDACTED]
 Murden, Charles Hoyt, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Zurek, Walter John, [REDACTED]
 Andersen, Homer Paul, [REDACTED]
 Culp, Chester Harold, [REDACTED]
 Poe, John Everett, [REDACTED]
 Miller, Lynus Parker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Grending, Carl Nelson, [REDACTED]
 McCleary, Robert Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Fohman, Thomas Spare, [REDACTED]
 Kellerman, Jack Hickman, [REDACTED]
 Reinhardt, Herbert Wilton, [REDACTED]
 Fox, Robert Winston, [REDACTED]
 Ritter, Herbert Waldemar, [REDACTED]
 Herrington, John Athol, [REDACTED]
 Deterding, Floyd Milton, [REDACTED]
 Edwards, James Thomas, [REDACTED]
 McGlasson, Robert Bruce, [REDACTED]
 Ivey, Maury Herbert, [REDACTED]
 Kafer, Ernest Emanuel, [REDACTED]
 Austin, John Florea, [REDACTED]
 Parker, Van Robison, [REDACTED]
 Francis, Tim Benton, [REDACTED]
 Morgan, Russell Dodson, [REDACTED]
 Monroe, Shelton Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Fussell, James Glen, [REDACTED]
 Hill, John Theodore, [REDACTED]
 Moe, John Gillette, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ragon, Dale Ambrose, [REDACTED]
 Johnston, Robert Edward, [REDACTED]
 Pryor, Daniel Franklin, [REDACTED]
 Jennings, Elton Jordan, [REDACTED]
 Hall, Thomas William, [REDACTED]
 Allen, Ed Crow, [REDACTED]
 Chandler, George William, [REDACTED]
 Mona, Reuben Edward, [REDACTED]
 Stewart, John Leger, [REDACTED]
 Cartwright, Everett Jackson, [REDACTED]
 Slater, Ralph Phipps, [REDACTED]
 Wilson, Woodrow, [REDACTED]
 Hamilton, Samuel Davis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Konin, David Harry, [REDACTED]
 Rogers, Dale Edward, [REDACTED]
 Spohn, Clifford Adams, [REDACTED]
 Kruge, William Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Latham, William Roberts, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Klegel, Albert Charles, [REDACTED]
 Nelson, Neelian Omar, [REDACTED]
 McGuigan, Thomas Harris, [REDACTED]
 Wernlein, Frank Allen, [REDACTED]
 Baucom, George Elmer, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jacobs, Herbert Milton, [REDACTED]
 Sexton, Ralph Eugene, [REDACTED]

