H.R. 3542

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1961

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the enormous increase in the cost of higher education during the past 15 years has created a condition which, in many instances, makes college attendance by qualified students economically impossible. These costs have increased to an extent that many tuition-free city and State higher educational institutions are contemplating the imposition of tuition charges for the first time.

In this era when educational attainment is, both from the point of view of the individual and that of our national security, of such overriding importance, we must take steps which will help to insure higher educational opportunity to all qualified individuals.

As we all know, especially those of us who have financed higher education for our children, the present tax laws do not make provision for a deduction of tuition and maintenance charges incurred by a taxpayer on behalf of a dependent. The law merely provides for a continuance of the normal $600 exemption while a dependent is a student supported by the taxpayer. Obviously, tuition and maintenance far exceed that small amount.

In an attempt to somewhat reduce the financial burden placed upon parents whose dependents are desirous of attaining a college education, I have today introduced H.R. 3542 which provides for a full deduction, for income tax purposes, of higher educational expenses incurred by a taxpayer in behalf of a dependent.

In the case of all tax deduction proposals we must look not only to the benefit afforded the taxpayer but also to the loss in revenue to the Treasury. Judged by these standards, I believe my bill strikes a balance between the two considerations. The exclusion of tuition paid to private elementary and secondary schools from the benefits of the legislation prevents a serious revenue loss permitting relief to be given in the area of the greatest need.

My bill would authorize the deduction of tuition and other fees, transportation costs and expenses of books, supplies, and equipment. The bill further provides for a deduction of food and lodging expenses. It is noteworthy that the food and lodging provision would permit a deduction even if the student resides at home with his family. This provision, I feel, will afford some measure of relief to taxpayers whose children attend college within their local community. Without this provision the legislation would favor those taxpayers whose dependents attend schools away from home.

The seriousness of this problem was pointed up last week when Assemblyman Stanley Steingut, representing the 18th Assembly District of Brooklyn, introduced a concurrent resolution in the New York State Legislature memorializing Congress to enact legislation such as H.R. 3542.

To help make a college education economically feasible to every qualified student, it is my hope that H.R. 3542 will be favorably considered and enacted into law.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1961

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

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

Almighty and everlasting God, as we bow in this quiet moment, dedicated to the unseen and eternal, confirm, we beseech Thee, our abiding faith in the deep and holy foundations which the fathers laid, lest in foolish futility we attempt to build on sand, instead of rock.

Make us alive and alert, we beseech Thee, to the spiritual values which underlie all the bitter struggle of these epic days.

In all our frantic seeking for satisfactions and solutions, if we find all except Thee, we have nothing but vanity, and our spirits remain still famished and athirst. To these, Thy servants, who in the ministry of public service have been called by their counsel to help lead the peoples of the earth in these perplexing days, give a right judgment in all things.

Grant them the sustaining grace both to will and to do the things which are good and acceptable in Thy sight.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, January 13, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 50)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Transmitted herewith is the annual report on the operations of the mutual security program for the period ending June 30, 1960. The report was prepared under the direction of the Coordinator of the mutual security program by the Department of State—including the International Cooperation Administrator—the Department of Defense, and the Development Loan Fund.

At the turn of this decade we have seen change and political uncertainty in the developing areas which have caused us to strengthen our programs for economic and social development. We have had as our goal the promotion of peaceful change for millions of people in Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East who are seeking domestic tranquility and a better way of life. We have responded to the hope of these millions for a decent future for themselves and their children through well-conceived programs of economic and technical assistance. Our friends and allies have shared this responsibility with us.

Our common safety has been of equal concern and it has been our purpose to unite the free people of the world in a sustained common defense against overt attack or suppression of liberty. We have maintained the strength of our alliances by reinforcing collective defense arrangements. In doing this we have again demonstrated that firmness in the face of threatened aggression is a dependable safeguard to peace.

The events of the past year once again emphasized the need for a strong and vigorous mutual security program. Urgent issues will continue to confront us as members of the international community and we must respond wisely through constructive action.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the 10th Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

AGREEMENT FOR MOST EFFECTIVE PATTERN OF NATO MILITARY DEFENSE STRENGTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which with the accompanying data, was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

To the Congress of the United States:

In December 1957 the heads of government of the nations members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization reached agreement in principle on the desirability of achieving the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive strength, taking into account the most recent developments in weapons and techniques. In enunciating this agreement in principle the heads of government made it clear that this decision was the result of the fact that the Soviet leaders, while preventing a general disarmament agreement, had left no doubt that the most modern and destructive weapons of all kinds were being introduced into the Soviet armed forces. The introduction of modern weapons into NATO forces should be no cause for concern on the part of other countries, since NATO is purely a defensive alliance.

It is our conviction and the conviction of our NATO allies that the introduction into NATO defenses of the most modern weapons available is essential in maintaining the strength necessary to the alliance. Any alliance depends in the last analysis upon the sense of shared mutual interests among its members, and by sharing with our allies certain training information we are demonstrating concretely our sense of partnership in NATO's defensive planning. Failure on our part to contribute to the improvement of the state of operational readiness of the forces of other members of NATO will only encourage the Soviet Union to believe that it can eventually succeed in its goal of destroying NATO's effectiveness.

To facilitate the necessary cooperation on our part, legislation amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was enacted by the Congress in 1958. Pursuant to that legislation agreements for cooperation were concluded with four of our NATO partners in May and June 1959. A similar agreement was also recently concluded with our NATO ally, the Republic of Italy. All of these agreements are designed to implement in important respects the agreed NATO program.

This agreement with the Government of Italy will enable the United States to cooperate effectively in mutual defense planning with Italy and in the training of Italian NATO forces in order that, if an attack on NATO should occur, Italian forces could, under the direction of the Supreme Allied Commander for Europe, effectively use nuclear weapons in their defense.

These agreements previously concluded and this Italian agreement represent only a portion of the work necessary for complete implementation of the decision taken by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in December 1957. I anticipate the conclusion of similar agreements for cooperation with certain other NATO nations as the alliance's defensive planning continues.

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, I am submitting to each House of the Congress an authoritative copy of the agreement with the Government of Italy. I am also transmitting a copy of the Secretary of State's letter accompanying an authoritative copy of the signed agreement, a copy of a joint letter from the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of this document, and a copy of my memorandum in reply thereto setting forth my approval.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the budget message which was read in the House on yesterday be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

(For President's message, see RECORD of January 16, 1961, pp. 734–760.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 107) exempting from Federal excise tax admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 107) exempting from Federal excise tax admissions to official inaugural functions and sales of official inaugural medallions authorized by the Inaugural Committee, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the present session of Congress.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby authorized, to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed.

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

REPORTING OF EXPENSES INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds, by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law provides that within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year the chairman of each committee shall prepare a consolidated report and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate. The Appropriations Committee, under the terms of the law, is required to insert the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In accordance with the terms of these various laws, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the report submitted to the committee dated January 11, 1961, by the Joint Economic Committee.

Within the next 2 months many committees will be forwarding to the Senate Committee on Appropriations similar reports relating to their expenses. I will include these reports in the RECORD from time to time upon receipt by the committee, without the detailed legal references I have given today.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
January 11, 1961.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Enclosed is the report on foreign currencies expended by the members and staff of the Joint Economic Committee between January 1 and December 31, 1960.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 11, 1961.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1960

Name	Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
			Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	Dollars U.S. equivalent or U.S. currency
J. K. Javits	France	Franc	167,772	341.11	53,415	108,49	16,800	34.17	26,310	53.41	264,297	537.18
Do	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	50-0-6	140.07	25-6-3	70.88	15-5-0	42.70	20-7-2	57.00	110-18-11	310.65
Total				481.18		179.37		76.87		110.41		847.83
J. W. Knowles	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	22-6-6	62.51	8-8-4	23.57	1-13-0	4.62	11-2-2	31.10	43-10-0	121.80
Do	Belgium	Franc	726	14.52	609	12.18	145	2.90	860	17.20	2,340	46.80
Do	Denmark	Kroner	158.70	22.97	119.70	17.32	4.50	0.65	67.10	9.71	350	50.65
Do	Sweden	do	77.40	15.01	54.18	10.51	6.15	1.19	47.00	9.18	184.73	35.89
Do	Netherlands	Guilder					4,187	1,101.85			4,187	1,101.85
Total				115.01		63.58		1,111.21		67.19		1,356.99
J. W. Lehman	United Kingdom	Pound sterling	21-14-2	60.78	13-18-6	38.99	4-9-4	12.51	6-18-0	19.32	47-0-0	131.60
Do	Belgium	Franc	1,196	23.92	418	8.36	200	4.00	456	9.12	2,270	45.40
Do	Denmark	Kroner	179	26.00	56	8.05			85	12.25	320	46.30
Do	Sweden	do	90	17.37	112	21.63	5	0.97	88	17.01	295	56.98
Do	Netherlands	Guilder					4,187	1,101.85			4,187	1,101.85
Total				128.07		77.03		1,119.33		57.70		1,382.13
Sar Levitan	Germany	Mark	135.00	32.14	328.50	78.21	4,737.28	1,127.93	31.00	7.38	5,231.78	1,245.66
Do	Italy	Lira	27,810	44.78	41,890	67.46	7,200	11.59	7,600	12.24	84,500	136.07
Total				76.92		145.67		1,139.52		19.62		1,381.73
Belle Notkin	France	Franc	32,775	66.89	31,850	65.00	14,700	30.00	21,560	44.00	100,885	205.89
Grand total				868.07		530.65		3,476.93		298.92		5,174.57

Recapitulation: Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent), total $5,174.57

(Signed) PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. on Friday, and that on Friday, after the transaction of any routine business and a quorum call, the Senate proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the inaugural ceremonies; that at the conclusion of the ceremonies the Senate return to its Chamber, and that it then be in order to receive nominations from the President. While the Senate will stay in session to hear any debate of such nominations, no vote will be taken thereon on Friday. I also ask that when the Senate concludes its session on Friday, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Saturday, and that it then be in order to consider any nominations reported by committees.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SALARIES, EXPENSES, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 307, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 307 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT, STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, executive office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret copy of No. 1 of the Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report, for the period ended June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE OFFICERS ASSIGNED AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislation Liaison, Department of the Air Force, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of the end of the second quarter of fiscal year 1961, December 31, there were assigned to the seat of government by the Air Force, 2,320 officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE ACT

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia Government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved August 11, 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FINAL REPORT OF THE HIGHWAY COST ALLOCATION STUDY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the highway cost allocation study (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FOR CITY OF NEW YORK

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of $1,500,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REVISION OF RESTRICTION ON THE CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS LAND FOR HISTORIC-MONUMENT PURPOSES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON OFFICE OF DEFENSE LENDING

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJUSTMENT OR CANCELLATION OF INDIAN DEBTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564, 25 U.S.C. 386a), relating to the adjustment or cancellation of Indian debts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CANCELLATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF IRRIGATION CHARGES OF CERTAIN NON-INDIAN LANDOWNERS OF WIND RIVER INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a secretarial order canceling and adjusting irrigation charges of certain non-Indian landowners of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, and transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to approve the order (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO MINING LEASES ON TRIBAL INDIAN LANDS AND FEDERAL LANDS WITHIN INDIAN RESERVATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law relating to mining leases on tribal Indian lands and Federal lands within Indian reservations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SALE OF INDIAN TIMBER

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 857, 25 U.S.C. 406, 407), with respect to the sale of Indian timber (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE PALA INDIAN RESERVATION, THE PAUMA INDIAN RESERVATION, AND CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to add certain public lands in California to the Pala Indian Reservation, the Pauma Indian Reservation, and the Cleveland National Forest, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PER DIEM PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF INDIAN ARTS AND CRAFTS BOARD

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the payment of per diem to members of the Indian Arts and Crafts Board at the same rate that is authorized for other persons serving the Federal Government without compensation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REVOCATION OF SCHOOL AND AGENCY FARM RESERVE ON THE LAC DU FLAMBEAU RESERVATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit the Secretary of the Interior to revoke in whole or in part the school and agency farm reserve on the Lac du Flambeau Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO EFFIGY MOUNDS NATIONAL MONUMENT, IOWA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PAYMENT OF OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY FOR CRUISES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXCEPTIONS TO RULES OF NAVIGATION IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS TO LAND THEIR CATCHES OF FISH IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit certain foreign-flag vessels to land their catches of fish in the Virgin Islands in certain circumstances, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF AUTOMOBILE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE ACT TO GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY UNDER FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency of its activities under the Federal Airport Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

IMMIGRATION VISAS TO CERTAIN ALIEN ORPHANS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing the issuance of nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, to transfer responsibility for determining the suitability of the home of the adopting parents for such orphans to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, dated 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF POWER TO GUAM TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN INTERSTATE COMPACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF MARCH 2, 1889, RELATING TO REQUIREMENT THAT GRANTORS FURNISH ABSTRACTS, OFFICIAL CERTIFICATIONS, AND EVIDENCES OF TITLE

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal that part of the act of March 2, 1889, as amended, which requires that grantors furnish, free of all expenses to the Government, all requisite abstracts, official certifications, and evidences of title (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Mrs. Robert Pinckney Tucker, of Charleston, S.C., relating to membership on the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the United Brick and Clay Workers of America, AFL–CIO, District Council No. 9, relative to a resolution adopted by that council, concerning the serious problem of cutthroat competition from foreign imports; to the Committee on Finance.

STANDARDIZING DRUGS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Tompkins County, N.Y., Medical Society, relating to the standardization of drugs.

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

STANDARDIZING DRUGS—A RESOLUTION BY THE TOMPKINS COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

1. Whereas a Special National Academy of Sciences Committee advisory to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming, composed of Dr. C. Phillip Miller, Chairman, professor of medicine, University of Chicago; Dr. John H. Dingle, professor of preventive medicine, Western Reserve University; Dr. Maxwell Finland, associate professor of medicine, Harvard Medical School; Dr. Colin M. MacLeod, professor of medicine, New York University; Dr. Karl F. Meyer, Director Emeritus George Williams, Hooper Foundation, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco; Dr. John R. Paul, professor of preventive medicine, Yale University; Dr. Carl F. Schmidt, professor of pharmacology, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Wesley W. Spink, professor of medicine, University of Minnesota, has reviewed the policies and procedures of the Food and Drug Administration concerning the acceptance and certification of new drugs; and

2. Whereas this committee has recommended (a) that the Food and Drug Administration should be given statutory authority to require proof of the efficacy, as well as the safety, of all new drugs; (b) that the Food and Drug Administration be authorized to carry on continuous inspection of drug factories to guarantee compliance with quality standards before marketing, and (c) that several other procedures be instituted with the purpose of safeguarding the public health with regard to drug therapy; and

3. Whereas the Tompkins County Medical Society believes that these recommendations are sound and urgent: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Tompkins County Medical Society endorse these recommendations and urge the New York State Medical Society to recommend that the Congress of the United States adopt legislation to enact them into law; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING and Congressman JOHN TABER.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ a temporary additional clerical assistant (S. Rept. No. 5); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF STUDIES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) to print as a Senate Document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of the studies on United States foreign policy prepared under the direction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 336, agreed to July 31, 1958, as amended by Senate Resolution 31, agreed to February 2, 1959, and Senate Resolution 250, agreed to February 9, 1960.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such Senate document. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STUDY ON VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 43); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) common defense generally;

(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

(4) soldiers' and sailors' homes;

(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

(6) selective service;

(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

(9) ammunition depots;

(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $190,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. KERR), from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 45); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from February 1, 1961, through January 31, 1962, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consulant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,400 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $135,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ENTITLED "GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT, 1960" — REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT NO. 4)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Procurement, I submit a report entitled "Government Procurement, 1960," on lack of competition in military procurement and its impact on small business, which I ask may be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

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. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware):

S. 432. A bill to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any act or joint resolution of the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 433. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

S. 434. A bill to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois Waterway, Illinois and Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Knud Erik Didriksen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 436. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims of customs officers and employees to extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed after August 31, 1931, and not heretofore paid in accordance with existing law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 437. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and

S. 438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Giovanna Hopkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 439. A bill for the relief of Verda Mae Jennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 440. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of August 3, 1956, with respect to the pay-

ment of annuities to the widows of judges of U.S. courts who died prior to the enactment of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Rodopi Statherou (Statheron); and

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 443. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 444. A bill for the relief of Ok Hi Shin and Tae Soo Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 445. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to authorize the United States to intervene in certain school desegregation cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 446. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to give the Civil Aeronautics Board certain review authority over the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; and

S. 447. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the authority of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency over airmen's certificates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 448. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional judge for the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 449. A bill to extend the time in which the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission shall submit its final report; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. MILLER):

S. 450. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 451. A bill to authorize the distribution of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to former Members of Congress requesting such copies; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 452. A bill for the relief of Nellie V. Lohry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 453. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Scanlan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. McGEE):

S. 454. A bill to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, until March 31, 1965; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 455. A bill to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 456. A bill for the relief of Concetta Casola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 457. A bill to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 458. A bill for the relief of Chin Hee; and

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Melisarris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game and food fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, so as to allow a taxpayer to deduct certain expenses incurred by him in obtaining a higher education; and

S. 462. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 463. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 464. A bill granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of library facilities and services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 465. A bill for the relief of Pietro Realmuto; and

S. 466. A bill for the relief of Miss Hanako Konishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 467. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income; and

S. 468. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 469. A bill to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 470. A bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes;

S. 471. A bill to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government; and

S. 472. A bill to repeal the provision of law establishing 6-year terms of civil service commissioners; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 473. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal Employee Unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 474. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 475. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $2,936,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 476. A bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 477. A bill to provide for a First Secretary of the Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 478. A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 479. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine:)

S. 480. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 481. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 482. A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 483. A bill to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 484. A bill to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts attempting to desegregate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Charles Edward Pifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. MORSE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 486. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 487. A bill to provide a new farm program for certain specified agricultural commodities under which American agriculture will be restored to a free enterprise basis; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 488. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended, in order to prohibit export subsidy payments on certain products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 489. A bill for the relief of Dellarose J. Dowler;

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Cutter Laboratories; and

S. 491. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel P. Skamangas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. GORE):

S. 492. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern district of Tennessee, the middle district of Tennessee, and the western district of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 493. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern administration and office building at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 494. A bill to provide the appointment of additional district judges for the northern, southern, and western districts of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 495. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 496. A bill for the relief of Yun Fun Cheng Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 497. A bill to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr GRUENING):

S. 498. A bill to establish a water resources commission for Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 499. A bill to modify conditions for reduced rate of contributions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 500. A bill to authorize reimbursement to the States for certain free or toll roads on Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 501. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 502. A bill to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Federal Government by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 503. A bill to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S.J. Res. 33. A joint resolution designating the week of May 22–27, 1961, as Police Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

SPLIT SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) relating to split sessions of the Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mrs. SMITH of Maine, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF STUDIES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) to print as a Senate document a compilation of studies of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF COUNTERFEIT DRUG TRAFFIC

Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 42) relating to an investigation of the counterfeit drug traffic, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

STUDY ON VARIOUS AREAS OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 43) to provide for a study by the Committee on Armed Services on various areas of national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

CERTAIN EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 44), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1961, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,400 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $80,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE ACTIVITIES BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. KERR), from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 45) to investigate matters relating to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE TO U.S. DELEGATION TO GATT, REGARDING TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 46) relating to the U.S. delegation to GATT to negotiate and bring about favorable conditions for the health of world trade generally, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

ELIMINATION OF REDUCTION BY EXECUTIVE ORDER OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any act or joint resolution of the Congress.

The bill is short, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill (S. 432) to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any act or joint resolution of the Congress, introduced by Mr. CURTIS was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce by Executive order, in whole or in part, any appropriation or appropriations made by any Act or joint resolution, whenever, after investigation, he shall find and declare that such action will aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt, and that the public interest will be served thereby: *Provided*, That whenever the President issues an Executive order under the provisions of this Act, such Executive order shall be submitted to the Congress while in session and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such order is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor such order: *Provided further*, That the continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, but, in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain. As used in this section, the term "appropriation" includes an authorization to create obligations by contract in advance of an appropriation.

SEC. 2. Any appropriations or parts thereof eliminated under the authority of this Act shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and the same action shall be taken with respect to any amounts by which any appropriations or parts thereof may be reduced under the authority of this Act.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, 30 years is a relatively short time—yet when we look today at an array of talented youth in high places we know much can be accomplished in 30 years.

In the time of this Republic, 30 years represent one-sixth of our national span of life. Too—this is a short time, but our collective accomplishments in the fiscal affairs of this Nation present a much gloomier picture than does the array of individual success about us. To be frank, our record in fiscal matters is a bleak one.

True, we have encountered many grave situations in our generation. Recessions, depressions, wars and threats of wars have greatly expanded spending at the Federal level. This we all know, yet, in the prior 150 years this Nation has met, and risen above, other grave emergencies. There have been recessions, depressions, wars and threats of wars of another day. As I stated, they were met, the country moved ahead, and its bills were paid.

Concern over our national solvency is by no means only the concern of those Senators who have joined with me today in the introduction of a bill designed to improve fiscal procedures and effect Federal economies. It is by no means only a concern of those who deliberate in our National Legislature. It is the concern of all our citizens. Unless we face up to reality and make our best efforts now—it will be the concern of many future generations of this proud Nation.

There are times when I worry whether we have reached a degree of sophistication that denies reality. Has reason been shelved by many who believe we can spend more than we gather for most of these 30 years past and yet avoid a day of reckoning? If any of those are among us, I invite them to take another look at the debt, at its annual cost of service, and at the lack of any fixed policy toward its retirement.

I submit there is no single cure-all to the fiscal problem. The bill which we have introduced today, if enacted, will be an important step forward. It will provide a brake on profligate spending. It will be an important vehicle in pursuing our total objective of fiscal responsibility.

The retiring Budget Director, the very able Mr. Maurice O. Stans, had the following to say about an identical bill introduced in the last Congress:

At the present time, general appropriation bills are usually enacted late in any session of the Congress. They provide funds for essential Government functions, and appropriations for a number of different departments and agencies are customarily included in each such bill. From time to time, such bills contain appropriations to which the President may object, or which he may regard as excessive. However, there is a traditional reluctance on the part of any President to veto such measures, notwithstanding his objections, because of the possible disruption of essential Government activities. A President is, therefore, as a matter of fact, compelled to approve officially that which he does not approve, in order to avoid striking down an entire bill with highly undesirable consequences. There is no present procedure—other than a veto of an entire bill—by which the President may formally and effectively bring to the attention of the Congress any objections which he may have to the action taken by the Congress on individual appropriation items and secure reconsideration of those items in the light of his views.

It would be hoped that this bill would provide an effective procedure to overcome these difficulties. After making a finding that the elimination or reduction of certain appropriations would aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt, and that the public interest would be served thereby, the Executive order providing for eliminating or reducing those appropriations would be submitted for consideration of the Congress before becoming effective. Thereafter, either House of Congress could, by a simple majority vote, prevent the President's proposed reductions from becoming effective. The proposed procedure would thus retain a high degree of congressional control over appropriation matters, while at the same time providing the President with an effective means of securing specific congressional consideration of his views on particular items.

The bill which I am introducing today has nothing to do with the veto or approval of a measure. It would vest in the President the power to reduce or to eliminate appropriations at any later time by Executive order. This proposal provides that the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce in whole or in part any appropriation made by Congress when, after investigation, he finds and declares that such action will aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt and that the public interest will be served thereby.

This proposal further provides that, when the President issues such an Executive order, he must do so while the Congress is in session and the order eliminating or reducing an appropriation shall not take effect for 60 days. It further provides that, if, during that 60-day period, either the House of Representatives or the Senate passes a resolution disapproving the Executive order, it shall not become effective.

In other words, the Congress does not lose its power over appropriations. The President can make his finding, and reduce or eliminate an appropriation, but either House, by a simple majority vote, can override his decision. In my opinion, this will have a sobering and salutary effect. If either House of Congress does override the President, it must do so in the face of the President's finding that they are upsetting the budget, adding to the public debt, and threatening the public interest.

As used in my bill, the term "appropriation" is a broad one which includes authority to create obligations by contract in advance of an appropriation.

Mr. President, in preparing this measure I have followed the general scheme of the Reorganization Act. It is a plan whereby we vest in the President the power to do certain things, but retain power in either House of the Congress to override such actions. I believe that the enactment of this measure will materially assist in balancing the budget, reducing the debt, and bringing about a long-hoped-for tax reduction.

Mr. President, by way of explanation, I might say something about section 2 of this proposal. It provides that any appropriation or part thereof eliminated in this manner shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury. I am aware that appropriated funds do not leave the Treasury until they are actually expended and that, therefore, this section may not be necessary. I might say that this section is placed in the bill at the suggestion of the drafting service. Its purpose is to make it clear that, once an appropriation is eliminated or reduced in this manner by Executive action, it cannot be restored by the Executive. The funds could only be restored by being reappropriated by Congress.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction. I submit an analysis of the bill, because it is very simple. The approach is extremely direct, and I believe it represents what I think can best be done in this field. The statement is not long, but I shall not trespass on the patience of the Senate; instead, I ask that the statement and a copy of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 433) to authorize Federal financial assistance for school construction, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

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

TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1961."

PURPOSE OF ACT

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to authorize Federal financial assistance in the construction of urgently needed public elementary and secondary school classrooms.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. Any assistance rendered under provisions of this Act shall not relieve the States and local communities from the primary responsibility for financing the costs of public school facilities, including classrooms, or be a means by which any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise, directly or indirectly, any direction, supervision, or control over the policies, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, administration or operation of any school in any community receiving assistance under this Act except with respect to the conditions set forth in section 6.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. Amounts appropriated under the authorization of this section shall remain available until the first day of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made.

ALLOCATION TO STATES

SEC. 5. Within sixty days after the effective date of this Act, the Commissioner shall notify the Governor of each State of the amount of assistance to which such State is entitled, which shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate of amounts authorized in section 4 that the number of children under age fourteen in that State bears to the total number of children under age fourteen in the United States, as determined by the 1960 census.

REPORTS BY STATES

SEC. 6. Each State desiring assistance under the provisions of this Act shall—

(a) Within one year from the effective date of this Act, submit to the Commissioner for approval a report

(1) showing for each classroom construction project for which the State desires assistance

(A) the number of classrooms to be constructed by the project;

(B) its cost;

(C) the size and character of the community in which it is to be located;

(D) the reason or reasons why the classrooms could not be constructed without assistance under this Act;

(E) a description of any other school facilities constructed by or for the community receiving assistance during the ten years preceding the filing of the report, or under construction, the cost of each and the source and amount of the funds expended or financing in connection therewith;

(2) stating the manner in which the particular projects were selected by the State for assistance;

(3) certifying that

(A) the communities receiving assistance are those having the greatest need for classrooms and the least ability to finance their construction;

(B) procedures will be adopted for such fiscal controls as may be necessary to assure the proper disbursement of funds paid to the State under the provisions of this Act;

(C) assistance under the provisions of this Act will not exceed one-half the actual total cost of each classroom construction project;

(D) the assistance provided under this Act will be used only for the construction of classrooms;

(E) not more than 25 percent of the total funds obligated or expended for the construction of school facilities by each community receiving assistance will be used for the construction of school facilities other than classrooms for a period of 10 years from the date of the report unless any such assistance received by such a community shall be first repaid;

(F) the classrooms constructed with assistance provided by this Act will be available to all students as required by law; and

(4) stating the aggregate amount of assistance requested by the State (which shall not exceed the amount allocated to the State under the provisions of sec. 5) and requesting the portion of such amount expected to be expended prior to the end of the next Federal fiscal year.

(b) Annually after the report submitted as required by subsection 6(a), and at such other times as the Commissioner may direct, until the completion of all projects in that State, submit to the Commissioner for approval a report certifying—

(1) the progress of each classroom construction project;

(2) the funds disbursed in connection with each such project (including any assistance under this Act), stating the source of such funds and the amount of funds from each source;

(3) that not more than 25 percent of all funds obligated or expended by each community receiving assistance under the provisions of this Act for the construction of school facilities has been used for the construction of school facilities other than classrooms;

(4) the portion of the State's allocation expected to be expended prior to the end of the next Federal fiscal year (after deducting any amounts previously requested under the provisions of this act and remaining undisbursed) which shall constitute a request for such amount; and

(5) any other information reasonably requested by the Commissioner.

PAYMENT TO STATES

SEC. 7. The Commissioner shall pay to each State as it complies with the requirements of sections 6 (a) and (b) the portions of the financial assistance requested by such State in such reports, upon his approval of such reports, and such funds shall thereafter be deemed to be State funds to be distributed and expended in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The Commissioner may, upon reasonable grounds, refuse to approve any such report and any funds requested therein shall be deducted from the total

amount authorized in section 4 and from the allocation to such State.

APPROPRIATION FOR ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 9. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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

(c) the term "assistance" means Federal financial assistance under the provisions of this act.

(d) the term "community receiving assistance" means the community served by the school system in which the classroom construction project is to be located.

(e) the term "school system" means a governmental authority which operates and directs public education in a city, county, township, or other local political subdivision of any State.

(f) the term "school facilities" means any buildings, furnishings, equipment, supplies, and land used or held by the school system.

(g) the term "classroom" means a school area used principally for instruction in subjects required for graduation, except that it shall include libraries. It shall not include any indoor athletic facilities or any special purpose rooms unless the subject to be principally taught in any such room is required for graduation.

The statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

SCHOOL AID

I have described the school bill which I introduced as one to provide assistance for education, but not frills. It will require sacrifice. It is simple, direct and austere.

I should like to discuss now some of the principal provisions of the bill.

NEED

First there is the question of need. Section 2 says that the bill is to provide for assistance in constructing urgently needed public school classrooms. Not any school facility but only classrooms and then only where they are urgently needed.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND CONTROL

It is my thesis that the States and local communities have the primary responsibility for education and it is not the intent of this bill to shift that responsibility to the Federal Government. Section 3 provides that this responsibility remains with the community and State.

Education should be a matter of local concern and local communities should have the full control over education in their areas. Therefore, section 3 provides expressly that no department, officer or agent of the Federal Government shall exercise, directly or indirectly, any direction, supervision or control over the administration, operation or course of instruction of any school in any community receiving assistance under the bill.

AMOUNT OF AID

The bill provides for $1 billion of aid, $250 million in each of the next 4 years. It further provides that amounts appropriated shall be available until the first day of the third fiscal year following the year for which the appropriation was made. The money is spaced out over a period of years because school construction programs are not conceived nor are schools built overnight.

AMOUNT OF AID TO EACH STATE

The bill provides a simple formula to determine the amount of aid each State gets. It is the same faction of the whole amount as the number of children under age 14 in that State is to the total number of children under age 14 in the United States and is determined by the 1960 census. There are no fancy quotients, "State school effort indexes," "national school effort indexes," or elaborate matching formula—just the number of children under age 14. I want to emphasize that the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17 should not be the basis of an allocation because many of them will have finished school by the time the schools are built. On the other hand the schools will be used by the children who are under age 5 today, and they should be included in any determination of any aid. The test in the bill is simple, and a State can know the amount to which it is entitled almost immediately after the passage of the bill.

WHAT A STATE MUST DO TO RECEIVE AID

First, within a year from the effective date of the act it must formulate its program and submit a report on its needs to the Commissioner of Education. This report shall show the number of classrooms to be constructed, their cost, the size and character of the community, the reasons why the classrooms could not be constructed without assistance under the act, and a description of any other school facilities which the community has constructed within the past 10 years or has under construction and how they have been financed. This will let all the world know how a State has spent its own money, how it is spending its share of Federal assistance, and whether the projects are worthy. The report must also state how the particular projects were selected by the State for assistance and certify that the communities receiving the aid had the greatest need for classrooms and the least ability to finance their construction; that proper procedures will be adopted for the disbursement of the funds and that for the next 10 years not more than 25 percent of the total funds spent by the community for school facilities will be used for construction of facilities other than classrooms unless any Federal aid shall be first repaid. Thus a State which spends the bulk of its money in frills rather than no classrooms will not get Federal aid under this bill.

MATCHING FUNDS

Each State must promise that the Federal aid will not exceed one-half the total cost of each classroom construction project.

DISCRIMINATION

On the subject of discrimination I want to emphasize that this bill is a school construction bill not a civil rights bill. It is concerned with building classrooms and it leaves to other legislation to decide who shall use the classrooms. It does provide most emphatically, however, that the classrooms must be available to all students as required by law. It also provides that if a State certifies this to be the case and it is not, that the assistance provided by the bill may be cutoff.

PROGRESS REPORTS

While the projects are in process of construction, the bill provides for progress reports, so that all may know whether the State is keeping its part of the bargain.

If these or any other reports by the States show that the State is not keeping its part of the bargain or are not honest, or are misleading, the bill provides that the Federal assistance to the State may be cutoff or reduced.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I also want to point out that the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and the Pacific island areas share in this aid on the same basis as any State.

CLASSROOMS

Last, I want to point up what I mean by classrooms and why the aid is limited to classrooms. I believe that our youth should have a well-trained mind and a well-trained body. This means an emphasis on basic subjects and basic physical training. The frills are fine to have but the other things should come first, and must come first when the people of all the country are being taxed to help communities meet local problems. Thus the bill provides no aid for special purpose rooms used for frills and for such things as indoor swimming pools. If communities want them they can build them on their own, if they can afford them. The basic subjects for graduation and some outdoor exercise can be good for everyone. The bill provides aid for those and no further.

CONSTRUCTION OF LOCKS AND DAMS ON THE ILLINOIS WATERWAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year the Army Engineers reported on a project for the improvement of the Illinois Waterway, for the expansion of locks and dams. However, the project did not eventuate, because of budget difficulties. Therefore, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize again this improvement; and I send the bill to the desk, together with a release I issued at the time and a copy of the engineers' report, and ask that the release and the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 434) to authorize certain improvement of the Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The report and statement presented by Mr. DIRKSEN are as follows:

(S. Rept. No. 1524, 86th Cong., 2d sess., June 6, 1960)

ILLINOIS WATERWAY, ILL. AND IND.

Location: The Illinois Waterway provides a channel for barge navigation between the Mississippi River, 38 miles above St. Louis, and Lake Michigan at Chicago.

Report authorized by: House Rivers and Harbors Committee resolution adopted March 16, 1943; Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted March 24, 1956.

Existing project: Provides for nine locks and six dams; navigation channel 9 feet deep in the Illinois and Des Plaines Rivers from the mouth of the Illinois River to Lockport, a distance of 291.1±miles upstream extension and branch channels 9 feet deep in the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Chicago River, Calumet-Sag Channel, Little Calumet River, Calumet River, and Grand Calumet River; and appurtenant improvements including bridge changes. The project is complete except for construction of two locks, one on Calumet River and the other on Grand Calumet River and improvements of the branch channel in the Grand Calumet River.

National problem: Commerce on the Illinois River has increased since the improved waterway to Chicago was opened from about 1.7 million tons in 1935 to 21.4 million tons in 1955. Most of the traffic

delays now occur at the locks because many tows require rearrangement to permit a single lockage and the larger tows must make a double lockage. The congestion at the locks resulting from these delays will be more critical as the traffic increases.

Recommended plan of improvement: Modification of existing project to provide for construction of supplemental locks, 110 feet wide and 1,200 feet long, at the seven existing lock sites on the Illinois and Des Plaines Rivers. (The first two locks estimated to be needed by 1968 and the last three by 1977.)

Estimated cost (price level of January 1957): All Federal, $114,652,000.

Project economics:

Annual charges	$4,594,300
Annual benefits, all transportation savings	22,320,000

Benefit-cost ratio: $4.9.

Local cooperation: Provided that prior to construction local interests agree that they will assume title to, and maintain and operate the new bridge across the lower approach to the Brandon Road lock when the bridge is placed in service.

Comments of State and Federal agencies:

Fish and Wildlife Service: No interest in project.

State of Illinois: Concurs in conclusions and recommendations.

Comments of the Bureau of the Budget: Notes that commerce on the waterway has increased at a rapid rate since 1935; however, it states that a projection of the past rate of growth is by no means certain. The Bureau of the Budget does not question the economic justification, but considers authorization 10 to 19 years in advance of the need is premature and accordingly urges that the report be regarded only as a study of future need, and that the estimates on commerce and average tons per lockage be brought up to date in a future report to Congress in 5 years.

Remarks: The committee held extensive hearings on this project. Opponents presented voluminous information on prospective future traffic that would move over the completed waterway. The committee has long pointed with pride to this project as an example of how traffic will develop over extensions of our inland waterway system. The existing project provides for a 9-foot navigation channel from the Mississippi River at Grafton, Ill., to Lake Michigan at Chicago, by use of seven locks 110 feet wide and 600 feet long, and by channel dredging. Commerce on this waterway has increased from 1.7 million tons in 1936 to 23.4 million tons in 1956. The commerce moves in large multiple-barge tows which require double locking through the existing locks. There are 13 principal cities along the waterway, all of which are highly industrialized and there are numerous water terminals along the route. The principal commodities moved on the waterway are coal, petroleum products, sand, gravel, grain, sulfur, and iron and steel products. The committee was advised that the practical capacity of the existing locks is 29.8 million tons annually. Supplemental locks 110 feet wide and 1,200 feet long, at the seven existing locks on the Illinois and Des Plaines Rivers are proposed. These supplemental locks would eliminate the multiple-lockage now required and would adequately care for the predicted traffic of 55 million tons annually by the year 2000.

The committee notes the exceedingly high benefit-cost ratio of 4.9 for this project. It also notes the comments of the Bureau of the Budget which questions the estimates of traffic growth, and that another report be submitted to Congress in 5 years. The committee believes the estimates on future commerce to be reasonable, and that such commerce will approach 30 million tons in a very few years. It is realized that it is a little early to determine the effects St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes traffic will have on commerce on the Illinois Waterway, but such effect might be considerable. The committee realizes that a large amount of planning must go into a project of this magnitude. Almost 2 years of the 5-year period the Bureau of the Budget referred to has elapsed. The committee sees no necessity of submitting another report in the near future. It recommends authorization of the project at this time, with planning carried forward at an early date, at which time the economic benefits of the project can be reviewed with a view to completion of the first two locks by 1968, when present estimates indicate they will be needed.

STATEMENT

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, Illinois, minority leader, today proposed an amendment to the House-passed River and Harbor and Flood Control bill to authorize the construction of 7 supplemental locks 110 feet wide and 1,200 feet long on the Illinois waterway, Illinois and Indiana, at the following points:

Lockport, Brandon Road, Dreseen Island, Marseilles, Starved Rock, Peoria and La Grange at an estimated cost of $114,652,000. The bill as it passed the House did not include an item providing for authorization of the duplicate locks projects which have been approved by the chief of engineers and the board of engineers for rivers and harbors.

"The existing locks will have reached their maximum capacity to move the growing volume of commerce on the river based upon estimates which the engineers admit may be optimistic as far as capacity is concerned and unduly pessimistic as far as potential commerce is concerned," Senator DIRKSEN pointed out. "Governor Stratton has already concurred in the report for the State of Illinois."

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have joined the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] and other Senators in the introduction of several civil rights bills.

Substantial progress has been made during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, the greatest progress in 100 years. The occupant of the chair, the Vice President, by his influence in many cases by specification has helped immeasurably that progress.

I have joined in supporting bills, in which I have a strong interest. I introduce now an additional bill for myself, and the senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, which would specifically deal with the problem which is now before the country, and which has been before the country for a long time. That is the question of school desegregation, under the 14th amendment and the Brown case.

The bill which I introduce is similar in some respects to the bill I introduced in 1957 at the time of the debate on the civil rights bill. It did not receive many votes at that time, although it went to the immediate problem before the country in 1957.

Last year the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators joined me in introducing the bill I introduce today. Its purpose would authorize the Attorney General to intervene in school desegregation cases, in the name of the United States, and at the expense of the United States for those who are denied their rights in school desegregation cases.

That is the issue which is still before us. In 1957 I was troubled by the resistance to school desegregation cases in one place in my own State of Kentucky, which did not represent the true opinion of the people of my State. Today this resistance persists in some of the States of the South, and in other States. It is a crisis which we must meet. It is a constitutional question. It affects the breakdown of law and order. It is an ethical question. It tests the very validity of our democratic system.

The bill I introduce squarely meets these issues.

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

The bill (S. 445) to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to authorize the United States to intervene in certain school desegregation cases, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. JAVITS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF NATIONAL WOOL ACT OF 1954

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my senior colleague [Mr. MCGEE] and myself, I introduce a bill to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act to March 31, 1965. The National Wool Act passed in 1954 has been an effort to bring stability to one of the great industries of the West and of the Nation. It was extended by the 86th Congress in 1958, to March 31, 1962.

It is highly desirable that this extension be made in the first session of this Congress. Not to do so would leave a very short time at the beginning of the second session when we would be faced with deciding under the pressure of the March 31 deadline. I, therefore, believe that an early introduction of the extension is most desirable. I know that there are many Senators with a great knowledge and interest in the wool industry. I request, therefore, Mr. President, that the bill be allowed to lie on the table until January 27 for the signatures of other Senators who may desire to join me in its introduction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be allowed to lie on the table as requested.

The bill (S. 454) to extend the provisions of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, until March 31, 1965, introduced by Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

THE PUBLIC MUST PARTICIPATE IN OUR BATTLE AGAINST SMOG

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, from time to time during my service in the Senate I have had occasion to discuss

the insidious and serious character of air pollution. It has been my privilege to sponsor a variety of proposals by which the Federal Government has entered the fight now going on in many sections of our Nation to obtain scientific data and to devise and apply controls necessary to assure our people of clean air.

Since the first participation was authorized in 1955, Federal agencies have taken on a primary responsibility of seeking basic information about the causes and effects of smog and other types of air pollution. It is gratifying, as President Eisenhower noted last week in his state of the Union message, that Federal activities in this field have been intensified.

One of the principal duties of the Federal Government is to provide leadership in efforts to abate air pollution. Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney, in making public a thought-provoking and challenging report of an advisory task group, just a little over a month ago stated:

> The problem of air pollution, like many challenges of our modern environment, can be resolved only by a balanced partnership among many agencies and interests.

In order that the Federal Government may better discharge its obligations in this field, I am introducing for the second time in less than a year a bill designed to strengthen the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Public Health Service in their key role of the antipollution campaign. I am gratified that once again my colleague from California and my two colleagues from Pennsylvania have done me the honor of joining as co-sponsors of this proposal, which this Senate approved last June 28 but which, I deeply regret, died in a committee of the other body with final adjournment. The need for this legislation is even more pressing than previously.

Although I believe the time is fast approaching when we should consider stepping up the level of expenditures in the air pollution field, I am content at the moment to seek only approval of the measure which passed this body at the last session. The bill would authorize the Surgeon General, either on his own initiative or on request from State or local governmental agencies concerned with the problem, to conduct public hearings on any aspect of air pollution deemed of general concern or of interstate character. Such authority is urgently requested by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and is in accordance with goals set forth by the President, which I feel confident the new administration will continue striving to reach.

Mr. President, in connection with these comments I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the communications received last year by the Committee on Public Works from the Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the General Services Administration in respect to this proposed legislation be set forth in full.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of February 29, 1960, for the views of the Bureau of the Budget on S. 3108, a bill to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation is identified with the draft bill transmitted with a letter to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on February 19, 1960.

The Bureau of the Budget concurs with the views expressed by the Secretary in his letter. The President, in his 1961 budget message, stated that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will make legislative recommendations to authorize greater Federal leadership in combating air pollution. The provisions of S. 3108 are designed to accomplish that objective.

Accordingly, I am authorized to advise you that enactment of S. 3108 would be in accord with the program of the President.

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE,
March 8, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of February 29, 1960, for a report on S. 3108, a bill to provide for public hearings on air-pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes.

S. 3108 is the same as the draft bill which we submitted to the President of the Senate on February 19, 1960. For the reasons stated in the letter transmitting the draft bill, we recommend enactment of this legislative proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

BERTHA ADKINS,
Acting Secretary.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1960.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of February 29, 1960, requested that your committee be furnished suggestions with reference to S. 3108, a bill, to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes.

The purpose of S. 3108 is, under certain conditions enumerated therein, to provide that the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare may call a public hearing on any problem of air pollution which may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or which may affect any community or communities in any State other than the State in which the matter causing or contributing to the pollution originates.

The measure also provides the necessary mechanics for conducting the hearings and reporting thereon, authorizes appropriations for each fiscal year such sum as may be necessary, and extends the Federal air pollution control law indefinitely by removing the present limitation of June 30, 1964.

General Services Administration is in accord with the objectives of the underlying legislation and favors its amendment as provided in S. 3108.

We are not in a position at this time to estimate the increase, if any, in the fiscal requirements of GSA which would result from enactment of the measure.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN FLOETE,
Administrator.

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

The bill (S. 455) to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems of more than local significance under, and extend the duration of, the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CONTROL OF NOXIOUS PLANTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with Federal legislation on the control and eradication of noxious weeds. I hold in my hand a letter I have received from Warren C. Teel, director of the Noxious Weeds Division of the Kansas State Board of Agriculture. In the letter, Mr. Teel discusses the need for this legislation. I also have before me a resolution on this subject which was adopted by the Weed Society of America. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, the resolution, and a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD in connection with these remarks.

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

The bill (S. 457) to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of Agriculture or other proper agency of any State in which there is in effect a program for the control of noxious plants may enter upon any land in such State under the control or jurisdiction of a department, agency, or independent establishment of the executive branch of the Federal Government, with the permission of and in accordance with the program acceptable to the head of such department, agency, or independent establishment, and destroy by appropriate methods noxious plants growing on such land if—

(1) the same procedure required by the State program with respect to privately owned land has been followed; and

(2) the department, agency, or independent establishment involved has failed to comply with the requirements of such program.

SEC. 2. To the extent that funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act are available therefor, any State incurring expenses pursuant to the first section of this Act shall be reimbursed, upon presentation of an itemized account of such expenses, by the head of the department, agency, or independent establishment of the executive branch of the Federal Government having control or jurisdiction of the land with respect to which such expenses were incurred.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the executive branch of the Federal Government such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. CARLSON are as follows:

KANSAS STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
Topeka, Kans., January 13, 1961.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washintgon, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: You will recall my contact to you last summer pertaining to proposed Federal legislation on noxious-weed control. I believe Senate bill 861 passed the Senate on August 21, 1959, and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. However, there is a chance that the bill will need to be reintroduced in this session of Congress.

The matter of Federal legislation on noxious-weed prevention, control, and eradication was discussed at our North Central Weed Control Conference last month and the conference regulatory committee and conference officials once again approved the adoption of such legislation. I'm enclosing a copy of the original resolution passed by this organization.

During 1961 I am serving as chairman of the regulatory committee of the North Central Weed Control Conference and a member of the legislative committee of the Weed Society of America. It is in this capacity and as director of the Kansas noxious weeds division, Kansas State Board of Agriculture, that I am contacting you regarding this proposed legislation.

I will certainly appreciate your support and assistance in getting this piece of legislation reintroduced into the Senate and House for action in this session of Congress. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need further information regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

WARREN C. TEEL,
Director, Noxious Weeds Division.

Whereas (1) the advancement in weed control through the use of better seed-cleaning methods, improved cultural practices and better herbicides makes the production of weed-free crops possible; and

2. The presence of weed seed in seed used for sowing purposes is a continuing source of dissemination; and

3. The presence of objectionable weed seeds in grain reduces its value and is an obstacle in the marketing of such grain; and

4. The screenings of grain containing weed seeds is a source of continued dissemination of such weeds; and

5. The presence of weeds in hay and forage crops reduces its value and is a continuing source of dissemination of such weeds; and

6. Lack of uniformity in the restrictions and requirements under Federal and State law reveals a lack of agreement on the problem of weed control and the most practical efforts to reduce it, which fact impairs the desirable progress which would seem possible with a coordinated approach: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there must be closer coordination of the many regulatory efforts to reduce the injury and waste caused by weeds and that this may be done through:

1. More uniformity in the noxious weed seed restrictions in the several State seed laws, at least on a regional basis consistent with soil, climate and agronomic practices, coupled with more educational efforts to encourage greater use of modern seed-cleaning equipment which permits the sowing of weed-free seed;

2. Adoption of a suggested uniform State weed law which is practical of enforcement and gives encouragement to farmers who endeavor to grow weed-free crops;

3. Adoption of a uniform State feed control law which restricts the dissemination of screenings and other feed materials containing weed seeds;

4. Restrictions against the importation of screenings containing weed seeds; and

5. Coordination of the Federal and State seed, feed, and weed laws and regulations; and be it

Resolved further, That the Weed Society of America serve as a coordinator urging each agency, association and organization involved to comply with the sense of this resolution and report at the next meeting of the society on the progress made.

ALLOWANCE OF LAWFUL EXPENDITURES FOR LEGISLATIVE PURPOSES AS LEGITIMATE BUSINESS EXPENSE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as legitimate business expense.

The Internal Revenue Service has interpreted the income tax laws so as to prevent labor unions, chambers of commerce, trade associations, professional groups and other such organizations from legitimately trying to influence legislation.

Every person who must make decisions on legislation has to obtain information from many sources. We have found that associations, whether they are made up of business interests, labor interests, manufacturers, farmers, doctors, or some other group, are invaluable sources of information. Legislators need to know the pros and cons from as many sources as possible. That is why we have always welcomed mail and advice from organizations, as well as individuals. Organizations present information which enables representatives to understand problems of various segments of the population and judge bills more intelligently.

This legislation will provide free speech for organizations. I earnestly hope that Congress this year will act to protect this vital right of Americans to get together and tell their story to their legislators.

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

The bill (S. 467) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that lawful expenditures for legislative purposes shall be allowed as deductions from gross income, introduced by Mr. HARTKE was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASED PENSION FOR WORLD WAR I VETERANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing a $100 a month pension for World War I veterans.

When Congress approved the Veterans Pension Act of 1959, I emphasized that it was my belief that this did not relieve the Congress of the responsibility we have to make further improvements in the program.

World War I veterans never received benefits comparable to those given to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. The ranks of the World War I veterans are decreasing each year. Many of them are now retired or will soon retire and are living on low and fixed incomes.

Most of these veterans are now in their sixties. Congress has received volumes and volumes of information on the difficulties which American citizens in their sixties are having. Many of them cannot afford adequate medical care. They cannot, for health reasons or because of age discrimination, become gainfully employed. They served our country at a time when there was no GI bill of rights. The benefits which they have received from the Government in no way measure up to the benefits which we have provided for veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. They suffered as much during the First World War as other veterans. They were taken from their homes, their loved ones and their jobs. And what did we provide for them? No educational programs. No assistance in purchasing homes. None of the rights accorded other veterans.

I think that this country has done well in providing for the World War II and Korean veterans. I have benefited from the GI bill of rights and I am thankful. But I think that it is time, late as it may be, to provide some help for veterans who were excluded.

This is why I am introducing this bill. I earnestly hope that we will be able to consider this matter early and that favorable action will be taken this year to help this group of Americans.

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

The bill (S. 468) to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COUNTRY LIFE COMMISSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Country Life Commission. The purpose would be to evaluate, and make recommendations for meeting, the long-range challenges in agriculture.

Over the years, the agricultural picture in America has undergone far-reaching changes.

The technological revolution has had a dramatic impact on farm life and progress.

Economic and social conditions on the farm have changed tremendously.

A new relationship—too little understood—has developed between rural and urban citizens.

The farm economy itself has suffered from a dangerous and costly supply-demand imbalance.

The trend toward larger and larger farms, resulting in a migration of country folks to the city, has had a dramatic effect on country life.

The American farmer faces serious, unresolved problems in housing, health, long-hour-for-little-pay work schedules, resulting from new forces and influences affecting rural life.

The proposed Country Life Commission had an important forerunner in history. In 1908, President Teddy Roosevelt established such a commission. During the succeeding years, the findings of the Commission made an invaluable contribution to formulation of agricultural policy.

To cope more effectively with these and other challenges in farming, I am proposing the establishment of a Country Life Commission.

The Congress, I believe, should act early and favorably on this legislation.

To enable fellow Senators to join in cosponsoring the measure if they wish to do so, I request unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for a week.

In addition, I request unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 469) to establish a Commission on Country Life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. Because (1) economic changes are profoundly affecting all phases of human life and endeavor in country communities; (2) there is currently a need for greater awareness on the part of all people, their organizations, and their leadership concerning the interrelatedness of rural and urban forces shaping the country community; (3) rural organizations and leadership are in need of a critical and thoughtful appraisal of the forces shaping the country community; (4) in a time of great economic adjustment spokesmen for country people must be encouraged to safeguard the opportunity for full development of individual and local community initiative; and (5) there is a need for an approach to the changing country scene which will provide the Nation with a body of objective facts, thoughtful appraisal, and a value base to help its people make wise decisions in the area of country living, it is therefore determined to be necessary to establish a commission to develop this approach, advise and recommend with regard to problems, needs, probable courses of action, or other appropriate means which will help the Nation to act wisely in this time of unprecedented change in country community living.

COMMISSION ON COUNTRY LIFE

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this Act there is hereby established an independent commission to be known as the Commission on Country Life (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members, as follows:

(1) Nine members, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party and shall be appointed by the President of the United States;

Three members appointed by the President of the Senate, not more than two of which shall be members of the same political party; and

(3) Three members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not more than two of which shall be members of the same political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (5 U.S.C. 99).

(f) The members of the Commission shall select a Chairman and Vice Chairman from the membership of the Commission.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall carry out the purposes of section 1 of this Act and in so doing shall—

(1) assemble the facts necessary to give a comprehensive picture with respect to the major trends affecting country community living;

(2) identify major gaps between the problems of country residents and the organized means to handle their problems;

(3) evaluate interrelatedness, and functions of the various institutions, agencies, and organizations serving country people;

(4) evaluate the impact of technological developments on living and ways of making a living in the country community;

(5) assess the impact of the changing composition of the country community population on economic goals and values; and

(6) develop a set of principles and guides to serve as a basis for approaches to improved country living in the years ahead.

(b) The Commission, not later than one year after the date on which the fifteenth member of the Commission is appointed, shall submit to the President and to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission shall also from time to time make other reports on the activities and studies of the Commission. Copies of reports of the Commission shall be distributed free to interested persons.

HEARINGS; OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or each subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) All agencies, departments, and independent instrumentalities of the Government are hereby authorized and directed to cooperate with the Commission, and, to the extent permitted by law, furnish all such information as requested by the Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENSES, AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member of such Commission, to any such member who is receiving other compensation from the United States, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(f) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe. The compensation paid to such Director under the provisions of this subsection shall not exceed the rate of $16,000 per annum.

HEADQUARTERS

SEC. 6. The Commission may establish and maintain its headquarters at whatever place within the United States that is determined by the Commission.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 3(b) of this Act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

RECOGNITION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE UNIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of this body to a bill which I introduced, in conjunction with the senior Senator from Minnesota, which I sincerely believe will have a highly beneficial effect on the future efficiency of the entire Federal establishment.

I do not think it is necessary to point out that the success of our entire governmental operation depends to a major extent on the morale and efficiency of the 2½ million civil service personnel who make up our employee force. And I want to stress particularly the fact that the future efficiency of our governmental operation depends on the caliber of people whom we are able to recruit into civil service careers.

Despite these indisputable facts, the personnel practices which presently exist in the Federal establishment are antiquated and oppressive to a point where

they lag at least a full half century behind the practices universally accepted in private industry.

The legislation which the Senator from Minnesota and I have jointly introduced will bring Government personnel policies and practices up to date so that in many important respects they will compare favorably with those in private industry.

I might add that this task has been neglected for far too long a time. Government is the largest employer in the country. Government is also the largest business in the world. We must therefore be competitive with other large employers and other large businesses if we expect to attract to Government—and to keep in Government—its proper share of the Nation's employment pool.

Certainly we are not offering to Government employees extravagant wage scales. Government employees are almost always a couple of years behind the cost-of-living index—particularly in the lowest grades. Even after the pay raise which we voted last year, the Federal employees are not in a particularly advantageous position. The long-awaited—and long delayed—report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics certainly proves this statement to be true.

The fringe benefits which we offer Government employees, while vastly improved over what they have been, still fall short of the benefits being offered in competitive private industry.

Government employees—quite rightly—are forbidden the right to strike. It is essential, of course, that this situation be maintained, but it does leave Federal employees almost completely dependent on the humanity, the liberalism, and the farsightedness of the Congress and of the President of the United States.

Up until now, their work conditions and their work procedures have depended pretty much on the attitudes of their department heads. At times these attitudes have been good. At far too many times, they have been wicked.

In any case, all policies governing work conditions and work procedures have flowed downward from top management to the employees. All labor-management decisions—whether they be good or whether they be bad—are thrust upon the employees without previous consultation and without previous device.

In cases where the policies have been good, this has resulted in a firm but benevolent paternalism. In cases where the policies have been bad, the result has been a kind of soul-killing despotism.

The legislation which the Senator from Minnesota and I have introduced will cure this antiquated procedure, which has stultified initiative among the rank-and-file employees and which has caused innumerable injustices over the years. It will also produce greater efficiency in the Government in that it will provide definite procedures by which management can avail itself of the vast pool of experience, brains, and ingenuity among the 2½ million dedicated civil service employees who make up our Federal employee force.

The legislation which we have introduced will do several important things—all of them beneficial to the employer and the employee and to the overall efficiency of the Federal establishment.

First of all, it will provide for a degree of recognition for the existing unions and associations of Federal employees. It will recognize officially the right of officers or representatives of such unions and associations to present grievances in behalf of their members, and it will forbid Government officials to attempt reprisal, discrimination, or intimidation as a result of such presentation of grievances.

The legislation will also make it mandatory for Government department heads to consult with the designated representatives of the unions and associations of Federal employees, and to listen to their views before promulgating regulations or policies affecting the working conditions or the work procedures in the field service.

This, Mr. President, makes great good sense. Most department heads, no matter how worthy they are, are unfamiliar with the specific conditions existing in the field service or in certain areas of the field service. It is impossible for them to know what effect their policies will have on personnel in the field. As a result, many policies which look excellent and, indeed foolproof on paper, turn out to be monstrosities when translated into human terms. Previous consultation with employee leaders would prevent such disasters.

Conversely, Mr. President, many wise policies fail because their purpose and effects have not been explained to the employees in advance. Since Government agencies do not have the apparatus by which they can effectively reach their farflung employees to explain proposed procedures, it will be extremely helpful to them if they make use of the unions and associations which do have such an apparatus.

And, of course, after three-quarters of a century, in which they have proved over and over again their dedication and effectiveness, the unions and associations of Federal employees are long overdue for the measure of recognition which this legislation provides.

The legislation also modernizes the obsolete procedures in Government for the arbitration and settlement of grievances.

It also provides for an entirely voluntary system for the collection of union and association dues.

This would be voluntary—dependent entirely on the wishes of the individual employee.

If this proposal seems startling at first glance, I would like to point out that we established the principle of a checkoff when we passed the Government Employees Life Insurance program in 1954. I would also like to point out that we reestablished this principle when we passed the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. To extend the idea of a checkoff to the collection of union and association dues would be merely to reaffirm our collective judgment in years past.

Mr. President, I shall not expatiate further on this proposed legislation except to reiterate my initial statement that it is long overdue. The personnel practices of Government for too many generations have been carried on under rules which would have seemed somewhat old-fashioned to our grandfathers. The welfare of 2½ million men and women has been controlled on a completely hit-or-miss basis without proper safeguards for the employees and without proper assurance of fair and decent treatment. This legislation will bring these policies and procedures up to date and make them compatible with the middle of the 20th century. It will make the Federal service far more attractive to those who are presently in it, and it will also make it far more attractive to those who are eligible to join it and make it a lifetime career.

I sincerely urge that the Members of this body give this legislation their earnest and wholehearted attention.

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

The bill (S. 473) to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is an honor to be joined as a cosponsor on the bill introduced today by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Senator JOHNSTON, which would give to the entire Federal establishment, for the first time in history, a truly modern personnel program.

The personnel policies of the Federal Government, Mr. President, have their roots deeply embedded in the 19th century. From time to time we have placed some 20th century patches on the mid-Victorian structure of laws and regulations which govern the relationship between management and labor in Government, but we have never before attempted to modernize the basic structure itself.

Mr. President, since the U.S. Government is the largest single employer of manpower not only in the Nation, but in the entire world, I think it is imperative that we make of our Federal establishment a model employer in the modern mold and not permit it to remain an antiquated and arbitrary throwback to the autocratic practices which characterized the earliest and grimmest days of the industrial revolution.

If we are to enter into an era of New Frontiers, we must make those frontiers of enlightenment available to those who look to us for their livelihood and for the maintenance and improvement of the conditions under which they must earn that livelihood.

As we all know, Federal employees are denied the right to strike. But, just because Federal employees cannot strike against the Government, there is no reason why they should be denied certain other rights and privileges which are commonplace in the world of private industry and commerce.

The bill which we have introduced will grant certain rights and privileges which

are generally enjoyed by workers in private industry throughout America.

The legislation which we have introduced shall give to the representatives of Government employee unions and associations the legal and inalienable right to present grievances in behalf of their members without fear of reprisal, intimidation, or interference. It would also make it mandatory for Government department heads to confer with designated representatives of such unions and associations on all matters of policy affecting working conditions, work procedures, automation, safety, in-service training, labor-management cooperation, methods of adjusting grievances, transfers, appeals, granting of leave, promotions and demotions, rates of pay, and reductions in force.

Our legislation goes further to insist that the views of such organization leaders should be sought before new policies affecting these areas should be promulgated or before existing policies should be modified.

The legislation which we have introduced provides for a complete overhaul and modernization of the grievance procedures of the Government which are reminiscent not so much of the 19th century as of the star chamber practices of 17th century England.

The legislation also provides for a voluntary check-off plan for the collection of union and association dues. I stress the word "voluntary."

As you know, Mr. President, we broke ground in this area when we approved the Federal employee life insurance law in 1954. We broke further ground when we approved the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. In both cases, our collective judgment proved eminently correct. I see no reason why we cannot now extend this practice to the collection of organization dues in the same way as the practice is observed in private industry.

The unions of Federal employees over the years have been a model and an inspiration for clean and progressive trade unionists throughout the United States and, indeed, throughout the free world. And yet, up until now, we have denied these 2½ million dedicated and devoted human beings basic rights which are part and parcel of trade union practices in every civilized nation on the face of the globe.

It is only common humanitarianism to grant these common rights to these highly uncommon and deserving people.

But, more than that, it is good business. Our approval of this legislation will result in a dramatic improvement in the overall morale of our Federal employee force. It will result in an overall improvement in efficiency. And it will make the Government service greatly more attractive to prospective recruits and insure us of an even higher caliber of Federal employee in the years to come.

If we are to continue to attract employees of equal ability and trustworthiness as those in private industry, we must compete with private industry, not only in regard to remuneration, but also in regard to conditions of work.

I feel strongly that the legislation we have introduced will accomplish this end, and at practically no additional cost to the Government. I earnestly direct your attention to this legislation, Mr. President, and I earnestly seek the sympathetic approval of my distinguished colleagues.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to have these remarks go in the RECORD. I am satisfied that, with the Senator's assistance in this body, we shall probably pass the bills in the Senate without much trouble.

VOLUNTARY PENSION PLANS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to permit and encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by the self-employed of our Nation.

This bill will provide a system whereby the self-employed such as doctors, lawyers, farmers, accountants, architects, engineers, insurance agents, dentists, and so forth, can be covered under approved pension plans similar to those presently enjoyed by most corporation employees in our country. The intent of this legislation is to give equality of opportunity to the self-employed to set aside a portion of their income for their old age, in much the same manner as corporate employees now contribute to company operated pension plans.

In concept this is not new legislation. It has been many years in evolving to the present form in which this bill is drafted. However, the bill I am introducing today makes a number of important changes over the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee last year: First, it eliminates all proposed restrictions on corporate pension plans covering so-called owner-employees; second, it does not require a self-employed person to include his employees under the plan unless they are more than three in number, excluding part-time or seasonal employees; third, it modifies the severe limitations of the previous bill on the amount of contributions which can be made on behalf of owner-employees, that is, sole proprietors and partners having more than a 10-percent interest in the business; and, fourth, it bases the self-employed individual's contribution on the amount of his self-employment earnings rather than on his earned income from the business.

Other features of this new bill include the following:

First, where there are more than three employees and the plan covers any owner-employee, the employees' rights must be nonforfeitable for the plan to qualify.

Second. There is no "stepped up" contribution for persons over age 50 and no lifetime limit on contributions.

Third. Contributions to the plan in behalf of owner-employees may not exceed the greater of (a) $2,500 or 10 percent of self-employment earnings, whichever is the lesser, or (b) where there are more than three employees and the plan covers any owner-employee, the same ratio of contributions to compensation as applies to any employee.

Fourth. Partners having not more than a 10 percent interest in the business are in general affected by the same rules as true employees.

Fifth. The plan cannot have a waiting period for employee coverage of more than 3 years, instead of 5 years as under qualified pension plans generally.

Sixth. No benefits can be paid to an owner-employee under the plan before he reaches the age of 59½ years, except in case of disability, and must commence not later than age 70½.

Seventh. Retirement benefits payable to a self-employed will be taxed as ordinary income as and when received, except that (a) in lieu of capital gain treatment lump sum payments after age 59½—and after at least 5 years coverage—or on death or disability shall not be subject to tax greater than five times the increase in tax resulting from the inclusion in gross income of one-fifth of the distribution and (b) distributions of $2,500 or more prior to age 59½ shall be taxed at not less than 110 percent of the liability which would have resulted had the distribution been spread over the taxable year and the 4 prior years.

Eighth. Retirement funds can be invested with a bank as trustee or used to purchase retirement annuities from an insurance company. Alternatively, the bill permits the plan to provide for custodial accounts to be set up with a bank if the investment of the contributions and earnings is made solely in regulated investment company stock and also allows the employer to purchase and distribute to his employees a special form of nontransferable U.S. bond redeemable after age 59½ or disability and providing for the payment of interest only upon redemption. Investment can also be made in face-amount certificates.

Congressman EUGENE J. KEOGH has introduced an identical bill in the House, where it has been given the same number, H.R. 10, as it had in the 86th Congress. Inasmuch as this measure does affect Federal revenue, it must first be considered by the House before the Senate can act upon it. However, the introduction of my bill today will give the Senate Finance Committee a chance to consider this measure at an early date along with other self-employed retirement bills introduced by other Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, the American Bar Association has been one of the leading advocates in emphasizing the need for legislation to encourage voluntary pension plans for the self-employed. However, this bill has wide support among all self-employed, including the legal and medical professions, farm organizations and small business associations. In fact, I am informed that some 70 national associations have given their endorsement to the concept involved in the Keogh-Bennett bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 474) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans

by self-employed individuals, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this act may be cited as the "Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. QUALIFICATION OF PLANS.

Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (5) of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this paragraph and subsection (d)(5), the total compensation of an individual who is a self-employed individual (as defined in subsection (c)(2) is such individual's self-employment earnings (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) and the basic or regular rate of compensation of such an individual shall be determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, with respect to that portion of his self-employment earnings which bears the same ratio to his self-employment earnings as the basic or regular compensation of the employees (other than self-employed individuals) under the plan bears to the total compensation of such employees.";

(2) by adding at the end of the subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(7) A trust shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless the plan of which such trust is a part provides that, upon its termination or upon complete discontinuance of contributions under the plan, the rights of all employees to benefits accrued to the date of such termination or discontinuance, to the extent then funded, or the amounts credited to the employees' accounts, are nonforfeitable. This paragraph shall not apply to benefits or contributions which, under provisions of the plan adopted pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to preclude the discrimination prohibited by paragraph (4), may not be used for designated employees in the event of early termination of the plan.

"(8) A trust shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless, under the plan of which such trust is a part, the entire interest of each employee—

"(A) either will be distributed to him not later than his taxable year in which he attains the age of 70½ years, or, in the case of an employee other than an owner-employee (as defined in subsection (c)(4)), in which he retires, whichever is the later, or

"(B) will be distributed, commencing not later than such taxable year, (i) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, over the life of such employee or over the lives of such employee and his spouse, or (ii) in accordance with such regulations, over the life expectancy of such employee or over the life expectancy of such employee and his spouse.

"(9) A trust forming part of a pension plan shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless the plan provides that forfeitures must not be applied to increase the benefits any employee would otherwise receive under the plan.

"(10) If—

"(A)(i) on one day in each quarter in the taxable year of the plan, an employer has more than 3 employees, or

"(ii) this paragraph applied at any prior time in respect of such plan, and

"(B) the plan provides for current or future contributions for any owner-employee, then the trust shall be a qualified trust under this section only if each employee having a period of employment of 3 years or more is included under the plan. For purposes of the preceding sentence, (i) the term 'employee' does not include any employee whose customary employment is for not more than 20 hours in any one week or is for not more than 5 months in any calendar year, nor does such term include an owner-employee, and (ii) in the case of a partner who is not an owner-employee, the period of time during which he has been such a partner shall be included in his period of employment.

"(11) If paragraph (10) does not apply, then the determination as to whether a trust is a qualified trust under this subsection shall be made—

"(A) in the case of a plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees who are not owner-employees, without reference to any portion of such plan which provides contributions or benefits for owner-employees, and

"(B) in the case of a plan which provides contributions or benefits for owner-employees, without reference to any portion of such plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees who are not owner-employees.

"(12) A trust forming part of a plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees (as defined in subsection (c)(4)) shall constitute a qualified trust under this section only if the requirements in subsection (d) are also met."; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (h) and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) DEFINITIONS AND RULES RELATING TO SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS AND OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term 'employee' includes, for any taxable year, a self-employed individual.

"(2) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'self-employed individual' means an individual who has self-employment earnings (as defined in paragraph (3)) for the taxable year.

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS.—The term 'self-employment earnings' means net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a)) determined—

"(A) without regard to paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1402(c),

"(B) in the case of any individual who is treated as an employee under section 3121(d)(3)(A), (C), or (D), without regard to paragraph (2) of section 1402(c), and

"(C) without regard to items which are not included in gross income for purpose of this chapter, and the deductions properly allocable to or chargeable against such items.

"(4) OWNER-EMPLOYEE.—The term 'owner-employee' means a self-employed individual who—

"(A) derives self-employment earnings from a trade or business carried on by him, or

"(B) in the case of a partnership, is a partner who owns more than 10 percent of either the capital interest or the profits interest in such partnership.

"(5) EMPLOYER.—In the case of a trade or business carried on by a self-employed individual, such individual shall be treated as his own employer. A partnership shall be treated as the employer of each partner who is an employee within the meaning of paragraph (1).

"(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION OF TRUSTS AND PLANS BENEFITING OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—A trust forming part of a pension or profit-sharing plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees shall constitute a qualified trust under this section only if, in addition to meeting the requirements of subsection (a), the following requirements of this subsection are met by the trust and by the plan of which such trust is a part:

"(1) In the case of a trust which is created on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, or which was created before such date but is not exempt from tax under section 501(a) as an organization described in subsection (a) on the day before such date, the trustee is a bank but a person (including the employer) other than a bank may be granted, under the trust instrument, the power to control the investment of the trust funds either by directing investments (including reinvestments, disposals, and exchanges) or by disapproving proposed investments (including reinvestments, disposals, and exchanges). This paragraph shall not apply to a trust created or organized outside the United States before the date of the enactment of this subsection if, under section 402(c), it is treated as exempt from taxation under section 501(a) on the day before such date. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'bank' means—

"(A) a bank as defined in section 581,

"(B) a corporation which under the laws of the State of its incorporation is subject to supervision and examination by the commissioner of banking or other officer of such State in charge of the administration of the banking laws of such State, and

"(C) In the case of a trust created or organized outside the United States, a bank or trust company, wherever incorporated, exercising fiduciary powers and subject to supervision and examination by governmental authority.

"(2) Under the plan, no benefits may be paid to any owner-employee before he attains the age of 59½ years, except in the case of his becoming disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(3) If subsection (a)(10) applies, the employees' rights to or derived from the contributions under the plan are nonforfeitable at the time the contributions are paid to or under the plan.

"(4) In the case of a profit-sharing plan, the plan provides a definite formula for determining the contributions to be made to the trust by the employer on behalf of employees (other than owner-employees).

"(5) If subsection (a)(10) applies, the plan does not permit the ratio of contributions by the employer for any owner-employee to such owner-employee's compensation to exceed the ratio of contributions by the employer for any employee (other than an owner-employee) to his compensation. For purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) The term 'compensation' means total compensation, or basic or regular rate of compensation, whichever may be specified in the plan.

"(B) If—

"(i) of the contributions deductible under section 404, not more than one-third is deductible by reason of contributions by the employer for owner-employees, and

"(ii) taxes paid by the owner-employee under chapter 2 (relating to tax on self-employment income), and the taxes which would be payable under such chapter 2 by the owner-employee but for paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1402(c), are taken into account as contributions by the employer for such owner-employee,

then taxes paid under section 3111 (relating to tax on employers) with respect to an employee may be taken into account as contributions by the employer for such employee under the plan.

"(6) The plan does not permit—

"(A) contributions to be made by the employer for any owner-employee in excess of the amounts which may be deducted under section 404 for the taxable year;

"(B) in the case of a plan (or, if subsection (a)(11) applies, the portion thereof)

which provides contributions or benefits only for owner-employees, contributions by or for any owner-employee in excess of the amounts which may be deducted under section 404 for the taxable year; and

"(C) if a distribution under the plan is made to any employee and if any portion of such distribution is an amount described in section 72(m)(5)(A)(i) (whether or not section 72(m)(5) applies to such amount), contributions to be made on behalf of such employee for the 5 taxable years succeeding the taxable year in which such distribution is made.

"(7) Under the plan, if an owner-employee dies before his entire interest has been distributed to him, or if distribution has been commenced in accordance with subsection (a)(8)(B) to his surviving spouse and such surviving spouse dies before his entire interest has been distributed to her, his entire interest (or the remaining part of such interest if distribution thereof has commenced) will, within 5 years after his death (or the death of his surviving spouse), be distributed, or applied to the purchase of an immediate annuity for his beneficiary or beneficiaries (or the beneficiary or beneficiaries of his surviving spouse) which will be payable for the life of such beneficiary or beneficiaries (or for a term certain not extending beyond the life expectancy of such beneficiary or beneficiaries) and which will be immediately distributed to such beneficiary or beneficiaries.

"(8) Under the plan—

"(A) any contribution which is an excess contribution (as defined in subsection (e)(1)), together with the income attributable to such excess contribution, is (unless subsection (e)(2)(E) applies) to be repaid to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution is made;

"(B) if for any taxable year the plan does not, by reason of subsection (e)(2)(A), meet (for purposes of section 404) the requirements of this subsection with respect to an owner-employee, the income for the taxable year attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under the plan is to be paid to such owner-employee; and

"(C) the entire interest of an owner-employee is to be repaid to him when required by the provisions of subsections (e)(2)(E).

"(9)(A) If the plan provides contributions or benefits for an owner-employee who controls, or for two or more owner-employees who together control, the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, and who also control as an owner-employee or as owner-employees one or more other trades or businesses, such plan and the plans (if any) established with respect to such other trades or businesses constitute a plan which meets the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4), and paragraph (10) or (11) (as the case may be), of subsection (a) with respect to the employees of all such trades or businesses (including the trade or business with respect to which the plan intended to qualify under this section is established).

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), an owner-employee, or two or more owner-employees, shall be considered to control a trade or business if such owner-employee, or such two or more owner-employees together—

"(i) own the entire interest in an unincorporated trade or business, or

"(ii) in the case of a partnership, own more than 50 percent of either the capital interest or the profits interest in such partnership.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, an owner-employee, or two or more owner-employees, shall be treated as owning any interest in a partnership which is owned, directly or indirectly, by a partnership which such owner-employee, or such two or more owner-employees, are considered to control within the meaning of the preceding sentence.

"(10) Under the plan, contributions by or for any owner-employee may be made only with respect to the self-employment earnings of such owner-employee derived from the trade or business with respect to which such plan is established.

"(e) EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) EXCESS CONTRIBUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'excess contribution' means—

"(A) if, in the taxable year, contributions are made under the plan (or, if subsection (a)(11) applies, under the portion of the plan) only by or for owner-employees, the amount of any contribution made by or for any owner-employee which (without regard to this subsection) is not deductible under section 404 for the taxable year; or

"(B) if subparagraph (A) does not apply—

"(i) the amount of any contribution made by the employer for any owner-employee which (without regard to this subsection) is not deductible under section 404 for the taxable year;

"(ii) the amount of any contribution made by any owner-employee (as an employee) at a rate which exceeds the rate of contributions permitted to be made by employees other than owner-employees; and

"(iii) the amount of any contribution made under the plan by any owner-employee (as an employee) which exceeds the lesser of $2,500 or 10 percent of the self-employment earnings for such taxable year derived by such owner-employee from the trade or business (or trades and businesses) with respect to which the plan is established; and

"(C) the amount of any contribution made by or for an owner-employee in any taxable year for which, under paragraph (2) (A) or (E), the plan does not (for purposes of section 404) meet the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee.

For purposes of this subsection, the amount of any contribution which is allocable (determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance shall not be taken into account.

"(2) EFFECT OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If an excess contribution (other than an excess contribution to which subparagraph (E) applies) is made by or for an owner-employee in any taxable year, the plan with respect to which such excess contribution is made shall, except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D), be considered, for purposes of section 404, as not meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee for the taxable year and for all succeeding taxable years.

"(B) INCLUSION OF AMOUNTS IN GROSS INCOME OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—For any taxable year for which any plan does not meet the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to an owner-employee by reason of subparagraph (A), the gross income of such owner-employee shall, for purposes of this chapter, include the amount of income for such taxable year attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under such plan.

"(C) REPAYMENT WITHIN PRESCRIBED PERIOD.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an excess contribution with respect to any taxable year, if, on or before the close of the 6-month period beginning on the day on which the Secretary or his delegate sends notice (by certified or registered mail) to the person to whom such excess contribution was paid of the amount of such excess contribution, the amount of such excess contribution, and the income attributable thereto, is repaid to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was made. If the excess contribution is an excess contribution as defined in paragraph (1)(A) or (B)(i), or is an excess contribution as defined in paragraph (1)(C) with respect to which a deduction has been claimed under section 404, the notice required by the preceding sentence shall not be mailed prior to the time that the amount of the tax under this chapter of such owner-employee for the taxable year in which such excess contribution was made has been finally determined.

"(D) REPAYMENT AFTER PRESCRIBED PERIOD.—If an excess contribution, together with the income attributable thereto, is not repaid within the 6-month period referred to in subparagraph (C), subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an excess contribution with respect to any taxable year beginning with the taxable year in which the person to whom such excess contribution was paid repays the amount of such excess contribution to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was made, and pays to such owner-employee the amount of income attributable to the interest of such owner-employee which, under subparagraph (B), has been included in the gross income of such owner-employee for any prior taxable year.

"(E) SPECIAL RULE IF EXCESS CONTRIBUTION WAS WILLFULLY MADE.—If an excess contribution made by or for an owner-employee is determined to have been willfully made, then—

"(i) subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), shall not apply with respect to such excess contribution;

"(ii) there shall be distributed to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was willfully made his entire interest in all plans with respect to which he is an owner-employee; and

"(iii) no plan shall, for purposes of section 404, be considered as meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee for the taxable year in which it is determined that such excess contribution was willfully made and for the 5 taxable years following such taxable year.

"(F) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—In any case in which subparagraph (A) applies, the period for assessing any deficiency arising by reason of—

"(i) the disallowance of any deduction under section 404 on account of a plan not meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to the owner-employee by or for whom an excess contribution was made, or

"(ii) the inclusion, under subparagraph (B), in gross income of such owner-employee of income attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under a plan, for the taxable year in which such excess contribution was made or for any succeeding taxable year shall not expire prior to one year after the close of the 6-month period referred to in subparagraph (C).

"(f) CERTAIN CUSTODIAL ACCOUNTS.—

"(1) TREATMENT AS QUALIFIED TRUST.—For purposes of this title, a custodial account shall be treated as a qualified trust under this section, if—

"(A) such custodial account would, except for the fact that it is not a trust, constitute a qualified trust under this section;

"(B) the custodian is a bank (as defined in section 581);

"(C) the investment of the contributions to such account, and of the earnings attributable thereto, is to be made solely in regulated investment company stock with respect to which an employee is the beneficial owner; and

"(D) the shareholder of record of any such stock is the custodian or its nominee.

"(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'regulated investment company' means a domestic corporation which—

"(A) is a regulated investment company within the meaning of section 851(a), and

"(B) issues only redeemable stock.

"(g) FACE-AMOUNT CERTIFICATES TREATED AS ANNUITIES.—For purposes of this section and sections 402, 403, and 404, the term 'annuity' includes a face-amount certificate, as defined in section 2(a)(15) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C., sec. 80a–2)."

SEC. 3. DEDUCTIBILITY OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PLANS.

(a) INCLUSION OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—Section 404(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deductibility of contributions to pension, annuity, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plans or plans of deferred compensation) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 401(a) (3), (4), (5), and (6)," in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, in the case of a plan described in paragraph (9 of this subsection, which meets the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1), (3), and (4))"; and

(2) by adding after paragraph (7) the following new paragraphs:

"(8) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a plan included in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for self-employed individuals within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), for purposes of this section—

"(A) the term 'employee' includes a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual is the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5);

"(B) the term 'self-employment earnings' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(3);

"(C) the contributions to such plan by or for a self-employed individual shall be considered to satisfy the conditions of section 162 or 212 to the extent that such contributions do not exceed the self-employment earnings of such individual derived from the trade or business with respect to which such plan is established, and to the extent that such contributions are not allocable (determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance; and

"(D) any reference to compensation shall, in the case of a self-employed individual, be considered to be a reference to the self-employment earnings of such individual derived from the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established.

"(9) PLANS BENEFITING OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—In the case of a plan included in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees—

"(A) the limitations provided by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7) on the amounts deductible for any taxable year shall be computed, with respect to contributions on behalf of employees (other than owner-employees), as if such employees were the only employees for whom contributions and benefits are provided under the plan;

"(B) the limitations provided by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7) on the amounts deductible for any taxable year shall be computed, with respect to contributions on behalf of owner-employees—

"(i) as if such owner-employees were the only employees for whom contributions and benefits are provided under the plan, and

"(ii) without regard to paragraph (1)(D), the second and third sentences of paragraph (3), and the second sentence of paragraph (7); and

"(C) the amounts deductible under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7), with respect to contributions on behalf of any owner-employee, shall not exceed the applicable limitation provided in subsection (e).

For purposes of this paragraph and subsections (e) and (f), the term 'owner-employee' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(4)."

(b) LIMITATIONS ON DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Section 404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deductibility of contributions to pension, annuity, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plans or plans of deferred compensation) is amended by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsections:

"(e) SPECIAL LIMITATIONS FOR OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a plan included in subsection (a) (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees, the amounts deductible under subsection (a) in any taxable year with respect to contributions on behalf of any owner-employee shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

"(A) $2,500, or 10 percent of the self-employment earnings derived by such owner-employee from the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, whichever is the lesser; or

"(B) if section 401(a)(10) applies, the maximum amount of contributions permitted on behalf of such owner-employee on the application of section 401(d)(5).

"(2) CONTRIBUTIONS MADE UNDER MORE THAN ONE PLAN.—

"(A) OVERALL LIMITATION.—In any taxable year in which amounts are deductible with respect to two or more plans (whether established with respect to the same trade or business or different trades or businesses) on behalf of an individual who is an owner-employee with respect to such plans, the aggregate amount deductible for such taxable year under such plans with respect to contributions on behalf of such owner-employee shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

"(i) $2,500, or

"(ii) the sum of the amounts so contributed under all such plans to the extent that, with respect to each such plan, the amount contributed does not exceed the amount described in paragraph (1)(B).

"(B) ALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS DEDUCTIBLE.—In any case in which the amounts deductible under subsection (a) (with the application of the limitations of this subsection) with respect to contributions made by or for an owner-employee under two or more plans are, by reason of subparagraph (A), less than the amounts deductible under such subsection determined without regard to such subparagraph, the amount deductible under subsection (a) with respect to such contributions under each such plan shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) CONTRIBUTIONS ALLOCABLE TO INSURANCE PROTECTION.—For purposes of this subsection, contributions which are allocable (determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance shall not be taken into account.

"(f) CERTAIN LOAN REPAYMENTS CONSIDERED AS CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of this section, any amount paid, directly or indirectly, by an owner-employee in repayment of any loan which under section 72(m)(4)(B) was treated as an amount received under a contract purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or purchased as a part of a plan described in section 403(a) shall be treated as a contribution to which this section applies on behalf of such owner-employee to such trust or to or under such plan."

SEC. 4. TAXABILITY OF DISTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 72(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to employees' annuities) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (1).—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) if the employee died before any amount was received as an annuity under the contract, the words 'receivable by the employee' shall be read as 'receivable by a beneficiary of the employee'; and

"(B) any contribution made with respect to the contract while an individual is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) which is not allowed as a deduction under section 404 shall be treated as consideration for the contract contributed by the employee."

(b) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS AND OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to annuities, etc.) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsections:

"(m) SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEE ANNUITIES AND DISTRIBUTIONS UNDER EMPLOYEE PLANS.—

"(1) CERTAIN AMOUNTS RECEIVED BEFORE ANNUITY STARTING DATE.—Any amounts received under an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract before the annuity starting date which are not received as an annuity (within the meaning of subsection (e)(2)) shall be included in the recipient's gross income for the taxable year in which received to the extent that—

"(A) such amounts, plus all amounts theretofore received under the contract and includible in gross income under this paragraph, do not exceed

"(B) the aggregate premiums or other consideration paid for the contract while the employee was an owner-employer (as defined in section 401(c)(4)) which were allowed as deductions under section 404 for the taxable year and all prior taxable years (not including any portion of such premiums or other consideration properly allocable, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to the cost of life, accident, health, or other insurance).

Any such amounts so received which are not includible in gross income under this paragraph shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (e).

"(2) COMPUTATION OF CONSIDERATION PAID BY THE EMPLOYEE.—In computing—

"(A) the aggregate amount of premiums or other consideration paid for the contract for purposes of subsection (c)(1)(A) (relating to the investment in the contract),

"(B) the consideration for the contract contributed by the employee for purposes of subsection (d)(1) (relating to employee's contributions recoverable in 3 years), and

"(C) the aggregate premiums or other consideration paid for purposes of subsection (e)(1)(B) (relating to certain amounts not received as an annuity),

any amount allowed as a deduction with respect to the contract under section 404 which was paid while the individual was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) shall be treated as consideration contributed by the employer, and there shall not be taken into account any portion of the premiums or other consideration for the contract paid while the individual was an owner-employee which is properly allocable (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his

delegate) to the cost of life, accident, health, or other insurance.

"(3) LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS.—

"(A) This paragraph shall apply to any life insurance contract—

"(i) purchased as a part of a plan described in section 403(a), or

"(ii) purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) if the proceeds of such contract are payable directly or indirectly to a participant in such trust or to a beneficiary of such participant.

"(B) Any contributions to a plan described in subparagraph (A)(i) or a trust described in subparagraph (A)(ii) which is allowed as a deduction under section 404, and any income of a trust described in subparagraph (A)(ii), which is determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to have been applied to purchase the life insurance protection under a contract described in subparagraph (A), is includible in the gross income of the participant for the taxable year when so applied.

"(C) In the case of the death of an individual insured under a contract described in subparagraph (A), an amount equal to the cash surrender value of the contract immediately before the death of the insured shall be treated as a payment under such plan or a distribution by such trust, and the excess of the amount payable by reason of the death of the insured over such cash surrender value shall not be includible in gross income under this section and shall be treated as provided in section 101.

"(4) AMOUNTS CONSTRUCTIVELY RECEIVED.—

"(A) ASSIGNMENTS OR PLEDGES.—If during any taxable year an owner-employee assigns (or agrees to assign) or pledges (or agrees to pledge) any portion of his interest in a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or any portion of the value of a contract purchased as part of a plan described in section 403(a), such portion shall be treated as having been received by such owner-employee as a distribution from such trust or as an amount received under the contract.

"(B) LOANS ON CONTRACTS.—If during any taxable year, an owner-employee receives, directly or indirectly, any amount from any insurance company as a loan under a contract purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or purchased as part of a plan described in section 403(a), and issued by such insurance company, such amount shall be treated as an amount received under the contract.

"(5) PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(A) This paragraph shall apply—

"(i) to amounts (other than any amount received by an individual in his capacity as a policyholder of an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract which is in the nature of a dividend or similar distribution) which are received from a qualified trust described in section 401(a) or under a plan described in section 403(a) and which are received by an individual, who is, or has been, an owner-employee, before such individual attains the age of 59½ years, for any reason other than the individual's becoming disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)), but only to the extent that such amounts are attributable to contributions paid on behalf of such individual (whether or not paid by him) while he was an owner-employee,

"(ii) to amounts which are received from a qualified trust described in section 401(a) or under a plan described in section 403(a) at any time by an individual who is, or has been, an owner-employee, or by the successor of such individual, but only to the extent that such amounts are determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to exceed the benefits provided for such individual under the plan formula, and

"(iii) to amounts which are received, by reason of the distribution under the provisions of section 401(e)(2)(E), by an individual who is, or has been, an owner-employee of his entire interest in all qualified trusts described in section 401(a) and in all plans described in section 403(a).

"(B) (i) If the aggregate of the amounts to which this paragraph applies received by any person in his taxable year equals or exceeds $2,500, the increase in his tax for the taxable year in which such amounts are received shall not be less than 110 percent of the aggregate increase in taxes, for the taxable year and the 4 immediately preceding taxable years, which would have resulted if such amounts had been included in such person's gross income ratably over such taxable years.

"(ii) If deductions have been allowed under section 404 for contributions paid on behalf of the individual while he is an owner-employee for a number of prior taxable years less than 4, clause (i) shall be applied by taking into account a number of taxable years immediately preceding the taxable year in which the amount was so received equal to such lesser number.

"(C) If subparagraph (B) does not apply to a person for the taxable year, the increase in tax of such person for the taxable year attributable to the amounts to which this paragraph applies shall be 110 percent of such increase (computed without regard to this subparagraph).

"(D) Subparagraph (A) (i) and (ii) of this paragraph shall not apply to any amount to which section 402(a)(2) or 403(a)(2) applies.

"(E) For special rules for computation of taxable income for taxable years to which this paragraph applies, see subsection (n)(3).

"(6) OWNER-EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'owner-employee' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(4).

"(n) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CONTRIBUTIONS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—

"(A) DISTRIBUTIONS BY EMPLOYEES' TRUST.—Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C), this subsection shall apply to amounts distributed to a distributee, in the case of an employees' trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) if, the total distributions payable to the distributee with respect to an employee are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee—

"(i) on account of the employee's death,

"(ii) after the employee has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(iii) after the employee has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(B) ANNUITY PLANS.—Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C), this paragraph shall apply to amounts paid to a payee, in the case of an annuity plan described in section 403(a), if the total amounts payable to the payee with respect to an employee are paid to the payee within one taxable year of the payee—

"(i) on account of the employee's death,

"(ii) after the employee has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(iii) after the employee has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(C) LIMITATIONS AND EXCEPTIONS.—This subsection shall apply—

"(i) only with respect to so much of any distribution or payment to which (without regard to this subparagraph) subparagraph (A) or (B) applies as is attributable to contributions made by or for a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and

"(ii) if the recipient is the individual by or for whom such contributions were made, only if contributions which were allowed as a deduction under section 404 have been made by or for such individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) for 5 or more taxable years prior to the taxable year in which the total distributions payable or total amounts payable, as the case may be, are paid.

This subsection shall not apply to amounts described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) of subsection (m)(5) (but, in the case of amounts described in clause (ii) of such subparagraph, only to the extent that subsection (m)(5) applies to such amounts).

"(2) LIMITATION OF TAX.—In any case to which this subsection applies, the tax attributable to the amounts to which this subsection applies for the taxable year in which such amounts are received shall not be greater than 5 times the increase in tax which would result from the inclusion in gross income of the recipient of 20 percent of so much of the amount so received as is includible in gross income.

"(3) DETERMINATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—Notwithstanding section 63 (relating to definition of taxable income), for purposes only of computing the tax under this chapter attributable to amounts to which this subsection or subsection (m)(5) applies and which are includible in gross income, the taxable income of the recipient for the taxable year of receipt (and for any other taxable year) involved in the computation under subsection (m)(5) shall be treated as being not less than the amount by which—

"(A) the aggregate of such amounts so includible in gross income, exceeds

"(B) the amount of the deductions allowed for such taxable year under section 151 (relating to deductions for personal exemptions).

In any case in which the preceding sentence results in an increase in taxable income for any taxable year, the resulting increase in the taxes imposed by section 1 or 3 for such taxable year shall not be reduced by any credit under part IV of subchapter A (other than section 31 thereof) which, but for this sentence, would be allowable."

(c) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES' TRUSTS DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 402(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to capital gains treatment for certain distributions) is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new sentence: "This paragraph shall not apply to distributions paid to any distributee to the extent such distributions are attributable to contributions made by or for an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(d) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES' ANNUITY PAYMENTS.—Section 403(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to taxability of a beneficiary under a qualified annuity plan) is amended—

(1) by striking out in paragraph (2)(A)(i) "which meets the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in paragraph (1)";

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following new sentence: "This subparagraph shall not apply to amounts paid to any payee to the extent such amounts are attributable to contributions made by or for an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'employee' includes an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual is the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5)."

SEC. 5. PLANS FOR PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES BONDS.

(a) QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deferred compensation, etc.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 405. QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.

"(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATIONS.—A plan of an employer for the purchase for and distribution to his employees or their beneficiaries of United States bonds described in subsection (b) shall constitute a qualified bond purchase plan under this section if—

"(1) the plan meets the requirements of section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, if applicable, the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1), (6)(B), and (8)); and

"(2) contributions under the plan are used solely to purchase for employees or their beneficiaries United States bonds described in subsection (b).

"(b) BONDS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—

"(1) CHARACTERISTICS OF BONDS.—This section shall apply only to a bond issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, which by its terms, or by regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such Act—

"(A) provides for payment of interest, or investment yield, only upon redemption;

"(B) may be purchased only in the name of an individual;

"(C) ceases to bear interest, or provide investment yield, not later than 5 years after the death of the individual in whose name it is purchased;

"(D) may be redeemed before the death of the individual in whose name it is purchased only if such individual—

"(i) has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(ii) has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)); and

"(E) is nontransferable.

"(2) MUST BE PURCHASED IN NAME OF EMPLOYEE.—This section shall apply to a bond described in paragraph (1) only if it is purchased in the name of the employee.

"(c) DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Contributions paid by an employer to or under a qualified bond purchase plan shall be deductible in an amount determined under section 404(a) in the same manner and to the same extent as if such contributions were made to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a).

"(d) TAXABILITY OF BENEFICIARY OF QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLAN.—

"(1) GROSS INCOME NOT TO INCLUDE BONDS AT TIME OF DISTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this chapter, in the case of a distributee of a bond described in subsection (b) under a qualified bond purchase plan, or from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), gross income does not include any amount attributable to the receipt of such bond. Upon redemption of such bond, the proceeds shall be subject to taxation under this chapter, but the provisions of section 72 (relating to annuities, etc.) and section 1232 (relating to bonds and other evidences of indebtedness) shall not apply.

"(2) BASIS.—The basis of any bond received by a distributee under a qualified bond purchase plan—

"(A) if such bond is distributed to an employee, or with respect to an employee, who at the time of purchase of the bond, was not a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), shall be the amount of the contributions by the employee which were used to purchase the bond, and

"(B) if such bond is distributed to an individual, or with respect to an individual, who, at the time of purchase of the bond, was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), shall be the amount of the contributions used to purchase the bond which were made by or for such individual and were not allowed as a deduction under subsection (c).

The basis of any bond described in subsection (b) received by a distributee from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(e) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT NOT TO APPLY TO BONDS DISTRIBUTED BY TRUSTS.—Section 402(a)(2) shall not apply to any bond described in subsection (b) distributed to any distributee and, for purposes of applying such section, any such bond distributed to any distributee and any such bond to the credit of any employee shall not be taken into account.

"(f) EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' includes an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual shall be the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5).

"(g) PROOF OF PURCHASE.—At the time of purchase of any bond to which this section applies, proof of such purchase shall be furnished in such form as will enable the purchaser, and the employee in whose name such bond is purchased, to comply with the provisions of this section.

"(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 405. Qualified bond purchase plans."

SEC. 6. PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.

Section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to prohibited transactions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) TRUSTS BENEFITING CERTAIN OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.—In the case of a trust described in section 401(a) which is part of a plan providing contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees (as defined in section 401(c)(4)) who control (within the meaning of section 401(d)(9)(B)), the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, the term 'prohibited transaction' also means any transaction in which such trust, directly or indirectly—

"(A) lends any part of the corpus or income of the trust to;

"(B) pays any compensation for personal services rendered to the trust to;

"(C) makes any part of its services available on a preferential basis to; or

"(D) acquires for the trust any property from, or sells any property to;

any person described in subsection (c) or to any such owner-employee, a member of the family (as defined in section 367(c)(4)) of any such owner-employee, or a corporation controlled by any such owner-employee through the ownership, directly or indirectly, of 50 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote or 50 percent or more of the total value of shares of all classes of stock of the corporation.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR LOANS.—For purposes of the application of paragraph (1)(A), the following rules shall apply with respect to a loan made before the date of the enactment of this subsection which would be a prohibited transaction if made in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961:

"(A) If any part of the loan is repayable prior to December 31, 1964, the renewal of such part of the loan for a period not extending beyond December 31, 1964, on the same terms, shall not be considered a prohibited transaction.

"(B) If the loan is repayable on demand, the continuation of the loan beyond December 31, 1964, shall be considered a prohibited transaction."

SEC. 7. OTHER SPECIAL RULES, TECHNICAL CHANGES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT.—Section 37(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of retirement income) is amended—

(1) by striking out subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) pensions and annuities (including, in the case of an individual who is, or has been, a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), distributions by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a),"; and

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "and", and by adding after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) bonds described in section 405(b)(1) which are received under a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a) or in a distribution from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or".

(b) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) PENSION, PROFIT-SHARING, ANNUITY, AND BOND PURCHASE PLANS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), the deductions allowed by section 404 and section 405(c) to the extent attributable to contributions made by or for such individual."

(c) DEATH BENEFITS.—Section 101(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1054 (relating to employees' death benefits) is amended—

(1) by striking out clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(ii) under an annuity contract under a plan described in section 403(a), or"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL NOT CONSIDERED AN EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall not be treated as an employee in the case of—

"(A) a pension or profit-sharing trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or

"(B) an annuity contract under a plan described in section 403(a).

if such individual was included at any time under the plan as a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(d) AMOUNTS RECEIVED THROUGH ACCIDENT OR HEALTH INSURANCE.—Section 104(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to compensation for injuries or sickness) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"For purposes of paragraph (3), in the case of an individual who is, or has been, a self-

employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), contributions made by or for such individual while he was such an individual to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or under a plan described in section 403(a), shall, to the extent attributable to contributions allowed as deductions under section 404, be treated as contributions by the employer which were not includible in the gross income of the employee."

(e) AMOUNTS RECEIVED UNDER ACCIDENT AND HEALTH PLANS.—Section 105 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amounts received under accident and health plans) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL NOT CONSIDERED AS EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' does not include an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(f) NET OPERATING LOSS DEDUCTION.—Section 172(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to nonbusiness deductions of taxpayers other than corporations) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) any deduction allowed under section 404 or section 405(c) to the extent attributable to contributions which are made on behalf of an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) shall not be treated as attributable to the trade or business of such individual."

(g) CERTAIN LIFE INSURANCE RESERVES.—Section 805(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to pension plan reserves) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subparagraph (B) "meeting the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6) or" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in section 403(a), or plans meeting"; and

(2) by striking out "section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)," in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, in the case of a plan described in section 404(a)(9), which meets the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1), (3), and (4)),"; and

(h) UNINCORPORATED BUSINESS ELECTING TO BE TAXED AS CORPORATIONS.—Section 1361(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) LIMITATION.—For purposes of sections 401(a) (relating to employees pension trusts, etc.) and 405 (relating to qualified bond purchase plans), a partner or proprietor of an unincorporated business enterprise as to which an election has been made under subsection (a) shall not be considered an employee other than as a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(i) ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 2039 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption from the gross estate of annuities under certain trusts and plans) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (c)(2) "met the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting "was a plan described in section 403(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subsection, contributions or payments on behalf of the decedent while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) made under a trust or plan described in paragraph (1) or (2) shall be considered to be contributions or payments made by the decedent."

(j) GIFT TAX EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 2517 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exclusion from gift tax in case of certain annuities under qualified plans) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (a)(2) "met the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "was a plan described in section 403(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subsection, payments or contributions on behalf of an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) made under a trust or plan described in subsection (a)(1) or (2) shall be considered to be payments or contributions made by the employee."

(k) FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT.—Section 3306(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) under or to an annuity plan which, at the time of such payment, is a plan described in section 403(a), or

"(C) under or to a bond purchase plan which, at the time of such payment, is a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a);".

(l) WITHHOLDING OF INCOME TAX.—Section 3401(a)(12) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) under or to an annuity plan, which, at the time of such payment is a plan described in section 403(a); or

"(C) under or to a bond purchase plan which, at the time of such payment is a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a)."

(m) INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to information concerning transactions with other persons) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6047. INFORMATION RELATING TO CERTAIN TRUSTS AND ANNUITY AND BOND PURCHASE PLANS.

"(a) TRUSTEES AND INSURANCE COMPANIES.—The trustee of a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) to which contributions have been paid under a plan by or for any owner-employee (as defined in section 401(c)(4)), and each insurance company which is the issuer of a contract purchased by such a trust, or purchased under a plan described in section 403(a), contributions for which have been paid by or for any owner-employee, shall file such returns (in such form and at such times), keep such records, make such identification of contracts and funds (and accounts within such funds), and supply such information, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(b) OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Every individual by or for whom contributions have been paid as an owner-employee (as defined in section 401(c)(4))—

"(1) to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or

"(2) to an insurance company under a plan described in section 403(a),

shall furnish the trustee or insurance company, as the case may be, such information at such times and in such form and manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by forms or regulations.

"(c) EMPLOYEES UNDER QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Every individual in whose name a bond described in section 405(b)(1) is purchased by his employer under a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a), or by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), shall furnish—

"(1) to his employer or to such trust, and

"(2) to the Secretary (or to such person as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe),

such information as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(d) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For criminal penalty for furnishing fraudulent information, see section 7207."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subpart B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6047. Information relating to certain trusts and annuity and bond plans."

(3) PENALTY.—Section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any person required pursuant to section 6047(b) to furnish any information to any trust, any insurance company, his employer, or the Secretary who willfully furnishes any information known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any material matter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

REIMBURSEMENT OF THE NEW YORK CITY POLICE FORCE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred by the police force of the city of New York during the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. This bill is introduced on behalf of myself and my senior colleague, Senator JAVITS.

For several months now I have been actively interested in the efforts of the city of New York, and particularly of Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy, to have the Federal Government partially cover the tremendous costs involved in protecting Premier Khrushchev, Fidel Castro, and the several other Soviet puppet dictators, who were in New York last fall for the convening of the 15th annual United Nations General Assembly session.

President Eisenhower, the Budget Bureau, and the State Department have clearly recognized the justification for this request. Last Friday the President sent a message to the Congress calling for an authorization of $1,500,000 for this purpose.

I am delighted that the President has acted favorably on this matter. However, I personally do not feel that $1,500,000 is adequate remuneration for the significant services rendered by the police force and taxpayers of the city of New York. The bill which Senator

JAVITS and I introduce today calls for the payment of $2.936 million, which is the full cost, at straight-time rates, for the hours of the New York City policemen who worked so long and hard, under trying circumstances, to protect the visiting Communist dictators. This is approximately one-half of the full cost to the city. In a letter which I received on October 31 from Police Commissioner Kennedy, he states that the total cost to the city, at time and one-half rates, and including the costs of services and equipment, was $6,364,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the above-referred-to letter appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE POLICE COMMISSIONER,
CITY OF NEW YORK,
October 31, 1960.

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: First, I want to repeat my thanks for your commendations of the police department during the recent emergency period of the United Nations General Assembly.

Knowing of your interest in exploring methods of compensating the city for the extraordinary police expenses incurred, I am taking the liberty of summarizing for your information a report completed today on the costs of overtime compensation and all other extra services and equipment. As you know, this department bore the primary responsibility for providing security in the United Nations area itself, protecting the visiting foreign representatives at their residences and in their travels throughout the city, and in controlling the crowds, demonstrations and other incidents arising from strong antagonisms towards some of the delegates attending the session.

The report indicates a total cost to the city as follows: $6,364,000, if overtime compensation is computed on the basis of time-and-a-half rates; $4,896,000, if overtime compensation is computed on the basis of regular salary rates.

These total sums consists of two main categories:

First, the amount attributable to compensation for overtime: $4,404,000 at time-and-a-half rates, or $2,936,000 at regular rates.

Second, the cost of equipment and personnel transferred, in the main, from regular police duties to special details relating directly to the United Nations General Assembly, and the cost of personnel whose normal vacations were suspended until after the emergency period, amounting in the aggregate to $1,960,000.

With respect to the first category, it should be pointed out that during the emergency special duty hours were in effect, requiring all members of the force to perform duties greatly in excess of the normal 42-hour week.

With regard to the second main category of $1,960,000, only a small portion of these costs were "extra" costs in the sense that they would not have been otherwise incurred; however, the equipment and personnel represented by these costs were diverted from their standard function of police protection throughout the city to the special function of protecting the United Nations and the individual security risks who were attending the General Assembly.

To recapitulate:

		At time-and-a-half rates	At regular rates
Overtime		$4,404,000	$2,936,000
Services and equipment:			
Cost of equipment	$91,000		
Cost of personnel diverted from regular duties	1,204,000		
Cost of suspended vacations	665,000		
		1,960,000	1,960,000
Total cost		6,364,000	4,896,000

I should like to draw your particular attention to the funds necessary to provide compensation for overtime hours of duty. Under considerations both of law and of good conscience, it is imperative that the members of the force be compensated for their overtime duty by financial means. In fairness to the people of the city it would not be proper to grant compensation by means of days off. The magnitude of the necessary vacations would strip the city of necessary police protection for months to come, thus seriously jeopardizing the safety of the community.

Please be assured that I deeply appreciate your interest in securing reimbursement for the city and compensation for the individual members of the force for their impressive services on an overtime schedule.

If any further information is desired, I of course am ready to provide it at any time.

Faithfully yours,
Steve,
STEPHEN P. KENNEDY,
Police Commissioner.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. William B. Macomber, Assistant Secretary of the State Department, dated October 27 and indicating the position of the Department on this matter, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 26, 1960.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I wish to refer to your inquiry concerning the cost to the city of New York of providing police protection to the members of delegations to the United Nations at the outset of the present session of the General Assembly.

The attendance at the 15th General Assembly of so many world leaders was unprecedented in the history of the United Nations. The Department recognizes that an additional financial burden was placed upon Commissioner Kennedy's department as a result of the task created by their presence in New York City. The Department recognizes also, and appreciates, the outstanding service rendered the Government and the people of the United States by Commissioner Kennedy and the members of the New York City Police Department.

At the present time, various areas within the Department are exploring ways and means of assisting the city of New York in defraying the additional cost of police services occasioned by the current session of the General Assembly. I am quite certain that means can be found to meet this Government's responsibilities in this unforeseen and unparalleled situation.

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

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I very much hope that the appropriate committees of both the Senate and the House will act favorably on this bill. Our bill calls for the exact same amount of reimbursement to the city of New York that has been requested by Mayor Wagner. I think this is a fair and reasonable payment to the city under the circumstances here involved.

I recognize that a certain part of the responsibility for protecting delegates and visitors to the United Nations, while in the city of New York, rests with the city. The city wanted the United Nations located at Lake Success and derives great benefit from its being there. However, the extraordinary and unprecedented circumstances of last fall go far beyond the responsibility of the city. In part, this responsibility must be borne by our Nation as a whole, acting in its capacity as leader of the free world and host to the United Nations.

Although these funds are badly needed by the city of New York, no amount of money in the world could repay the policemen of the city of New York for the fine way in which they carried out their duties in connection with the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations. They certainly lived up to their reputation as New York's finest. They were away from their homes and families all hours of the day and night, rain or shine. They did an excellent job in averting the unpleasant incidents which were anticipated in response to the appearance of so many unpopular world figures in the great city of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill which we introduce at this time and a copy of a brief memo on the legislative justification for such a bill be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 475) to authorize the appropriation of $2,936,000 as an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses incurred during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,936,000 for payment to the city of New York. The said appropriation shall be considered an ex gratia payment to assist the city of New York to defray the extraordinary and unprecedented expenses which the city incurred in affording protection to visiting chiefs of state and heads of government

during the Fifteenth General Assembly of the United Nations.

The memo presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

Subject: Reimbursement for expenses of New York City Police Department in re the recent U.N. session.

While there is no specific precedent to cover the unique situation brought about by the leaders of the Communist world attending en masse the recent U.N. session, there is no question that a definite moral obligation rests upon the Federal Government to reimburse the city of New York for the extraordinary expenses incurred by its police department in providing protection for these leaders.

The agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the headquarters of the United Nations, by section 16, imposes an obligation upon "appropriate American authorities" to provide police protection for the United Nations Headquarters District and its vicinity, and by section 25 provides that where such an obligation is imposed the Government of the United States shall have the ultimate responsibility for its fulfillment.

The New York City Police Department, "an appropriate American authority," under the terms of the foregoing agreement (see *People* v. *Carcel*, 1956, 150 N.Y.S. 2d 436) having performed for the benefit of the American people as a whole and with commendable efficiency an ultimate obligation of the United States to protect the persons of these Communist leaders and to prevent any untoward incident connected with them that might mar our international relations, it is inherently just and fair that the Federal Government should reimburse the city for the extraordinary expenses so incurred.

That these expenses are extraordinary and so far in excess of expenses that might reasonably be considered rightful obligations of the city of New York incurred in connection with the visits of foreign dignitaries is evidenced by the letter of Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber to me, in which he states: "I am quite certain that means can be found to meet this Government's responsibilities in this unforeseen and unparalleled situation."

ESTABLISHMENT OF POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. KUCHEL], I introduce a bill for establishment of a national seashore park on Point Reyes Peninsula, Marin County, Calif., as a part of the national park system.

The bill is the result of years of study by the National Park Service and by interested parties in California, including the able Congressman from the area, Representative CLEM MILLER, as well as Senator KUCHEL and myself. Representative MILLER is introducing identical legislation in the House.

Each of us has examined the proposals put forth by the National Park Service, and has discussed them with many local officials as well as authorities on park needs and legislation. The proposed Point Reyes National Seashore has been, to date, the subject of three favorable National Park Service studies and reports. Today's bill substantially embodies the proposal first recommended by the Park Service last April, at a public hearing conducted in Marin County by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Last August, this proposal was favorably recommended to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

We feel that this legislation is justified only on the bases of a strong showing that this is the most effective means of achieving highest and best use of the peninsula for present and future generations, that the area is of national significance, and that the proposal is consistent with advancement of local community and economic interests.

I believe that this bill, individually designed for this area, provides a workable framework for equitable harmonizing of the various National, State, county, local, and private interests involved in a project of this nature and magnitude.

We have tried to set this proposal against the perspective of history, the needs of the future, and the need to protect the interests of the local residents. Seashores suitable for family recreational uses and near large centers of population are a very limited part of our heritage today. We have seen what has happened in many of our Atlantic and Great Lakes States where developments of many kinds are often crowded together so as to destroy or bar public access to the very natural attractions which most people go to the seashore to enjoy.

We were impressed with the Park Service's 1957 preliminary report which described an immediate recreation potential of the first magnitude at Point Reyes:

> This relatively undeveloped region, from its 45 miles of seashore to forest-covered Inverness Ridge, a scant two miles away, provides a combination of scenic, recreation and biologic interests which can be found nowhere else in this country as near a large center of population. * * * The opportunity as a matter of good government for the people to preserve and enjoy this superlative seashore is unusual, if not unique.

Following this preliminary appraisal, we requested that funds be provided by the last Congress for a more detailed National Park Service land-use survey and economic feasibility study. This report is now published—"Proposed Point Reyes National Seashore Land Use Survey," Department of the Interior, 1960. The report confirms and, we believe, justifies the Park Service's belief that the area should be included within the national park system.

The natural character of Point Reyes Peninsula is compounded of many elements: ocean, beach, cliff, off-shore rock, bayshore, marsh, pond, dunes, open space, and forest, as well as unique geological features and plant and animal life, including marine, waterfowl, and upland game. To these natural features is added the additional ingredient of historical interest as the probable location of the first English landing—by Sir Francis Drake, in 1579—in what is now the United States.

The peninsula is located 30 to 35 miles north of San Francisco, the center of one of the fastest growing metropolitan regions in the fastest growing part of the Nation. A number of population studies tell us that the 13-county San Francisco Bay region alone, estimated to have a population of nearly 4½ million in 1959, is expected to grow to at least 7.2 million by 1980, and to nearly 11.7 million by the year 2000. In addition, more than 2½ million out-of-State tourists are expected to visit the bay region annually by 1980. Several already programed road construction improvements would speed access to the proposed park area.

The National Park Service estimates that the proposed park would attract about 2,350,000 days of visitor use annually by 1980. This would be more than visited Yosemite, Kings Canyon, Sequoia, and Lassen National Parks, combined, 5 years ago.

Under the development plan recommended by the Park Service, recreational activities would include a wider range than is permitted in national parks. These would include hiking, nature study, camping, golf, boating, sailing, fishing, riding, and cycling. Existing fishery operations could be expanded to furnish charter-boat service for deep-sea sport fishing. The southern half of the peninsula—considered the most scenic part—would become accessible to the public for the first time in more than a century.

Throughout our consideration of this proposal we have tried to keep at heart the sentiments of the present residents of the peninsula. It is essential that their legitimate interests be met. While the bill specifies exact proposed boundaries, final determination will of course be worked out by the Congress following the hearings on this legislation by the appropriate committees. The bill includes provisions which seem to us to afford reasonable protections to the residents and to the ranchers within the proposed ranching area.

In this connection, several features of the bill are worth special mention:

First. Of the total area of not more than 53,000 acres, not less than 20,000 would be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as a ranching area or pastoral zone in which private dairy and beef cattle ranching would continue under lease agreements.

Second. Owners of improved residential property, on which construction was begun before September 1, 1959, could, as a condition of sale to the Government, retain the right of use and occupancy for life, or for a term ending at the death of his spouse, or until his last surviving child reaches the age of 30, whichever is the latest.

Third. The Secretary could acquire property in the area by exchange of any federally owned property under his jurisdiction within California and adjacent States.

Fourth. The proposed boundaries leave expansion areas for residential and commercial growth of the established communities of Inverness and Bolinas.

The preliminary Park Service proposal and the Point Reyes bill introduced in the last Congress in 1959 provided for a smaller maximum acreage than the 53,000 provided for in this bill. Since 1959 the Park Service has completed its land-use plan and final report on the proposal. The report recommends that

the park should encompass approximately 53,000 acres. Virtually all the difference in acreage between the proposal embodied in today's bill and that of the earlier bill is represented by the proposed ranching area or pastoral zone, as distinguished from the public use zone.

In order to provide adequate facilities for the public, so as to permit reasonable use and enjoyment of the area, and to permit proper administration of it, the Park Service has had to consider the need for, and location of, campgrounds, picnic areas, roads, trails, and other developments. While certain ranch and other open lands not required for actual development purposes could continue in their present uses, it is considered necessary to have control over them.

We fully appreciate the firm desire of many owners to maintain fee title to their lands and their intentions to continue ranching. However, there is no assurance that they might not change their minds at a later date, or that increasing land values and taxes might not make it economically impossible to continue these operations. Without this control we might find ourselves with subdivisions, a manufacturing center, or other incompatible development in the middle of the park's beautiful natural setting. Such a situation would seriously impair public use and enjoyment of the area. The Park Service report states that about half of the existing dairy and beef cattle lands on the peninsula would continue operation under lease agreements covering lands within the proposed ranching zone.

The Park Service also recommends that the commercial fisheries at Point Reyes, the oyster beds and oyster cannery on Drakes Estero, and the two transpacific radio receiving stations continue in operation.

We are pleased to note that the economic survey made last year by the National Park Service, in cooperation with the University of California economists and other authorities—incorporated in "Proposed Point Reyes Seashore Land Use Survey," 1960—makes these points:

First. Removal of lands from the tax rolls in the event of national seashore establishment would not necessarily result in increased tax burdens to other property owners in Marin County;

Second. Any possible loss in tax revenues unquestionably would be more than compensated for in a short time by the various taxes paid by new and expanded facilities and services outside the proposed park area that would be essential to serve the visitors. A national seashore would serve for Marin County in the same role as industrial property, in that it would attract taxable commerce and facilities to serve visitors. Such expansion would add to the property, sales, gasoline, and other tax bases of the county, which has few industrial properties in proportion to residential properties, and thereby has a property-tax burden on households which is greater than for any other San Francisco Bay area county.

Third. The proximity of a national seashore park would help attract new commercial enterprises to the region, because they would find that the increased recreation advantages of Marin County would make it easier to hold skilled labor and professional forces, especially of the substantial types Marin County is trying to attract.

In summary, we strongly believe it is in the national interest to capitalize now on the few remaining clear opportunities to save our vanishing shoreline for public recreational use, particularly the very few still unspoiled and outstanding shoreline areas near large concentrations of population. By any standard, it seems to us and to most of the citizens and public leaders from whom we have heard that Point Reyes Peninsula presents such a clear opportunity.

The National Park Service first recommended, in 1935, consideration of this peninsula for a 53,000-acre national seashore recreation area. The author of the 1935 report considered it almost a miracle that this choice area, but 30 miles from the San Francisco metropolitan population of over a million persons, should still be virtually unknown. Today this is no longer the case. The peninsula is already the object of speculative interest on the part of a number of potential subdividers.

Time is of the essence. The public decision on the future of this beautiful island in time cannot be postponed much longer; the peninsula soon will be developed in one way or another.

Those who prevented purchase of Point Reyes and certain other proposed shoreline recreation areas in 1936 only succeeded in leaving the Nation diminished opportunity to accept a lesser program at an enormously increased cost.

It is our hope that this Congress will authorize establishment of this and other national seashores this year, so that we may begin to meet the public need in this field and so be better prepared for the future.

If we act sensibly and foresightedly now, while the opportunity remains, we shall have preserved for America and for California and for the people of Marin County a priceless heritage to be enjoyed many times over, not only by our generation, but also by those which follow.

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

The bill (S. 476) to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED FIRST SECRETARY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for a First Secretary of the Government.

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

The bill (S. 477) to provide for a First Secretary of the Government and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that in his budget message President Eisenhower, for whom we have the deepest affection and respect, a great President who served our country and the whole free world so nobly during the past 8 years, said:

> I have given much personal study to the assistance the President needs in meeting the multitude of demands placed upon him in conducting and correlating all aspects of foreign, political, economic, social and military affairs. I have reached the conclusion that serious attention should be given to providing in the President's office an official ranking higher than Cabinet members, possibly with the title of First Secretary of the Government, to assist the President in consulting with the departments on the formulation of national security objectives, in coordinating international programs, and in representing the President at meetings with foreign officials above the rank of foreign minister and below the rank of head of state.

The subject matter of these recommendations was considered during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Governmental Policy Machinery of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the honor to be a member; and also follows the suggestion sponsored before us in those hearings by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York and other distinguished Americans.

Mr. President, the primary functions of the First Secretary, who would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, would include the coordination of national security and international affairs required by the cold war. The First Secretary would receive a salary of $35,000 annually—equivalent to the amount received by the Vice President and Justices of the Supreme Court—and would stand after the President pro tempore of the Senate in line of succession to the Presidency.

The bill I am introducing today is also a direct implementation of that part of the Republican platform plank on Government administration.

The Republican Convention unanimously endorsed the proposal that two top positions should be established to assist the President in, first, the entire field of national security and international affairs; and second, governmental planning and management, particularly in domestic affairs. The post of First Secretary would carry out the first of those two suggestions. In addition, my bill would implement the proposal included in the Nixon-Rockefeller agreement of July 23, 1960, for the creation of a post to assist the President in the whole area of national security and international affairs.

The First Secretary of the Government would be the No. 1 aid to the President and be responsible to him for the effective coordination of U.S. activities in the cold war.

Prompt consideration of this plan should receive top priority by the Congress and the new administration.

The months of intensive hearings by the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery of which I am a member included much testimony by men of both parties who served in the highest policy-making appointive posts and under different Presidents. Many stressed in the

most persuasive terms the urgent need for a super-Cabinet official who can help direct and coordinate concerning national security and international affairs policy once it has been set by the President.

Under the terms of my bill, the First Secretary would be a member of the National Security Council and could preside at these meetings should the President so direct. His staff could include four employees each eligible to receive a maximum of $19,000 per annum, and two additional officers appointed by the President to assist the First Secretary. On a protocol basis a First Secretary also could relieve the President of at least some of his appearances, ranking as he would with other prime ministers.

Although we may be aware of the enormous dangers and the tremendous challenges which confront us on almost every front, foreign and domestic, few of us can conceive of the extreme pressures or the awesome complexity of the problems which daily come to the desk of the President. As Governor Rockefeller pointed out in his testimony before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, the President must play many roles. He is Chief of State, Chief Executive, Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, constitutionally responsible for conducting foreign policy, and head of his political party. More than 50 departments and agencies of Government report directly to the President and those involved in the national security field have a total annual budget of almost $50 billion. This, in turn, has led to the creation of scores of interdepartmental and interagency committees—160 exist in the field of international affairs alone. In addition, there are 18 independent agencies, many more boards and commissions—4 Government agencies and 6 international financial organizations are concerned with foreign economic aid.

My bill provides that the First Secretary may serve as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems. In a sense, this chairmanship is a high command post in U.S. foreign economic policy for the Council is responsible for U.S. activities in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Monetary Fund.

Decisionmaking as President Eisenhower has properly emphasized, is properly a function of the Presidency. However, the outstanding contributions which are made regularly by Cabinet officers, the Vice President, and other top level advisers in the efficient and imaginative conduct of Government cannot be discounted. The creation of the post of First Secretary is meant to contribute to this process by vesting the coordinating responsibility for activities related to our very survival in an official able to carry multidepartmental authority without encroaching on what must be recognized as the final authority and the constitutional powers of the President.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I are today introducing a civil rights package of seven bills in order to implement the major fields of civil rights legislation contained in the 1960 platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties. I emphasize that these measures are bipartisan sponsored. In each case the sponsors differed slightly in respect to different bills. In some I am the principal sponsor; in others the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is, together with other of our colleagues.

The seven bills in the package would—

First. Authorize the Attorney General to bring key civil actions for the protection of civil rights, and to permit him to intervene in similar cases brought by private individuals—this proposal is similar to the part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 which was stricken in the Senate. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Second. Provide technical and financial assistance to State and local school districts seeking to desegregate. Sponsored by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, SCOTT and SMITH of Maine.

Third. Establish a statutory Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, similar to proposals repeatedly recommended by President Eisenhower to the Congress. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, HART, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Fourth. Extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission—due to expire in September 1951—for an indefinite period. Sponsored by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, HART, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, MOSS, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Fifth. Establish as sufficient proof of literacy for voting purposes the completion of the sixth grade in school, thus eliminating the use of such tests to deny the right to vote on racial and similar grounds. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, COOPER, DOUGLAS, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, MOSS, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Sixth. Make unlawful deprivations of rights under the 14th amendment, such as the right to a fair trial. Sponsored by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

Seventh. Eliminate by statute the poll tax or any other property qualifications as a legal requirement for voters. Sponsored by Senators JAVITS, KEATING, ALLOTT, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, MOSS, SCOTT, and SMITH of Maine.

I send those bills to the desk for appropriate reference.

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

The bills referred to by Mr. JAVITS were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 478. A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 479. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 480. A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 481. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 482. A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HART, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 483. A bill to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. FONG, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine):

S. 484. A bill to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts attempting to desegregate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr President, I have a brief statement prepared by Senator KEATING and myself.

The absence of civil rights from the reported list of legislation labeled top priority by the new Democratic administration is a glaring omission. The new recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission in its report "Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education," plus the dramatic events involving school desegregation in New Orleans underline emphatically the need for additional civil rights laws. The

opponents of the Supreme Court's desegregation decision will not be convinced that the country demands compliance with the law unless Congress shows its determination to act. The announced intention of the new administration to exercise Executive action to end discriminatory practices in such areas as education, housing, employment and voting is fine as far as it goes but is not adequate to the job and will not remedy the legislative gaps which exist.

Finally I wish to say for myself that I think there is no escaping this responsibility by President-elect Kennedy. Whatever may be said about his alleged deferral of interference in the rules fight with respect to the filibuster, the same cannot be said about these measures, and I deeply feel that civil rights in this country will not be adequately enforced if only the Executive acts, any more than they were adequately enforced when only the Supreme Court acted.

We must have Congress involved, and that is the fundamental objective of my colleague, myself and the colleagues who have joined with us on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted to join in sponsoring and cosponsoring these civil rights measures with my colleague from New York and other Senators.

These bills outline a minimum program for legislative action in this field. I must candidly say that in some respects they are only a pale reflection of the promises made to the American people by both parties during the campaign. However, last Wednesday's action on attempts to amend rule XXII suggested the wisdom of a cautious approach to this subject, and these proposals have been shaped accordingly.

I would be delighted to discover that sentiment on this issue has been misjudged. I have no doubt that much more could reasonably be done to protect civil rights than is proposed in these bills. Indeed, I now have under study a number of proposals which may be needed to promote a fuller realization of all the principles of our Constitution.

This is a great and wonderful land, and every American can take immense pride in the achievements of our Nation. But only a blind man could fail to see that much remains to be done to remove the last vestige of lawless and wasteful discrimination from the American scene. We have made steady progress in the past, but overwhelming problems still confront us in our goal of equal protection for all Americans.

These bills, if enacted, would take us a step closer to these goals, but they are no panacea.

Of all the bills, the most important at this time is the bill to continue the Civil Rights Commission on an indefinite basis. This outstanding Commission will expire this year unless we act. The present bill is drawn to avoid the necessity and hazards of a biennial battle for its preservation. Congress could still terminate the Commission any time it desired, but in the interim, it could carry on its important work without facing periodic harassment and peril. The Commission, made up of dedicated men from all sections of the country, has given us a wealth of information and insight into this field. It would be foolish to risk its expiration before it has completed the many tasks which have been barely undertaken.

Another of our bills would abolish any use of literacy tests as a device for discriminating against qualified citizens attempting to exercise the right to vote. This is based on the extensive investigations of this subject by the Civil Rights Commission, which disclosed that individually administered literacy tests were being misused by election officials in some areas on a large scale to unfairly disenfranchise Negro voters.

I do not argue with the requirement of literacy for voting—but the present unscrupulous resort to such tests as a pretext for racial discrimination compels this kind of protective legislation. The bill would simply provide that anyone who has completed the sixth primary grade in an accredited school is not incompetent shall not be subjected to a phony literacy examination.

We are also proposing the elimination of poll taxes or other property taxes as a qualification for voting. The payment of a fee for the privilege of voting is abhorrent to our democratic spirit and I know that there is overwhelming sentiment for abolition of any such requirements. I hope that we will not permit a dispute over whether this should be done by statute or constitutional amendment prevent our taking action to eliminate poll taxes by one method or another.

Another bill would give the Attorney General authority to institute civil injunctive suits under certain conditions in all cases involving denial of equal protection of the law and not just voting cases. The language of this title is modeled after part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as it was recommended by the administration and passed by the House of Representatives. I believe that events since then have demonstrated the error which the Senate made in striking part III from that legislation. The absence of such authority has proven to be a severe handicap in school cases and has placed an intolerable burden on poor private citizens forced to finance and prosecute their own cases. It is certainly high time we remedied this situation.

Two of our bills contain the provisions of the 1959 Civil Rights Act proposed by President Eisenhower which were deleted during Senate consideration of the measure. They relate respectively to technical and financial assistance to State and local school districts attempting to desegregate their schools and to the grant of statutory authority to the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts.

One important change in the technical assistance bill would permit grants directly to local school agencies in States which have not made any efforts to comply with the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. These proposals were the subject of extensive hearings and debate during the last session of Congress, and I will, therefore, not dwell upon them at this time except to stress their continued importance.

Our final bill would be designed to make fully effective the guarantees of due process under the 14th amendment to the Constitution. The Supreme Court in *U.S.* v. *Williams* (341 U.S. 70 (1951)), interpreted the present civil rights statutes, title 18, United States Code, sections 241 and 242, as being inapplicable to 14th amendment rights. This bill would overcome the impact of that decision, and give added meaning to the hallowed concept of due process expressed in the Constitution.

Mr. President, last Wednesday's action—deferring, if not defeating, a change in Senate rule XXII—in my opinion will make it virtually impossible to consider these proposals in a normal, deliberative manner. The threat of a filibuster automatically arises whenever legislation is proposed in the field of civil rights—and we may as well face that fact.

That situation increases the difficulty, but it in no way diminishes the importance of action in this field. Those of us in favor of continuing the advance of human freedom will simply have to work more diligently and maybe more astutely to succeed. We are disheartened, but we are by no means vanquished.

Mr. President, these are the first civil rights bills introduced this session. I expect that there will be others and there should be because much remains to be done in this field. Let us not delude the American people into thinking that bold Executive action can solve these problems. The President cannot abolish poll taxes, or eliminate discriminatory literacy tests. He cannot extend the Civil Rights Commission or provide financial and technical assistance to the States to help them carry out the Supreme Court's desegregation decision. And he cannot direct the institution of equal protection or 14th amendment suits without legislative authority. Nor can he give the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity statutory powers. Of course, there are problems which the President can help resolve without additional legislation. But in the areas covered by these bills, nothing can substitute for the legislation which is needed. This was clearly recognized not so long ago during the 1960 conventions and campaign. I do not believe the American people are going to be misled by any strategy of delay and expediency now that the elections are over.

We intend to continue to utilize every appropriate opportunity to press for action in this field until at least a measure of the solemn promises we have made to the American people are redeemed.

Mr. President, I send to the desk bills to extend the Civil Rights Commission, to provide technical and financial assistance to the school districts attempting to desegregate, and to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the 14th amendment, and ask that they be appropriately referred.

I also ask unanimous consent that the texts of the bills and the names of the

cosponsors be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 478, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. LONG OF HAWAII, MR. MOSS, MR. SCOTT, AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to protect the right to vote in national elections by making unlawful the requirement that a poll tax be paid as a prerequisite to voting in such elections, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that the requirement that a poll tax or other tax be paid, or that any property qualification be met, as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, is not and shall not be deemed a qualification of voters or electors voting or registering to vote at primaries or other elections for said officers, within the meaning of the Constitution, but is and shall be deemed an interference with the manner of holding primaries and elections for said national officers, an abridgment of the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States, a tax on such rights and privileges, an obstruction of the operations of the Federal Government, and an impairment of the republican form of government.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other governmental authority or any subdivision thereof, or for any person, whether or not acting on behalf of any State, municipality, other governmental authority or subdivision thereof, to levy, collect, or require the payment of any poll tax or other tax or to impose a property qualification as a prerequisite for registering to vote or voting in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, elector for President or Vice President, or Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, or otherwise to interfere with or prevent any person from registering to vote or voting in any such election by reason of such person's failure or refusal to pay or assume the obligation of paying any poll tax or other such tax or meeting any property qualification. Any such levy, collection, or requirement, and any such tax or property qualification, shall be invalid and void insofar as it purports to disqualify any person otherwise qualified from voting at such primary or other election.

S. 479, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. COOPER, MR. DOUGLAS, MR. FONG, MR. HART, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. SCOTT, AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a commission to be known as the "Commisison on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts", hereinafter referred to as the Commission.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall consist of fifteen members appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the President. The Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be designated by the President.

(b) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve the Commission without additional compensation. Members of the Commission who are not officers or employees of the United States shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(c) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered to be service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall make investigations, studies, and surveys, and shall conduct such hearings, as may be necessary or appropriate in the discharge of its duties under this Act.

(b) To implement the policy of the United States Government to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of persons in the performance of contracts or subcontracts to provide the Government with goods or services, the Commission shall make recommendations to the President and to Government contracting agencies with respect to the preparation, revision, execution, and enforcement of contract provisions relating to such nondiscrimination in employment.

(c) The Government agencies contracting for goods or services to be furnished the Government shall perform such duties as may be requested of them by the President to cooperate with the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall also encourage, by the development and distribution of pertinent information and by other appropriate means, the furtherance of educational programs by employer, labor, civic, educational, religious, and other nongovernmental groups in order to eliminate discrimination in employment.

(e) The Commission is authorized to establish and maintain cooperative relationships with agencies of State and local governments, as well as with nongovernmental bodies, to assist in achieving the purposes of this section.

SEC. 4. The Commission may employ such personnel as may be required for the effective performance of its duties.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall render to the President annual reports for transmission to the Congress.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

S. 481, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. COOPER, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. SCOTT, AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

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

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

"SEC. 123. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person is being deprived of, or is about to be deprived of, the equal protection of the laws, and whenever the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, commencement of litigation by such person (1) may create the danger of injury to the person, family, or property of the complainant or of any other person with standing to bring such litigation, or of any counsel retained for purposes of such litigation, or (2) may create the danger of economic sanctions against the complainant or any other person named in (1), the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proper proceeding for relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining orders, or other order.

"(b) Whenever an action has been commended in any court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General in the name of the United States may intervene in the action with all the rights of a party thereto if he certifies that, in his judgment, the maintenance of the action may result in any of the injuries or economic sanctions set forth in subsection (a).

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

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

S. 480, INTRODUCED BY MR. JAVITS (for himself, MR. KEATING, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. COOPER, MR. DOUGLAS, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. MOSS, MR. SCOTT AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to prohibit the application of unreasonable literacy requirements with respect to the right to vote

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress, assembled, That (a) the Congress finds that the right to vote is fundamental to free, democratic government and that it continues to be the responsibility of all Federal Government to secure and protect this right against all unreasonable and arbitrary restrictions.

(b) The Congress further finds that the right to vote of many persons has been subjected to arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on account of race or color; that tests of literacy have been used extensively as a device for arbitrarily and unreasonably denying the right to vote to otherwise qualified persons on account of race or color; and that laws presently in effect are inadequate to assure that all qualified persons shall enjoy this essential right without discrimination on account of race or color.

(c) The Congress further finds that illiteracy is rapidly disappearing in the United States; that the quality of elementary education furnished by the Nation's schools is of high caliber; that persons completing six grades of education in a State-accredited school can reasonably be expected to be literate; that a literate electorate can be assured by affording the right to vote to any otherwise qualified person who has completed six grades of education; and that any test of literacy that denies the right to vote to any person who has completed six grades of education is arbitrary and unreasonable.

(d) The Congress, therefore, further finds and declares that the enactment of this Act is necessary to make effective the guarantees of the Constitution, particularly those contained in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments by eliminating or preventing arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions on the franchise which occur through the denial of the right to vote to persons with at least six grades of education and which exist in order to effectuate denials of the right to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"All citizens of the United States who are otherwise qualified by law to vote at any election by the people in any State, territory, district, county, city, parish, township, school district, municipality, or other territorial subdivision, shall be entitled and allowed to vote at all such elections, without distinction of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and without subjection to any arbitrary or unreasonable test, standard, or practice with respect to literacy; any constitution, law, custom, usage, or regulation of any State or territory, or by or under its authority, to the contrary notwithstanding. 'Arbitrary or unreasonable test, standard, or practice with respect to literacy' shall mean any requirement designed to determine literacy, comprehension, intelligence, or other test of education, knowledge, or understanding, in the case of any citizen who has not been adjudged an incompetent who has completed the sixth primary grade in a school accredited by any State or by the District of Columbia."

S. 482, INTRODUCED BY MR. KEATING (for himself, MR. JAVITS, MR. ALLOTT, MR. BUSH, MR. CASE OF NEW JERSEY, MR. FONG, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. KUCHEL, MR. LONG OF HAWAII, MR. SCOTT, AND MRS. SMITH OF MAINE)

A bill to make unlawful deprivations of rights guaranteed under the fourteenth amendment, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1509. Deprivation of rights under the 14th amendment

"Whoever willfully injures, oppresses, threatens or intimidates any person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any procedural right secured to such person by the 14th amendment to the Constitution by virtue of his custody under State authority or of criminal proceedings against such person under such authority, or on account of such person having exercised such right; or willfully hinders or prevents any person from exercising or enjoying such right; or

"Whoever willfully injures, oppresses, threatens, or intimidates any person acting by or under the authority of any State in the exercise of his duty to accord any other person due process of law as guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution; or willfully hinders or prevents any person acting by or under the authority of any State from exercising such duty—

"Shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both:

"Provided, if injury to any person results, the punishment shall be a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 10 years, or both:

"Provided further, if death to any person results, the punishment shall be imprisonment for any term of years or for life, but the court may impose the death penalty if the jury so recommends."

APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL JUVENILE COURT JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

It is with great pleasure that I can announce that joining as cosponsors of this bill are the same Senators who are presently members of your committee and who approved this measure 2 years ago when it cleared your Committee on the District of Columbia. They are my distinguished colleagues and friends, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], who was chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill 2 years ago; the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

This is not new legislation. An identical bill was approved by the Senate almost 2 years ago but it failed to clear the Congress because others apparently felt a solution required more than additional judges. Almost 3 years ago the Senate passed legislation authorizing one additional judge for the juvenile court. It likewise failed to clear the Congress.

Mr. President, I cannot be forceful enough in classifying the present situation in the judicial handling of wayward juveniles in the District of Columbia as a tragic calamity. Testimony before a Senate committee last summer showed a total of 1,667 cases were awaiting hearing, an increase of 300 cases compared to the backlog the court had 6 months before.

On January 1, 1961, the court backlog had reached more than 2,200 cases, a 14-percent increase in 3 months. That backlog today is increasing at a rate of more than 100 cases per month.

Testimony has shown that in too many cases 6 months to 1 year are required from the time a juvenile comes to the attention of law-enforcement officers until the court hears the case. Too often the youngsters are back out on the streets, with the opportunity of having further difficulties with the law, before they have even appeared before the court on their first infraction.

This is a shameful situation. It cannot, by its very nature, instill respect by our boys and girls for the law or for our court system.

I am not wedded to any concept that all the juvenile court needs is more judges. I am firmly convinced the court should have more judicial manpower. However, if a three-judge court is not the entire answer, then we must get at least some answer. It may well be that some additional relief is desirable, that the juvenile court more properly should be a direct arm of the District's general judicial system with more centralized authority, or that jurisdictional and administrative changes are desirable.

Today, with the case backlog increasing at least 100 per month, the boys and girls, the mothers and fathers, and each and every citizen of this great city are the big losers. Our youth must be saved from going down the juvenile delinquency path with all the tools at our command. The youngsters and their parents alike must be given the proper service and guidance they deserve from their Government.

Your committee desired to go into all aspects of the juvenile court problem and a staff study is presently in progress looking to this end.

One thing is certain. The juvenile court backlog has increased steadily the last 2 years. The court cannot solve the problem itself. The Congress must provide assistance, whatever form that may be.

With Washington, D.C., increasingly becoming the city the world looks to as a showcase, our juvenile court system must measure up to assist the children of today become better citizens of tomorrow.

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

The bill (S. 486) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Senators MORSE, HARTKE, BEALL, and PROUTY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia and my colleagues on that committee in the introduction of a bill to alleviate the congestion of the juvenile court calendar through authorizing the appointment of additional juvenile judges.

This measure, or one accomplishing the objective of reducing the backlog of cases in the juvenile court, ought to be enacted early in this session. Relief in this critical area is long overdue. As of September 30, 1960, according to published statistics, there were 533 juvenile cases and 1,361 adult cases awaiting judicial action. This is a court backlog of 1,894 cases. The statistics for the period October 1 through December 30, 1960, have not yet been released, but I am informed that at least another 117 juvenile and at least another 189 adult cases will be added to the existing arrears, when the December 30, 1960, report is published. The addition of at least 306 cases in a 3-month period—this is a 14-percent increase in backlog—makes it increasingly clear to me that remedial action on the part of the Congress must be taken, and soon.

It is true that in one sense the backlog figure represents many cases previously heard upon which some action has already been taken but which have been scheduled for additional hearings. Given the nature of the court, this will occur, but I make the point that each such case, necessarily, will take the time of the court and will prevent another case from having an initial hearing.

It is essential that the court be freed of a part of the human pressure of work to be done, if it is to give to the boys and girls appearing before it the best service. We must not forget that many of the children dealt with by the court are dependency cases, neglected children, and orphan children. To these we owe a special duty of prompt and adequate care.

Mr. President, the Washington community is understandably deeply interested in this problem, and rightly so. I am encouraged by this interest, whose latest manifestation is the half hour program devoted to the juvenile court crisis which will be presented on WTOP at 8 p.m. tonight on channel 9. I urge Senators whose schedules will permit to view this program in order to obtain an

understanding of the problem. I am especially happy to recommend this program to the Senate since one of the major participants in it will be my chairman, the senior Senator from Nevada. Senator BIBLE brings to this subject, as to so many others relating to the District, his informed judgment and practical legislative sagacity. In this fight to remedy an almost intolerable condition he will find a strong ally in me and in our good friends and stanch colleagues on the committee.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks an announcement published by WTOP–TV entitled "Juvenile Court Practice To Be Investigated in Half-Hour Editorial Program January 17 on WTOP–TV."

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

JUVENILE COURT CRISIS TO BE INVESTIGATED IN HALF-HOUR EDITORIAL PROGRAM JANUARY 17 ON WTOP–TV

A special half hour program, "A WTOP Editorial: The Juvenile Court Crisis" will be presented Tuesday, January 17, at 8–8:30 p.m. on channel 9, George F. Hartford, vice president and general manager for WTOP–TV, announced today. The program is being produced under the supervision of the WTOP editorial board.

WTOP Newsman Jack Jurey will narrate the program. Jurey is regularly the spokesman for the station on its daily editorial.

The program investigates the need for an additional judge in the District of Columbia Juvenile Court. At the present time there is only one juvenile court judge. Bills are pending in the U.S. Congress to increase the number of judges to three. These bills have been blocked in recent sessions of Congress by a subcommittee of the House District Committee. The editorial takes the position that the need for increasing the number of judges is critical.

Judge Orman Ketcham, the juvenile court judge for the District of Columbia, is interviewed on the program. Many other statements by prominent Washington officials and civic leaders are also seen on the program. These include Robert E. McLaughlin, President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners; Judge E. Barrett Prettyman, until recently chief judge of the District of Columbia Judicial Court Circuit; and Senator Alan Bible, Democrat, of Nevada, chairman of the Senate District Committee.

This is the second in a continuing series of special WTOP editorials exploring in depth some major national and local problems and expressing the station's view on those problems. The first special editorial was presented on October 27; it dealt with the problem of slot machines in Charles County, Md.

Film for "A WTOP Editorial: The Juvenile Court Crisis" was made by WTOP–TV cameraman Hal Saylor. The program will be directed by William Linden.

"Father Knows Best," usually seen Tuesday at 8–8:30 p.m., will be preempted one time only for this special program.

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES FOR TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the appointment of three additional district judges for Texas, one each in the northern, southern, and western districts of the State. These judges are very badly needed to handle the large volume of litigation in those districts. As capable as the present judges are, the volume of work has increased to such a degree that long delays in bringing cases to trial have resulted, to the detriment of the judicial process.

I am hopeful that those concerned will find it possible to take speedy action on this matter. The bar of Texas has been vitally interested in this improvement for some time, and I feel confident its members are virtually unanimous in approving such an expansion.

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

The bill (S. 494) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern, southern, and western districts of Texas, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO LOANS TO FARMERS AND RANCHERS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify and consolidate the existing authority for loans made to farmers and ranchers by the Farmers Home Administration. I ask unanimous consent that it be held at the desk through the close of business January 20 for cosponsorship and that it be set out in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk through the close of business on January 20, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

The bill (S. 497) to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this bill is a refinement of legislation which I first introduced in 1956. A similar bill, sponsored by Congressman COOLEY, was approved by the House on June 20, 1960, as H.R. 11761. Unfortunately that bill was still under consideration in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when we adjourned.

The need for the bill is clear and concurred in by the current administration and by all farm groups. To my knowledge there is no opposition to the idea of this legislation.

Very briefly it should be explained that title I of the bill would replace the existing authority for real estate improvement loans now handled under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; soil and water conservation loans now processed under authority of the act of August 28, 1937; and loans for the construction and repair of farm dwellings now authorized under title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

Title II of the bill provides simplified authority for farm operating loans similar to that now provided by title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Title III of the bill authorizes emergency loans now authorized by Public Law 38 of the 81st Congress. Procedures would be simplified but loans would be made for the same purposes as those in titles I and II.

In general, the loans would be authorized for family type farms only, except those made under title V of the Housing Act of 1949. The ceiling of indebtedness for any farmer or rancher would be $10,000 except that 10 percent of the amount appropriated might be utilized for loans in excess of that ceiling under titles I and II. Title III provides a limit on the outstanding indebtedness for emergency loans of $50,000.

The bill also provides simple and modern authorization for administration under title IV. It would also authorize a revolving fund into which would be funneled all existing liabilities and assets. However, loans could be made only in such amounts as authorized through the annual appropriations process, thus retaining complete control by the Congress and the appropriate committees.

This new bill would retain the county committee for local operation of the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. President, in conclusion, during the past 6 years I have presented various bills to the Congress and to the committees of the Congress. It has been the policy of the Congress to provide a Farm Credit Administration for our farmers. Because of the fact that the original act has now been amended some 30 times, it requires 1,200 pages of regulations to interpret the laws. Even the lawyers in the Department of Agriculture, to say nothing of a Philadelphia lawyer, say frankly that they find it almost impossible in some instances to interpret the conflicting laws and the conflicting regulations.

We are spending the money for a Farm Home Administration, not only for emergency credits, but ordinary credit to farmers who cannot get it from banks, cooperatives, or other sources. We are spending the money. Why should we not finally awake and pass a bill which is streamlined, which codifies all preexisting legislation on this subject, and which would make the farm credit laws of the country meaningful, and make credit speedy and certain for those who need it?

No one who has lived in a farming community, as I have, and who has seen that community stricken by unusual circumstances, as I saw the Great Plains area stricken from 1952 to 1957, can forget the specter of farmers lining up for a block and a half down the street from the farm credit office in order to obtain loans to tide them through. This is a spectacle which we should not tolerate, and we will not tolerate it.

This bill will go a long way toward stopping the confusion which is caused by the present situation with respect to the complexity of laws. We are going to spend the money. I certainly am for

the program. But let us make it meaningful. Let us make it efficient, and let us make it certain.

The bill (S. 497), introduced by Mr. ALLOTT, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act may be cited as the "Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961."

(b) The Congress finds that the statutory authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary," for making and insuring loans to farmers and ranchers should be revised and consolidated to avoid multiplicity of loan types and to provide for more effective credit services primarily for family-type farms.

TITLE I—REAL ESTATE LOANS

SEC. 101. The Secretary is authorized to make and insure loans to farmers and ranchers in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who (1) are citizens of the United States of America, (2) have a farm background and recent farming experience which the Secretary determines is sufficient to assure reasonable prospects of success in the proposed farming operations, (3) are or will become owner-operators of not larger than family-type farms for each family and, in the case of farm purchase loans, will derive their principal income from farming, and (4) are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance their actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near their community.

SEC. 102. Loans may be made or insured under this title for acquiring, enlarging, or improving farms, including farm buildings, land and water development, use, and conservation, refinancing existing indebtedness, and for loan closing costs. For the purpose of loans only to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace farm dwellings and other farm buildings in order to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing and adequate farm buildings, the term "farm" shall include a parcel or parcels of land which is used for agricultural production and operated as a single unit which produces or is capable of producing agricultural commodities for sale or for home use of a gross annual value of not less than $400 in 1944, as determined by the Secretary. In making or insuring loans for farm purchase, the Secretary shall give preference to persons who are married or have dependent families and, wherever practicable, to persons who are able to make initial downpayments, or who are owners of livestock and farm implements necessary successfully to carry on farming operations.

SEC. 103. The Secretary shall make or insure no loan under this title (1) for the purpose of acquiring or enlarging any farm which has a value as acquired, enlarged, and improved in excess of the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units in the county, as determined by the Secretary from time to time, or (2) to any individual which would cause (a) the unpaid indebtedness against the farm at the time the loan is made to exceed 90 per centum of the normal value of the farm, or (b) the loan to exceed the amount certified by the county committee, whichever is less. In determining the normal value of the farm, the Secretary shall consider appraisals made by competent appraisers under rules established by the Secretary. Such appraisals shall take into consideration both the normal agricultural value and the normal market value of the farm.

SEC. 104. (a) The Secretary is also authorized to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit and public or quasi-public agencies, for the purpose of providing facilities for soil and water conservation, development, use, and drainage primarily for serving farmers, ranchers, farm laborers, and rural residents. No such loan shall be made which would cause the association's unpaid principal indebtedness to the Secretary under this title and under the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, to exceed $500,000 at any one time: *Provided, however,* That no initial loan under this section shall exceed $350,000.

(b) The service provided or made available through any such association shall not be curtailed or limited by inclusion of the area served by such association within the boundaries of any municipal corporation or other public body, or by the granting of any private franchise for similar service, within such area during the term of such loan; nor shall the happening of any such event be the basis of requiring such association to secure any franchise, license, or permit as a condition to continuing to serve the area served by the association at the time of the occurrence of such event.

SEC. 105. The period for repayment of loans under this title shall not exceed forty years. The Secretary shall from time to time establish the interest rate or rates at which loans for various purposes will be made or insured, taking into consideration the prevailing private and cooperative interest rates for loans for similar terms and purposes but for insured loans not in excess of 6 per centum per annum and for direct loans under this title not in excess of 5 per centum per annum. The borrower shall pay such fees and other charges as the Secretary may require.

SEC. 106. Loans under this title may be insured by the Secretary, aggregating not more than $150,000,000 in any one year, whenever funds are advanced or a loan is purchased by a lender other than the United States. In connection with insurance of loans, the Secretary—

(a) is authorized to make agreements with respect to the servicing of loans insured hereunder and to purchase such loans on such terms and conditions as he may prescribe except that no agreement shall provide for purchase by the Secretary at a date sooner than five years from the date of the note; and

(b) shall retain out of payments by the borrower a charge at a rate determined by the Secretary equivalent to not less than 1 per centum per annum on the principal balance of the loan unpaid from time to time.

Any contract of insurance executed by the Secretary under this title shall be an obligation supported by the full faith and credit of the United States and incontestable except for fraud or misrepresentation of which the holder has actual knowledge.

SEC. 107. (a) The fund established pursuant to section 11(a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, shall hereafter be called the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund and is hereinafter in this title referred to as the "fund." The fund shall remain available as a revolving fund for the discharge of the obligations of the Secretary under agreements insuring loans under this title and loans and mortgages insured under prior authority.

(b) Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed by the United States. The Secretary may purchase with money in the fund any notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining money for the fund.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to make and issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining funds necessary for discharging obligations under this section and for authorized expenditures out of the fund. Such notes shall be in such form and denominations and have such maturities and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes shall bear interest at a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to the notes issued by the Secretary under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes of the Secretary issued hereunder, and for that purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include the purchase of notes issued by the Secretary. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(d) Notes and security acquired by the Secretary in connection with loans insured under this title shall become a part of the fund. Notes may be held in the fund and collected in accordance with their terms or may be sold by the Secretary with or without agreements for insurance thereof at the balance due thereon, or on such other basis as the Secretary may determine from time to time. All net proceeds from such collections, including sales of notes or property, shall be deposited in and become a part of the fund.

(e) The Secretary shall deposit in the fund such portion of the charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans at least equal to a rate of one-half of 1 per centum per annum on the outstanding principal obligations as he determines to be an appropriate insurance charge and the remainder of such charge shall be available for compensating lenders and others for loan servicing or for administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration to be transferred annually and become merged with any appropriation for administrative expenses.

(f) The Secretary may utilize the fund—

(1) to make loans which could be insured under this title whenever the Secretary has reasonable assurances that they can be sold without undue delay, and may sell and insure such loans. The aggregate of the principal of such loans made and not disposed of shall not exceed $10,000,000 at any one time;

(2) to pay the interest to which the holder of the note is entitled on loans heretofore or hereafter insured accruing between the date of any prepayments made by the borrower and the date of transmittal of any such prepayments to the lender. In the discretion of the Secretary, prepayments other than final payments need not be remitted to the holder until the due date of the annual installment;

(3) to pay to the holder of the notes any defaulted installment or, upon assignment of the note to the Secretary at the Secretary's request, the entire balance due on the loan;

(4) to purchase notes in accordance with agreements previously entered into; and

(5) to pay taxes, insurance, prior liens, expenses necessary to make fiscal adjustments in connection with the application and transmittal of collections and other expenses and advances authorized in section 405(a) in connection with insured loans.

SEC. 108. The Secretary shall take as security for the obligations entered into in connection with loans first or second mortgages on farms with respect to which such loans are made and such other security as the Secretary may require, and for obligations in connection with loans to associations under section 104, shall take liens on

the facility or such other security as he may determine to be necessary. Such security instruments shall constitute liens running to the United States notwithstanding the fact that the notes may be held by lenders other than the United States.

TITLE II—OPERATING LOANS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to make or participate in loans to farmers and ranchers in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who (1) are citizens of the United States of America, (2) have a farm background and recent farming experience which the Secretary determines is sufficient to assure reasonable prospects of success in the proposed farming operation, (3) are or will become operators of not larger than family-type farms, and (4) are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance their actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near their community.

SEC. 202. Loans may be made under this title for (1) paying costs incident to reorganizing the farming system for more profitable operation, (2) purchasing livestock, poultry and farm equipment, (3) purchasing feed, seed, fertilizer, insecticides, and farm supplies and to meet other essential farm operating expenses including cash rent, (4) financing land and water development, use, and conservation, (5) refinancing existing indebtedness, (6) other farm needs including but not limited to family subsistence, and (7) for loan closing costs.

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall make no loan under this title to any individual (1) which would cause the total principal indebtedness outstanding at any one time for loans made under this title and under section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to exceed $30,000: *Provided, however,* That not more than 25 per centum of the sums made available for loans under this title may be used for loans which would cause such indebtedness of any borrower under said Acts to exceed $10,000, (2) for the purchasing or leasing of land other than for cash rent, or for carrying on any land leasing or land purchasing program, or (3) in excess of an amount certified by the county committee.

SEC. 204. The Secretary shall make all loans under this title at an interest rate not to exceed 5 per centum per annum, upon the full personal liability of the borrower and upon such security as the Secretary may prescribe. Such loans shall be payable in not more than seven years and no such loans shall be made to any person who has been continuously indebted for loans under this title or under section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, or both, for the immediately preceding ten years.

TITLE III—EMERGENCY LOANS

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary may designate any area in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as an emergency area if he finds (1) that there exists in such area a general need for agricultural credit which cannot be met for temporary periods of time by private, cooperative, or other responsible sources (including loans the Secretary is authorized to make under title II or to make or insure under title I of this Act or any other Act of Congress), at reasonable rates and on terms and conditions which farmers and ranchers could be expected to meet under the circumstances; and (2) that the need for such credit in such area is the result of a natural disaster or severe production losses.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make or participate in loans in any such area to established farmers or ranchers who are citizens of the United States of America and to private corporations or partnerships engaged primarily in farming or ranching provided they (1) have experience and resources necessary to assure a reasonable prospect for successful operation with the assistance of such loan, and (2) are unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance their actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near their community.

SEC. 302. Loans may be made under this title for any of the purposes authorized for loans under titles I or II of this Act.

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall make no loan under this title to any individual, corporation, or partnership (1) which would cause the borrower's unpaid principal indebtedness for loans made under this title to exceed $50,000, or (2) in excess of an amount certified by the county committee, whichever is less.

SEC. 304. The Secretary shall make all direct loans under this title at the same rate of interest established for a loan for similar purposes under titles I and II of this Act, repayable at such times as the Secretary may determine, taking into account the purpose of the loan and the nature and effect of the emergency, but not later than provided for loans for similar purposes under titles I and II of this Act, and upon the full personal liability and available security of the farmer or rancher, or, in the case of corporations or partnerships, upon the full liability and available security of the corporation or partnership and of each person holding as much as 10 per centum of the stock or other interest in the corporation or partnership.

SEC. 305. The Secretary may make additional loans without regard to the designation of emergency areas under section 301(a) or the $50,000 limit in section 303, to persons or corporations who are indebted to the Secretary for loans under the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, or the Act of August 31, 1954, as amended, to the extent necessary to permit the orderly repayment or liquidation of said prior indebtedness.

SEC. 306. The Secretary is authorized to utilize the revolving fund created by section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1148a) (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Emergency Credit Revolving Fund"), for carrying out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 307. (a) All sums received by the Secretary from the liquidation of loans made under the provisions of this title or under the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, or the Act of August 31, 1954, and from the liquidation of any other assets acquired with money from the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund shall be added to and become a part of the fund.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund such additional sums as the Congress shall from time to time determine to be necessary.

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATION PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. For the purposes of this Act and for the administration of assets under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, as amended, the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, the Act of August 31, 1954, as amended, and the powers and duties of the Secretary under any other Act authorizing agricultural credit, the Secretary may assign and transfer such powers, duties, and assets to the Farmers Home Administration, to be headed by an Administrator, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, who shall receive basic compensation as provided by law for that office.

The Secretary may—

(a) administer his powers and duties through such national, area, State, or local offices and employees in the United States and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as he determines to be necessary and may authorize an office to serve the area composed of two or more States if he determines that the volume of business in the area is not sufficient to justify separate State offices;

(b) accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and with the consent of the agency concerned, utilize the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, territory, or political subdivision;

(c) within the limits of appropriations made therefor, make necessary expenditures for rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, purchase and exchange of supplies and equipment, purchase or hire of passenger vehicles, printing and binding without regard to the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C. 111), and such other facilities and services as he may from time to time find necessary for the proper administration of this Act;

(d) acquire land and interest therein without regard to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(e) compromise, adjust, or reduce claims and adjust and modify the terms of mortgages, leases, contracts, and agreements entered into or administered by the Farmers Home Administration under any of its programs, as circumstances may require: *Provided, however,* That—

(1) compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims of $15,000 or more must be effected by reference to the Secretary of the Treasury or to the Attorney General pursuant to the provisions of section 3469 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 194);

(2) compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be based on the value of the security and a determination by the Secretary of the debtor's reasonable ability to pay considering his other assets and income at the time of the action and with or without the payment of any consideration at the time of such adjustment or reduction;

(3) releases from personal liability may also be made with or without payment of any consideration at the time of adjustment of claims against—

(A) borrowers who have transferred the security property to approved applicants under agreements assuming the outstanding secured indebtedness;

(B) borrowers who have transferred the security property to approved applicants under agreements assuming that portion of the secured indebtedness equal to the current market value of the security property or transferred the security property to the Secretary;

(C) borrowers who have transferred the security property to other than approved applicants under agreements assuming the full amount of or that portion of the secured indebtedness equal to the current market value of the security property on terms not to exceed five annual installments with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate determined by the Secretary; and

(D) borrowers who transfer security property under items (B) and (C) above for amounts less than the indebtedness secured thereby may be released from personal liability only on a determination by the Secretary that each such borrower has no reasonable debt-paying ability considering his assets and income at the time of the transfer and the county committee certifies that the borrower has cooperated in good faith, used due diligence to maintain the security property against loss, and has otherwise fulfilled the covenants incident to his loan to the best of his ability.

(4) no compromise, adjustment, or reduction of claims shall be made upon terms more

favorable than recommended by the appropriate county committee utilized pursuant to section 402 of this Act; and

(5) any claim which has been due and payable for five years or more, and where the debtor has no assets or no apparent future debt-paying ability from which the claim could be collected, or is deceased and has left no estate, or has been absent from his last known address for a period of at least five years, has no known assets, and his whereabouts cannot be ascertained without undue expense, may be charged off or released by the Secretary upon a report and favorable recommendation of the county committee and of the employee of the Administration having charge of the claim, and any claim involving a principal balance of $150 or less may be charged off or released whenever it appears to the Secretary that further collection efforts would be ineffectual or likely to prove uneconomical; and

(6) partial releases and subordination of mortgages may be granted either where the secured indebtedness remaining after the transaction will be adequately secured or the security interest of the Government will not be adversely affected, and the transaction and use of proceeds will further the purposes for which the loan was made, improve the borrower's debt-paying ability, permit payments on indebtedness owed to or insured by the Secretary, or permit payment of reasonable costs and expenses incident to the transaction, including taxes incident to or resulting from the transaction which the borrower is unable to pay from other sources.

(f) collect all claims and obligations arising or administered under this Act, or under any mortgage, lease, contract, or agreement entered into or administered pursuant to this Act and, if in his judgment necessary and advisable, pursue the same to final collection in any court having jurisdiction. All legal work arising out of such claims and obligations, including, but not limited to, the prosecution and defense of all litigation, is authorized to be performed, as determined by the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, through the Department of Justice, by attorneys of the Office of General Council of the Department of Agriculture, or by local counsel.

SEC. 402. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to appoint in each county or area in which activities are carried on under this Act, a county committee composed of three individuals residing in the county or area, at least two of whom at the time of appointment shall be farmers deriving the principal part of their income from farming. Committee appointments shall be for a term of three years except that the first appointments for any new committee shall be for one-, two-, and three-year periods, respectively, so as to provide continuity of committee membership. The Secretary may appoint alternate committeemen. The members of the committee and their alternates shall be removable for cause by the Secretary.

(b) The rates of compensation, the number of days per month each member may be paid, and the amount to be allowed for necessary travel and subsistence expenses, shall be determined and paid by the Secretary.

(c) The committee shall meet on the call of the chairman elected by the committee or on the call of such other person as the Secretary may designate. Two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum. The Secretary shall prescribe rules governing the procedure of the committees and their duties, furnish forms and equipment necessary, and authorize and provide for the compensation of such clerical assistance as he finds may be required by any committee.

SEC. 403. In connection with loans made or insured under this Act, the Secretary shall require—

(a) the applicant to certify in writing that the applicant is unable to obtain sufficient credit elsewhere to finance his actual needs at rates and terms prevailing in or near his community.

(b) except for loans under section 104, the county committee to certify in writing that the applicant meets the eligibility requirements for the loan and has the character, industry, and ability to carry out the proposed farming operations, and will, in the opinion of the committee, honestly endeavor to carry out his undertakings and obligations; and for loans under section 104, the Secretary shall require the recommendation of the county committee as to the making or insuring of the loan.

(c) an agreement by the borrower that if at any time it shall appear to the Secretary that the borrower may be able to obtain a loan from a production credit association, a Federal land bank, or other responsible cooperative or private credit source, at reasonable rates and terms for loans for similar purposes and periods of time pervailing in the area, the borrower will, upon request by the Secretary, apply for and accept such loan in sufficient amount to repay the Secretary or the insured lender, or both, and to pay for any stock necessary to be purchased in a cooperative lending agency in connection with such loan;

(d) such provision for supervision of the borrower's operations as the Secretary shall deem necessary to achieve the objectives of the loan and protect the interests of the United States; and

(e) the applications of veterans for loans under title I or II of this Act to be given preference over similar applications of nonveterans on file in any county or area office at the same time. Veterans as used herein shall mean persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation or during the Korean conflict and who were discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.