Caldwell, Herman Bert, Jr., XXXXX
 Zachmann, Robert Francis, XXXXX
 McElrath, John Adam, XXXXX
 LaVier, Eugene Clark, XXXXX
 Cousins, Otie Columbus, XXXXX
 Cole, Benjamin Harold, XXXXX
 Conner, William Fred, XXXXX
 Schmidt, Fred Carl, Jr., XXXXX
 Kraus, Russell Bernhardt, XXXXX
 X Asprey, William Palmer, XXXXX
 Fahlstedt, Alfred Arthur, XXXXX
 Howell, Ernest Melville, XXXXX
 Blood, Arlie James, XXXXX
 Winebrenner, Louis Elmer, XXXXX
 Sharp, Charles Elton, XXXXX
 Wysocki, Chester Constantine, XXXXX
 Weeks, Howard Tolford, XXXXX
 Reed, Vincent Raymond, XXXXX
 MacDonald, James William, XXXXX
 Baker, Hollis Hershall, XXXXX
 Bogren, Stanley Edward, XXXXX
 Lyons, Ralph J., XXXXX
 Taylor, William Earl, XXXXX
 Heard, Wade Coleman, XXXXX
 Nash, Russell James, XXXXX
 Faulk, Melvin Wilson, XXXXX
 Dowling, James Klemp, XXXXX
 Foster, John William, XXXXX
 Becnel, Joseph Richard, XXXXX
 Strathy, Charlton Graham, XXXXX
 Hassenmiller, Marshall Griffith, XXXXX
 Simon, Edwin Herman, XXXXX
 Egan, Paul Francis Graham, XXXXX
 Jones, George Page, Jr., XXXXX
 Newark, Charles Glen, XXXXX
 Hoffman, Harold Jefferson, XXXXX
 Hunter, James Heggie, XXXXX
 Simon, Edward Rudolph, XXXXX
 Weaver, William Joseph, XXXXX
 Keyes, Lawrence James, XXXXX
 Kendrick, Donald, XXXXX
 Fish, Vinton Alfred, XXXXX
 Stone, Lynn Elden, XXXXX
 Plourd, Webster William, XXXXX
 Boatright, Loyd Alvin, XXXXX
 Dereskevich, Algert Stanley, XXXXX
 Baldrige, William Holmes, XXXXX
 Ulrich, Robert Charles, XXXXX
 Crowder, Robert Graham, XXXXX
 Nestor, Joseph Emmet, Jr., XXXXX
 Cleric, Henry John, XXXXX
 Peabody, Prentice Bayan, XXXXX
 Beall, Arthur Wilcoxon, Jr., XXXXX
 Rawls, Charles Alva, XXXXX
 Warner, George Oliver, XXXXX
 Buckley, Russell William, XXXXX
 McCredie, Cassius Milburn, XXXXX
 Schott, Carl Victor, XXXXX
 Carlson, Ragnar Lodbrok, XXXXX
 Pilkington, Thomas Milford, XXXXX
 Bertling, Stephen Joseph, XXXXX
 Douglas, Gene LeRoy, XXXXX
 Speer, Maurice Edmund, XXXXX
 Verbruggen, George John, XXXXX
 Hardy, Kermit Wayne, XXXXX
 Gotchey, Robert Emmett, XXXXX
 Hannley, Vincent Paul, XXXXX
 Rogers, Jack Mabry, XXXXX
 Martin, Ralph Gilbert, XXXXX
 Coade, William Arthur, XXXXX
 Eider, Harold Wyatt, Jr., XXXXX
 Oylor, George Clinton, XXXXX
 Fouts, John Elijah, Jr., XXXXX
 Zohn, Bernard, XXXXX
 Stanley, Gregory Quinn, XXXXX
 Wilson, Jerald Bruce, XXXXX
 Cocke, Charles Edward, Jr., XXXXX
 Koszarek, Frank Andrew, XXXXX
 Duncan, Ivan Merwin, XXXXX
 Rector, Walter Stokes, XXXXX
 Menth, Blaine Berlin, XXXXX
 Schou, Andrew James, XXXXX
 Anderson, Bernard Elwood, XXXXX
 Allen, John Thomas, XXXXX
 Campbell, Herbert Maxwell, XXXXX
 Lockhart, Russell Durward, XXXXX
 Knabel, Lewis Julius, XXXXX
 Moll, Robert Gustavus, XXXXX
 Dresser, Cornelius Sheldon, XXXXX
 Moore, William Wylie, XXXXX