SEC. 404. All property subject to a lien held by the United States or the title to which is acquired or held by the Secretary under this Act other than property used for administrative purposes, shall be subject to taxation by State, territory, district, and local political subdivisions in the same manner and to the same extent as other property is taxed: *Provided, however,* That no tax shall be imposed or collected on or with respect to any instrument if the tax is based on—

(1) the value of any notes or mortgages or other lien instruments held by or transferred to the Secretary;

(2) any notes or lien instruments administered under this Act which are made, assigned, or held by a person otherwise liable for such tax; or

(3) the value of any property conveyed or transferred to the Secretary,

whether as a tax on the instrument, the privilege of conveying or transferring or the recordation thereof; nor shall the failure to pay or collect any such tax be a ground for refusal to record or file such instruments, or for failure to impart notice, or prevent the enforcement of its provisions in any State or Federal court.

SEC. 405. (a) The Secretary is authorized and empowered to make advances, without regard to any loan or total indebtedness limitation, to preserve and protect the security for or the lien or priority of the lien securing any loan or other indebtedness owing to, insured by, or acquired by the Secretary under this Act or under any other programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration; to bid for and purchase at any execution, foreclosure, or other sale or otherwise to acquire property upon which the United States has a lien by reason of a judgment or execution arising from, or which is pledged, mortgaged, conveyed, attached, or levied upon to secure the payment of, any such indebtedness whether or not such property is subject to other liens; to accept title to any property so purchased or acquired; and to sell, manage, or otherwise dispose of such property as hereinafter provided.

(b) Real property administered under the provisions of this act may be operated or leased by the Secretary for such period or periods as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the Government's investment therein.

(c) The Secretary may determine whether real property administered under this Act is suitable for disposition for purposes consistent with section 102 of this Act to persons eligible for assistance under title I of this Act. Any property which the Secretary determines to be suitable for such purposes shall, whenever practicable, be sold by the Secretary as expeditiously as possible to such eligible persons in a manner consistent with the provisions of title I hereof. Real property which is not determined suitable for sale to such eligible persons or which has not been purchased by such persons within a period of three years from the date of acquisition, shall be sold by the Secretary after public notice at public sale and, if no acceptable bid is received then by negotiated sale, at the best price obtainable for cash or on secured credit without regard to the laws governing the disposition of excess or surplus property of the United States. The terms of such sale shall require an initial downpayment of at least 20 per centum, and the remainder of the sales price payable in not more than five annual installments with interest on unpaid balance at the rate determined by the Secretary. Any conveyances under this Act shall include all of the interest of the United States including mineral rights.

(d) With respect to any real property administered under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to grant or sell easements or rights-of-way for roads, utilities, and other appurtenances not inconsistent with the public interest. With respect to any rights-of-way over land on which the United States has a lien administered under this Act, the Secretary may release said lien upon payment to the United States of adequate consideration, and the interest of the United States arising under any such lien may be acquired for highway purposes by any State or political subdivision thereof in condemnation proceedings under State law by service by certified mail upon the U.S. attorney for the district, the State Director of the Farmers Home Administration for the State in which the farm is located, and the Attorney General of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the United States shall not be required to appear, answer, or respond to any notice or writ sooner than ninety days from the time such notice or writ is returnable or purports to be effective, and the taking or vesting of title to the interest of the United States shall not become final under any proceeding, order, or decree until adequate compensation and damages have been finally determined and paid to the United States or into the registry of the court.

SEC. 406. No officer, attorney, or other employee of the Secretary shall, directly or indirectly, be the beneficiary of or receive any fee, commission, gift, or other consideration for or in connection with any transaction or business under this Act other than such salary, fee, or other compensation as he may receive as such officer, attorney, or employee. No member of a county committee shall knowingly make or join in making any certification with respect to a loan to purchase any land in which he or any person related to him within the second degree of consanguinity or affinity has or may acquire any interest or with respect to any applicant related

to him within the second degree of consanguinity or affinity. Any persons violating any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000 or imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

SEC. 407. The Secretary may provide voluntary debt adjustment assistance between farmers and their creditors and may cooperate with State, territorial, and local agencies and committees engaged in such debt adjustment, and may give credit counseling.

SEC. 408. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this Act and for the administration of assets transferred to the Farmers Home Administration.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make and issue notes to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of obtaining funds in such amounts as the Congress may approve from time to time for making direct loans under this Act. Such notes shall be in such form and denominations and have such maturities and be subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such notes shall bear interest at a rate fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average market yields of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having maturities comparable to loans made by the Secretary under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any notes of the Secretary issued hereunder, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include the purchase of notes issued by the Secretary. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of such notes shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(c) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund known as the "Farmers Home Administration Revolving Fund" (hereinafter in this section called the "revolving fund"). The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund established by section 107 of this Act, or the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund established by section 306 of this Act, the assets and liabilities thereof or the Secretary's authority with respect thereto.

There are hereby transferred to the revolving fund the unexpended balances of any appropriation, the sums heretofore borrowed, and the claims, notes, mortgages, property and receipts acquired and now held by the Secretary, including any claims, notes, mortgages, or property held by the Secretary on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury which were made, arose, collected or are being administered under this Act or under the following Acts or parts thereof (hereinafter in this section referred to as "said Acts"): (1) titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, including any amounts transferred from collections for loan insurance charges or other charges for administrative expenses; (2) the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, as amended, excluding the assets of the State rural rehabilitation corporations but including any sums received from the accounts of said corporations for administrative expenses; (3) the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, including any amounts transferred from collections for loan insurance charges or other charges for administrative expenses; (4) title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; (5) the item "Loans to farmers—1948 flood damage" in the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1038); (6) the item "Loans to farmers—property damages" in the Act of May 24, 1949 (63 Stat. 82); (7) the sales and development accounts in the water conservation and utilization projects (53 Stat. 685, 719, as amended and supplemented by 16 U.S.C. 590y, z1–10); (8) the Act of September 6, 1950; and (9) the Act of July 11, 1956.

There shall be deposited in the revolving fund all appropriations hereafter made, any sums borrowed under existing or future authorizations for the purposes of said Acts or this Act, all notes, mortgages, claims, and property hereafter acquired and held by the Secretary, the proceeds from the use and sale of any such property, all collections of principal and interest, and any other receipts under said Acts or under this Act.

The Secretary may sell and assign any notes and mortgages in the revolving fund with the consent of the borrower or without such consent when the borrower has failed to comply with his agreement to refinance the indebtedness at the request of the Secretary. Such loans may be sold at the balance due thereon or on such other basis as the Secretary may determine from time to time.

The notes of the Secretary issued to the Secretary of the Treasury under said Acts or this Act and all other liabilities against the appropriations or assets transferred to or deposited in the revolving fund shall be liabilities of the revolving fund and all other obligations against such appropriations or assets shall be obligations of the revolving fund.

The unexpended balances of any appropriation or authorizations transferred to and all sums deposited in the revolving fund shall remain available to the Secretary until expended (1) for loans under title I of this Act not to exceed the total unobligated balances of the sums appropriated or made available for loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Act of August 28, 1937, and not to exceed the amount apportioned by the Budget Bureau for loans under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, for the fiscal year 1961, for loans under title II of this Act not to exceed the unobligated balances of sums appropriated or made available for loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for administrative expenses under this Act not to exceed the appropriation for administrative expense, for the fiscal year current when this Act becomes effective; (2) for the purposes of this Act in such further annual amounts as Congress in Appropriation Acts may from time to time determine; and (3) for interest on and repayments on notes issued by the Secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided, however,* That collections on sales and development accounts in water conservation and utilization projects shall be transferred to and deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Subject to the foregoing limitations, collections deposited in the fund may be utilized in lieu of, or partially in lieu of, issuing additional notes to the Secretary of the Treasury under said Acts or under this Act.

(d) At least 25 per centum of the sums authorized in any fiscal year for direct loans to be made by the Secretary under title I of this Act shall be allocated equitably among the several States and territories on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy, as determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 409. The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations, prescribe the terms and conditions for making or insuring loans, security instruments and agreements, except as otherwise specified herein, and make such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 410. (a) References to any provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, title V of the Housing Act of 1949 or the Act of August 28, 1937, superseded by any provision of this Act shall be construed as referring to the appropriate provision of this Act. Titles I, II, and IV of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, except the authorization contained in section 511 thereof, the Act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the Act of August 31, 1954, as amended, are hereby repealed effective 120 days after enactment, or such earlier date as the provisions of this Act are made effective by the Secretary's regulations. The foregoing provisions shall not have the effect of repealing the amendments to section 24, chapter 6 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, section 35 of chapter III of the Act approved June 19, 1934 (D.C. Code, title 35, section 535) enacted by section 15 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, and by section 10(f) of the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended.

(b) The repeal of any provision of law by this Act shall not—

(1) affect the validity of any action taken or obligation entered into pursuant to the authority of any of said Acts, or

(2) prejudice the application of any person with respect to receiving assistance under the provisions of this Act, solely because such person is obligated to the Secretary under authorization contained in any such repealed provision.

(c) If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 411. Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is further amended by the following new section 35:

"SEC. 35. The provisions of this title shall extend to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In case of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, the term 'county' as used in this title shall be deemed synonymous with the territory thereof, or any subdivision thereof as may be determined by the Secretary, and payments under section 33 of this title shall be made to the Governor or to the fiscal agent of such subdivision."

WATER RESOURCES COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Water Resources Commission for Alaska. A similar version of this bill passed the Senate during the 86th Congress, 1st session, on September 10, 1959.

This bill, Mr. President, would create a study commission patterned after other commissions which have been of great assistance to the executive department, the Congress and to such regions as New England and the Southeastern and Southwestern parts of the United States.

The Alaska Water Resources Commission, to be created by this bill, would be the principal agency for coordinating Federal, State, and local plans for developing water and related land resources in Alaska. It would recommend a long-range schedule of priorities for collection of information and for the planning and construction of needed projects. The Commission would conduct studies of water resources problems and prepare and submit to the President

a comprehensive development plan. The members of the Commission would be appointed by the President, four of whom would be nominated by the Governor of Alaska.

Mr. President, Alaska has a great need for this Commission, and for the information and rational analysis of our resources which this Commission would provide. With such a commission, Alaskans will be working with Federal officials to realize the creative potential of Alaska's great glaciers, lakes and rivers in such areas as navigation, power, recreation, irrigation, and fisheries.

Mr. President, this proposed legislation is an expression of the desire of Alaskans to participate in the thoughtful and careful study processes which will make possible an ever greater contribution by Alaska to the well-being of the Nation, and which will insure that governmental efforts to develop rivers, ports, and drainage basins in Alaska on a comprehensive basis will be preceded by sound research by knowledgeable persons.

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

The bill (S. 498) to establish a Water Resources Commission for Alaska, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES FOR CERTAIN FREE OR TOLL ROADS ON INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize reimbursement to the States for certain free or toll roads on the Interstate System.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an announcement I have made concerning the bill may be printed in the RECORD after these remarks, followed by the text of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 500) to authorize reimbursement to the States for certain free or toll roads on the Interstate System, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be the policy of the Federal Government to equitably reimburse a State for free or toll highways on the Interstate System within its boundaries, the construction of which has been completed or partially completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which was either in actual construction, or under construction by contract, for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, if such highway or partially completed section thereof meets the standards required for the Interstate System.

SEC. 2. If an existing free or toll highway or partially completed section of highway which is located upon the Interstate System and included in the report submitted to Congress under section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374) (House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress), is believed to measure up to the standards of construction adopted under section 108(i) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, a State may request of the Secretary of Commerce that it receive reimbursement for such highway, and the State shall be entitled to receive such reimbursement subject to the conditions of this Act. The Secretary of Commerce shall first determine whether or not the highway, or partially completed section of highway, meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary of Commerce shall determine, in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to section 4 hereof, the amount of reimbursement to which the State is entitled based on the cost of such highway, less depreciation and the total amount of any Federal funds used in the construction of such highway. In each such determination for a toll highway, the Secretary shall also exclude from the cost of the highway the cost of financing thereof and the cost of any toll plazas, toll collection facilities, and any other facilities not included within the definition of the term "highway" under Federal-aid highway legislation.

SEC. 3. Any State entitled to reimbursement under this Act, whether for a toll or a free highway or a partially completed section of highway, shall use the funds so reimbursed, first, for construction of projects on free highways which connect with the Interstate System and enhance the utility of such system; and then, if there be any funds remaining after completion of such projects, on any Federal-aid system, subject to the condition that all Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to a State under Federal-aid highway legislation for the current fiscal year have been expended within the meaning of said legislation. Whenever a State constructs such projects with funds received as a result of a reimbursement under this Act, all procedures and steps shall be taken in the same manner as though such funds had been apportioned under Federal-aid highway legislation: *Provided,* That State matching funds shall not be required: *And provided further,* That the funds received as a result of a reimbursement under this section shall constitute the total Federal share of any project upon which such funds are expended. The State shall obligate the amounts to which it is entitled to be reimbursed under this section prior to July 1, 1976, and any portion of such amount not so obligated shall lapse. No State shall be permitted to obligate in any one fiscal year more than 10 percent of the amount to which it is entitled to be reimbursed under this section.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Commerce shall establish such rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The announcement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

WASHINGTON, January 17.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH urged the 87th Congress today to reimburse the States for free and toll highways taken by the Federal Government for incorporation into the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

"It is time that this debt of the Federal Government to the States was paid," the Connecticut Senator said, in announcing he is reintroducing a reimbursement bill. "This Congress must come to grips with the problem of financing completion of the Interstate System, and the Federal Government's indebtedness to the States must not be overlooked."

Senator BUSH said that all of the 48 mainland States have highways which would be eligible for reimbursement under the terms of his bill. In Connecticut a total of 143.6 miles of highway on the Interstate System, including 89 miles of the Connecticut Turnpike, would qualify.

"The Federal Government owes Connecticut about $300 million for the mileage it has taken for the Interstate System," he said. "Under the terms of my bill, we would be able to use these funds for construction of highways connecting with interstate routes, including North-South roads urgently needed by communities in the interior of our State."

Senator BUSH's bill would—

1. Declare it to be the policy of the Federal Government to reimburse equitably the States for acceptable highways, free or toll, which have been incorporated into the Interstate System.

2. Authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide reimbursement, upon request of a State, if he determines such highways meet interstate standards. The amount of reimbursement would be limited to the cost of the highway, less depreciation and the total amount of Federal funds used in its construction. In the case of toll highways, the reimbursement would be further reduced by deductions for the cost of all auxiliary features needed for its toll operation.

3. Require the States to use the funds for construction of projects on highways which connect with the Interstate System and enhance its utility and, after completion of such projects, on any Federal-aid system. No State matching funds would be required.

Senator BUSH said it was equally important to recognize what the bill would not do—

"1. It would not give any State so-called windfall because if the State had not had the initiative to construct the highway, the Federal Government would have had to finance its construction with 90 percent Federal funds under the terms of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

"2. It would not violate the prohibition against use of Federal funds on toll highways because any funds reimbursed would have to be spent on highways which are toll free."

Senator BUSH said that the total cost of reimbursement has been estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads at approximately $4.2 billion.

"In order to avoid an excessive addition to the normal flow of Federal highway funds in any single year," he said, "the bill provides that a State shall have until July 1, 1976, to obligate reimbursed funds to its credit, with a proviso that no more than 10 percent of the total credit may be obligated in any one fiscal year."

Senator BUSH said the bill was intended to implement the reimbursement proposals of the so-called Clay committee, whose recommendations led to the Highway Act of 1956.

"Although many Members of Congress fought hard for the Clay committee's principle of reimbursement when the 1956 act was under consideration," he recalled, "a decision was postponed at that time. The act merely contains a declaration that it was the intent of Congress to determine whether or not reimbursement should be made to the States for highways, toll or free, which had been completed, or put under construction on the Interstate System between August 2, 1947, and June 30, 1957.

"The 87th Congress should now make that determination, and fairness and justice require that reimbursement be granted. Otherwise, severe penalties will be imposed against the very States which, prior to enactment of the 1956 act, had made the most progress in modernizing the Interstate System within their borders."

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED FEDERAL PERSONNEL BY BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, toward the close of the last session, I introduced a bill in the hope that the subject it treats of would receive attention and study, to the degree that interested parties would be prepared to testify early in this session on such a bill.

The purpose of this bill is to help effect a fuller use of mature and experienced professional manpower, here in the District of Columbia, without having the plan cost the Federal or the District Government any higher expenditures.

I am now introducing this bill again. I hope it will receive early consideration. The plan it proposes is a simple one; one which I hope will be of help to both the Federal Government and the District of Columbia.

It provides that any person who is retired from the Federal Government service, may, if he has all the qualifications required by the Board of Education of Washington, D.C., be appointed to teach in Washington's public schools, and draw his Federal retirement pay as well. The bill further provides as a complementary provision, that any professional employee of the Board of Education may on his retirement accept a position in the Federal Government, and continue to draw his earned retirement pay. Such a plan is both practical and just.

At present, any teacher who is retired under the laws of any State in the Union may accept a position in the Federal Government, for which he may be qualified, and any person, retired under the Federal employees' retirement law may accept a position in any school system in the United States, for which he may be qualified, except in the District of Columbia.

Some years ago we passed a bill making retired teachers eligible for service as substitutes in the schools of Washington, without having such appointment in any way impair their pension. The proposal in this bill simply extends the principle of the earlier bill, now a law.

A number of qualified Federal workers are interested in doing a few years teaching, after having had a period of service in the Federal Government and similarly a number of teachers are interested in rounding out their careers with a few years in Government service.

The bill involves no additional costs to either the Federal Government or the Washington public schools, and is so far as I have heard not controversial. As it would be of some help in recruiting much-needed professional manpower, and as no additional cost is involved, I hope we may give early favorable consideration to it.

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

The bill (S. 502) to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Federal Government by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the employment of retired personnel of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, by the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any former employee of the Federal Government who has been retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall, if otherwise qualified under the rules of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, be eligible for appointment to the position for which he may be qualified under the rules of the Board, and shall draw the pay or compensation authorized for the position to which he may be appointed, in addition to the pension he is authorized to receive under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

SEC. 2. Any former employee of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia who shall have been retired under the Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia, approved April 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended, shall, if otherwise qualified under the rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, be eligible for appointment to the position for which he may be qualified under the rules of the said Civil Service Commission, and shall draw the pay or compensation authorized for the position to which he may be appointed, in addition to the pension he is authorized to receive under the Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia, as amended.

SPLIT SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I submit today, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution proposing that the annual sessions of Congress be split, with the first part being in the period of January to August and the second being November to January. In the even-numbered years, the second part would be 15 days later because of the November election.

This is the same proposal that I made in 1959 with Senate Concurrent Resolution 77.

The purpose of the resolution is clear. Year after year we see sessions going late into August, September, or October—and we see tempers frayed, mental fatigue, and exhaustion, and minds on such matters as election campaigns. The overall result is that we legislate in such periods under conditions that are not conducive for clear minds and stable emotions.

I think that the wisdom of this proposal that I made in 1959 was proved in 1960 when we had the August session after the national conventions. The frustration and confusion was evident to almost everyone.

There is another aspect of this matter. Under the present system many congressional families are broken up for as much as 6 months of the year. With school recessing in June, many of the wives and children go back home while the Members must remain here in Washington. Then when the mothers and children return to Washington in September when school starts again, the chances are that the Members have left Washington to go back home to their constituency—often not to return to Washington until January.

Under the schedule I propose, the families would be kept together instead of being divided so much of the year. It would be a schedule keyed more to the school year schedule. If most of us will examine the annual schedule of Americans, we will see that most families key their schedule to the school schedule.

Of course, it is to be recognized that a session starting in mid-November in the even-numbered years would result in a lame duck session. While there are objections to this, I believe the objectionable features of the present system are much greater and involve far greater risks militating against performing the function of legislating under the best circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) providing for annual adjournments of Congress, submitted by Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 132. (a) Effective with the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress, in each even-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 15, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 15 in that year, or the following Monday if November 15 falls on Saturday or Sunday; and in each odd-numbered year in which the two Houses have not adjourned sine die by August 1, they shall stand adjourned on that date, or on the next preceding day of session, until 12 o'clock meridian on November 1 in that year, or the following Monday if November 1 falls on Saturday or Sunday.

"(b) The consent of the respective Houses is hereby given to an adjournment of the other for the period specified in subsection (a)."

INVESTIGATION OF COUNTERFEIT DRUG TRAFFIC

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I submit a resolution providing for a complete and thorough investigation of the counterfeit drug traffic in the United States.

This traffic is a multi-million-dollar racket, a flourishing trade in fake and diluted drugs stamped with the counterfeit trademarks of reputable firms. A conservative estimate has placed the annual turnover at $50 million, but some observers have placed the yearly value of these fake and dangerous drugs at $150 million.

The recent discovery of counterfeit drugs here in Washington, D.C., and in Baltimore are but a few examples of a vicious practice spreading throughout the United States. Mr. President, we cannot allow unscrupulous men to pile up profits at the expense of the health of our citizens.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, while an excellent piece of legislation, cannot possibly cover every one of the possible violations and evasive techniques which have come into being within the last few years.

Counterfeit drugs constitute an obvious danger to patients. Furthermore, traffic in such drugs places a heavy burden on thousands of honest, conscientious druggists and pharmacists who must compete with the callous few in the drug profession who place their own financial well-being above the interest of their customers.

At present, the only basis upon which action can now be taken against counterfeit drugs per se is that of mislabeling and then only when the mislabeled drugs have been introduced into interstate commerce. It has been suggested that a statute aimed directly at the manufacture of counterfeit drugs would have a tremendous impact upon those few whose greed places sick and ill people in mortal danger daily.

To date there have been no recorded tragedies resulting from counterfeit drugs. But customers may not be so fortunate with the next batch of falsely marked and illegally produced drugs. It is up to the Congress to insure that there is no "next batch."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following excellent article entitled "A New Program To Protect You From Counterfeit Drugs," in the January 15, 1961, edition of Parade Magazine printed in the RECORD following the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 42), submitted by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER), was received, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the health and welfare of the people of the United States demand full utilization of the vast technical advances in the development of new drugs; and

Whereas the effectiveness and safety of drugs are dependent upon the maintenance of the highest standards in manufacture and prescription; and

Whereas there is definite evidence of a growing traffic in counterfeit drugs manufactured in many instances without regard to prescribed standards and under wantonly unsanitary conditions; and

Whereas the continued traffic in such counterfeit drugs constitutes an increasingly serious menace to the health and welfare of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized under Sections 134A and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to conduct a full and complete study and investigation to determine the extent of the traffic in counterfeit drugs in the United States and to recommend to the Senate such legislative or other action as in the opinion of the Committee is necessary to be taken to assure the health and welfare of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Committee shall report their findings together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but no later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which will not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Committee.

The article presented by Mr. BUTLER is as follows:

[From Parade, Jan. 15, 1961]

A NEW PROGRAM TO PROTECT YOU AGAINST COUNTERFEIT DRUGS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A new offensive has been launched to stamp out the vicious—and flourishing—traffic in counterfeit drugs. Generated within the drug industry itself, the program promises new safeguards against a multi-million-dollar racket that now threatens the health of every American.

On October 23, 1960, Parade first warned that nationally-known drugs and medicines are faked in filthy basements and garrets at vast profits to quacks who make them. Since then, the Food and Drug Administration has said that the production of so-called zombies is not declining but growing. Deputy Commissioner John L. Harvey declares:

"An FDA survey now going on indicates that drug counterfeiting may be on the increase. Retail druggists have been warned to insist on sealed manufacturers' packaging and to be on the alert for suspicious drug marketing practices which may suggest that the drugs involved are counterfeit. This is a serious threat to the public health."

But out of the national outrage that followed Parade's article has come a plan to strike back.

The District of Columbia Pharmaceutical Association, anxious to purge an honorable profession of its shady operators, conferred with Parade about the problem. As a result, the National Committee Against Counterfeit Drugs was organized. And a local pilot project was set up, which, it is hoped, will be the model for a nationwide campaign against drug faking.

Pharmacists will sign a pledge of ethical practice and agree to forfeit a $10,000 bond if, knowingly, that pledge is broken. Those who sign will be issued blue-and-white seals as a symbol of the purity of their pharmacies.

DOCTOR'S DILEMMA

The danger of contaminated drugs is obvious. Not so obvious are the dangers of dilution and substitution. A doctor orders a certain treatment. The patient buys the prescribed drug but gets a zombie. It may contain no harmful ingredients; it may simply be a diluted imitation. Naturally, the patient won't respond properly. It may be weeks before the doctor discovers, if he ever does, what has happened. In the meantime, the disease may progress unchecked, until the patient is beyond cure.

It would be bad enough if this shameful trade were a hole-in-the-wall business. But Parade's investigation revealed that the counterfeiters literally are flooding the country with zombies.

Parade found three basic reasons why the trade flourishes:

The Food and Drug Administration has been understaffed and apathetic;

Some States do not require drugmakers to be licensed, allowing counterfeiters to operate after they have been chased out of other States;

Reputable manufacturers and pharmacists have been wary of exposing the racket, fearing that customers would be frightened away from legitimate drugs. Leading pharmaceutical manufacturers have spent millions of dollars every year in research to perfect, develop, and control new drugs.

Parade's exposé brought in letters of praise by every mail. Honest pharmacists across the Nation wrote bitterly of what they called a disgrace to our profession. The National Wholesale Druggists' Association ordered the article reprinted and sent 20,000 copies to its members from coast to coast. The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association declared: "We certainly want to compliment you on this effort to make the public aware of what apparently is a growing threat in the field of health care."

"Many innocent pharmacies could be taken by such nefarious peddlers," wrote Sol S. Turnoff, of the Pennsylvania State Board of Pharmacy. "The decent and honest pharmacists thank you."

REACHING THE PUBLIC

"You have made a real contribution to consumer education," Leavitt C. Parsons, publisher of the Apothecary, a trade magazine for druggists in New England, declared. "So much of this vital information has appeared only in the technical-trade papers. I feel very strongly on the need of educating the general public."

The American Association for the Advancement of Science, citing the Parade article, declared hopefully: "This publicity may result in considerable pressure on legislators to do something." The Michigan State Pharmaceutical Association commented: "The public should be encouraged to place their confidence in reputable pharmacists as they would in reputable physicians. The pharmacist, in turn, should respect his role in the physician-pharmacist-patient relationship and dispense only drugs of high quality purchased from reputable companies. The Parade feature emphasizes what the results can be when one loses sight of the importance of providing only high-quality, lifesaving drugs."

But the letters and telegrams from the public were the most heart rending. They told of savings squandered on phony drugs—from sawdust-filled "vitamin" pills to fake "wonder drugs" made of chalk, flour, and other fillers—all sold at fancy prices. They told of dear ones who may have suffered months of needless illness, who might even have died, because of quack medications. Most letters simply sought help in identifying counterfeit drugs. Doctors also raged against the prevalent practice of filling their prescriptions with substitutes.

The District of Columbia Pharmaceutical Association, however, was not content merely to express alarm and indignation. Harold Elwyn, of Western Pharmacy, called an informal meeting of the District of Columbia pharmacists at his home and urged that something be done. His specific plan for a joint pharmacy committee to safeguard public health was rejected. But officers of the Association called upon Parade to discuss the problem.

Charles N. Grubb, president; Eileen Brooks, executive secretary, and Frank Stoutenburgh, publicity director, met with Washington correspondent Jack Anderson, who directed Parade's investigation. Out of the meeting came a proposal to issue special seals to Washington druggists who would pledge themselves to fight counterfeiting. By resolution of the executive board, the association adopted the drug seal program at a meeting November 27.

The issuing of seals and recording of pledges in Washington will be the responsibility of the National Committee Against Counterfeit Drugs. A three-man committee was set up, consisting of Anderson, Warren Woods, prominent Washington attorney in no way connected with the drug industry, and Walter Mancuso, president-elect of the Pharmaceutical Association, who was selected by the pharmacists as their representative. Since the committee is a public-spirited, nonprofit organization, all three will serve voluntarily without fee.

The "pledge of ethical practice" seal will be issued, beginning today, to those Washington pharmacists willing to pledge never to deal knowingly in counterfeit drugs.

Any $10,000 forfeits collected will go to a scholarship fund for the training of pharmacists.

Certain drug manufacturers have expressed willingness to help the committee by providing shoppers, investigators and testing facilities to police the program. Committee investigators will spot-shop drugstores. Any complaint that a pharmacist is violating his "pledge of ethical practice" seal will be thoroughly investigated. Serious evidence of counterfeiting will be turned over to authorities for prosecution. Should the authorities fail to take what the committee considers to be satisfactory action, however, the committee will reserve the right to file civil suit and present evidence in court to collect the $10,000 forfeiture.

BLOWING THE WHISTLE

The response to the seal program has already been vastly encouraging. Local civic leaders in Washington are giving wholehearted support. Leading newsmen, radio and TV stars have agreed to promote and publicize the anti-counterfeit drive. Among them are WRC's Patty Cavin, WWDC's Steve Allison, WTOP's Mark Evans, and WMAL's Jerry Strong and Del Malkie. O. Roy Chalk, owner of the D.C. Transit Co., also has agreed to display the seal in every bus and streetcar so customers will know what to look for when they buy drugs.

To kill the bootleg drug racket will require tougher State and Federal laws, perhaps tougher policing and penalties. Until that day comes, pill purchasers should be on their guard.

"We've started the ball rolling," says Washington pharmacist Stoutenburgh of the seal program. "Now we are hoping the rest of the Nation will join up and stamp out once and for all this vicious practice."

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there has been much discussion in recent months of the economic problems the United States now faces in the conduct of her world trade. Growing imports of many items formerly supplied by our country to the rest of the world, the increased ability of foreign countries to supply one another with needed items, and the change in the trade position of nations once devastated by war, have placed in new focus the coming negotiation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

New developments in the control of international trade place a difficult burden on our negotiators. Quotas which frequently exclude our products from other nations even though tariffs may be low, currency restrictions which discriminate against U.S. dollars and the products they will purchase, and Government restrictions on import and export licenses all fall under this category. Although they are not directly a part of the tariff negotiations, they have an important bearing on the outcome of this conference. I, therefore, feel that the United States should take the use of these restrictions into full consideration in its negotiations to achieve genuine reciprocity.

Industry in New England and in fact throughout the whole country looks forward to growing exports and an equalization of its opportunity to compete with the imports now entering our country from nations which are in the position of purchasing increasing amounts of our products.

Considering the evolution in the whole character of international trade, I hope that the Senate may see fit to support increased efforts on the part of our negotiators. I believe that under these circumstances the Senate can helpfully state its views on the negotiations shortly to commence under GATT. I wish to present a resolution which I have discussed with State Department officials and also with representatives of New England industry which I hope can serve as a vehicle for such an expression of the sense of the Senate.

I therefore file for appropriate reference a resolution calling for the U.S. delegation to GATT to negotiate vigorously in these areas so as to benefit our exporters and assist in bringing about favorable conditions for the health of world trade generally.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 46), submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas the Trade Agreements Committee on May 28, 1960, announced the intention of the United States to participate in international tariff negotiations, listing United States import articles to be considered for possible tariff concessions; and

Whereas in such negotiations the United States delegation will be authorized to offer tariff concessions on certain articles; and

Whereas to counter the unfavorable balance of payments now being experienced by the United States, every effort must be made to stimulate United States exports and improve the United States balance of trade position; and

Whereas to counter unemployment in certain distressed areas of the United States every effort must be made to stimulate domestic manufacturing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States delegation to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade should be instructed to use its authority to the fullest extent practicable to offer and seek concessions in the manner best designed to obtain from other countries participating in these negotiations maximum reduction in their tariffs and liberalization of their quotas and other restrictions for the benefit of United States exporters consistent with the achievement of the goal of genuine reciprocity in our tariff and trade agreements with foreign nations.

TREATIES RELATING TO WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). On behalf of the majority leader, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive C, 87th Congress, 1st session, a treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington January 17, 1961; Executive D, 87th Congress, 1st session, the second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on August 16, 1960; Executive E, 87th Congress, 1st session, a copy of the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, signed at Paris on December 14, 1960; and Executive F, 87th Congress, 1st session, the texts of amendments to article 10(a)(2) and 13, of the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, held at Geneva from April 1 to 28, 1959, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the treaty, the second agreement, a copy of the convention, and the texts of amendments, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's messages be printed in the RECORD.

The messages from the President are as follows:

EXECUTIVE C, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

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 treaty between the United States of America and Canada concerning the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin, signed at Washington January 17, 1961, together with a report of the Secretary of State.

The treaty is an important step toward achieving optimum development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin as a whole from which the United States and Canada will each receive benefits materially larger than either could obtain independently.

The United States will secure a large block of power at low cost, substantial flood control benefits, and additional incidental benefits for irrigation, navigation, pollution abatement, and other uses resulting from controlled storage. Canada will also receive a large block of power at a low cost, as well as flood control and other benefits resulting from the control of water flow.

The treaty envisages the construction, in the Columbia River Basin in Canada within a 9-year period, of reservoirs providing 15.5 million acre-feet of storage. The treaty also clears the way for construction by the United States, at its option, of the Libby project on the Kootenai River in northern Montana, which was authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1950. The reservoir area for this project extends 42 miles into the Canadian province of British Columbia.

The flood control and power benefits resulting from the treaty will be realized at a much earlier date and at a cost materially less than would be the case were they to be provided exclusively through projects in the United States.

The developments brought about under the treaty will be of great significance for their human values as well as for the material gains they will provide.

The flood control objectives of the United States for the lower Columbia River in Oregon and Washington which have been a pressing need for many years will be brought to substantial realization within a span of less than a decade. The Libby project will resolve the critical flood control problem in the Bonners Ferry area in Idaho. Removal of

the hazard of periodic floods will pay incalculable dividends in the saving of human life and the avoidance of suffering, as well as through economic improvement in areas heretofore subject to recurring flood damage.

The initial power benefits realizable in the United States from Canadian storage under the treaty are comparable to another Grand Coulee Dam, the largest hydroelectric project now in operation in the United States. The Libby clearance presents the opportunity to gain an additional block of power substantially greater than the output of Bonneville Dam. The total initial result is a gain to the United States of over 1,686,000 kilowatts of low-cost prime power.

Over the longer term, this large block of storage will make more valuable the existing projects in the Columbia River Basin, representing an investment of some $3.5 billion, by accelerating the time at which their full potential can be realized. The large blocks of power that will result will be a tremendous asset in fostering the Nation's economic growth and in augmenting our national resources.

Due to the location of the storage, there will be no interference with the cycle for salmon and other anadromous fish which constitute such an important economic and recreational asset for the people of the Pacific Northwest.

To provide flood control and power benefits equivalent to those provided by the Canadian storage as of 1970 entirely from projects in the United States would require an investment in the United States of about $710 million (including the cost of necessary additional transmission facilities) over this decade. To realize the treaty benefits, on the other hand, the costs in the United States over the next 10 years are estimated at not over $150 million. Between 1970 and 1985 an additional estimated $268 million of U.S. expenditures will be required. Most of this added expenditure will go to install additional generating facilities in the United States to take full advantage of the Canadian storage. In all, the total capital outlay in the United States by reason of the treaty (exclusive of the cost of the Libby project) is estimated at about $418 million.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the treaty which should not be considered from the aspect of economic benefit alone but also as a further demonstration of the spirit of cooperation and mutual accommodation which has traditionally characterized relationships between Canada and the United States of America.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Treaty concerning the cooperative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin.)

EXECUTIVE D, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany regarding certain matters arising from the validation of German dollar bonds, signed at Bonn on August 16, 1960.

There is transmitted also for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding the agreement.

By providing for validation of certain East German dollar bonds as to which there are guarantors or substantial assets of the issuer in the Federal Republic of Germany, the agreement will permit payments to be made to the U.S. holders of such bonds. I recommend that the Senate take favorable action with respect to the agreement.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Agreement.)

EXECUTIVE E, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

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 copy of the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, together with copies of two protocols relating thereto, signed at Paris on December 14, 1960, by representatives of the United States of America, Canada, and the 18 member countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation.

The convention reflects the broad area of mutual interest among the major industrialized nations of the North Atlantic area. It represents a historic step toward closer economic cooperation among them. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development will forge a strong new link between Western Europe and North America, and will provide the means to intensify economic consultation and cooperation to meet the new challenges facing the member countries.

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

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Copy of the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with copies of two protocols relating thereto.)

EXECUTIVE F, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to approval of amendments to articles 10(a)(2) and 13 of the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, I transmit herewith the texts of those amendments as embodied in resolutions adopted at the Third Congress of the Organization, held at Geneva, from April 1 to 28, 1959. The amendment to article 10(a)(2) eliminates an inconsistency between the English and French language versions of the text with respect to voting on membership. The amendment to article 13 increases the membership of the Executive Committee of the Organization. The U.S. delegation to the Third Congress voted for the resolutions.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the amendments.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1961.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Amendment of article 10(a)(2), resolution 1 (Cg-III). 3. Amendment of article 13, resolution 2 (Cg-III).)

ADDITIONAL SPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for some time I have been very much concerned with the effect of the present electoral college system of electing our President and Vice President, in distorting the relative effect of the votes of our citizens, depending upon the State in which they live and other factors which have no substantial place in the election of our Chief Executive. I have come to the conclusion that the most effective way to deal with this problem is to amend the Constitution in order to eliminate the electoral college provisions and to provide for the election of our President and Vice President by popular vote.

It is of particular interest to me that a joint resolution to this effect has been introduced by the majority leader, since both he and I announced our interest in such legislation soon after election day, when the closeness of the balloting again called the incongruity of the present system to the attention of all Americans. The majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], has kindly consented to my joining as a cosponsor of his measure to this effect. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed as a co-sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 23 at the time of its next printing.

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

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS AND WHITE FLEET BILLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor to two bills which I introduced last week—S. 404 which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps, and S. 324 which would authorize establishment of a White Fleet for purposes of providing aid to people of other lands suffering from natural disasters.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ARCHIBALD COX, OF MASSACHUSETTS, SOLICITOR-GENERAL-DESIGNATE, AND BYRON R. WHITE, OF COLORADO, DEPUTY ATTORNEY-GENERAL-DESIGNATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, January 18, 1961, at 10:30 a.m.,

in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, before the Committee on the Judiciary, on Archibald Cox, of Massachusetts, Solicitor-General-designate, and on Byron R. White, of Colorado, Deputy Attorney-General-designate.

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency will hold public hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, January 18 and 19 on S. 1, S. 6, and S. 9, and any other bills which may be before the subcommittee relating to area redevelopment. We shall begin at 10 a.m. on Wednesday.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Milton P. Semer, counsel, Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, room 5304, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921.

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

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address delivered by him entitled "Public Education in a Democracy," at dedication of the Lexington High School, Lexington, Va., November 6, 1960.

AMBASSADOR DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a recent issue of the New York Times carried a story from Tokyo, by Robert Trumbull, on the expected departure of Ambassador Douglas MacArthur 2d from that city. The occasion ought not to pass without recognition of the outstanding services which Mr. MacArthur has rendered his country during the past few years.

It is all too easy to overlook these services, because of the riots last summer in Tokyo, which were the result of many factors. The fact is that Ambassador MacArthur has headed our entire official mission to Japan during a most critical transitional period. During this period we have moved from the vestiges of war and occupation to a sound footing of peaceful cooperation in Japanese-United States relations. Mutually beneficial trade has flourished; American personnel in Japan and, hence, costs, have been sharply reduced. And a new pattern of cooperation in defense is replacing the former one-sided dependency of Japan on the military power of the United States.

These achievements are due in great part to the distinguished and dedicated service of Douglas MacArthur 2d. He has led, as it is proper for an Ambassador to lead, all the various United States agencies and departments which are represented in the official mission in Tokyo. He has led them firmly and judiciously as a coordinated group. His work has been outstanding, both in this connection and in his personal relations with the leaders of the Japanese government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the story in the New York Times previously mentioned.

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

UNITED STATES AND JAPAN ENTER NEW ERA; THEIR MAJOR ISSUES ARE SETTLED—MACARTHUR ENDING TERM AS ENVOY AFTER HELPING BRING FORMER OCCUPIED LAND TO FOOTING OF EQUALITY AS ALLY

(By Robert Trumbull)

TOKYO, January 6.—With the expected departure soon of Ambassador Douglas MacArthur 2d as a new administration takes office in Washington, the United States will close a critical phase in its postwar relations with Japan.

The era of the second MacArthur here has brought relations between Tokyo and Washington to a new footing of equality after 15 years of Japanese subordination. The first MacArthur here was the occupation commander, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, the Ambassador's uncle.

The envoy's accomplishments were somewhat obscured by the riotous demonstrations against the new United States-Japanese mutual security treaty last May and June. The demonstrations forced the cancellation of President Eisenhower's scheduled visit here. Since then, the political party that adopted the treaty has been returned to power in the Diet (Parliament).

NO PROBLEMS OUTSTANDING

Premier Hayato Ikeda, assuming the direction of the Government as the leftist-led clamor subsided, declared significantly that no outstanding problems remained between Tokyo and Washington. This statement, which no Japanese leader could have made before, really denoted the end of the postwar transitional period in American-Japanese relations.

Developments followed a distinct progression from outright occupation, during which the Japanese political, economic and social systems underwent a thorough reform along democratic lines. Relations went through a period of economic and political dependency and into a third phase marked by the acute dissatisfaction of an emergent nation over what it considered to be restrictions upon its sovereignty.

Through protracted, negotiations, with Ambassador MacArthur handling United States policies, the Japanese grievances were resolved or ameliorated.

Near the outset of Mr. MacArthur's tenure in the Embassy, Japanese suspicions in one important area of relations with the United States decision to let local courts try Sp3c William C. Girard, accused of shooting and killing a Japanese woman on a firing range in an action outside the line of duty.

More than Specialist Girard's fate was involved here. The case had brought into question the good faith of the United States in interpreting the agreement on criminal jurisdiction over American personnel. The Embassy's action was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. The soldier was given a suspended sentence and removed from Japan.

SERVICE PERSONNEL CUT

Heeding a Japanese plea, the United States halved its number of combat personnel in Japan to about 50,000, forming an inconspicuous element in the population.

In response to Japan's complaint that the U.S. forces were needlessly hanging onto many land areas and buildings sequestered during the occupation, hundreds of these facilities were turned back to Japanese use.

In the new security treaty, the annual assessment on Japan to support American troops on her soil was dropped.

Another complaint was stilled when the United States expedited the parole of the last of the Japanese war criminals held in Sugamo Prison by any of the Allied nations. The Japanese had contended that their continued incarceration inflicted a "living stigma" on Japan for war guilt long since expiated.

Washington refused for security reasons to return the Bonin Islands but Congress ameliorated this grievance by voting $6 million compensation for Japanese residents of the islands who are prevented from returning to their homes.

THE NATIONAL BROADCASTING CO. WHITE PAPER SERIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the National Broadcasting Co., recognizing the urgent need for presenting to the public extraordinary national and international occurrences in the form of effective television documentaries, has developed a unique series known as NBC white paper.

The NBC news and public affairs department, in organizing these programs successfully, has made painstaking efforts to research, analyze, and collate the actual facts surrounding such unusual events as the U-2 affair, and the sit-in strikes, which affect the lives of every citizen in our community.

NBC news and public affairs prepared this white paper series not only to capture and hold the interest of the vast television audience from coast to coast, but, more importantly, to stimulate and activate public awareness and to create in the public a greater consciousness toward the safeguarding of the American way of life.

In view of the growing necessity for our people to understand fully these responsibilities as citizens both at home and abroad in the challenging crises of our times, the National Broadcasting Co., through its white paper series, has fulfilled its true role as a communications medium. It is NBC's hope that this kind of programing will help our Nation continually realize and appraise our ideals, and also, in this way, create and promote among our people an increased alertness to our national goals and our cherished democratic institutions.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that the National Broadcasting Co. is to be highly commended for its successful efforts to originate and present programs of such unique national importance as the NBC white paper series.

SOUTH DAKOTA ARGUS-LEADER ESSAY WINNERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the inauguration of a new President close at hand, I think it is fitting to bring to the attention of my colleagues five essays

which have been written on inaugurations of the past.

The five essays have been selected as the most outstanding in competition conducted by the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, South Dakota's largest daily newspaper, the publisher of which is John A. Kennedy. The writers of these highly interesting and informative articles will arrive in our Nation's Capital Wednesday, as guests of the Argus-Leader, for the Presidential inauguration.

Each of the writers is a high school student; and I can well imagine the thrill it will be for them as they attend this inspiring demonstration of our great democracy as the transition is made from one Chief of State to another. In view of the research and study the winning students have made, I expect that this trip to Washington will be a most fitting climax to what most certainly has been a keenly whetted interest in our Government.

Before placing the essays in the RECORD, I want to extend my congratulations to the student-writers on this outstanding recognition of their fine work. The Argus-Leader essay winners are:

Melody Gilbride, of Sioux Falls,
Burdell Peterson, of Flandreau.
James W. Conklin, of Aberdeen.
Vicki Barnett, of Sioux Falls.
Linda Nelson, of Vermillion.

Mr. President, I request permission that the articles be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Melody Gilbride)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Precedent was broken here today on this the 20th day of January in 1941.

A tradition, steeped in history since the Presidency of George Washington was washed out as Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath which made him the first third term President in American history.

Amid the circumstances of war in Europe, the Democratic Convention in 1940 nominated Franklin Roosevelt for a third term.

Roosevelt said he had accepted because the country needed every citizen and it was up to the electorate to say whether or not he had made the right choice in running again.

His opponent was Wendell Willkie, an old Bryan Democrat turned Republican, who hammered hard at Roosevelt's domestic policies but who refused to let himself get pushed into an attack on the President's foreign policies.

Today dawned crystal clear and just enough snap in the air to make people hurry a little to keep warm. The people had been waiting since early morning for this event.

Roosevelt's third inauguration went smoothly, and gracefully, just as his brief sermon-like speech had gone. Only twice did events slip from schedule; once when the President's Scottie, Falla, tried to accompany his master to the Capitol; and again when the clerk of the Supreme Court, Charles E. Cropley, suffered an attack of butterfingers with the Roosevelt family's heavy 200-year-old Bible.

This afternoon, President Roosevelt stood before the White House and reviewed the Nation's armed and civilian forces in the traditional inaugural parade. Well coated against the brisk, crisp breezes from the northwest, the President smiled and waved as the marchers strode past.

About midway through there was a lull. The paraders disappeared in the distance. From far up the avenue a dull rumble was heard. It grew louder. The President, nearsighted, groped for his glasses. Fitting them on his nose he saw units of light tanks approaching in clouds of blue exhaust. After them came medium tanks, motorcycle troops, armored combat cars at 20, 30, and 40 miles per hour. The crowds around the President cheered.

For in the thunder of those mechanized forces they heard the beating of the wave of America's future.

Could Roosevelt have wondered of his future?

Aided to the reviewing stand by his son James, the President did not look as robust as he did 8 years ago.

This inauguration has many interesting factors. Roosevelt is the first person to serve three terms. The people apparently wanted him to guide America for another 4 years. The world is in danger of war and many feel he can keep America out of war. The people have placed an unmeasurable amount of trust in him.

He is a heartwarming man, full of courage, and an unselfish person. He appears to be an inspiration to the people of America. He had kept their chins off the ground and spirits high.

Now this history-breaking event is in the hands of history.

What will it say of Franklin Delano Roosevelt? Where will it place him in American history?

Handicapped by a crippling disease, he has made bold moves in his previous 8 years. Does today's Inaugural Day signal more bold moves? Can he steer America on the path of peace or will he be forced to drape on his stooped shoulders the mantle of Commander in Chief of America's Armed Forces?

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Burdell Peterson)

When Andrew Jackson assumed office on March 4, 1829, it was with the simplicity of a Hebrew prophet. Jackson was the first President who was not descended from an old and aristocratic family. He was a typical frontiersman, from west of the mountains, and he was idolized by his backwoods followers. They poured into Washington from 500 miles around to share in his triumph. They seemed to think that he had rescued the country from some terrible danger.

The more cultured and conservative easterners watched with apprehension as the West crowded into Washington to celebrate.

Inauguration morning was ushered in by a salute of 13 guns.

By 10 o'clock on this sunny, springlike day, Pennsylvania Avenue was crowded with splendid carriages, old carts, wagons, people in finery, and people in rags. The frontiersmen wore coonskin caps and buckskin jackets, spat accurately, swore eloquently, and sang loudly the praises of Old Hickory. Half the men wore their trousers tucked in their boots and others wore pistols at their sides. So popular was Old Hickory, the newly elected President, that horsemen clopped by with hickory bark bridles, hickory stirrups, and hickory sticks. Women wore necklaces of hickory nuts and carried hickory brooms.

Among the spectators was Francis Scott Key who remarked of the mighty crowd, "It is beautiful, it is sublime." Another spectator said, "A monstrous crowd of people is in the city. I never saw anything like it before."

Jackson walked up unpaved Pennsylvania Avenue from the Indian Queen Hotel with his head uncovered "as a servant in the presence of his sovereign, the people of the United States." At about 12 a rending shout announced the presence of the general upon the eastern portico, which, from its elevation, rendered the ceremony extremely conspicuous and imposing. Order being reclaimed, the oath was administered by John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Then another shout went up from the multitude. After a dignified bow, the President commenced his short address. His manner was simple and emphatic. The only sign of nervousness was the trembling of his hands. His voice was low but distinct and audible at a considerable distance. He promised economy, the payment of the national debt, the protection of States rights, and a tariff for national industries.

The address being finished, another acclamation rent the air. There was now a general rush among the foremost to reach the President's hand.

When the ceremony at the Capitol ended, the crowd of Jackson's admirers—10,000 strong—followed him to the White House pleading for jobs all along the way. High and low, old and young, black and white pushed into the White House grounds and forced their way into the spacious mansion through all the doors and windows. No plans had been made to provide police for the reception. No one ever dreamed that the rabble would dare to attend.

In their eagerness to be served with refreshments, men in muddy boots leaped on satin-covered chairs, overturned tables, broke china and glassware, and pulled draperies from their hangings. Later, Jackson himself was glad to escape through a window and return to the Indian Queen Hotel. Peace was not restored in the White House until tubs of spiked orange punch had been placed around on the lawn to lure the mob out of doors. Even then there was still fighting going on inside the White House. Women as well as men had bloody noses. When it was all over, the White House looked as though it had been through a tornado. The damage to glassware, furniture, rugs, and draperies totaled several thousands dollars.

The election had been a great victory for Jackson as he received 178 electoral votes to 83 for Adams. It is recorded of the rough and ready Andrew Jackson that, before his nomination for the Presidency, he made an impulsive remark that he was not such a fool as to think he was fit for President. He could lead a body of men in a rough way but he wasn't the man for President.

However, he won the Presidency and entered the White House proud, yet grieving, for his wife had recently died from a heart attack.

So ended the "people's day" in honor of the "people's President."

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION

(By James W. Conklin)

No President of the United States has ever approached the office with so much private misgiving and public acclamation as did George Washington in 1789. There was no campaign for Washington, and his immense popularity was due to his primary role in winning the war that made the Presidency possible; a role that could never be duplicated by his successors. This acclamation is a prime factor in making this inauguration, the first Presidential inauguration under the new Constitution, the most interesting.

Washington alone was trusted both by the conservatives and by the democratic leaders. All agreed that under Washington the new Government might work. This faith that everyone had in Washington has never been equaled, and is another factor in making this inauguration interesting. The fact

that Washington was elected President by unanimous choice of the electors is another illustration of the people's faith in him.

Governor Morris, in urging Washington to accept the Presidency said, "Your cool, steady temper is indispensably necessary to give firm and manly tone to the new Government."

Washington was prevailed upon to turn his back once more upon the private life for which he longed. He was weary of public service, and honestly believed that he was not capable of the great task before him.

Never has a President had such a great, triumphal march to the Capitol as did Washington. From beginning to end his procession would have honored a Roman conqueror. In every village the people from the farm and workshop crowded the streets to watch for his carriage, and the ringing of bells and firing of guns marked his coming and going. At Baltimore, a cavalcade of citizens escorted him, and cannons roared a welcome. At the Pennsylvania line, Governor Mifflin, with soldiers and citizens, gathered to greet him. In the midst of a troop of cavalry, he rode into Philadelphia, beneath triumphal arches, for a day of public rejoicing and festivity. As he passed under one arch, a concealed mechanism lowered a wreath on his head. At Trenton there was sunshine, and arch of triumph, and young girls walking before him throwing flowers in his path. Songs of praise and gratitude were sung. The committees of Congress met him at Elizabethtown Point, and here he went on board a barge and was rowed to the city of New York, the temporary Capitol. A long procession of barges swept after him with music and song, while ships in the harbor fired salutes in his honor. When he reached the landing, he was accompanied by Governor Clinton to his house.

Thursday, April 30, was Inauguration Day. At 9 o'clock every church bell began a salute to the occasion. Washington dressed himself in a dark brown American-made suit, white silk stockings and silver shoe buckles; he was later to fasten on a dress sword in a steel scabbard. By the time the official procession reached his door at noon, he was ready to enter his coach, which was cream-colored, and of an elaborate design. The Washington coat of arms was on its sides, decorated with a scroll depicting the four seasons.

Between lines of cheering watchers, the parade proceeded to the new Federal statehouse on Wall Street. Washington went to the balcony and bowed to the cheering crowds. Then came the moment for which the whole Nation had waited. Washington repeated the oath of office after Chancellor Robert R. Livingston, and reverently added, "So help me God." He bent forward and kissed the Bible. Livingston turned to the railing and proclaimed in a ringing voice, "Long live George Washington, President of the United States."

There was cheering from the crowd below and the roar of a 13-gun salute. Washington stood bowing for a minute or two, then went into the Senate Chamber and read his inaugural speech. When it was over, he proceeded to St. Paul's Chapel to attend services. That concluded the ceremonies.

Therefore, Washington's inauguration is the most interesting because of the following: It was the first; it received a tremendous public acclamation; Washington's election was due to the unanimous choice of the electors in spite of the fact that he wanted to return to private life; his inauguration had a pageantry which has never been attained since; his inaugural established a precedent for subsequent inaugurations; and last, but certainly not least, due to Washington's inaugural and devoted service to the new Nation, it remained the United States of America.

THE MOST INTERESTING PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By Vicki Barnett)

The time is March 4, 1829. The place is the Nation's Capitol in Washington, D.C. The occasion is the inauguration of the seventh President of the United States, Andrew Jackson.

The south side of the Capitol is literally alive with the cheering, swarming crowds, who stand ready to receive their hero, "Old Hickory." The enthusiastic group bears no distinction of color, wealth, social level, or ability. The great new West, with its frontiersmen and pioneers, seems to be the predominantly represented section of the country. (Jackson himself is a typical native son of the unadulterated frontier, and truly represents the mass mind of the West.) Scattered among the pioneers are Jacksonian hunters and backwoods farmers from the South, whom Jackson has led to glory. The hickory emblem, symbolic of General Jackson, is in evidence everywhere. Hickory canes and staffs are carried by the men. Women are wearing bonnets trimmed with hickory leaves, and necklaces composed of hickory nuts fancifully painted. There is obviously an atmosphere of triumph hovering over the crowd as the cheering and singing grows louder; the people really seem to think that the country has been saved from some great danger.

Now the general and his small bodyguard are approaching on foot. Unlike his predecessors, Monroe and Adams, Jackson has no parade or military outfit with him to announce his arrival. Impeded by the huge throngs, Jackson's procession moves at snail pace. Even from a great distance, Jackson can be discerned from those who accompany him, for he is the only one who is hatless, thereby giving the impression that he wishes to be a servant in the presence of his sovereign, the people.

Entering the portico, the general advances to the table where he is to recite his oath of office. He is wearing two pair of spectacles; one for reading and one for looking. While one is in use, the other is pushed up on his forehead. Piercing shouts rend the air as the new President steps up to the rostrum to give his inaugural address. In words of simplicity, again appealing to the common people, Jackson touches on matters which are not too gravely important. In fact, as yet, no one really knows his political views, for this election was won solely on personal popularity.

Concluding his speech, President Jackson, amid the singing and shouting of his ardent admirers, mounts a fine, white horse and proceeds to make the short trek to the White House, where a gigantic feast has been prepared. The barrier which had been built up between President Jackson and the citizens because of scandalous rumors concerning his wife, Rachel, has now been broken down; therefore, the gates of the White House are flung open, allowing everyone present to attend the inaugural reception. Once more, Mr. Jackson demonstrates that he is a "man of the people."

Inevitably, mobs get out of hand, and this one is certainly no exception. Within the great white mansion, upholstered furniture is being trampled, many ornate decorations, pieces of costly china, and fine crystal glassware are being smashed. In their eagerness to shake the hand of their hero, the mobbing people have jammed President Jackson against the wall, to the serious peril of his ribs. Finally, friends help him to escape through a back entry.

The building being stuffed, Negro servants are bringing out buckets of punch and salvers of cake. Much food and drink is being wasted. In an effort to get inside the people have blocked the doorways so that those wishing to come out have to climb through windows and drop six feet or more to the ground. Everywhere, women are fainting; men are quarreling and badly bruising each other's faces.

Undoubtedly, to some, this demonstration represents only the intrinsic dangers of mob rule. But to others, including myself, the incidents occurring on March 4, 1829, directly symbolize the entrance of the true democratic spirit into American Government. For even though democracy has been the United States recognized form of government since the signing of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, democracy, as we now think of it did not come into existence overnight. Countless hardships were endured, battles were fought and won, the pangs of numerous depressions were felt, and drastic changes were made before the United States finally became a full-fledged democratic nation. The inauguration of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency was one of these drastic changes which represented a victory for democracy. Consequently, I believe that it was the most interesting Presidential inauguration in American history.

THE MOST INTERESTING INAUGURATION IN HISTORY

(By Linda Nelson)

"He is one of us" was the cry of the people when Andrew Jackson was elected to the highest office in the land. And rightly so, for Jackson was a product of the people. He was born in a frontier community in South Carolina, the son of poor Irish immigrants. With only a scanty education, Jackson became a lawyer. Later he went on to become a successful Indian fighter and army general. And in 1828, Andrew Jackson was elected to the U.S. Presidency.

Figuratively, Jackson came into Washington on the shoulders of the mob. The city was filled to capacity with Jackson supporters during the inauguration. Daniel Webster described the tremendous multitude in this manner: "I have never seen such a crowd before. Persons have come 500 miles to see General Jackson, and they really seem to think that the country has been rescued from some dreadful danger."

Prior to the inauguration Jackson stayed temporarily at Gadsby's Tavern, located across the river in Alexandria. The hostel was overrun with the President-elect's friends, swarming about the rooms and shaking hands with their idol.

March 4, 1829, dawned as an overcast day; but as Andrew Jackson left Gadsby's and walked to the Capitol, the sun broke through the clouds. At an early hour Pennsylvania Avenue had been lined with Jackson's friends, and he was impeded by the crowds thronging about him. As he proceeded, he could be seen from a distance since he alone was not wearing a hat. He was the servant in the presence of his sovereign, the people. Jackson was wearing a black suit and a black cravat. An English woman noted: "He wore his gray hair carelessly but not ungracefully arranged, and in spite of his harsh gaunt features looked like a gentleman and a soldier."

John Q. Adams, the well-educated, highly polished outgoing President, nurtured a great contempt for the new President. He had refused to ride in the inaugural parade with Jackson and had taken leave of Washington before the inauguration.

At noon Andrew Jackson delivered his inaugural address and was sworn into office by John Marshall. The grounds and steps of the Capitol were covered with Congressmen, Army officers, foreign ministers, and ladies dressed in the varying hues of fashionable colors. It was a most beautiful and inspiring scene.

After the ceremonies the new President rode to the White House with the entire mob on his heels. The Presidential home had never seen such a sight. Because of the defaming of the mansion in the eyes of the aristocrats, Jackson's critics nicknamed the home the "White House" because it no longer seemed like a mansion but merely a whitewashed house.

At the inaugural reception, according to the Justice Story, "The reign of the king mob seemed triumphant," and the White House was overrun by "crowds of all sorts of people, from the highest and most polished down to the most vulgar and gross in the Nation." The aristocrats looked on the noisy rabble with horror and disgust.

Half the men wore coonskin caps, had their trousers tucked into their bootlegs, and carried pistols openly in their belts. In their muddy boots they clumsily tramped over precious damask chairs, and carelessly knocked bric-a-brac off the walls while stampeding for refreshments. Women fainted; men had bloody noses; and to add to the confusion, no police had been placed on duty. To relieve the White House of the tumultuous crowd, punch was hauled outside; and the noisy festivities were continued on the front lawn.

During the gaieties friends had to form a blockade around Jackson to protect him from overzealous well wishers. Finally, Jackson crawled from a back window and retreated to Gadsby's to escape the din which shook the Capital all night long.

Andrew Jackson's hour of triumph, however, was marred with sadness by the death of his devoted wife, Rachel. She lived to see her husband elected but died before he moved into the White House. Rachel was arrayed for burial in the same white satin dress which she had planned to wear to her husband's inauguration. Jackson entered the White House, a lonely and shattered man.

Andrew Jackson's inauguration went down in history as a grand and hilarious spectacle; but amid the celebration and confusion, one important ideal was brought forth. The people at the inauguration realized that Jackson was the President of the people of the United States. He was one of them.

PRESIDENTIAL DIRECTIVE TO REDUCE NUMBER OF ARMED SERVICES DEPENDENTS STATIONED ABROAD AND TO CONSERVE DOLLAR EXCHANGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the estimated effects in Japan of the Presidential directive to reduce the number of dependents of armed services personnel who are serving abroad and to conserve dollar exchange. I believe the directive should be modified in the interest of improving the morale of our Armed Forces. I also believe that the reasons underlying the issuance of the order should be reexamined; and I take this position for the following reasons:

I have made an investigation, primarily from the Navy viewpoint, although my observations apply equally to the Army and to the Air Force.

The Navy intends to implement the reduction in the number of dependents stationed abroad first, by sending some officers and men home early, with their families; second, by encouraging single men to extend the length of their service; third, by sending out replacements without their families, the number of dependents stationed abroad to be reduced 50–70 percent; fourth, by applying the reduced percentage impartially through all ranks and enlisted grades. Army and Air Force plans are similar.

Numerous ships and staffs are homeported in Japan. This practice makes it possible to keep more active ships in the 7th Fleet. For this reason, preference has been recommended for the dependents of officers and men attached to these ships. If carried out, this will mean that very few personnel stationed ashore will have families with them. The problem of choosing the select few is essentially insoluble. Morale is sure to drop, and serious losses of career people will result.

Navy men are marrying Japanese women at the rate of about 1,100 per year. So far these newly acquired dependents are exempted from the quotas, although future action is unpredictable. The injustice of this action to U.S. wives is readily apparent.

The number of marriages to Japanese women will increase. So will the informal liaisons with these women, already a serious moral and morale problem, especially when U.S. personnel are married and have families in the States.

At present, in all services, about 50 percent of our people live in private rentals in the Japanese community. These men and their families are a major factor in the people-to-people program. As the dependents decrease in number, all of them, with few exceptions, will be concentrated—perhaps "segregated" is more accurate—in military posts. There may be many more "Ugly Americans."

The purchase of Japanese and other foreign goods for resale in our Navy exchanges has been stopped. Upward of 100,000 people in Japan, mostly in small business, have been concerned with the manufacture of goods for sale in the stores operated by the services. The owners are caught with goods in inventory amounting to several millions of dollars. Unfortunately, these goods in many cases are not salable to Japanese, and there is no established U.S. market for them.

The profits from these sales have gone to welfare and recreation funds, and amount to about 35 percent of all profits. With our base stores denied as outlets, these goods will be sold in the towns outside our gates. Prices will be higher, and quality uncertain. No profit will be generated for welfare, and more dollars will be spent.

Considerable latitude has been given in the expenditure of appropriated funds. Ship's stores afloat are still permitted to purchase foreign merchandise for resale to embarked personnel within certain restrictions. Purchase of Japanese goods and services by purchasing activities will be affected to only a small degree, since exceptions are provided if the price differential is greater than 25 percent, or if the purchase is under $1,000, or if the commodity is perishable. Within the exceptions granted, I expect that the economical repair of ships and airplanes in Japan will continue. I consider this program to be the most important expenditure of U.S. dollars in Japan in terms of value received and in supporting 7th Fleet operations in the western Pacific.

This order will result in some reduction of dollars spent overseas. But more dollars will have to be appropriated to the military, if our present strength overseas is maintained, in order to pay for greatly increased travel costs, inasmuch as single men and married men without dependents will be shifted approximately every 12 months, and for the purchase of higher priced goods and services in the United States.

In Okinawa there are to be no restrictions on the number of dependents stationed there or on sales in the stores. But the Navy has, as housing assets there, a total of 31 condemned Quonsets; and private rentals are scarce and very expensive.

This is a gloomy but, I fear, an accurate appraisal. If we are to continue to honor our worldwide commitments we must deploy military personnel overseas to support them. These personnel should be reasonably well paid and well housed. They cannot be expected to remain in the services, loyal and effective, if they are required by the United States to leave their families at home.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that this country—the wealthiest nation ever known—should have, from time to time, to go through the pains of periodic economic readjustments which bring unemployment and other economic and personal suffering to large sections of the country.

My own State of Wisconsin has several depressed areas, and I feel it is urgent that their plight be given immediate attention.

In the continued struggle between American democracy and Soviet communism, one of the major questions is which of the two systems will better be able to satisfy the needs of the people and to provide continued security to labor, to management, to small business, to the retired persons, and to all other segments of our economy. We cannot afford to fail winning this contest with communism.

Recently, I received from the Ashland County Civic Club, in Wisconsin, a resolution expressing the concern of the club over the problems of foreign competition through the importation of foreign ore, steel, and wood products.

I should like to read this resolution in the RECORD.

Whereas the importation of foreign ore, steel, and wood products has seriously retarded the economy of our whole area, and caused the closing of many of our plants, and curtailed the operation of our existing mines and retarded progress in opening new mines, causing a serious unemployment problem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Ashland County Civic Club in special meeting assembled, do respectfully request the national Congress to pass regulations curtailing such imports and as far as possible make Federal funds available for opening of potential sources of new employment in these depressed areas.

Also that a copy of this resolution be sent to the State legislature and to the Governors

of the three States who are facing this same problem, namely, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, with instructions that we collectively request the Congress to pass legislation to remedy this situation.

ASHLAND COUNTY CIVIC CLUB,
HERMAN PATITZ, *President.*
GERALD J. SCHRANFUGEL, *Secretary.*

On this occasion, I wish to stress that our domestic problems are numerous, immediate, and overwhelming. In fact, we may very well need to develop our own domestic point 4 program to cope with these problems. Now that many of our foreign friends have gotten on their own feet, a domestic aid program is doubly appropriate.

Certainly there is national justification for our overseas aid programs. But we cannot forever go on helping Europe, Asia, and Africa, when there are slums in our midst, when there are pockets of industrial unemployment in the Eastern United States and even in my own State of Wisconsin. We have spent great fortunes on foreign aid. Now the time has come for us to establish a domestic program for aid to our own needy areas.

I hope Congress and the administration will study this problem carefully and will act in order to prevent greater economic suffering and in order to prevent more serious disruptions in our economy.

NAVAL RADIO STATION AT CUTLER, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, during the last week of 1960 I made a tour of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps establishments in my home State of Maine. I had visited most of the establishments many times before, but this was my first coordinated, overall tour of the Maine bases.

I was greatly encouraged with what I found. Our service personnel are doing a dedicated and truly wonderful job for the defense and security of our country. I am very proud of the manner in which the people of Maine are cooperating with them.

In this tour I visited the naval radio station at Cutler, Maine, for the first time. It was a fascinating experience that defies imagination; the station is truly one of the wonders of the world.

This vitally important naval installation will beam radio waves and communications to all corners of the world and to sea depths never accomplished before. It will be the hub of the worldwide communication system for the greatest defense weapon we have, the Polaris missile nuclear submarine.

So fantastic is the naval radio station at Cutler, Maine, that I wish all Members of this body could visit it. I guarantee that it will be well worth their time and will be a most gratifying and interesting experience for them.

I wish to express high commendation for the commander of the naval radio station, Comdr. J. J. Zammit, and his staff, for the very excellent performance they have given, and to the Continental Electronics Co. Together they have performed a rare achievement—the completion of the construction of the station a year ahead of the scheduled time. This is unheard of in Defense Establishment construction.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a fine, perspective analysis of our economic structure today, written by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's press, and I refer particularly to the Washington Post.

The burden of Mr. Lippmann's analysis suggests we must concern ourselves deeply not only with the rate of our economic growth, an economic growth consistent with our own population explosion and the needs attendant on it, but, likewise, with the question of economic needs, not alone of consumption by purchasers but of productivity and consumption on the national level and in the national interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the able article by Walter Lippmann be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1961]

THE TWO POSITIONS

(By Walter Lippmann)

In his last message on the state of the Union and the budget President Eisenhower, as was his constitutional duty, has stated his own views about economic policy. They differ importantly from those of the incoming Kennedy administration, and they point to certain basic issues which will now be much discussed. As it happens, there is available for the discussion not only Mr. Kennedy's campaign speeches but the report of Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, which was made public about 10 days ago.

As between the Eisenhower and the Kennedy positions on the recession, the budget, and the state of the economy, there are two main points of difference. The one is about the current recession. The other is about the general condition of the American economy since about 1955 when it has been shaped by the Eisenhower-Humphrey-Anderson policies.

On the recession, President Eisenhower expresses an unqualified optimism that the recession will soon cure itself and that consequently we shall have a small budgetary surplus by June 30 next. The Samuelson report to Mr. Kennedy rejects the idea that we can count on the recession curing itself quickly. The report calls for some immediate but moderate measures to reflate the economy—something in the order of three to five billions of expenditures above the Eisenhower level. But these suggestions are followed by a warning that the recession may grow worse—that unemployment, which is now about 6 percent of the labor force, may rise to seven and a half percent, which is the peak for the postwar era. Should this happen, the Kennedy administration is advised to prepare for still stronger measures of reflation, including perhaps a temporary cut in taxes.

As of now no one can tell whether the stronger measures will be necessary. But there is good reason to disbelieve in the Eisenhower optimism about the recession, that it will quickly cure itself. There is an ominous and pertinent precedent for this disbelief. In early 1958, when the second of the Eisenhower recessions was underway, the President predicted a small budgetary surplus for fiscal 1959, just as he is now predicting a small surplus for 1961 and a larger surplus for 1962. But in fact, because of the recession, the 1959 budgetary year ended with a deficit of $12 billion, the largest deficit ever in time of peace. After that, we must look with caution and skepticism at optimistic predictions that all will right itself quickly, and that nothing is needed except words of confidence and hope.

The difference between Eisenhower and Kennedy on the current recession is, however, not nearly so important as their differing views on the general condition of the economy.

President Eisenhower says in the message on the state of the Union that "the expanding American economy passed the half-trillion-dollar mark in gross national product early in 1960. The Nation's output of goods and services is now nearly 25 percent higher than in 1952."

While the figures are true, the impression of strong growth, which they are meant to convey, is misleading. For they leave out of the picture the fact that since 1952 the population of the continental United States has grown by something like 25 million persons.

In the years 1955–60—when the consequences of the Korean war were over and the Eisenhower-Humphrey-Anderson economic policies were operating—our gross national product increased from $448 billion to about $503 billion. (This is the President's "half trillion.") These figures mean a rate of growth of 2.6 percent per year, which is among the very slowest of the advanced industrial nations of the world. Worse still, measured against the increase of the population, these figures mean that the annual production per capita has increased by something less than 1 percent.

This sluggish rate of growth is at the root of many of our domestic and of our foreign problems. The Samuelson report to Kennedy says "Had our economy progressed since 1956—not at the dramatic sprint of the Western European and the Japanese economies or at the rush of the controlled totalitarian systems, but simply at the modest pace made possible by our labor force and productivity trends—we could have expected 1961 to bring a gross national product some 10 percent above the $500 billion level we are now experiencing." This would mean, says the report, that we would be producing about $50 billion more per year, and that at the present rate of taxes this would produce a budget surplus of $10 billion.

Those who say that without inflation or regimentation our rate of growth cannot be increased above the Eisenhower level should ponder what it means to say this. It means that we can no longer achieve the rate of growth which we have achieved for over a century. It means that, as compared with all our economic competitors, not to speak of the Soviet Union, we have become—though we are still the biggest of the lot—sluggish and slow to develop. Must we accept this view of ourselves? Would it not be a good thing to be a little less optimistic about the recession which stares us in the face and to have a little more confidence in the American future?

But this is not all. The Kennedy administration will be concerned not only with the rate of growth but with the kind of growth.

President Eisenhower's convictions on this point were put forward most explicitly by the Chairman of his Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Saulnier, who once testified in 1949, "As I understand an economy its ultimate purpose is to produce more consumer goods. This is the object of everything we are working at: to produce things for consumers." Then he went to to say that "if you take total gross national production, you find growth in recent years has lagged. But if you look at consumption—the thing which, as I say, I regard myself as being committed to maximize—you find that we are doing better."

The results show that if this was the right goal, the Eisenhower administration has reached it. Between 1955 and the first half of 1960, personal consumption expenditure increased at the rate of 3.3 percent per year, whereas the whole economy grew by only 2.6 percent. This is not the character of a sound and prudent society—that, when subjected to an historic challenge, when faced with an explosive growth of population and its concentration in great cities, personal consumer expenditure grow faster than expenditures for productive investment or for the national defense.

BUDGETING CONFIDENCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on another subject, I call attention to an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning entitled "Budgeting Confidence." This is an extremely able analysis of budgeting problems in the transition from one administration to the next. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BUDGETING CONFIDENCE

President Eisenhower's final budget makes the best of assorted uncertainties and leaves for President-elect Kennedy the hard but probably necessary job of throwing the books into the red for this year and next. Deficit financing of some Federal needs would be a thoroughly justified move against recession, if the consensus of expert economic judgment is correct. It will probably be necessary, in any case, to meet the minimal defense and domestic needs that have been shortchanged in the Eisenhower budget.

Mr. Eisenhower appears to have chosen the most optimistic of several economic forecasts put before him in relying, for revenue estimation purposes, upon a growth in total output from $503 billion last year to between $510 and $515 billion in 1961. This prognosis assumes that the economy has now merely leveled off and will head upward by late winter, more or less on its own. But a more detailed examination of production figures indicates that the country is, indeed, in a decline and that the end is not in sight barring some strong Federal action to compensate for the slump in private investment.

Again, putting the best face on matters, Treasury Secretary Anderson prefers to believe that the decline in inventory purchasing reflects business confidence in stable prices. Budget Director Stans, complementing this observation, suggests that a few words of "confidence" from the new administration would do more than billions in spending to keep things steady. There is no denying that confidence is of central importance in the functioning of the American economy, but it is not something that can be pulled out of the air by Presidential incantation.

The confidence that the American people need must be grounded upon a certitude that the Government in Washington is aware of and responsive to national needs. Thus prompt action to extend and improve unemployment benefits, beyond any measures proposed by Mr. Eisenhower, would generate confidence. The early acceleration of needed highway, urban renewal and other public works programs, most of which in many communities lag far behind requirements, would stimulate confidence.

More adequate funding of certain military research and development programs essential to restoring and maintaining American influence would add to confidence. Some basic tax reforms to stimulate private investment and perhaps a temporary tax cut would encourage confidence. But the mere proclamation, "all's well," which is the thesis of the Eisenhower 1962 financial program, is not enough.

Mr. Kennedy is wise, we think, to plan on making his changes in the budget bit by bit as he and his associates have a chance to analyze the weak spots and to formulate the best ways to strengthen them. This will make it a little harder for the public to follow the development of the Kennedy program as contrasted with the proposals of Mr. Eisenhower, but even without a change in administration the budget is altered many times during a year by changes both in revenue estimates and in spending expectations.

It would be helpful if the new Budget Director, particularly in this year of transition, could provide monthly budget reviews in place of the half-yearly revisions which are customary. The summaries compiled by congressional committees during the year are never all-inclusive, and there is no central place where a good cumulative accounting of executive branch proposals and legislative actions is always and readily available.

Mr. Eisenhower reiterates in his final message the philosophy of public spending that has blinded both of his administrations to the economic challenge which confronts this country. That philosophy is that private disposition of earnings by individuals is inherently sounder and wiser and better for the Nation than public allocation of the fruits of industry. Thus the smaller the Federal budget in proportion to gross national product, the better for the country. In his 8 years, Mr. Eisenhower has indeed succeeded in pushing downward, however slightly, the proportionate level of Federal expenditure, and in this cold statistic he takes great pride.

But during those 8 years American military primacy has been seriously challenged, the Federal Government has failed to keep pace with State and local efforts to meet problems in education, health, and welfare, and despite a general private affluence, deep pockets of poverty and human misery persist throughout the land. Private, individual decisions will not bring the remedies that are needed, and a prejudice against public action in meeting these needs has no place in the budgeting of American economic effort.

The first task for the new administration is to remove this senseless shackle and permit the realistic statement of priority public needs. Until this is done, Congress will be unlikely to respond with the equally necessary realism on the Federal revenue structure.

REHABILITATION NEEDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, an article in the New York Times of January 15, written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, gives a full report on the recommendations of the section on rehabilitation at the recent White House Conference on the Aging.

I believe these recommendations merit the careful attention of all those who are concerned about the welfare of disabled people, their families, and the social costs of disability. As Dr. Rusk points out:

The recommendations of the White House Conference, if followed, not only would change the course and tempo of the present program of rehabilitation of the aged, but would make possible new lives of dignity for a considerable segment of our population.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Rusk's fine article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REHABILITATION NEEDS—FIRST WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE REPORTS ON REQUIREMENTS OF ELDERLY INDIGENT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—More than 3,000 interested experts and citizens in the field of the aging have been meeting this week in Washington at the first White House conference on this subject.

The program was obviously a complicated one, because of the breadth of the problem, which ranges from leisure time activity to medical care. Ten work groups and 20 sections met in 8 Washington hotels.

Unfortunately, the controversy over method of payment for medical care for the aged has obscured the other important problems considered at the conference, and many of the most significant findings of the week were left unreported.

Throughout the conference, there was tremendous interest in rehabilitation and the vital role it plays in the health and well-being of the elderly.

The final report of the section on rehabilitation is quoted in its entirety, because it is believed that those interested in rehabilitation and the problems of the aged will be eager to know the recommendations of the White House conference for an action program.

"THE ONLY HOPE

"Rehabilitation is the only hope for those afflicted with and disabled by chronic or degenerative conditions until such time as specific means are found to prevent and cure them. The rehabilitation program must be dynamic and total, designed to meet the physical, emotional, social, and vocational needs of the chronically ill and disabled.

"Only a fraction of those needing these services can secure them, due to lack of facilities, personnel, financial resources and knowledge as to the opportunities available through such dynamic rehabilitation. In an effort to meet these deficiencies and promote understanding the following recommendations are offered by the Section on Rehabilitation:

"Vocational rehabilitation services must be improved and expanded so that older disabled persons may obtain or regain their ability to work and secure suitable employment.

"This requires staff increases; greater public understanding of career opportunities in rehabilitation; additional funds specifically allocated for the vocational rehabilitation of the aging; creation of more job opportunities for qualified older workers; continued exploration of methodology for maximum utilization of the work skills of beneficiaries receiving social security disability benefits; the enactment of Federal grant-in-aid legislation to help communities establish rehabilitation workshops meeting acceptable standards to provide diagnostic and therapeutic services and terminal employment for those not capable of competitive work.

"Such workshops should be eligible to secure Federal surplus property on the same basis as schools and hospitals.

"TEACHERS NEEDED

"Qualified teachers must be provided and well structured units concerned with the teaching of rehabilitation principles need to be established or expanded in schools of medicine, dentistry, nursing, and in departments of psychology, education and other related disciplines, both on the graduate and undergraduate level.

"Hospitals and rehabilitation centers should have adequate outpatient and inpatient facilities for the rehabilitation of the aging. Rehabilitation services could well be a condition of accreditation for hospitals, particularly those with approved internship training programs.

"Facilities offering long-term care should be required to have minimum rehabilitation services to be licensed or otherwise approved. Staff training programs should be available. The fee structure should be such as to encourage the provision of rehabilitation services. These facilities should be encouraged to affiliate with organized and approved training programs for the improvement of their nonprofessional staff. Persons with practical knowledge may serve a useful purpose to supplement the services of professional workers.

"EVALUATION STRESSED

"Geriatric rehabilitation must begin with the first professional exposure and persistently continue in the institution or institutions to which the patient is subsequently admitted. Prompt and comprehensive rehabilitation evaluation must be made at the earliest possible time to determine the patient's future.

"Admission of emotionally disturbed older people to psychiatric institutions should be preceded by a thorough evaluation by qualified medical personnel.

"A Federal grant-in-aid program should be established to help States develop programs designed to inculcate rehabilitation practices in governmental, nonprofit, and proprietary institutions providing long-term services to handicapped older people. This would involve research, demonstration, and training of personnel.

"Communities should develop additional supporting services and facilities such as home care programs, homemaker services, day hospitals, patient clubs, halfway houses, foster homes, and preventive clinics for well older people. Careful attention to the training of the aging in the use of prosthetic and self-care devices would enable many of them to lead more independent lives.

"State councils of representatives of public agencies concerned with rehabilitation services to seriously handicapped older people should be established. Local councils should be organized also to serve as centers for public information, referral, and planning services.

"Public assistance agencies should be given the financial resources to implement the provisions of their laws for self-help and self-care to include persons who are not recipients of public assistance. They should strengthen the rehabilitation concept in their medical care program. State rehabilitation agencies should utilize existing authority to provide more rehabilitation services to older people. Arbitrary age limits, where they exist, should be removed. Public health agencies should be more adequately financed in order to allow them to assume a greater responsibility in the field of rehabilitation and related services.

"Voluntary and health insurance plans should provide inpatient as well as outpatient coverage for rehabilitation services in hospitals and in rehabilitation centers.

"As one means of strengthening rehabilitation efforts, consideration should be given to the establishment of a National Institute of Rehabilitation.

"Research should be encouraged to identify administrative and organizational patterns through which rehabilitation services can be provided effectively for older people. In this and other fields voluntary effort must be encouraged at all levels and individual community initiative emphasized. Churches, schools, libraries, and other public and private institutions should be alert to the needs of older handicapped people within the scope of their own activities. There should be a Federal grant-in-aid program to help communities establish rehabilitation facilities as well as workshops.

"To promote the well-being of persons suffering visual loss and maintain their integration as members of society there are available a considerable array of valid processes. These consist of two major kinds: (1) Means of sight preservation and restoration, including visual aids and (2) means of self-management as blind individuals.

"THE TALENTS NEEDED

"For the first of these the combined talents of medicine, optometry, and social work require special facilities and training under the aegis of properly constituted public health programs.

"For the second, resources of rehabilitation are required, particularly skills in self-management as developed in rehabilitation for the blind, as well as the liberal use of such motivation measures as reader and guide service.

"Pragmatically sanctioned treatment and care as developed in various existing programs for the blind can be serviceable to the aged population, if expanded. There is need to learn more about the true function of work, leisure, and recreation in the lives of aging persons with vision loss.

"There is both ignorance and complacency with respect to the serious problems presented by hearing loss among the aging. There is great need, therefore, to point up the problems of the hard of hearing and the deaf and to stimulate public concern.

"CASE FINDING SYSTEM

"We need to establish a system for case finding in both urban and rural areas and to promote the training of professional and technical personnel. Hearing aids and training in their use should be provided as needed. We need also to devise special plans for job placement and job maintenance for our older people with hearing impairments.

"Appropriate safety provisions for these older individuals with hearing loss should be incorporated in housing planning. Deaf persons requiring institutional care should be provided appropriate accommodations in institutions serving the aged.

"Several million of our older citizens are dependent on others for meeting the normal demands of daily living. They cannot travel, feed themselves, dress, communicate adequately, or move about without aid. If they were provided modern rehabilitation services, many could once again learn to live their lives in independence and with greater dignity. Some could return to work.

"The benefits from rehabilitation services would extend not only to these disabled persons alone, but to their families and to society as a whole. A Federal grant-in-aid program should be established to provide the rehabilitation services they need that would lead to independent living."

The recommendations of the White House conference, if followed, not only would change the course and tempo of the present program of rehabilitation of the aged, but would make possible new lives of dignity for a considerable segment of our population.

REPORTS OF POSTMASTERS GENERAL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, my hometown paper, the Lexington Gazette, one of the oldest weeklies of continuous publication in the Nation, reprinted in its issue of January 11, 1961, the following news item from its issue of January 8, 1836:

From the report of the Postmaster General, it appears that the post routes during the year ending June 30, covered over 112,754 miles. In daily and less frequent trips, the mails were carried on these routes about 25,869,486 miles. The number of post offices was 10,770, the gross revenue for the year was $2,993,556.66 and expenses $2,757,350.08 leaving a balance in favor of the Department of $236,206.58. Mr. Kendall appears to manage this extensive concern with more ability than his predecessor.

That substantial surplus which the Postmaster General reported for the end of the previous fiscal year 125 years ago is in pleasing contrast to the deficit of $888 million which the Postmaster General is expected to report at the end of the current fiscal year.

NATIONAL CHILD EVANGELISM WEEK

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the week of February 25 to March 6, 1961, has been designated as "National Child Evangelism Week" throughout the United States and Canada.

Special services will be held in churches and other places during the week to alert the people of the United States and Canada to the need for Bible teaching to children.

During this week special proclamations will be issued by Governors of States, mayors of municipalities and other governing bodies.

National Child Evangelism Fellowship, Inc., sponsors of National Child Evangelism Week, has issued the following report:

Report of Child Evangelism Fellowship accomplishments for 1 year, Sept. 1, 1959–Aug. 31, 1960

Total number children's home Bible classes (Good News Clubs)	8,495
Total number children contacted in these classes	279,578
Total number children contacted in these classes not in Sunday school	25,479
Total number children starting Sunday school as a result of these contacts	4,351
Total number children reached in school classes (other than above)	83,982
Total number children contacted in summer 5-day clubs	74,042
Total number children contacted in rallies	62,051
Total number children contacted in vacation Bible schools	27,170
Total number children contacted in other ways (fairs, hospitals, trailer courts, detention homes, playgrounds, etc.)	108,112
Total children contacted in all phases of this work	634,935
Total number volunteer teachers, helpers and hostesses	13,515
Total number of children personally dealt with and making decisions for Christ	107,043

This is a very conservative report as several different States did not make reports for several months.

Child Evangelism Fellowship serves the church by channeling into the Sunday school the children contacted in the home Bible classes; giving the church contact with families who do not attend church; giving specialized training to Sunday school teachers and church workers; and making available the best in visual aids, Bible lessons, and teaching materials.

I trust that this program, sponsored by the National Child Evangelism Fellowship, will receive the approval and active support of church organizations throughout the country.

THE EISENHOWER REGIME—A FRANK APPRAISAL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in a few days President Eisenhower will be concluding his 8 years of service as President of the United States.

As a Kansan and one who made two trips to Paris to urge Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to return to the United States and become the Republican candidate for the Presidency, I am proud of the fact that he retires from office with the good will of the American people.

During his administration there have been outstanding achievements in both the international and domestic fields. His ability as a Chief Executive to work with Congress is notable in the fact that there has been less bickering between the White House and Capitol Hill than with respect to any previous administrations.

One of the criticisms which might be made against President Eisenhower is the fact that he was not partisan enough. He was truly a statesman, and politics was laid aside in the interests of all of our people.

During the past few days Congress has received his last two messages to the Nation and to the Congress; namely, his message on the state of the Union and his budget message.

For 8 years our Nation has been at peace, but during this period military preparation has been underway which gives us the deterrent power to defend ourselves on any part of the globe.

The life ambition of the President—soldier-statesman that he is—is to bring about a solution of our tense world problems so that citizens everywhere may live in security and peace. Great progress has been made in this field, but there is much more to be done.

In the domestic field notable gains have been made in civil rights, social security, and welfare. When he assumed the Presidency, the purchasing power of the dollar had suffered greatly through inflation. It was through his tireless efforts that the inflationary trends were arrested. Family income increased by more than 15 percent and the laborer's wages went up 20 percent.

History will, in my opinion, record the fact that no President ever left the White House with stronger support among the people than President Eisenhower. There is no doubt in my mind that had he desired to serve another term and had there not been a constitutional prohibition against a third term, he would have been elected overwhelmingly.

One of President Eisenhower's close friends for many years, Roy Roberts, editor of the Kansas City Star, wrote an article entitled "The Eisenhower Regime—A Frank Appraisal," which appeared in the Kansas City Star January 15, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a part of these remarks.

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

THE EISENHOWER REGIME—A FRANK APPRAISAL

We're entirely too close to the man and the events to make a fully objective evaluation of the Eisenhower era. Time and history will write the final story.

But, as an era ends and an era begins, there are bound to be many contemporary appraisals. It would be fascinating, a couple of decades hence, to tune in on history's evaluation of these swift-paced years. We have our hunch about them, and a definite belief that history will substantiate it. We suspect that time will ultimately find President Dwight D. Eisenhower a niche much higher in our national annals than today's intellectuals and pundits seem willing to give him.

We believe that history's judgment will be based primarily on one phase of the Eisenhower record that has been largely overlooked. Certainly Dwight Eisenhower will not be given accolades as one of the most brilliant or imaginative of Presidents. But few men in the decades of the Republic have so captured the hearts, the trust, and the faith of the people. More important, this general turned President has retained the deep affection of his countrymen practically undiminished to the end.

In short, it will be Ike the man whom history will remember and evaluate. The impact of his personality on the world, the great drama of one individual working unceasingly for peace, will form the basis for time's judgment. These qualities will overshadow the specific measurements of success and failure.

The Ike legend will grow. For history possesses, in the retiring Presidents, one of those rare individuals who are taken completely into the hearts of the people. Who can say that a man and his purpose in life cannot have an impact greater than can be measured by his specific deeds?

General Eisenhower entered the White House with the aura and glamour of a war hero. The remembered reputation of the battlefield soon faded. Ike, the man of good will, honesty, and peace, began to emerge. His era draws to a close now, but the affections of his fellow Americans remain. Even in the politically charged atmosphere of the late campaign, predominantly Democratic cities such as Chicago and New York staged tremendous demonstrations, almost impromptu, for the President. Not for political love but for the man himself.

It was pretty generally admitted even by his opponents and critics that had Dwight Eisenhower been running again in 1960, there would have been another Eisenhower landslide. The Democratic opposition handled the Chief Executive gingerly until the closing weeks of the campaign when no holds were barred. The Democratic attitude was, we believe, simply a practical and political recognition of the popular feeling toward Ike the man.

Perhaps more important in the story of our times is the fact that the Eisenhower appeal proved to be a highly exportable commodity. Consider the savage, sometimes humiliating propaganda onslaughts by Nikita Khrushchev and the Communists in the closing months of the Eisenhower era. Nothing that ruthless men could say or do effectively diminished the worldwide reputation of Dwight D. Eisenhower as a leader for peace.

We think of the millions who greeted him on his dramatic journeys to other lands, of the crowds in the streets of Karachi or New Delhi or in countless other spots around the globe. We think of the old ideas—the American ideas—of peace and justice and freedom that he made new for the masses of the nations. We think of the cheering multitudes and the hand-drawn sign of a little Turkish boy that said: "Ike Like We."

And here, perhaps, we have achievement that will provide history its most pointed judgment. Before the world Dwight D. Eisenhower stood as the symbol of peace and good will. In Moscow, in Peiping, and elsewhere others have sought to tarnish the image. But we have no doubt that the symbol of peace and good will has been transferred in a large degree to the United States itself. The intangible something that Dwight Eisenhower possesses made people trust him. History must consider the fact, even though Ike will never be judged as the most profound or brilliant of world leaders.

In evaluating any President and his record, you have to examine three aspects of his White House years:

His world leadership.

His national leadership.

His party leadership.

The biggest single problem confronting Mr. Eisenhower in his 8 years at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue was the problem of war and peace. To be sure, the Communist advance was, in those 8 years, virtually halted from a geographical point of view. But unquestionably, the world picture darkened in the later years. No one disputes that gloomy fact and history will so record it.

Yet everything is comparative. During the previous administration, the world saw the forces of communism advance menacingly. More than a fourth of the world's population, in continental China, disappeared behind the impenetrable curtain of communism.

In 1961, as President Eisenhower prepares to leave office, the Reds have a foothold in Cuba right on the doorstep of our continent. Nevertheless, it is a fair judgment to say that the actual loss to communism during his administration has been small compared to the free world's losses in the preceeding years.

There is another fact that alters today's judgments and which history cannot avoid. As President, Mr. Eisenhower faced more than just the sinister thrust of communism. His years watched the spreading spark of world revolution, of striving nationalism. Around the globe, and especially in Africa, new nations have taken their place in the sun. The have-nots have sought the status of the haves. And the underdeveloped new nations in particular have offered fine waters for the Communists to fish in.

Man's desire for freedom and for self-determination has started one of the great movements of history. The world leaders of all nations have been forced to cope with that movement. Keep that in mind as you study the overall Eisenhower record. And, considering the many forces and tensions of today, one fact at the moment stands out: We have had 8 years without the start of a new war even though we have been perilously close to the brink several times.

We recall the early Eisenhower days when it looked as though the Indo-China affair was about to create another Korea. Within the administration itself and in the diplomatic circles there were tremendous pressures for armed American intervention.

After sleepless nights, spent pacing the floor of his White House quarters, the warrior-President made the decision for peace, not war.

History in time may note how curious it is that this devotion to peace should have predominated throughout the regime of a great war hero who became President.

From a practical point of view, there were two definite periods of Eisenhower foreign policy. The first was dominated by the vigorous, uncompromising Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. In the second period, President Eisenhower himself took personal command.

We suspect that historians may wage their fiercest debates over two major foreign policy decisions. Both, oddly enough, involved the simple question of honesty.

Secretary Dulles was ill when the first major decision, in the Suez crisis, was made. France, England, and Israel had moved on Egypt. The United States had been urging the United Nations to condemn the aggression of Communist Russia in bloody Hungary. What was the United States to do when its own allies—wisely or unwisely—put themselves in a similar position before the world?

Dwight Eisenhower took the position that the United States had to be honest with the world. And that it must insist that the rules of world conduct apply to our allies as well as our foes.

For a time, it looked as though the North Atlantic Treaty Organization would break wide open and that our tight ties to Europe would be destroyed. But NATO and our friendships with Europe survived. In time even closer bonds were forged.

The second decision that will fascinate history was the President's personal handling of the U–2 affair. It wasn't cricket, it wasn't even logical under the rules of international conduct, to admit such an incident. When spying of any sort is mentioned, a nation speaks with diplomatic white lies. Everyone knows it.

But Ike amazed the world. Candidly, he admitted what the United States had done. That decision started the chain reaction that rocked the Nation and destroyed the last faint hopes of a successful summit. Whatever history's appraisal of this action by Dwight Eisenhower, this much we know: It was entirely typical of the man.

So the United States, under Mr. Eisenhower, has passed through a period of world leadership in which the tensions have been increased, not lessened. The tide of nationalism has moved relentlessly. But Europe made an amazing economic comeback in this period. There was no retreat from Berlin although there was no settlement.

And under a man of peace, the United States has had 8 years of peace—though peace that has been admittedly uneasy. That man of peace has been most effective as his country's good will ambassador to the millions.

Let's look now at Dwight Eisenhower as a national leader. The record has been unspectacular but sound. And it must be considered in the light of the forces that are altering history as we watch it.

We need to consider, for example, the expanding population of the Nation. We cannot afford to underestimate automation as the creator of the second industrial revolution through which we are living. In the late fifties the United States for the first time in the postwar era sensed the challenge of other nations to its role as chief exporter to the world.

Science dominated the life of the Nation as never before. Man reached, for the first time, into the distant cosmos and the short-lived atomic age suddenly became the space age. Great questions of public policy were posed—on the size of Government, on inflation and its dangers, on the proper level of Federal activity.

In the domestic field, we are convinced that Mr. Eisenhower's greatest achievement was the establishment of a national sense of fiscal responsibility. The forces of inflation were not checked altogether. But Ike put on the brakes emphatically. Again we have a dramatic comparison. President Eisenhower's years followed a period in which the dollar had been drastically eroded.

We recall a conversation several months ago with a man who has played a large part in the Government through several administrations.

Never in his experience, he remarked, had he known a President who arrived in Washington with so little knowledge of money, inflation, and fiscal problems. Literally, Mr. Eisenhower had had no experience in these matters. He was a soldier, not an economist.

But there was an almost unbelievable evolution in the President's knowledge. He did his homework, assiduously. In time, our friend added, Dwight Eisenhower came to understand the fiscal and monetary forces of our times possibly better than any other President.

He grasped the meaning of inflation as it affected the entire Nation, and particularly those who live on pensions and fixed incomes. He understood the potential and actual trends of the cost-of-living figures. He understood these matters and he was ready to fight.

Here, we think, was Ike's biggest single domestic contribution. To be sure, the administration departs with the Nation in a condition of mild recession. But, by and large, the Eisenhower years have been characterized by prosperity and boom.

And here's a thought for the future: The public may look back on the last 8 years as much rosier than they now seem. We say this in spite of the three recessions. To be sure, unemployment has remained disturbingly high. But in 1960 more Americans had jobs than ever before. And this fact must be considered in the light of that awesome force of automation.

So the sound dollar was the object of an Eisenhower crusade. We think the overall results have been apparent. The anti-inflation crusade was coupled with the Eisenhower distaste for big government. Long ago Ike concluded that the people could spend the money better and more wisely. It wasn't always a politically popular concept. But the President never retreated from his firm belief that America was built by the creative genius of private initiative. He held firmly to the view that the Federal Government should never intervene except when individuals and the lower levels of government couldn't do the necessary jobs.

There have been many paradoxes in the Eisenhower domestic record. Critics—especially labor spokesmen—always referred to him as the "businessman's President." Yet more antitrust cases were filed and prosecuted during his 8 years than in practically all the previous history of the Government.

Labor leaders never accepted Dwight Eisenhower. Yet there is no question he received a bigger share of union members' votes than any Republican in several decades. And under a supposedly "anti-labor" President, labor and the working man made greater advances than ever before.

The President has opposed the basic conception of the welfare state. Yet in his 8 years, there were as many advances in social legislation as in any previous period.

Another paradox. His Agriculture Secretary, Ezra Taft Benson, refused to play politics with the farm problem. The administration came in for more abuse on its farm program than on any other subject. Yet the Eisenhower administration poured out more billions to help the farmers—many times more—than did any previous administration.

There are, of course, a number of mileposts in the story of the Eisenhower era that will mark off the path of history. Mr. Eisenhower was the President who signed the bill creating the first U.S. Government agency concerned largely with outer space, the sun, and the stars. He witnessed the admission of the 49th and 50th States into the Union. But we would venture a guess on two particular accomplishments that figured not at all in the last campaign. They stand as monuments to the Eisenhower years:

The construction and opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The dream of decades became reality.

The establishment of the great interstate highway program that is building today the magnificent expressways of tomorrow.

The domestic record of the last 8 years was highlighted by the Supreme Court decision on school integration. And President Eisenhower signed the first civil rights law enacted since the days of reconstruction.

On civil rights as on other issues the position of Dwight Eisenhower was essentially the position of moderation. He did not move as aggressively for drastic enforcement measures as many persons demanded. Conversely, in the opinion of the South he went much too far. The President believed that in this trying period of change in a Nation's way of life, moderation was essential.

Sum it up, then: As a national leader, Dwight Eisenhower gave the people sound government dominated by his own philosophy of the middle-of-the-road. For the most part, we believe, the people had faith in their government and the man who guided it.

As a party leader, Mr. Eisenhower was probably at his weakest. This much should be said before considering the political Eisenhower, however: Ike couldn't be a strong partisan. He served his country and his party with the philosophy that what was best for the Nation was to be found in the middle of the political road, neither to the far left nor far right. Mr. Eisenhower moved down the center. And it is only realistic to admit that some leaders of his own party found this fact disturbing.

In a sense, Dwight Eisenhower just wasn't cut out to be a politician. But his friendly smile and his winning ways captured the crowds. The orthodox techniques of politicking were nearly always beyond his understanding. Yet the Nation saw him win two elections by landslide margins. And most observers agree that he could have won a third except for the third-term amendment. Yet here is a highly significant paradox: Mr. Eisenhower did not succeed in building his party to the point where it, too, could win.

Mr. Eisenhower won by huge margins. But his party controlled both Houses of Congress only in the first 2 of his 8 years. President Eisenhower faced three successive opposition Congresses. And the success with which he dealt with them suggests something about Ike the man.

For indeed, he worked easily with the Democratic leadership in the last 6 years. Not being an extreme partisan, it was relatively easy for him to carry on more or less bipartisan government throughout most of his administration.

Certainly the congressional leaders of the Democratic Party deserve some credit for the success of divided government. Speaker SAM RAYBURN in the House and LYNDON JOHNSON, the Senate majority leader, fully recognized Mr. Eisenhower's firm hold on the people. They respected the President. They were willing to work with him.

And then there is the footnote of political history to the Eisenhower years. For three successive elections, the Republican Party had been soundly defeated in its efforts to win Congress. Yet when the national chips were down in 1960, Mr. Eisenhower's Democratic successor was able to win only by the closest of margins. Much of the election hinged on the Eisenhower record. But for the Republicans, the effective magic of the Eisenhower personality was lost.

So another era draws to a close, the era covering 8 portentious postwar years. Another President has written his record and left his stamp on his country and on the

world. Within a few days the Eisenhower years will be the property of history, for the final judgment and evaluation of time.

Dwight David Eisenhower leaves the White House with a tribute received by few men—the devotion of scores of millions at home and around the world.

EVEN LIPPMANN IS SUBJECT TO HUMAN ERROR

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] placed in the RECORD a column by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the newspapers this morning.

I always approach a column by Walter Lippmann with the same reverence with which I approach a Socratic dialogue. His wisdom is a unique national resource.

However, even Walter Lippmann is human, and I think this morning he falls into error.

I agree with his basic argument that we should gear our economy to growth rather than consumption. However, I believe Walter Lippmann makes an error in two ways. First, he identifies the Samuelson report with the position of President-elect Kennedy. The Samuelson recommendations were simply task force recommendations, and they have in no sense been agreed to by President-elect Kennedy. The President-elect has not committed himself to them in any sense. I earnestly hope he will not do so.

In the second place, Lippmann compares the Samuelson recommendation as the Kennedy approach, with the Eisenhower budget, the Eisenhower approach. He writes that the Eisenhower budget may be unrealistic in implicitly predicting that the country is coming out of the recession.

In the Lippmann view the Samuelson task force makes the more realistic prediction that the recession may continue and deepen. It therefore prescribes as a first step an increase in spending of $3 to $5 billion. The Samuelson committee recommends a second step to be taken, if necessary, of a moderate tax cut.

Lippmann argues, in part, that the Eisenhower prediction may have less validity in view of the Eisenhower failure in 1958 to predict a recession that turned an estimated 1959 fiscal year surplus into a whopping deficit of more than $12 billion.

But, Mr. President, the great lesson from that 1959 deficit is not that the estimate was wrong and therefore prevented wise and appropriate Federal action. The lesson is that in spite of this error, in spite of no deliberate, planned increased spending, in spite of no tax cut, the Federal Government did have a gigantic deficit of more than $12 billion which automatically contributed to the recovery from the recession.

Mr. President, unless one argues that the $12 billion was not big enough—and no one to my knowledge argues that—it seems to me the conclusion logically follows that additional spending or tax cutting in the 1958–59 period would have been in error.

The great lesson of the 1958–59 recession in my mind is that automatic stabilizers make the Samuelson approach of increasing spending or cutting taxes in anticipation of a recession both unwise and unnecessary.

Mr. President, it is very fortunate that this is so. The state of economic forecasting is so primitive that any administration that bases its taxing and spending on economic predictions is going to be in trouble. Budget forecasters, Federal Reserve economists, and the finest academic economic experts alike have a record of being wrong at least as often as they have been right.

Second, any administration which expands or contracts public spending in periodic response to economic predictions is bound to operate wastefully.

This is not to say the Government should be heartlessly inactive in the face of recession. It is to say that we should improve and sharpen our built-in stabilizers, such as unemployment compensation and depressed areas legislation. We should, of course, provide those public services which are necessary, and we should do so promptly. But we should not contract or expand, speed up or slow down spending or taxing in response to the erratic predictions of economic forecasting.

I earnestly hope that President-elect Kennedy, as well as Walter Lippmann, will recognize the distinction.

TELEVISION'S ROLE IN DEMOCRATIC PROCESS SHOWN BY NBC'S "U–2 AFFAIR"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, how to hammer into the minds and hearts of American citizens the significance of immensely important historical developments is a central problem of a democracy. It is a truism that this great democracy can move little faster than public opinion permits it to move. It is no exaggeration to say that our future as a nation depends on our ability to reach the American citizen's understanding, to hold his attention, to touch his heart. How brilliantly television can do this was demonstrated by the recent NBC television White Paper entitled "The U–2 Affair."

Those who saw this broadcast were able to witness a recreation of the high drama of this extraordinary episode. They were also presented with a careful discussion of our Government's actions during the course of the crisis. The program concluded with a pointed analysis of what had gone wrong, including suggestions on how similar mistakes might be avoided in the future.

To paraphrase one of the newsmen quoted in this program, NBC has here grasped a piece of history by the tail. In the years to come Francis Gary Powers' fateful U–2 flight will be dismissed and analyzed by chroniclers of our time. An excellent summary of what really happened will be available to these future historians in this NBC program. But the great point of television is that it literally can change history. And programs of this kind can do exactly this. History can be changed because our American public opinion can be informed and thereby transformed into an instrument of national wisdom in the future. National decisionmakers—Presidents, Cabinet officers, Senators can act far more constructively and wisely because there is much greater public awareness and understanding.

Narrated by Chet Huntley, this program was written and produced by Al Wasserman and Arthur Barron. Irving Gitlin was the executive producer, and the sponsor was Timex, Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the script of the program be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE U–2 AFFAIR

(Narrator: Chet Huntley)

(Broadcast Tuesday, November 29, 1960)

CHET HUNTLEY. Almost 6 months have passed since the day of the U–2 flight and the crisis it created. But a crisis should not be filed and forgotten in a nation's archives simply because it is in the past. Now that the passions and partisanship of an election year have subsided—and because we feel that the consequences of this crisis are still unfolding and the lessons to be learned are still significant—NBC news has decided to retell and reexamine the story of that fateful flight of May 1 and the events that flowed from it.

If the story can properly be said to begin anywhere, it is with the superb airplane itself and the men who built it. This is a U–2, filmed by NBC with special permission at the place of its birth, the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. in Burbank, Calif.

Here is the man who designed it, Lockheed vice president, Kelly Johnson.

KELLY JOHNSON. Back in 1953 and 1954, we were studying ways and means of making fighter airplanes like the F–104 go higher and further than they did at that time. As we went further and further into these studies it soon became apparent that it would take an entirely new kind of aircraft to do the job that we wanted done.

From this came the U–2. We made a wing that had a very long span—over 80 feet. The wing had to carry the whole weight of the aircraft and still be very, very light. It had to be designed not only to hold a great amount of fuel, but it was designed so the wingtip acted as part of the landing gear.

On the takeoff, we invented what we called the pogo landing gears. These stick into sockets in the wing, and rest on the ground and keep the airplane level on takeoff.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If the design of the U-2 presented unusual problems, so too did flying it. The pilot of a U-2 must spend an hour-and-a-half before takeoff relaxing and breathing pure oxygen in order to prepare himself for high altitude conditions.

His helmet is airtight and sealed to his body by a cork ring; he can, therefore, neither eat nor drink before * * * or during a flight. A long flight may keep the pilot sealed up for more than 8 hours.

After such a voyage, he will emerge hungry and thirsty from his cramped cockpit, his skin chafed and raw from the tight fitting suit and helmet. The plane he flies will range as high as 90,000 feet—17 miles above the earth—far above the operating ceiling of any other jet * * * and during the 8 hours it can stay aloft, the U-2 will half fly, half glide for nearly 4,000 miles.

It was evident from the start that the U-2 would be an invaluable airplane. It was—and is—employed by the Air Force and other agencies for high altitude scientific research. More recently, the Air Force has been using the planes to observe missiles in flight and to track missile nose cones on the way down.

But, to the civilian Central Intelligence Agency, the U–2's ability to fly higher and

farther than any interceptor aircraft made it a superb spy. With dark paint and a special reconnaissance equipment, the unmarked plane the Russians came to call the black lady of espionage systematically probed the borders and penetrated deep behind the iron curtain for nearly 4 years.

A crash landing at a glider strip near Tokyo in 1959 provided the most dramatic breach in the secrecy surrounding the espionage activities of the U-2. These pictures were made before the area could be cordoned off by U.S. security guards.

Over the years other hints of the black ladies' secret missions came to the surface, first in a British flight magazine, then in reports of a mysterious crash that killed Lockheed test pilot Robert Seiker, then in other newspapers and aviation magazines including Russian ones. In 1958–59 the newspaper Soviet Aviation attacked the espionage flights, the men behind them, and the planes they flew.

POWERS' MOTHER. Ever since Francis was just a little boy he was interested in airplanes, and made model planes. And always said he wanted to become a pilot. So he, after so long a time, he made a pilot.

Well, I wanted the boy to do what he thought best. Because it was his life. And I was kind of scared, though, as I was afraid of planes, the dangers of them. Anything that goes up has to come down. So that's the reason I was kind of afraid for him, afraid he would crash, sometime, and maybe kill himself.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In August 1956, Francis Powers arrived at Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, an American installation on a flat, bleak, plain 10 miles from the town of Adana. It is a normal Air Force base with one exception. Isolated in a trailer camp at its western end is the top secret 10–10 reconnaissance detachment, which conducted U–2 overflights. Francis Powers and his wife moved into trailer T–1356, where, in common with seven other civilian pilots and their families they lived in mystery and seclusion for nearly 4 years, aloof from the rest of the base. On Thursday, April 27, 1960, a transport plane flew Powers and other members of the 10–10 detachment from Incirlik to the Pakistani Air Base at Peshawar. Then, when conditions were right, Powers would begin a 3,300 mile voyage across the Soviet Union, his equipment continuously monitoring its industry and defenses. If all went well, he would touch down at Bodo, Norway, 8 hours after takeoff.

And so, early on Sunday morning on the first of May 1960, Francis Powers lifted off from Pakistan. Most of the Western World was still in darkness and, as he crossed into Soviet territory, dawn was just breaking in Moscow.

In a few hours, the May Day parade was scheduled to begin, an annual display dedicated to the glorification of the Communist regime. Already the city was being prepared for the great event.

As Powers continued his flight, it was still the night of April 30 in the United States of America.

In Washington, D.C., at midnight, it was time for the daily ritual of shutting down the city's landmarks.

At the White House, guards kept watch over an empty building. The President was away for the weekend at his Gettysburg farmhouse.

At the State Department, a few lights were burning late. A summit conference—the first in 5 years—was scheduled to begin in Paris in 2 weeks, and there were preparations to make.

In one section of the city there was considerable activity.

The Sunday papers had just come off the presses and were being readied for delivery. Whatever news was to occupy attention that morning was already frozen in type and bound in wire. And of all those who would soon be casually scanning the morning papers, in Washington, and in Moscow, no one was aware that a news story that would shake the world was being born in the wreckage of an American plane, down 1,200 miles inside the Soviet Union.

The circumstances surrounding the downing the U–2 are still largely a mystery. American intelligence sources have communicated a version of what happened to several reporters, among them, Robert Holtz, editor of the authoritative Aviation Week magazine.

Mr. HOLTZ. Our Government knew that Powers was in trouble almost from the moment that it first occurred. This is because we have a rather extensive network of monitoring Soviet communications, and they also have a similar network with which they monitor ours.

This is an example of what we got from listening to the Russians. This incident took place about 2 years ago.

Sound: Russian fighter pilot conversation.

The Russian fighter pilots are moving in to attack. Here is the official translation of their conversation at this point:

"The target is a four-engine transport—roger; 201, I am attacking the target; the target is burning; there is a hit; the target is banking; it is going toward the fence. Open fire. 218, are you attacking? Yes, yes. The tail assembly is falling off the target. I will finish him off, boys. I will finish him off on the run. The target is falling, yes. Form up—go home."

During Powers' flight across Russia our monitoring system was functioning and gained a great deal of useful information. From conversation of the Russian radar crews it was evident that Powers' flight was expected and it was tracked almost from the moment he crossed the Afghan border. From conversations of fighter pilots and air defense installations it was evident that they set up relays of supersonic fighters in an attempt to shoot him down. As Powers neared Sverdlovsk, he reported a flameout in his jet engine and began to descend to the altitude at which it was possible to start this engine in the air. The last communication with Powers was about 40,000 feet. When Powers came down in the Soviet Union, our Government knew the following facts: The fact that the plane had come down in the area of Sverdlovsk; the fact that it had been forced down by a mechanical failure, not shot down by a rocket at 70,000 feet as the Soviets later claimed. What our Government did not know was whether the pilot was still alive and what the condition of the aircraft was when it hit the ground.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Powers' plane had crashed in a field near the city of Sverdlovsk, some 900 miles east of Moscow. According to the Russians, the pilot had parachuted down and had been taken into custody by several local citizens. They described how they disarmed him, gave him a drink of water and a cigarette, and drove him to the local rural Soviet, where he was turned over to security police.

In Moscow, it was 8:53 a.m. at the time of the crash. The streets outside Red Square were already crowded with spectators waiting for the May Day parade to begin.

As the Russian high command walked out of the Kremlin to take their places at the reviewing stand, they were probably still unaware of what had happened.

Among those in Red Square watching the events of that morning was NBC News correspondent, Joe Michaels.

Mr. MICHAELS. Exactly at 10 a.m., as always, the May Day ceremony officially began. The first part of the parade was the military section. I watched the mobile units going by to see if there was anything new. There wasn't. Most of the time, I kept my eye on the reviewing stand. From a reporter's point of view this is the most likely place to pick up anything of interest. And at about 10:45—three-quarters of an hour after the parade began—I did notice something most unusual. An excited Marshal Vershinin, the head of the Soviet Air Force, arrived late. He entered at the rear of the reviewing stand, went up to Khrushchev, and whispered something in his ear. Of course it's only a guess, but I am inclined to believe that this was the moment Khrushchev found out that the U–2 was down.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If the manner in which Khrushchev learned the news is open to speculation, so is the manner in which our own key officials learned. According to Powers' testimony, his destination was to have been the NATO Airbase at Bodo, Norway, a small fishing town at the edge of the Arctic Circle. The plane was due at 7 a.m., Washington time on May 1. When it failed to arrive, this information must have been communicated to the headquarters of the Central Intelligence Agency in Washington. In any event, by noon, 5 hours after the plane was due, it is known that word had already spread among a group of top Washington officials.

At CIA, under whose direction the overflights were conducted, Director Allen Dulles had been advised.

At the Pentagon, Defense Secretary Gates knew about it.

At NASA—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—which operated the scientific weather flight program of the U–2's, Director Keith Glennan and Deputy Director Lawrence Dryden also knew.

And at the Department of State, Under Secretary Douglas Dillon had been informed. What they did not know was that in Moscow, as the May Day festivities continued into the night, Francis Gary Powers, the pilot of the U–2 was alive and already confined in a cell somewhere behind the forbidding walls of Lubyanka prison.

That same night of May 1, in Washington, our Government began to take action. To tell us about it NBC News State Department correspondent, Frank Bourgholtzer.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. I've been told by persons whom I believe that there was a meeting not long after the word was received that the U–2 was missing. This was a meeting at a relatively low level of those persons who normally meet to discuss such intelligence problems.

At this meeting a rather routine decision was made to go ahead and put out a cover story; that is to say, a story that would cover for the record the fact that the plane was missing without revealing anything of its true mission.

Mr. HUNTLEY. This is Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired, a former specialist in intelligence and military affairs analyst for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. PHILLIPS. From an intelligence point of view, the original cover story seemed to be particularly inept. One gets the impression, and I believe it's a true one, that it had been in the files for a long time. And when the U–2 came down, it was just yanked out of the files and issued.

A cover story has certain requirements. It must be credible. It must be a story that can be maintained; and it should not have too much detail. Anything that's missing in a cover story can be taken care of by saying the matter is being investigated.

The most striking thing was the failure to consider, in the cover story issued, the possibility that the pilot might be alive and the airplane might be intact.

Mr. HUNTLEY. As the events of the week of May 1 were to demonstrate, the story that was issued to cover the disappearance of the U–2 failed to serve its purpose. This failure was not immediately apparent.

The days following May 1 were quiet ones, and the cover story first began to come

to the surface on Tuesday, May 3, in Istanbul, Turkey.

On May 3, Istanbul was a city under martial law, the atmosphere heavy with tension. Turkish students were rioting in protest over the stern police policies of Premier Menderes and his ruling party. Although the government was still in control, it's downfall was only a few weeks off.

At the Municipal Palace in Istanbul, troops stood guard while, inside, a meeting of the NATO countries was taking place. Attending, was Secretary of State Christian Herter and a number of his top aids in the State Department. Among those covering the developments of the day was a Turkish reporter.

Mr. GOREN. I'm Zeyyat Goren, United Press International Bureau Manager for Turkey. It was a Tuesday morning, May 3. I was writing a story on the NATO Council meeting and the anti-Menderes demonstrations. A stringer of mine called me. He said he heard a story about an American plane missing—somewhere in eastern Turkey—from Incirlik Airbase at Adana. After I got the tip, I called Incirlik Airbase and talked to the information sergeant, who gave me the details of the story.

The sergeant said the story is true. The plane is missing since 2 days. And the last they have heard from the pilot, he has trouble with his oxygen supplies somewhere over Van Lake area—which, he added, is near to the Persian border. Of course, being a native of Turkey, I know Van Lake area is also near to the Russian border, which was the angle of my story—though I didn't know that day that this story will come such a big story.

BILL FOX. I'm Bill Fox, day cable editor for United Press International in New York. I was on duty on May 3 when we received a dispatch from Istanbul, Turkey, about 8 o'clock in the morning reporting that a U.S. Air Force plane, a U–2, was reported missing somewhere in the rugged mountains of eastern Turkey in the area of Lake Van, which is near the Soviet border. I have here the original dispatch which we received by radio teletype from London. Of course, at the time I didn't know what a U–2 was, nor did I realize that we had a piece of history by the tail. But, the fact that an American airplane was missing in the general area of the Soviet border, I felt was newsworthy. Consequently, I rewrote the story, adding some information that another American plane had been downed in the same general area about a year previously. I checked it with the foreign editor and sent it to the news desk. From there it was put on our transcontinental A wire for simultaneous dispatch to all UPI subscribers throughout North America.

The text of our story went like this: A single engine U.S. Air Force plane with one man aboard was missing today near the Soviet border in the rugged mountains of southeastern Turkey. The plane was one of two that took off Sunday morning from Incirlik Airbase near Adana on a weather reconnaissance mission. One plane returned but the pilot of the missing craft reported that his oxygen equipment was out of order. Three C–54 planes from Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya under the command of Maj. Harry E. Hayes, of Clarksville, Tex., were combing the area in search of the missing plane, but thus far without success.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The cover story appeared in print on the morning of May 4. At the time, it was so unimportant that only a handful of papers across the country carried it—and only one, the Washington Post and Times Herald ran it on the front page—a small story that was eliminated in later editions to make room for a baseball headline.

In Washington, on Wednesday, May 4, there was not much to be found in the way of news.

In the morning, the President had breakfast with a number of Republican Congressmen, then chatted with them on the steps of the White House.

Later in the morning, he signed an important wheat agreement with India, and in the afternoon played a round of golf.

In New York, Mayor Wagner presided at the opening of a tulip display. Spring was on its way.

And in Paris, workmen were busy tidying up the Elysee Palace for a summit conference that would never be held.

All in all, it was a quiet day, May 4—the last such day the world would know for some time to come.

Moscow, Thursday, May 5.—NBC News Correspondent Joe Michaels again reporting.

Mr. MICHAELS. On Thursday morning, May 5, I was present in the hall of the great Kremlin palace as the supreme Soviet began its 3-day meeting. First on the agenda was a speech by Premier Khrushchev. At 10 a.m. Khrushchev began his 3½-hour address. Most of it dealt with such matters at tax reform, wages, prices, currency change, and so forth. But toward the end, he suddenly introduced a new theme.

To a stunned and startled audience, Khrushchev announced that an American U–2 spy plane had been shot down in the Soviet Union. He did not specify where, and he did not indicate the fate of the pilot. He went on to warn those countries harboring U.S. bases that they were playing with fire and promised a stern protest to the United States and to the United Nations. But he added, "I do not doubt President Eisenhower's sincere desire for peace. Reason must guide us."

Mr. HUNTLEY. With Khrushchev's speech, the U–2 affair had become a full-blown crisis. The world was waiting for our Government to respond, and respond we did—during a 2-day period of chaos.

NBC News State Department Correspondent Frank Bourgholtzer, and White House correspondent, Ray Scherer, were following the story as it developed.

Mr. SCHERER. At the time the U–2 incident broke into the headlines, events were moving so rapidly and we were all so close to the story that none of us could really follow its ramifications. Now, with the passage of time, certain things have become clarified.

We know, for example, that following the National Security Council meeting on May 5, the President called together a small group to discuss how to handle the situation. Two decisions emerged from this meeting: One, to continue with the cover story that had already been planted; and two, that any statement by this Government on the situation would come only from the State Department. This latter decision was not implemented. In a recent discussion with Jim Hagerty, Frank Bourgholtzer and I questioned him about that.

Mr. SCHERER. Now after you saw us on that Thursday morning and told us that the President had asked for a full investigation, you referred us to NASA and to the State Department for further information.

Mr. HAGERTY. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Now I went over from the White House to NASA upon hearing your word they would have a statement. They seemed to know nothing about it. They weren't prepared to make a statement. But they did make one later. Why was the time—

Mr. HAGERTY. Ray, I don't know. I can't answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you in on the framing of their statement?

Mr. HAGERTY. No, I was not.

Mr. SCHERER. Just to establish a further point, did the men at NASA, and did the men in the State Department involved in the cover story know it was a cover story, or were they simply agents?

Mr. HAGERTY. That I cannot answer. I do not know.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. On the morning of May the 5th I was at the State Department. We were waiting with more than normal curiosity for Link White's daily briefing. He came out to see us at 12:45 and he read the following statement:

Mr. WHITE. The Department has been informed by NASA that, as announced May 3, an unarmed plane—a U–2 weather research plane based at Adana, Turkey, piloted by a civilian, has been missing since May 1. During the flight of this plane, the pilot reported difficulty with his oxygen equipment. Mr. Khrushchev has announced that a U.S. plane has been shot down over the U.S.S.R. on that date. It may be that this was the missing plane. It is entirely possible that having failure in the oxygen equipment, which could result in the pilot losing consciousness, the plane continued on automatic pilot for a considerable distance and accidently violated Soviet airspace. The United States is taking this matter up with the Soviet Government, with particular reference to the fate of the pilot.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Thinking back to the answers Link White gave to the many questions we later posed it is perfectly clear that he had not been informed of any decision to make the State Department the sole spokesman about the U–2. When reporters pressed him for details, he volunteered the information that "infinitely more detail" was being given out at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. SCHERER. At 12:15 on May 5, as soon as the Hagerty news conference was over, I followed his suggestion, ran from the White House across Lafayette Park to NASA. I was the first reporter to arrive. I said, "I have come for the statement." And they said, "What statement?" I said, "The statement that Jim Hagerty said that you were going to put out." Well that seemed to confuse them. They didn't know anything about any such statement. They finally took me in to see Walt Bonney, the Information Chief. He didn't know anything about it either. There was a lot of conferring and some more confusion. Other reporters arrived. Well, I finally left and I had the impression that there wouldn't be any statement. But at 1:30 p.m., Bonney did release a statement that attempted to answer the questions reporters had been asking him.

Mr. BONNEY. Now, if the pilot continued to suffer lack of oxygen, the path of the airplane, from the last reported position, would be impossible to determine.

Mr. SCHERER. The Bonney statement went considerably beyond that of the State Department. For instance, there were details about the supposed U–2 flight plan, how many U–2's we had, where they were stationed, and so forth. The statement was so detailed that it raised almost as many questions as it answered. For example, Bonney contended that the U–2 had taken off from Incirlik Airbase in Turkey at 8 a.m. local time. This was considerably later than the time announced in Khrushchev's speech, and reporters were quick to notice the discrepancy.

Mr. HUNTLEY. One more incident occurred in Washington on that confusing May 5th which is worth noting. Late in the afternoon, a telegram was received from Ambassador Thompson, in Moscow, advising the State Department of the possibility that Powers might be alive. Despite this warning, on the following day we still seemed curiously unaware of the full potentialities of the situation.

On the morning of Friday, May 6, President Eisenhower attended a union industrial exhibit. Reporter Charles Roberts of Newsweek magazine, was there.

Mr. ROBERTS. On Friday, May 6, I was standing just 2 feet from President Eisen-

hower when he gave his first public reaction to the U–2 incident. At a union industry show in the Washington Armory, talking to George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, he remarked that he was going to give a hydrojet boat to Khrushchev on his trip to Russia. Then, he added the phrase, "If I go." Up until then the White House had refused to comment on the U–2 incident or acknowledge in any that it had disturbed our relations with the Soviet Union. After the show, around noon on Friday, Ike climbed into his helicopter, outside the armory, and flew to Gettysburg where, that afternoon, he played a round of golf. Some of us were surprised that he flew to Gettysburg in time of crisis—but the White House has always insisted that with modern communications the President can run the Government from his Gettysburg farmhouse as well as he can from the White House.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Later that same afternoon, Secretary of State Herter returned from abroad. Despite the crisis, it would still be 2 days before he and the President were to see one another.

And at the State Department, in his press conference that day, held in a setting similar to this, it was evident that Lincoln White had still not be advised to exercise caution. In response to questioning by reporters, he said, "It is ridiculous to say we are trying to kid the world about this."

Later, he added, "There was absolutely no—N–O—no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet airspace and there has never been."

Saturday morning, May 7, for Nikita Khrushchev, a day of triumph.

Once the applause of the Supreme Soviet quieted down, Khrushchev revealed a secret that he had been keeping almost a week. He displayed photographs, which he said were taken from the captured U–2, and announced that the pilot was alive and had confessed. Then he said, of the Americans, "When they learn that the pilot is alive, they will have to think of something else, and they will."

Khrushchev's announcement had blown our cover story to pieces. Newsweek correspondent, Charles Roberts, continues with his report of developments in Gettysburg that day.

Mr. ROBERTS. Early Saturday morning, May 7, a number of reporters, including myself, came up to Gettysburg to cover late developments.

White House News Secretary James Hagerty had promised us a story that morning, and we thought it would relate in some way to the U–2. At 9:36, while the President was out playing golf, we sat down with Hagerty at a makeshift pressroom at the Gettysburg Hotel. To our astonishment, the story he promised concerned nuclear testing.

He announced that the United States was prepared to resume nuclear testing as soon as possible—as he put it. The tests were to be for the purpose of improving means of detecting underground blasts—a step toward policing a nuclear test ban. But we were still surprised that the Government would put out an announcement, while it was under fire for aerial spying, that might be interpreted as a new cold war maneuver. Hagerty still refused to discuss the U–2 incident. He said he had informed the President of Khrushchev's latest speech, but that he would have no comment. Any reaction, he said, would have to come from the State Department. Meantime, Ike had been on the golf course since 9:05. He finished his round at 11:28—score unreported. Then, he returned to the farmhouse, where he spent the remainder of the day. During that day, at the State Department in Washington, a crucial meeting was held to work out an answer to Khrushchev's latest speech. The President did not attend that meeting, but Hagerty informed us that Ike was in contact with Secretary of State Herter by phone during the day. Late in the afternoon, a statement was read to the President by phone—and he approved it without change. At 6 p.m., Lincoln White of the State Department read that statement to newsmen.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Only the previous day, Lincoln White had said, "There was absolutely no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet airspace and there never has been." Now he was stating something different.

Mr. WHITE. As a result of the inquiry ordered by the President it has been established that insofar as the authorities in Washington are concerned, there was no authorization for any such flight as described by Mr. Khrushchev. Nevertheless it appears that in endeavoring to obtain information now concealed behind the Iron Curtain a flight over Soviet territory was probably undertaken by an unarmed civilian U–2 plane.

Mr. HUNTLEY. This one statement, agreed upon at a hastily convened meeting, represented a historic decision—our Government was, in effect, admitting that we had previously lied, and that we had committed espionage—admissions no nation had ever made before.

QUESTION. How will this incident affect the United States, do you think?

YOUTH. I feel that it will give the Americans a black eye all over Europe.

MAN 1. My feeling is that the country did the right thing in sending these planes over—or this plane over. Because we have to keep abreast of the Russians, as far as the information is concerned.

MAN 2. I think that if we fly over Russian territory, we take the chance of being shot down because of engaging in espionage—the same as we would do to them if they flew over our territory.

MAN 3. I think that we ought to sink one of those submarines that have been spying off Cape Canaveral.

WOMAN. Well, I don't think we should admit it. Yes. Yes. Never mind what the pilot said. We have a right to protect ourselves.

MAN 4. Thinking it over, I think the State Department has really erred in the whole thing. They got a mixup there. They don't seem to be coordinated. The one doesn't know what the other is doing.

Question. What do you think about it?

WOMAN 2. Well, I can only say what we were told in church yesterday. We should pray for that boy. He needs it.

Mr. HUNTLEY. On Wednesday, May 11, President Eisenhower answered the one major question that remained: Who had authorized the flights?

President EISENHOWER. Our deterrent must never be placed in jeopardy. The safety of the whole free world demands this. As the Secretary of State pointed out in his recent statement, ever since the beginning of my administration I have issued directives to gather, in every feasible way, the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for defense.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The President himself had assumed responsibility for authorizing the program of intelligence flights. We have learned that CIA Director, Allen Dulles, had offered to serve as the traditional scapegoat and to resign. However, this is not the course the President chose. This avowal of responsibility by a head of state for intelligence activities was unprecedented in the history of international relations. It is a decision that has been the subject of considerable debate. Here are the views of the chairman of the Senate committee that investigated the U–2 affair—Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT—and of the President's Press Secretary, James Hagerty.

There is a great deal of puzzlement in my own mind of people that say why did the President or the Government of the United States take responsibility. Well now this is something new that has been added to my world. If you gentlemen are spies, and I am not, and you get caught, I can say I never heard of you, or saw you before. But if you strap a U–2 to your back, it is a little difficult, to say the least, not to admit and assume responsibility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The President need never have avowed or disavowed is the point I make. He should have taken the position of silence in this matter and left the—uh, if anyone had to take responsibility, it should have been the head of the intelligence.

Uh, it should have to depend on circumstances as to who avowed or disavowed anything but it shouldn't have been the President who as I say embodies the whole sovereignty and dignity of the whole American people. I think personally this was perhaps the most serious fault in this whole operation, this whole incident.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Coupled with the President's assuming responsibility for the U–2 flights, was our attempt to justify our right to engage in them.

Mr. HAGERTY. As the President himself at a press conference and in speeches said, when a closed society makes threats against our very welfare, it is up to us to find out everything we can about such a closed society, whether they are preparing for war, whether they are building up, and also the determination of the members of the Government that there will never be another Pearl Harbor if they have anything to do about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think one of the most serious things to, uh, growing out of this, was our endeavor, on the part of our people, to justify uh, this—these flights. Uh, to say you need something such as intelligence in international relations certainly is no justification for it. But in the position the President took he was in fact asserting the right to do this and not the need. They could understand the need. They understand that espionage goes on within certain areas all the time. But they never take full responsibility for it. The head of state does not. I think that it's responsible to believe that this avowal put Mr. Khrushchev in the position where he could not proceed to treat with the man who at the same time is asserting the right to violate the sovereignty of his country, in this case, the U.S.S.R.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Following our avowal of the U–2 flights, one more significant question was raised during the week preceding the summit conference—the question of whether the flights would be continued. As the week began this became a source of apparently deliberate confusion.

Mr. SCHERER. On Monday morning May 9, the New York Times carried a story saying, "It was learned that the President had ordered cessation of all flights over or near the borders of the U.S.S.R." Well, later that morning, at Jim Hagerty's news conference, we asked him whether the flights had been canceled. He said that the President had not canceled the flights. When asked whether they had been canceled by any order other than the President, Jim answered, "I know of no such orders." Well the impression we were left with was that despite the events of the last few days, the U–2 flights were still going on. This impression was reinforced by a statement of Secretary of State Herter, which was released by Lincoln White the same afternoon.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Although the administration had denied that it intended to imply that the flights would continue, this was the inference that was drawn by most observers. All these events led to an atmosphere of increasing tension as the summit conference approached.

Mr. HUNTLEY. In the Soviet Union, Khrushchev toured an exhibit that opened in

Gorki Park. Here in a hall customarily devoted to the pastime of chess, the Russians had put on display remnants of the plane, its equipment, and the pilot's personal effects.

Later, in an impromptu press conference, Khrushchev reacted violently to what he termed our threat to continue the flights. He canceled his invitation to President Eisenhower for a visit to the Soviet Union that had been planned for the following month.

And in Washington, as administration leaders explained their decision to Congress, the beginning of a major controversy, involving both this country and its allies, was already apparent.

CHESTER BOWLES. We have certainly lost ground. Major elements in our Government have been caught telling blatant falsehoods to the world, to ourselves, to each other, and to congressional committees. We have not told the truth. We have taken grave risks on the very eve of a great and important international conference. And we put the President in a position of not knowing who keeps store.

BARRY GOLDWATER. We have nothing to gain by going to the summit. We have nothing to negotiate at the summit. And about all we can do is to add dignity to this last beastly act of the Soviets. And I hope the President decides not to go. How can you negotiate with murderers? How can you negotiate with people who have shot down numbers of our planes? How do you negotiate with people who tell lies and who do not fulfill their solemn obligations? I don't think you can gain anything by going to the summit with these types of people. I think we ought to realize, in this country, that we're in a cold war and we better be in this war to win it—and start acting like it.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The former Foreign Minister of Canada.

Mr. PEARSON. It was pretty stupid, on the part of the United States, if I may say so, for getting itself in a position, before the summit conference, that the Soviets could exploit an incident of this kind.

In other words, I don't think they've handled the matter very well. As long as the cold war goes on, governments are going to collect intelligence, legally or illegally, and the Russians are at the forefront of that parade. But if you do this kind of thing—collect intelligence—you should do it intelligently.

Mr. HUNTLEY. On Saturday, May 14, President Eisenhower left the White House by helicopter to board the plane that would take him to Paris. The trip that was to have been the capstone of his career was already foredoomed to a failure that he, least of all, would have wanted. As James Reston had written in the New York Times, "The tragedy of President Eisenhower in the spy-plane case is that he and his colleagues have created almost all the things he feared the most. He wanted to reduce international tensions and he has increased it. He wanted to strengthen the alliance and he has weakened it. He glorified teamwork and morality, and got lies and administrative chaos. Everything he was noted for—caution, patience, leadership, military skill, and even good luck—suddenly eluded him precisely at the moment he needed them the most. What happened after the President's arrival has become part of the folklore of history. The conference that was to be held at the Elysee Palace was never formally convened. After bitterly attacking the President of the United States, Premier Khrushchev stalked out of the first preliminary meeting. And before returning to Moscow he began what has since become an all-too-familiar pattern of public performances."

The Russians now exploited to the fullest the propaganda advantage we had given them with the U–2. Whether the incident was chiefly responsible for the summit failure is still being debated; but it did provide ammunition for the Russians as they intensified cold war pressures throughout the world. Fear of Russian rockets in the months following the summit made American bases the object of an increasing number of protest demonstrations.

The United States found itself embarrassingly on the defensive—and in the riots against the Japanese-American Security Treaty, even high United States officials were caught in the storm.

Mr. SCHERER. Jim, by way of taking a longer look at this whole U–2 incident, now that the dust has settled somewhat, how do you think the United States came out of it?

Mr. HAGERTY. Well, I think they came out very well. I think that basically the argument of an open society versus a closed society has been very well brought to the fore, has been brought to the attention of the peoples of the world. I think that is an oversea reaction. I think domestically the reaction of the American people quite frankly was "It was too bad we got caught, but we are glad we were doing it." That is the way I would sum it up.

Mr. BOURGHOLTZER. Do you, looking back, think that if you had it to do over again, you might have done anything in some different fashion?

Mr. HAGERTY. No, with the exception that I think everybody admits, of the failure of the cover story. But outside of that, no.

Mr. SCHERER. As you look back on this U–2 incident, who was in charge of our side of the thing as it developed—issuing of statements, coordination of policy, the whole aspect?

Mr. HAGERTY. Well, I just can't answer that, Ray, I am sorry.

Mr. SCHERER. Having had this experience, and now speaking with the benefit of hindsight, what lessons emerged from this for the future?

Mr. HAGERTY. Don't get caught.

Mr. HUNTLEY. At the hearings held by the Fulbright committee, the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, was also asked what lessons could be learned from the U–2 affair. His answer was "Not to have accidents." We leave it to the American public to decide whether "Don't get caught" and "Not to have accidents" are the only lessons to be learned from U–2.

What you have seen in the past hour is an attempt at a historical evaluation of a most controversial subject, including opposing viewpoints on the matter. Over 30 responsible reporters who covered this story as it unfolded contributed to this effort. There are certain conclusions that may reasonably be drawn from the facts examined in this report.

1. The cover story was inadequate to its mission. It was hastily released, excessive in detail and failed to take account of the possibility that Powers might be alive.

2. As the U–2 crisis developed, there was a serious lack of coordination among the governmental agencies involved, which resulted in conflicting and damaging statements to the world.

3. By avowing that intelligence flights, an act unprecedented in the history of nations, our Government suffered the consequences of having been caught in public misstatements.

4. Nobody expects the United States, or any other nation to stop intelligence activities, but by justifying the U–2 flights and implying they would continue, we materially affected the summit conference. If Khrushchev intended to wreck the conference beforehand, we gave him a readymade excuse, If he intended to negotiate, we made it difficult for him to do so.

5. Throughout the whole U–2 affair, we suffered from the fact that there was apparently no one official or agency to direct our total response to this crisis.

This is not a matter for the history books, but vitally affects our ability to survive as a nation. There will be other crises that the new administration, and succeeding administrations, will have to face. In the world as it is today, we cannot afford another U–2 affair. Good night.

VARIOUS VIEWPOINTS ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, because of the paramount importance of urban transportation in the economic and social welfare of the Nation, I wish to place in the RECORD in one convenient place a number of diverse and penetrating papers and statements on this subject.

One of the best broad-scale statements on urban transportation that it has been my pleasure to read was prepared in October last year by Mr. Luther Gulick, president of the Institute of Public Administration in New York. I will not attempt to summarize his article except to say that it delves into such important questions as the function of urban transportation, the qualitative distinction between transportation within an urban area and transportation between urban areas, the causes and consequences of the urban transportation crisis, the effect of public and private decisions on urban transportation, and the relationship of land-use development to transportation.

This last point is one that is emphasized in a number of these papers and one to which I spoke at length in a statement January 11 of this year at the time of introduction of S. 345, on urban mass transportation. Without comprehensive planning for our entire urban areas, our decisions and efforts in transportation will be poorly based and may ultimately be in vain for failure to control land-use developments once the transportation networks have been established.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gulick's "Observations on Urban Transportation" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

OBSERVATIONS ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION

(By Luther Gulick)

This paper discusses urban transportation policy from the point of view of the urban public administrator and researcher. This will best focus what the author has to say on certain aspects of the economics of urban transportation, putting them in a framework of policy development and planning.

The discussion is built around the following four topics:

1. What makes the modern urban area?

2. What is the function of urban transportation?

3. Why are we concerned with urban transportation as a problem today?

4. Economic considerations and the decision process.

I. WHY THE MODERN URBAN AREA?

If you scattered the 32 black and white pieces of a chess set out over a room, and then assumed that the various pieces had strong reasons for conferring, or working, or dealing with each other, you would have a simple picture of the forces that create urban centers, and of their transportation problem.

The first response to the wide scatteration of the chess men would be the effort of certain pieces to get together. For some reasons, the bishops might want to be close together; as might the knights, or the pawns. For other purposes one queen would want to be surrounded by the knights, and a bishop would certainly want to shepherd the black pawns. The kings would move with their castles; and the knights, after occasional forays, would return to their kings. And the only way that all of these kaleidoscopic desires and needs could be met easily would be by assembling all of these pieces in the closest possible compass which still permits changes in their interrelations from time to time. Packing them in a box does not give the answer, because the pieces must always have the chance for further movement.

This illustrates the bipolar force that creates the modern urban center.

The whole purpose is to reduce the space that separates man, without freezing the relationships, so that contact and communication may be easy and varied at will.

We cut down the space by crowding together in a restricted geographic area. This is the urban region.

The fact is, the human being is a social animal, as Aristotle observed over 2,000 years ago, and is by nature a teamworker. He can't do much by himself alone. But there are apparently few limits to what he can accomplish working with others. For this reason there is no limit either to the need, the desire, or the economic advantages of getting human activities close together in a fluid teamwork matrix.

But crowding makes problems for human beings, problems of health, and sanitation, and comfort, and aggression. Crowding also puts a physical block in the way of easy communication except with the fellow "with his elbow in your eye." Yet easy communication with the various people one may select at will is the very purpose of urban concentration. Thus crowding itself can defeat the basic function of the city.

As a result, we have three adjustments to human crowding. The first is to make crowding livable by controls, services, and amenities. The second is to make crowding less necessary by creating methods of human communication which do not require immediate physical propinquity, such as the telephone, radio, and TV. The third is by speeding and mechanizing circulation, so that people may work together on the same job, or exchange goods with other than their direct neighbors, without significant expense or loss of time. This, of course, is what we call the transportation system.

Each of the approaches—crowding together, communications, and transportation—makes its contribution, and each has its limitations and costs.

Crowding

Crowding humans together in a narrow geographic space is the first and most direct method of obliterating space. But it soon begins to defeat itself as people and activities get so close and piled up that they cannot move easily on their various and changing errands. The costs of living also mount as sanitary and other considerations pile on their requirements. And, while human beings are sociable, and like to be together at times, they also like to be alone and quiet, and they hate other people's dirt and noise and invasion of their privacy. Crowding together thus has serious drawbacks.

Cities have from the earliest times done a great deal to gain the benefits of close association and at the same time to mitigate the unhealthy and undesirable effects of crowding by planning, zoning, sanitary, health, police, fire and other services, by prohibiting acts which deprive others, and by making a place for the special architectural instruments of close association.

Communication devices

The mechanical and electrical aids to communication have also made an incalculable contribution. Think of the talk and visits that are saved by the newspaper, the steps and meetings that are saved by the telephone, the congregating and going to and fro that are saved by radio and TV. The extraordinary progress, the increased dependability, and the magic of modern communication, which we now take for granted, have gone a long way to wipe out space for a certain range of human contacts. The time loss involved is virtually nothing, and the unit costs of modern communication are minimal.

The only drawback in substituting mechanical and electronic communication for direct personal communication is the range and accuracy of the sensory impacts which are thus conveyed. This is partly a matter of our limited vocabulary and instrumentation and partly a matter of unreflected subtile combinations. In other words, in spite of extraordinary progress over the past two decades, especially the combination of direct sound and sight, there are still important gaps and distortions. No communication system is sufficiently hi-fi to reflect the more subtile human relationships and activities or to treat all situations with equal impartiality. The communication system can obliterate space for a certain limited range of habitual sounds, images, facts, decisions. But it cannot obliterate space for the direct physical factors and for certain intangible psychic values. Therefore where there is a required feedback between the physical and the sensory, and vice versa, this will be lost from any indirect intercommunication process.

While this may not be too important in the humdrum relations of life, it is important in the most significant human relations, particularly those relating to leadership, the processes of social agreement and decision, habit changes, invention, creative work situations, the deeper education, artistic creation and enjoyment, and the highest contributions of mind, spirit, friendship, and sacrifice. Even with the progress that still lies ahead, the electronic devices will never catch up with the full multidimensional physical and spiritual reality of human personality, because, after all, man will use and thus continuously rise above and beyond the machines, however beautiful and clever they may be.

As a result of these inherent limitations of mechanical and electronic communications, we must conclude that such devices cannot take the place of massive urbanization. For some essential purposes we will always need densely packed human concentrations.

II. THE FUNCTION OF URBAN TRANSPORTATION

This makes the third method of adjusting our life to urban crowding, namely, the transportation and circulation system, basic to civilization. The function of this system is to overcome space as a barrier without destroying space as a channel of free and changing contact.

By physical transportation we make it possible to reach across space and bring together persons, things and persons, and things. Everything that is used in this process is part of the comprehensive circulation and transportation system.

Under this definition, sidewalks, elevators, escalators, hoists, loaders, pipelines, tubes, wires, conveyor cables and belts, pushcarts, and even sewers, are just as much a part of the total transportation system as are streets, freeways, bridges, railroads, tunnels, canals, subways and elevateds, buses, private cars and trucks, airways and airfields, garages, terminals and port facilities, and all the equipment that uses these facilities and their rights-of-way. Too often, we seem to overlook the vast intermeshed complexity of the total mechanical and institutional structure man has evolved over the centuries to master space.

The great advantage of good physical transportation as a method of overcoming space is that you really bring persons and things together. You do squeeze out the intervening space while preserving the freedom to move and to establish new contacts. When physically brought together human beings can work together, communicate, bargain, argue, compromise, and agree, as though they were direct neighbors. But instead of having 10 neighbors, a man can have a thousand neighbors, or a hundred thousand, or a million, with all the added choices and teamwork possibilities afforded by this wider horizon. Goods can be seen and exchanged, raw materials can be processed, components assembled, and commodities handed over and consumed.

The great disadvantage of transportation is that physical movement of people and things takes time, consumes scarce resources and can destroy not only the space, which we are seeking to master, but also the freedom of further movement, which we must preserve. And this is where our problem of urban transportation begins.

Transportation—Internal and external

I am convinced that it is useful to recognize two major categories of transportation in each major urban concentration. These are, first, the external transportation which ties the city to the rest of the Nation and the world; and second, the internal system of circulation and movement.

Of course, the two are related where they meet, and neither can be fully effective without the other. But when it comes to thinking about the internal circulatory needs of an urban area, and doing something about them, I think it will be agreed that we need to divide the external and the internal to clarify the situation. When we do this, we can immediately relate the rail commuter problem not to the national railroads, but to the local circulatory system; and we can think more intelligently also about the local impacts of the interstate highways.

The function of the exurban transportation system is to tie the urban areas to each other and to their rural and resource hinterland. The function of the urban circulatory system is quite different. It is to capture the advantages of compounded human crowding, thus extending infinitely the probability of fruitful contacts and creative teamwork, while at the same time preserving the maximum freedom of choice in shifting these contacts.

This defintion places the emphasis on human beings rather than on the transportation of commodities. This, I think, is appropriate.

Urban concentrations are human, not material, except incidentally. It follows that our first problem today within the urban areas is therefore human contacts and human circulation. As we have seen, human, face-to-face contact is now the only real reason for the modern city. Unless we have to crowd people together for their own advantage, we don't need to bring them together at all. This fact has been obscured by past history when defense, trade, great distances, power, labor, and limited transport and communication were compelling.

Henry Fagin has recently called attention to the relation of transportation and the division of labor. In this he is, of course, quite right. But the important thing here is not the movement of the material components, but the human phenomenon of specialization and the related social structure of cooperating specialists and of interrelated external economies.

The movement of food and goods is important, yes essential, for the urban concentration and, furthermore, this physical

movement of commodities can seriously interfere with the required human circulation. Therefore we cannot omit goods movement within the urban area from our consideration of the total system, but we must always recognize that our prime consideration is the people.

I venture to emphasize this point because we can take any major self-contained manufacturing process out of the urban areas without too much difficulty along with the minute division of labor, as some social planners have already suggested. This can be done with little loss and much gain for the individual establishment and its routine employees. Each such enterprise, within its own walls and the surrounding dependent community, is an integrated, rationalized and closed economic and social system, with its designed internal and external transportation. It is not, and cannot be a fluid teamwork matrix.

This freedom of choice can only be provided in the open social and economic lack-of-fixed-structure of an urban area with its infinite pluralism.

It is the function of the system of circulation and transportation to make this kind of fluid human life fully viable, in the vast urban movement.

III. WHY ARE WE CONCERNED WITH URBAN TRANSPORTATION TODAY?

We are concerned with urban transportation today because the ecological equilibrium between human concentration and the internal urban circulation system established over the past century has now been thrown out of kilter.

This came about suddenly because of an extraordinary combination of circumstances after World War II. These include a phenomenal growth of our population, the formation of millions of new families, the lack of acceptable city housing, the artificial stimulation of suburban housing, a marked change in income distribution, universal ownership of automobiles, cultural suburbanization, the spread of hard roads, electricity and telephones, and then the scatteration of retail outlets and employment opportunities.

The combined effect of these developments on urban transportation has been catastrophic. The major impacts are these:

The people have scattered out into the country as to their living arrangements, though they want to continue to work for city corporations, shops, factories, and in city professions and trades. This creates a scattered urban population outside the city and reduces population and density in town, except for the economically handicapped.

Because of scattered homes, these people start to work in their private cars and prefer to finish their trip without changing. This increases road traffic but cuts mass transportation.

Many factories, needing more space, have moved out because space is available and cheaper outside, and because they can now get labor, coming in their own cars, and handle their goods by truck. This cuts employment in town.

Shops and shopping centers have also developed in the suburban region, depending on auto and truck transport. This cuts trips to town and business in town.

Professional and service trades follow the population which commands buying power, and travel to their work by private car.

Fine new highways have been built in the suburbs along with throughways, bridges, and other conveniences for automobile traffic, and garages and parking lots are being provided in town.

Automobiles have been improved and endowed with heightened status appeal.

Mass transportation within the urban center has lost business, lost income, reduced service, failed to modernize, and has generally lacked imagination and an understanding of what is happening.

All of this has taken place at the same time that we were going over onto a 5-day, 40-hour week—with no business for common carriers on Saturday and Sunday, and heightened peak loads each workday. Radio and TV improvements have also revolutionized entertainment in the home.

As a result, the urban circulation system, evolved for totally different conditions, cannot now perform its twin responsibilities. It can get people and things together, but it cannot do so without inordinate time delays, nor can it preserve the freedom of movement and contact we require.

In other words, the basic function of the urban concentration is now threatened by the breakdown of the internal circulation system. This is the first reason for our concern with urban transportation.

The second reason is that we all recognize, almost instinctively, that we are now blundering into solutions of urban transportation problems, without really knowing what we are doing, or what the results will be. We suspect that some of the things we are now doing relate only to superficial symptoms, and may even make matters worse in the end.

Our third reason for deep concern is because we know that nothing will set the pattern of the future for any town so irrevocably as the major outlines of the transportation system which is now adopted and installed. The sequence of land development in a metropolitan area under present conditions appears to exhibit six clear steps.

First, the extension and marked improvement of all-season, limited access passenger and goods highways.

Second, the development of land, thus made accessible, with suburban housing, both high and middle income, and the proliferation of shopping centers, factories, and warehouses.

Third, the extension of electricity, telephone, and other utilities in pace with, or just ahead of, development.

Fourth, the establishment of local services and service trades, along with spotty location of lower income housing, partly by conversion and partly by new construction.

Fifth, a frantic and not too successful effort to catch up with required governmental services, especially sewers, schools, water supplies, paving of secondary roads, and the development of parking. Policing, fire protection, education, health, welfare, and recreation are equally involved.

Sixth, as the secondary roads are built and the services extended, more land is rendered "ripe for development" and the cycle repeats itself.

This sequential spiraling cycle is not entirely new. It happened when streetcars were introduced, and again when rapid transit arrived. Our current cycle is based on the ubiquitous ownership of automobiles and trucks, and triggers initially a less dense but far broader pattern of settlement.

This initial situation now gives us highly desirable suburban opportunities. This may, however, be a transitional delight, destined to deteriorate sharply as the land fills in, the highways become congested and slow, the golf clubs vanish, the open spaces disappear, the governmental facilities continue to lag behind the needs of the developing population, taxes rise, the value of land climbs out of the reach of the middle-income class for single houses, and the nodal centers begin to build high-rise structures, including apartments, to increase the earning power of the land. When this happens, highways which were a joy for the first settlers, will be a headache for the third wave of settlers, and the costs of added throughways will be prohibitive. We shall then have suburban slums which do not have the power to save themselves, and an urban concentration which cannot be sustained because of the collapse of circulation. It is not a pleasant prospect.

There was a time when transportation was designed to meet the need for movement generated by land uses. This is not our situation today. As John T. Howard says in the October Traffic Quarterly, "Over the long run, the relation reverses itself. Future locations of land-uses largely result now from the circulation system and its impact."

This fact justifies America's great concern today with urban transportation and its problems.

Land uses and urban efficiency for the future rest directly upon, and will be limited by the circulation and transportation framework we now design and install. Under modern conditions those who lay out the urban circulation system determine the geographic pattern of our future civilization.

IV. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS AND THE DECISION PROCESS

In modernizing the urban circulation system we must obviously be controlled by the basic urban function, namely to increase the opportunity for human contacts and at the same time to preserve freedom of movement. This involves an economy both of time and cost. This cost factor is highly important.

Other urban regions, with their cities and suburbs, are eternally in competition not only with each other, but with other sections of the world as well. If a city has a wasteful transportation system, the inhabitants of the town will, in the end, have to accept a lower net income and fewer things that they desire, than if they enjoyed an economical transportation system. Transportation is surely an area in which the "iniquities of the fathers will be visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generations," as the Good Book says.

There is not much a city can do about the efficiency of its external transportation ties, since these are determined by the natural advantages of the city and by the national and international transportation system. The great differences between cities which have equally good locations will thus arise from their own internal transportation systems, their own docks and terminals, their flow of internal traffic, the efficiency of their pattern of arrangement, and the time costs involved in meeting the circulation requirements of the individual urban community.

The pattern of a city has a great influence on the economy of its internal transportation system. You can imagine a city of 2 million arranged on an oblong island as follows: first factories, then business and stores, then low rent housing, and finally high rent housing. Compare the transportation of such a city with one arranged; factories, low rent housing, business, and then high rent housing. Merely by interchanging two use districts, as in the second arrangement, you might cut the community transportation bill by 25 percent. Between the least economical arrangement of these four traffic generating factors and the most economical there is a mathematical difference in man-miles of commuter travel of 67.2 percent. While this is an imaginary model, and things are never so clear cut, variations of this problem exist in every city. Only recently Washington, D.C., found that it was laying out a new transit system assuming that many people would live in the Northwest of town and work in the Southeast, commuting at peak hours through the heart of the business center; and Baltimore found that a proposed industrial district would permanently involve unnecessarily high transportation costs.

When uneconomic costs of this sort are deliberately built into a community, they cannot fail to have a long and permanent effect on its economy.

Origin and destination studies

In recent years millions of dollars have been spent on origin and destination studies. Some lay committees have been led to believe that the transportation system of the future should be designed to fit a straight line projection of present origin and destination linkages. Even some engineers bow down and worship before the idol of origin and destination because it gives them a comfortable religion, a substitute for real planning and thought.

Every origin and destination study is a picture of the past. It is powerfully determined by the existing inadequate and irrational traffic linkages. It is usually a picture of what we want to get away from, not what we want.

When the origin and destination ratios are extended into the future all we are doing is saying "this is how bad things will be if we do nothing to guide our urban development."

I am all for sampling origin and destination studies, especially to develop trends and interrelations, but let us stand ready to start with the future and work back, not with the past and extend this into the future. In the process, we will be in a better position to guide traffic-generating land uses, to modify the circulation system, to create new transportation facilities, to establish individual economic incentives, and thus to mold the future demand lines to give us a more convenient and economical set of linkages in place of the fantastic costs that will be incurred if we proceed under the high priests of origin and destination. No one can see very far into the future when on his knees, burning incense and bowing down to origin and destination.

The great decisions

It is thus appropriate to inquire into how we are now making our major decisions as to the future transportation and circulation systems of our fast developing urban concentrations.

It is now clear that the great decisions, those which will mold the urban communities of the future for generations to come, are being made in four clearly distinct theaters:

The first is at the Federal and State level, largely in connection with the new limited access through highways. Also involved are airports (Federal), interstate commerce controls over rails, water, and trucking (Federal), harbor and navigational maintenance (Federal), and slum clearance, urban renewal, and public housing (Federal, State, and local).

The second theater of decision relates to the flow of individual trips made by people and goods from hour to hour, and day to day. These decisions are almost entirely individual and personal. Each trip decision is made by the individual user to suit his individual convenience and pocketbook. The grand decision in this theater is the accumulated sum total of all these private acts.

The third area of decision relates to the governmental allocation of scarce resources locally, including the determination of how much land within the urban region shall be devoted to exclusive rights-of-way, to terminals, and to vehicle storage.

The fourth area of decision comprises the decisions, public and private, which set the general character and volume of urban circulation needs and demands, by determining or guiding the traffic-generating land uses.

Let us examine each of these areas of decision to see what the controlling forces are, and where they will get us in building for the future.

The top level of decisions

The top level of decisions, those relating in the main to the exurban transportation system, are made by the Federal Government and by the States, chiefly now through the massive new interstate highway program. This was undertaken for national defense, the prevention of tragic and costly accidents, and the modernization of the obsolete intercity highway system.[1] The Federal interest in airways and airports, railways, and water commerce are similarly limited to the external commerce of the urban areas, though several congressional committees have recently become involved in urban commuter problems. However, Connery and Leach, after a comprehensive review of present Federal impacts on the urban areas observed that "As the Federal Government has become involved, it has proceeded on an ad hoc basis, its many parts moving independently most of the time without any attempt at coordination."[2]

Thus at the top level, the decisions are made individually, program by program, with only incidental attention to the interrelations of the Federal, State, and local activities. Furthermore, it is inevitable that these decisions are concerned with the exurban aspects, not with the internal circulation of people and goods.

The user decisions

The next level of decisions come from the user. These decisions are a continuous, highly visible and vigorous force. They operate all the time. People and goods must move.

What determines these decisions? The personal convenience and direct cost to the user of each individual trip or shipment. This phenomenon of arriving at an economic answer by taking the result produced by millions of free individual decisions is known as the market. It would be a wonderful way of finding what kind of a transportation system a city needs, provided (a) you have a free market, (b) a community could freely experiment with a system, discard it and try another, and (c) the charge for each individual service reflects the true costs.

But the fact is you cannot meet these conditions at any point. The market is not free, transportation tends to be a monopoly, each type in its own sphere. Once a major type of transportation is laid out, little can be done about it for 50 years or more. The user cannot shop around, he must select from among the modes of movement provided. He cannot experiment and test, he must take what there is, including the equipment furnished, however obsolete.

But the real problem comes on pricing. There is hardly a mode of urban transportation in connection with which the trip user knows what the trip really costs him, or the community of which he is a part. Some rates are higher than are economically required, while others are distinctly lower. In my town, the man who crosses the Triborough Bridge helps pay for the Coliseum, the Holland Tunnel user helps finance the Narrows Bridge and docks in Brooklyn, the man who takes the helicopter from one airport to another gets a Federal subsidy (probably out of his income taxes) of $3 for each $1 he pays, the New Haven Railroads commuter is subsidized out of freight rates and the pockets of the stockholders, the subway rider comes over a right-of-way furnished by the real estate taxpayer, to the tune of about $100 a million a year, and many a man drives his private car free, over a bridge paid for by local real estate taxes, and stores his car all day, tying up 25 percent of a street capacity, all for not more than the cost of his gasoline, a third of which is taxes collected by the State and the Nation.

It is thus an understatement to say that urban transportation is not in the free economy. It is in an area of "managed prices," some of which are loaded and some of which are heavily subsidized. It is difficult to find a single transportation service with reference to which the charges for service reflect the true cost. If you know of any, I should like to hear about it.

This chaotic situation is, however, not the result of any thought-out plan or policy. It has arisen almost by accident, deeply affected by shifting waves of historical development and public opinion.

Rail versus private car

The point at which the free market price breaks down most conspicuously is when the user compares the cost of riding on a railroad with the cost to him of driving his personal automobile.

The railroad owns its vehicles and its exclusive right of way, its terminals, and its storage yards. The auto owner owns his car but drives over public streets, uses the streets for loading and unloading, and, though he may have a carport at home, stores his car in town, where land is really valuable, on the street, if he can find any space and is not ruled off by the cops. As a result, the public land in most city streets has now been given over to private car storage and terminals to the extent of 25 to 50 percent of its capacity during business hours.

The railroad was once a vicious monopoly and still carries the burden of heavy real estate and other taxes. The motorist, in contrast, pays a nominal license and fuel taxes, which fall far short of direct governmental outlays for his benefit and control, though these taxes are gradually rising. He does pay tolls on a few new facilities and for a small part of his parking.

Economics of fixed charges

Another major difference as between the private auto and all other methods of public transportation arises from the economics of fixed charges.

Where the user owns the vehicle he must, of course, carry the burden of depreciation, insurance, and operating costs. There is no escape. Of these costs, only the operating costs rise or fall with the per trip use of the vehicle; most of the other costs run on whether the vehicle is used or not. This economic law applies to all owners, be they railroads, bus companies, taxis, or private auto owners. Therefore, when a railroad or bus company fixes its fares, it, being the owner of the vehicle, must apportion a part of the depreciation and the insurance to each trip. But the private automobile owner, when he figures his trip cost, is in a completely different position. As owner, his costs go on whether he uses his car or not. Therefore, the added cost to him of the contemplated trip excludes depreciation and insurance, and includes only the fuel and oil (and tolls or parking, perhaps) for the trip. While this computation may be slightly affected by marginal factors, these are more than made up for most men by the use of the car for recreation and family errands. Of course, most private owners keep no accounts, and know nothing about the economic analysis I have just sketched. All they know is that the only cost to them of driving to town is the gasoline because the car is just sitting there anyway. Thus the practical man and the theorist come out at the same place.

From the analysis, it follows that the decisions made by individuals as to modes of travel, trip by trip, though thoroughly rational and economical for them at the time, are made with a grossly distorted picture of true costs, particularly as to depreciation, insurance, rights-of-way, terminals, and storage. These happen to be the major part of the total true cost, and they happen to involve the private use of community resources, a matter of overriding public concern.

---

[1] "A Ten Year National Highway Program," report to the President, the President's Advisory Committee, Lucius D. Clay, Chairman. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington (January 1955).

[2] Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," Harvard University Press, 1960, p. 61.

User charges

Charges to the user for special transportation services are becoming more and more significant, especially in and around the eastern urban areas and in the Middle West. Such charges are generally applied only to new facilities, and are politically justified by the greatly improved service rendered by a new tunnel, bridge, throughway, or parking garage. Some of these facilities run a profit from the start, while others operate "in the red" for many years.

Without these charges many of the most spectacular motor transport improvements could not have been undertaken because of the lack of State and local financial resources, borrowing powers, and willingness to go ahead.