 Campbell, Dick Martin, XXXXX
 Arnold, Robert William, XXXXX
 Lueke, Kenneth Lincoln, XXXXX
 deVore, Nicholas, Jr., XXXXX
 Huskey, Homer A., XXXXX
 Landwehr, Virgil Henry, XXXXX
 Ashley, George Robert, XXXXX
 Scales, John Cayme, XXXXX
 Baker, Carl Kraus, XXXXX
 Howe, Everitt Weir, XXXXX
 Haas, Chester Roy, XXXXX
 Dockstader, Daniel B., XXXXX
 Vick, John Oliver, XXXXX
 Maloney, Edward James, XXXXX
 Miller, Edwin Martin, XXXXX
 DeMun, Earl Edward, XXXXX
 Mineur, George Edward, Jr., XXXXX
 Rethman, Vincent Carl, XXXXX
 Watkins, James Dudley, XXXXX
 Breindel, George Joseph, XXXXX
 Grubaugh, Glover Porter, XXXXX
 Griffith, Frank Todd, XXXXX
 Flannigan, Ralph Eugene, XXXXX
 Field, Alexander Caldwell, Jr., XXXXX
 Greene, Grover Young, XXXXX
 Webb, Joe Slaughter, XXXXX
 Stanton, George LaRue, XXXXX
 Hemminger, George Carl, XXXXX
 Johnansen, Ernest Wortman, XXXXX
 Karably, Louis Stephen, XXXXX
 Jones, James Marion, XXXXX
 Glenn, Charles Swyers, XXXXX
 Vega, Carl Emmanuel, XXXXX
 Arnold, Dixon Jay, XXXXX
 Schindler, Wilbur James, XXXXX
 Kurovski, Walter Chester, XXXXX
 Barclay, Errol Dale, XXXXX
 Raynolds, Ted Eugene, XXXXX
 Hare, James Clark, XXXXX
 McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., XXXXX
 Brantner, James Andrew, XXXXX
 Reed, Everett Gilmer, XXXXX
 Patch, Dwight Dresser, XXXXX
 McIntyre, Joseph Douglas, XXXXX
 Shay, Michael, XXXXX
 Patterson, George Arnett, XXXXX
 Thornton, William Henry, Jr., XXXXX
 Miller, Danforth Parker, Jr., XXXXX
 Martin, Patrick James, XXXXX
 Kochel, Michael Joseph, XXXXX
 Bowman, Sam William, Jr., XXXXX
 Gainer, Hubert William, XXXXX
 King, James Porter, XXXXX
 Gibson, Dick Finley, XXXXX
 Jones, Richard Gordon, XXXXX
 Buckingham, George Edward, XXXXX
 McGregor, Oris Eugene, Jr., XXXXX
 Walters, Robert Whiting, XXXXX
 Duff, Elmer Hayden, XXXXX
 Reed, Edward Blakslee, XXXXX
 Leach, George, XXXXX
 Rogers, Woods White, Jr., XXXXX
 Boyd, Edwin Iwin, XXXXX
 Barber, George Alva, XXXXX
 Stanley, Ralph Willard, XXXXX
 Murphy, Bruce Crittenden, XXXXX
 Gustafson, Wayne Albert, XXXXX
 Latane, David Eaton, XXXXX
 Ward, James Aubrey, XXXXX
 X McGuire, Thomas Charles, XXXXX
 Hill, Charles Henry, XXXXX
 James, Harold Clinton, XXXXX
 Brunson, William Percy, XXXXX
 Mannon, Willard Beattie, XXXXX
 Robbins, Harold Wendell, XXXXX
 Barker, William Hamblin, XXXXX
 Govocek, Joseph Glenn, XXXXX
 Weaver, Marvin Eugene, XXXXX
 Polivka, Emil Walter, XXXXX
 Newell, Edward Wilson, XXXXX
 Karas, Christopher James, XXXXX
 Wagner, Carl Emil, XXXXX
 Peterson, Martin Eugene, XXXXX
 Henderson, Walton Bronlowe, XXXXX
 Bowman, Frank Michael, XXXXX
 Martin, Charles Abramson, XXXXX
 Osgood, Lynden Timson, XXXXX
 Mears, Forrest Eugene, XXXXX
 Debons, Anthony, XXXXX
 Jennings, Clifton Victor, XXXXX
 Thompson, Lorenzo Maurice, XXXXX
 Fertig, Norman, XXXXX
 Witt, Lynn Elwood, Jr., XXXXX
 Hippenstiel, Charles Robin, XXXXX
 Johnson, James Robert, XXXXX
 Weiss, Sidney, XXXXX
 Reifsteck, Calvin David, XXXXX
 Willis, Milton Dean, XXXXX
 McGee, Joseph Burgess, XXXXX
 Rohr, Loudin LaHugh, XXXXX
 Seay, William Woodrow, XXXXX
 Wallace, Wesley Fillmore, XXXXX
 Scurlock, Reagan Andrew, XXXXX
 Giles, Melvin Curry, XXXXX
 Molyneaux, Silas Robarre, XXXXX
 Keyser, William Russell, XXXXX
 Bland, Ruskin McArdle, XXXXX
 Kendall, Jimmie Winstead, XXXXX
 Taylor, Joe DeLay, XXXXX
 Riddle, Edmund Ross, Jr., XXXXX
 Ash, Robert Preston, Sr., XXXXX
 Hammond, William, XXXXX
 Blanco, Ira Joseph, XXXXX
 Monaco, John Junior, XXXXX
 Bruey, Thomas Joseph, XXXXX
 Barbour, Walter Raymond, XXXXX
 Berry, Gleneth Boyd, XXXXX
 Tracy, Joseph Francis, XXXXX
 Gooch, Ritchie Belton, XXXXX
 Loftus, Joseph Francis, XXXXX
 Tatum, William, XXXXX
 Harris, Joe Leslie, XXXXX
 Caples, Robert Osgood, XXXXX
 Zielinski, Urban Joseph, XXXXX
 Lawler, John Francis, Jr., XXXXX
 Bero, Francis, XXXXX
 Westberg, Kenneth Charles, XXXXX
 O'Rourke, John Bernard, Jr., XXXXX
 Cruver, Harry Franklin, XXXXX
 Brasler, Carl Oscar, XXXXX
 Wood, Lynn Frederick, XXXXX
 Ross, William Osmond, XXXXX
 Loughran, Harold Ray, XXXXX
 McCurdy, John William, XXXXX
 Barber, Zeneth O., XXXXX
 Timm, Paul August, XXXXX
 Quesada, Anthony, XXXXX
 Scott, William Richard, XXXXX
 Scherer, John Joseph, XXXXX
 Crowder, Harlan Burrell, XXXXX
 Ransier, Harry DeLosse, XXXXX
 McIntosh, Wayne Wesley, XXXXX
 Carey, Robert Henry, XXXXX
 Parks, Richard Watson, XXXXX
 Mahon, August Charles, XXXXX
 Stublarec, Michael Jack, XXXXX
 Haaf, Arthur Herschel, XXXXX
 Connell, Leonard Tilly, XXXXX
 Williams, Jack Pryer, XXXXX
 Skelton, Milton Bruce, XXXXX
 Cain, Walter Frank, XXXXX
 X Matsko, George, XXXXX
 Torr, Francis Evelyn, XXXXX
 Sandifer, John Douglas, Jr., XXXXX
 Jones, Waldo Brigham, XXXXX
 Davitt, Ralph Gregory, XXXXX
 Davis, Jerome Nicholson, XXXXX
 Berry, Edmund Burke, 3d, XXXXX
 Parmelee, David Burtis, XXXXX
 Burnett, Melvin Max, XXXXX
 Van Deusen, Clark Bedell, XXXXX
 Schwartztrauber, Ernest Phil, Jr., XXXXX
 Williams, William Milburn, XXXXX
 Devine, John Emmet, XXXXX
 Stone, Francis Marvin, XXXXX
 Schonka, Joe Mitchel, XXXXX
 Johnson, Andrew Everett, XXXXX
 Denton, Harris Leonard, XXXXX
 Raley, James Andrew, XXXXX
 Bourgault, Samuel Peter, XXXXX
 Maersperger, Walter Paul, XXXXX
 Belcher, Delbert Ray, XXXXX
 Stevens, Raymond Wesley, XXXXX
 Battallo, Samuel Thomas, XXXXX
 McMillan, Shubal King, Jr., XXXXX
 Clinger, Dallas Adellon, XXXXX
 Hackett, James Edwin, XXXXX
 Pitts, Arthur Simmons, 2d, XXXXX
 Weide, Edward James, XXXXX
 DuMont, Harold Joseph, XXXXX
 Lack, Wendell Douglas, XXXXX
 Blood, Kenneth Edward, XXXXX
 Jacobson, Alden Dale, XXXXX