Lyle C. Fitch, New York's city administrator, has called attention to another economic effect of these user charges. When a price is attached to the individual trip, this will of itself exclude from the facility those who feel that the service is not worth the cost to them for the trip or service in question. This automatically persuades the user, of his own free will, not to use a bridge, a throughway, a tunnel, a public garage or parking space, unless there is an economic reason for doing so. If a service is not thus rationed on an economic basis, it will automatically be rationed by queueing and congestion, which thus gives the service to the person whose time is least valuable to him, and presumably to the economy.

It has also been pointed out that this resort to the market has a political benefit as well. When tolls are charged, those who use the facility are voting with their dimes and quarters, thus expressing their continuing need for the service. This is surely a more accurate way of determining the required levels of service than holding public hearings and asking for legislative votes.

The automatic economic rationing is also more acceptable to the public than any method of sorting out and restricting the frivolous users by administrative devices, as we did during the war. In peacetime, it is doubtful if the public will readily accept such administrative rationing. In contrast, no one resists the economic rationing, except when it is applied to a service long free or underpriced.

It must be noted, however, that pricing a service does not decide in advance what will be required. This advance decision must always be a political decision, however much it is based on prior engineering and fiscal analysis. But the psychology of measuring the need for the service, the effective benefit, over against the service charges which will be paid, has its own economic value.

In view of these compelling facts as to user decisions we must conclude that the transportation and circulation system of an urban area cannot be determined or designed by the market, the user, or the extension of O & D studies. The user will always pick and choose to suit his own preference and economic need, but the framework of choices given him must be set up by public action.

Governmental allocation of land

A crucial decision as to its transportation system in any urban area is this: How much of our total land must we dedicate to circulation?

This is a question of urban design and is like the same problem faced in the design of a factory, a theater, a school, or an office building.

We cannot go at the problem in precisely the same way, however, because an American cit, is not a controlled social and economic structure, and we don't want it to be. Under our definition of a city as a place for free and easy, unregimented contacts, we cannot have, and do not want, a structure rigorously controlled to the same degree as a building by a fixed architectural blueprint. When we plan and design a city, or additions to a city, we must not reach beyond the elements of the framework lest we intrude upon the free flow of contacts. But to preserve this very freedom, we have now found it necessary to apply to the use of land space the same kind of social limitation which we place on other human conduct in order to maximize the free opportunities of all by limiting the unsocial acts of the few. This is a difficult but necessary social decision, because private land use in an urban area affects not only the immediate neighbors, but also the whole area through its proportionate effect on the total circulation system.

One aspect of theater design is much like the design problem of the city. In a theater, the revenue comes from the seats. The more seats, the more revenue; and the more space we put into the aisles, the less floor space we have for seats. The same problem arises, with some variations, in the city. Our city community income also arises from the "seats," that is, the land put to economic use. If we put half of the land, or more, into the circulation and transportation system, what will this do to the economic life of the community?

If we put the entire land surface into parking lots and concrete, we know the answer. Where in between should each urban community reach its best balance? If a city finds its raison d'etre in facilitating human association, what happens when you gouge a Panama Canal for private automobiles through the middle of the town and then introduce yawning parking lots and sterile high-rise garages into the business district?

If the workers in modern office buildings all went to work in their private cars, we would require not less than 75 percent of the total downtown land area for throughways and streets, and for each office building the size of the Empire State Building we would need for its employees alone two garages of equal size to store their cars during the hours they are at work.

Some cities will want it that way. They will have a predominantly private auto circulation system, and they will have an economic community in which business itself and professional life are also atomized. This has many attractive features. But for other cities, particularly those with important executive, managerial, financial, interdependent professional, multiple-idea exchanging, and non-self-sufficient little economies, a different kind of urban concentration will be required. In such cities no large space separators can be permitted, and land must be conserved and arranged for the maximum face-to-face contacts.

The decisions as to the proportion of urban land to be assigned to transportation, and to what kind, is made by the local government, with an assist from State and Federal agencies when it comes to the through highways and some other modes of movement. The difficulty is that the local governmental decisions are not now made as part of a general plan, but only as each separate facility is designed and constructed by each local governmental unit, be it city, county, or town. As a result, nobody knows where any regional circulation system is headed, or where it will end up. Until recently, in my city, the only overall circulation plan has been that of a private planning group of good citizens drawn up 35 years ago, and this paid little attention to rail commuters. A half dozen separate official agencies have built this or that subway extension, bridge, tunnel, throughway, parkway, street, ferry system, or garage. Someone else regulates parking lots, and another department entirely installs parking meters and decrees one-way streets. And nobody, but nobody, has worried about the commuter railroads, until they began to fold.

Urban land is terrifically valuable for the community. It cannot be squandered away thoughtlessly, a little here and a little there.

From now on, no land should be allocated in any city to any part of the circulation and transportation services, public or private, without competent, impartial professional examination and comparison with a general idea of what the city is for, and a cross check with an official comprehensive circulation plan or program.

This is not something that can be done in pieces, nor by separate squabbling authorities, nor by private agencies, however competent. It is a job for a responsible and well-staffed instrument of State and local government. And it must be done on a comprehensive basis with the broad goals continuously in mind.

Land use planning and control

The fourth theater of decision as to the circulation and transportation system of an urban area is found in its street system and its local zoning controls. These are determined by the local municipal government when it lays out and improves streets, accepts the platting of private land, adopts and enforces its zoning controls, locates public open spaces and facilities, and approves mass transportation franchises or routes. These are city planning and legislative acts, though generally undertaken under executive and technical guidance.

Fortunately, we are beginning to recognize that each kind and intensity of urban land use tends to generate a known amount and kind of traffic. As a result, any city which is really determined to solve its traffic problem in the next generation can do so by zoning its land uses now and, at the same time, designing its major comprehensive transportation system so that the land-use pattern and the circulation system will be in reasonable balance. Such a system will have built into it a series of economic persuaders and controls to keep things in line, and it will be continually under planned modification to meet changing conditions. This solution cannot be achieved all at once, but it can be evolved, once a community firmly and irrevocably decides to work its way out of its present mess. This kind of decision must involve a firm commitment by the business, banking, labor, civic, educational, entertainment, and political leaders of a community. It is not something that a few well-intentioned people can bring about by stealth. It can only come as the result of a strong community commitment and sustained administration. But it will surely be worth the effort.

Obstacles to action

There are many obstacles to action along this line which we cannot take time to explore here. The fundamental problem is the fragmentation of the metropolitan area into scores, or hundreds, of local governmental authorities. As a result, there is frequently no concept of land-use allocation or zoning control in the fastest growing fringe of the urban area. In these areas there is no effort to plan for a balanced residential, industrial, and retail development, except to get while the getting is good, or inconsistently to preserve the old town. Nobody is thinking about a balance between land uses and the circulation system of the entire social and economic area of which the given town is an inseparable part. Each little fringe community and each central city is going its own way. The ultimate penalty for this kind of thoughtless and selfish development will be very high, both for the towns and for the entire urban region.

Other economic considerations

There is no thought of covering all of the economic considerations affecting transportation in this brief paper. Economies and diseconomies of scale are involved, though

our knowledge in this field is fragmentary, and most decisions are being made without the benefit of rational analysis. Perhaps these decisions can be looked at as experimental and thus subject to revision after trial. This approach is not fundamentally unscientific, though it is wasteful, especially where the experiment is irreversible for generations to come, as with the establishment of the circulation system.

The effect of the circulation and transportation system on land values throughout the metropolitan area is a further matter for analysis. Robert Murray Haig demonstrated over a generation ago that a perfect, frictionless, urban transportation system would equalize the site value of land throughout the area, by making land at the center no more desirable or income producing than any other land, even out to the farthest suburbs. This equalizing effect on land values from improving the circulation system is dramatically evident in the transfer today of city residential and shopping values into the country. The same centrifugal effect is seen with the service trades. But when it comes to the highest quality commodities and services, and to the higher levels of managerial, idea-exchanging, creative, and other required face-to-face contacts, may not the demand be for aggregation per se? If so, the best possible circulation system will favor concentration by facilitating confluence from a wider base. This would then create higher peak land values at such a center. In the city of New York one can see both of these forces, the one centrifugal, the other centripetal operating simultaneously. The identification of the functions which gain by flying out, and those which gain by pressing in, and their mutual interrelations in the metropolitan complex, is still inadequately understood.

Another basic economic and political problem of the urban area is posed by the development of insulated and favored suburban enclaves. Such quality suburbs do have higher incomes, more tax resources per child in school, for example, and may capture a good industry to help carry the load, while the neighboring suburb may have only the burdens, and the old, central cities have the renewal problem to keep them busy while some of their taxable values are sliding away. The economist recognizes in this situation the basic question of the redistribution of income, both within the public and within the private sectors, and as between the two. The resulting disparities and imbalance are both economic and political, and will lead to fundamental changes in our tax systems and the reallocation of now local governmental powers and services. The administrator and planner cannot overlook this redistribution problem even though the major adjustments will be made at the higher levels of our national social philosophy and politics. After all, the local governments are still the major retail outlets under our system for distributing social income.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, I want to urge on you as engineers, six lines of thought:

1. Wherever you have a chance to influence the situation, insist that a big city shall approach any one of its major traffic, transportation, or parking and terminal problems as an integral part of its total circulation philosophy and system. We must have the comprehensive approach, even if this requires more studies, more cooperation, and more delay. Those who rush into breaking this or that individual traffic bottleneck from now on, will only break their own, or that of the city for whom they work.

2. No big city can now plan, or design, or finance its internal circulation system without incorporating into these processes the broader metropolitan area of which it is now a part. Our city lines were established when the pattern of the streetcar and horse-drawn vehicles dominated the scene. The geographic area to be covered today in dealing with internal circulation must be greatly extended. This is a technological as well as a political requirement. For these broader studies, and operations, and financing, we shall need new broader jurisdictions, with built-in cooperation of Federal, State, and local authorities. This has been decided for us by the way the American people want to live and work, now that they have small, flexible individual units of fast locomotion.

3. We must expect quite different answers to the traffic and transportation problem in each of the major cities and their surrounding areas. These will depend on the shape, functions and past history, and the future mission, of each urban area. Make no mistake, cities can't do much to change their basic place in the world or the Nation, but they can lose out by falling down on the transportation job, and letting somebody else fall heir to their natural birthright. Internal circulation is a major factor in this picture. For most cities, transportation may be the critical determinant of that city's future arrangement, efficiency, and livability. It therefore becomes essential to develop our comprehensive transportation planning on the basis of solid economic and social understandings and community decisions to proceed. Nothing but disaster will come from putting the monomaniacs in control, be they rail, rubber, monorail, helicopter, conveyor belt, or other enthusiasts. What we now need is the designed circulation function, relating land and rights-of-way and modes of movement and communication, fused in an evolving economic and social structure which recognizes human needs as paramount.

4. The circulation system, the process of getting about, uses a great deal of time and consumes a great amount of manpower and material. These can become a serious drag on the income of any community and can injure its competitive economic situation in the world, or the arrangement can become a real community asset. We must therefore seek to make circulation easy and inexpensive, to mold the growth of the community to avoid unnecessary cross hauls and long linkages, and to create a transportation system and a pattern of land use which are complementary and in balance, inducing for each movement a mode which is appropriate and economical.

5. The selection of the best mode of individual urban movement must be left to the individual user. As a practical matter, however, the user can select only from among the available modes, and makes his decision to suit his own convenience and pocketbook. Without advance community decision as to the general circulation system, the free decisions of individuals end up in inordinately expensive chaos, as we now know. It is therefore imperative that the community shall decide and provide the general outlines of a rational, comprehensive circulation and transportation system. When this has been done and land uses and density are controlled accordingly, the community can rely on the free choices of individuals, and can depend on economic persuaders rather than police controls, to achieve an efficient, economic, and smooth flowing total system. People will do the right and sensible thing when given a chance.

6. Finally, I plead with you to insist that any new or modified circulation and transportation system you can help to design and install will function effectively for the future only as the load on that system is held within reasonable balance by land use control. As engineers you know better than anyone else that this is true. You have the duty, therefore, to make this point over and over, every time you have anything to do with urban transportation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, next I would like to call attention to an address by Mr. Donald C. Wagner, managing director of the city of Philadelphia, to the annual conference of the American Municipal Association, held in New York City in November last year.

Mr. Wagner also emphasizes the need for the development of a general comprehensive plan, preferably for the entire metropolitan area, after which there must follow a comprehensive transportation plan in much more detail and depth. It is for this latter type of planning, particularly mass transportation planning, that S. 345 is designed to assist with matching funds to State and local governments. Mr. Wagner raises an important point when he states that—

If the city makes the region's plan unilaterally, it is likely to be unrealistic and almost sure to meet with opposition from other parts of the region.

It was my thought, in introducing S. 345, that comprehensive, areawide mass transportation planning is so badly needed that we cannot wait for the formation in every case of bodies with areawide representation to undertake such planning. But the bill does require the administration to give planning grants to those bodies best qualified to plan for the area as a whole and to make a continuing contribution to the fulfillment of the plans. Also he is directed to encourage the participation and cooperation of other interested municipalities in the formulation of the plans so as to insure maximum communitywide support for them.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Wagner's talk on "Solving Traffic Congestion in Large Cities" be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

SOLVING TRAFFIC CONGESTION IN LARGE CITIES

I must in all frankness admit my own inadequacy in handling this subject. We have not yet solved our traffic congestion in Philadelphia despite all of the effort we have put into it. I am sure that many of you have done and are doing tremendously important and interesting things in coping with this problem in your cities.

In this group of cities of over a quarter million in population we have one thing in common. Each of our cities is the core city of a larger and very important metropolitan area. Many of our cities lost population from 1950 to 1960, yet the population of the total metropolitan area has increased tremendously. The cities that have not lost population are those which encompass or have annexed vast areas and large portions of the metropolitan area are within their boundaries. The growth of these metropolitan areas is expected to continue significantly certainly for another decade or two and therefore the importance of circulation in, through, and around the core city must be recognized. With the inevitable growth in population will come a corresponding growth in the use of that product for which Detroit is famous, and many of the increased numbers of automobile trips will be in and through our cities. It is our belief that the centers of our cities can and must be maintained in their vitality and attractiveness so

that the entire area recognizes it as the throbbing heart giving life and purpose to the region.

I assume that each of us has done what now seems elementary: (1) developed to the maximum one-way street patterns of movement; (2) restricted or prohibited onstreet parking or stopping during peak hours; (3) developed truck routes bypassing congestion; (4) required loading and unloading to be done off peak or off street; (5) reversed flows for morning and evening peak; (6) performing our own public works and utility reconstruction at night; (7) provided modern traffic signal control so synchronized as to keep traffic flowing; (8) generous use of channelizing and street lane marking to avoid physical conflict; and many others.

Not so elementary, but gaining in use and importance are such things as lanes reserved for buses during peak hours, underground streets for loading and unloading operations and servicing buildings, streets reserved for mass transit, and pedestrian malls bypassed by all vehicular traffic.

I will attempt to survey what seems to me to be some of the basic steps that any city of a quarter million or more people must take in order to meet the needs of transportation of people and goods and at the same time avoid traffic strangulation. Perhaps I can bring you some of the understanding that I have been able to get from State highway departments as one of your representatives on the joint AMA–AASHO Committee on Highways, from participation in the Sagamore conference and from what has been reported to me on the Connecticut general conference and the more recent Woods Hole seminars on transportation.

First, every one of us should have a comprehensive development plan for our city and, preferably, for our metropolitan area. Since Philadelphia's plan has just been published this year, I feel this statement can be made in good grace. It took us 8 years to complete this plan, and it is being changed already; but, nonetheless, we do have a plan for all of the city which includes land use, transportation, economic development, recreation, parks, and facilities for all types of institutions, both public and private. Unfortunately, this plan is limited by the city's boundaries, although forecasts of regional economic and population growth were taken into account.

It seems clear to us that the region itself somehow must set its basic goals on a broad range of public and private facilities and objectives; otherwise, transportation cannot be brought in balance with the needs of the citizenry. Those of you who have been concerned with this task know how difficult it is to make a valid long-range plan. It is even more difficult when the city attempts to do this jointly with the other government units that make up the region. And if the city makes the region's plan unilaterally, it is likely to be unrealistic and almost sure to meet with opposition from other parts of the region.

Our own comprehensive plan was preceded by a transportation study in which forecasts of economic growth and population distribution became the basis for a recommended program of improvements to the transportation system so as best to serve a strong central city and a spreading region. These recommendations were published in the spring of 1956 by the city's urban traffic and transportation board as "Plan and Program, 1955." This publication was adopted as the city's "bible" of transportation policy, allowing separate projects to be shaped toward our long-range goals and the major findings were embodied in the comprehensive plan.

After the comprehensive plan, of course, should come the transportation plan in very much more detail and depth. In Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Washington such major transportation plans either have been completed very recently or, in the case of Pittsburgh, are well on the way. We have a year and a half to go to the completion of our own major transportation plan which is being done by the Penn-Jersey transportation study for the Philadelphia-Camden-Trenton region. This study is perhaps unique in its field for two reasons: (a) it includes Philadelphia and eight counties in two States, and (b) the governing board consists principally of governmental generalists, rather than just highway people, although most of the money comes from highway user taxes, State and Federal. The 500 or more people now employed on this study will turn out a regional plan for transportation which we believe even our suburban counties of the opopsite political party will agree has the right objectives for the region.

Many, if not all, of the objectives for solving traffic congestion can be accomplished on a do-it-yourself basis. The National Committee on Urban Transportation, recently dissolved, put forth a series of manuals showing how this can be done at home, using local talent as an ongoing part of government. AMA, through staff assistance, is encouraging cities to make such studies themselves. You, your city manager, or your city traffic engineer certainly should be familiar with these manuals and should be accumulating the data which they indicate will be helpful, not only for a major transportation plan, but for the ordinary operation of your city's transportation system.

If you are in a very large city such as Philadelphia, you're going to find a whole gamut of short-range plans to be necessary. Perhaps the array which Philadelphia has instigated will give you some indication of the complexity of this problem: (a) About the same time that the urban traffic and transportation board was giving a comprehensive look at the transportation policies facing the city and outlining how they could be brought into balance, the transit situation was being studied in more depth by the department of public property and its consulting engineers, and they came out with a plan for the surface transit system which was very helpful as we negotiated with the transit operators on the abandonment of surface rail routes and their conversion to bus routes; (b) the city's department of streets, through their consultants, did a comprehensive study on the utilization of the surface street system in our central business district. This led to the development of a completely interconnected electronic signal system with measuring devices to vary the signal timing automatically for a very large area at a cost of over a million dollars. Even this has not proved able to carry the burden which the automobile has put on our very narrow streets, many of them only 50 feet wide with 26-foot cartways, but it is typical of the study in depth which we think is necessary in order to reach reasonable decisions in the transportation field; (c) in parking we have utilized short-range plans, particularly in the center city where we have had a comprehensive analysis of the parking needs of our central business district related to the numbers of people which we expect to bring in by automobiles. Frankly, we never solve transportation congestion; we merely ameliorate it or move the congestion from one spot to another because, as I indicated at the outset, the great growth in population and automobiles is so far ahead of anything that can be done within the physical framework of an existing city that a full solution is impossible.

Often not even the short-range plans can be completed before a municipality must do something. It is needless for me to tell you this for, as administrators, you all know that decisions have to be reached before all the facts are available. You draw the best conclusions you can and move ahead. We have the same kind of difficulties in Philadelphia, but we try to do a fair job of studying projects before they are instituted. We have literally dozens of substantial transportation projects in various stages—plans and reports on the shelf, others which have been put into operation wholly or in part, and others which are underway. And the city traffic engineer makes literally hundreds of studies every year to find solutions to major or minor irritants. The location of a traffic signal (or nonlocation) takes a great deal of staff time, as you well know.

Our commuter railroad improvement program has been a major effort which has attracted considerable attention throughout the region and perhaps in the Nation. Beginning just 2 years ago, in October 1958, the city began supporting improved service at reduced fares on 2 of the 15 or so railroad commuter lines serving the region. Great increases in ridership resulted. In September 1959 it was possible to add a third line with increased service and reduced fares. Service improvement included not only more frequent trains, filling in gaps in the schedules, but also the provision of transit rides at roughly half the going rate of 22 cents cash or 20 cents by token. This permits a person to ride a bus in the outskirts of the city to a railroad station and come by train to the center of the city for as low a fare as 40 cents. And just a month ago, three additional lines, making a total of six, were put into this program. One of these goes up into the far northeast where it has been necessary to add two zones above the standard 30-cent fare. We are anxiously watching to see if these lines show a significant increase in ridership, which has been as high as 400 percent over previous years on the most lightly patronized line. I could talk the whole time on what this program is, how it is operated, and how successful it has been. But if you have interest in it, perhaps we could give you more specifics in terms of your interest at the question session. Our purpose is to keep in use not only the commuter rail facilities we have but to improve them and extend their use, and at the same time keep our rapid transit lines running as near to capacity as we can.

We believe in the tremendous value of expressways and we urge their construction just as speedily as possible, but we do have high-quality commuter railroad and rapid transit systems which are here now and operating. The investment of Federal and State funds in our modest expressway program—and it is modest compared to other cities in this Nation—will not provide enough funds to build a complete system for four decades, and it seems impossible to speed the rate of investment very much. We, therefore, believe it unwise to risk losing an existing railroad and rapid transit system which is doing so much by carrying the peak-hour loads to the central business district. This will permit our limited highway funds to be applied to facilities which have a much greater offpeak to peak ratio and, therefore, return far greater benefits to the region.

We have a whole gamut of parking projects, including a few major central-city garages. Here we are attempting to attract private capital to build the structures while the city is providing the land on a lease basis, and we have two dozen smaller lots in suburban business districts to provide more adequate parking space in these important areas. We have not yet found it possible to provide residential parking because we do not find people willing to pay the cost. Yet Philadelphia, built to very high density with no off-street parking space in many areas, desperately needs such parking in residential areas, particularly along arterial streets. We have longingly looked at the Milwaukee parking tax and have for some

time concluded that the tax is the only possible way we have of raising sufficient funds to get cars off the street in areas where there are no garages.

We have related our transportation plans to our redevelopment plans in every redevelopment area. Even though we build to fairly high density in redevelopment projects, fortunately we find that car ownership is a little below normal and we do not greatly overload the parking spaces provided. It has not been possible, within the Federal framework or rules, to provide as much parking as we would like to in these major redevelopment projects. Finally, the city does have an arterial street system which is perhaps even more important than the expressway system. We have not yet carried through the comprehensive studies which we think are necessary to determine just how our limited funds shall be spent on this system. Nonetheless, the city traffic engineers, the street commissioner and the whole administration have drawn value judgments on which projects are the most important and many arterial streets are being improved in our 6-year capital program. Unfortunately, we get practically no assistance from the State highway department in this area compared to the amounts paid by Philadelphians to support the highway department. This, too, is an old story to this group. Nonetheless, all of us must work, at both the State and Federal levels, to make certain that adequate sums of money are available to do the things that the central cities cannot do alone. This must include equitable sharing of highway funds, and finally, support for mass transit facilities where they are more economical for the public than highways alone, certainly from the Federal Government and possibly from the State government.

In conclusion, we believe a balanced transportation system can contribute greatly to solving traffic congestion not only in Philadelphia, but in any large city. Balanced, in our view, means a conscious decision by the government to make available to the public the best kinds of transportation at the lowest cost. We believe that highways cannot do the job alone and that we will not have enough money to support them in heavily built-up urban areas unless we take advantage of the economies of mass transportation. In some cities in our group, buses, properly handled, may be able to move the masses of people without congesting traffic; in others rail rapid transit and railroad commuter lines on their own right-of-way or in subways are the best means of hauling large numbers of people at peak hours. Each city should make its choice after thorough study. This is not a problem which will solve itself. It must be faced with a boldly planned program and money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a third speech of particular interest to those studying the unique phenomenon known as the New York metropolitan region, was given by Mr. Ernest Erber, a member of the New York Regional Plan Association and Passaic Valley Citizens Planning Association, to the Business Forum at Fairleigh Dickenson University, on November 15, 1960.

This statement well illustrates the extent to which urban transportation has become an almost insoluble problem in the New York-New Jersey area. It is worth considering the fact that only a mere 9 percent of the commuters in the nine counties of North Jersey actually commute into New York. The other 91 percent are busy struggling to and from work within the north Jersey area itself.

This fact demonstrates the magnitude of the problem facing us, and, I should think, provides the rest of the urban areas across the country with adequate warning of what is to come unless prompt and bold attention is given to land use and transportation developments, particularly to the potentials of modern mass transportation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Erber's statement on "Transportation in Metropolitan Northern New Jersey" be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

TRANSPORTATION IN METROPOLITAN NORTHERN NEW JERSEY

(By Ernest Erber)

It is most appropriate that students of business administration engaged in a study of industry be concerned with transportation, for it has always been the lifeblood of commerce—whether in the age of the camel caravan or the age of the jetplane.

My talk cannot possibly encompass transportation everywhere and in all its phases. I wish to cover that aspect of which I have knowledge from professional experience. This is passenger transportation by both public and private conveyance in the metropolitan counties of northern New Jersey, namely Bergen, Passaic, Hudson, Essex, Morris, Union, Middlesex, Somerset, and Monmouth. These counties form a continuous complex of urban and suburban development that is more populous than any city in the Nation except New York and more populous than any metropolitan region outside of the New York region, except for the Chicago or Los Angeles regions.

It is therefore apparent that even after my self-imposed limitation to transportation of persons in north Jersey, the subject matter remains rather imposing; far too vast and complex for exhaustive treatment within the confines of a single lecture, even if I were equipped with the knowledge to cover it comprehensively. I will not attempt, therefore, to make this presentation a definitive paper on the subject.

The problem of traveling in our New York-New Jersey region has been very much in evidence on the front pages of the metropolitan press in these past few years. We have read about commuter trains that have stopped running; about State subsidies to railroads; about huge expressway construction programs; about schemes for new technological innovations such as monorail; about the Port of New York Authority's alleged failure to carry out its responsibility; about pending Federal legislation; about a State transportation study just getting underway which will spend over $3 million to seek a solution.

Incidentally, the $3 million are held to be insufficient to do a thorough job by some people who know this field. If this staggers your sense of proportion, it will be stabilized again when I tell you that $3 million will build less than one-half mile of the proposed Essex Freeway. When we are engaged in programs that spend $7 million per mile of highway and when we hear of rapid transit proposals that exceed $1 billion, the $3 million study just getting underway sounds like small change.

You can realize from this that we are talking about something that is big—I would guess that it sounds big even to students of business administration. You will understand, therefore, why I shun the role of the encyclopedic authority on every phase of this problem and speak here tonight in the humble role of the practitioner in city planning who seeks to convey to you a distillation of his observations and experiences gained in a dozen years of professional work in north Jersey.

I have another reason for not undertaking an encyclopedic review of this subject. Such an effort at complete coverage of the subject within a single lecture would, of necessity, be confined to a reading of topical headings and subheadings in a comprehensive outline. Such a syllabus is proper for a complete course of study of this subject. However, as a visiting lecturer bringing some specialized knowledge to bear, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to deal with the subject in such a manner as to make a contribution to a better understanding of some phase of it not just for my listeners, but also for those in positions of responsibility who must make the decisions that shape public policy in the field of transportation. If my effort here tonight results in placing some phases of the transportation problem into sharper focus, I shall consider myself fully compensated for the effort made.

To put into sharper focus any phase of this complex problem is to make a distinct contribution to its solution. For I contend that the failure to make more progress in improving transportation in north Jersey stems, largely, from misconceptions of the nature of the problem especially the fallacy of oversimplification. I wish to illustrate this contention with several examples.

There is a widely held view—and, unfortunately, one held in positions of influence, that the crux of north Jersey's transportation problem is to transport the New Jersey resident to his Manhattan job swiftly, comfortably and economically. I do not deny for one moment that this is a commendable objective, nor that its solution should have a claim upon our intellectual and financial resources. However, I deny that this is the crux of the problem, and I contend that its solution will represent only a relatively minor contribution to the overall problem of the balanced development of metropolitan northern New Jersey.

I contend that this is not the crux of the problem because the typical New Jersey breadwinner earns his living on this side of the Hudson River. In the nine metropolitan counties of North Jersey, 91 percent of those gainfully employed work in New Jersey. Only 9 percent cross the river daily to work in Manhattan. I do not belittle the importance of providing transportation for this 9 percent without a strain upon their time, pocketbooks or nerves. But if the transportation problem of the 91 percent remains unimproved, North Jersey will still represent a disorderly transportation jungle. (If any of you have to fight your way down Route 17 in the morning or evening rush hours, you will know what I mean when I say that its jungle nature is apparent from the fact that the law of the fang and the claw holds sway.)

I attach importance to clarifying this misconception about the New York-bound Jerseyite as the crux of the problem, mainly because it is a misconception and, as with all misconceptions, it obscures an appreciation and understanding of the true nature of the problem. By the same token it postpones a coming to grips with the real problem. I have introduced this reference to the 9 percent and the 91 percent as an example of a misconception that I hope to correct. I will have more to say on this aspect of the problem later on in my remarks when I shall try to spell out what I deem to be the real problem.

However, while dealing with misconceptions that need dispelling, I wish to turn to another one that has come to be widely held and has contributed greatly to disorienting those seeking answers to our transportation problem. This is the oversimplified view that everything was fine until people deserted public transportation for private cars. This

is alleged to have caused the financial ruin of public transportation companies and the congestion on our highways which necessitates vast public expenditures for road building. It is easy to understand why so many people—including many who speak out publicly on this subject and thereby mold public opinion—should hold this oversimplified, and basically fallacious, view of how we got into our transportation crisis. This view is almost inevitable for anyone who has sat behind the wheel of his car inching his way down to the Lincoln Tunnel in bumper-to-bumper traffic. On occasions like that, one cannot escape the conclusion that about everyone in New Jersey who owns a car (and that is just about everybody) is trying to drive it to Manhattan. From experiences like this are born the sage advice that the transportation problem would be solved if we could only get people to leave their cars at home and use public transportation. (I wish to comment, parenthetically, that I suspect that most such sage advisers really mean to say that if everyone else used public transit, they would have no delays in taking their car through the tunnel.)

However, the statistics show that the use of the private automobile for the trip to New York could not be the sole, nor even the main, cause of financial difficulties for public transportation, and more specifically, railroads. The metropolitan rapid transit commission study of December 1957 showed that some 383,000 persons crossed the Hudson River from New Jersey to New York on a typical working day in 1955. Of these, 263,000 were destined for Manhattan. Of these, 135,000 traveled to Manhattan between 7 a.m. and 10 a.m. and can be presumed to have consisted mainly of commuters bound for a Manhattan job. Of these only 16,000, or about 12 percent, traveled by car. Of these, only 6,000 went by car during the peak hour of morning travel, namely between 8 a.m. and 9 a.m., when the bulk of the white-collar workers are en route to work. If these 6,000 were lured away from their cars and added to the 76,000 fellow Jerseyites who were using trains and buses during this peak hour, it would hardly constitute a financial windfall for the common carriers, though it would have the wholesome effect of unclogging bridges and tunnels for use by buses and trucks.

Why do I attach so much importance to dispelling these misconceptions of what constitutes north Jersey's transportation problem? I do it because while public attention is riveted on the Manhattan-bound Jerseyite, and more particularly in trying to get 6,000 of them to leave their car at home, there are 32,810 residents of Union County trying to fight their way through morning traffic to jobs in Essex County, and 22,066 residents of Essex County trying to fight their way to jobs in Hudson County, and 23,117 residents of Hudson County trying to fight their way into Bergen County, and 27,669 Bergen residents trying to squeeze across an insufficient number of inadequate bridges over the Passaic River to jobs in Passaic County. They are among those who compose the 91 percent of the gainfully employed Jerseyites who work in New Jersey. It is my contention that a study of this problem will bring us closer to the crux of the crisis of transportation in north Jersey.

I say this without the slightest emotional attachment to the interests of New Jersey vis-a-vis the rest of the metropolitan region. I say it coldbloodedly and objectively from my concept of the New York region as a whole, which concept I base in large part upon the economic and population data presented in the monumental Harvard studies sponsored by the Regional Plan Association and published in nine volumes, the last of which was released on Monday. I believe that implicit in this data, and explicit in large measure in the analysis by Dr. Raymond Vernon and his associates, is a concept of the emergent metropolitan region considerably at variance with that which still persists as the public's image and, alas, the false basis for many public policy decisions.

However, before I leave the matter of the erroneous concentration of attention on the 9-percent-Manhattan-bound commuters, I wish to comment on one phase of the trans-Hudson problem. In a public address at a recent conference, the dean of one of our schools of architecture decried the double-decking of the George Washington Bridge as an example of the folly of building additional facilities to make New York accessible by automobile. He advanced the oft-repeated advice that the money spent on automotive tunnels and bridges would be used more wisely if used to construct rapid transit. I am an ardent advocate of rapid transit—into Manhattan, into Newark, into Paterson, into Elizabeth; wherever it is economically feasible to build it. But I am also aware of its limitations. Unless our entire pattern of living undergoes a change, rapid transit, at best, can answer only our workaday travel needs. I rather doubt that Americans will ever leave the car at home and take public transportation on pleasure jaunts, especially on the weekend when they head for the wide-open spaces with the family or just on a Sunday trip to visit Aunt Tilly, whether she lives in Canarsie or Morristown. It is, therefore, symptomatic and not accidental that the day on which the greatest number of autos crossed the George Washington Bridge was on Mother's Day. A swift and comfortable ride on a modern transit facility from Far Hills or Scarsdale to a Manhattan job is a desirable objective. However, it must also be weighed against the need for adequate facilities to permit that percent of New Yorkers who own cars and whose tax moneys help to pay for highway construction, to leave their city through uncongested exits and enjoy the beaches, State parks and, generally, the countryside. I have interjected this reply to the dean of architecture at this point for two reasons. One is to give evidence that my concern is for the region as a whole and that I have as much concern for the transportation needs of the Brooklynite who wishes to take his family to Palisades Interstate Park as I have for the resident of Kearny who works at the Ford motor plant in Mahwah. My second reason is to combat another misconception that obscures an understanding of our transportation. It cannot be rapid transit or highways. We need both and they should be planned to supplement each other.

Now that I have wielded my lance in combat with what I consider to be several of the hoary and pernicious misconceptions that obscure an understanding of the transportation problem in metropolitan north Jersey—and if any believe that these misconceptions are mere windmills and not real dragons, they must still convince me—I shall turn my thoughts to comments on the nature of the problem as I see it. If some of you are thinking that this is where I should have begun the lecture, you will have to attribute my choice of sequence to an inbred querulousness and contentionousness in the face of what I interpret as error, especially error that is widespread and espoused in high places. That is why I am an inveterate and, I fear, incorrigible member of that tribe of Americans known as letter-to-the-editor writers. However, I hope that you have noted that while I was speaking critically of what I consider to be misconceptions, I was, by the same token, simultaneously advancing some of my own positive conceptions of the problem, especially with reference to the 91 percent of the gainfully employed Jerseyites who work in Jersey, and with reference to the intercounty commuting that takes place in New Jersey, and with the need to find a more substantial explanation for the financial difficulties of the common carrier, and with the need to plan public and private transportation facilities as complementary, and not to the exclusion of the one or the other. I will now expand upon these concepts within the context of my description of the metropolitan region and its Jersey sector as I see them emerging from the 15-year period of transition since World War II.

The biggest news in the population field in recent months has been the relative decrease in the central cities—and an absolute loss of population in many—and the spectacular increase of population in most of the standard metropolitan areas. Preliminary figures released by the Census Bureau indicate that approximately 61.3 percent of the Nation's population, or some 108.9 million persons, is contained in the 189 standard metropolitan statistical areas defined by the Bureau prior to the census. Some 80 percent of the total population increase of 26.4 million occurred in the standard metropolitan statistical areas, with the suburban sectors receiving about two-thirds of the total increase.

As a result of these spectacular population changes America is at last discovering the metropolitan region. When we turn our attention to our New York region and begin examining its internal geography, we quickly realize that—as in most everything else—New York is different. If not different in any other respect, than certainly in size. The New York region is not simply one of many. It is in a class by itself. It is a superregion.

One need but roll off the vital statistics to see how far it is set apart from those regions closest to it in size: nearly 7,000 square miles, some 16 million people, 7 million jobs, 22 counties, etc. From Morristown to Hempstead, and from Suffern to Danbury to Red Bank, it is one continuous urban and suburban complex. As is true in so many areas of investigation of various phenomena—both natural and social—in which quantitative differences often translate themselves into qualitative differences, so in the case of New York as a superregion we find that it is also different qualitatively. One of these qualitative differences is the fact that large portions of the New York region have a degree of socioeconomic self-sufficiency beyond that found in any other region. This could not be different in view of (1) the vast area of the New York region; (2) the divisions within it created by waterways; and (3) the existence of old, central cities of the size of Newark, Jersey City, Elizabeth, Paterson, Bridgeport, Yonkers, etc.

Of the various portions of the New York region, that having the greatest degee of self-sufficiency is the New Jersey portion. This is a vast urban complex in its own right. Existing by itself, North Jersey would be a major American metropolis, the fourth largest region in the Nation. Its nine counties contain 2,268 square miles (one-third of the region), 4½ million people (one-fourth of the region), and 1¾ million jobs (one-fourth of the jobs in the region).

In referring to population growth above, I stated that two-thirds of the population growth of the metropolitan area has taken place in the suburbs. I used "suburbs" with the loose construction with which we use the term in referring to areas outside of the central city. For purposes other than such a ready reference to these areas, the term "suburb" is very misleading and its use creates a mental image of the region which is in conflict with the facts as revealed in the Harvard study. All of the 4½ million persons living in the Jersey sector of the New York region can hardly be said to be living in the suburbs, if this word is used with any exactitude of meaning.

The dictionary tells us that a suburb is "a place adjacent to a city" or "outlying residential districts." The latter could hardly apply to Hoboken—nor to the place of residence of millions of Jerseyites which, if not as urban as Manhattan, are certainly no less urban than Brooklyn, the Bronx, or Queens. It is, therefore, apparent that we must dig below the superficial concept of central city and its suburbs if we are to understand the nature of the New York region and, especially, its Jersey sector.

The physical characteristics of any region—or of a community, for that matter—take shape in response to two factors: (1) the economic and population drives which spur a relentless research for the most advantageous location for industrial, commercial, residential, and other land uses under the impact of changing technology, and (2) the impact of these drives upon, and accommodation to, the existing structures, installations and facilities, both public and private, as these exist at a given moment as a product of all previous historical development. In this sense the north Jersey of today and tomorrow is being shaped between the hammer of economic and population change and the anvil of north Jersey's existing physical plant as the heritage from its past. This is why I can stand on a street corner within 5 minutes' walk from my home in Radburn (itself a suburban community of the 1920's), and see as adjacent land uses a shopping center, complete with a branch bank and a city-type delicatessen; an industrial park, giving employment to over 5,000; an apartment house project containing hundreds of families; and a truck farm with a goat nibbling grass on the front lawn. This is an extreme example, but it is by no means unique. This is symbolic of Jersey as it looks today—the successive overlayering and interlarding of more intensive urban development upon previous less intensive suburban and rural forms. However, the new urban forms are not a facsimile of the central city. When National Biscuit moves its plant from 14th Street in Manhattan to Fair Lawn, the plant undergoes a physical transformation to suit modern architectural design and modern technology, to adapt to less expensive and more ample land, including extensive landscaping, and to provide the large parking areas required by a large auto-borne working force. When Bambergers or Gimbels appears in Parasmus it is likewise in mid-twentieth century garb and spatially situated to accommodate the auto-borne shopper. When a 10-story elevator apartment building goes up in Clifton it is located at the junction of a State highway and the Garden State Parkway (though, incidentally, a few truck farms can still be seen from its upper floors). This successive overlayering results in a change—with a typical old central cities like Passaic or Hoboken at one extreme and typical new Los Angeles-type of auto-age communities like Clifton, Wayne, or Paramus at the other extreme.

A landscape dominated by a National Biscuit plant, by Gimbels, and by a 10-story apartment building—this is not suburbia. This is urbia—but urbia of a new type. This is the low density, land-devouring urban growth of the automobile age. This is Los Angeles superimposed upon the central city-suburban-rural pattern that was north Jersey 25 years ago. Then we had Newark and Paterson and Elizabeth and New Brunswick as typical central cities with an industrial base. Then we had Montclair, Glen Ridge, Ridgewood, and Englewood as typical on-rail, upper income suburbs. Then we had Paramus and Wayne, and the Caldwells as rural areas. Today these previous community forms live on, with varying degrees of survival. In the old cities it is blight, slums and urban renewal. In the old suburbs estates are being subdivided and big old houses are being converted. In the old rural areas the plow is yielding to the bulldozer.

What shall we call this—the new New Jersey that is taking shape? A suburb of New York? Hardly. A collection of separate cities? Hardly, when they are really so interdependent economically. (A man may live in Clifton, work in Jersey City and shop in Newark or Paramus.) There is no easy categorizing of north Jersey. It is sui generis, a thing unto itself—at least for the time being and until a clearer socioeconomic-physical form takes shape.

I wish at this time to introduce a postulate which is widely accepted in the planning profession. This is that transportation is basically determined by land-use patterns, but that the relationship is a reciprocal one and that transportation, in responding to needs created by land use, can foster new land development.

Based on this postulate, we can say that what has happened in New Jersey is that the automobile and the highway answered the transportation needs of scattered, growing communities—whether cities, towns, or hamlets—and, in providing the answer, set in motion entirely new patterns of urban growth tailored to private automotive transportation.

The result is this city of north Jersey, with its 4½ million people, spread over nine counties. Can we make it a city in fact? I do not refer to a city as a single political entity. I refer to a city as an urban development that caters to all of man's needs—physical and intellectual. Can north Jersey become an urban home for its millions and prove livable? Can it become fully civilized in the sense of combining physical convenience with intellectual and esthetic stimulation? Fortunately, north Jersey can always rely, to some extent, upon Manhattan which will remain the cultural center of the Nation. Nor is there a need to duplicate that which only such a center can provide. However, to the extent that every modern urban complex should satisfy man's hunger for physical comfort and mental stimulation, north Jersey can succeed only if it is served by a modern transportation system. Can the addition of highways and the multiplication of travel lanes provide such a system? Is such a transportation system based upon the private automobile compatible with an urban environment that is livable, enjoyable, and intellectually enriching?

This, then, I hold to be the crux of north Jersey's transportation problem. I do not know the answer, certainly not the whole answer. However, it is up to you, as an important segment of our citizenry—I hope tomorrow's captains of industry—to understand this problem and make your contribution to finding the answer in the arena of public discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Next I should like to call attention to a memorandum prepared by Mr. William B. Saunders, a Washington, D.C., transportation consultant, who raises some basic questions on urban transportation to which I would hope the Federal Government would devote considerable research effort, along with other kinds of research authorized by S. 345.

Also there is a memorandum on the cost-benefit concept in urban transportation planning, together with some of the factors that should be evaluated in such studies. The bill, S. 345, gives a great deal of emphasis to these all-important studies. It authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make studies on the model procedures that might be used in cost-benefit studies. It encourages these studies to be undertaken as a part of comprehensive mass transportation planning by State and local governments. And it authorizes the Administrator to undertake them in connection with funds granted for pilot demonstration projects.

Mr. President, I ask that this statement by Mr. Saunders be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

COMMENTS ON COMMUTATION

Many people think of the commuter problem as confined to a handful of our largest cities. However, it casts a shadow over all large cities as they continue to grow. Therefore, the treatment of today's major problems will have an impact on solutions to be applied in later years elsewhere. Likewise, planning activities now going on in the various cities will unquestionably be influenced by what is done now.

There can be no real cure without a knowledge of what caused the disease. Cities are congested by automobiles because people prefer them. Transit companies suffer declining patronage and service deteriorates, with resulting further declines in traffic volume. There are two basic questions to evaluate:

(a) Why do people prefer autos?

(b) Even if better for the individual, should the continued shift be encouraged from a public policy standpoint?

Like it or not, we have to face the fact that the individual's preference is affected with a public interest if only because government provides the highways and collects taxes. In its simplest form, the fact is that when we build bigger and better roads to attract automobiles, inevitably we affect the tax revenues of cities, the earnings of private transit companies, the congestion-exasperation index of the downtown driver, and the number of traffic policemen hired. This is all created initially by government decisions.

We must decide where the net benefits lie. Does the whole community—city and transit company and driver and business taxpayer and consumer—spend more for less one way than the other? If the overall costs versus benefits suggest continued encouragement of the private car, we should not be shoring up transit but rather providing for an orderly decline of the central city.

The automobile has made possible the suburb and the distant commuter. The scatter of population is the key to the lost traffic density on the commuter lines—rail and bus. People start from the edges of a wide circle and move into a narrow center. Good, frequent transit service at the edges (anything even remotely like the convenience of the private car) cannot possibly be provided at a profit to the transit company because of the light traffic on most of the run. But, from a public point of view, less total money might be spent even if buses did go in and out of town or in and out of concentration points with light loads.

Providing new highways to the central city and downtown parking lots means money spent by one set of political jurisdictions. The private car owner lives in the "bedroom" area and pays taxes there—but he works in the central city, which has the primary responsibility for providing the buses and police to keep him moving. Thus, a key fact which hinders solutions is the matter of jurisdiction. What practical steps can be taken to bring the workroom and the bedroom governments together (a) financially and (b) administratively?

If the problem is seen as one involving the best use of total resources, we can ask whether any existing agency is in a position

to deal with the problem. Thus, even the far-flung New York Port Authority is not equipped to solve all the New York area's problems—even if it wanted to. True, it could take over the transit companies and absorb their deficits out of tunnel tolls and other activities. But it has no voice in the planning or location of highways or other facilities. How could it give leadership and direction to a local program of encouraging people to drive only as far as a suburban parking lot? How can the costs be fairly apportioned among the big and little beneficiaries of reduced congestion? These are some of the practical considerations which must be faced.

We may see a short run or a long run solution here. For the short run, a city or area authority can merely absorb the deficits of existing transit facilities. For the long run, total urban area planning must be considered—including the nature and location of highways and other public facilities.

THE COST-BENEFIT CONCEPT AS APPLIED TO URBAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Our cities need a fresh look at their transportation problems and policies if they are to survive on a healthy basis. Two features of life today must be included in that look. The first is a recognition of the economic togetherness of communities in each area. The second is the vital need for looking at total transportation rather than only one mode.

The key to effective planning of urban transportation lies in creating public understanding of these points. As a result of the traditional segregation of mass transportation from highway programs, the net impact of total transportation plans is often obscure, even to community leaders.

There is now a glimmering of recognition, for example, that highway construction brings many social benefits, but that it also produces social costs through the loss of taxable real estate. We must ask the same kinds of questions about all public and private transportation policies. Ultimately, the community must face a basic economic question—how can the total burden be minimized.

The tragedy is that the central cities everywhere are being strangled by their own efforts to give the people what they want, without regard to total net cost. This comes about in part because people say that highways are congested and therefore we need more highways—particularly since we have a Federal-aid program in this field.

In a total transportation system approach, we must measure the relative costs and benefits which would accrue to the community from alternative public policies designed to meet present and prospective demands for transportation.

In its simplest form, one might visualize two extreme alternatives. The choice might be shown as between relying exclusively on private automobiles to meet demand for metropolitan movement versus relying entirely on public transportation (rail and bus) to meet the given demand.

In reality, of course, the number of choices is much greater than this, with the best practical alternative being some combination between the extremes. It is helpful, however, to think of the problem in its simplest form for convenience of description.

The important points to be evaluated in considering any proposed alternative are shown in the attached table.

If we ask questions about these items and assign a money value for each, it will soon be clear what the relative advantages are of various transportation plans. Such analysis would help to show the public why it is not sufficient merely to add new highway approaches to the metropolitan core. It would possibly show that total taxes might be lowered in both the bedroom sector as well as in the office sector of the metropolitan area by a better coordinated transportation system.

This subject is so important as to warrant some prompt pilot study treatment. I do not think any of our cities have ever really done this job as it should be done. It is a real challenge to government and community leaders alike. But the rewards to the Nation from a successful approach are immeasurable.

Transportation plan evaluation summary

	(1) All private automobile	(2) All transit (bus and/or rail)	(3) Mixed system
What will be the effect of each system on—			
(a) Public expenditures for highway construction			
(b) Public expenditures for highway maintenance			
(c) Public receipts from user charges			
(d) Public or private expenditure for off-street parking			
(e) Public or private expenditures for transit equipment and facilities			
(f) Revenues of public carriers			
(g) Operating costs of public carriers			
(h) Costs of private automobiles—			
for operation			
for capital investment			
for user charges			
(i) Business activity (and construction)—			
in core area			
in suburban area			
(j) Tax base and revenue—			
in core area			
in suburban area			
(k) Convenience to individual rider—			
in value of time in transit			
in accident and insurance costs			
(l) Community service requirements—			
for police			
for traffic control			
for other			
(m) Economic development—land values, employment, income, etc.			
(n) Other			

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Finally, I was privileged just last week on January 12, to address the downtown developments committee of the National Retail Merchants Association at their 50th annual convention in New York City. Joining with me in discussing urban mass transportation were Mr. Dwight Palmer, New Jersey's State highway commissioner; Mr. Walter Patchell, vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; and Mr. Herbert Harper, president of Public Service Coordinated Transport in New Jersey.

Mr. President, I ask that the statements of these gentlemen be included in the RECORD.

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

THE ROLE OF THE STATE GOVERNMENT IN PROVIDING ADEQUATE MASS TRANSIT FACILITIES IN URBAN AREAS

(By Dwight R. G. Palmer, New Jersey State highway commissioner, at the 50th Annual Convention, National Retail Merchants Association, Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York City, Jan. 12, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, when Mr. Pasqual Guerrieri asked if I would come to New York City to visit with a group of his associates in the business and civic life of this city on certain aspects of adequate transit facilities, I readily accepted his invitation that I might convey to you what I feel is industry's and business' real opportunity in our today's economy.

There are, in my opinion, few organizations other than your own that have a better understanding of how much the vitality of downtown areas depends on adequate public transportation. It is organizations such as your Downtown Development Committee of the National Retail Merchants Association, through its membership and its members' affiliation with other civic and business groups that can do much to spell success or failure for programs initiated by governmental agencies. It seems to me that no organization could be more concerned than is yours with the decline of central cities, particularly as centers of retail trade; also of the flight to the suburbs of thousands of middle income families precipitating the springing up of suburban shopping centers by the dozen changing all of your retail marketing patterns. Those of you who have maintained your ties with the central cities have seen develop the imbalance in social structure with the loss of numerous families to the suburbs—an imbalance that reduces city income on the one hand while increasing costs of education, protection and welfare on the other.

Narrowing our attentions to transportation and the congestion that we have grown to associate with our motorized age, you have asked me to discuss the "Role of State Government in Providing Adequate Mass Transit Facilities in Urban Areas." All of us are conscious of the problem that we face in keeping alive our public transportation network. The problem that we have in New Jersey has been with us for many years and presently is extremely critical—particularly with the suburban railroads.

We came across a statement that took our interest—a public official said:

"If the railway department could be relieved of providing all passenger services an acceptable balance between its revenues and working expenditures would be realized. * * * There has been allowed to develop a position of uneconomic competition between bus and rail services although one mode of transportation would be sufficient to cater for the traffic offering from each suburb. The only solution to this problem is the coordination of rail and bus operations withing the city."

This is a familiar tune—it is being sung in most of our metropolitan areas but this statement was made by the Treasurer of the State of Queensland, Australia, in introducing his budget to Parliament for the new fiscal year.

Also a white paper on the Nationalized Railway System in England emphasized the losses being incurred and made a plea for coordinated transit.

Maybe we can take some comfort from the realization that our problem in transportation is not unlike that being experienced in every corner of our globe. Although our problem is a common one, the solution is not. Returning to Australia for a moment we find one extreme—the State Government of New South Wales, for instance, provides a state-owned and operated rail transit system from the city of Sydney—a complete system being provided by the State for its urban area. At the other extreme, in this country, the States have, in general, limited participation to that of exercising regulation over private transportation companies. Last June however, landmark action was taken in New Jersey when our Gov. Robert B. Meyner signed into law a measure enabling the State to actively participate in the private transportation effort and share with rail carriers a part of the problem of providing rail service essential in the public interest. To our knowledge New Jersey was the first State to recognize such responsibility.

The decision to face the transportation problem head on was influenced by New Jersey's strategic location between the metropolitan complexes centered on New York City to the north and Philadelphia to the south. These major cities along with Newark, Jersey City, Elizabeth, Trenton, Paterson, Camden, and Atlantic City have left practically no municipality in the State immune from developing a commuter population. A look at some of the commuter patterns that have developed since the last war emphasizes the nearly statewide nature of the problem. There are, for instance, 500 people who board trains at Point Pleasant day after day, and ride for 2 hours or more, traveling at least 65 miles, for 8 hours work at their office, retracing the same journey in the evening. Another 700 commute daily from Trenton to Newark and New York and even with only one train to ride, some 80 daily passengers make an 80-mile trip from the Cape May area to Philadelphia in the winter season—in the summer the number of Philadelphia-Cape May commuters may triple. The laurels for distant commuting, however, must go to those 250 Pennsylvanians who travel the 90 miles from Philadelphia to New York every day and pay the railroad $67.90 each month for the privilege. For many of these hardy souls their commutation also involves a subway, bus, or rail trip at one or both ends of the through trip. These 20th century pioneers have disregarded natural geographical barriers and man-made political divisions in exercising their right to work and live where they choose. They have exhibited great tenacity of purpose in meeting their individual travel needs. They crisscross the State from border to border—from every direction. Combined with the great masses of intermediate and short haul rail commuters, their number is so great that the difficulties they face with ever shrinking railroad service are such that they cannot be ignored by the State. Without the rails our citizens would of necessity have to move over the highways in private cars or auto buses. New Jersey's traffic density already is 5½ times the national average; 3 times that of Pennsylvania and 3¾ times the density on New York State highways. Twenty-four billion automobile miles were traveled last year—it is forecast that in the next 15 years this mileage will double to 48 billion. New Jersey has the dubious honor of being the most densely populated State of the Union and the population is increasing—up 25 percent in a decade and all studies indicate the upward trend will not only continue but increase.

Currently the rails are transporting about 100,000 of our citizens between home and office during morning and evening rush periods, the periods when our major highway arteries are already clogged with vehicles. Should the rails suddenly fail to provide this service, the conditions on our highways, bridges, and tunnels would become chaotic. Incidentally they are bad enough right now. The alternative to continuing rail service lies in greatly expanding our highway program, with most of the expansion taking place in the urbanized areas where the cost of land is prohibitively high and where communities can no longer tolerate a continual loss of ratables as would be required to develop a transportation network relying solely on automobiles and buses. The results of an overemphasis on one form of transportation has not proved satisfactory in any of our metropolitan areas; we are hopeful that our leaders will profit by the experiences of others and develop a public transportation network that will make maximum use of all forms of transportation—a system that will coordinate rail, bus, highway, and parking facilities for maximum efficiency; a system that will eliminate parallel, duplicating rail and bus lines; a system whereby one mode of transport will complement, not compete, with another, and that all such planning will take into consideration slum clearance and overall land use.

We will be the first to admit that it is easy to speak of integrated transit or coordinated systems—it is still another matter to bring them about. To gain time for such accomplishments and to assure our citizens that they would have continuity of rail service we placed rail carriers under contracts with the State to provide a tabulated schedule of service at established rates. For this first year, 1960–61, $6 million was recommended as an amount sufficient to accomplish our objectives. Although the legislation did not compel railroads to participate in the program, we have about 95 percent of our daily railroad patrons riding in trains that are under contract with the State. Payments to the five carriers total nearly one-half million dollars per month. Our contracts required operation of additional trains on certain routes and required instituting or restoring the sale of reduced rate, round-trip tickets for travel at other than commuter rush periods. We expect the contract program will continue for several more years. During this period we expect other recommendations made in our report to Gov. Robert B. Meyner and the legislature last spring, to be accomplished—namely, serious interest in the H & M by the port authority; rerouting the Jersey Central service to Newark providing direct rail service to the State's largest city from one of its most densely populated corridors and combining the Jersey Shore service of the Jersey Central and the Pennsylvania in one carrier, presently provided by both operating the trains through to Penn Station, Manhattan. This is the nucleus of the State program to date. Looking to the future and beyond the projects just mentioned, the goal is to effect improvements that will permit the suburban railroads to operate without State assistance; to substitute rapid transit for certain railroad service and to develop the integrated transport network previously described. The State recognizes that developing adequate mass transit is a matter that transcends municipal, county and even State borders—that it can only be solved by an agency whose jurisdiction extends geographically over the area encompassed by the problem.

A little out of context but, nevertheless, in the field of transportation, the following I clipped from a periodical:

"The president of a famous railroad rode in a drawing room on one of his own trains recently and was horrified to spend the night in a bed which was infested with bedbugs. The next day he dictated a blistering letter to the man in charge of such complaints. But, to see what would happen, he used a different name and letterhead. Three days later a reply came back from the railroad. It was three pages long, single spaced. It offered the most sincere apologies and shared his horror at such a thing. The complaint manager said that such a thing has never before happened on that railroad, and he didn't understand how it could have happened, etc. He begged the traveler's forgiveness and assured him that steps were being taken to prevent such a thing from ever happening again. The railroad president was pleased with the long, seemingly personal letter until he turned the page and found that the writer's secretary had by mistake also sent along his original letter of complaint. On it the complaint manager had scrawled, 'send this s.o.b. the bedbug letter'."

There is a trend today toward establishing special districts or authorities to cope with special problems as they arise. According to the New York Committee for Economic Development there are now 3,200 special districts in metropolitan areas and the number grows every year. In Los Angeles a transportation district has been created that covers an area one-half the size of the State of New Jersey; in Miami a federation of localities has been created to better contend with areawide public matters including transportation; in Cleveland the first attempt to consolidate a number of areawide functions under the county government was rejected at the polls as were similar efforts in Buffalo, Toledo, and St. Louis—the trend toward change is established however, and each year will see local governments being adapted to enable them to carry out more efficiently public responsibilities which are clearly metropolitan in scope. Resistance to change in municipal relationships is expected—the role of the State should be to lead the way through law and constitutional changes that will permit formulation of governmental structures with greater capacity to meet the complex problems of a society that each year is more urbanized in character.

Pending such changes it is certainly a State function to identify responsibilities that rest with the municipalities in the joint effort to preserve and improve mass transport for our citizens. There is general agreement that the economy of many of our suburban communities is sustained by virtue of its rail service, yet few have taken municipal action contributing to the continuance of this service. This is partly due to a failure to understand what its responsibilities are. There is one allied service essential to successful railroad operation that should, in my opinion, become a municipal function—the acquisition and operation of passenger stations and parking areas at the stations. Railroads in New Jersey are disposing of parking areas at an increasing rate. Problems relating to policing the areas—to reserve the space for railroad patrons—and the tax burden, are cited as reasons for selling the land or leasing it to concessionaires. In many instances the carriers have given municipalities first option to acquire or lease parking space before otherwise disposing of it.

A valuable contribution toward solving the rail problem would result if each village or city would take over the station and establish parking facilities.

Space for a ticket agent could be leased back to the railroad including in the terms of the agreement the hours the office would be open. The city of Red Bank in Monmouth County, N.J., has gone a step further—this city is striving to finance a new modern station at a location with larger parking areas and more convenient automobile access.

In summary I might point out that we are not only studying the passenger patterns via rail and the movement of people—their travel habits—their parking needs and their origin and destination, but the movement

of goods—the waterfront handling of goods, that is, the facilities and personnel engaged in this activity.

Under Gov. Robert B. Meyner's inspiration and direction we have taken more than a mere bite of the cherry. Our progress to date apparently is heartening to the carriers, the informed thinking public and those of us intimately engaged in this venture. With the support and active interest of organizations such as the National Retail Merchants Association we can, with due application and nominal sums of money, in due season deliver the finished product, I hope. We are a society that is on the move—we daily look for new frontiers. It is your and my opportunity to promote this development and to find the ways and means to intelligently direct this movement of people and of goods.

You have been good to listen so patiently to this review of our transportation problem. As I sign off I salute you on the occasion of your 50th anniversary and wish you all, the best of everything for 1961.

THE ROLE OF THE SUBURBAN RAILROAD IN PROVIDING ADEQUATE MASS TRANSIT FACILITIES IN URBAN AREAS

(Remarks by W. W. Patchell, vice president of special services, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., at the 50th Annual Convention of the National Retail Merchants' Association, Jan. 12, 1961)

The National Retail Merchants' Association is to be congratulated upon having a downtown development committee, which is actively looking at the future.

Future Government policies with respect to passenger transportation are most important, especially for mass transportation and, particularly, as distinguished between the suburban railroads, transit systems, and bus lines. As suburban development continues, the movement of people during the rush hours will increase. The real question facing the public is whether it will continue to utilize the present investments in railroad rights-of-way and facilities, to move these great volumes of people, or whether we will continue to waste millions by further expanding the development of superhighways, to move these peak hour volumes either by private automobile or bus.

However, to understand the problem, it is first necessary to realize that the suburban rail services developed from the local passenger service which was operated to serve local communities and feed the through railroad passenger services. As population expanded, a need arose to move people to and from work each morning and evening.

In those days, the rails were able to handle this movement without any appreciable increase in cost. Therefore, the so-called commutation rates were established on an additive basis, which was never fully compensatory. It was like your 1 cent sales.

Today, the original function of the suburban rail services—that of serving the through passenger business—has disappeared. These trains are left with the 1 cent sale business, which cannot produce sufficient revenue to make these services self-sustaining. The impact of this 1 cent sale bargain is even more evident when you realize that, although the unit cost of railroad wages and supplies has increased almost 300 percent, railroad basic coach fares are today only 20 percent higher than they were 40 years ago.

The capacity of each mode of travel should determine its role in urban transportation. On this chart, you can see how the capacity of one railroad track compares with one lane of buses or private automobiles. Note that the rail lines have the capacity to handle 20 times the volume of people as automobiles. This is computed at a rate of one and one-half people per automobile, even though the average automobile in metropolitan areas carries only 1.1 or 1.2 people. The rail lines also have the capacity to handle about seven times the capacity of buses operating on an exclusive express lane highway. Eventually, expressway traffic must be fed into and from access ramps, so that the ramp congestion will further affect this comparative capacity. I do not mean to discredit the bus. Each mode of transport has an area in which it can serve most efficiently, but buses just do not have the capacity to move vast volumes of people. This is like comparing the mass movement of materials on a conveyor system with handling materials on individual push trucks.

The essentiality of mass transportation has been well demonstrated by the Congress Street Expressway in Chicago. This expressway has four lanes in each direction, with two tracks of the Chicago Transit Authority in the middle. Soon after the expressway was built and opened, it was loaded to capacity. Today, the rush hour congestion on it is almost intolerable and it is impossible to get more cars on and off the expressway without additional entrances and exits. But the more entrances and exits there are, the greater the congestion and the less expressway capacity you have. Private automobiles and buses are moving a peak of only 7,650 people per hour. Contrasted with this, one track of the rail line is moving 12,350 people per hour, and this is only about 25 percent of its capacity.

In other words, the rail line could take on three times its present load. If abandoned, seven additional expressway lanes would have to be constructed to provide sufficient highway lanes for automobiles to carry the present load, or two more lanes exclusively for buses. And to provide the present peak capacity of this rail line would require at least 20 additional expressway lanes in each direction if everyone went by automobile, or 7 additional bus lanes if everyone were forced into buses. And remember, more lanes mean more entrances and exits and more delay.

Another quality desired of urban transportation is reliability. Some of you recall the severe snowstorm which struck the eastern seaboard just a month ago today. Many areas were grateful for suburban railroads, which proved the reliability of rail systems by continuing to function, even under such adverse conditions. I must say that operations were far from perfect, especially because the snowbirds, many of whom had not traveled by rail for years, deserted highway transportation and crowded onto the trains. Nonetheless, the railroads proved their ability to carry people to work and to shop at your stores in all kinds of weather.

Urban mobility, or the ease with which people can get between home and your stores, is an essential asset for the success of your business and for the economic vitality of your community. Actually, it is the lifeblood of your business. If it doesn't flow, your business does not live. Suburban rail transportation is an essential factor in urban mobility, especially where large volumes of people must be carried—a further reason why your community needs these reliable, all-weather rail systems.

Another attribute of a suburban railroad is its ability to carry large volumes of people at the lowest total cost to the community as a whole—in other words, to the citizens and businesses that pay the taxes. We made a study in the Philadelphia area of what would be involved if the expansion of the highway system were continued, in an attempt to take over just the passenger load being carried by the Pennsylvania Railroad's suburban services. It would cost $611 million for additional facilities to do this job by highway. Yet the cost to the public to provide for the continuation of this rail service would be only $4 million a year, to cover the Pennsylvania's present losses on this service. Certainly, it is not economical to spend $611 million, or even half of that amount, when the same purpose can be accomplished by having the public spend only $4 million annually to purchase a needed service.

This problem is repeated in every metropolitan area, where it is costing the public up to $40 and $45 million a mile to build superhighways which consume much valuable land, reduce tax ratables, and carry only a fraction of the number of people which rail systems can handle.

However, there is a much greater problem to be faced than just the question of cost. It is the impracticality of attempting to do this job with highways alone. The highway traffic engineer of Los Angeles, the chief engineer of New York's Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, and my good friend, Dwight Palmer, here, have all stated that highways are not the sole answer to carrying the peakload. Even the Port of New York Authority recognized this fact and stated that, even with their newly expanded bus terminal, they would still need the existing suburban railroad lines to carry the peak-hour loads.

The reason these highway authorities state that highways are not the sole answer to carrying the peakloads is easily demonstrated. A 10-percent reduction in the mass transit volume of a city will produce a 42-percent increase in auto travel. A 20-percent reduction will produce an 84-percent increase, and a 24-percent reduction will produce a 100-percent increase. These are not railroad calculations, but were prepared by the city of Philadelphia.

Not only is it impossible to solve this problem with highways, but it is cheaper for the citizens and the community to buy the insurance of the suburban rail lines to move peakloads of the individual between his residence and place of business, because:

1. Each railroad track can handle as many people per hour as 20 lanes of superhighways in the manner in which people are now moving.

2. Sufficient highways cannot be built; there is not the money to build them or the room to put them.

3. As soon as highways are built, the peakloads immediately begin to congest them.

4. A constant increase of automobiles cannot be moved into the downtown areas because of lack of access for the peakloads and room for automobile storage.

5. Expansion of the highway program into the downtown area would further destroy the important tax base.

Another problem facing our cities is that of proper land use. If you rely entirely upon automobile transportation as a means of access to your store, you know that you need three times as much parking area as you have floor space in your store. This problem is especially acute downtown, where land is valuable. As population increases, land becomes more scarce in every part of the metropolitan area. Our land must be preserved and used most wisely. The more land you devote to parking spaces, the more your stores are dispersed, and the more you lose compactness and convenience.

Los Angeles is an example. Today, two-thirds of the land in downtown Los Angeles is devoted to highways, streets, and parking spaces. This means that less space is left to do business. The compactness of the center core, so essential for the economic vitality of the area and your business, has been seriously affected.

Rail systems have the capacity to carry large volumes of people in a short period of time to your stores. They can provide efficient downtown distribution of these people by using frequent station stops, where justified and desirable.

I know that all of you, as businessmen, are not only interested in increasing the volume of your business, but also in reducing ex-

penses and increasing the value of your property. Experience has proved that the use of rail systems to serve your store areas can save money for you, your customers and the community as a whole. When your customers travel by rail, they preserve street space for movement of your delivery vehicles and save you and themselves valuable time and money by reducing street congestion, which would otherwise become even more intolerable than it is today.

The community saves money, by avoiding the need for tremendous expenditures for new highway facilities and their operation and maintenance. Also, by using rail systems, the community avoids the demolition of vast tax ratables necessary to carry the same volume of people by highways. Just visualize your own hometown and what your tax bills would be if even one-half of the off-street land area had to be used for parking.

Some areas have already recognized the importance of using rail systems to preserve tax ratables and permit proper land use. Toronto, Canada, is a good example. Seven years ago Toronto built its first subway system. The subway encouraged redevelopment and new development along its entire route, and property along the subway has become more valuable. Values have increased as much as 79 percent and 93 percent in two of the subdivisions immediately adjacent to the subway. Rather than destroying downtown property values, the construction of this rail line has virtually paid for itself because of the resulting increase of about $5½ million annually in city tax revenues. Further, it is estimated that the subway is keeping 10,000 automobiles from further congesting the streets every business day. With such favorable experience, Toronto is now expanding its rail subway system, at a cost of $220 million.

Each mode of transportation has a significant role to play in this job and should be used to its best advantage. The automobile is essential for mobility in the sparsely populated suburban areas. It is a most inefficient tool when used to carry large volumes of people en masse. Where volume is sufficient to support its use, the bus is far more efficient than the automobile and serves as an excellent feeder to rail systems. However, the bus has to cope with the same traffic congestion confronting automobiles on our urban streets and highways.

The most efficient tool for carrying large volumes of people at peakloads with speed and reliability is the rail system, and there has been increasing recognition of the essentiality of the suburban railroads. However, there are problems. The problem for the railroads, however, is not technological, but financial. Faced with continuing expenditures by the public for highway facilities which help to put the railroads out of the through passenger business, the railroads can no longer subsidize the community. Yet the community cannot afford to be without these suburban rail services.

In order to preserve the communities and to save money for them and their citizens, the suburban rail services, where they exist, must be preserved.

Local conditions will require different local solutions. All areas need highways, but where existing rail facilities can be used or reclaimed for suburban rail service it would be sheer folly to discard them. Of course, it will be fine to provide, eventually, the most modern equipment and operating controls, but remember that the first problem is to arouse government to its responsibility to preserve these services. The time remaining to accomplish this is very, very short.

As merchants and businessmen who have a financial interest in this problem and in the economic vitality of your community, your time for action is now.

The Role of the Surface Transit Company in Providing Adequate Mass Transit Facilities in Urban Areas

(Remarks of Herbert E. Harper, president, Public Service Coordinated Transport, at the downtown development session, National Retail Merchants Association, 50th annual convention, January 12, 1961, 2:30 p.m.)

In the earlier years of the 20th century people who lived in row houses and tenements of American cities were within walking distance of places of employment, shopping, worship, entertainment, or close to a transportation service.

More recently many city people have moved to new areas situated outside city limits. Whole new regions, composed of many separate communities, have sprung up which, together with the mother city, now comprise a new metropolitan area. The growth of those metropolitan centers has been fantastic. In 1,900 core cities of 50,000 or more persons, with adjoining areas, contained only one-third of the national population; today the figure is almost two-thirds. You may recall that the 1960 census, compared with that for 1950, showed that many large cities suffered a loss in population, while the metropolitan areas of which the cities are a part showed substantial growth. The majority of people in a metropolitan region still live in the central city, but by 1975 it is forecast that 60 percent of the metropolitan residents will be living in communities outside the central cities. The great desire for suburban living is creating many problems that must be solved if the cities with their business areas are to prosper.

Most of my comments will be directed to the problem of providing adequate mass transit facilities in urban areas. I do so recognizing that the many other smaller business areas and scattered shopping centers that serve the new suburban markets have transportation problems of their own.

Public transportation, to win acceptance of the public, must move people quickly, conveniently, and at reasonable rates of fare. All forms of surface transportation, whether on rail or highway, are a part of the solution.

RAILROAD COMMUTER SERVICE

Railroad commuter services, designed to carry great numbers of people to and from the urban centers, are experiencing heavy operating losses because costs are being pyramided by limited use—about 20 hours per week—of passenger equipment, stations, and portions of rights of way. The relatively well patronized commuter railroad service should be preserved as long as justified by such patronage even though that service may require financial aid similar to that provided by the Meyner-Palmer (New Jersey) plan of relief for railroads. Conversely, poorly patronized rail service should be discontinued in the interest of helping to preserve essential service.

RAIL RAPID TRANSIT

Relatively few American cities today have rail rapid transit—Boston has it; Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, and Toronto, Canada—and those services are losing money. Public Service operates a short subway-open cut rail line known as Newark City Subway and that, too, is a losing proposition. Rail rapid transit for other cities has been studied and recommendations submitted, but the story is the same—high construction and operating costs produce estimated losses. The equation to be solved by the large metropolitan areas is a simple one—how many dollars, and from what sources, would be justified to obtain the advantages of rail rapid transit service?

THE AUTOMOBILE

Then we have the ever popular automobile—costly to use, a waster of space, limited in carrying capacity and with an average use of only 30 percent of that capacity. The faults of the automobile, however, are overshadowed by the advantages of convenience, availability at zero headway, speed, and pride of ownership. Forecasters predict that the per capita use of the automobile will continue to increase annually and that continuously increased facilities will be required for its accommodation. It may be that the appetite of the automobile for space never will be satisfied even though autoists appear willing to pay for the use of facilities that make driving faster, safer, and more convenient.

The popularity of the automobile has forced major improvements in traffic control and given impetus to betterments in street and highway construction. Experts concede, however, that the automobile alone cannot solve a city's transportation problem.

MOTORBUS

The modern motorbus, of all forms of public surface transportation, comes closest to equaling the flexibility, availability, and convenience of the private automobile. The introduction of air suspension and air conditioning, among other things, has made the motorbus attractive to increasing numbers of people. City transit, starting with the horse-drawn omnibus, improved by the horsecar, the cable car, the electric streetcar, and finally by the modern large capacity motorbus, always has made the most productive use of street space. The motorbus in large measure has replaced electric streetcars and been substituted for lightly patronized railroad service.

NEW JERSEY BUS OPERATIONS

I will use my remaining time to give you a composite of bus transit operations in New Jersey and the part played by my company, Public Service Coordinated Transport. Those operations are representative of good surface transit generally found in the larger urban areas of the United States.

Relatively few people realize the degree to which industry, commerce, residents and others depend on bus transit for local and suburban transportation. Buses do the whole transit job in New Jersey, except for the Newark City subway, the only remaining electric car line in the State. The 1,500,000 passengers carried on regular lines on an average weekday represent 25 percent of the State's population (estimated 1960 New Jersey census).

Bus service in the State's 21 counties is the most important single segment in New Jersey's passenger transportation industry. A total of 496 appropriately authorized carriers use 4,346 motorbuses. Special, contract and chartered service is furnished by 147 other operators having a combined total of 980 buses. The industry's employment figure exceeds 11,000 persons.

BUS SERVICE—NEWARK

The city of Newark, New Jersey's largest city, has one of the finest and most complete bus transportation systems in the country. A total of 85 lines serve the city with almost 1,100 buses that operate over 13,000 bus trips daily to, from and within the city. More than 400,000 passengers are transported each weekday, and that figure, by way of comparison, almost equals the 1960 census population of the city of Newark. Public Service Transport operates 69 of the lines, the remaining 16 lines being operated by other companies.

The widespread network of 85 lines reaches all sections of Newark and extends to suburban points and other cities such as Perth Amboy, New Brunswick, Plainfield, Netcong,

Paterson, Hackensack, Jersey City (all in New Jersey) and New York City.

The importance of Newark's bus system to the retail merchant best can be visualized by the 133,000 automobiles that would be required to transport the average weekday load of 400,000 passengers. The cessation of all that bus service even for a day or two would be catastrophic. A number of unfortunate transit strikes have served to emphasize that point, the last such strike having occurred in Boston last August.

LINCOLN TUNNEL PARK-RIDE

My comment about bus operations in New Jersey would not be complete without reference to one of the most successful park-ride operations in the East, between the Lincoln Tunnel parking lot in North Bergen, N.J., and the port authority bus terminal, near Times Square, New York City. Persons may park their cars at the parking lot and ride to the port authority bus terminal by express bus, in 14 minutes, and return for the sum of $1. The advantage to the motorist readily is apparent as he saves tunnel toll each way as well as a parking fee in central Manhattan of $1.50 upwards for all-day parking.

The operation is conducted 6 days a week, and a daily high of 1,945 cars parked was reached on the 24th of last March. A weekly high was attained in the period November 14–19 when 10,354 cars were parked.

The parking lot was constructed on unused land under the approach highway to the Lincoln Tunnel and is owned by the Port of New York Authority. Public Service Transport operates the lot and the park-ride service on a contract basis.

PROBLEMS—BUS INDUSTRY

The bus industry, in common with all other passenger transportation services, today is confronted with the problem of maintaining operations on a profitable basis at fare rates that are generally acceptable to the public.

The inflationary economic trend experienced since the end of World War II has raised substantially labor, material, bus equipment, and construction costs. As an example, the cost of providing a single seat in a city-type bus was $338 in 1945, $505 in 1958, and $557 in the new city-type buses delivered in 1960.

The bus industry, of necessity, has practiced economy in all phases of its operation and quickly has taken advantage of technological improvements in bus equipment, automation, work procedures, and building design. The industry has met changing trends in passenger traffic, made extensions of lines where necessary, and inaugurated new services in growing industrial, commercial, and residential areas of New Jersey.

The enigma of traffic congestion is of great concern to the transit industry. While the construction of expressways, parkways, and freeways has afforded substantial relief, too little attention has been given to less spectacular but effective measures that, if adopted, would mean much to the maintenance of good headways on services operated within cities having heavy volumes of traffic. Some of those measures already taken by the city of Newark, and by some other cities in the Nation, are—the enforcement of parking regulations; the establishment of one-way streets; exclusive lanes for buses; the banning of parking on heavily traveled arteries, particularly during the morning and evening rush hours; elimination of certain left-hand turns; and the proper timing of traffic signals.

TRANSIT AND THE MERCHANT

As members of the National Retail Merchants Association you have a real self-interest in the preservation and improvement of transit because you must depend on transit to bring downtown a substantial percentage of your customers. Further, transit is used by most people who work in the central business area and those people constitute a sizable portion of each downtown store's patronage.

The question naturally arises as to what the downtown merchant can do to help transit. The merchant can help in many ways. First, he must recognize the importance of transit to his business and encourage transit's efforts to improve operating conditions in the downtown area. He can advocate the advantages of using transit by word of mouth, store newspaper advertisements and through news releases of the local merchants' association. The local transit company will be glad to help in those efforts. The merchant should favor all plans to widen and improve main thoroughfares and back reasonable traffic regulations pertaining to parking, no parking, traffic light timing, bans on left-hand turns, the purposes of which are to speed the movement of traffic generally including bus transit.

The retail merchant should consider extending to the transit-shop patron the same treatment on refunds as that extended to park-shop customers. In other words, pay all or a part of the fare of transit patrons similar to the refunding of all or a part of the parking fees to automobile customers. An alternative for the merchant would be to encourage park-ride undertakings and then to support them by contributing toward the park-ride charge.

The merchant should favor tax relief for transit, especially when needed to help keep transit fares at the point of acceptability to the public. He also should encourage the placing of most auto parking facilities at the fringe of the central business district so that traffic congestion might be lessened in the central business area.

CONCLUSIONS

The merchants should continue to strive, as I know they have in the past, to make the central business district more attractive by modernizing and glamorizing their places of business, and then making those places more accessible by insisting that all traffic regulations be uniformly enforced, and that all essential physical improvements be effected in the city's street system.

Transit is meeting a real need in furnishing safe, convenient, fast and economical service, and offers the autoist the greatest inducement to use public transportation.

I am certain that the bus industry, with the continued sympathetic cooperation of the merchants it serves, city governments, legislatures and regulatory agencies, will meet successfully the challenge of the urban areas in the future.

EAST-WEST CENTER

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the last Congress established a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Hawaii. Initial funds from the Federal Government became available only in November 1960. However, since the State of Hawaii had already appropriated money to assist in the creation of this bold plan to create mutual understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the western Pacific, no time was lost in starting out. The first students are already in residence. The first buildings will soon be going up.

A progress report covering the initial few months of operation was recently issued by the University of Hawaii, which is operating the East-West Center under contract with the Department of State. It tells of the first students to report to the center—from India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Korea—and the number of scholarship applications which are being considered.

The detailed report is too lengthy to reproduce in the RECORD. However, I believe that the Members of Congress will obtain a great deal of useful information from certain excerpts from the report of Mr. Murray Turnbull, interim director of the East-West Center, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF MR. MURRAY TURNBULL

The establishment of the East-West Center was authorized by chapter 7 of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 which was signed into law on May 14. Subsequently on August 31 the Congress appropriated the sum of $10 million to provide for the first year of the operation of the center. This appropriation was based upon extensive plans for the organization and operation of the center prepared by the University of Hawaii and a committee appointed by the Governor and approved by the Department of State. These plans were incorporated as a part of an agreement between the university and the Department of State vesting responsibility for the administration of the center in the university and including documents describing the organization and operation of the center in some detail. This was signed by President Laurence Snyder on October 21, 1960, and placed in effect as of October 25. As a consequence the center became an official and integral part of the university, and its various institutes and divisions were placed in operation.

The first installment of funds for the first fiscal year was received by the university on November 8, 1960, in the amount of $1,124,918. This sum is intended to provide for scholarships, grants, and operational costs until March 31, 1961, at which time a second allocation is due, to be followed in the future by quarterly payments. The sum of $9,693,000 has been requested for the year of operation beginning July 1, 1961. It should be noted that the State of Hawaii has also appropriated $756,000 for the construction of a dormitory, $124,094 to provide for certain operational and administrative costs for the present fiscal year, and is making available 21 acres of land on its university campus valued currently at about $2,740,000. It is also providing its other university resources of faculty and staff, laboratories, classrooms, and libraries, plus various other resources in the State government and the community at large for the development of the center.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Beginning with the establishment of the center and the International College at the end of October and henceforth all foreign students will apply for admission to and be accepted by and into the International College as unclassified students. This college, acting as an administrative agent, will provide for screening and processing of scholarships through a trained admissions staff and academic screening committees, and for academic counseling until each student is qualified for admission to one of the degree-granting academic colleges or to the graduate school. This arrangement will provide for the application of customary programs and standards for degrees, yet allow for flexibility in planning nondegree courses of study for individual students, assuring special tutoring or counseling where needed. All applications will be processed through academic departments, although some students will receive grants for special studies not falling within degree programs or leading to specific degrees. Until a permanent admissions staff can be formed and a perma-

nent screening system adopted, a subcommittee of the advisory committee has been serving to screen applications after review by departments.

U.S. educational commissions and Embassy cultural affairs officers abroad have cooperated extensively and with commendable speed and effort in publicizing the first available grants and in screening students preliminary to the submission of applications, final selection resting with the university. In one country more than 400 students have applied for February admission, and in another over 700 have been screened. Although the center will proceed further to establish its own screening and selection procedures, wherever feasible, it could not have awarded any scholarships thus far without this assistance.

Applications received, by countries, up to December 15, 1960:

Australia	1
Burma	0
Cambodia	1
Ceylon	1
Hong Kong	4
India	29
Indonesia	2
Japan	22
Korea	4
Malaya	1
Laos	4
Nepal	3
New Zealand	0
Pakistan	3
Philippines	29
Singapore	2
Taiwan	49
Thailand	12
Vietnam	0
United States	14
Formosa	1
Fiji Islands	1
Total	183

Allocations of scholarships by fields of study for the first 375 students have been made as follows (these will include all scholarships offered for February 1961 and for the academic year beginning in September 1961):

AREAS OF STUDY FOR FIRST 300 ASIAN STUDENTS

Undergraduate: Total of 30 in all areas of study.

Graduate: Total of 270.

Agricultural economics	4
Animal science	8
Anthropology	4
Art	4
Business administration and economics	25
Botany	10
Chemistry and biochemistry	15
Drama and theater	4
Entomology	8
English	5
English as a 2d language	20
Education	34
Engineering (civil probably)	5
Far East studies	4
Geography	4
Genetics	10
Government and public administration	15
History	5
Mathematics	5
Meteorology	5
Microbiology	6
Nutrition	4
Philosophy	5
Physics	5
Public health	5
Psychology	5
Soil science	12
Sociology	5
Social work	5
Speech	
Tropical crop science	12
Zoology	8

AREAS OF STUDY FOR FIRST 75 AMERICAN STUDENTS

Undergraduate: Total of 25 primarily in Asian studies program and language and area studies.

Graduate: Total of 50.

Far Eastern studies: 15; China, 5, Japan, 5, Korea, 5.

Oversea operations program: 15.

Far Eastern history: Four.

Far Eastern art: Four.

Geography: Four.

Government (comparative and international relations): Four.

Pacific islands studies: Two.

Philosophy (Eastern or comparative): Two.

(Minor adjustments in all of these figures are to be expected.)

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Seven architectural and engineering firms are presently working on plans for East-West facilities. In addition to these firms, a consultant electrical engineer and a landscape architect have been working in the area of their specialties on this project.

An entirely new corporation has been formed under the name of East-West Center Associates, Ltd., for the purpose of carrying out the complete design assignment for East-West facilities. Principals of this firm include I. M. Pei & Associates, architects, New York City, N.Y.; McAuliffe, Young & Associates, architects, Honolulu, and Law & Wilson, engineers, Honolulu.

The structures and facilities to be designed under stage I of this contract consist of the administration-food service building, the theater-auditorium, a high-rise dormitory housing 480 students, a low-rise dormitory housing 120 students, and a transient facility which will initially provide quarters for 72 transients plus 48 apartments for visiting scholars. At a later stage, these apartments will be converted to transient use, making the transient capacity of this building 120 persons.

In addition to the structures listed above, the stage I facilities include a laboratory-classroom building. This building, to house the department of zoology and entomology will be located across McCarthy Mall from Bilger Hall and connect to the Life Science-Health Research Institute Building, also under design, on each of four floors.

The administration-food service building, the theater auditorium, and the high-rise dormitory are now in the cost estimate stage prior to approval of final studies of preliminary plans.

The low-rise dormitory, transient quarters, and laboratory-classroom building are being developed by the associates for review on December 23.

The present schedule calls for the complete design assignment, including working drawings, specifications, and cost estimates, to be ready for advertising for bids on May 10, 1961.

This will permit awarding of bids for construction contracts for all stage I facilities prior to July 1, 1961, and completion of construction for occupancy in August 1962.

OPERATING PRINCIPLES

The center has recently extracted and published from its plan for organization and operation the following principles:

A. The center should have as its primary objective the increase and development of mutual understanding between the peoples of the countries of the Pacific area. The term "interchange" in the title of the center should carry the greatest possible weight and be of the utmost significance in the formulation and carrying out of basic policies and operations.

B. The center should have as a parallel objective the betterment of American relationships with foreign peoples. This objective should be understood as consistent with and, in fact, dependent upon the first objective.

C. The center should encourage and solicit, indeed, make paramount, the fullest mutual cooperation and participation of foreign countries and institutions, as well as mainland American universities and other institutions, in fulfilling its objectives.

D. Plans for the organization and operation of the center should be flexible enough to be adaptable to multiple, diverse, and changing needs of the countries, students, and senior scholars and leaders involved.

E. The center should actively seek, at home and abroad, foundation and private financial support for its programs and enterprises, along with assistance from existing governmental agencies and legislation. The ultimate aim should be to reduce special Government support and increase support from nongovernmental organizations.

F. All awards, grants, and expenditures made through, for, or on behalf of the center should be devised to acknowledge and develop the highest standards of intellectual achievement and community service in the course of human welfare.

G. The center should seek to fulfill its objectives through two different kinds of people—first, young men and women who are potential leaders in their own communities; and, second, men and women of established reputation and achievement.

H. Grants to individuals should be made to men and women of promise and ability who may be expected to make or are making a significant contribution to life in their own countries. Such people from abroad should be selected on the understanding that they will return to their own countries upon completion of studies or other assignments pertaining to the operation of the center.

I. Expenditures for conferences, research, and other special programs of the center should be planned to promote and facilitate the free passage of information and ideas, and should be based on the acknowledgments of mutual capacity and potential of participating individuals and countries.

TRIBUTE TO ALBERT L. McDERMOTT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to Albert L. McDermott, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor, who has done a remarkably effective job in serving our great friend, the Secretary of Labor, James Mitchell, whom so many of us wish more success in the days ahead. I ask unanimous consent that the letter written by Secretary Mitchell, in acknowledging Mr. McDermott's resignation, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

JANUARY 4, 1961.

Mr. ALBERT L. MCDERMOTT,
Special Assistant to the Secretary,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR AL: It is with regret that I accede to your personal desires and accept your letter of resignation, to be effective on January 6, 1961.

You may take great pride in the accomplishments achieved during the almost 7 years that you have served as my special assistant with the responsibility for maintaining liaison between the Department of Labor and the Congress. Your skill, discretion and knowledge greatly enhanced the efforts of the Department in assisting the Congress in the enactment of important legislation

which has truly benefited the wage earners of our Nation.

You have my very best wishes for success as you return to the practice of law in the District of Columbia, and I hope that our paths will cross frequently in the future.

Cordially yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the legislative liaison officer of a Federal agency is the key for us Members to a cordial and cooperative working arrangement with that agency in our many dealings therewith. One of the most competent individuals in the present administration who has served for some years in that capacity is Albert L. McDermott, who has handled such work with the Congress for the Department of Labor. Secretary of Labor Mitchell has announced that Mr. McDermott has resigned to resume the private practice of law. My best wishes for his continued success go with him.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with appreciation that I join in this tribute to Al McDermott, special assistant to Secretary Mitchell for congressional relations. Al has served with great distinction for 6 years. He has expertly facilitated relationships between Members of the Congress and the Secretary of Labor. In my own case, Al has willingly and eagerly assisted me and members of my staff in preparing materials and memorandums on legislation affecting the interests of working men and women throughout New York State and our Nation.

Secretary Mitchell has done a better job than any other Secretary of Labor in developing a sound and harmonious understanding between labor leaders and representatives of management during the past 7 years in which he has served as Secretary of Labor. Al McDermott has been of great assistance to the Secretary in this work, and it is with pleasure that I join in the comments made on the fine work which has been done.

GIFT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Before morning business is closed, the Chair would like to make an announcement with regard to a gift the Chair would like to leave for the Senate on this occasion, when he is presiding for the last time over this body.

One of the problems of a Presiding Officer is to time equitably Senators who wish to speak under the 3-minute rule. For example, earlier today we had a case in point.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair forbear, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum? If so, Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to suspend further proceedings under the call.

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

The Chair, before the quorum call began, was making a statement which he would like to conclude at this time.

This is the last time the present occupant of the chair will be privileged to preside over this body. He has been trying to think of some gift he could leave to the Senate that would be useful and also appropriate.

One of the major problems the Presiding Officer has, as the Chair has learned, is to enforce the so-called 3-minute rule in the morning hour equitably as to all Senators. We had, for example, an instance this morning where a question was raised as to whether a Senator had exceeded the 3 minutes. The Chair has noted the intention of Senators on both sides to enforce that rule more stringently in the future than it has been in the past, when we have, for reasons we all understand, allowed considerable leeway to Senators exceeding the 3 minutes.

The Chair noted that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] suggested on the Senate floor recently that it might be well to have on the Presiding Officer's desk an hourglass such as was the case in the senate, as he said, in ancient Greek parliaments.

Of course, an hourglass would not serve the purpose we are attempting to achieve, unless it were a sandglass that ran for 3 minutes. Consequently, the Chair has explored the situation and has found it is possible for him to purchase a 3-minute glass, which will be given to the Senate, and which Presiding Officers, in their discretion, will be able to use to keep time equitably, so that no Senator on either side of the aisle will question whether the Presiding Officer has cut him short when he has to rap the gavel and end his tenure on the floor. As a matter of fact, the Chair is leaving not only one 3-minute glass, but two, because Senators may not use the full 3 minutes. When that happens, the other glass can be brought into play to indicate the end of the 3 minutes, so that every Senator will have a full opportunity to have his full 3 minutes without interruption by the Chair or by another Senator.

With this gift, the Chair feels he will have left to the Senate a device which will help to maintain orderly procedure and which will assure that, whoever sits in this chair, be he from one side of the aisle or the other, a question will never be raised as to whether he can tell the time of day.

TRIBUTES TO THE VICE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know that the distinguished occupant of the chair manifests a very practical instinct and indicates that he has some familiarity with the technique of the kitchen. It never occurred to me that there ought to be two 3-minute glasses, but I can see the wisdom of it, because one cannot very well upend the hourglass and get the desired result. And, really, when a speech begins in the morning hour, there must be one glass in operation, and then, if the 3-minute period is not consumed, there must be another available. So I trust the distinguished Vice President will find this instrument will enable us more efficaciously to enforce and monitor the 3-minute rule.

I do not know whether the 3-minute rule originally was designed to be consonant with what it takes to get the right consistency in eggs; but, in any event, it is a 3-minute period, and these glasses are made for the purpose the Vice President has stated.

Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished occupant of the chair could make such a useful gift; but, since this is going to be his last day in the chair, there are a number of sentiments I want to utter, and in so doing, I think I speak for my colleagues who constitute the leadership on this side who are at the White House today for a luncheon for the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada.

First, Mr. President, before you leave, let me salute you as a man. Never in your public service have you forgotten that the important thing in life is never to lose the human attributes that make a man. I am reminded that in an English church is an epitaph which reads:

Here lies Peter Bacon.
Born a man.
And died a grocer.

Mr. Vice President, you always retain the attributes of the individual. And what a heartwarming experience it was to go through the Capitol with you on occasions when we marched to the House and to hear, "Howdy, Mr. Vice President." "Hi, Dick." That is really a great tribute to you.

Second, may I say you have been one of the most distinguished Vice Presidents of this country. If I needed anything to verify that statement, what happened on November 8 was an ample demonstration as to the trust and confidence of our people in the way you have conducted the public business as the Vice President of the United States. No Vice President in the whole history of this Republic has taken a more active part in the formulations of policies and affairs of the country than have you. No Vice President has been designated to greater responsibilities in the executive branch than have you.

So we salute you, not only as a man: We salute you as a great Vice President and a great public official.

We also salute you as the Presiding Officer of this great deliberative body. Always have your rulings been fair. Always have they been impartial. Always have they been so knowledgeable, and based upon the rules of this body. I can think of no greater tribute—and I think I am correct in saying this—than that never in the 8 years in which you have presided over the deliberations of the U.S. Senate—never once—has one of your rulings been reversed on appeal. I can think of no greater testimony to the fairness, to the knowledge, to the capacity, and to the judicial approach you have taken to your responsibilities as the Presiding Officer of this body.

Now, Mr. President, there will be for you a respite for a time. You will not be too deeply beset with the prolixities and the vagaries of rule XXII; and, if you are, you will not be called upon to pass judgment.

I have an idea—and I say it modestly—that probably Pat will be the speaker in your household, even as the good ladies are the speakers in all households, so when rule XXII comes up for discussion in the family menage it will not be you but the speaker of your great household, Pat, who will pass on the matter.

You will not be beset, I take it, with parliamentary inquiries and points of order, except as they may relate to the children and what they do from time to time.

So, as you put aside the mantle of your responsibility as the Vice President of the United States and as the Presiding Officer of this body, may you enjoy a thorough rest, a thorough respite from the public business, with the understanding that your interest will be an intense and continuing one, because we expect to see you often in the course of our pursuit of the public business.

So, Mr. Vice President, I say for my colleagues, hail and farewell.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I believe this will be the last time we shall have an opportunity—certainly for at least the next 4 years—to address you as Mr. President. That there may be a repetition of this opportunity goes without saying, so far as the opinion of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania is concerned.

I believe this is the first time in the history of the Senate it will become possible for the Presiding Officer to lift a glass within these sacred confines, and this glass will be lifted for the betterment of and for the common welfare of all Senators. While it may not prove as refreshing as other glasses lifted in other places on other occasions, it at least will be a timely reminder that each of us really does not have as much wisdom to impart as he thinks he does, and that the other 99 Members of this body are impatiently awaiting their opportunity to enlighten the people of America with their sound judgment, their wise observations, and their keen wit.

Mr. President, it is said that time and tide wait for no man. It will now be demonstrated that while time does not wait for any man, every Senator must wait, after the sands of the glass have expired for him, at least on that occasion.

We have heard the phrase, "time and the river." I think it is a good thing that we have decided the river of oratory shall be dammed—and I use the word in the respectful and proper sense—from place to place by the interception of this reminder.

Mr. President, all of us wish for you the best of everything in life. We say to you, with sadness and with fondness, and we say to your wife, Pat, that always in our lifetimes the influence which has been brought to bear by your leadership will be with us. We hope that leadership and that inspiration will continue. We believe it will. We wish for you much joy, much serenity and much pleasure in such future duties as you may choose to assume.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to join my minority leader and all the others of my colleagues in expressing my appreciation for your service as Presiding Officer of this body. I think you have brought it to a very appropriate climax today, because for the first time over many, many years you have found a way to resolve the problem of cloture. You have given us the cloture device to which all Members of the Senate can agree, which does not require complicated legislation, which has the advantages of being automatic and of being simple. I think in so doing you have made a tremendous contribution to our future success.

No man can leave an office, I think, with greater satisfaction than to know that he has left something behind him which will improve and increase the efficiency of an organization he has served, as you have served us, so well and faithfully.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I accept and concur in every fine thing which has been said about our Vice President. I wish to thank him personally for his service in this body and to the Nation as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, for his fairness, his kindness, and his consideration.

It would take a long speech—it would take many speeches—to enumerate the high points only in the career of our distinguished Vice President. That I shall not attempt to do. I have no fears concerning the verdict of history concerning our Vice President.

Our Vice President is very much loved by the people I represent. He has visited in the State of Nebraska many times. He has personal friends there. He has old college chums there. It was not surprising that in the recent election 62.4 percent of the vote cast for President in that State was cast for our beloved Vice President, RICHARD NIXON.

That is not an isolated sectional verdict, I will say. As the Senate proceeds with its business this year there will be more Senators here who represent States which voted for RICHARD NIXON for President than there will be Senators who represent States which voted otherwise.

Of course, we abide by the results of the election. I will say, however, that our distinguished Vice President has followers and friends who are legion in number—more than he can realize. We wish for him and his fine family every good thing from this moment on.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in extending our very best wishes to you and to Pat and to your gracious young daughters, who, as a family, have worked so hard and have helped you to dignify and to fulfill so ably the Office of Vice President of the United States. As you depart into private life I know of no greater tribute that can be paid to you as our Vice President than to say that our country and the world at large are better places in which to live as the result of your distinguished service, and we in the U.S. Senate are better men and women for having had the opportunity of knowing you and Pat.

Good luck and best wishes, but not farewell.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, our distinguished Vice President has said and done many things which will have a lasting impact upon the Senate of the United States. At times he has cajoled, cheered, advised, and praised various Members of this body. We shall, all politics aside, miss his strong hand, his good judgment, and his fine leadership.

The Vice President has today taken an action which perhaps will have a lasting and strong effect upon the Senate. He has given us the perfect recipe for instant oratory: Allow to simmer for 3 minutes and then turn off. The minuteman gave us freedom. May the "3-minute man" help us to preserve it.

Time will mow us down by the instrument which the Vice President has presented to us, but it is inescapable that winds may blow, come and go, but sand is sand, time is time, and that is that. Three minutes are three minutes, and what is presented to us is a very constructive gift which I know we shall all cherish and appreciate.

This gift of time is made particularly significant when one considers how well the giver has exemplified, in his lifetime, the golden uses to which time may be put. What the Vice President has done he has done surpassingly well. He has reached great heights because his outstanding qualities of intellect, of courage, and of leadership have lifted him to those heights. And surely, the magnificent and gracious manner with which he recently accepted defeat represents, in a very true sense, a victory of the human spirit, and a lesson to all of us that the real test of greatness lies not only in the way a man wins but also in the way he loses.

Mr. Vice President, as you give up the office which you have held with such dignity and ability, it is the heartfelt wish of the junior Senator from New York that you and your entire family will have great happiness, and that you will continue to make significant contributions to the welfare of your Nation, as you have in such a unique manner during the years you have served as Vice President of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Vice President, speaking from the majority side of the aisle, I should like to say to the distinguished occupant of the Chair that it is to his great credit that many Senators on this side of the aisle have come to know him, to appreciate him, to respect him, and to have great affection for him.

I wish to remind him that when he came to the Senate in 1950 he was assigned office space and on the same floor and in the same corridor in which the junior Senator from New Mexico had an office. I had many pleasant opportunities to discuss then with the distinguished occupant of the Chair, his activities in the past, and his plans for the future, and also to see the responsibility with which he undertook his first work.

To one who has come to know an individual so well, television can bring some very interesting and perhaps strange thrills. I wish to assure the Vice President that even though I had a

greater interest in another political convention, I received a deep thrill when he was brought to the platform and joined his hands with the able President of the United States in their salute to the convention. The team of President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon swept the country. We have seen the Vice President in the intervening years grow substantially in his position. I have been many times impressed with the fact that the young Senator who came from the House of Representatives in 1950 bears very little resemblance to the seasoned statesman who sits in the chair of the Presiding Officer of the Senate at this time. We have all been proud of his growth during the past 8 years.

Mr. President, I would not wish to close without saying that while Mrs. Nixon is a wonderfully fine wife and mother, I take particular pride in the way in which she has conducted herself as head of the Senate ladies.

I speak not only from the standpoint of what my own wife tells me, but also from what other wives comment as they leave meetings and as we meet them in other places.

Mrs. Nixon has been a wonderfully fine presiding officer — democratic, friendly, and kindly to all. I wish to speak a word of commendation for her as well as for the able Presiding Officer in the Senate, and say to him that I know the Senators on the Democratic side wish for him and his fine family the very best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Vice President, I came to the House of Representatives when the Vice President came there in 1947, a veteran, fresh from the wars, with something of the same desire to serve further. However, we had served previously—I as a staff officer, the Vice President in an active role in the Navy, and others in capacities more or less heroic. We all came to the one conclusion that men had suffered too much, and that we must do our utmost to alleviate all suffering.

I have been a long-time admirer and friend of the Vice President through all the days since then, and perhaps the greatest tribute I can pay to the Vice President of the United States is to say that I am proud of his friendship after all these arduous years of struggle and turmoil, of agreement and of difference.

The Vice President's service to our Nation and to our country and to the free world would be underestimated if some of the historic highlights of his service were not mentioned, even if briefly, today. I think that his so-called good will visits, which showed America to the people of the world in the person of one of its most distinguished young men, will have repercussions for decades. I have heard the Vice President described as epitomizing those descriptions, too, in his automobile trip through Warsaw, with the emotion, the tears, and the flowers which commemorated that occasion. I think I know something about the European mind from my own antecedents. It does not forget for generations, and that kind of impression may well prove, years from now, a live and fresh rallying cry to people who will yet get their freedom, though it seems dim indeed to us today.

Then we recall the Vice President's story to us all of his experiences in Caracas, which also had a historic significance because it showed how close to us a problem could have arisen. The event was a deep experience of regret and shame to the people of Latin America, one which will be remembered for decades, and may some day result in a far more substantial practice of democratic ideals and free institutions there because it happened, than otherwise.

Finally, some very tasteful and somewhat humorous observations have been made by my colleague about the 3-minute rule, and the Vice President's tasteful contribution to the enforcement of that rule.

I prefer to speak of the historic service of the Vice President in his ruling that the Senate has control over its rules under the Constitution of the United States. This may prove to be the most single historic act that the Vice President has performed in his incumbency that is directly related to his office and not peripheral in its responsibility at all. This subject remains one of the great problems of the country. I think we shall solve it. If we do so, I believe the Vice President can take enormous satisfaction from the fact that he laid the foundation for its solution.

To you, Mr. Vice President, who have shown us an example of not only a great public man but also a great family man, to Pat and the children, every good wish in life. The happy days are just beginning. All health and success to you.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Vice President, my colleagues have touched less completely than any of them would have wished upon your service to the Nation—and it is a very great service—and upon the unique and very special job you have performed as Vice President in every capacity. I shall not, therefore, labor that subject, except to note that it alone would have been more than sufficient reason for all of us to heap our accolades upon you at this time.

The Senator from New York has just mentioned a subject upon which I had intended to dwell, one of many incidents in your distinguished career as Presiding Officer over this body. Perhaps your ruling will prove to be the most important, historic, and the most lasting of your contributions in that regard. But your whole conduct has been that of a distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate, and for this conduct we thank you.

I should like to add a word about the Vice President's able leadership of the party of which we are both members. The leadership has been on the forward-looking side. It has been on the side which understands that a great American party must represent all the people and that it has a tremendous obligation for progress, as well as a proper obligation for restraint and responsible conduct. For this we thank you.

But of course most of all—and this is what we feel most strongly—we appreciate the friendship, the personal understanding, and the warm relationship we have enjoyed with you during our service, some of us in the House, and all of us in the Senate, most recently as you presided over the Senate.

Our good wishes to you and to your wife and to your family go without saying. We express our good wishes with less sadness because we know that from time to time you will be around here, and we will have much pleasure in seeing you. Good luck.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I did not want to let the opportunity pass by without expressing my appreciation to you, Mr. Vice President, for the outstanding service you have rendered to this body.

. I was sworn into the Senate on November 29, 1950. According to the records, the Vice President was sworn into the Senate on December 5, 1950, in the 82d Congress. Therefore, our service in this body has been pretty much together, although in different capacities during some part of the time.

It has been a great privilege and pleasure to work with you, Mr. Vice President, and a great pleasure to have known you, not only as the Presiding Officer with your great ability and great fairness, but personally. One of the majority colleagues came walking along a few moments ago and he said to me: "Among all the Presiding Officers I have ever served under, I never questioned the fairness of the present occupant of the chair." That is a compliment which, coming from the other side, is worthy of note, and I am sure the feeling is shared by all the Members of the Senate.

I have been proud, too, of the splendid good will ambassador you have been for our Nation. As a matter of fact, wherever you and your good wife have traveled, you have left nothing but good will. You have implanted among the peoples of other nations a character and life that exemplify the true America. Sometimes the pictures foreign people get of our country are not very good. That is largely because many who carry those pictures to foreign lands leave a poor image of this country. That is not the kind of image you left overseas.

Mr. President, you have rendered great service in these fields. We will miss you. As has been suggested, you will of course, come back and will be around here with us. Wherever you and your good wife, Pat, go, we all wish you the best of everything. Godspeed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to join my distinguished colleagues in the statements they have been making about our distinguished Vice President. I merely wish to add, as one of the youngest Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle, that you, Mr. Vice President, have provided the young members of our party, as well as the young voters of the country, with great inspiration. You have demonstrated that there is a high place in the leadership, not only of one's party, but also of one's country; that there is that place for the younger as well as the older citizens of this country.

For this reason, in addition to the great many reasons advanced by my col-

leagues, we thank you, and we wish you the very best.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in the remarks they are making about the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, our Vice President, who, after 8 fruitful years, is on the verge of leaving the Senate.

I understand that some reference has been made to 3-minute glasses this morning. I assure the distinguished Vice President that he will not need one to keep me within the 3-minute limit. At the same time I want him to know that I appreciate the graciousness, the courtesy, the understanding, and the tolerance he has shown during the 8 years he has graced the chair which he new occupies.

I will admit that I have not always been in accord with his rulings, especially those that are advisory, but I do recognize that the chair has been occupied by one who believes in the dignity of the Senate and in the dignity of the office which he has had the honor and privilege to occupy for so long a period of time.

I do not believe this is a hail and farewell meeting for the Vice President. I am sure I speak on behalf of all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle when I say that we are deeply appreciative of the many courtesies he has extended to us, and also for the graciousness and understanding and tolerance that he has consistently shown.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last week I had an opportunity to speak about the Vice President on the occasion of his birthday. What I would say now would be in reiteration to a great extent of what I said on that occasion.

When we consider that in the short space of 15 years the Vice President, although still a young man, has been elected to the House of Representatives, to the Senate, has served as Vice President for 8 years, has been chosen by his party to be its candidate for President, and received almost half the votes of the people in this country for the Presidency, we have testimony which speaks more eloquently than anything I can say, of the deep respect and confidence in which he is held by the people of the United States.

We are proud of him for the campaign he made for the Presidency of the United States; and for the sense of responsibility to his country, which he maintained during the campaign—and when the campaign was over, by his understanding and respect for the American system, the glory which makes it stand out more than any other free system; the glory that ours is a free system which continues whatever the result of the election may be.

The Vice President has broken new ground in the Senate by his rulings, made with integrity and with great courage, and yet with profound respect for the Senate's character. I doubt if the extent of his rulings and their significance for the years to come is as yet widely understood and appreciated by peoples to whom they will mean much.

I speak of his work for world understanding and peace. Wherever he traveled throughout the world, he represented our country's best and deepest purposes. When I say represented our country, I cannot say more.

Two years ago I was in London at the time of the dedication of the chapel in St. Paul's Cathedral to American servicemen who lost their lives during the second great war.

I stood in St. Paul's that day, with pride and emotion when the Vice President of the United States walked down the aisle of that great cathedral as the representative of the United States in the moving ceremony.

I believe it was the Vice President's first visit to England in his official capacity. Before he came to London, many articles appeared in the newspapers speculating, inquiring about the Vice President of the United States.

He spoke several times in London; he was seen, heard; he talked to all types of people. And then the newspapers wrote of his integrity, ability, the intellectual capacity, and the service of the Vice President of the United States.

The Vice President and his wife have again symbolized the promise and opportunity our country affords to young men and women of capacity, integrity and patriotism. They have given devoted and patriotic service to country.

This is not a day to say, "Hail and Farewell." I remember the lines from Gilbert and Sullivan which go something like this:

> The privilege and the pleasure
> That we treasure beyond measure
> Is the satisfying feeling
> That our duty has been done.

They do not speak the philosophy of the Vice President. I know that his duty to his country will never be done. We bid him goodbye knowing this to be true.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the members of the house of NIXON prepare to exemplify the great American song, "California, Here We Come," I should like to be among those extending the wish of good fortune and good cheer to Pat and DICK and their two charming daughters.

It has been my unusual good fortune to be very closely associated with the Vice President through most of his public career. We served together as Members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through some pretty hectic and exciting days.

We served together as members of the Senate Investigating Committee, through another significant and important era of American history.

I was privileged to be among those campaigning for him in a significant campaign out in California between Mrs. Douglas and DICK NIXON. I have enjoyed every minute of my close association with the Vice President. It has been a challenge to work with him.

DICK NIXON has never lost an election in South Dakota. He has always carried every contest, whether in a convention or in a fall election.

I know that he has served his country well as a messenger of good will abroad and as an advocate of good sense here at home; and I know that as he goes to California we will hear much in the future about this very energetic and patriotic young American.

I think it might well be said of him, as Churchill said, that this is not the beginning of the end. Perhaps today is the end of the beginning, because he starts out once again as a private citizen with a vast reservoir of knowledge about American public affairs and world affairs in general.

I am sure the country will hear more in the form of words of counsel and suggestions as he brings into focus his experienced opinions on the various problems of our time.

I think DICK NIXON has demonstrated that he is a great gladiator in contest. He accepts defeat with dignity. After all, that is the American philosophy. After the voters have spoken, we unite behind the victor.

I congratulate DICK NIXON on a great career of 14 years in public life in Washington. He had a useful and constructive career in private life and in military service prior to that time.

I assure him that Mrs. Mundt and I are among those wishing for him and his family the best of everything in years to come.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I join other Senators this afternoon in paying my heartfelt respects to our distinguished Vice President, and conveying my sincere regards in connection with his departure within the next day or so from his official duties as Vice President of the United States.

As is the case with other Senators who have spoken, I have known RICHARD NIXON for a number of years. I have known him and worked with him in various capacities. I think the record is abundantly clear that no man in public life, either in this generation or in any past generation, has possessed a higher degree of devotion to public service and to his fellow man, or a higher degree of zeal for service, than has the Vice President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

In some ways, one period in the American political system is coming to a close, and another one is beginning. Eight years ago when you, sir, became Vice President of the United States, we were in one of the major wars that have beset the United States throughout its history. We saw that war brought to a close, and we saw carried to a successful conclusion the arduous task of the reestablishment of economic and political stability in this country, as differentiated from wartime politicial and economic situations.

During those 8 years we have witnessed great progress in our country. We have seen perhaps the greatest consistent period of reliable prosperity this country has ever known. We have seen great confidence in the United States sustained, and in my opinion advanced, not only here, but throughout the world. We have seen a record of accomplishment that may never be equaled.

But, Mr. President, the greatest thing I recall in these years of association with you has been your great cordiality and your willingness to assist and cooperate.

That applies not alone to those of your party, but those of both political parties. No man can successfully point his finger at you and say that you ever deceived him in any way, or that you ever failed to do anything but give him the fullest and most honest cooperation in any matter touching you and him.

We have a special pride and a special proprietary interest in you, Mr. President, because of your service in Iowa during World War II. All one has to do is to go to Ottumwa, Iowa, and talk with any man or woman on the street, or in any home. They speak with pride about knowing you and Mrs. Nixon. They recall with nostalgia the days you spent there. Not only have you always been welcome in Iowa, but you have visited us too infrequently for our own satisfaction, although you have favored us with repeated visits.

In your recent political campaign, which was the culmination of many years of some of the most extensive and effective preparation for further political life that any man has ever had, and perhaps the most anyone has ever had in the history of this country, you conducted yourself with the highest degree of verity and truth and strength of argument.

At no time did you indulge in any demagogic programs or campaigns. You talked facts and figures, and expressed interest in the American people and the American system. I think the American people overwhelmingly appreciate that particular trait.

I shall always remember that campaign as one of vigor; and although your party and mine did not prevail, I remember the campaign with a considerable degree of satisfaction which comes from the fact that in the last analysis your programs and the ones which I supported and which other Republicans supported were honorably, fairly, and decently presented to the American people in the truest traditions of our political life.

I have just completed a swing around Latin America; I left on November 14. At that time the outcome of the total vote in the election was still uncertain. When I left, the difference between the total popular votes received by each candidate was approximately 175,000, out of 68 million-plus votes. In a number of Latin American countries I found great concern about the closeness of the vote; and as the margin decreased until, before I returned, it was approximately 112,000, in the various countries I was repeatedly asked by nationals of great importance in their countries, "What are you Republicans going to do with so close a vote?" Of course my answer was, "We will abide by what the majority of the people of the United States say." After the first inquiry had given me the key, I said to each of those persons, "What would you do if you had an election that close in your country?" Almost invariably the answer they gave was, "We would have a revolution." I took that opportunity to refer to the American principle which you, Mr. President, so magnificently expressed on the day of the official canvass of the electoral college at the joint session of the Congress. As you so magnificently said on that day, I tried to impress on those persons the fact that we in this country believe we have arrived at the most fundamental of all self-governing principles; namely, to accept with grace and dignity the will of the majority of the people.

Mr. President, not in the nature of a requiem at your departure, but because I intend it in the nature of one of the greatest tributes I can pay, I say that no man has ever met, accepted, and surmounted defeat when he sought election to the highest office in the land, with greater grace or greater devotion to the true principle of rule by the majority in a free society than you yourself, sir. To me, that is one of the greatest tributes that could be paid you.

The magnificence with which you have met the vicissitudes of that campaign, of the election, and of the postelection days, is something I shall always remember; and it will inspire me and, I know, all others in the United States.

To you and Mrs. Nixon and your children, Mrs. Hickenlooper and I extend our best wishes; and we wish you all of the best things in life during the years to come.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, not upon the occasion of the ending of his public service, but, rather, upon the occasion of almost the end of his service while presiding over the U.S. Senate. I believe that too few persons in the country realize that successful participation in the Government, not only by the President and the Vice President, but by anyone in public office, is the result of a studied circumscribing of emotions and baser motives and the achievement of objectiveness which, in the truest sense, marks a real public servant and, in the truest sense, marks a statesman.

In this respect I could enumerate many things which demonstrate the applicability of that statement to the Vice President, the President of the Senate. For example, I think of the situation which existed when the Vice President was called upon to rule for the first time upon the responsibility and the opportunity of the Senate to make its own rules when it met at the beginning of a new Congress. It would have been easy for the Vice President to have ruled otherwise than as he did rule on that occasion, and there were many pressures to do it. There were many persons who would have liked to see him rule otherwise. In view of the fact that even by then it was fairly obvious that the Vice President might well be a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, it would have been easy for him to have curried favor with certain sections of the country by making a ruling other than the one he did make. I was happy and privileged to take part in the debate in the Senate at the time when the ruling was made; and I believe it is to the eternal credit of the Vice President that, regardless of political considerations and, I know, without emotion, but strictly in reliance upon his own ability as a lawyer, he made a study of the rules and of the Constitution and of the history of the Senate and, on that basis, made the ruling that at the beginning of a Congress the Senate can make its own rules. In doing so, I must say that I believe he was completely correct.

Let me also say, Mr. President, that following the recent election, all of us—even though of course we reserve the right to criticize—will support the new President and the new Vice President in the same way that every President and every Vice President of our country must be supported, in the interest of our national welfare. But following that election, which was won by so small a margin, the Vice President must have a great glow of warmth in his heart from the realization that almost 50 percent—only an infinitesimal number less than that—of the people of the country supported him and supported the doctrines and the ideals of government which he has so ably espoused.

And I am particularly happy, of course, that the people of my own State overwhelmingly—I repeat, overwhelmingly—supported the Vice President in that election and the ideas and the concept of the future of this country which he so ably expressed during the campaign. In all this, of course, his lovely wife, Pat, has had a great part; and I would be remiss if I did not express, for Mrs. Allott and myself, the deep affection we have for her as well as for the Vice President, and the very great job she has done—and it has been a great job—as the wife of the Vice President of the United States.

Then I think, if I may say so, Mr. Vice President, that it is a wonderful thing that a man like yourself still stands today as a part of the American tradition and the American ideal that high office and great leadership can be attained regardless of the state of a man's birth, or his religion, or the place of his birth. So long as we have people who, like yourself, are of modest means, as you have been all your life, who can attain such high office, I think we can look forward with hope that the boys and girls of America will cherish this American tradition and ideal.

I speak, lastly, of courage. The present occupant has brought the office of the Vice-Presidency up to its present great prestige—a level of prestige not previously accorded this position. I cannot forget that, from the time he entered the Senate, and, yes, even before, when he was the spearhead of the effort to uncover one of the foulest infiltrations of our Government that ever took place, the Vice President has been the subject of vitriolic, and many times vicious, attacks by his opponents in this country. Through all of this, he has shown the same courage, the same objectiveness, the same unwillingness to resort to the kind of emotional involvement that has occasionally overtaken his opponents.

And I cannot forget the courage he showed as our ambassador, not the official ambassador, but the representative of this country as Vice President. If people could have heard, as I heard, his report on the situation in Caracas and

his visit to South America, they could have only asked themselves this question: "Could I, under the same circumstances, have displayed the same courage the Vice President and his wife displayed at that time?" No man could have answered that question in the affirmative, because no man could have been subject to greater provocation or danger and remained so composed.

So today, for all practical purposes, ends one phase of the Vice President's life. None of us can see into the future, neither the Vice President, nor I, nor any of us present on the floor, nor anyone except the all-pervading Deity. I hope that in the years to come we can see a constant enhancement and enlargement and enrichment of the Vice President's public service, and feel certain that we will.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], would have you especially note their concurrence in these tributes, since they are unavoidably detained.

Mr. President, second, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to submit their tributes for inclusion in the body of the RECORD.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all these tributes be assembled and published as a Senate document, notwithstanding the existing rule.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I sat in the Senate for the last 8 years and listened occasionally to tributes paid both our living friends and those who have departed, I could not help but feel that they sounded something like a wake. I feel a great sadness in my heart at your leaving this body and leaving the high office that you hold; but, as I think about it, there are many things we Americans can be happy about in the 8 years you have served the country as Vice President and have served this body as its President.

Instead of sounding sad about your leaving—which I am—I should like to enumerate some of the things we ought to be happy about. I might say, facetiously, that the people of Arizona are happy that one who lived in Arizona has been Vice President, and that he has been the best Vice President this country has ever had. I think Arizonians are happy to see what its waters can do for a man who lives in California.

Now I speak more as an American citizen than as a Senator: I am very proud and happy of the way you served our country in time of war. I am very proud of the way in which you served our country as you traveled around in the many, many countries, representing America and the American people and American ideals. This is to my mind one of the few times that this objective has been so completely accomplished and with such conspicuous success.

I am very happy, as an American, that you had the courage to seek to ferret out Communists in our Government. I only wish your example of courage had been followed more completely and more fully by others who followed in your footsteps.

I am very happy, as an American, for the example you have been, because I happen to have four children and two grandchildren. I am happy to be able to say that this office of Vice-Presidency has been filled by such a competent man, who measures up to every definition of that word.

And, Mr. President, I think we are all happy that your wife, Pat, showed such good judgment in marrying you, because we have looked upon you, in the office of the Vice-Presidency, as what we call an ideal, if not almost perfect, American family. I would use the word "perfect," but, being a father, I know that is rather hard to achieve in a family. But I think Pat deserves almost as much credit as you do for the conspicuous success you have had in your public life. And to her and to your family I think all Americans show a great respect and a great deal of respect for having been as you are.

Finally, I am very happy to have had your friendship through the years, and that I have had the opportunity to display my friendship to you; and I shall look forward in the years ahead, to the retention of your friendship and the opportunities from time to time to show my friendship and my respect for an American for whom I have great admiration.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Vice President, as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, is presenting the Senate with 3-minute glasses, the Senator from New Hampshire will show his appreciation by confining his remarks well within the limit.

Mr. President, it is impossible for me to participate in these tributes without injecting a slightly personal note. You will remember, Mr. President, it was the privilege of the junior Senator from New Hampshire to hold up his hand and to take his oath of office as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives 14 years ago on the same day that you entered that body. It was the privilege of the junior Senator from New Hampshire to serve with you in that session of Congress. It was the privilege of the junior Senator from New Hampshire to serve with you and a group of freshman Representatives in Congress who met week by week to compare notes and to improve their own viewpoints together.

So, as I rise this afternoon, I think of that personal relationship and some of the memories which come to me of the years that you have served—particularly the earlier years. I recall very well—and I shall never forget—the afternoon in the House of Representatives when you, Mr. President, rose to make your report on the so-called Alger Hiss case to the House of Representatives. I shall never forget your opening words, that the United States of America, this country, cannot afford another Hiss case. I recall how unimpassioned, how careful, how fair, how analytical was that report. I went out of the House of Representatives that afternoon saying to a friend, "That man will be heard from in future years."

I remember that a group of Representatives gathered together at the close of the 80th Congress, which was our freshman term, to talk about the record made by each new Representative. Of course, everyone in the group secretly felt he had made the best record, but actually the composite opinion of the group was that RICHARD NIXON of California was perhaps the most promising of all the young men who entered public life in that Congress.

As the years unfolded it was my privilege to serve with you in the House of Representatives, as it was later my privilege to serve under you as the Presiding Officer in the Senate, to know you as Vice President of the United States, and to work for you as my candidate for President of the United States.

I do not think of your career as a succession of achievements, as a calling of the roll of the positions you have held, the responsibilities you have met and the duties you have discharged.

I think, rather, of the qualities of mind and of heart which have impressed themselves upon all who know you. The first of those qualities, of which I always think, is that you have impressed me, and I think you have impressed all who know you well, as a precision thinker. I have never known you to, in the colloquialism of my good old New England State of New Hampshire, "Go off half-cocked." I have never known you to utter a hasty, ill-considered, unfortunate word. I have watched you go through many delicate missions abroad. I have watched you handle yourself through two Presidential illnesses without one single major misstep in all those years. From the time I first heard you address the House on the Hiss case through all these years, in every capacity, you have exhibited the same restraint and never yielded to the temptation of being sensational or demagogic. I for one rejoice in the fact that while many wished you to resort to these devices in the recent campaign, you steadfastly remained yourself to the end. Such intellectual honesty, in the long run, cannot fail.

I think of you first as a precision thinker. We need such men. That attribute must not be lost to leadership in this country.

I think of you second because of the personal relationship I have been privileged to have with you through the past 14 years. I think of you in a way more and more Americans, I think, are coming to think of you, particularly in these later days, though they did not think of you always in this way in times past—as a warm, affectionate personality. That same sincere devotion you have exhibited to your family you have for your friends and you have for all with whom you come in contact. We who have known you know these things.

I do not even take the time to think about your achievements, the offices you have held, the trips you have taken, and the speeches you have made. I think,

rather, of what you are. Like the Senator from Arizona, I feel this is not an unhappy occasion, even though you are leaving this Chamber in which you have served so well.

Those who know you believe the things you possess, the qualities you have, and the abilities you have demonstrated, are so valuable that they cannot long remain in disuse. We expect and believe we shall be associated with you again.

In closing, on that rather warm human note, I should like to use a paraphrase of words of Fielding:

God bless you, RICHARD NIXON, may you live
a thousand years—
To guide us on our pathway through this
weary vale of tears,
And may we live a thousand, too, a thou-
sand less one day,
For we would not want to be on earth the
day you pass away.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in congratulating Vice President NIXON upon his record during the 8 years he has presided over the U.S. Senate. He has been fair, and he has been clear in his rulings. He has been friendly and helpful to the individual Members of this body. He has not hesitated to cast his vote to break a tie when he was required to do so.

As an individual, he retires from his present post with a thoughtful understanding of our national and international problems, which are complicated and difficult. He has done much to better international relations with our friends in other countries, and he has proved himself, with Mrs. Nixon's help, a worthy, courageous, and intelligent representative of the United States in areas of the world which are not so friendly to us or our way of life. On domestic questions, he has proved himself a sound public official.

On the many occasions when he has spoken briefly at a dinner, his remarks have been apt, humorous, and yet appreciative of the amenities of the gathering.

Now he leaves us as the Presiding Officer of this body, but will continue as a friend and helpful counsellor in the days to come. I am certain that DICK NIXON and his wife, Pat, have many happy and useful years ahead of them. I am sure we will hear of him often and favorably in the days to come.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, when the history of the administration of Dwight Eisenhower is finally and completely chronicled, it will tell of a unique and dedicated public service, quite unparalleled in the Nation's history, which was rendered during all those years by the Vice President of the United States, my fellow Californian, RICHARD NIXON.

Today, for the last time, the Vice President presided over the proceedings in the Senate. During all the time that he has been the second highest officer in the country, those who have served with him in this Chamber, regardless of their political persuasion, have saluted him as an able and honorable Presiding Officer, skilled in parliamentary law, fair in his decisions, and honest in the opinions which he has rendered.

The other day, on the occasion of his birthday anniversary, I recalled what I thought was a remarkably clear, cogent, able, and courageous opinion which the Vice President had previously uttered with respect to the constitutional rights of a majority of the Senate in each Congress to determine the rules by which the public business in this Chamber might be transacted. This opinion, I believe, will be one of the milestones in the career which Vice President RICHARD NIXON has made for himself in this Chamber.

But far more than the success and the reputation which he achieved here in the Senate Chamber are those far-flung responsibilities given to him by his Chief, each of which he discharged with distinction to his Government and to the American people.

The Vice President was placed in charge of the governmental Committee on Fair Employment Practices; and there, in company with a group of outstanding Americans, attempted to make, and did make, progress in the fair and equal treatment of our people who are employed under contracts awarded with governmental tax dollars in the defense industry and otherwise.

Across the street, at the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court, is the eloquent phrase "Equal justice under law." In the deliberation of the Committee on Fair Employment Practices, and in the leadership which Vice President NIXON provided for that committee's activities, substantial progress was made toward equal treatment under law, one of the basic American dreams.

Our people, too, will remember him as he represented the people of the United States abroad. Vice President NIXON traveled in many climes during the past 8 years.

They will recall that, at the direction of his Chief, representing the Government of the United States, he stood unflinching in the face of mob violence in Venezuela. They will recall him as the symbol of American freedom when the Polish people strew the highways with garlands of flowers as he proceeded to go through the streets of that beleaguered country and traveled among its gallant people.

All in all, the Vice President of the United States, as he and his wife and two daughters leave the District of Columbia to return to the State which I have the honor to represent in part, his native State of California, will take with him real satisfaction and inward pride in the manner in which he has discharged the multitude of official chores, both legislative and executive, which were given to him in the great years through which our country and the world have now passed.

He and his family will take away with them something more than mere recollections and a sense of pride. They will take with them the respect and affection of Members of the Senate, of those in government who have worked with him, in both political parties, and quite regardless whether they have disagreed with him from time to time. The Nixons will take with them the respect of all who have known them here at the seat of Government and all across the land.

In the last campaign the Vice President of the United States was the nominee of my party for Chief Executive of our country. He conducted a campaign honorably. He conducted it well. Almost half our citizens supported him. Since last November his public utterances have been accepted by the American people as an attempt—and I think I may say a successful attempt—to weld us all together into one strong, American Nation.

The other day, when the Congress met in joint session in response to the constitutional provision with respect to the counting of the electoral votes, I thought the Vice President of the United States, in his comments on that occasion, demonstrated what is at the bottom of the American dream—a dream which we, no matter what our race or creed, no matter whence our forebears sprang, can realize. We are Americans together, as he said so well, united by an unflinching zeal to retain the liberty which we have, and to accept the responsibility which is ours, to lead the world toward freedom and a just peace, and away from slavery.

In the words he used the other day, he was vigorously applauded by all in the Congress who sat and listened to him as fellow citizens.

I am glad to say on this occasion, Mr. President, as Vice President NIXON returns home, he takes with him good wishes and Godspeed from all of us.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in associating myself with the remarks previously made in regard to Vice President NIXON, I wish to say that it is a matter of deep personal regret to me that the Vice President is very shortly to take leave of us.

I have listened with great interest and sympathy to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and I share the great feeling of affection and respect that he has voiced regarding DICK NIXON.

Vice President NIXON has been, I believe, the most tireless and self-sacrificing worker for the Republican Party in the last 8 years, at least; and I say this because during that period I have been closely associated with him.

He has come to Connecticut whenever we wished him to do so, to help our party; and he has made a wonderful impression there. His popularity in my State has increased with every trip he has made there; and people in the press and people in other walks of life in Connecticut who were opposed to him have come to respect him greatly.

I believe that no campaigner for the Republican Party has been more greatly respected and, I may say, even feared by the other party than DICK NIXON. Of course, that situation has placed him under fierce attack. However, when confronted with such attacks, he has always faced them forthrightly, with iron nerve, and he has been undaunted and undiminished in his efforts to accomplish what he set out to accomplish for our party.

Vice President NIXON has been a great leader.

The Vice President has also been a great loser, as all of us have observed

during the last few weeks. He is what I call a great sportsman, too, because he has taken his defeat in the manner in which great sportsmen do take defeat—without rancor, but with good will for all—not only all who worked for him, but even those who were responsible for his defeat. This has increased enormously our admiration of him.

Finally, Mr. President, I would observe in regard to Mrs. Nixon that her friendship has been one of the friendships which Mrs. Bush has enjoyed to the utmost in the past 8 years. They have been great friends, and I know I speak for Mrs. Bush—and I am glad to do it—when I say that a very sad parting will take place when Pat Nixon leaves Washington. She has, of course, endeared herself to all of us who have had the privilege of knowing her, and we shall miss her very much indeed.

I know that the Senate wives, over which she presided by virtue of being the wife of the Vice President, have formed a very deep affection for her, and that is true not only of the Republican women but also of the Democratic women. Last spring, when the group broke up, extremely fine tributes were paid to Pat Nixon, and the most glowing one was made by the wife of a Democratic Senator—a tribute which was accompanied by a gift symbolic of their deep affection for Pat Nixon.

So, Mr. President, rather sadly, although I am glad to have this opportunity to speak, I pay my affectionate respects to the Nixons. I state without qualification my great pride in our friendship and my great regard for this great politician, this great statesman, and this great servant of the American people.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is unable to be here, because of illness. He asked me to read the following:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

We are going to miss Vice President NIXON. During his campaign his first stop was at Indianapolis and our Hoosier State immediately climbed aboard his bandwagon.

RICHARD M. NIXON has served our country well with dignity and sincerity. The service he has given as Vice President is unparalleled in the history of our Nation.

I hope his experience and knowledge will be available to our country for many, many years to come.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying my respects to the Vice President, our Presiding Officer.

I can remember, as some of my other colleagues can, receiving the oath of office in the House of Representatives at the same time the Vice President received his. I shall always remember with pleasure and with pride the many years that I was associated in the House with him.

I feel at this time possibly a deeper loss, as the Presiding Officer concludes his many years of service in this body, for I, as a new Member of the Senate, am losing the opportunity to once again be associated with a man for whom I hold the highest respect and deepest admiration.

Despite the outcome of the recent election, the Vice President is well aware of the legion of friends that he has in my State of Delaware. Our people have always looked with anticipation on his many visits, and I am sure they feel as my colleague from Iowa expressed it—his visits were all too infrequent.

I shall, too, add finally, that I do not believe that this is "hail and farewell." I would rather believe that it is only "auf wiedersehen."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as a codicil to this testament of tribute and affection, I simply say "Godspeed."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S INHERITED BURDEN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this week, 3 days hence, the will of the people, expressed in the election of last November, will take effect. John Fitzgerald Kennedy will be inaugurated as President of the United States, LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON as Vice President. This week tens of thousands of Americans will converge on the National Capital to attend the inaugural ceremonies and to cheer the new leadership. Tens of millions will watch the ceremony over television and listen to it by radio.

For the first time in some years, the executive and legislative branches will be under the guidance of the same political party—a condition, I believe, which should and will tend to more effective functioning of our Government. The transition from the executive administration of one party to that of another has been accomplished with unprecedented smoothness and effectiveness, and with a gratifying tolerance and good feeling both on the part of the outgoing and incoming officialdom. A great deal of credit for the efficiency of this transition belongs to Clark Clifford, to whom this task has been entrusted by President-elect Kennedy. But it is also due to the thoughtful courtesy, kindliness, good nature, and good will of the outgoing and incoming national leaders, and worthy of a special salute, the good sportsmanship of Vice President NIXON. Their gallant performance is a tribute not only to them but to the American system.

This subject was admirably discussed by that outstandingly wise commentator, James Reston, in Sunday's New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that his column be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

THE REASSURING CIVILITY OF THE TRANSITION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—The changing of the guard in Washington has been achieved with more civility and commonsense this time than ever in living memory.

There has been less friction and less personal bitterness, despite the closeness of the election, than anybody expected, and this says a great deal for the essential unity of the American people and the stability of their political institutions.

In no truly democratic country in the world is there such a sharp contrast between the lives of the defeated and the lives of the victorious. In victory, RICHARD NIXON is the leader not only of the Nation but of the whole free world; in defeat, he is a lawyer outside Los Angeles.

It is a cruel system; maybe not as cruel as in Russia, where a man who loses power may lose his head, or in Latin America, where the defeated candidate often loses his homeland; but it is cruel enough to bruise men's souls and debase their reason.

If this has happened this time, however, it is certainly not apparent. President Eisenhower has been a model of courtesy and generosity. Vice President NIXON has slipped into the shadows with dignity and even good humor. And Senator Kennedy has moved with great sensitivity to bind up the wounds of the campaign.

THE HUMAN COURTESIES

It is not only that the practical obligations of the transition have been met. The files of the old administration have, of course, been opened to the new, but the spirit of the whole thing has been admirable in every one of the departments, and the new Cabinet has been treated on Capitol Hill with elaborate courtesy.

Kennedy has not only avoided extreme partisanship or ideological alinement in picking his Cabinet but has paid attention to those important human details which make disappointment tolerable.

He called on Mr. NIXON. He paid his respects to Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, and Hoover. He reassured the financial community and the business community by inviting Douglas Dillon and Robert McNamara into his Cabinet, and he filled the sub-Cabinet posts with distinguished men regardless of their political affiliations.

As a result, an interesting thing has happened. The mail reaching the capital now is full of letters from Republicans testifying that they feel much better about Kennedy's victory today than they did two months ago, and the President-elect is thus approaching Inauguration Day with a larger margin of support than when he was elected.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

There are of course, differences between the parties, particularly on the state of the Union. The Republicans are saying that we have made great progress in the last eight years and the Democrats are saying that we are in terrible shape, and of course both are right

The confusion lies in definition of progress. In his last state of the Union message this week, President Eisenhower defined progress in terms of a catalog of improvements over what we had before.

Thus, he cited the phenomenal rise in the productivity of the Nation with more guns and butter, and more people employed at higher wages and with more Social Security than ever before.

The Democrats do not challenge these facts, but they have a different definition of progress. When they talk of our decline,

they are speaking relatively, not about where we are now in relation to where we were internally eight years ago, but where we stand in relation to our external problems.

Herbert Spencer defined "progress" as an increase of a man's adaptation to his environment. George Bernard Shaw observed that there were five main directions in which a civilization could go wrong: By being overwhelmed as a result of falling out of date in its economics, its politics, its science, its education, and its religion.

This is what Kennedy is talking about. He is not saying we have not improved in many ways, but that improvement is not necessarily progress in Spencer's terms, that we have improved but not enough to adapt to our revolutionary environment.

Nevertheless, even this argument between the parties is proceeding now without rancor. We may not know where we are or where we're going, but we're on our way, and at least for the moment, nobody in Washington is very mad at anybody else.

Mr. GRUENING. However, Mr. President, there is a basic fact—indeed a series of basic facts—connected with the change of administration that needs to be called to the attention of the American people.

That fact is that the Kennedy administration inherits a very grave situation—or series of situations—from the Eisenhower administration.

This fact is not generally known or appreciated by the American people.

It is not generally known or appreciated for several reasons. In the recent Presidential campaign, Vice President NIXON campaigned on the optimistic theme that all was well.

Domestically, he insisted, there would be no recession.

Abroad, he declared repeatedly, the prestige of the United States was never higher—the prestige of our totalitarian opponents never lower. In short, everything was on the up and up both at home and abroad.

Likewise, President Eisenhower, in his farewell state of the Union message, naturally stressed the favorable aspects of his 8-year administration, highlighted what he believed had been its accomplishments, and minimized the adverse factors.

So, for these and other reasons, the American people are not aware of what a heavy burden President Kennedy will inherit when he takes office on January 20.

What are the facts?

Domestically, the Nation is going into a serious recession. It may become a depression, although the difference between a recession and a depression may be one of degree—or semantics. The fact is that unemployment has reached its highest peak since 1940, and the trend is far more unemployment.

The dollar is in peril, and the belated efforts of the Eisenhower administration to stop the outflow of gold testify to that fact.

Abroad, the free world is confronted with grave crises in southeast Asia, Latin America, and Africa, all legacies of what has been done, or not done, by the outgoing administration.

Let us look at the state of the Nation's economy—the home front.

To my knowledge, no one has ever thought of the U.S. News & World Report as a magazine displaying preference for the Democratic Party. However, it is thorough and exhaustive in its discussion of economic problems, national and foreign, and its newsgrams are generally perceptive and accurate. Hence, its statements that John F. Kennedy "is walking right into a recession," that "business is getting worse, not better," that unemployment is rising, and that industry's output "will be running 7 percent below a year earlier," may be taken as a fair estimate of what our President-elect faces. It is indeed a gloomy picture.

I ask unanimous consent that the newsgram from U.S. News & World Report be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

NEWSGRAM

John F. Kennedy, walking right into the middle of a recession, is to face this situation on January 20:

Business will be getting worse, not better. Unemployment will be above 5½ million, and rising. Steel mills will be operating at barely half of capacity. Output of industry will be running roughly 7 percent below a year earlier. Factory orders will be lagging.

Some bright spots will be showing through. People's incomes, in total, will be high. Retail trade will be good—not booming, probably, but good. Reports on Christmas trade, coming out in January, will mark up a new high.

The recession, as recessions go, will be mild overall, yet painful for many. Recovery, when Kennedy takes over, still will be months away.

That's to be the first problem the new President will have to face.

Kennedy, at the outset, will be limited in what he can do about it. The new administration, trying to deal with a business slump at home, will be caught by troubles of the U.S. dollar abroad.

The dilemma will be this: Raise Federal spending sharply to give business a lift, and the budget will be thrown for a loop. That could mean further damage to the dollar's standing in other countries. Cut taxes, and it's the same story—a budget out of whack, meaning more trouble for the dollar. Cut interest rates to encourage spending of borrowed money, and more capital flows out of the United States to seek higher returns abroad. That would hurt.

Besides, it's Congress that has the last word on big scale spending or tax cuts. Action there takes time. Federal Reserve Board holds the power over interest rates, and FRB doesn't have to take orders from the White House.

It would be a mistake to expect any sudden magic from a new administration.

The recession, in other words, will run about the same course as if there were no change in Washington. Speedup in defense contracts will continue. That has started under Eisenhower, and will help. Some other programs may be pushed a bit faster. Kennedy's main proposals to Congress, however, will be mostly longer range, with limited effect on the current recession.

The timetable for business now looks about like this:

Christmas, 1960: Business good in the stores, yet far below expectations in most lines. Increases over a year ago showing up mainly in sales of autos, which were in short supply last Christmas season.

First quarter, 1961: Business sagging. Profits down. Production slipping further. More layoffs, unemployment climbing.

Second quarter, 1961: Troubles continuing. Output down. Unemployment still high. However, first signs possibly appearing to suggest a pickup.

Third quarter, 1961: Recovery starting. Production picking up. Profits rising strongly. Rehiring in many lines, but unemployment still a problem.

Fourth quarter, 1961: Better times again. Production continuing to rise. Profits good. Employment up, unemployment down moderately.

Unemployment will be the continuing headache. Kennedy's program, in large part, will be related to that problem. Congress, worried about it, will be receptive to ideas on how to open up more jobs.

All that, however, and nearly everything else Kennedy wants to do, will be conditioned by what the budget will stand. Here is the problem:

This year, the year to end in mid-1961—tax receipts are down, mainly because of a drop in corporate profits. Instead of the surplus of $1.1 billion predicted officially in September, there is to be a small deficit.

Next year, starting in mid-1961—revenues will decline further. That will result from the profit squeeze of the current recession. Spending will go up by roughly $1.6 billion, even without any costly new programs. Result: a deficit of $5 to $6 billion. Higher spending or lower taxes would widen the gap.

Kennedy, thus, is not likely to rush in with a whole hatful of high-priced ideas, as many expected. Tax cuts are unlikely any time soon. If anything, he will be inclined to seek more revenue—mainly by closing tax loopholes.

Mr. GRUENING. More contemporary confirmation comes from an Associated Press article taken from last Friday's Washington Star, revealing that total unemployed in December had risen half a million, the highest figure in 20 years, and that a worsening of this situation may be expected.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, with its headlines, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

JOBLESS UP HALF MILLION, TOTAL BIGGEST SINCE 1940—UNEMPLOYMENT RATE HITS 6.8 PERCENT; EXPERT SEES FURTHER INCREASE AHEAD

(By the Associated Press)

Unemployment rose by a half million in December to 4,540,000—highest December total since 1940.

Employment declined by 1,173,000 to 66,009,000.

Announcing these figures today, the Labor Department also reported that the rate of unemployment to the total work force rose from 6.3 percent in November to 6.8 percent. This is the highest December rate since 1940. The percentages are seasonally adjusted.

Seymour Wolfbein, Labor Department manpower expert, said that the idle total is going up further this winter.

Mr. Wolfbein said that if the seasonally adjusted 6.8 percent idle rate remains unchanged the unemployed total will increase by 1 million to 5½ million during January.

USUALLY BETTER IN SPRING

On this same basis of assuming only seasonal factors, without continued worsening of factory employment, Mr. Wolfbein said that the prospective idle totals will be 5.6 million in February, 5.4 million in March, and 4.9

million in April. The spring season generally brings improvement because the warmer weather permits construction and other outdoor work.

An indication of how unemployment has mounted since the mid-December date, when the 4.5 million December unemployment was recorded, can be seen in unemployment compensation claims.

These increased by 600,000 from December 10 to December 31, and reached an all-time record December total of approximately 3 million.

December usually brings some decline in employment and increase in unemployment, but officials said that this year the changes were considerably more than seasonal.

JOBLESS INCREASE TRIPLES

For example, the half-million December unemployment increase is about triple the increase that would be regarded as normal for the month. The drop in employment also was extraseasonal.

For the first time in a year, the employment total was smaller than the corresponding total a year ago.

The number of persons idle for 15 weeks or longer—the long-term unemployed—remained at approximately 1 million for the third straight month. Nearly half of these workers have been unable to find work for 27 weeks or longer—a half year.

The unemployment rate for married men reached 5.1 percent in December compared with 3.6 percent a year earlier, a significant change because of family responsibilities.

ELECTION WORKERS OUT

Compared with a year ago, unemployment is up almost 1 million.

About 700,000 farmworkers left jobs in December because of winter weather, as expected. Also, about 250,000 workers temporarily employed in fall election duties lost their jobs.

Helping to offset this was the usual expansion of 570,000 in holiday trade employment and a 300,000 holiday period increase in the postal work force. There was an unusually sharp decline of 300,000 in construction activity. This was due in part to heavy snows.

The storms were blamed in part, also, for a drop in the average workweek to 38.8 hours. A rise in hourly earnings to $2.32 offset the work-time decline, so that average weekly earnings of the factory worker remained at $90.02 in December.

FACTORY JOBS ARE CORE

Mr. Wolfbein said that, outside of the expected seasonal changes, a continued decline in factory employment is the core of the unemployment problem. Factory employment dropped sharply in December, by almost 300,000 jobs.

Mr. Wolfbein said that unemployment compensation claims show that the idle problem is worst in six big States: Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, Michigan, New York, and Illinois. These six States account for close to two-thirds of the increase in idle payment claims during 1960.

Mr. GRUENING. Statistics are impressive and, in this case, depressing, but the words "unemployed" or "out of work," or "no jobs available" signify personal tragedies to husbands, wives, mothers, and fathers—and children.

What the present deepening recession means, in human terms, is revealed in a story in last Sunday's Washington Post, which discloses that hunger is now stalking the land, and right here in the Capital of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post headed "Mommy Don't Eat Most of Time," be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

"MOMMY DON'T EAT MOST OF TIME"—UNEMPLOYED LIVE FROM DAY TO DAY ON CABBAGE, BEANS, GIFTS, AND HOPE

(By Wendell P. Bradley)

Mrs. Robert Curry didn't eat breakfast last week, and she hasn't eaten lunch since November, when her husband lost his job.

"It's easy once you get used to it," she said. She has always had something for dinner—fried potatoes and bean soup one night; cabbage, perhaps, the next.

"Just cabbage?" she was asked.

"Just cabbage," she said.

When visitors called on Mrs. Curry last Thursday she turned to her 10-year-old son.

"Bob," she said, "would you go upstairs and get the light bulb?"

When Bob returned with the bulb—the only one in the house—she put it in the table lamp in the livingroom and invited her callers to sit down. As she talked, four of the five Curry children played on the floor and in and out of her lap.

The Currys are a statistic, one of the 4.5 million unemployed in this country. One can talk to quite a number of statistics in a 3-hour driving radius of Washington—construction laborers in the District who worked 2 months last year, shivering steelworkers in the unemployment lines of Baltimore, who cannot buy milk for their children, aircraft workers in Hagerstown (where the Currys live), whose unemployment payments ran out 8 months ago.

Mrs. Curry was asked if her children eat three meals a day.

"The ones that go to school do," she said. "The smaller ones at home get their breakfast and maybe a slice of bread with jelly at noon. So far we've managed to get milk for the kids every day—enough for their breakfast cereal."

"Mommy don't eat most of the time," Belinda, 9, said, looking up from the floor.

She said it the way she might have said, "Sally got a new doll," or the way her brother, Bob, interrupted a few minutes later with this bit of information: "I got a quarter from some men once and bought some ice cream for us all. Mommy didn't want any."

Neither Bob nor Belinda seemed to know why. And it was just as an isolated fact again when Belinda said: "I don't think Mommy will manage to give us quarters for our lunch anymore."

"I've always managed so far," Mrs. Curry said. "Somehow I've always managed to have quarters for the kids to take to school every day."

She went on:

"This was the worst Christmas the children ever had. They got a dart game from the Salvation Army and Bob bought the boys a friction airplane for 88 cents."

Bob interrupted, "Mom, I got a box of cookies and an eraser."

"I'd forgotten," Mrs. Curry said.

"We used to get plenty of toys," Bob said. "I hoped I'd get a tire and an inner tube for Christmas, but I didn't."

"I know a boy," he continued, "and he and his little brother didn't get anything for Christmas."

"Why didn't they, Bob?"

Bob shrugged his shoulders. "I don't know," he said.

"Their father's unemployed," Mrs. Curry said.

The Currys are better off than many former Fairchild workers. They still receive unemployment benefits of $43 a week.

NEIGHBOR'S PLIGHT

Jim Wilson, who lives a few blocks away, has no money, no food in the house, no prospect of a job, but he has plenty of bills.

"I called a feller Monday in Washington about a painting job," Jim said. "He said, 'Call next Wednesday.' I said, 'Man, I don't have money to call. It's 55 cents.' "

Wilson was laid off by Fairchild 2 years ago. He has worked a total of 7 months since. He is 33 years old and has four children.

"Everywhere you go there's no one to help. I went over to welfare. They said you've got to be disabled. I said, 'My God, what can I do? I can work, I'm dying for work. But there isn't any work.'

"I even went to a loan company. I wanted $100 to pay $50 on the rent and $50 on the car."

Wilson can't sell his car because his only trade, except for Fairchild where he worked 9 years, is painting. His only work in the past 2 years was in the District.

Hunting for jobs around Hagerstown, where more than 15 percent of the labor force is unemployed, is like looking for a needle in the proverbial haystack. The men gang up, in search of work, chip in for gas, and drive to Baltimore, Washington, and Virginia.

Sometimes it means they have to skimp on the tub of coal or the few gallons of oil they buy daily to heat their homes. Usually the trips are fruitless.

PROBLEMS AT 62

"I've gone here and there but at my age you're too young for your old age benefits and you're almost too old for a job," Russell K. Heefner said. Heefner is 62 and was laid off last June after 18½ years at Fairchild.

"I've been through one depression but that one was easier," he said. "You could forage for wood for the old stove and beans were 5 cents a can and a big loaf of bread was a dime. Now you go to the store with $5 and you don't get anything really.

"And you've got to pay the gas and the electricity. I'd turn off the electricity and use oil for light but I've got to have it for the furnace. I hate to think what's going to happen when my unemployment runs out."

It runs out next month.

Heefner and his wife, who appears cheerful in spite of their troubles, live in a neat little bungalow in a new subdivision outside of Hagerstown. Their payments on the bungalow are $54 a month. They will lose it unless something turns up.

HOW JOBLESS ARE PAID

In Baltimore, a man with a sign on his back reading "Checks Cashed Free. Hot and Cold Drinks. Stan's Corner," walks up and down beside the lines of unemployed men and women outside the Employment Security Building. A relief official calls out: "One o'clock line on the left. One-thirty line on the right."

The unemployed are let into the building 75 at a time. The wait to receive their checks is usually an hour.

(The economists call Baltimore's unemployment cyclical—the result of a downturn in the business cycle which has forced cuts in steel production at Sparrows Point. Hagerstown's unemployment is called chronic, because Hagerstown, situated in depressed western Maryland, has suffered from it for many years. Washington's unemployment, on the other hand, is the mildest kind, seasonal, caused primarily by the weather's slowdown of building activity.)

"Ha," William J. Elmore, 34, said when he was asked about Christmas. "I ain't worked 5 days since last summer. Toys? I can't buy my kids milk."

Elmore has five children. He gets a $43 unemployment check from the State and $18.65 supplemental unemployment check from Bethlehem Steel where he has worked for 10 years. Since 1958 he has been laid off for longer periods than he has worked, he said.

"The rent's overdue. Everything is overdue. I got loans on top of loans," he said.

"People think I don't want to pay. I want to pay but I don't have the money. I buy food until the money runs out and I pay bills until the money runs out. The kids get about two meals a day. Potatoes and rice."

OWES ON LOANS

Elmore said he borrowed about $600 from two loan companies. On one loan, he owes $212; on the other, about $190. He owes the grocery store $55. He hasn't had a Christmas tree for 3 years.

Elmore says he's better off than some of his friends. He knows steelworkers who were terminated, not told to stay home, as he was, until work picks up. This is based on seniority.

Where do the terminated steelworkers go for work? "There are no jobs around Baltimore, that I know," Elmore said. "More people are out of work there than are working."

It is not so bad if a jobless man has only one child. Not so bad financially, that is.

"What's unemployment like? It's having fights with the old lady," Edward Gramuth, 26, said. "I get up in the morning and watch TV, eat—you gotta eat—and watch TV. Or maybe play cards with the wife half the day.

"Like today. I'll get home, wash the clothes and maybe help with the baby. It gets on your nerves if you're used to working.

"When you come home from your job you don't feel like just watching TV, you feel like going out somewhere. I'd take the wife out.

"I lost my car when I got laid off, but otherwise I'm getting along pretty well."

Gramuth has been a steelworker 7 years. He looked all over Baltimore for a job, but work there is so scarce, he said, that employment offices are reluctant even to take applications.

CONSTRUCTION WORKERS HIT

In Washington the construction trades are the hardest hit. Building stopped December 11 when the snow came. It is only slowly starting again. But even before the snow, work was slack. Only 3,000 of the 4,500 members of the Building Laborers' local here worked steadily in 1960.

Wayland McManus, 52, of 1302 Park Road NW., worked 2 months in the past 12. He supported two sisters and two nieces on approximately $1,500. Seventy dollars a month went for rent and all the rest for food. Clothes came from welfare agencies and emergencies were met by "this man, he's from my hometown. He'll give me a couple of dollars," McManus said.

Thomas C. Brooks, 47, of 1524 Constitution Avenue NE., a laborer, worked 3 months at $20 a day last year. He has six children. He had to send two of them to his in-laws in North Carolina. They live on a farm and mail food to him every once in a while.

"My house is bought and paid for, thank the Lord," Brooks said. "Most of what I make goes for food and electricity and gas. I haven't made enough even to have my TV fixed so the kids can't look at it.

"I feed 'em three meals a day, but most of the time it's beans and rice. Sometimes when I'm working I give 'em some vegetables. They're not hungry.

"I eat out most of the time to leave the food for them. I get a bowl of beans and cornbread for 26 cents at noontime. I can make it on that.

"I feel all right. Not tired. Just sick, kind of, from worrying—thinking all the time about where to get some money."

On weekends, Brooks goes out to Burning Tree. He makes a few dollars caddying.

Mr. GRUENING. Another crisis facing the Kennedy administration, as it takes up the reins of office, is our ever-dwindling gold supplies. This, too, has been a situation which has been developing over the years. The Eisenhower administration gave no indication of taking intelligently planned action in the years past to meet the worsening situation. It barely mentioned the growing crisis—and took no practical steps to alleviate the situation until the elections were over. Now these drastic measures come late.

An editorial in yesterday's New York Times, entitled "Plugging a Gold Leak," refers to the latest of these measures, but as the editorial states—

It does not solve the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

PLUGGING A GOLD LEAK

President Eisenhower has wisely moved to plug a potentially serious leak in our gold supplies by prohibiting the purchase abroad of gold by Americans and American enterprises, and by prohibiting their ownership of gold abroad after May 31. Such a ban might have been justified long ago simply on the ground of equity, since ownership or purchase of gold in this country, except for dental, jewelry, and similar purposes, has been prohibited since 1933. But it was obviously the continuing drain on our gold stocks rather than any considerations of equity which prompted the President's move.

Behind this move are insistent reports that wealthy Americans, fearful of the dollar's future, have been a major element in stimulating the demand for gold on the London gold exchange and elsewhere. Obviously foreigners who have seen Americans thus engaged in a flight from the dollar have been encouraged to do likewise. If this were permitted to go on, the danger was posed of a real world crisis of confidence in the dollar, one having no relationship to the economic realities but important nevertheless.

But whatever help this latest move provides for easing pressure on the dollar, it does not solve the problem behind the outward gold flow: Our adverse balance of payments. Long continued, this adverse balance and continued gold loss could force the most drastic measures, up to and including exchange control, despite all the unfortunate impact such control would have upon normal economic relations with other countries.

The need is obviously for bold leadership early in the new administration to correct the fundamental factors behind the situation. A drive to step up exports, a really energetic campaign to bring foreign tourists here, and an effort to attract more foreign investment in this country are among the steps that need to be taken. Beyond these specific areas, there is need for a broad educational campaign to make our population understand the stake that every one of us has in correcting the present imbalance of our foreign accounts. We hope President-elect Kennedy has this problem high on his agenda of matters that need attending to very soon after he takes office next Friday.

Mr. GRUENING. As for the foreign situation—there are grave crises in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

In Laos, into which the outgoing administration has poured hundreds of millions of dollars, Columnist Joseph Alsop refers to its status as "desperately grave," and that "the truth is that this remote situation now shows all signs of getting wholly out of control," and, he adds, "it has been a sorry story."

Life magazine, of the Luce publications, gives that sorry story in detail. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Mess in Laos," by Stanley Karnow, Time-Life bureau chief in Hong Kong, and the leading story in this week's issue of Time, be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Is there objection?

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

THE MESS IN LAOS

(By Stanley Karnow)

BANGKOK.—The land of the million elephants, as Laos is historically known; is an antique, sleepy country whose people want little more than to be left alone in their paradise of poppy fields and gilded temples. But this week the Lao were once more incongruously, dramatically, perhaps tragically projected onto the international stage and the United States with them.

After 5 years of effort and an expenditure of $300 million in aid, we are identified in Laos with an artless government and an ineffective local army incapable of waging war or making peace. Our allies in SEATO (the eight-nation Southeast Asia Treaty Organization convened to cope with the crisis) are basically at odds with us over our handling of the situation there. "Dollar for dollar," a U.S. Asian expert summed it up, "it is about as bad a bargain as international aid money has yet bought."

Should American foot soldiers have to fight "another Korea" in Laos it would be on the worst possible terrain. Landlocked Laos is a rugged region of dense jungle, practically no communications or navigable rivers, few roads, a handful of simple airstrips, a land where no skirmish is decisive and no war is really won. And should we attempt a peace settlement, there will be the tough opposition of the Soviets, who have wormed their way into a strong bargaining position, as well as continuing pressure from surrounding Communist countries.

If the aircraft carriers are now underway and U.S. Marines are in readiness, this is only the latest and most dramatic in a series of stopgap measures to prop up a policy in Laos that has consistently failed. Ironically, the unattractive dilemma in which we now find ourselves is to a great degree of our own making.

In Laos U.S. money has been wasted, squandered and mismanaged by both Americans and Lao. But the real loss comes from Washington's insistence—often against the appraisals of U.S. diplomats on the scene—on trying to fit Laos into a broad strategic military picture, creating and inflexibly following goals and aims which the backward, imponderable little country could not possibly have achieved.

From the very beginning of U.S. responsibility in Laos in January 1955 there was a spirit of urgency. Americans still remembered Korea. The French had just lost Indochina. The cocky Chinese and Vietnamese Communists, fresh from the unhappy Geneva Conference, seemed poised to move again. To the Secretary of State—John Foster Dulles—Laos was a crucial link in a chain of defense the United States was trying to forge for southeast Asia.

In the policy discussions in Washington the Dulles view prevailed over the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who wanted a small flexible force of 12,000 to 15,000 men. Dulles won authorization for a Lao army of nearly twice that size—to be supported by the United States. Laos would become "a bulwark against communism."

And so the trouble began. To feed, equip, and pay the army—at one of the highest pay scales in Asia, the United States started flooding the country with money and consumer goods to generate local currency. Underwriting practically all the Lao budget, the U.S. Treasury deposited dollars in American banks to support new currency printed by the Lao treasury.

To try to absorb the enormous pile of new money, we established a big import program whereby local businessmen could buy foreign merchandise with U.S. dollars, bring it in and sell it for Lao money. They could then get more dollars to import more goods. All this was too rich for a simple economy to absorb safely. It was also too much of a temptation for almost every well-placed Lao to resist. Politicians, princes, burghers went on a spree of illegal money-making, allowing of course for intermittent pauses to protest their devotion to anti-communism and thus keep the U.S. cash coming in.

Unhappily American aid officials apparently expended no great energy to find out whether the merchandise authorized for import was suitable for the country, or even to check whether merchandise given import licenses was actually brought into the country. "There was," recalls Haynes Miller, a former U.S. aid investigator in Laos, "an almost fairy-tale implausibility" about the result. Lao businessmen were buying and selling import licenses, arranging for phony documents, purchasing goods under the American aid program and selling them in Bangkok (Thailand) as they were unloaded from ships. Despite the fact that Lao spin and weave their minimal apparel in every village, import licenses for textiles in 1955 and 1956 ran to more than $4.5 million.

Though the country has only a few miles of road, about $1.3 million worth of automobiles were licensed for import during the same period. Lao importers, faking invoices and conniving with local officials, often got the United States to put out sums sometimes three times the real price paid.

AMERICANS AND THE FAST BUCK

In one operation a Laos businessman with proper U.S. connections got authorization to import German-made generators, actually bought up U.S. Army surplus equipment and made a fast $147,000 profit—cash—through the courtesy of Uncle Sam. Other imports listed included such unlikely items as: 37 tons of toothpaste, and 4½ tons of feather dusters.

Not all Americans in Laos were immune to the local kind of search for the fast buck. Among many U.S.-sponsored projects was road maintenance and construction. And by 1956 it looked as if one American construction company was getting favored treatment from U.S. officials. It was receiving money and equipment but there were doubts not only about how the contracts were arranged, but if they were being properly fulfilled.

U.S. investigator Miller, concurring with the assessment of the U.N., economic adviser to the Lao Government, began to air his suspicions of corruption and inefficiency. He was advised by superiors to discontinue his poking around. When he persisted he was removed from the mission. At the same time a top U.S. official was writing home to Washington fine reports about roadwork and construction. "For the first time American aid is producing something visible of major importance."

A congressional committee, after investigating the affair, saw fit to call down the U.S. authorities in Laos who were ultimately responsible for "railroading" Miller home. Another official in Laos—Public Works Officer Edward T. McNamara—admitted receiving $12,000 in cash and stocks from the company.

To such reports of bungling and inefficiency in Laos, American officials involved have an almost automatic response: "Well," they shrug, "it hasn't gone Communist, has it?"

That common consolation is not only lame, but largely inaccurate. On maps lining walls of Washington offices, Laos can of course be counted as a country in the free world. But the reality of Laos is different.

The capital and a few towns, isolated from each other by poor communications, are in government hands. Some areas are controlled by nominally pro-Western civil or military commanders who, like Chinese warlords, unpredictably shift their allegiance as the winds of power change.

Probably the largest part of the countryside belongs, in a very loose sense of the word, to the pro-Communist Pathet Lao. They do not govern it in any juridical manner. But from a few unadorned and well-hidden bases, they can roam freely over jungle trails and hills.

These Pathet Lao partisans—there are probably only some 4,000 of them—have no magic charms and they spout few Marxist slogans. They are not especially liked even by the independent back country people. But they take advantage of discontent among tribal minorities. And to many remote rice farmers and mountain tribesmen ignorant of the very existence of the State of Laos, these guerrillas are the only outside authority ever seen. There are huge regions of the country in which no official of the U.S.-supported government has ever set foot. "It's not fair to say the government lost the countryside," a Lao explained to me. "They never had it to lose."

TRUCKS BUT NO ROADS

The United States might have had the countryside—and held it—had we learned the basic lesson which the Pathet Lao and other Communist-style guerrillas know so well. To work in a country like Laos you must adapt to the terrain, make contact with and develop the local rural population. Instead the U.S. emergency aid program called for a large army to assure internal security and provide initial resistance in case of invasion. That army got U.S. equipment—most of it unsuited to Laos: armored cars, jeeps and trucks which rusted in parking lots for lack of roads; artillery designed to cannonade fixed targets but no answer to flushing out small, mobile, elusive Pathet Lao guerrillas in the jungle.

Outside of Vientiane one day last month in the fighting between Captain Kongle's forces and General Phoumi's men, I encountered a howitzer battery firing away toward the north without any forward observers. "Enemy is out there somewhere," explained a Lao officer.