- Ward, George Phillip, [REDACTED]
 Stiefel, Max Allen, [REDACTED]
 Hudson, William Lee, [REDACTED]
 Davis, John Kenneth, [REDACTED]
 Stroud, Conley Burns, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jones, William Dibreil, [REDACTED]
 Stephens, Donald Alfred, [REDACTED]
 Heino, Alfred Veikko, [REDACTED]
 Panko, Albert Robert, [REDACTED]
 Buford, William Meadows, [REDACTED]
 Nelson, John Amos, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Craig, Warren George, [REDACTED]
 Rogers, Carleton Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Miller, Hubert Edward, [REDACTED]
 Broich, Lee August, [REDACTED]
 Montgomery, David F., [REDACTED]
 Lee, Harold George, [REDACTED]
 Seab, Malcolm William, [REDACTED]
 Stubbs, Robert Reid, [REDACTED]
 Bradford, Oscar Arthur, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Savage, Rollin Richard, [REDACTED]
 Goddard, Guy Harold, [REDACTED]
 X Baker, Frederick John, [REDACTED]
 Stainback, Frank Pleasants, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Crow, Duward Lowery, [REDACTED]
 Winfree, Isaac Owen, [REDACTED]
 Anderson, Windsor Temple, [REDACTED]
 Gilbert, Willard Russell, [REDACTED]
 Perkin, Irving Richard, [REDACTED]
 Cochran, Wharton Clayton, [REDACTED]
 Avery, Hamilton King, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Weidner, Joseph John, [REDACTED]
 Rosenbaum, Bert Stanford, [REDACTED]
 Hershenow, William John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Woodruff, Roscoe Barnett, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Alden George, [REDACTED]
 Doerr, George Robert, [REDACTED]
 Funderburk, William Osler, [REDACTED]
 Miller, Carl Lee, [REDACTED]
 McElroy, Mansell Barrymore, [REDACTED]
 Flummer, George Allen, [REDACTED]
 Reichal, Joseph C., [REDACTED]
 Bergman, Harold Oscar, [REDACTED]
 Symes, Isaac Mathis Baker, [REDACTED]
 Schultze, David Rowland, [REDACTED]
 X Cox, Edward Luther, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Oss, Louis Hinebaugh, [REDACTED]
 McCleary, George Clifford, [REDACTED]
 Reid, Robert Jesse, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Henningan, James Edward, [REDACTED]
 Hause, Milton Maynard, [REDACTED]
 Gramm, Raymond Norris, [REDACTED]
 Dunkelberger, Vance Eaton, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Woodrow Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Schofield, Charles Stanley, [REDACTED]
 Heydon, Thomas Aloysius, [REDACTED]
 Stroud, Walter Charles, [REDACTED]
 Barnett, Clyde Haywood, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Maynard, Ray Smith, [REDACTED]
 Howell, John Richard, [REDACTED]
 Wiener, Murray Arnold, [REDACTED]
 Edenbo, John William, [REDACTED]
 Mitchell, Harry Leonard, [REDACTED]
 Machosek, John Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Gillesby, Fred Gerald, [REDACTED]
 Leetch, Donald Gordon, [REDACTED]
 Buck, Arthur Wilbur, [REDACTED]
 Jenkins, Robert Maxwell, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jablecki, Leon Stanyislav, [REDACTED]
 Brown, Meade Marsh, [REDACTED]
 Kursar, August, [REDACTED]
 Bouknecht, Robert William, [REDACTED]
 Dobbs, Ross Ebbie, [REDACTED]
 Bellman, Arthur Burton, [REDACTED]
 Northup, Robert Lowell, [REDACTED]
 Sunderland, Duane Oral, [REDACTED]
 Harris, Jesse Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Farley, James Vincent, [REDACTED]
 Paskvan, Paul Ronald, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Martin, Clyde James, [REDACTED]
 Schillereff, Raymond Edward, [REDACTED]
 Heikkinen, Risto Mikael, [REDACTED]
 Parker, Stanley Elston, [REDACTED]
 Bussey, Carver Thaxton, [REDACTED]
 Zins, William Elmer, [REDACTED]
 Hassemer, David Warren, [REDACTED]
 X Fogg, Lewis Warner, 3d, [REDACTED]
 Crosby, James Erwin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Gaines, Robert Usher, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cunniff, Paul Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Avriett, Giles Croxton, [REDACTED]
 Cumiskey, William Temple, [REDACTED]
 Young, Franklin Frederick, [REDACTED]