Virtually the only effective combat units in the Lao Army are the two battalions of paratroopers—and these are now opposing each other. The rest of the army's 29,000 men are service troops, headquarters personnel and assorted garrison defenders who may shoot back, if assaulted. By a Lao yardstick, these soldiers are well-paid citizens. In a country where the per capita income is roughly $50 or less per year, an army private earns more than $130 annually plus food. Officers' wages range from $800 to $3,000 yearly, with extras that might include a house and car.

With the bulk of the American money going for the support of this large, ineffective, overpaid army, hardly organized for combat, little assistance ever got out into the countryside. Yet a little economic help to the rural population can be as effective a military weapon as a rifle, and much more effective than a tank.

Finally in 1957 there was some recognition that the villages had been neglected. But like most U.S. measures taken in Laos, the cure was a fast, stopgap plan, provoked largely by fear that the Communists would win local by-elections. It was called Operation Booster Shot. For some $3 million, work was begun on simple irrigation ditches, flood control dams, school repairs and other small but practical projects.

The short span of the program did not, of course, prevent some Communist success at the polls. But even in those few months, as the new U.S. Ambassador was able to report, Booster had a greater impact on Laos than any other aid program. Its cost was only a drop in the bucket—since aid to Laos by then totaled $135 million. But Washington did not, apparently, enter into any searching reappraisal of the old policy. The idea for a dynamic village aid scheme died away.

Last year the total capital earmarked for rural projects was $2.5 million. This was less than the salaries of the Americans working on them. But the growing insecurity throughout the country had by that time spread so far that neither the rural projects nor a newly planned $8.6 million road-building program ever got started. After sitting idle for months, American technicians were evacuated from Laos last week, sourly grumbling the old theme—too little and too late.

But that was not really the trouble. The United States came to Laos early and spent more per capita in aid than in almost any country in the world. Yet the United States, flexible and pragmatic at home, is often program-bound and inflexible abroad; and in Laos we showed an overriding concern for grand strategy. There was often total impatience with practical details, details which were necessary for the most elementary efforts at developing sound economic growth and political unity.

Primitive countries like Laos cannot be expected overnight to make responsible decisions, demonstrate sincere allegiance, behave like real nations or react to standard programs designed for rational modern economies. They must go through basic steps first. Putting them through such steps is a huge enterprise even for the strongest ally, and hard even without the chronic Communist danger.

In Laos the United States barely tried this basic approach. It was easier to pour in money, pay the semblance of a national army, encourage politicians who would sound sympathetic and—as emergencies inevitably succeeded one another—try a convenient tactic to get by them.

Even before Captain Kongle's coup last August sent Laos into a roil of new crises, U.S. hopes to preserve independence and integrity in Laos were not much closer to achievement than they had been back in 1955, when we started. On the level of international politics our margin to maneuver has been narrowed almost to a choice between an inconclusive kind of war and an unsatisfactory kind of peace.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if Laos goes, all southeastern Asia is in imminent danger of following and likewise going behind the Iron Curtain. This is among the crises which the Kennedy administration inherits.

In the Western Hemisphere, the Monroe Doctrine, which has stood firmly for nearly a century and a half, has been breached for the first time, and right at our door—in Cuba.

Not only has our nearest island neighbor, Cuba, gone behind the Iron Curtain, not only has the free world lost Cuba, but on the very eve of the change of administration the situation has deteriorated beyond precedent; for the Eisenhower administration, not content with turning over this most serious problem to its successor as it had been, felt obliged to sever diplomatic relations with Cuba

and create a situation without precedent or parallel in our relations with our Latin American neighbors.

Moreover, Cuba is not an isolated example of Communist penetration in Latin America. Foci of Communist infiltration exist widespread throughout the Western Hemisphere among the nations to the south of us, whom, until recent years, we could count upon as our friends, and supporters of the principles of freedom.

Eight and one-half years ago, when the administration that moved into the White House in 1953 was campaigning to achieve that end, it used as one of its slogans that it was necessary to clean up "the mess in Washington." This time, the mess is not in Washington. It is far more widespread. It extends to the fields of unemployment all over the Nation and to the grave crises abroad. The American people should realize what a terrific burden, what a terrific legacy, faces our gallant new President.

WHERE DOES CHESTER BOWLES STAND ON RED CHINA?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly be called upon to advice and consent to the nomination of Chester Bowles as Under Secretary of State. If confirmed, he will have a key role in the determination and execution of the foreign policy of the U.S. Government.

Therefore, I believe I have an obligation to present the principal reasons for my concern over his appointment, and to raise some of the points which I feel must be fully and frankly answered by Mr. Bowles before his nomination is acted upon by the Senate.

Let me say at the outset that I have no personal animosity toward Mr. Bowles. He has a distinguished record of public service, as OPA Administrator, as Ambassador to India, as Governor of Connecticut, and as a Member of Congress. He is an able and articulate spokesman for the things in which he believes, and I have found many statements in his public speeches with which I entirely agree.

However, his attitude toward Communist China raises grave and serious questions in my mind—questions which must be clearly resolved before I could conscientiously vote for his confirmation.

This issue is not a minor one. Communist China is the most populous nation on the face of the earth, but the importance of our policy toward its government is not measured by that country's size alone. Our attitude toward Red China is a crucial element in our relations with virtually all of the nations of Asia.

Where does Chester Bowles stand with respect to Red China?

First, Mr. Bowles has expressed himself in opposition to diplomatic recognition of Communist China at this time. In a speech to the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations on October 21, 1960, he said:

> In developing more realistic policies in regard to east Asia, we can avoid some emotional debates by viewing the question of recognizing the Peiping government for what it is; a diplomatic dead end street.
>
> Unless we agreed to recognize his jurisdiction over "the province of Taiwan," Mao Tse-tung would refuse under present circumstances to recognize our recognition of him. Since our commitment to the independence and defense of Taiwan is irrevocable, the question is not negotiable.

Second, Mr. Bowles has opposed Communist China's admission into the United Nations. The Democratic platform of 1960, for which he was responsible as chairman of the platform committee, says:

> We reaffirm our pledge of determined opposition to the present admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

For these two forthright statements Mr. Bowles should be commended, and if they stood alone, without being weakened or diluted by other utterances, my concern over his appointment would be greatly lessened.

Most Americans believe, and believe fervently, I think, that opposition to recognition of Red China and to admission of Red China into the United Nations are bedrock foundations of our policy. Mr. Bowles apparently does not, for he described them as "a posture and not a policy" in an address to the United Press Conference of Editors and Publishers in Washington, September 9, 1960. Here are his words:

> In regard to Communist China, one thing at least is clear; her growing strength and aggressive nature will impel us to have a policy toward her in the decade of the sixties. Even though we will continue to oppose recognition and United Nations membership for the Peiping government, such attitudes are a posture and not a policy. Of various issues from news coverage to arms control, a new administration will have to take positive measures to cope with the China problem.

What does Mr. Bowles mean by "a posture and not a policy"? What kind of "positive measures to cope with the China problem" will he advocate as Under Secretary of State?

He may have already given us some hints about this in an article entitled "The China Problem Reconsidered," which he wrote for the April 1960, issue of Foreign Affairs. Here is what he said then:

> Only when we start to move off dead center in east Asia, beginning with the creation and implementation of imaginative policies based on the reality of two Chinas, will we start to exert a constructive influence on the shape of events to come.

Exactly what does Mr. Bowles mean by "the reality of two Chinas"? For a long time the phrase "two-China policy" has had a distinct meaning—recognition of Communist China as the ruler of the Chinese mainland and Nationalist China as the ruler of Formosa only. It would appear that while Mr. Bowles asserts, no doubt sincerely, that he is opposed to the immediate formal recognition of the two Chinas, he believes in the acceptance of their reality. The difference between acceptance and recognition is very slight. I submit that the first would be only a prelude to the second.

Perhaps this is not what Mr. Bowles has in mind. Perhaps I do not clearly understand what he means by "the reality of two Chinas", but we had better find out what he means before his nomination is confirmed as Under Secretary of State. If by "reality of two Chinas" he does not mean the acceptance and ultimate recognition of two Chinas, then what does he mean?

If his use of the words "two Chinas" does mean what we know as the two-China policy, then he should not be confirmed as American Under Secretary of State.

In my opinion acceptance of the two-China policy is not only unworkable, but it would be disastrous for the United States and for the free world.

It would have to be forced on both the Republic of China and Communist China. Both are violently opposed to it.

It would be regarded as a betrayal not only by Nationalist China but by other free nations, particularly those under the shadow of Red China.

The whole series of free world alliances which are key elements in our own defense would be weakened by such evidence that we would ignore or turn our back on a stanch friend.

No small nation anywhere in the world dependent on our support would feel they could ever trust us again. What do Senators think would be the reaction in South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, South Vietnam, and Pakistan?

Would the reaction of Korea be shared by West Germany? Both of these countries are tested allies of the United States, and both are divided. A two-China policy would imply U.S. approval for two Germanys and two Koreas.

In short, it would weaken our strength and our moral leadership throughout the world.

In addition, Mr. Bowles, as I have noted above, has called for "positive measures to cope with the China problem" and for "the creation and implementation of imaginative policies."

There can be no quarrel with those concepts. Our policies should all be imaginative and positive—so long as they are not soft and gullible.

Our policies will be tested, not just for their imagination, but for how well they stack up against the dull and often brutal facts.

We should not forget, as Cardinal Cushing recently reminded us, that the Chinese Communist Government "in no way represents the will or aspirations of the Chinese people. It came to power by force and deceit, and continues to hold power by force. Today, after 10 years, less than 2 percent of the people belong to the Chinese Communist Party. It has maintained control by constant purges and the liquidation of at least 18 million Chinese. It has subjugated 600 million people, but it has not won their hearts."

The Communist Chinese Government continues to hold five Americans in prison on trumped-up and ridiculous charges. They include Catholic Bishop James E. Walsh, of Cumberland, Md., serving a 20-year sentence for espionage.

The Red Chinese Government still refuses to give any accounting for the 389

American servicemen missing from the Korean war, some of whom were known to have been alive in Communist hands at one time.

They have callously refused to take any steps on these matters. Moreover, they have used them, and every other possible pretext, as the excuse to make demands on our Government which are nothing short of blackmail and extortion.

Negotiation over news coverage is a case in point. The State Department long ago agreed to validate the passports of U.S. newsmen for travel in Communist China, but the Chinese have refused to issue visas. Negotiations, conducted by the U.S. and Red Chinese Ambassadors to Poland, have foundered over the Communist demand that newsmen be admitted to China only on the understanding that their visits are designed to promote the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Formosa.

U.S. concessions to Communist China at this time, under the present circumstances, could only involve the abject payment of blackmail demands—something no self-respecting government could agree to.

Perhaps new and imaginative policies can find a way around the dilemma—and secure the release of the five American prisoners, for instance, without the stigma of having knuckled under to extortion. But I want it clearly understood that I am unalterably opposed to any softening or weakening of our attitude toward Communist China, unless that government purges itself of its crimes by positive acts, not intimations or promises of future conduct, and by acts that are not predicated on concessions by us. All the world would regard such softening as a sign of weakness and irresolution; and these are fatal attributes for any Nation which hopes to meet the Communist challenge.

Mr. Bowles will have the opportunity during his forthcoming appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to clarify his position. Perhaps he will be able to end all doubt on these important issues. Indeed, I hope so, for this is not a partisan matter, but an issue of vital importance to our national security. However, I must say that, for me, it will require some very firm and clear-cut commitments on his part. It is hard for me to believe that anything but a softening and faltering in our policy toward Red China can result from the appointment of a man who talks as Mr. Bowles has been talking.

Mr. Bowles' concern over the long range trend of developments in East Asia is commendable, and I am not questioning his sincerity in advocating changes in our policies for Communist China. Indeed, I am not questioning his sincerity in respect to any subject.

We should be constantly testing our policies to be as certain as we can be that they serve our purposes—that they advance the cause of peace, justice, and human liberty.

In conclusion, let me quote the words of the late John Foster Dulles:

There are occasions when others, and not we, should provide the change. Nothing could be more dangerous than for the United States to operate on the theory that, if hostile and evil forces do not quickly or readily change, then it is we who must change to meet them.

FORT WORTH LEGION POST VOTES FOR REFORMS IN ELECTION LAWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Bothwell-Kane Post No. 21 of the American Legion, Department of Texas, urging a number of badly needed election law reforms on both the State and Federal level.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE BOTHWELL-KANE POST NO. 21, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS

Whereas we have associated ourselves together for God and country and are dedicated to the proposition that right shall be the master of might; and

Whereas the energies of the National American Legion, the State American Legion and the 12th district of the American Legion have been devoted in 1960 to a major register-and-vote campaign, and

Whereas participation in our Government should be encouraged rather than discouraged; and

Whereas it is essential that every vote be counted fairly and honestly, and that the sanctity of the ballot be preserved so that we, the people, shall have confidence in our elected officials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Bothwell-Kane Post No. 21 of the American Legion in its regular meeting at the veterans memorial on the 8th day of December 1960, That all political parties, the National Congress, the Texas Legislature, all veterans, all public officials and all citizens interested in good government give earnest consideration to the following recommendations for improving our American and Texas election procedures:

First. Replace the electoral college with a provision for election of the President and Vice President by popular vote. Second consideration is also recommended for the Gossett-Lodge plan for splitting the electoral vote of each State in accordance with the percentage of popular vote.

Second. Establish in Texas a permanent registration system for voters, and thereby replace the annual poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Third. Move the voter registration deadline from January 31 to 1 month prior to the first primary.

Fourth. Permit registration for national elections during a 2-week period ending 1 month before general election, and reduce residence requirements for national elections.

Fifth. Shorten the span time between election and inauguration, by providing for inauguration in the first week in January and by delaying the general election to the first Saturday in December.

Sixth Hold the presidential nominating conventions the last 2 weeks in September, in order to shorten the presidential campaign period.

Seventh. Hold the Texas party conventions the second week in September.

Eighth. Hold the first primary in Texas the first week in August, with the second primary following in the first week in September.

Ninth. Establish a joint primary election system in which both Democratic and Republican Parties participate, wherein the voter requests the ballot of the party of his choice, with such primaries to be financed by the States or the counties rather than by the candidates.

Tenth. Provide for reasonable filing fees for public office so as not to deter good men from entering public service.

Eleventh. Encourage the two-party system by basing the number of delegates to party conventions on the number of votes cast for each party's nominee for President, and restore order to conventions by reducing the number of delegates permitted on the floor; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the next 12th District convention for its approval; and that copies of this resolution be provided to all Texas Senators and Congressmen, to all members of the Texas Legislature, to the national Legion commander, to the State Legion commander, to all district commanders, to the Texas Legion News, to the American Legion magazine, and to all local news media.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. One point of the resolution calls for abolition of the poll tax in Texas. During the last session I joined in cosponsorship of a bill aimed at abolishing poll taxes in Federal elections, and I should be glad to support this proposed State action for abolition of the poll tax.

While I would want to give additional study to some of the reforms suggested in this resolution, I find myself in agreement with several of the proposed reforms and urge the resolution to the attention of the Congress.

In his letter accompanying the resolution, Post Commander Bill Wills informed me:

The post members have asked me to send the resolution to you and to express the feelings that caused its adoption. We believe each of the recommendations has merit and we urge you to give careful consideration to all of them. If you are persuaded by one or more of these ideas, we urge that you take the leadership in securing legislative approval for them.

We believe it is fundamentally important that we encourage everyone to take an active interest in government. We are convinced that it is essential for each citizen to have the utmost confidence in democratic processes and in the men who he helps elect to office. The members of our post are certain that enactment of the recommendations contained in the resolution will accomplish these ends.

Another point calls for a change in the electoral college.

Another calls for the establishment of a joint primary system, in which both Democratic and Republican Parties participate, wherein the voter requests a ballot for the party of his choice, such primaries to be financed by the State and counties, rather than by candidates. Under our present system, such campaigns are financed by the candidates, and only those of considerable means can afford it.

The tenth point provides for reasonable filing fees for public office so as not to deter good men from entering public service. In our State 5 percent of the first year's salary is required as a filing fee.

There are a number of other good provisions recommended in this resolution. I should like to give additional study to some of the proposed reforms. Some of them require further study. The resolution shows a far-reaching study by the Bothwell-Kane Post No. 21, of the American Legion, Department of Texas.

COTTON PARITY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have never taken a sectional view of the farm problem and the farm price-support program. The various basic commodities supported by marketing loans have different problems which arise at different times.

This year cotton is confronted with a specific situation which demands the attention of the new Secretary of Agriculture at an early date and, if necessary, also the attention of the Congress.

I urge the new Secretary to give his full support and assistance to a program that will hold the loan support value for cotton to at least 75 percent of parity.

This would mean about 1½ to 2 cents a pound above the 70-percent minimum permitted by law for 1961.

Let me refresh the memory of the Senate on the legislative history of the farm bill and the statements made by the Senate floor manager when the farm bill was up for consideration in 1958.

At that time we clearly committed ourselves, as a matter of legislative policy, to a loan support price in the neighborhood of 30 cents a pound for Middling 1-inch cotton in 1961.

If 70 percent of parity goes into effect, combined with the new formula substituting average-of-the-crop staple length for Middling ⅞-inch cotton, farmers would receive approximately 28 to 28½ cents a pound for Middling 1-inch cotton.

This two-way cut in the price-support loan is too drastic. Such a sharp drop in 1 year would create undue hardships throughout our cotton industry.

I consider the promises made during the 1958 consideration of the farm bill to be a clear mandate for a price of at least 30½ cents a pound for Middling inch cotton in 1961.

I am convinced that improvements in the supply and demand situation now apparent in the cotton industry fully justify a price support loan at 75 percent of parity.

I remind the new Secretary and I advise the Senate that no new change in law is necessary to make this price adjustment, because the 1958 law clearly gives the Secretary of Agriculture full discretion to act and to set the loan support price for 1961 at 75 percent of parity, instead of the minimum permitted, 70 percent.

This question should be faced promptly by the new Secretary of Agriculture. If not, then early legislation should be enacted; and I stand ready to introduce the necessary legislation on this vital matter. I hope that other Members of the Senate who are interested in this problem will express an active interest therein, and I urge them to call this matter to the special attention of the Secretary.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the second report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, issued last November, contains a number of recommendations for State and Federal action to improve the conditions of migratory workers.

Legislation regarding migratory workers will be before this session of the Congress, and I believe Members will find this report of interest and value as they prepare to take such legislative action.

I believe that the recommendations generally are good. In my opinion, too great a burden is placed upon the States and too much responsibility is imposed upon them in dealing with problems which are essentially national in character. Nevertheless, the recommendations, when taken altogether, are good and deserve the consideration of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a part of the news release announcing the report, along with a summary of the Committee recommendations, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The second report of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor, issued today by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, says that the lives of most migratory farmworkers are characterized by lack of adequate employment, low wages, poor housing, lack of education, lack of health and welfare services, and in some cases, unsafe vehicles for transportation.

The Committee report was released simultaneously with President Eisenhower's announcement that he has signed an Executive order formalizing the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. Secretary Mitchell is chairman of the Committee, other members are: Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior; Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Norman Mason, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The President's Committee on Migratory Labor has two main objectives: (1) Bringing about improved conditions for migratory workers needed under the existing patterns of agricultural production; and (2) reducing the need for workers to migrate by stabilizing agricultural employment.

Most Committee efforts thus far have been directed toward the resolving of contemporary problems. Decent camp housing, safe transportation, adequate education and health services, extension of labor laws to agricultural workers, and greater employment opportunities are matters of immediate concern to the migrant and those interested in his welfare.

The President's Committee on Migratory Labor believes that over the Nation modest progress has been made toward reaching the first objective. The Committee is cognizant of the many problems involved, and of the interlocking interests and responsibilities at all levels of Government and industry. The process of bringing to fruition needed legislative and other measures is time consuming and challenging to both Federal and State authorities.

Nevertheless, there has been progress. Five years ago, migratory agricultural workers were not covered by old-age and survivors and disability insurance. Today they are. Two years ago there were no regulations governing the interstate transportation of migratory workers. Today, such regulations exist. Twenty-one States have formed migratory labor committees since the establishment of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor. There has been improvement in the housing for migrants, and programs such as the annual worker plan have helped provide more continuous employment for migrants.

Much remains to be accomplished, however, before the job is completed. Outlined below are various areas which lend themselves most appropriately to State action, and to which the attention of State authorities is sincerely invited. Areas of Federal responsibility are similarly outlined for emphasis and for future action by the President's Committee and related Federal departments.

State responsibility: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends action by the States in the following areas:

1. Extension of State workmen's compensation laws to agricultural workers.
2. Creation of State safety regulations for the transportation of agricultural workers.
3. Extension of State child-labor legislation to hired agricultural workers.
4. Adoption and enforcement of housing regulations which apply to seasonal farm-labor housing in those States that do not already have such regulations.
5. Reimbursement to local school boards for education of migrant children.
6. Reimbursement of funds to local health agencies to assist them in extending public health services to migrant workers and their families.
7. Provision for adult education classes for migrants, including vocational education.
8. Extension of child-welfare services, including day-care facilities, to migrant children.
9. Elimination of residence requirements in all State health, education, rehabilitation, and welfare programs.
10. Employer education on worker training, employer-employee relationships, and community relations.

(NOTE.—As has been mentioned in this report, Federal-State studies on the possible extension of unemployment insurance to agriculture are now in progress. Recommendations in this field will be based on the results of these studies.)

Federal responsibilities: The President's Committee on Migratory Labor recommends action by the Federal Government in the following areas:

1. The passage of crew leader registration legislation to protect migrants from the unscrupulous practices of some crew leaders and labor contractors.
2. Adequate staffing of the Interstate Commerce Commission to insure proper enforcement of the regulations governing the interstate transportation of migratory workers in privately owned trucks and buses.
3. More positive leadership and guidance of State extension programs for education and service to migrants.
4. Continuing review of all foreign labor import programs to make certain that the importation of foreign workers does not have an adverse effect on the employment opportunities, wages, and working conditions of domestic farm workers.
5. Elimination of residence requirements as a condition for receipt of Federal funds.
6. Continued and strengthened emphasis and encouragement of action to assure the provision of needed health services to migrant families and adequate housing whether that housing is in camps, isolated units, or farms, or fringe areas of towns.

AGRICULTURAL INCOME EQUALIZATION ACT OF 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this 87th Congress has a mandate to devise and enact a new national farm program. If its efforts are to result in a realistic and effective plan, it must face up to four fundamental facts.

The first is that the only justification for a farm program is to increase farm income.

The second is that farm program dollars which do not go directly into the pockets of the farmers are wasted.

The third is that to be workable, a farm program must restore to the farmer the responsibility for marketing what he grows.

And the fourth is that to be successful, a farm program must be correlated with the entire economy and serve the best interests of both farmers and consumers.

I regret to say, Mr. President, that none of the election-year solutions to our grave agricultural problems proposed last year takes all of those factors into account. None of the campaign ideas put forward envisions the bold, front-door approach which the farm crisis demands.

All of the fancy formulas and high-sounding schemes for saving the Nation's agricultural economy are worth less than the paper on which they are written unless they have as their basis the solution of this country's No. 1 economic ill—farm income which is less than one-third that earned in other phases of the national economy.

If all that was required to achieve that solution was the mere expenditure of tax dollars, then Ezra Taft Benson would have gone down in history as the savior of American agriculture. Under his direction, the Department of Agriculture spent more during the last 8 years than during all the previous 90 years of its existence, combined. Yet, despite all his spending, Mr. Benson distinguished himself only by reducing farm income by 24 percent and forcing more than 5 million persons to leave the farms of America.

We know from experience, Mr. President, that programs which seek to solve farm problems by reducing acreage and prices result only in creating vicious cycles of surplus and depression and in placing an intolerable burden on the taxpayers of the country, without helping the farmers.

All of the variations of farm programs which have been tried to date have suffered from the same fatal flaw; that is, they all put the U.S. Government in the business of buying, transporting, storing and selling farm commodities and, consequently, have piled up the $9 billion agricultural surplus with which the taxpayers are stuck. I know the theory has been that the Government only makes loans on the security of unsold crops, but the result has been that the Government has been left with the farmers' mistakes and, in trying to get rid of them, has disrupted the Nation's agricultural economy to the point of disaster.

It is to be hoped, Mr. President, that Congress will profit from the sad experience of the past and, taking heed of the lessons it teaches, will step ahead instead of backward in working out a permanent solution to our agricultural problems.

Mr. President, I have given long and serious study to this subject. And, as I have stated previously before the Senate, I am convinced that the only way in which the desired solution can be achieved is through discarding the present patchwork of discredited farm laws and taking a fresh start which will get away from the compounded failures and stereotyped concepts of the past. I am further convinced that such a program must have three coequal objectives: First, to let the farmer farm; second, to guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income; and, third, to place American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices.

It was to those objectives that I addressed the Talmadge farm plan which I introduced during both the 85th and 86th Congresses and which I rise today to reintroduce in a revised and perfected form.

Stated simply, Mr. President, my bill would free the Nation's economy of the expensive and ineffectual farm laws which have caused the present disastrous agricultural depression, and restore American agriculture to a free-enterprise basis, bolstered by a system of compensatory payments limited to domestically consumed basic commodities.

It would eliminate all acreage controls and government loans and, instead, assign to each farmer a domestic production quota. Expressed in terms of pounds, bushels, bales, and other appropriate units of measurement, that quota would be the same percentage of the previous year's national consumption of basic commodities as the farmer's average annual production bears to the total national average production.

The farmer would market what he produced and would be guaranteed the difference between the price he received for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity. He would have to submit a bill of sale to qualify for his support payment, and no farmer would be allowed to receive more than $12,500 in Government payments in any one year.

Payments also would be prohibited to contract farmers and to farmers whose families have total nonfarm incomes of more than $5,000 a year.

To quality for inclusion in the program, a farmer would have to agree to place a specified portion of his land over 30 acres—but not exceeding 20 percent of his total acreage—into conservation practices without compensation.

Commodities covered by the program would be corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and the various classes of wheat. Tobacco would continue under its present program and would not be affected.

It has been argued that under such a plan the farmer would plant himself into the ground. I do not accept that thesis, because, I believe farmers are good businessmen who will not plant crops they cannot sell 2 years in a row. However, out of an abundance of caution, I have provided in my revised bill authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to impose marketing quotas whenever it appears that market prices are about to fall below 75 percent of parity in the case of peanuts, corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, or butterfat; 60 percent of parity in the case of each of the various classes of wheat; and 55 percent of parity in the case of cotton or rice.

Another feature of the bill I am introducing today is the four-step program for disposing of the $9-billion-plus agricultural surplus which Mr. Benson has accumulated.

The first step would be to prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from acquiring further stocks of commodities covered by the act.

The second step would be to have the Secretary of Agriculture and the National Security Council make a determination as to the amount of the surplus which should be set aside and preserved as a strategic reserve.

The third step would be to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend specific legislation for prompt disposition of as much as possible of the surplus through normal trade channels.

The fourth—and, by far, the one offering the most promise—would be to absorb the remainder of the surplus in the farm program itself.

The first three steps are self-explanatory, and the fourth would be accomplished in this way:

Any farmer so electing could, by agreeing to put into conservation practices without payment the amount of land on which he would grow his domestic production quota, receive from the Secretary of Agriculture a negotiable certificate entitling him to sell the equivalent of his quota from surplus stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

No compensatory payments would be paid on such sales as the participating farmers would have, in effect, received such payments in eliminating the cost of growing their shares of the domestic market.

Under such an arrangement existing commodities would be substituted unit for unit for assigned quotas which would assure against disruption of normal trade channels. In addition, farmers electing the option would still be free to grow on land not thus committed to conservation practices as much of any commodity as they might desire to attempt to sell on the world market.

Another feature of the new version of the Talmadge farm plan is that it places upon the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility for sending to Congress each year a detailed report setting forth both the short- and long-range objectives of the Department of Agriculture and specific legislative recommendations for achieving them.

The cost of the Talmadge farm plan would depend upon the resulting free market price levels of the covered basic commodities, but in any event it would be considerably less than that of the present program. It would likely vary between $2 and $3 billion, and agricultural experts of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress have estimated its potential saving to the taxpayer at between $2 and $3 billion a year.

While costing less, it ultimately would put perhaps as much as $1 billion a year more in the pockets of the farmers. As paradoxical as that might seem, it would

be the case because the high costs of administering the present bureaucratic program would be considerably reduced. For instance, one of the costs which would be greatly reduced and eventually ended would be the billion dollars a year now being spent to handle surplus agricultural commodities.

Furthermore, whatever its ultimate cost might prove to be, the Talmadge farm plan would assure that every farm program dollar went into the pockets of the farmers of America, which decidedly is not the case at the present time.

Even more important than the financial considerations are the intangible advantages to be derived from a free enterprise farm program bolstered by compensatory payments.

Such an approach is extremely simple and would take the redtape out of the farm program.

Such an approach would eliminate the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls.

Such an approach would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases.

Such an approach would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, and selling farm commodities and place the responsibility for marketing with the farmer and private enterprise, where it belongs.

Such an approach would guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income and restore agriculture to a free-enterprise, competitive base.

Such an approach would end the accumulation of the national farm surplus which has glutted the Nation's markets and stagnated its economy.

Such an approach would make the national farm program an estimable budget item which would remain relatively stable over the years.

Such an approach would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American agricultural products, both raw and processed, back on the world markets at competitive prices.

Such an approach would give the farmer protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and right to collective bargaining and industry's tariff and Government contracts and subsidies.

Such an approach would take the realistic view that the only justification for a farm program is to increase the income of farmers and would seek to do that by going in the front, instead of the back, door.

Such an approach would mark a new and fresh start which would release agriculture from the bonds of past mistakes and relieve the Nation's economy of the burdens of abortive farm laws.

My proposal has been loudly criticized by both those who want no farm program at all and those who want even more stringent controls than we already have. Mr. Benson, for example, saw fit to call the Talmadge farm plan a long step toward a fully socialized agriculture and maintained it joined the issue of Government control versus freedom.

To the former assertion, I would reply that Mr. Benson either is totally ignorant of the provisions of the Talmadge farm plan or he was looking in the mirror at his own mess of a program when he coined his description.

To the latter claim I would say that it is true that the issue has been joined but that the roles are the reverse of what he would have them be.

My recollection of elementary economics is that socialism is synonymous with nationalization or government ownership and control.

Now, I ask, Mr. President, would American agriculture be more nationalized under my plan whereby the farmer could plant what he pleases and be held responsible for selling what he grows, or under the present plan whereby the Government tells the farmer how much he can grow and then buys, stores, transports and sells it for him?

My knowledge of the present farm program which stems from my own experience as a farmer operating under it is that its basis is drastic and ever-constricting acreage controls.

Now, I ask, Mr. President, would the American farmer have more freedom under my plan whereby the farmer would be free to decide for himself what and how much he would grow, or under the present plan whereby the Government puts strict limits on his planting and subjects him to stiff penalties for failing to comply with them?

I think the answers to those questions are obvious.

There have been some who have sought to label my proposal a "Brannan plan."

Such a label is not supported by the facts of the matter.

The only point of similarity between the Talmadge and the Brannan plans is the compensatory payment idea, and, if it is the intent of critics to equate that feature of my proposal with the Brannan plan, then by the same logic it also could be called the Eisenhower plan, the Seaton plan and, yes, even the Benson plan.

That is true because officials by those names have advocated a similar application of the compensatory payment idea to producers of metals and growers of wool and sugar.

While I am enough of an old-fashioned Jeffersonian Democrat to believe that we would all be better off if our entire economy were freed and allowed to seek its own level, I am also, by the same token, enough of a realist to know that with virtually every other segment of the Nation's economy protected by law, the farmer cannot be left as the only person without a legislative guarantee of his proportionate share of the national income.

If the farmer is to share in the general prosperity of the rest of the country—if he is to own an automobile, send his children to school, and give his family a reasonable standard of living—it is essential that a new farm program be devised which will give him that assurance.

The American standard of living is the highest in the world and to deny the American farmer legislative protection in the enjoyment of it would amount to putting him into direct competition with farmers in countries where living standards are minute fractions of our own and to make of him a virtual peon in a land of plenty.

The sands of history are littered with the wrecks of civilizations and nations which perished as the result of dissipating and destroying their independent farming populations.

The vitality of any people stems from the soil, and it is an inexorable law of nature that it withers and dies when its roots are transplanted to a wholly urban culture.

The worst fate which could befall our country would be for urban Americans to lose sight of the fact that their present and their future are dependent upon the maintenance of a vital and progressive agriculture.

The day we allow ourselves to be deceived into believing that the American farmer is an economic liability will be the day which marks the beginning of the end of our great Nation.

Americans must look beyond their own personal interests and recognize the great truth uttered by Daniel Webster when he declared:

> Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of civilization.

That is why, Mr. President, we must look to our farms as the only source of a posterity which cherishes its freedom and is dedicated to its preservation.

That is why, Mr. President, we must do whatever is necessary to sustain our farms as the roots of our great American civilization.

That is why, Mr. President, it is imperative that this Congress act soon and decisively to write and enact a workable and productive farm program which will assure for all time to come that those roots will continue to nourish and replenish the life's blood of our Nation.

It is in the hope, therefore, Mr. President, that my ideas can make some contribution toward those deliberations that I herewith introduce my bill and ask unanimous consent that it be read twice, appropriately referred, and that the text of it printed in the RECORD at this juncture.

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

The bill (S. 487) to provide a new farm program for certain specified agricultural commodities under which American agriculture will be restored to a free-enterprise basis, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Agricultural Income Equalization Act of 1961".

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to afford to the farmers of the United States legislative protection and assistance equivalent to that received by

other segments of the national economy. It is recognized that previous farm legislation has failed to achieve that end, and that a policy of reduced acreage and reduced prices leads only to reducing farm income to a disastrous level. Therefore, it is the purpose of Congress, in enacting the program provided for in this Act, to free the Nation's economy of the burdens of abortive farm laws and to restore American agriculture to a free enterprise basis bolstered by a system of compensatory payments. The objectives of Congress is so doing are (1) to let the farmer farm, (2) guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income, and (3) place American agricultural commodities back on the world market at competitive prices.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION QUOTA

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall proclaim each year a domestic consumption quota for corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and each class of wheat, respectively. Such quota shall be proclaimed in terms of pounds, in the case of peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat; bushels, in the case of corn, oats, barley, rye, and each class of wheat; and bales, in the case of cotton.

(b) The domestic consumption quota for any year for cotton, peanuts, rice, and each class of wheat shall be the average annual amount of such commodity consumed domestically during the three years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the domestic consumption quota is proclaimed for any such commodity. The domestic consumption quota for any year for corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, and rye shall be the amount of such commodity sold domestically during the year immediately preceding the year in which such quota is proclaimed. The domestic consumption quota for any year for fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat shall be the domestic civilian disappearance for food from commercial sources during the year immediately preceding the year in which such quota is proclaimed. The Secretary shall proclaim the domestic consumption quota for any year for any specified commodity in the calendar year immediately preceding the marketing year for which such quota is proclaimed.

ASSIGNMENT AND DETERMINATION OF FARM DOMESTIC PRODUCTION QUOTAS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall assign each year, after the effective date of this Act, to every eligible farm on which is produced one or more of the specified commodities a domestic production quota for each such commodity. The domestic production quota for any such farm with respect to any such commodity shall be determined by the Secretary in terms of pounds, in the case of peanuts, rice, sorghum grain, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat; bushels in the case of corn, oats, barley, rye, and each class of wheat; and bales, in the case of cotton.

(b) (1) Any farm in order to be eligible to receive a domestic production quota for cotton, peanuts, or rice must have received an acreage allotment under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for such commodity during the twelve months prior to the enactment of this Act. Any farm in order to be eligible to receive a domestic production quota for corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and each class of wheat must have produced such commodity for sale during any two or more of the five years immediately prior to the enactment of this Act.

(2) No farm shall be assigned a domestic production quota for any specified commodity unless the owner or operator of such farm contracts with the Secretary (A) to devote to soil conserving practices, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, without payment, a percentage of the tillable acreage of the farm in excess of thirty acres which corresponds to the percentage of the total tillable acreage of all farms not needed (as determined by the Secretary) for the production for sale of such commodity sufficient to accomplish the purposes of this Act, but not to exceed in the case of any farm for any one commodity 20 per centum of the total tillable acreage of such farm in excess of thirty acres, (B) to comply with such marketing regulations governing such commodity produced on such farm as the Secretary may prescribe pursuant to section 7, and (C) to comply with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may from time to time prescribe with respect to production quotas and compensatory payments made under this Act.

(c) (1) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for cotton, peanuts, and rice shall be an amount of such commodity which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such commodity for such year (as proclaimed by the Secretary) as the average production from the acreage allotment for such farm for the five-year period 1956 to 1960, inclusive, bears to the average annual production from the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such period.

(2) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for any class of wheat shall be an amount of such class of wheat which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such class of wheat as the estimated average annual acreage seeded on such farm to such class of wheat in 1952 and 1953 multiplied by the average yield per acre of such farm for such class of wheat bears to the national average annual acreage seeded to such class of wheat in 1952 and 1953 multiplied by the national average yield per acre for such class of wheat. For the purposes of this section "average yield" means the annual average yield per acre for the seven highest yielding years of the ten-year period 1951 to 1960, inclusive.

(3) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, and rye shall be an amount of such commodity which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such commodity as the average production for commercial sale of such commodity for such farm for the five-year period 1956 to 1960, inclusive, bears to the average national production of such commodity for commercial sale for such period.

(4) The domestic production quota for any farm in any year for fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat shall be an amount of such commodity which bears the same ratio to the domestic consumption quota (less any portion withheld pursuant to subsection (d)) for such commodity as the average production of such commodity for domestic civilian food sales for such farm for the five-year period 1956 to 1960, inclusive, bears to the average national production of such commodity for domestic civilian food sales for such period.

(d) The Secretary shall withhold from the domestic consumption quota, proclaimed pursuant to section 3, in any year for any specified commodity an amount of such quota not to exceed 3 per centum for use in making domestic production quotas available to new farms and to increase farm production quotas in hardship cases. From any such amount withheld, the Secretary shall make available farm domestic production quotas to farms ineligible for quotas under subsection (c) of this section, and may increase farm domestic production quotas in hardship cases. The Secretary shall prescribe requirements of eligibility for new farms and for hardship cases and shall assign farm domestic quotas to new farms and increase quotas in hardship cases on as equitable a basis as possible.

COMPENSATORY PAYMENTS

SEC. 5. (a) Any producer whose farm has been assigned a domestic production quota pursuant to section 4 for any specified commodity shall receive compensatory payments for such quota as provided in this section.

(b) The Secretary shall pay to any such producer, with respect to any such commodity produced on his farm within such quota, the amount, if any, by which the parity price for such commodity (for the year in which such commodity is sold by him) exceeds the national average market price for such commodity (for the year in which such commodity is sold by him).

(c) No producer shall be paid a compensatory payment except upon presentation by him of a receipt of sale of the commodity produced by him. He may receive compensatory payment upon any portion of his quota for which a receipt of sale is submitted. In no event shall any producer be paid an amount in excess of $12,500 in compensatory payments for any one year.

(d) Compensatory payments shall be made in such manner and at such times as the Secretary shall prescribe, and receipts of sale required under this section shall be in such form and contain such information as he shall prescribe.

(e) No producer shall be paid a compensatory payment on any commodity for any year under the provisions of this Act if such producer during such year—

(1) marketed any specified commodity produced on his farm in violation of any marketing agreement regulation for such commodity prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to section 7;

(2) had a total income, together with any member or members of his dependent family, from off-farm sources in an amount greater than $5,000 during the preceding year;

(3) entered into a contract with a prospective purchaser for any specified commodity produced on such producer's farm for which payments are provided by this Act under which the prospective purchaser contributed in any manner to the financing of all or any part of the costs of producing such commodity;

(4) failed to devote a percentage of his acreage to soil conserving practices pursuant to the provisions of section 4(b)(2); or

(5) violated the provisions of any regulation issued by the Secretary under this Act.

PAYMENT IN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

SEC. 6. (a) Any producer eligible for a farm domestic production quota for any specified commodity for any year may elect pursuant to the provisions of this section not to plant such quota for such commodity for such year and receive a certificate issued by the Secretary which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in agricultural commodities owned by the United States. No person shall be paid a compensatory payment on any commodity delivered by the Commodity Credit Corporation in redemption of any certificate issued under the provisions of this section.

(b) In order to be eligible for a certificate as provided in subsection (a), such producer shall agree to devote to soil conserving practices, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, such portion (as determined by the Secretary) of his tillable acreage as would have been utilized for the production of his quota for such commodity for such year. Such portion shall be in addition to any acreage he would have been required to devote to soil conserving practices in order to be eligible for compensatory payments on such commodity under this Act.

(c) Any producer who withholds any commodity from production pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be entitled to receive, upon presentation to the Commodity Credit Corporation of the certificate issued to him, an amount of such commodity equal to (or equivalent in value to) the amount of such commodity the producer would have normally produced, as determined by the Secretary, had such producer planted his farm production quota to such commodity. A certificate may be issued only for the same kind of commodity withheld from production by the producer to whom such certificate is issued and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not in redeeming any certificate deliver any commodity other than the commodity for which such certificate was issued.

(d) Certificates issued pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be freely transferable and each certificate shall indicate on its face (1) the amount of the commodity, expressed in appropriate units of measure, for which such certificate may be redeemed, and (2) the minimum dollar value of the commodity for which such certificate was issued. The dollar value indicated on any such certificate shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the market price, at the time such certificate is issued, of the average class, grade, or staple, as the case may be, of the commodity (for which such certificate was issued) produced by the producer to whom such certificate was issued in the last year in which such commodity was produced by him. Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payment in cash for any certificate issued under the provisions of this section.

(e) Any certificate issued pursuant to the provisions of this section may be redeemed by the holder thereof at the warehouse or storage facility of the Commodity Credit Corporation nearest such holder, unless the Secretary indicates that the commodities of such warehouse or storage facility are not available for such purpose. No transportation costs shall be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to the transportation of any commodity after such commodity has been delivered in redemption of a certificate at the warehouse or storage facility of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

(f) The Secretary shall have authority to discontinue or suspend temporarily the right of producers to an election under this section with respect to any or all commodities at any time he determines the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation are insufficient to carry out the purposes of this Act.

EMERGENCY MARKETING REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. As an emergency safeguard to prevent the price of any specified commodity from dropping to a level which would overload the domestic or world market and prevent producers from receiving a reasonable price for such commodity on the open market, the Secretary is authorized and directed to effectuate such marketing regulations for any marketing year with respect to any specified commodity as he determines necessary in order to maintain the national average price received by farmers for such commodity during such marketing year at not less than the following percentage of the parity price for such commodities: (1) in the case of peanuts, corn, sorghum grain, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, and butterfat, 75 per centum, (2) in the case of each class of wheat, 60 per centum, and (3) in the case of cotton and rice, 55 per centum.

APPLICABILITY

SEC. 8. The provisions of this Act shall apply to farms in the several States and territories, and in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

PUBLICATION AND NOTICE OF FARM DOMESTIC PRODUCTION QUOTAS

SEC. 9. All domestic production quotas assigned to farms in a county or other local administrative area shall, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, be made and kept freely available for public inspection in such county or other local administrative area. Notice of the farm domestic production quota assigned to a farm shall be mailed to the owner or operator of such farm.

REVIEW OF ASSIGNED QUOTAS

SEC. 10. (a) Any farmer who is dissatisfied with the farm production quota established for his farm may, within fifteen days after mailing to him of notice as provided in section 9, have such quota reviewed by a local review committee of three farmers from the same or nearby counties appointed by the Secretary. Unless application for review is made within such period, the original determination of the farm domestic production quota shall be final.

(b) The members of the review committee shall receive as compensation for their services the same per diem as that received by the members of the committee utilized for the purposes of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended. The members of the review committee shall not be entitled to receive compensation for more than thirty days in any one year.

INSTITUTE OF PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 11. If the producer is dissatisfied with the determination of the review committee, he may, within fifteen days after a notice of such determination is mailed to him by registered mail, file suit against the review board as defendant in the United States district court, or institute proceedings for review in any court of record of the State having general jurisdiction, sitting in the county or the district in which his farm is located, for the purpose of obtaining a review of such determination. Bond shall be given in an amount and with surety satisfaction to the court to secure the United States for the cost of the proceeding. The bill of complaint in such proceeding may be served by delivering a copy thereof to any one of the members of the review committee. Thereupon the review committee shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record upon which the determination complained of was made, toegther with its findings of fact.

COURT REVIEW

SEC. 12. The review by the court shall be limited to questions of law, and the finding of fact by the review committee, if supported by the evidence, shall be conclusive. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there was reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the review committee, the court may direct such additional evidence to be taken before the review committee in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. The review committee may modify its findings of fact or its determination by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and it shall file with the court such modified findings or determination, which findings of fact shall be conclusive. At the earliest convenient time, the court, in term time or vacation, shall hear and determine the case upon the original record of the hearing before the review committee, and upon such record as supplemented, if supplemented, by further hearing before the review committee pursuant to direction of the court. The court shall affirm the review committee's determination, or modified determination, if the court determines that the same is in accordance with the law. If the court determines that such determination or modified determination is not in accordance with law, the court shall remand the proceeding to the review committee with direction either to make such determination as the court shall determine to be in accordance with law or to take such further proceedings as, in the court's opinion, the law requires.

STAY OF PROCEEDINGS AND EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION

SEC. 13. The commencement of judicial proceedings under this Act shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the review committee's determination. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the jurisdiction conferred by this Act to review the legal validity of a determination made by a review committee pursuant to this Act shall be exclusive. No court of the United States or of any State shall have jurisdiction to pass upon the legal validity of any such determination except in a proceeding under this Act.

NO EFFECT ON OTHER QUOTAS

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding any increase of any farm as a result of review of the determination thereof under this Act, the domestic production quota for other farms shall not be affected.

REPEALS; EFFECT ON SOIL BANK

SEC. 15. (a) All provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, relating to acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price support shall be ineffective with respect to any specified commodity after the effective date of this Act, except that any right, claim, or action which accrued under any such provisions prior to such effective date shall not be affected.

(b) The provisions of section 114 of the Soil Bank Act, relating to compliance with acreage allotments for any specified commodity, shall be ineffective after the effective date of this Act. Except with respect to compliance with acreage allotment requirements nothing in this Act shall be construed as altering the terms of any contract entered into under the provisions of the Soil Bank Act.

MILK MARKETING ORDERS

SEC. 16. Milk orders established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreements Act shall be reviewed and may be amended to take into account the payments made pursuant to this Act and the purposes of this Act to improve farm family income in relation to the criteria provided in this Act.

RULES AND REGULATIONS; PROHIBITED ACTS

SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act.

(b) The Secretary shall include in such regulations acceptable marketing practices for the disposition of the specified commodities for which compensatory payments are to be paid.

(c) Any person who knowingly and willfully violates any rule or regulation promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to this section for the purpose of obtaining a compensatory payment or a certificate issued under the provisions of section 6 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or one year in jail, or both.

(d) The Secretary shall prescribe rules and regulations providing for the cancellations of the production quota assigned any farm in the event the owner or operator of such farm is guilty of violating any rule or regulation prescribed by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

UTILIZATION OF LOCAL, COUNTY, AND STATE COMMITTEES

SEC. 18. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary shall utilize the local,

county, and State committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 19. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ACQUISITIONS AND DISPOSITIONS BY THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SEC. 20. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not after the effective date of this Act acquire any additional stocks of specified commodities.

(b) The Secretary shall, in conjunction with the National Security Council, make a determination as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the kinds and quantities of agricultural stocks owned by the United States that are needed for purposes of a strategic reserve to protect this country against shortage of such stocks in the event of a national emergency.

(c) The Secretary shall, immediately after such determination has been made, submit to the Congress specific recommendations for legislation necessary to provide for the prompt disposition, by such means as would not adversely affect normal trade channels, of any agricultural stocks owned by the United States in excess of those needed for strategic reserve purposes.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SHORT AND LONG RANGE LEGISLATION

SEC. 21. The Secretary of Agriculture, with the advice and assistance of other appropriate officials and agencies of the Executive Branch of the Government, shall prepare and submit to Congress at the beginning of each session of Congress a detailed report setting forth both the short and long range objectives of the Department of Agriculture with reference to achieving and maintaining prosperity and living standards for the agricultural economy equivalent to those afforded persons dependent upon other gainful occupation, and shall submit specific recommendations for legislation and appropriations required to achieve such objectives.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 22. The provisions of this Act shall become effective on December 31, 1961, except that the Secretary may by proclamation make such provisions effective with respect to any specified commodity prior to such date if he finds that such action will effectuate the policy and purposes of this Act as declared in section 2. In the event the provisions of this Act are effected with respect to any such commodity prior to December 31, 1961, the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended shall, as prescribed in section 15(a), become ineffective with respect to any such commodity as of the date the Secretary proclaims the provisions of this Act effective with respect to such commodity.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 23. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) The term "specified commodities" shall mean corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, grain sorghum, oats, barley, rye, fluid milk, manufacturing milk, butterfat, and each class of wheat, respectively;

(3) The term "fluid milk" shall mean whole milk sold by producers in fluid form which is sold to the ultimate consumer as whole milk in fluid form;

(4) The term "manufacturing milk" shall mean all whole milk sold by producers in fluid form for use in the manufacture of the products of milk;

(5) The term "butterfat" shall mean all butterfat sold by producers in the form of fluid cream.

(6) The term "parity price" shall mean parity price as such term was defined in section 301(a)(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, prior to the effective date of this Act; and

(7) The term "producer" shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, or estate.

(b) As used in this Act the term "cotton" shall not include extra long staple cotton as described in section 347(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD H. REES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for the first time in 24 years, a new Congress has opened without having as one of its Members my very good friend and coworker Edward H. Rees, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas.

Ed was a good legislator, a fighter for the principles in which he believed, and a sincere public servant, one devoted and dedicated to the cause of good government.

Legislation proposed and sponsored by him in the interest and welfare of our Federal civil service employees will stand as a mark of his leadership and his statesmanship.

There have been many good editorials written about Ed Rees. One of the best I have seen is the one written by E. C. Hallbeck, the very able president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, AFL–CIO. It appears in the January issue of the Union Postal Clerk.

I ask unanimous consent this editorial be printed in the RECORD along with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

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

EDWARD H. REES

When the 87th Congress convenes, a number of our friends will be among the missing, some retiring of their own choice and some having been defeated in their bids for reelection. Among the former is the kindly Edward H. Rees, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas for 24 years, from 1937 to 1960, inclusive. During his entire period of service Mr. Rees was a member of a committee that had much to do with the welfare of Government employees; first, as a member of the House Committee on Civil Service and, following the Reorganization Act which combined that committee with the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service where he had the honor of serving as the first chairman.

To list all of the beneficial measures that have been enacted for postal and Federal employees during Ed Rees' service on the committee would in itself be quite a job; but perhaps some faint idea of the magnitude of the task can be realized by recalling that at the time he came to Congress the substitutes' hourly rate was 65 cents, regardless of how long they subbed, and a regular clerk received a wage of $1,700 to $2,100 per annum. Postal employees had 10 days sick leave and 15 days annual leave each year, regardless of service; and the average employee with 30 years of service at age 65 received $1,200 per annum upon retirement, with no provision for his widow or dependents. Substitutes received neither sick nor annual leave. There was no such thing as life insurance, hospital and surgical benefits, or other fringe benefits.

Ed Rees played a conspicuous part in the effort to enact all of the legislation that brought about the conditions we enjoy today; and while it would not be entirely correct to say that he voted for every single bill in our interest during all of those years, it would be entirely proper to say that he supported most of them and where his views differed from ours, it was a difference of degree rather than principle. It is also proper to recall that Mr. Rees was chairman of the committee when the Congress enacted what, up until this year, was the largest single salary increase ever granted to postal employees, as well as the most far-reaching and advanced retirement measure ever to become law.

For all of these we are grateful, but we are also grateful for his kindly and friendly counsel; for his patience and fairness; and for his unfailing devotion to the cause of good government. We are personally grateful for his many unobstrusive acts of kindness. Ed Rees could disagree without being disagreeable. He could oppose without becoming petty or vindictive. We salute him for these sterling qualities.

We wish for Ed and Mrs. Rees a long, healthy, and happy life, filled with all of the blessings that life may bestow. Of him we say—Well done, thou good and faithful soldier.

MR. LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this morning's issue of the New York Times there appeared an article by Mr. Arthur Krock, a columnist of the New York Times, criticizing—and I think it would be accurate to say castigating—some of us who led the fight on the floor of the Senate in the not too distant past against the confirmation of Mr. Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce. In the article Mr. Krock, as is so frequently typical of hasty journalistic writing, and particularly typical of his column, demonstrated once again that he had not done his bookwork. He has taken an obiter dictum passage out of the recent Supreme Court decision on the infamous Dixon-Yates case and has sought to use it to sustain his fallacious conclusion that Mr. Strauss knew little about the Dixon-Yates contract. If he had done his bookwork, he would have known the fact was completely to the contrary.

In the course of his column Mr. Krock stated:

However, the Chief Justice wrote by way of dictum, "True as it is" that Wenzell's superiors in the Budget Bureau know of "his activities and of his interest in First Boston, it is significant, we think, that: * * * no one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project.

May I say most respectfully that the question as to Strauss' knowledge of the Dixon-Yates contract was not at issue before the Supreme Court. Had it been at issue, then I am satisfied that Chief Justice Warren would have made a more

careful examination of the record before he wrote the language that is now contained in his obiter dictum.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Krock, published this morning in the New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AN OBITER DICTUM OF SOME ANTIQUARIAN INTEREST

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—Shortly after midnight, June 19, 1959, the Senate by a vote of 49 to 46 declined to confirm President Eisenhower's nomination of Lewis L. Strauss of Virginia to be Secretary of Commerce. Many of the Senators who voted to reject, including the majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, gave no reason for participating in an action by which the President of the United States has only on eight occasions been overruled in his Cabinet selections.

Senator Kennedy generalized the rejection as a disagreeable job done in the national interest. But others of the 49 explained they voted against Strauss' confirmation because, as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, he had been active in behalf of negotiating the Dixon-Yates contract.

As sometimes before when the Senate has sought more popular ground on which to base an action dominated by partisan politics and/or personal vendetta, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, had provided it. Senators McGee and O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, had already done some effective scouting in the area. Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, had previously made it clear to some Democrats who were disposed to vote for Strauss that he would take rejection as an endorsement of his position in the longstanding controversy between him and the AEC chairman. And news reporters had found a strong impression in the Democratic cloakroom that a vote against Strauss would be far from displeasing to majority leader JOHNSON, who eventually also voted to reject the nomination.

Then rose Senator MORSE to say as follows: "I do not deny that Mr. Strauss is probably a very intelligent man * * *. I do not think he is disloyal to our country and our form of government. (Strauss had been accused of obstructing the right of Congress to be given executive information within its constitutional sphere.) * * * I do not find that Mr. Strauss has used his powers or office, or will use them, to enrich himself * * *. There is no indication of his personal conflict of interest."

"But," he continued, "the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. KEFAUVER, has given the Senate a carefully documented account of the Dixon-Yates scandal and the role Mr. Strauss played in its negotiation, * * * [and] in his effort to foist this illegal contract upon the country Mr. Strauss was an enemy of the American people."

Last week the Supreme Court decided, 6 to 3, that this contract between the Government and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. (the Dixon-Yates combine) was indeed illegal and therefore unenforcible. Chief Justice Warren, for the Court, upheld the Department of Justice's claim to this effect, on the ground that the role of Adolphe E. Wenzell as a Budget Bureau consultant in the negotiation of the contract, while retaining his connection with and pay from the First Boston Corp., violated the conflict-of-interest statute. The Chief Justice held it to be irrelevant that the Budget Bureau sought and encouraged Wenzell's participation with full knowledge of his dual role. And he rejected a Court of Claims award, made on the basis of this knowledge, to the M.V.G. Co. of about $1.9 million for costs it had incurred in preparations to execute the Government-signed contract.

However, the Chief Justice wrote by way of dictum, "True as it is" that Wenzell's superiors in the Budget Bureau knew of "his activities and of his interest in First Boston," it is significant, we think, that—

No one in the AEC, which was the Government's contracting agency, and which had expressed reluctance about the contract throughout the negotiations, had knowledge until December 1954, that Wenzell, while serving as a consultant to the Budget Bureau, had been meeting with and supplying information to the sponsors regarding the project.

It is also significant, though now of mere antiquarian interest to anyone but the victim of the charge made by MORSE and other Democrats as a principal reason for rejecting Strauss, that in this period he was Chairman of that very AEC in which no one knew of the duality of Wenzell and which had been reluctant at all times to negotiate the contract. But it is characteristic of politics, and therefore not at all significant, that no Senator who made the charge against Strauss of "an effort to foist this illegal contract on the country" has taken any notice whatever of the finding to the exact contrary by the entire Supreme Court, dissenters included.

Mr. MORSE. So Mr. Krock this morning, seizing upon the obiter dictum of Chief Justice Warren's decision, seeks to give the American people the impression that those of us in the Senate, when it was an issue as to whether Mr. Strauss had knowledge of Wenzell's conduct, were in error in the criticisms we made of Mr. Strauss during the confirmation hearing.

By way of introduction to my reply to Mr. Krock, I wish to repeat that Mr. Strauss knew of Wenzell's conflict of interest conduct in connection with the contract, and that after he knew of it, he continued to support and defend the contract.

I now take the time to prove it from the record.

When a journalist of Mr. Krock's alleged standing is guilty of the misleading representation that he makes in his column this morning, it is important that he be answered, and that the facts be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. Arthur Krock makes about as poor a case in defense of his friend, Lewis Strauss, as it is possible to make. He makes it only by ignoring most of the facts regarding Strauss and his involvement in the Dixon-Yates contract.

As I have pointed out, the reference in the Supreme Court opinion to the Atomic Energy Commission and the conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates contract is just what the headline on Mr. Krock's column calls it—an obiter dictum. In law, an obiter dictum is an incidental remark or opinion of the judge which does not bear on the outcome of the case. Had the knowledge by the AEC and by Commissioner Strauss of conflict of interest in the negotiation of the contract been a controlling fact in the case, the Court would undoubtedly have gone further than it did into the testimony and the record on this point.

When the Senate was required under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution to look into the qualifications of Mr. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, this was a very important point. It was a point which was at issue. It was one on which the consent to the appointment would largely turn. Therefore, Senators had to look at the record of our own hearings, investigations, and inquiries put to Mr. Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract.

FINDINGS OF ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE

These are some of the statements made under oath on which the Senate had to judge Mr. Strauss and his role in the Dixon-Yates contract:

First. In testifying before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in July 1955, Adolphe Wenzell stated that he first met with Lewis Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract on January 18, 1954. That was not December, but the first month of the year 1954—January 18, 1954. The sworn testimony in the official record of the Senate reads as follows:

Senator KEFAUVER. Did you go into the Atomic Energy Commission representing the Bureau of the Budget or the First Boston Corp.?

Mr. WENZELL. At that time I considered my work entirely as a representative of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. KEEFFE. Did you tell Admiral Strauss you were a representative of the budget, a consultant of Mr. Hughes?

Mr. WENZELL. Yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. Let's get that straight. I didn't understand the import of your question. You explained to Admiral Strauss that you were there as a consultant of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. WENZELL. The appointment having been made by the Bureau of Budget; yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. And you talked with him as a consultant?

Mr. WENZELL. I did; yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Wenzell, you said a few minutes ago that Admiral Strauss knew who you were, knew that you were a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget. You were down there several times, subsequently; were you not?

Mr. WENZELL. Yes, sir.

Senator KEFAUVER. He certainly knew who you were, didn't he?

Mr. WENZELL. I told him so at the beginning.

Yet before the same Senate subcommittee, Mr. Strauss testified that he knew Mr. Wenzell as a representative of the First Boston Corp.

Mr. President, let us never forget the controlling fact in this whole issue of conflict of interest as involved in the Dixon-Yates case. That was the activity of Mr. Wenzell as an official of the First Boston Corp. while he was also representing the Bureau of the Budget of the Federal Government. There is no question that his dual role was known by many of his associates in the Budget Bureau, including the Director.

So we have Mr. Strauss' testimony as follows:

Mr. STRAUSS. I have no recollection of Mr. Wenzell's status that is in conflict with my then belief that he represented his firm, the

First Boston Corp., advising all present at the conference on the availability and cost of financing.

A second indication that some people at the AEC knew of Wenzell in more than one role was also brought out by the Antitrust Subcommittee. In 1954 serious questions were raised about the contract. Wenzell himself testified that he had qualms about his dual role, and had been advised by his firm's attorney to resign from his job as consultant to the Budget Bureau. The matter was discussed with the Director of the Budget Bureau, who felt that Wenzell was unduly concerned.

One of the shocking things about this case is that this was not a case of oversight. This was a case of full and complete knowledge on the part of the Federal Government's officials in the Eisenhower administration. This was a case of where even the Bureau of the Budget discussed this point of conflict of interest. So it is impossible for the Eisenhower administration to try to gloss over this notorious example of what I consider to be shocking political corruption within its record, along with the others that I discussed the other day in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate.

President Eisenhower then directed the Budget Bureau and the AEC to prepare a chronology of negotiations on the contract and it was published on August 21, 1954. Neither Wenzell nor Paul Miller, vice president and assistant vice president, respectively, of the First Boston Corp., was mentioned as having participated in the contract negotiations.

That is the incident to which I referred the other day in my speech, when I pointed out that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] had called for a list of the individuals involved in the negotiations in regard to this matter. When the list was submitted, it was interesting to note that Wenzell's name was not on the list.

It has always been my opinion—and I think it was shared by the Senator from Tennessee, and I said so at the time, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show—that the Bureau of the Budget thought it could get by with the omission.

When Senator KEFAUVER challenged the omission, the lame excuse of the Bureau of the Budget was that it was an oversight.

But Richard W. Cook, Deputy General Manager of the AEC, had prepared three or four drafts, all of which subsequently were destroyed. He was aided in their preparation by his predecessor, Walter Williams. The original drafts of both Cook and Williams had included the names of Wenzell and Miller.

At the suggestion of William F. McCandless, of the Budget Bureau, the AEC agreed to drop them from the list of participants.

Let me say, for the benefit of Mr. Krock, that he should have done his bookwork before he wrote this uncalled for and misrepresenting column this morning. The testimony on this episode appears on pages 697 through 711 of the Antitrust Subcommittee hearings.

In considering whether to give or withhold its consent to the appointment of Mr. Stennis to a Cabinet post, the Senate had to give full consideration to this question of how much Mr. Strauss and the AEC knew of the conflict of interest and what action they took regarding it; the Supreme Court did not have the responsibility of determining that question of fact. It was not at issue before the Supreme Court, may I say for the benefit of Mr. Krock, who is not a lawyer, but who should not be writing on legal subjects such as this without having the benefit of counsel from a lawyer before he becomes guilty of the gross misrepresentations that were contained in his column this morning.

As to Mr. Strauss' efforts to "foist this illegal contract upon the country," the record is equally clear. Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, spoke at length in the Senate on the possibility of conflict of interest in the negotiation of the Dixon-Yates contract on February 18, 1955. On June 27, the Antitrust Subcommittee opened its hearings. On June 28, the Atomic Energy Commission passed a resolution reaffirming the contract and its necessity. It was not until November of that year that it was finally terminated. Subsequently the Dixon-Yates combine filed suit in the Court of Claims for its "out-of-pocket" costs; the Justice Department countered that the Government was not liable because the contract had been illegally negotiated.

Yet up to the very moment of the Senate vote in 1959, Lewis Strauss continued to defend the contract. This was his testimony to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee on April 30, 1959:

The CHAIRMAN. And you, then, as Chairman, had looked over the contract and, as I understand it, you approved the contract?

Mr. STRAUSS. Yes; I thought it was a good contract and I still do, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. That is my next question I was going to ask you. In view of subsequent events, do you think that contract still is a good contract?

Mr. STRAUSS. It has been terminated, but it was to provide power——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I understand that, but I am asking your opinion: Do you still think it was a good contract?

Mr. STRAUSS. I did and do; and it would have cost the people a great deal less than the plant that is now going to cost, which is not yet complete.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the point of my question—I think we could argue that point back and forth—but what I wanted on the record is: If the Dixon-Yates contract, as approved by the Commission on that date, were before you now, you would approve of it?

Mr. STRAUSS. Well, that is a very "iffy" question.

The CHAIRMAN. No, it isn't "iffy."

Mr. STRAUSS. I think it is, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the same contract.

Mr. STRAUSS. If the circumstances were the same I would approve it; certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do you still think it is a good contract? You just said that you did, and were going to give your reasons.

Senator BUTLER. As of that time.

Mr. STRAUSS. As of that time, under those circumstances, I thought it was a good contract. I think its provisions were fair; I think as a matter of fact they were more than fair to the Government of the United States. And today we could not get the money for such a figure, anything like such a figure; and I doubt whether we would ever be able to get any companies to agree to the limitations on earnings which these companies at that time were willing to agree to.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any opinion about the contract now, if it were up now?

Mr. STRAUSS. If it were up now?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRAUSS. I would think it would be a good contract.

I repeat, when the final question was put to him, as to whether or not, at the very time he was testifying, and on the basis of the facts which had been brought out, he thought it was a good contract, his answer was:

I would think it would be a good contract.

In short, what the U.S. Supreme Court considered was the question of the legality and enforceability of the contract; what the Senate considered were the qualifications of Mr. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. I think both bodies rendered the proper verdict on the basis of the applicable facts.

For the benefit of Mr. Krock, let me repeat again today, as I did in my speech when I opposed confirmation of Mr. Strauss' nomination, that the record showed—and I have repeated the record today—that Strauss knew of the Wenzell connection with the First Boston Corporation; while he was also representing the Budget Bureau, and notwithstanding Wenzell's connection with the First Boston Corporation, and notwithstanding the fact that he also served as a staff member of the Bureau of the Budget, participating in the preparation and negotiation of the contract, Mr. Strauss approved the contract. Not even his friends, like Mr. Krock, can get him off that hook of misconduct.

In my judgment there was a failure on his part to perform the services which the American taxpayers have the right to expect of any public official.

I voted against confirmation of his nomination, and I shall always be proud of my vote against his confirmation, because I am satisfied that upon the record he showed that he was not fit to serve as Secretary of Commerce, and in my opinion he was justifiably rejected for the position.

FOREST ACCESS ROADS—THE KEY TO WISE DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT OF OUR FEDERAL FORESTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today on behalf of myself and Senators MAGNUSON, ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BIBLE, ENGLE, GRUENING, JACKSON, MCGEE, METCALF, MOSS, NEUBERGER, CARROLL, DWORSHAK, ALLOTT, and HICKEY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act as it relates to forest development roads and trails.

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

The bill (S. 501) to amend chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr.

MORSE for himself and other Senators was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I explain the bill, I should like to pay high tribute and commendation to an associate of mine of many years in the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The senior Senator from Washington and I have worked together and stood shoulder to shoulder for many years in our endeavors to secure congressional approval of an expanded so-called access road program.

We have met with some success, as the record will show, but at no time, in my judgment, has the Congress ever approved an adequate program for saving the American taxpayers many millions of dollars which would be saved to them if the Federal Government kept itself in a position so that it could harvest its timber without suffering the great losses it suffers each year from fire, disease, and windstorms.

As I have said so many times, we are dealing with a crop. Trees are a crop; and trees must be harvested at the point when it is time to harvest them if we are to save not only the great waste of a particular tree, but the great waste of surrounding timber. If diseased timber is allowed to stand, if blown-down timber, which becomes a fire hazard, is allowed to remain blown down, and is not cleared out, of course, the healthy surrounding timber is in danger.

So once again I raise my voice in the Senate in support of a forest access roads bill. I am satisfied that it is a sound bill from the standpoint of our Nation's economy. It will return to the Treasury of the United States many times its cost, making it possible for us to harvest timber which otherwise would be lost. The proceeds will go into the Treasury of the United States, to the great benefit of the American taxpayers.

Last year, when the Senate Committee on Public Works reported the highway bill, it indicated that studies would go forward and hearings would be held with respect to forest development roads. We introduce this bill on behalf of wise conservation and management of our forests and in order to place before the Senate Committee on Public Works the proper legislative vehicle with which to achieve these objectives.

The subject of forest access roads is one to which I have devoted a great deal of effort since I first came to the Senate. The following are some of the major measures I sponsored or cosponsored with my colleagues in the Senate on behalf of a greatly expanded program of Federal forest access roads:

Senate bill 800, of the 80th Congress. This bill sought to authorize $25 million for access road construction. It passed the Senate in May 1947.

Senate Joint Resolution 126, of the 80th Congress, which called for annual appropriations of $25 million for the construction of access roads and trails in our national forests.

Senate Joint Resolution 196, of the 80th Congress. This proposed the authorization of $30 million annually for the access road program of our Federal forests.

Senate Joint Resolution 24, of the 81st Congress, which passed the Senate in August 1949. It would have authorized annual appropriations of $30 million for Federal forest access roads.

Senate Joint Resolution 32, of the 82d Congress, and Senate Joint Resolution 86, of the 83d Congress. These resolutions would also have authorized $30 million annually for the program of our Federal forest access roads.

Senate bill 3420, of the 84th Congress. This bill called for a 12-year program of forest access road construction. It proposed fund authorizations ranging from $32 million for the first year to a maximum of $50 million a year for the final 10 years.

Senate bill 1136, of the 85th Congress, which called for a 12-year access road program, ranging from an initial $32 million up to $50 million per annum for the last 9 years.

Senate bill 2240, of the 86th Congress, cosponsored by a number of Senators. It proposed appropriations of $40 million for the fiscal year 1961 and $50 million for the fiscal year 1962, for the development of forest roads and trails in our national forests.

Those of us in the Senate who have sponsored forest access roads bills have made substantial progress in raising authorization levels. I say with considerable regret that for the past 8 years there has been strong administration opposition to any important increase in these authorizations. Despite the opposition, we have moved forward; but the rate has been less than that needed.

In 1959 the Secretary of Agriculture submitted a program for the national forests, which specifically called for $720 million in appropriated funds to be spent over the next 12 years for forest roads—an average of $60 million a year. It is a curious fact that both before and after the announcement of the program for the national forests, there has been consistent opposition from the Eisenhower administration to increases in these road authorizations.

Our bill proposes that by fiscal year 1963 we move to the authorization level which has been suggested, but not supported, by the Secretary of Agriculture. In fact, our bill asks the Public Works Committee to re-do the section of the 1960 Highway Act which provided $35 million for the fiscal year 1962 and $40 million for the fiscal year 1963, and to provide $45 million for 1962 and $60 million for 1963. The well-supported justification is a part of this program for the national forests. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the message of March 24, 1959, from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President of the Senate be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my speech.

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

ROADS AND TRAILS

The road and trail system which serves the national forest lands is a complex of highways and access roads and trails under various ownerships and jurisdictions. This transportation system is vital to the multiple use of all the resources of the national forest system.

For administrative purposes, the road and trail facilities are grouped into a forest highway system and a forest development road and trail system. All these facilities benefit the national forests. There are now 24,400 miles for forest highways, 149,700 miles of forest development roads, and 112,200 miles of trails. When fully installed, there will be about 70,000 miles of forest highways, 542,000 miles of access roads, and the trail network will be reduced to about 80,000 miles.

The forest highway program is administered by the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. The forest highways are, therefore, not included in the program herein outlined.

An adequate system of roads and trails is essential to proper management of forest lands. The presence or lack of access roads has a direct and controlling influence on many phases of forest management, such as the volume of timber that can be marketed; the size, duration, and distribution of sales within working circles; the level of salvage cutting; protection of national forest resources from fire, insects, and disease; and recreational and forage use.

Financial losses occur every year to the Federal Government through inability to market mature timber now inaccessible but in need of harvesting, and to promptly and completely salvage losses resulting from fire, windstorms, insects, and diseases. As the road and trail system is expanded the revenue to the Government increases, primarily through expanded timber sales. Timber access roads for the national forest system are investments which will pay their own way over a period of years.

The long-range objective is to have and maintain a system of roads and trails to service the national forests adequately at the levels needed to meet expected demands. Such a system will not only make that possible, but will at the same time enhance the value of the timber and other resources being utilized.

Construction of about 392,600 miles of new roads and 6,000 miles of new trails will ultimately be needed, along with reconstruction of about 112,600 miles of roads and 11,300 miles of trails. Also about 41,400 miles of existing trails will be replaced by construction of new roads.

In the short-term period the program proposals are—

1. Complete construction and reconstruction of about 90,000 miles of access roads and 8,000 miles of trails. This constitutes about 19 percent of roads and trails included in the long-range objectives. Approximately half of the value of the work on timber access roads planned for this period will be constructed by national forest timber purchasers, but paid for by the Government through adjustment of stumpage prices.

2. Provide maintenance to full standards on the 261,900 miles of existing development roads and trails and on 58,000 miles of new construction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the other sections are designed to give us the means whereby we may proceed with implementation of the program for the national forests. They will provide a policy guide for an adequate system of forest development roads and trails.

They will enable us to acquire roads and road rights-of-way needed in the development and management of lands administered by the Forest Service, and will authorize the granting of road rights-of-way over Forest Service lands. Of particular importance in these respects is the proposed new section 205 to title 23c, United States Code. The new section would have three subsections.

Subsection (a) would permit the Secretary of Agriculture, under rules and regulations promulgated by him, and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to provide for the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails within and near lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications to permit maximum economy. It would authorize this to be done either, first, directly, with appropriated funds; second, by requirements of purchasers of timber or other products from the lands when roads are needed in their removal; third, by cooperation; or fourth, by a combination of these. This subsection would also authorize the Secretary to require the payment of fees for the use and maintenance of such roads and trails in accordance with regulations promulgated by him.

In situations where it is in the public interest, usually where timber purchasers need to haul over a common road, the Secretary would be authorized to require deposits from the purchasers of timber or other products from Forest Service lands, for the maintenance or construction by the Forest Service of roads used by purchasers under their contracts.

Subsection (a) would also make it possible for the Secretary to advertise and sell timber at gross stumpage or unit rates which would include amortization rates for roads to be constructed by the purchaser. Also included would be: Appropriate provisions for retention by the purchaser-builder of amounts equal to road amortization rates until the value of the road construction is amortized; a provision for refunding of amounts needed to liquidate unamortized balances, and authority to adjust the road amortization rates from time to time. This would permit true amortization of road construction values, and would protect both the Government and the purchasers.

Subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary:

First. To grant easements for roads across Forest Service lands.

Second. To enter into agreements for the exchange of hauling rights or rights-of-way with those who own, control, or use lands intermingled with Forest Service lands. Where mutual need for access exists, the Secretary, notwithstanding other provisions of law, would be authorized to condition the granting of any permission or right to cross Forest Service lands upon the granting to the United States of rights or permission to cross the non-Federal lands to the extent the Secretary deems necessary.

Where the rights or permission granted to the United States under such circumstances are determined by the Secretary to be of greater value than those granted to the person seeking the permission or rights to cross Forest Service lands, the Secretary could make arrangements to reimburse the owner for the difference. Such arrangements could include payment by the Secretary with appropriated funds or provision for such compensation through requirements of purchasers of timber or other products from Forest Service lands who would need to use the road, or payment of fees by other persons using such roads.

Section (b)2 is intended to assure that the Secretary need not grant a permit to cross national forest land to one who refuses to permit the Forest Service to cross its lands. The expectation is that the prevailing situation will be one where agreements will be reached amicably.

In applying subsection (b)2, in a situation where the landowner and the Forest Service cannot reach agreement in time to meet an urgent need for public access, the Secretary may exercise two options. If the Secretary concludes that no agreement on price or condition is in sight, he can condemn a road, utilizing the authority in subsection (a), and pay for the road in accordance with subsections (a) and (c).

The Secretary could permit all persons to utilize forest roads and, to the extent proper, could recapture the share of the cost of the road attributable to non-Federal products, through the application of use fees. He would not be required to grant any rights for the construction of a parallel or duplicating road system to serve private timber unless it would be deemed to be in the public interest.

When negotiations over road use are underway, and are difficult and complex, there is always the question of whether in some way the private party may be shut off from road use pending a final solution. The language of this bill is broad enough to give the Secretary power to provide for temporary joint road use for a reasonable period until a final agreement could be reached.

Subsection (c) would authorize the Secretary to deposit into a special account, to be available for the purpose for which deposited, fees paid by purchasers or other users of roads, to cover deferred payments to the Government's grantor. Special accounts could also be authorlized for deposits required of purchasers of national forest products for road construction or maintenance. Provision is included for expending such deposits for work on adjacent or overlapping areas, or in areas which, in the aggregate, are determined to cover a single work unit on the combined areas. In this connection, the Government may use estimates based on a cost analysis of the type of work to be done to determine the cost to the United States of performing the work. Provision is also included for unexpended balances, upon accomplishment of the purposes for which deposited, to be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded to the depositor.

Mr. President, the substantive provisions of our bill were finally approved by the outgoing administration last year, but no action was taken for a number of reasons. One of the foremost was the strong opposition expressed by the larger timber interests to the provision dealing with the inability of the Forest Service to market its overripe timber.

Today there are over 56 billion board-feet of national forest timber in the five States of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho to which the Forest Service has not obtained access and to which access must be secured across private lands. This volume of timber is equal to the annual allowable cut from the national forests for 8 years. The total volume for which access is needed exceeds the total use of public and privately cut timber for this entire Nation for 1 year. This is a measure of the magnitude of the situation.

POSITION OF LARGE TIMBER OPERATORS

May I say, Mr. President, that I am well aware of the longstanding opposition of many of the big timber concerns of this country to prevent the Federal Government from having access to its own Federal timberlands across the property of private timber companies. The result of this course of action on the part of the big timber companies has not been in the public interest. The result of this selfish attitude on the part of the big timber companies of this country has cost the American taxpayers, over the years, hundreds of millions of dollars in losses in Federal forests.

It is a view of mine, well recognized in American jurisprudence, that no one has the right to use his private property in a manner that does damage to the public interest where there is a great public concern involved. Therefore, I have always taken the position that if the big timber operators are not willing to cooperate voluntarily in regard to this road access problem, then it is the clear duty of the Government, acting in behalf of all the taxpayers of this country, to take the necessary legal steps to require access, over private property, to Federal forests. And it is the clear obligation, as I have been heard to say before, of the Congress to see to it that the legislative power is carried out in order to compel the big timber operators of this country, if necessary, to make available access across private timberlands—of course, Mr. President, with appropriate compensation paid for such use of private property.

Mr. President, I am very much concerned about this problem in the Pacific Northwest, because I offer this bill today not only to protect the titleholders of the American Federal forests, which are the taxpayers of this country, but also because the bill could really be considered an emergency bill to help meet part of the need of an economically distressed area of the United States. I wish Senators from areas of the United States where unemployment has not yet reached disastrous proportions would just call at my office and look over the volumes of mail I am getting each day these days from the State of Oregon, dealing with the matter of a distressed area, because Oregon today is a distressed area. We have not had such unemployment in our State during the last

20 years. Thousands and thousands and thousands of wage earners are out of jobs, and they are not seasonal workers.

As was pointed out in my office this morning by a delegation that waited upon me in regard to the disastrous unemployment situation that confronts the State of Oregon, many of those now unemployed in the Pacific Northwest—and I speak only with knowledge of Oregon, but they assured me it was also true of Washington and Idaho—have not been out of work for a score of years.

They are craftsmen; they are men from the skilled trades. The terrific slump in the lumber market has resulted in the closing of a great many lumber mills in the State of Oregon, and the placing of many more on part-time shifts.

Of course, merely opening up the timber is not going to solve the unemployment problem, unless there is a corollary adopted with it. It will have to be supplemented, of course, with a construction program that will result in the building of homes, schoolhouses, and public works, so sorely needed in our country.

That will help put men and women back to work. That will help to start the cycle which is needed to expand the economy and to bring to an end the serious unemployment situation in this particular depressed area.

I am in a position so that I can speak on this matter, because in recent years I have urged relief on the economic front for areas of the country which were depressed at a time when my State was not. The RECORD is replete with speeches I have made over the years in support, for example, of the two Senators from Pennsylvania, of the two Senators from West Virginia, and of the two Senators from Michigan, only to mention three of the depressed areas of the United States of recent years which have needed assistance from the Federal Government, which the Republican administration denied them through the President's veto of the depressed areas bill.

Mr. President, my own State is now hard hit, and I am going to do whatever I can, seeking to start my work on the problem in the speech today, to see to it that the President of the United States who will take office next Friday is made fully aware of the shocking economic situation which confronts the people of the Pacific Northwest.

NEED FOR ACTION UNDER EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

In 1946 I was one of the sponsors and supporters of the Murray full employment bill. For the most part it has been a "dead letter" on the statute books ever since it was passed.

I say to President-elect Kennedy that when he takes the solemn oath on January 20 he will assume also, in my judgment, a solemn responsibility to see to it that the Federal Government lives up to what I consider to be a great moral and economic obligation to the people of our country who live in distressed areas. I think the Full Employment Act of 1946 is sound, both in political and economic philosophy. It is the obligation of a free government, existing under our constitutional form, to see to it that it does for its people what needs to be done in order to do justice and economic equity to them.

Mr. President, this Government cannot stand by and, in effect, throw up its hands in what might be interpreted as an exhibition of a do-nothing, despairing attitude, with increasing tens of thousands of people going out of work week by week.

As this administration comes to its end, it comes to its end with rising unemployment, with economic depression in various economic pockets in this country, the like of which we have not had for many years in the United States.

The new Kennedy administration will be confronted with a great challenge, which is to live up to what some of us have argued for many times in the Senate, ever since we passed the Full Employment Act of 1946, which is that when these deplorable economic conditions exist it is the duty of the Government to step in and to take the action necessary to see to it that men and women are put to work.