 Hahn, Albert Peter, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Miller, Verlin Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Hanzel, Thomas Charles, [REDACTED]
 Button, Ervine Jerold, [REDACTED]
 Farrell, Frederick Bernard, [REDACTED]
 McDaniel, Armour Green, [REDACTED]
 Webb, Rudelle Baxton, [REDACTED]
 Oppenheimer, Frances, [REDACTED]
 Krebs, Laurence Francis, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Gerald Thornton, [REDACTED]
 Mather, William Allen, [REDACTED]
 May, Lomax Louis, [REDACTED]
 X Armstrong, George Herbert, [REDACTED]
 Coverley, Edwin Dudley, [REDACTED]
 Scheible, Wilbur Roy, [REDACTED]
 Humphres, Earl Cranston, [REDACTED]
 Smith, John Edward, [REDACTED]
 Childress, Peter Mills, [REDACTED]
 Ryan, Paul Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Anderson, Rex Victor, [REDACTED]
 Flint, Raymond Leon, [REDACTED]
 Little, Edward Leo, [REDACTED]
 Trearse, Albert, [REDACTED]
 Champlain, Daniel Dolph, [REDACTED]
 Maurel, Anthony John, [REDACTED]
 Dean, Richard, [REDACTED]
 Rivers, William James, [REDACTED]
 Walker, Donald John, [REDACTED]
 Phillips, Lewis Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Hutchison, LeRoy Clifford, [REDACTED]
 Davis, Thomas Martin, [REDACTED]
 Plumer, William Bowdoin, [REDACTED]
 Goodfleisch, Don Marion, [REDACTED]
 Wilson, Walter James, [REDACTED]
 Renfro, William Glen, [REDACTED]
 Gentry, Ralph Patrick, [REDACTED]
 Hunsaker, Ben Wightman, [REDACTED]
 Dodd, Aulevian Minaryard, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Atterholt, Charles Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Perry, Robert Raymond, [REDACTED]
 Hallmark, John Milton, [REDACTED]
 McKenzie, Harry Crane, [REDACTED]
 McGovern, Marshall, [REDACTED]
 Robinson, Leo Hudson, [REDACTED]
 Davis, Ira Robert, [REDACTED]
 Schott, Murry M., [REDACTED]
 X Saylor, Henry Stephen, [REDACTED]
 Burdick, James Roland, [REDACTED]
 Bruno, Sam, [REDACTED]
 Ross, James Spillman, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Daniel, Heston Charles, [REDACTED]
 Tankersley, Carl Ray, [REDACTED]
 Morehead, James Bruce, [REDACTED]
 Shelton, Lee Mereden, [REDACTED]
 McHale, Robert Vincent, [REDACTED]
 Hensler, John Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Work, Robert Ernest, [REDACTED]
 Farry, Albert Barrett, [REDACTED]
 Tornes, Howard, [REDACTED]
 Heck, Joseph Denis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cushing, Arthur Leavitt, [REDACTED]
 Williams, John Grenville, [REDACTED]
 Reed, Jack Lester, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Forrester McLain, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wall, Edward Martin, [REDACTED]
 Alexander, Lawrence Edward, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Oakley, Harry Robert, [REDACTED]
 Beth, Elman John, [REDACTED]
 Meranda, Mark Donald, [REDACTED]
 X Biddle, Maurice Francis, [REDACTED]
 Bowers, Donald Moar, [REDACTED]
 Gueydan, James Edmond, [REDACTED]
 Dailey, Herbert Richard, [REDACTED]
 Wolf, Charles Sebastian, [REDACTED]
 Runyan, Samuel Harold, [REDACTED]
 Barnett, Wendell Hines, [REDACTED]
 Farr, Hugh Manson, [REDACTED]
 Hill, Robert John, [REDACTED]
 Derussy, Rene Amedee, [REDACTED]
 Hamilton, George Burton, [REDACTED]
 Papik, Corwin Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Padgett, Cadman Vinton, [REDACTED]
 McWhirter, Daren Auburn, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Harrell, Hunter Hugh, [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Glen Wilson, [REDACTED]
 Hasson, Albert Nolan, [REDACTED]
 Cowdery, Burnham Webster, [REDACTED]
 Early, Charles Law, [REDACTED]
 Jensen, Dale Henry, [REDACTED]
 Stevens, William Fay, [REDACTED]
 Sutter, Marshall Royce, [REDACTED]
 Hatten, Frank, [REDACTED]
 Smith, John Michael, [REDACTED]
 Black, Shirley Norman, [REDACTED]
 Crowell, Dick Merrill, [REDACTED]
 Waste, Robert Jackson, [REDACTED]
 Shelton, William Mays, [REDACTED]
 Howard, Homer Bruce, [REDACTED]
 Myers, Lansing Heald, [REDACTED]
 Poland, Marvin Elmer, [REDACTED]
 Steen, Garland Creighton, [REDACTED]
 Kelly, Dennis Peter, Jr., [REDACTED]

MEDICAL

- Finley, Robert Halbert, [REDACTED]
 Strub, Giles Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Seaman, Oliver Russel, [REDACTED]
 Comstock, Jack Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Tarrow, Arthur Bernard, [REDACTED]
 Watkins, Philip Baker, [REDACTED]
 Lau, Robert Edmund, [REDACTED]
 Ramsey, Douglas Elliott, [REDACTED]
 Tuttle, Charles Lemuel, [REDACTED]
 Prior, Bradley Warren, [REDACTED]
 Patterson, Robert Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Rothe, Courand Nicholas, [REDACTED]
 Meeter, Urquhart Louis, [REDACTED]
 Alvary, George, [REDACTED]
 De Fries, William Albert, [REDACTED]
 Tirman, Robert Martin, [REDACTED]
 Brubaker, Donald Larue, [REDACTED]
 Gulyash, Joseph Julius Francis, [REDACTED]
 Lett, James Edward, [REDACTED]
 Goss, Frank Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Alden, Charles William, [REDACTED]
 Lewis, William Benjamin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Underwood, Edgar Harrison, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Sheeley, William Flavel, [REDACTED]
 Wiedeman, Geoffrey Paul, [REDACTED]
 Sutherland, Lawrence Ralph, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Lewis Austin, [REDACTED]
 Marett, William Clinton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Weixel, Francis Xavier, [REDACTED]
 Hekhuis, Gerrit Leverne, [REDACTED]
 Galvin, James Augustin Vincent, [REDACTED]
 Wiemer, Robert August, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Bruce Willard, [REDACTED]
 Borah, William N., [REDACTED]
 Thomas, Herrick Melvin, [REDACTED]
 Hollister, Lucius Clark, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Steel, Maxwell Wensel, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Windham, Andrew Allen, [REDACTED]
 Kurland, Anthony Morrison, [REDACTED]
 Speakman, Walter Fred, [REDACTED]
 Connor, Joseph Augustine, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Baczewski, Zbigniew John, [REDACTED]
 Dorris, Henry Clay, [REDACTED]
 Streck, Fletcher William, [REDACTED]
 Twigger, Norman Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Lueth, Charles Salak, [REDACTED]
 Kavanagh, John Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Martin, Richard Lessell, [REDACTED]
 Smelsey, Samuel Oscar, [REDACTED]
 Dean, Guy Walker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Brannon, Earl William, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hernquist, William Carter, [REDACTED]
 Campbell, Daniel Currie, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Rowen, Burt, [REDACTED]
 Purvis, William Edmond, [REDACTED]
 Briggs, Randall William, [REDACTED]
 Cannon, Joe Hamilton, [REDACTED]
 Wilkins, John Hubble, [REDACTED]
 Kraus, Ralph Nicholas, [REDACTED]
 Henderson, John Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Scott, Edwin LeRoy, [REDACTED]
 Winter, William Chisholm, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Grantham, Edwin Stillman, [REDACTED]
 Schlecter, John Francis, [REDACTED]

DENTAL

- Clifford, William Benjamin, [REDACTED]
 Mohnac, Alex Michael, [REDACTED]
 Crofut, Vincent Everett, [REDACTED]
 Lightner, Lee Minis, [REDACTED]
 Wolfe, Rowland Daniel, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Metzgar, Richard Arthur, [REDACTED]
 Benhart, Sherwood Ferdinand, [REDACTED]
 Rooney, John Edward, [REDACTED]
 Pugnier, Vincent Allen, [REDACTED]
 Smith, Lloyd Sidney, [REDACTED]

Ralston, Joseph Wesley, [REDACTED]
 Kane, John Phillip, [REDACTED]
 Brookreson, Kendrick, [REDACTED]
 Brandt, Alfred Edgar, [REDACTED]
 Long, James Everett, [REDACTED]
 Butler, James Mathew, [REDACTED]
 Bock, James Louis Edward, [REDACTED]
 Harris, Norman Oliver, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, LeRoy, [REDACTED]

VETERINARY

Hummer, Robert Leo, [REDACTED]
 Wilder, Claude Otto, [REDACTED]
 Walters, Ralph Durward, [REDACTED]
 Christopher, Burton Chapman, [REDACTED]
 Nettles, John Robbins, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Day, Robert Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Madison, Russell Martin, [REDACTED]
 McIntyre, James Clayton, [REDACTED]
 Berger, Joseph Herman, [REDACTED]
 Sasmore, Daniel Paul, [REDACTED]
 Bills, William Edward, [REDACTED]
 Beadner, Harold F., [REDACTED]

MEDICAL SERVICE

Cheek, Russell Charles, [REDACTED]
 Lee, William Henry, [REDACTED]
 Lunnie, Francis Melrose, [REDACTED]
 Kretschmer, Ernest Theodore, [REDACTED]
 Farrell, Thomas Augustus, [REDACTED]
 Shaw, James Irvin, [REDACTED]
 Nielsen, George Leslie, [REDACTED]
 Payne, Robert Bryan, [REDACTED]
 Crowell, Gene Walter, [REDACTED]
 Thomas, Frederick William, [REDACTED]
 McInerney, James Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Haines, Charles C., [REDACTED]
 Streater, Russell Edward, [REDACTED]
 Waters, John Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Parker, James Franklin, [REDACTED]
 Criswell, Thomas Floris, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Herbert, Woodrow Charles, [REDACTED]
 Umphress, Donald La Voice, [REDACTED]
 Brunnemann, Auben William, [REDACTED]
 Sutton, Allan Duff, [REDACTED]
 Wood, Ross Anderson, [REDACTED]
 Fulton, John Donaldson, [REDACTED]
 Wagner, Owen Brooks, [REDACTED]
 Rogers, John Mathias, [REDACTED]
 Liles, Ben Carr, [REDACTED]
 King, Paul William, [REDACTED]
 Moore, David Leon, [REDACTED]
 Thompson, Ralph Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Eledge, William Walter, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Shanahan, Eugene Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Westra, Donald Freeman, [REDACTED]
 Turnipseed, Lawrence Lee, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Meyer, Alvin Felix, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Johnson, William Milton, [REDACTED]
 Jarboe, Wallace Evans, [REDACTED]
 Sangster, Maynard Allen, [REDACTED]
 Cubbler, Charles Andrew, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. All officers have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

AIR FORCE NURSES

To be majors with rank from December 14, 1950

Peschon, Ida Elaine, [REDACTED]
 Madden, Winifred P., [REDACTED]
 McCloskey, Zita Louise, [REDACTED]
 Zeller, Verena Marie, [REDACTED]
 Zeller, Dorothy Nellie, [REDACTED]

To be major with rank from January 16, 1951
 McDonald, Inez Velma, [REDACTED]

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, March 27 (legislative day of March 26), 1951:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be Deputy Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 1951

(Legislative day of Monday, March 26, 1951)

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

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

O God, infinite in mercy, love, and power, we come knowing that apart from Thee all is vanity, that all other cisterns are empty and broken and in Thee alone is the fountain of life. From the fret and fever of the vexed world's problems, from all thought of the praise or blame of men, from discordant noises and confused conceptions which beat upon our senses, at noontide we would follow the path to the quietness of Thy presence.

Touch every privilege we enjoy with the halo of sharing, we beseech Thee; melt it into unselfishness, translate it into service; let it not be poisoned by pride. Make every personal and national blessing a transparent window in the temple of service, so that Thy spirit can shine through it in glory for human good. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 27, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On March 27, 1951:

S. 58. An act for the relief of Edulji Dinshaw and his sister, Mrs. Bachoo Dinsha Woronzow; and

S. 63. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Ardans.

On March 28, 1951:

S. 243. An act for the relief of Dewey Pickett.

ORDER OF DEBATE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, it is my understanding that the time for debate today, Thursday, and Friday is equally divided; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; and the time is controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

INTRODUCTION TO THE SENATE OF
THE GOVERNOR OF IDAHO

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair cannot recognize any Senator unless time is yielded to him by either the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Idaho whatever time he desires to take.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I take this occasion to present to you and to my colleagues in the Senate my friend the distinguished Governor of the State of Idaho, Len B. Jordan. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is certain that he expresses the feeling of the Senate by saying that he welcomes the Governor of Idaho to the Chamber. He may remain as long as he wishes.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING CERTAIN PRISONER-OF-WAR CLAIMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 40) to extend the time within which prisoners of war may file claims under the War Claims Act of 1948, which were to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That section 2 (c) of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as of March 1, 1951, by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "The limit of time within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than March 31, 1952. The Commission shall take immediate action to advise all persons entitled to file claims under the provisions of this act administered by the Commission of their rights under such provisions, and to assist them in the preparation and filing of their claims."

And to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to extend the time for the filing of certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948."

Mr. O'CONNOR. I should like to make a brief explanatory statement. The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has been in charge of the joint resolution, is eager to have the amendments of the House considered and acted on by the Senate because of the time element involved with respect to the filing of claims under the War Claims Act of 1948. It is desirable that action be taken so that veterans of World War II may submit claims under the act within the time specified in the main House amendment which is only technical in character involving the termination date. I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield very gladly.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that the House has passed its version of the proposed legislation in the form of an amendment to the Senate joint resolution, and the Senate is now asked to concur in the House amendment rather than to adhere to its own language.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is exactly correct. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that the joint resolution was passed unanimously by the Senate after it had been unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The amendment is technical in nature. It merely changes a date.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the distinguished Senator from Maryland conferred with the minority members of the Committee on the Judiciary; and, if so, is the change agreeable to them?