In fact, I happen to think that the perpetuation of our economic system is dependent upon the Government meeting such obligations, because if we let such adverse conditions continue unchecked, Mr. President, we will find ourselves in the depth of a nationwide depression, and the people then will have a right to say to legislators and to executives, "You have betrayed your trust to the American people, and we will act accordingly."

Mr. President, with respect to the national forests created from the public domain, the Forest Service has proceeded on the basis that whenever private timber companies sought to build roads across the national forests to remove timber from private lands, they had that right. The only conditions which could be attached were technical, relating to protection of Government property. The result was an anomalous situation: The private companies could not be required to grant the United States the right to use the road, but the Forest Service had to let such companies use its roads. The result has been unsatisfactory. Private timber companies whose holdings are intermingled with the Government's have, on occasion, constructed roads and removed their timber while the Government timber stood rotting.

Our bill intends to achieve a degree of mutuality which does not now exist for all the national forest lands.

On the eastern national forests acquired under the Weeks law there is no statutory right of ingress and egress. If a private landowner blocks the Government in getting to its timber, the Government does not have to give access to that private party.

On the O. & C. lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management there is also a provision for reciprocal access. I think this is a sound policy and I believe the problem deserves early solution.

CONSERVATION NEEDS ARE PARAMOUNT

The Chief of the Forest Service said in testimony in 1956:

The national forests are under permanent administration for the use and benefit of the citizens of the United States. Permanent management and permanent use require permanent access.

I think this sums up very neatly the heart of the only method by which true multiple-use resource management can be achieved. I have dwelt heavily on timber, but I should point out that these roads serve equally and well all the varied uses of the national forests. Even those who wish to travel the solitude of the wilderness need a road to reach the place that takes them up into the high country and its pristine beauty.

The pressures which today exist upon our wilderness areas for diminution of their size and for permitting extensive timbering will be eased and even erased if we will but construct the needed roads in the commercial timber-growing sections of our public forests.

The key to a whole host of improvements in management and protection can be found in the development of adequate roads.

When I make this argument for access roads I am also making an argument for the expansion of recreational facilities available to the American people. Let us not forget that the recreational use of our great wilderness areas—the great forested areas of the West, the areas where rivers still run through primeval forests—is one of the great sources of income for the States of the West.

For all these reasons it is my hope that this bill will meet with the general approval of all who are dedicated to true conservation and wise use of our natural resources.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to say, on behalf of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that he had hoped to be present today when I introduced the bill, so that he could give support to the bill and to the position I have taken. However, as Senators know from the press reports, the Senator from Washington was called to Florida to confer with the President-elect and could not be present today.

So far as the bill is concerned, I speak for the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and he urges that the bill receive early consideration by the committee to which it is referred.

EXHIBIT 1

S. 501

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 205 a new section, as follows:

"§ 205A. System of forest development roads and trails.

"(a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) is authorized and directed under rules and regulations to be promulgated by him to provide a system of forest development roads and trails in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum long-term economy in the development and management of all the resources on lands administered by the Forest Service. Forest development roads and trails may be constructed, reconstructed, and maintained, and such roads and trails or rights-of-way therefor may be acquired by purchase, exchange, or condemnation, by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, by requirements on For-

est Service contractors, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, by requiring the payment of fees for the use and maintenance of roads and trails, by cooperation with public or private agencies or persons, or by a combination of these methods. The regulations of the Secretary shall provide that no fees for the use and maintenance of roads and trails shall be required for (1) the hauling of products produced from a farm or ranch within or adjacent to lands administered by the Forest Service on which the owner or operator resides, or (2) in the case of other products if the quantity hauled is minor, or (3) if he determines that the interest of the United States does not require such payment.

"(b) The Secretary is also authorized to—

"(1) grant easements for specified periods of time or otherwise in, upon, across, and over lands administered by the Forest Service for rights-of-way for roads upon such terms and conditions as he may deem are in the public interest; and

"(2) enter into agreements to exchange hauling rights or rights-of-way and easements for roads with those who own, control, or use lands intermingled with or adjacent to lands administered by the Forest Service and where mutual needs for access exist and notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to condition the grant of any right-of-way or permission to cross Forest Service lands upon the granting to the United States of rights or permission to cross lands owned, controlled, or used by the applicant to the extent the Secretary deems necessary and to make or receive reasonable compensation for such rights or permission: *Provided,* That no such condition shall be imposed upon persons residing within or adjacent to lands administered by the Forest Service seeking rights of ingress and egress to their homes.

"(c) Fees paid for the use of any road as to which the agreement under which the United States obtained its rights provides for delayed payments may be placed in a special account to pay the vendor and fees paid to cover the maintenance of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided,* That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further,* That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded."

(b) The analysis of chapter 2 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "205. Forest development roads and trails." a new item as follows:

"205A. System of forest development roads and trails."

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of sections 205 and 205A of title 23, United States Code, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for forest development roads and trails to and on the national forests the following sums: $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963.

WILLIAM BIRRELL FRANKE, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the impending departure of Secretary of the Navy, William Birrell Franke, recalls to us all the laudable service this distinguished gentleman has offered to his country. Mr. Franke has devoted almost a decade of leadership to our Nation's Defense Establishment, during which he served in the positions of Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Under Secretary of the Navy, and, most recently, he occupied the honored office of Secretary of the Navy.

Secretary Franke brought to each of these high positions a valued fund of experience, ability, acumen, and integrity. The record clearly demonstrates how well he has acquitted himself in meeting the weighty responsibilities with which he has been charged. He has provided decisive and inspiring leadership to our country's fine Naval and Marine Corps Establishment. He has guided the Navy and Marine Corps in an era of rapid technological advancement.

His sound counsel and direction have aided the Navy Department wisely to plot its course in the nuclear and space age. It is due in considerable measure to the Secretary's wise appreciation of these accelerated advancements that the eminently successful Polaris missile has come to early fruition.

Mr. Franke's unstinted and willing cooperation with the Members of Congress has greatly assisted us in our assigned task of providing, and watching over the affairs of our fine Navy and Marine Corps. When Mr. Franke leaves the office in which he served so well he will leave behind an example of devotion and capability.

I know also these brief remarks in respect to the Secretary are deserved and should also include praise for his highly capable assistants, Messrs. Bantz, Jackson, Milne, and Wakelin, all of whom have worked hard to build our Navy to its present high standard.

We congratulate Secretary Franke for the years of service he has given his country.

DAVID HAMIL

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Colorado takes a deep pride in her native sons and daughters who, in recent years, have served so well and faithfully in responsible Federal positions. All have acquitted themselves with dignity and honor. No breath of scandal has brushed a single one. Their departments and agencies—and the Nation—are the better for the work they have done. Some are leaving in the next few days; others stay.

One who comes particularly to mind is David Hamil, the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I have known Dave Hamil for many years. I have known him as a hardheaded, aggressive rancher; a man who built a large ranch out of nothing; a legislator of consummate skill and ability; and as a square shooting businessman. In his direction of the REA, he has retained all of these qualities and brought to the REA a new sense of progress. He has brought to himself a deep sense of gratitude from all the members of the REA for his faithful and efficient administration, as well as for his fair administration of that agency.

ANDREW J. MAIR

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of those men who has done much to help the farmer try to solve some of his ills has been Andrew J. Mair, who worked so effectively as Deputy Administrator for Operations of the Commodity Stabilization Service, and as a vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Those who dealt with Andy Mair constantly told me that his guidance and willing work brought a real sense of direction to these two operations. I am happy to report that this career civil servant is not being lost to the Government but that he has been transferred to The Hague as an agricultural attaché.

ROLLIN D. BARNARD

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, back in 1953 Postmaster General Summerfield conducted a nationwide talent hunt for a vigorous, experienced young man to head the Real Estate Division of the Post Office Department. He chose Rollin D. Barnard of Denver. In nearly 8 years, that choice has proven one of the wisest of this administration, and Mr. Barnard has risen to Deputy Assistant Postmaster General and then Assistant Postmaster General for the Bureau of Facilities. As such he has overseen the millions of dollars worth of vehicles, buildings, and supplies for the entire Department.

Under his guidance, 5,400 new post office buildings have been constructed and 27 major, modern mail-handling facilities, many of them by private capital on a lease arrangement which has saved the Government many dollars and kept them on local tax rolls. Mr. Barnard currently is supervising the new supply management and modern warehousing programs of the Post Office and the conversion of the awkward, costly fleet of specially built vehicles to a less expensive fleet of standard design trucks. For all this, he was deservedly given the highest honor a postal employee can receive, the Department's Distinguished Service Award.

ELMER BENNETT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for another Colorado story, one can go back to the days of World War II when a young Greeley attorney came to serve in Washington. He stayed, moved up through the ranks of civil service, spent a period as legislative assistant to the late, great Senator Eugene D. Millikin, and today, after service at the top of his chosen profession as Solicitor for the Department of the Interior, is Under Secretary of the Interior. He is Elmer F. Bennett.

In his position as Solicitor and Under Secretary, the West owes him a real vote of thanks for his assiduousness, his studiousness, and his conscientiousness with which he has applied his great ability. These abilities have been repeatedly testified to, not only by members of his own party, but also by Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle.

FRED SEATON, GEORGE ABBOTT, AND PHILIP J. MULLIN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, of course I cannot discuss the Department of the Interior without mentioning the outstanding work of Secretary Fred A. Seaton, whose second home, at least, is Colorado. For his great devotion to the West and to all of us who reside there a great endless debt is owed. Without his devotion to the West and without his understanding of the problems of our great arid and semiarid areas of the West, we would not have made the progress we have. We would not have made the great progress in reclamation which, despite the campaign speeches, we have made during the last 8 years.

Another one of these gentlemen to whom we owe a great tribute is Assistant Secretary George Abbott; also Mr. Philip J. Mullin, my former administrative assistant and now Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Mr. Mullin, of course is a Coloradan, but the others have worked so closely with us in the West, those of us in Colorado especially, that we feel almost as if we could claim them for our own.

THEODORE F. STEVENS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, another of the brilliant young men with whom I have enjoyed working is Ted Stevens, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. Although he is returning to Alaska, in whose statehood fight he was so prominently involved, we will remember him as the only person in history who was able to convince a Colorado girl that Alaska was the place to live.

I hope that the country will see more of him in public service.

JAMES T. PYLE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of those most respected by the aviation industry for his work with the former Civil Aeronautics Authority and now as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is James T. Pyle of Denver. Much of the credit for the rapidity with which the FAA is solving the complex, dangerous problems of the air age is due to Jim Pyle's love of his work, and his understanding of it and his ability to move forward in the very complex system which is necessary to govern our air transportation.

ROBERT S. McCOLLUM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, another Coloradan who has served with distinction on a highly specialized program is Robert S. McCollum, former Deputy Administrator in charge of the Department of State's Office of Refugee Affairs.

Thousands of anguished persons seeking a new way of life in freedom were aided by Mr. McCollum, who is now serving as vice chancellor of the University of Denver. His great idealism and his very great business ability and practical organization ability which he possesses have made a great success of the program. This will be attested by thousands who are now able to live in peace and happiness in this country, and who formerly knew only starvation and travail.

JOYCE BOVIK PEYTON AND ERNEST J. EATON

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Congress would be remiss in its appreciation if it did not recall at times such as this those who have served so well as liaison officers between the executive and the legislative. One outstanding characteristic of these men and women has been a friendly willingness to obtain information, to seek methods of solving problems and to keep us posted on developments in their fields.

Two Coloradans come to mind here:

One is Joyce Bovik Peyton of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mrs. Peyton brought to her work a practiced understanding of politics and a background of government study which made her one of the most effective liaison officers.

The other is Ernest J. Eaton, staff assistant at Department of the Interior. Here is a young man also steeped in the science of government as well as its practice and perhaps the best tribute to Mr. Eaton and his work is the high and warm regard in which he is held by our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

ELIOT RICHARDSON AND ALBERT McDERMOTT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, of course, there were many from outside Colorado who served honorably and well in the difficult task of coordinating the work of the executive and legislative branches of this Government. All of us who served on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee remember particularly the solid assistance given us by Eliot Richardson of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Albert McDermott, Assistant to Secretary Mitchell of the Department of Labor. I understand that Al is returning to the practice of the law here in the District of Columbia. All of my colleagues who have been exposed to his friendly and intelligent manner will join me, I feel certain, in wishing him well.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Friday, at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Friday, January 20, 1961, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1961:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for reappointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the temporary disability retired list to the permanent grade indicated:

To be lieutenant commander

Donald L. Campbell, effective October 7, 1960, with date of rank June 15, 1960.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant commander

Kenneth A. MacDonald.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Raymond L. Speer.
Jack W. Kinney, Jr.

To be ensigns

Victor R. Smith	Guy H. Fisher, Jr.
Ralph J. Land	John W. Bricker
Thomas M. Monaghan	Marvin G. Lane
Francis D. Moran	Robert C. McGuffee, Jr.
Robert A. Zimmer	Robert E. Lushene

ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Herbert Butler Powell O16684, U.S. Army, in the rank of general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, O16761, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3307, 3442, and 3447, for appointment as the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advoacte General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Lowman Decker, O18549, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3037, 3307, 3442, and 3447, for appointment as Assistant the Judge Advocate General, U.S. Army, as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Hall McCaw, O38722, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Tom Victor Stayton O18417, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Mervyn MacKay Magee, O18478, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, U.S. Army.

Col. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, U.S. Army.

Col. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Thomas James Hartford, O18330, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Juan Cesar Cordero, O222751, Army National Guard of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Russell Boyt, O266555, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Anthony Long, O274572, Army National Guard of the United States.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a).

To be major generals

Col. Paul Milton Booth, O327750, Army National Guard of the United States.

Col. Arthur Young Lloyd, O253763, Army National Guard of the United States.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Ashley, Alvie O., O89690.
Beavers, Guy M., O89177.
Braa, Emery W., O89184.
Callahan, Donald J., O89794.
Collier John F., O89442.
Holmes, James R., O89340.
Hopkins, James R., O91277.
Hubbard, Robert V., O90101.
Incremona, Richard S., O76256.
Jackson, Raymond F., O89227.
Luisi, Gerard H., O89248.
Martin, Bruce A., O89251.
Orr, Gerald W., O89365.
Price, Robert D., O89277.
Rambo, James E., O89280.
Renzi, Eugene C., O89584.
Taylor, Thomas W., O89150.
Walker, Prosper N., O89633.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Gillespie, Ronald L., O89490.
Jones, Donn C., O89229.
Stavish, Peter J., O88958.
Vann, Lawrence K., O89304.
Wilburn, James H., O89010.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

To be colonel

Sanderson, Harold Rennie, O42076.

To be lieutenant colonel

Miller, Samuel Theodore, O31377.

To be major (chaplain)

McLeod, Walter Grey, O60748.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3290, and 3292:

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Turrou, Edward Arnold (Adjutant General's Corps), O48222.

To be captain

Mittenthal, Lothrop (Medical Service Corps), O83844.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Williams, Edwin Hugh (Infantry), O87970.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Hembree, Calvin Still (Ordnance Corps), O91267.

Riordan, Michael William, Jr. (Signal Corps), O83442.

To be second lieutenant

Smith, Edward Charles, Jr. (Medical Service Corps), O84275.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Beuke, Henry Albert, O1844798.
Hartley, C. W., Jr., O1636013.
Kesler, Mac Purcell, O2026784.
Long, Louis Ernest, O1010478.
Mewha, John, O1014061.
O'Meara, William Frederick, O1646470.
Ortiz-Moreno, Orlando, O934461.
Petrik, Vernon Frank, O935286.
Sciortino, John Charles, O1684015.
Tharp, Charles Dean, O538228.

To be captains

Aaron, Jerome, O1036920.
Barton, Wade Goldsmith, Jr., O1913425.
Burhoe, John Merchant, O1112596.
Cassella, Arthur Colin, O1937016.
Dietsch, Richard Koehler, O4015531.
Ewing, Amos Dickson, O540749.
Ferris, Gordon Frank, O1891916.
Fleet, Robert Gordon, O954335.
Gearin, Cornelius Joseph, Jr., O1935342.
Gecoma, Richard Montgomery, O2021020.
Gilbert, Robert Lee, O1889907.
Golden, Robert Kenneth, O2263695.
Grzybowski, Conrad John, O1925709.
Haney, Leslie Dolin, O968432.
Jacoby, Richard Allen, O1876876.
Jones, Robert B., O1879684.
Kane, Francis John, O550498.
Kees, William George, O2203037.
Kizirian, John, O2263617.
Klugh, James Richard, O4012172.
Lair, Donald Earl, O4005112.
Lang, Bobby Ray, O1341885.
LeVasseur, Thomas Joseph, Jr., O2209934.
Lowery, Rolla Wilbert, O4019423.
Marder, Everett Joseph, O4006155.
Maxin, Stuart Elwood, O1925349.
Mead, Chester Robert, O953890.
Papajohn, Carroll, O4005341.
Paris, Kenneth Gail, O4005600.
Pate, John Horace, O1881958.
Phillips, William Daniel, O1879782.
Porter, Edward JeDon, O2206684.
Reinhart, William Jennings, Jr., O1891441.
Smith, Lloyd David, O2210103.
Sorenson, Ted Osborne, O1924578.
Stanfield, John Thomas, O2014628.
Steenborg, George Andrew, O1702304.
Stoessner, Richard Leonard, O4006259.
Sugiyama, Shigeki James, O1341720.
Thompson, Glen David, O2030536.
Trexler, Tommy Park, O2014531.
Vass, Marshall Bowie, O960303.
Watson, Robert William, O1883745.
Wetzel, Lewis Arthur, O1888231.
Woods, Chester Arthur, O2263233.

To be first lieutenants

Alliason, John Richard, O4010029.
Aschliman, Edward LeRoy, O5503255.
Barker, Rex Nelson, O4049505.
Beach, Ernest Ervin, O5302582.
Bell, James Claude, Jr., O4059302.
Berry, Tommie Joe, O5504308.
Bligh, Thomas Francis, Jr., O4058781.
Brown, Lee David, O4057879.
Bryant, Richard Lewis, O4034774.
Casey, Franklin James, O4060899.
Cochran, John Robert, O4028987.
Cook, John Jerome, O1886623.
Coyne, Robert Alan, O4031130.
Easterling, Ned Harve, Jr., O4072094.
Eshelman, John Everett, O4031133.
Fancher, Louis Clay, Jr., O5405013.
Frost, Henry Randall, O4074810.
Gilbertson, James Sylvester, O4031227.
Gonsalves, Robert Francis, O1923131.
Goodall, Billy Rhea, O4042977.
Gordon, Charles Lee, O4071650.
Graney, Donald Caryl, O4050288.
Gray, Frank McKay, Jr., O4063409.
Grubbs, William Francis, II, O4070715.
Harper, Oscar Ray, O4032877.
Hattersley, James Garland, O4010934.
Hawkins, Douglas Keith, O2264530.
Hedgcock, Robert Eugene, O4069470.
Heverly, Charles Irwin, Jr., O2291969.
Hightower, Loyal Glenn, Jr., O4044836.
Howard, James Wallace, O4059944.
Hull, Michael Harold, O4070454.
Hutto, Azel James, Jr., O4058748.
Karr, Don Everett, O4047930.
Kemp, Donald Thomas, O4024456.
Kincheloe, Carl Eldridge, O4062710.
Knauss, David Schelly, O4038956.
Lally, Michael Joseph, Jr., O4019656.
Leach, Robert Alan, O4047833.
Lee, James Robert, O2287917.
Leuer, Kenneth Charles, O4059707.
Little, Robert Eugene, O4059322.
Lollis, James Albert, O4074515.
Lomax, Rhoss Cook, Jr., O4049102.
Lott, Kirby Joe, O1934522.
MacLean, Bruce Donaldson, O4085678.
Maxwell, George Michael, Jr., O4085580.
May, Elmer Clarence, O4060981.
McClain, Charles Snyder, O5301537.
McConnell, Richard Marvin, O4024911.
McVeigh, Andrew Jackson, III, O4010980.
Medina-Goveo, Efrain, O4028567.
Morgan, Robert Daniel, O4051562.
Morris, Ellis Rowe, O5300299.
Morris, Robert William, O2210607.
Nagel, Joseph Leo, O4071712.
Nakamura, Leslie Katsumi, O4040120.
Nuckolls, Donald Ray, O4026883.
Parker, Charles Elmer, Jr., O5302644.
Perkins, George Roy, O4026309.
Rhodes, Roy Phil, O4024790.
Richardson, James Ottie, O4025865.
Rowlands, David Latimer, O4077158.
Ryan, William Jerome, O4041871.
Sanford, Jackie Willard, O4030758.
Santilli, Joseph Francis, Jr., O2275652.
Schwartz, James Loren, O4029836.
Serra, Robert Roger, O4038896.
Sinclair, Allen Blanding, O4053200.
Skinner, Gary Nolan, Sr., O1878012.
Solley, Lee Roy, O5405113.
Sorensen, Martin Peter, O4084224.
Stuart, Theodore Mortimer, O4032609.
Thiede, Alfred John, O5502337.
Todd, Rouse Jefferson, O4025123.
Tomes, Paul John, O4048577.
Trail, Carl Francis, O4040275.
Turner, Donald Eugene, O1923566.
Valverde, Robert Arturo, O4037779.
Verry, Horace Daniel, O4067088.
Vincent, Charles James, O5203130.
Wallace, William Clarkton, O4063474.
Warren, Wilford Neil, O4030961.
Williams, Lewis Eugene, O4006701.

To be second lieutenants

Alston, Norman Wayne, O5404880.
Alves, Robert George, O5704419.
Anderson, Thomas Warren, O5405395.
Apruzzese, Vincent Albert, O5000402.
Arwood, Thomas Blodgett, O5305426.
Beard, Charles Thomas, O5401653.

Beasley, Rodney Sid, O5304548.
Bennett, John Samuel, Jr., O5307976.
Blanchard, Robert Dewitt, O5403506.
Blatter, Erwin Walter, II, O4010663.
Bliss, Richard Aaron, O5506285.
Boyd, Thomas Gerald, O5402234.
Bray, Robert Francis, O5508873.
Bretsch, Kenneth Philip, O5306169.
Cain, Morton George, O5505436.
Calise, Gaetano George, Jr., O5007020.
Conklin, Robert Elliott, O5206121.
Cortelli, Richard Joseph, O5305005.
Cox, Ronald Dale, O5400960.
Craig, Norton Warwick, II, O5212063.
Davenport, Robert Leonard, O5702558.
Davis, Charles Leon, Jr., O2300433.
Dearman, Charles Sylvester, O5405509.
Dougherty, George James, O4085068.
Downing, Peter Sharron, O5405400.
Dunn, Ralph Bryan, Jr., O5402199.
Dvorak, Ernest Joseph, O5505050.
Fenton, Charles Richard, O5702070.
Ferrari, Robert Glen, O5702026.
Fisher, Thomas Paul, O5508954.
Fitzsimmons, John Edward, O5505864.
Gauntner, Donald Eugene, O5200327.
Gray, Josef Elmer, O5701931.
Grier, Edward George, Jr., O5704392.
Hadjis, John, O5203486.
Harrington, George Stephen, Jr., O4086019.
Healey, Roger, Jr., O5001447.
Herr, Edward Larue, O5207072.
Heuver, Robert Garret, O5704469.
Hicks, Arthur Joseph, Jr., O5403338.
Hooker, George Alwyn, O5307086.
Hunter, Victor Delano, O5302530.
Jaffe, Stephen George, O5004206.
Johnson, Michael Dennis, O5702316.
Johnson, William Morris, O5304824.
Jones, William Jennings, Jr., O5307357.
Kenworthy, John Howard, O4026438.
Kesterson, Charles Robert, O5206282.
Keszler, Lawrence William, O5509788.
Kilgore, Jack Eldon, O5205516.
Kimball, William Dorrance, O5304467.
Koury, Edward Norman, RA12574180.
Leach, James Edmund, O5504312.
Lee, David Weeks, O5510095.
Lennon, John Cale, O5305079.
Lewis, Homer, Jr., O5305052.
Liddle, Jack Wilson, O5209544.
Ludgewait, Herbert Harris, O5002277.
Lynch, Thomas Henry, Jr., O5508641.
Matthis, Earl Newell, O5209034.
Mauk, Gerald Francis, O5702009.
McCrary, Richard Francis, O5507051.
Meadows, Kenneth Doyle, O4074414.
Mitchell, Radcliff Golder, Jr., O5001093.
Mosley, Howard Robert, O5307377.
Myers, William Madison, O5505419.
Nee, John Richard, O5402476.
O'Hara, Thomas Charles, O5703867.
Osborne, James Cecil, O5202787.
Outlaw, James Franklin, Jr., RO14682002.
Parker, Purvis Lamar, O5304494.
Parman, Donald Wade, O5701790.
Patrick, Horace Beverly, O5205513.
Reed, David Bruce, III, O5308268.
Reid, Thomas Frederick, O5205237.
Riggs, Gary Anderson, O5205398.
Riley, Frank Joseph, O5405489.
Rogers, James Harvey, O5402881.
Roeder, Helmut Adolf Gunther, O5405614.
Shalikashvili, John Malchase David, O5405424.
Skeins, Harry, Jr., ER52374054.
Smith, Curtis Sneed, O5210276.
Smith, John Ray, O5307802.
Smith, Stanley Leroy, Jr., O5204116.
Southworth, James Vincent, O2298670.
Sowell, Mark Sanford, Jr., O5305100.
Sproul, Hugh Bell, III, O2296617.
Stallings, Jimmie Lee, O5404993.
Stewart, Alexander Gordon, O5702809.
Sullivan, Gordon Russell, O5006850.
Swain, Richard Capron, O4085544.
Talkington, Thomas Eugene, O5702910.
Terry, Robert Lee, O4058242.
Thompson, Wesley Winthrop, Jr., O5309106.
Tipton, Carl William, O5402968.
Waldack, Albert Charles, O5502304.
Welch, Jerry Floyd, O5510485.
West, Donald Randolph, O5400863.
Zachary, James Lee, O5307166.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be lieutenant colonel, Chaplain

Pawlowicz, Theodore Charles, O481318.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Kilby, Ralph Allen, O2303736.
Mayer, William Erwin, O2302308.
Schurter, Lonis Leon.

To be captains, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Benson, Valborg Matilda, J100169.
Werner, Janet Louise, J100079.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Ganow, Marie Bertha, N901473.
Houle, Alice Therese, N901236.
Johnston, Jane Helen, N900043.
Lynch, Betty Jane, N774378.

To be captains, Chaplain

Boggs, James Russell, O1878491.
Helton, Clinton, O1873294.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Cutcher, James Lawrence, O4073768.
DeLeo, Norman Joseph, O5500488.
Leonardo, Raymond Camillo, O5202583.
Shimoda, Larry Minoru, O5500311.
Von Gruenigen, James Albert, O5301084.
Williford, John Will, O5301210.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Hawley, Richard Springer, O2104221.
Sanders, Richard Durrett, O974380.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Bedynek, Julius Ludwig, Jr., O5701451.
Bergmanis, Juris, O4043938.
Gregory, Kelly Gentry, O2282901.
Hill, Jay Murray, O1880355.
Johnson, Lewis Allen, O4077985.
Lavenson, George Stanley, Jr., O2283897.
Leighton, Henry Alexander, O2211803.
Linnemann, Roger Edward, O2279361.
Logan, Donald James, O2283893.
Ormand, John William, Jr., O2302284.
Redd, Henry Jefferson, Jr., O2284664.
Siemsen, Arnold William, O4073840.
Sowell, John Michael, O4011664.
Walker, Jackson Kyle, O2283901.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Ikeda, George, O2271710.
Johnson, Aaron Basil, O2102829.

To be captain, Women's Army Corps

Barnwell, Shireley Mae, L1020637.

To be first lieutenants, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Hyde, Patricia Louise, M3067.
Pause, Barbara Edwina, M3078.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Coble, Patricia Irene, N2294702.
Greene, Patricia Ann, N805742.
Jagiello, Helen Dolores, N902475.
Jaskoski, Margaret Lucille, N902370.
Robertson, Joyce Alice, N901288.
Thomas, Nevaida, N902727.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Mills, Charlie Smith, O1856096.
Phillips, Major Hunter, Jr., O2297357.
Tolbert, Carl Edwin, O1942271.
Weathers, Clifford Thurston, O2295260.
Wetherell, Sterling Alan, O2294446.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Hann, John Robert, O2295829.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Beutter, Robert Charles, O5502479.
Butler, Richard Ward, O4077283.
Davis, Thomas Hugh, O2291957.
Dudzik, Joseph Anthony, Jr., O2298724.
Gehler, Robert Ray, O5512121.
Groshong, W. Ronald, O5702770.
Gullage, James Truett, O5309284.
Kirshman, Norman Harold, O2298692.
Lively, Floyd Robert, O5506548.
McNealy, Richard Kinney, O2298051.
Mittelstaedt, Robert Noble, O2298695.
Mounts, James Addison, Jr., O4002673.
O'Brien, Thomas Patrick, Jr., O5207697.
O'Kelley, Richard Dale, O5502551.
Passamaneck, David Joel, O2298780.
Patrick, Robert Franklin, O5701746.
Roberts, Norman Leslie, O5703905.
Schiesser, Charles William, O2298714.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps

Kalivoda, Andrew Joseph, O4052840.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Burris, Norman Leroy, O4032307.
Pulcini, Dino Joseph, O4064869.
Stevenson, Wilbert Charles, O4049293.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Eddy, Gerald Arthur, O5701429.
Kinnamon, Kenneth Ellis, O2297988.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Cooper, Alice Eugenia, L2294020.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Dorman, Joyce Rose Marie, N5407137.
Miles, Marcia Elaine, N2293782.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Arkinson, Thomas Eugene.
Dillie, Charles William, Jr., BR13689995.
Dubiel, Joseph, Jr., O4085507.
Graham, Richard William, O2299093.
Houston, William Eddie, O5212037.
Hubbard, James Arthur, O5204717.
Lamport, James Earle, O2297118.
Martinka, Gerald Rudolph, O5504021.
Murray, Robert Eugene, O2297343.
Norris, Jimmy Richard, O2297119.
Redman, David Elmer, O5401527.
Summary, James John, O2300222.
Thomas, Donald Wayne, O2300454.
Travis, Edward Ernest, O2298306.
Wergeland, David Andrew, O2300532.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

McCord, Patricia Ann, L2298792.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Christianson, Lloyd Duane, O5512454.
Hall, Joseph Andrew.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Besemer, Ellsworth Albert.
Bird, William Wirt, Jr.
Chen, William Shao-Chang.
Connell, Thomas Richard, Jr., O5705725.
Coseo, David Paul, O5311183.
Craig, John Davis.
Curcio, Anthony James, Jr., O5213423.
DeSantis, Edward, O5008245.
Dreska, John Paul.
Earle, Robert Ray.
Finnerty, Robert John.
Gallagher, Donald Michael.
Harris, Benny Ronney Sanford.
Hendrick, Thomas Gould, III, O5410462.
Hill, Wilmer Darden, O5311106.
Javorka, Frank Henry, O5410478.
Kemp, Robert Francis.
Korbel, John Robert.
Laird, Kenneth Wayne, O5705018.

Leatherwood, Thomas Lewis, Jr., O5410393.
Lind, Alan David, O5704989.
Mallette, Alfred John.
Martinez, Arthur Caulfield.
McCord, Chancey Kelly, O5213328.
McGruder, Kenneth Byron.
McNeil, William Dean.
Myers, Nathan Joseph.
Olsen, Kenneth Jay.
Owen, Dean Mallory, O5705746.
Peterson, Robert Dale.
Phelps, Arland Eugene.
Pratt, Joseph.
Sheffer, Ronald Gene.
Stubblefield, Joel Richard, O5410264.
Summers, Bruce Gregory, O5705175.
Tang, Douglas Brayton, O5512905.
Taylor, Edwin Fitz-Gerald.
Turnbull, John Gordon.
Ulrich, Carl Edward, Jr., O5705537.
Werner, David Ross, O5410490.
White, Douglas Raeburn, O5213800.
Woliver, Jimmy Wayne.

POSTMASTERS

The following named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Gilbert W. Melcher, Gulf Shores, Ala., in place of Frank Wenzel, removed.

COLORADO

Charles E. Casper, Campo, Colo., in place of B. M. Wells, retired.

IDAHO

Wayne J. Roos, Sandpoint, Idaho, in place of D. P. Woodard, retired.

ILLINOIS

Eleanor M. Smith, Thomasboro, Ill., in place of A. J. Ulrich, retired.

INDIANA

A. Wayne Kellams, Edinburg, Ind., in place of R. K. Auxier, retired.

KANSAS

Leonard Y. Craig, Mulvane, Kans., in place of G. E. Smysor, retired.
Marion E. Keely, Rock, Kans., in place of E. E. Kunkle, retired.
Thurman A. Kelly, Towanda, Kans., in place of La Vera Wheeler, retired.

KENTUCKY

Dan R. Cabell, New Castle, Ky., in place of E. L. Bailey, retired.

MARYLAND

Marion E. Hopkins, Nanjemoy, Md., in place of M. C. Ward, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

John A. MacIver, Monterey, Mass., in place of A. P. Phillips, removed.

MICHIGAN

Charles W. Fairchild, Frankfort, Mich., in place of R. E. Peterson, deceased.
Robert L. Selby, Sturgis, Mich., in place of J. E. Luttmann, deceased.
Mildred H. Seaman, Sumner, Mich., in place of A. W. Bond, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Albert V. Nelson, Austin, Minn., in place of Elmer Requa, deceased.
Harold A. Randen, Nicollet, Minn., in place of W. H. Gronholz, Jr., transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

J. Ray Bonds, Booneville, Miss., in place of F. J. Fugitt, retired.

MISSOURI

Charles W. Glass, Baring, Mo., in place of J. W. Costello, retired.
Byron D. Montgomery, Slater, Mo., in place of H. B. Brown, retired.

NEBRASKA

Earl W. Weber, Creston, Nebr., in place of G. H. Summers, retired.
Donald D. Smith, Douglas, Nebr., in place of D. G. Hendricks, retired.

NEW YORK

Robert E. Wallace, Castile, N.Y., in place of Martin Carey, retired.
Dorothy L. Varley, Thomson, N.Y., in place of G. E. Varley, retired.

OHIO

Alberta M. Edwards, Kipton, Ohio, in place of B. R. Waite, deceased.

OREGON

Norman B. Hess, Roseburg, Oreg., in place of C. W. Carstens, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Henry H. Greenfield, Coatesville, Pa., in place of C. H. Conner, retired.
George M. Brunner, Cranesville, Pa., in place of M. H. Thrasher, retired.
Billy D. Pomeroy, East Springfield, Pa., in place of M. G. Spencer, retired.
Charles K. Bantley, Windber, Pa., in place of C. W. Baumgardner, deceased.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Maurice D. Putnam, Artesian, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Heinricks, retired.
Hobart H. Gates, Custer, S. Dak., in place of H. M. Himebaugh, retired.

TEXAS

R. Donal Ray, Graham, Tex., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

VIRGINIA

Eva B. Toner, Claremont, Va., in place of Rudolph Shiffer, deceased.
Robert T. Gillette, Courtland, Va., in place of B. A. Williams, Jr., resigned.
Brenda S. Holt, Rockville, Va., in place of R. S. Johnson, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Raymond J. West, Blaine, Wash., in place of W. V. Cowderoy, deceased.
Dorothy D. Eldridge, Fox Island, Wash., in place of C. R. Bowyer, retired.
Paul C. Alvestad, Gig Harbor, Wash., in place of T. W. Tait, retired.
Albert A. Novick, Kelso, Wash., in place of S. M. Lord, retired.
John B. Walli, Lacrosse, Wash., in place of C. E. Shaver, resigned.
Aaron B. Green, Monroe, Wash., in place of C. H. Currie, retired.
Ida M. Femling, Riverside, Wash., in place of A. J. Dickinson, retired.
Merl T. Benton, Rockport, Wash., in place of E. V. Pressentin, retired.
Robert N. Prante, Satsop, Wash., in place of R. H. Hughes, retired.
Florence C. Blaisdell, Snoqualmie Falls, Wash., in place of L. E. Metzler, transferred.
Richard H. Usher, Sumner, Wash., in place of W. L. Barnard, retired.
Harvey L. Jones, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.
Samuel R. Campbell, Tieton, Wash., in place of A. R. Schooler, retired.
Gaines B. Seefeldt, Toppenish, Wash., in place of P. D. Wilson, retired.
John W. Rice, Valley, Wash., in place of A. J. Diedrich, retired.
Orville K. Allen, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of J. F. Lester, deceased.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Murat W. Williams, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Glennon, James B., Jr.
Carneal, Wyatt B., Jr.
Walsh, Walter R.
O'Connor, Thomas J.
Johnson, Richard S.
Spritzen, Roland J.
Lattimer, Hubert C.
Wilkinson, Andrew M.
Dalton, Honore G.
Aldridge, Frederick S.
Glickert, Robert W.
Russell, Gerald F.
Currin, Ralph H.
West, Fraser E.
Popper, Harry S., Jr.
Doyle, Edward J.
Helmer, Wilbur R.
Sawyer, Webb D.
Jewson, Winston E.
Kisgen, James T.
Moore, George E.
Oliver, William P., Jr.
Williams, Maxie R.
Pratt, Harry D.
Dobson, Charles E., Jr.
Harris, Arnold W.
Reid, Leonard D.
Cokin, Milton G.
Wertman, Howard E.
Altman, Sidney J.
Buzhardt, Harry O.
Feeley, James A., Jr.
McDaniel, James T.
Keller, Robert P.
Stapp, Donald H.
Armstrong, Alan J.
Lahue, Foster C.
Padley, John J.
Porter, Frank R., Jr.
Campbell, Albert W.
Mee, Fenton J.
Pratt, Spencer H.
Arsenault, Albert
Farrelly, Robert B.
Vogel, Frank H., Jr.
Clark, James H.
West, Robley E.
Gorman, John E.
King, John H., Jr.
Bangert, Douglas A.
Bronleewe, Thomas G., Jr.
Ireland, Julius W.
Howatt, William J.
Burnett, John R.
Randall, David S.
Winstead, Edwin G.
Esterline, William C.
Marsh, William H.
Blackwell, James R.
Dulacki, Leo J.
Daughtry, George W. E.
Hammond, Bruce B.
Nelson, Stanley J.
Brickley, John H.
Griffin, David R.
Ryffel, George G.
Hammond, Robert C., Jr.
Coss, Francis K.
Vick, Kirby B.
Schlesinger, Francis R.
Ingle, Shelton C.
Sherman, Donald W.
Olson, Merlin R.
Smith, Robert E., Jr.
Miller, Roy D.
Bonner, William R.
Clarke, Harry D.
Elliott, Benton H.
Norton, William R.
Kurdziel, Edward G.
Blackwell, John O.
Myers, Reginald R.
Leffers, James
Martin, Glen E.
Trompeter, Joseph D.
Atkin, Ernest G., Jr.
Miller, Norman A., Jr.
Andre, Paul L., Jr.
Smith, Sherman A.
McGlothlin, Joe H., Jr.
Baker, Robert R.
Yunck, Michael R.
Quilty, Joseph F., Jr.
McElhany, Boyd C., Jr.
Moran, Arthur M.
Moore, Jack R.
Morrison, Jack W.
Flaherty, Robert F.
Scott, Jack C.
Shuman, Perry L.
Abblitt, William E.
Eisele, Harold A.
Long, Herbert H.
Whitten, Robert T.
McMahon, John P.
White, Robert O.
Love, James W.
Holdzkom, Lincoln N.
Widdecke, Charles F.
Andruska, Bruno J.
Early, Cleland E.
Burgoyne, William R., Jr.
Wilson, Louis H., Jr.
Flake, William L.
Gottschalk, Vincent J.
Gililland, George A.
Mitchell, Bryan B.
Wojcik, Thaddeus P.
McLaughlin, John N.
Holmes, Fenwicke W.
Haltom, Winfield S., Jr.
Treleaven, Lewis F.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Aufmann, Richard N.
Westmoreland, William T., Jr.
Mulroney, Peter J.
Walker, Charles E.
Greene, Thomas N.
Jones, Jack R.
Earl, Quentin V.
Rudenauer, Francis X.
Ing, Herbert E., Jr.
Heier, William D.
De Long, Phillip C.
Harper, Edwin A.
Reber, John J.
MacLean, William G., Jr.
Lewis, Ralph H.
Hughes, Frederick E.
Coffey, John F.
Fry, William F.
Mesko, John
Castagna, Anthony J.
Einum, James R.
Averill, Gerald P.
Soupios, Alfred V.
McCreery, Russell E.
Sherbondy, Arthur L.
Faser, Karl E.
Haffey, Eugene H.
Keagy, Lowell T.
Sedgwick, Robert R.
Shapiro, Vernon W.
McMullen, Francis A.
Shelly, Kermit H.
Gehri, Donald J.
Bonner, Joel E., Jr.
Nuess, Robert H.
Phillips, William T.
Barker, Edward L.
Smith, Nathan R.
Breen, Richard R.
Olson, Virgil D.
Reed, Godfrey H.
Knapp, Raymond E., Jr.
Mitchell, Robert H.
Hurst, Thomas C.
Parran, Thomas, Jr.
Lengel, Dwain L.
Salvaggio, Marshall
Hilliard, Robert C.
Johnston, Oscar B.
Noel, Paul A., Jr.
Rickabaugh, David D.
Horne, Thomas M.
Maeger, Henry G.
McClure, Grover C., Jr.
Bowers, Marion B.
Schnettler, Edward L.
Hunter, Ovis D.
Merrick, Herbert R., Jr.

Wortman, Harry D.
Hedahl, Everet A.
Stauffer, James E.
Cole, Glenn O.
MacNeil, John A.
Fisher, Don H.
Brewster, David A., Sr.
Hill, Harold S.
Penn, Lloyd S.
Matheson, Bruce J.
McCaleb, Edwin H., III
Walley, James M.
Scherer, John H.
Hanthorn, Jack E.
Cervell, Joseph G.
James, Albert E.
Fuss, Paul
Shute, James J.
Padalino, Mauro J.
Horst, Henry W.
Miller, Lester
Carlson, Alfred G.
Herrick, Donald L.
Atkinson, Albert B.
Bennison, William H.
Kindred, Lawrence E.
Koetsch, Julius F.
Young, James P., Jr.
Lownds, David E.
Lo Prete, Joseph E.
Cornwell, Charles E.
Antley, William E., Jr.
Williams, Albert L.
Taylor, Summerfield M., Jr.
Autry, Robert L.
Sheppard, Frank J.
Wall, Ray B.
Gingher, Harold R.
Kersey, Robert W.
Augeri, Rosario J.
Rotter, Francis F.
Halbert, Wallace M.
Foster, Hardy E.
Moore, Walter
Radics, Emil J.
Pittman, Howard T.
Wilcox, Wilbur D.
Reifel, Horace C.
King, George W.
McDowell, Dean N.
Kleager, Frank C.
MacDonnell, Dermott H.
Cook, Edward
Mehaffey, Harold N.
Johnson, Victor M.
Ross, George O.
Beasley, Clarence B.
Frey, Leroy T.
Nelson, Kenneth B.
Guy, Charles B.
Winchester, Eugene H.
Legan, Stanley F.
Morgan, Henry H.
Saxon, Thomas J., Jr.
Rozier, William R.
Jones, Mark
Peebles, Robert R.
Holt, William R.
Schmidt, George C., Jr.
Pearson, John A.
Davis, Raymond N.
Stubbs, Robert S., II
Tuma, James W.
Read, Benjamin S.
Quint, Frederick A.
Canton, John S.
Giddens, Richard M.
Hall, Reverdy M.
Fris, Edward S.
Persinger, Harry B., Jr.
Dillow, Rex O.
Baird, Robert
Lang, Frank C.
McNiel, Monroe E.
Rieder, Glenn L.
Moos, Kenneth L.
Williams, Walter L.
Earney, William R.
Sturdevan, Garth K.
Melby, William E.
Ord, James B., Jr.
Keown, Lyman E.
McKiever, Charles F.
Kerr, William A.
Harney, John B.
Wegley, Don E.
Veigel, Lester E.
Cresap, Charles C.
Corley, Clarence E., Jr.
Kleber, Victor A., Jr.
Whitescarver, Kenneth T., Jr.
Glenn, John H., Jr.
Johnson, Earl W.
Marker, Rolland E.
Swenson, Lester V.
Lynch, Robert J., Jr.
Armstrong, Victor A.
LaMar, Robert L.
Mosca, Herbert P., Jr.
Humphreys, Zaphney O.
Lewis, George F.
Mack, William E.
Bryant, George M.
Emils, Arnold L.
Soderberg, Ralph A.
Fredrick, Charles D.
Harper, James A.
Lindell, Carl W.
Burnam, Thomas J.
Nowadnick, William R.
Ross, Thomas J.
Barnett, John E.
Troy, Harland E.
Bjorson, Richard A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Martin, Virgil R.
*Shenaut, Donald L.
*Roscoe Anthony J.
*Miears, William D.
*Hudock, John C.
*Nolte, William L.
Metz, Adam A.
Adams, Paul
Parham, Bill L.
Pines, Gerald L.
Goare, Henry G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Miller, William T.
*Stahlstrom, Harry A.
*Booker, Jesse V.
*Moore, Harry R.
*Peevey, Nathan B., Jr.
*Crapo, William M., Jr.
*Gibson, John A., Jr.
*Doxey, Donald T.
*Stanfield, James C.
*Ronald, Robert C.
*Leland, Harry E., Jr.
*McPartlin, Charles E., Jr.
*Limberg, Robert D.
*Blankenship, Clifford P.
*Cotton, James T.
*Sumerlin, Earl B., Jr.
*Lavoy, John H.
*Ciampa, Emilius R., Jr.
*Seibert, Kenneth D.
*Blakely, James A., Jr.
*Gallo, James A., Jr.
*Page, Leslie L.
*Riley, David
*Barney, Irvin J.
*Poppe, Elery G.
*Hickey, Thomas R. Jr.
*Waltz, Herbert R.
*Doty, William C., Jr.
*Kositch, Alexander
*Whitaker, James L.
*Carlock, Robert O.
*Morel, Oscar J.
*Daze, Louis R.
*Gentry, Tolbert T.
*Hopkins, Donald S.
*Dimond, Neil
*Shook, Frank A., Jr.
*Lauer, Stewart R.
*Crew, Charles E.
*Hall, Harold K.
*Aynes, James P.
*Bauman, George F.
*Doherty, John J.
*Redmond, Walter L.
*Stingley, Elmo J.
*Long, Edwin B.
*Mackel, Edward H.
*Brandon, Lawrence H.
*Pippin, Franklin N.
*Prestridge, John G.
*Barber, Billy H.
*Kapsch, Joseph R.
*Fox, James G.
*Stirling, Harold H., Jr.
*Dupre, Paul J.
*Gallagher, Burnett R.
*Young, Frank R.
*Reece, Josef I.
*Davis, Stanley
*James, William C., Jr.
*Stephenson, Lyle S.
*Ostby, John L.
*Yerkes, Robert W.
*Victor, James E., Jr.
*Knauf, Robert C.
*McRobert, Perry P.
*Turner, Byron C.
*Watson, Paul B., Jr.
*Allen, Robert L.
*Rupp, George R.
*Bell, Robert T.
*Gourley, Norman W.
*Cloud, Guy M.
*Biehl, William, Jr.
*Mayer, Henry
*Cordes, Alfred M.
*Canan, Christopher M.
*Lewis, Edward L., Jr.
*Campbell, Charles I., Jr.
*Jefferson, James M., Jr.
*Shields, Robert F.
*Ruffner, Paul M.
*Rinehart, James H.
*Dove, Charles E.
*Healy, Robert M.
*Smith, Leland R.
*Lillie, James L., Jr.
*Sanders, Roger M.
*Callen, George W.
*Traynor, William L.
*Taylor, Richard M.
*Magon, Walter E.
Malcolm, Joseph W., Jr.
Holcombe, James V.
Perry, Jack E.
Garrotto, Alfred F.
Schroeder, Charles L.
Davis, Dellwyn L.
Morrison, William R.
Dunlap, Jack
Cox, Lewis J.
Bennett, Eugene N.
Russell, Marvin R.
Gocke, Charles E.
Farrell, William
Webster, William J.
Woodard, Richard M.
Curtis, Oliver W.
Baker, Robert W.
Browning, Richard C.
Dochterman, Lloyd B., Jr.
Risner, Albert H.
Schoner, Albert C.
Hohl, Robert W.
Schriver, Richard J.
Bauer, Richard A.
Kelley, John P.
Lindley, Dean W.
Bledsoe, Willmar M.
Woods, Laurence H.
Jarrett, Clyde R.
Watts, Frederic T., Jr.
Klingman, Robert R.
Reier, Gordon R.
Fitzgerald, Austin C.
McMullen, Robert A.
Barber, Neil E.
Smith, Mercer R.
Skeath, Marvin A., Jr.
Perrin, John S.
Petro, George E.
Martin, Samuel F.
Briganti, Emi "o
Semb, Allen R.
Jobe, Harrel K.
Huntington, Kenneth E.
Helstrom, Roland S.
Horner, Bill E.
Walker, Edward H.
Johnson, James D., Jr.
Davis, Philip A.
Ward, Dale L.
Mouzakis, George E.
Wilson, Alexander
Redalen, Dwain L.
Michael, Richard L., Jr.
Bortz, William H., Jr.
Lucas, William R.
Waldrop, Otis R.
Wade, Robert
Gallentine, Owen V.
Seminoff, Nicholas M.
Luther, James W.
Phillips, Allen L.
Deasy, Rex A.
Austin, Marshall S.
Weidner, James M.
Norton, Lawrence C.
Johnson, Thirl D.
Poor, Ernest E.
Hill, Arthur T.
Knocke, Jack K.
Davis, George L., Jr.
Quay, John E., Jr.
Graham, Paul G.
Remington, Edgar F.
Collins, Ted H.
Slay, Robert D.
Fellingham, Richard J.
Clary, Matthew A., Jr.
Laspada, John F.
Barrineau, William E.
Kellogg, Wilbur C., Jr.
Mariades, James P.
Cooper, Milton B.
Holzbauer, Joseph F.
Fallon, Eugene B.

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel; subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Kleberger, Doris V.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Seward, Robert F.
Smith, Vincent J.
O'Connor, Alfred L., Jr.
Watson, Royce W.
McKamy, Donald I.
Lemmons, Ray T.
Kroodsma, Gordon A.
Hickman, Edwin L., Jr.
Nelson, Arthur A., Jr.
Hart, Lawrence P.
Beat, Nolan J.
Fassino, Anton N.
Bekins, Robert Q., Jr.
Watson, Warren C.
Busick, Clarence J.
Selleck, Lawrence M., Jr.
Lee, Harry .
McPherson, Gordon D.
Vonhorn, Charles S.
Stott, Harry D.
Read, John L.
Anderson, Howard A., Jr.
Matheson, Kenneth A.
Fulton, Floyd K., Jr.
Smith, George H.
Thompson, Roger B.
Cunningham, John D.
Beckett, William H.
Heflin, Bruce A.
Head, Ralph M.
Beal, Samuel G.
Alford, Bennett W.
Nahow, Theodore
Ferguson, Howard, Jr.
Cook, Bertram E., Jr.
Schmid, Clarence H.
Christopher, Willard N.
Ksycewski, Casimir C.
Boulware, John C.
Evans, Robert C.
Argo, Hugh D.
Dauphine, George M.
Kelly, Joseph J.
MacCormack, William H.
Vaught, Francis W.
Locke, William R.
McGowan, Louis J.
Weber, William E.
Reese, Robert V.
Kirk, Walter C.
Johnstone, John H.
Harris, William D.
Evans, Harold W., Jr.
Anderson, Hermann L.
Allen, James F.
Ball, Robert E.
Tunnell, Robert J., Jr.
Rowlett, Guy W.
Lindall, Albin L., Jr.
Byrum, Paul B.
Brandel, Ralph E.
Ladutko, John
Sanzo, James
Hail, Leslie R.
McGlynn, Raymond J.
Vandalsem, Robert R.
Settle, Ray W.
Green, Carleton M.
Gibson, George E., Jr.
Dunphy, James C.
Clyde, Denton P.
Thompson, John S.
Dillon, James W.
Kelly, Walter C.
Boudreaux, Donald L.
Gray, Harold Z.
Pechar, George
Sinclair, Robert B.
Janiszewski, George
Hall, Clifford D.
Doty, Duane J.
Penley, Virgil R.
Reeder, James H.
Hoch, Kurt L.
Rowe, Edward J.
Murphy, John J.
Nichols, Robert L.
Haynes, Albert B., Jr.
Ingram, Alfred L. V.
Allen, Warren H.
De Barr, John R.
Dunbar, Michael J.
Kirchmann, Charles S.
Frazier, Louis S., Jr.
Probst, Arthur E.
Roberts, James F.
Burch, Carrol B.
Moore, William L.
Sanders, Paul E.
O'Donnell, Andrew W.
Baar, Stuart P., Jr.
Kramek, Stanley E.
Bland, Kenneth R.
Jones, Barney D.
Glover, William R.
Webb, James O.
Mehlinger, Marion F.
Burnett, Loren E.
Hill, Malcolm A.
Sheehan, Charles I.
Rossi, Robert J.
Ettenborough, Robert B.
Shea, William E.
Mann, Clyde R.
Metcalfe, Robert B.
Coffeen, Albert E.
Nelson, William L.
Hershey, Gilbert R.
Hamilton, Ralph H., Jr.
Donahue, William F., Jr.
Shelby, Alfred C., Jr.
Pommerenk, Albert C.
Colella, Roland L.
Fisher, Sidney
Toups, Thaddeus J.
Weaver, Charles A.
Slenning, Bradford N.
Bonds, William E.
Wadsworth, Thomas B.
Snyder, Billy H.
Anderson, George B.
Hampton, Everett
Browne, Gordon S., Jr.
Sears, Redford D.
Webb, Marshall A., Jr.
Soper, James B.
Daskalakis, John A.
Skotnicki, Anthony J.
Reep, Maurice A.
Michaux, Alexander L., Jr.
Gore, Willis L.
Hoskins, Robert E.
See, Charles M.
Hendrickson, Arvil B.
Hunter, Glenn R.
Wagenhoffer, Martin T.
Wann, Charles M., Jr.
Shuford, Robert L.
Usher, Edward G.
Doering, John H., Jr.

Dayvault, Nevin E.
Croyle, Fred K.
Metzger, Theodore E.
Domina, Walter E.
Fox, Jean T.
Jones, Aubrey T.
Harpe, Lilburn L.
Bailey, Edward A.
Rumble, Gerould M., Jr.
Platt, Robert M.
Burke, Thomas W.
Weber, Raymond J.
Pates, Bruce A., Jr.
Bain, Herbert J.
Bell, Van D., Jr.
Groome, Roland C.
Barrett, James B.
Cunard, Earl M., Jr.
Franzman, Freddie L.
Lauck, John H.
Landrigan, James M.
Eddy, Samuel L., Jr.
Schwartz, John L.
Kelly, William D.
Novak, Anthony
Raphael, Milton L.
Kurth, Harold R., Jr.
Camporini, Edward E.
Costanza, Frank V.
Moritz, Andrew B.
Whitehurst, Kenneth
Girard, David D.
Crowley, John F.
Allen, Robert B.
Anthony, William S.
Roberts, Clyde R.
Frazier, Arthur C.
Rogal, Edward R.
Cox, Samuel A., Jr.
Mitchell, Weldon R.
Priddy, James R.
Davis, David A.
Park, Charles E.
White, James H.
Dittmar, Robert W.
Pavlicin, George A.
French, Harry D.
Alexander, Leland G.
Thomas, Alfred I.
Herndon, Wilber N.
Unger, William T.
May, William L., Jr.
Robinson, Eddie L.
Eberhart, John W.
Scott, Louis B.
Riggs, Thomas W.
Herald, Charles D.
Cuneo, John E.
Cooley, Richard A.
Sullivan, Arthur J.
Harris, Leroy C., Jr.
Adair, Harold F.
Hill, Franklin A.
Wilkerson, Herbert L.
Kluckman, Wilson A.
Stone, Earnest H., Jr.
Crispen, Richard W.
Walker, Emerson A.
Ziegler, Paul E.
Leeseberg, Phillip K.
Weizenegger, James A.
Johnson, Corbin J.
Chapman, Fred D.
Kearns, Timothy J.
Timme, William G.
Brierton, Thomas J., Jr.
Taylor, William W.
Mills, Dan L.
Terry, John M., Jr.
Nixon, Dalbro R., Jr.
Chambers, George G., Jr.
Pickett, Philip G.
Little, Eldon L., Jr.
Defenbaugh, Neil F.
Whitehead, Arthur T.
Schening, Richard J.
Harper, Esmond E.
Coppins, Frank B.
Primrose, Richard A.
Davis, Robert L.
Broome, Norris C.
Misiewicz, John
Campbell, Frederick H.
House, Arthur E., Jr.
Hewlett, Marvin M.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Hilgart, Valeria F.
*Baker, Constance

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

King, James P.
Slee, Don J.
Jones, Vernon E.
Fontenot, Karl J., Jr.
Saul, Jacque L.
Cottom, John W.
De Schuytner, Victor R.
Bird, James H., Jr.
Lewis, Robert W.
Trescott, Eugene H.
Green, Austin H.
Andrews, John W.
White, Michael E.
Hodges, Ervin E.
Turner, Frank P.
Barlow, Glen H.
Bates, William H.
Hollis, John S.
Deprima, Joseph
Weise, William
Hyland, Richard L.
Case, Richard A.
Altman, George F.
Thomas, Spencer F.
Christopherson, James W.
Borjesson, Stanley G.
Hofstetter, Robert E.
Field, Wells L., III
Huerlimann, Ernest A., Jr.
Lavigne, Arthur W. D.
Graham, Edward T., Jr.
Mc Lane, Donald C., Jr.
Steinberg, Melvin J.
Jones, Robert I.
Johnston, Paul M.
McBrayer, William L.
Dorman, John F.
Munson, James D.
Thompson, Alva F., Jr.
Davis, Jack W.
Gale, John R.
Wynn, Neal B.
Bucher, William E.
Snyder, Theodore O.
Mickle, Don A.
Andrus, Kermit W.
Drovedahl, Robert
O'Brien, John A.
Kuci, Richard A.
Harris, John B.
Hargadine, Walter W.
O'Brien, William J.
Grunwald, Harry H., Jr.
Penny, James R.
Kelly, Thomas J.
Wallace, Charles F.
Hagaman, Harry T.
Duffield, Daniel M., Jr.
Irion, John W., Jr.
Benton, William D.
Karker, Floyd A., Jr.
McCarthy, Eugene C.
Johnson, Frederick S.
Cheatham, Ernest C., Jr.
Pickett, Bayard S.
McGlone, Vincent P.
Radtke, Paul G.
Batchelder, Sydney H., Jr.
Angelo, Leon N.
Hunter, Maurice
Thomas, William J.
Tolnay, John J.
Chesla, Edward J., Jr.
Lee, Thomas I.
Reddick, Cleveland N. F., Jr.
Witt, Lewis C.
Cornwall, Gerald B.
Lynch, Ronald J.
Fitzgerald, Edward F.
Whalley, Albert
Phillips, John
Jones, Joseph F.
Conlon, James F.
Scoppa, Joseph, Jr.
Snyder, Louis G.
Powell, Rollin R., Jr.
Whelan, William L.
Kramer, William K.
Walker, Dallas R.
McEwan, Frederick J.
Gravel, Marcus J.
Hippler, Rollin E.
Corliss, Gregory A.
Balogh, Howard G.
O'Donnell, Harold F.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Cox, John V.
Johnson, Floyd J., Jr.
Moeller, Richard L.
Fibich, Michael J., Jr.
Moser, Charles F.
Gillis, James E.
Bogg, Charles F.
Cox, Stanley D.
Peck, Kenneth D.
Petersen, Frank E.
Valentine, Herbert J.
Green, Billy R.
Payne, Norman E., Jr.
Ihli, Leo J.
Brown, Carroll E.
Couch, Wallace M.
Kendrick, Harold L.
Wickman, George A.
Swayne, Robert W.
White, Robert E.
Smith, Conway J.
Gregerson, Johnny O.
Rice, Wesley H.
Coates, Franklin W.
Stark, Robert W.
Austgen, Donald R.
Weber, John E., Jr.
Clark, Frank A.
Morris, Wilbur J.
Pierson, Earl F., Jr.
Gillum, Donald E.
Quick, Daniel J.
Catt, Jack R.
Miller, Robert B.
Goodson, George O., Jr.
Goar, John W.
Van Den Elzen, James R.
Miller, Hubert E.
Higgins, James H.
Hahn, Billy H.
Harkey, Herbert J., Jr.
Mushett, Howard F.
Kinniburgh, John A.
Nesbit, Charles L.
Parker, John K.
Bicknell, Ralph L.
Romine, Richard E.
Harlan, Gale
Peterson, Burdette H.
McCauley, Bertram W.
Shaklee, Harold G.
Heesch, Robert W.
McDonald, Richard C.
Fry, Raymond S.
Kirkpatrick, Richard H.
Galloway, Jack J.
Dittmann, Wayne R.
Boyd, Clarence A., Jr.
Baker, William H.
Farris, William E.
Love, Ernold G.
Garrett, Elmer T., Jr.
Hossli, Carl C.
Morrin, Wardell C.
Wilson, Billy E.
Fish, Thomas E.
Cuppy, Will C., Jr.
Beach, Andrew D.
Ward, George W.
La Porte, Alphonse A., Jr.
Ford, Daniel J.
Roberts, Richard T.
Henley, Robert J.
Fink, Arden L.
Dean, Roland H.
Berthoud, Kenneth H., Jr.
Ruete, Alfred W., Jr.
Cohn, William A.
Drescher, Herbert W.
Casey, Francis M.
Lawendowski, John J.
Went, Joseph J.
Hafey, Robert J., Jr.
Field, Harold J., Jr.
Kelly, David A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Adamczuk, Russell W.
*Weiler, Frank V.
*Collins, Garrett L.
*Houder, Charles H., Jr.
*Rapp, John T.
*Schneider, Lawrence A.
*Ullom, Thomas H.
*Bruce, Frank H., Jr.
O'Neal, Robert P.
Ultsch, Harold E.
Evans, William T.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*O'Bymachow, Joseph P.
*Holben, David S.
*Wheeler, Thomas M.
*Graeff, Edward W.
*Gaffney, Jack A.
*Schafer, John B.
*Winberg, James M.
*Grimes, Billy M.
*Rogers, John A., II
*Capwell, George L., Jr
*Nussel, Arthur H.
*Lary, Ralph L., Jr.
*Kahler, Billy J.
*Cleveland, Robert E.
*Oldham, John S.
*McInroe, Jimmy B.
Armstrong, Stephen A.
Shockley, Gordon E.
Morris, John B.
Reeves, Michael P.
Dane, Donald W.
Lottman, William J.
Davis, William C.
Miller, James A.
Shaver, Glenn J., Jr.
Blackburn, George M.
Gagen, John A.
Tinsley, Dale L.
McCarthy, Donald J.
Llewellyn, Perry T.
Jahn, James D.
Smyth, George W., Jr.
Nelson, Marvin R.
Ruthven, Colin J.
Cathcart, Donald E.
Ausley, Wilbur H.
Adams, Richard J.
Anderson, Ira C.
Watson, Jac D.
Merritt, Gene R.
Thompson, Jerry R.
Hill, Lorenza H., Jr.
James, Gerald D.
Lively, Charles M.
Brown, Richard H.
Eddy, John L.
Spaulding, Dorsey L.
Lee, Peter B.
Gurtner, James F.
Kerce, Herbert M.
Correll, William R., Jr.
Wallace, Lorin C., Jr.
Rule, Julius M., III
Caylor, David A.
Burns, Mervyn J.
Miller, Ralph D.
Yates, Charles E.
Ellis, Gerald L.
Kirby, Donald E.
Pitt, Albert
Caldas, John J., Jr.
Tunget, Everett L.
Silva, Lionel V.
Ficere, William G., Jr.
McCarty, James A.
Murch, David H.
Wilson, Dwayne E. T.
Loe, Gerald E.
Strand, Gordon D.
Ramsey, David A.
Hohman, Richard B.
Freeman, Robert A.
Hatch, William W.
Heiser, Karl R.
Houle, Frederick J., Jr.
Bjork, Wayne V.
Ludlow, James L.
Broad, Robert O., Jr.
Walsh, Robert L.
Hatch, Donald J.
Smith, Norman H.
Allen, Francis R.
Ragsdale, James E., Jr.
Schuyler, John A.
Kennedy, Thomas J., Jr.
Kent, William L.
Kennedy, Clifford A.
Earls, Kenneth W.
Conway, Thomas F.
Carr, Donald S.
Bailey, David B.
Difiore, Harold J.
Poronto, Earle G.
Pritchett, Louis C.
Kitchens, Kenneth E.
Cloutier, Paul N.
Taylor, Charles W.
Voigt, Wilson A.
Kazmierczak, Robert B.
Kachauskas, Carl W.
Rhodes, James L.
Adams, Richard O.
Leo, Pasquale
Wessel, William C., Jr.
Seay, Donald R.
Robinson, Lucien C.
McCoart, James J., Jr.
Lougheed, Thomas P.
Marquette, Eugene O., III
Lee, Howard V.
Wilde, Hugh L.
Hanly, Alfred S.
Fullerton, Edward R.
Harding, William W., Jr.
Vreeland, Norman H.
Price, William G.
Parker, John B.
Sfreddo, Robert L.
Combs, Loyal D.
Byram, Joseph C., Jr.
Tharp, John J.
Douglas, Richard T.
Lutes, Morris W.
Johns, David D.
Page, Dorsie D., Jr.
Fennell, Harris J.
Johnson, Robert C.
Monroe, Jack J., Jr.
Livingston, Henry S.
Huston, Ralph S.
Owen, Ronald L.
Hunt, Harry A., Jr.
Finn, Robert C.
Memmer, George V.
Schumacher, James A.
Walker, Edwin H., IV
Hampton, Charles T.
Carrier, John H.
Schoon, John E.
Williams, Donald E.
McManus, William J.
Keenan, John M.
Preble, Lee A.
Coykendall, John M.
Donovan, John B., Jr.
Clark, George
Finlon, Arthur P.
Cameron, Dougal A., III
Throm, Robert B.
Brooks, Donald D.
Edwards, Fred L., Jr.
McKenna, William E., Jr.
Nice, Lloyd B.
Taylor, George H., III
Trader, Everett P., Jr.
Crudup, Dempsey B.
Kropp, Ronald G.
Slider, William P.
Corbett, Roy G.
Reed, Ralph L.
Johnson, Lester E.
James, Perry L.
Hunt, Theodore E.
McGrady, Garnett
Cody, Joseph F., Jr.
Hicks, Jimmie A.
Park, Ralph K.
Kropinack, Robert C.
Skelton, Richard J.
Larimer, Neil M., II
Jasper, Norman J., Jr.
Gonzales, Cyril E.
Splean, Roger A.
Johnson, Gunnar A.
Sinclair, Duan K., Jr.
White, Craig A.
Blair, Lynde D.
Turner, Terry
Shortt, Harry R.
McKellar, Charles W. F.
Glaser, Ronald R.
Reilly, James K.
Schultz, Jack T.
Eskam, John A.
Taylor, Richard B.
Martin, Delbert M.
Spooner, Richard T.
Reese, John A., Jr.
Zeterberg, David P.
Soesbe, Keith E.
Hatfield, Charles D.
Carroll, John E., Jr.
Vogel, Peter J.
Sullivan, Michael P.
Bode, Donald H.

Hornsby, Malcolm T., Jr.
Erickson, Bernon R.
Edens, Allen R.
Carroll, Edward P.
Russell, Eugene B.
Noll, Richard A.
Abraham, Louis R.
Smith, Robert W.
Carlton, John D.
Hey, John M.
Musilli, John A.
Cronin, Timothy J., Jr.
Rackham, Robert N.
Strain, Walter L.
Franklin, Ray M.
Bowlin, Jerry T.
Regan, Frank C., Jr.
Mulrooney, Michael J.
Williams, James P.
Adams, Thomas G.
Morgan, Harvey J.
Lundberg, Darwin D.
Spaete, Robert P.
Kartchner, Orville R.
Van Gorder, Jan H.
Hamilton, George S.
Kostesky, Raymond M.
Sasso, Louis G.
Knight, Frank P.
Landis, John L.
Brandt, Loren A.
Cone, Fred J.
Meeth, John C., Jr.
Edgar, Thomas R.
Dunn, Ronald E.
Nichols, Donald L.
Varney, Richard S.
Toben, Theodore J., Jr.
Ogden, Don J.
Porter, Charles R.
Baker, George A., III
Poorman, Gary L.
Burns, Jackie D.
Barnard, William H.
Sanders, Joe P.
Moe, Frederick J.
MacFarlane, John L.
Moore, Robert S.
Hanna, Don K.
Burke, John J., Jr.
O'Toole, Patrick E.
Searle, Henry L.
Gulick, Roy M., Jr.
Angle, Harold L.
Franklin, Carroll R.
Ledin, Jerry W.
Bateman, John H.
Tully, Thomas J.
Porter, Robert R.
Carbonar, Vincent A.
Shank, Paul J., Jr.
Raines, Henry R.
Smallman, John
Adamo, Nicholas J.
Crone, Forrest W.
Ryan, Edward F.
Barnes, Harry F.
Van Leeuwen, Neil R.
Friske, John D.
Yezzi, Richard C.
Swenson, Carter P.
Rice, James F.
O'Brien, Robert L.
Carney, Robert T.
Doerner, William C.
Chapman, Harlan P.
McDavid, James E., III
Chambers, Dwight L.
Frank, Armin H.
Winoski, Walter M.
Stannard, Robert A.
Egan, John J.
Lethin, Ronald R.
Becker, Raymond A.
Holmes, Lee B.
Murtland, James B., III
Smith, William D.
Marren, Harry T.
Morris, George S.
Bailey, Carlos T.
Stauffer, Robert M.
Orio, Carl D.
Townley, Edward F., Jr.
Albans, Constantine
Loring, Arthur P., Jr.
Whaley, William M.
Facklam, Arnold W., Jr.
Peterson, Robert L.
Kenworthy, Richard J.
Dailey, John R.
Dwyer, Robert H.
Phillips, Reed, Jr.
Moriarty, Neil F.
Wynn, Anthony M.
Sargeant, Robert A.
Rychlik, Robert W.
Szafranski, Leonard J., Jr.
Vernay, Vincent A.
Schneider, John F.
Ferdinand, Warren A.
Roach, James L.
Hager, George F., Jr.
Beck, Peter S.
Braun, Richard G.
Miller, Neil P.
Johnson, Bruce W.
Reilly, William J., Jr.
Taylor, Theodore W.
Fazekas, Alex E.
Cobb, Charles S., III
Carolan, Frederick A.
Luedke, Bruce D.
Wills, Wayne M.
Baggett, Robert L.
Formanek, Robert L.
Looney, Edmund P., Jr.
Schaet, Donald E.
Fredericks, Ronald D.
Svec, M. Ronald
Deibler, Harold J.
Stein, Michael E.
Palmore, Carroll A.
Seals, Charles J., Jr.
Monson, Charles L., Jr.
Harman, John R.
Houston, Thomas C.
Hart, Milledge A., III
Gillespie, Thomas E., Jr.
Dettle, Christian J.
Lynch, Thomas K.
Ryan, Thomas J.
Wuertz, Joseph B.
Lynn, Chester V., Jr.
Jaczko, Eugene S., Jr.
Becerra, Rafael A., Jr.
Swab, James E.
Ford, Pat D.
Hopkins, John I.
Dowling, Edmund H.
Lynch, Bruce G.
Martin, Joel A.
Weinerth, Stuart L., Jr.
Rohloff, Carl A.
Leva, Russell E.
Knettles, Charles E.
Norman, Ronald E.
Evans, John S.
Reinke, Milton A.
Stith, Edward E.
Lee, Alex
Milligan, Robert F.
Herlihy, Horace F.
Boyd, Edward H.
Thompson, Jack C.
Millington, Seth F.
Thompson, Milton S.
Mulcahy, Robert D.
Schmidt, James M.
Clark, Dale H.
Townsend, James B.
Dolson, Thomas C.
Treichler, Donald R.
Maeser, Earl S.
Beckman, Norbert J.
Felker, James E.
Wilkerson, Melvin V., Jr.
Brower, George H.
Cannon, Charles E.
Gazzaniga, Donald A.
Powers, Robert A.
Wildprett, William R.
Solomonson, Carl, Jr.
Barner, George B., Jr.
Andrews, William D.
Dubac, Carl H.
Motherway, Robert T.
Eikenbery, Terry L.
Palmer, John K.
Slough, Phillip G.
Krauss, Walter J., Jr.
Shigley, Richard T.
Mavretic, Josephus L.
Jastrzemski, Walter M.
Rourke, William B., Jr.
Frasier, Joseph A., III
Brokaw, James C.
Shillinglaw, James S.
Henry, John W., Jr.
Henry, Richard T.
Lewis, Franklin J.
Klingensmith, Cloyd H.
Lynch, Jarvis D., Jr.
McGrath, Daniel R.
O'Brien, Richard J.
Whitton, Frank H.
Douglas, Donald M.
O'Shea, Cornelius J., Jr.
Brown, Robert S., Jr.
Perry, Clarence R.
Smith, James W.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Donohoe, Katherine M.
Gulbransen, Jerry G.
Leonard, Betty L.
Connors, Anna M.
Hoskin, Patricia A.
Mink, Shirley L.
Hernandez, Manuela
Auldridge, Carolyn J.
Quisenberry, Delores J.
Primeau, Elaine E.
Rivera, Cuevas S.
Farman, Elsa L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abney, Robert D.
Adams, Dale H.
Adams, Hubert J., Jr.
Aiken, Thomas H.
Albright, Howard E.
Alexander, Charles R.
Alexander, John R.
Alexander, Richard H.
Alexander, Robert B.
Allen, James R.
Alley, Rodney H.
Allinder, Myrl W., Jr.
Alogna, John M.
Amick, Lewie E., Jr.
Andre, Joseph S.
Andersen, Donald E.
Anderson, John W.
Anderson, Leland G.
Anderson, Leon L.
Anthony, Anthony A.
Anthis, Bobby G.
Arnold, Curtis G.
Austin, Randall W.
Auten, Don E.
Ayers, James W.
Bailey, Gene E.
Baker, Charles W.
Baker, Horace W.
Baldwin, William S.
Barney, Dale G.
Barrett, Charles S., III
Bartol, Henry J.
Bauer, William D.
Beckwith, William H.
Behme, James E.
Bergen, Daniel F.
Bigler, James C., Jr.
Black, Robert M.
Blackington, R. C., Jr.
Bohr, Harper L., Jr.
Boman, Bruce B.
Bonthrow, William J.
Booth, Francis D.
Bossert, John M.
Bosworth, Gerald G.
Boudreaux, Sidney J., Jr.
Bowles, Ray W.
Bowman, Donald G.
Bown, Rodney L.
Brackman, James T., II
Breitenbach, Roy G.
Brennan, William F.
Brickett, Charles M.
Brill, Arthur P., Jr.
Brill, Newton C.
Brinegar, Richard L.
Brock, David A.
Brown, Charles J.
Brown, Larry K.
Brown, Richard H.
Browne, Edward R.
Bryan, Jonathan R.
Bucknam, Howard V.
Buerk, Gerald S.
Burke, John P.
Burleson, Eugene B., Jr.
Buss, Richard H.
Butchart, Edward W.
Butler, Frank H.
Byrnes, Robert E., III
Cady, Thomas C.
Campanella, Francis B.
Capek, Richard C.
Carlton, Richard L.
Carswell, Donn A.
Cartwright, David L.
Carty, John J.
Cassidy, Myles D.
Caswell, Russell J.
Caton, James R.
Chambliss, John C.
Chappel, John F.
Chase, William E.
Clark, Robert L.
Clay, John P.
Clinton, James R.
Cobb, Jerry L.
Cockell, Robert C.
Cohan, Leon, Jr.
Collins, Carl G.
Collins, Larry M.
Collins, Patrick G.
Collison, Walter N., Jr.
Cook, Ernest T., Jr.
Cooper, Harlan C., Jr.
Cooper, Jerome G.
Cooper, Matthew T.
Cooper, Samuel W.
Copeland, Joseph D.
Corn, Charles P.
Cox, Frank J., Jr.
Crabtree, Robert G.
Criger, Frank R.
Crubbs, Wendell O.
Cullen, Robert F.
Culver, Richard O., Jr.
Cunningham, Dennis M.
Cunningham, Francis J., III
Curd, James H. R.
Cuthrell, Donald W., Jr.
Czerwinski, John L.
Dalberg, James E.
Damuth, Don R.
Daniels, Clifton
Davis, Charles E., III
Davis, Charles W.
Davis, Ronald W.
Davis, William G.
Day, Bernard C.
Dean, Alan J.
Dean, Bennett R.
Deatrick, George B.
DeBrine, Richard A.
Deegan, Gene A.
DeMartino, Pasquale W.
Dennis, Charles H.
Dominquez, Marino T.
Donnelly, John L.
Donnelly, Walter A., Jr.
Dougherty, Paul K.
Doughty, Clifford C.
Douse, George H.
Driscoll, Eugene J., Jr.
Drury, Michael C.
Dube, Marcel J.
Dulaney, Richard L.
Dusek, Lowell M.
Dwyre, Michael D.
Dyer, Calvin R.
Dyer, Paul W.
Ebanks, William J., Jr.
Edwards, Elgin C.
Elofson, Rodger H.
Embry, John P. J.
Evans, Robert V.
Featherston, Robert K.
Felix, William D.
Ferguson, Robert A.
Ferguson, William C., III
Floyd, William C.
Foster, Edward B.
Foster, Roger G.
Fraser, Thomas J., Jr.
Fredricks, William B.
French, Leighton H.
Friedland, Alan S.
Garant, Philias R.
Garcia, Robert E.
Gardner, Benjamin W.
Garner, John T.
Gelpi, Gerard T.
Gilligan, Adrian
Ging, Edward D.
Giordano, Joseph F.
Gleason, Michael N.
Gleason, Richard E.
Gleim, Earl C.
Goldberg, Marvin A.
Goode, Kenneth N.
Gordon, Richard H.
Granger, James H.
Gratto, Joseph M.
Green, John M., Jr.
Greene, Robert W.
Hafner, Bron D.
Halbleib, John A.
Hale, Harold W.
Hale, William H., Jr.
Hanley, Michael J.
Hanson, Richard A.
Hanthorn, Russell L.
Hardgrove, William R.
Harnden, Milton D.
Harper, Hugh J.
Harris, John E.
Harvey, Alan N.
Hatton, George A., Jr.
Haws, William E., Jr.
Hayward, Benjamin N., Jr.
Hemingway, John W.
Henry, James W.
Himmerich, Robert T.
Hocevar, Francis A.
Hodge, Gene D.
Hofland, Robert M.
Hogaboom, Pieter L.
Horne, George R., II
House, David W.
House, Edward L., Jr.
Houseman, William B.
Hudson, Jerry E.
Huffman, Donald R.
Huff, Edwin L.
Huffcut, William H., II
Hulme, Michael E.
Hurley, Robert B.
Iles, Jacob E.
Iliff, Warren J.
Imbus, Robert J., Jr.
Irish, Jerry A.
Isherwood, Geoffrey B.
James, Joseph L.
James, Ronald K.
Jenkins, Jerry H.
Jespersen, Robert R.
Judkins, Paul G.
Kaapu, Kekoa D.
Kammeier, Frederick A.
Kandra, Myron J.
Kazalunas, John
Keane, Michael F., Jr.
Keating, Daniel J., Jr.
Keith, Charles R.
Kelly, Daniel A.
Kelley, Philip S., Jr.
Kerr, Richard A.
Keshian, Richard
Kester, Robert L.
Kieselbach, Philip J.
Kirkham, James H.
Klinkenberg, Arnold L.
Knapper, Roger E.
Knight, James R.
Knowles, Robert C., Jr.
Krebs, John F.
Kreicker, Graham H.
Kretschmar, Ernest T.
Kulp, James E.
Kynion, Kaye M.
Lakes, Jack B.
Lammerding, Richard L.
Landy, Barry A.
Lanigan, John D.
Larsen, Raymond E.
Larson, Richard D.
Lawe, Richard C.
Lawler, Traugott F.
Leary, Daniel F., III
Lee, William F.
Lemmons, Jimmy B.
Lengauer, George T., Jr.
Letscher, Martin G.
Lewis, Sherman R., Jr.
Lindseth, Clarence D.
Little, John C., III
Longdon, Alexander P., Jr.
Losack, Joseph P.
Lovell, John H., II
Luft, Robert S.
Lummis, Charles D.
MacCarthy, Alan W., Jr.
Mackin, Patrick M.
MacWay, Malcolm L.
Magee, James T., Jr.
Maguire, Robert J.
Mahoney, John M.
Ma Keever, Harrison A.
Maley, Frederic W.
Maloy, Kevin A.

Manazir, Charles H.
Martin, Edgar C.
Martin, Warren L.
Massey, Gerald J.
Maxwell, John A.
Mayberry, William B.
Mayers, Kenneth E.
McCabe, John G.
McCormick, Ralph C.
McElroy, Theodore R.
McFadden, Jack D.
McGuire, James S.
McIntyre, Melvin
McKinney, Ronald D.
McKittrick, Robert O.
McLaughlin, George D., Jr.
McNally, Paul F.
McNelly, John F.
McNutt, Kenneth A.
Mead, Charles P., Jr.
Means, Henry N., III
Meissner, Howard W.
Merriss, William D.
Milleman, Sherwood E.
Miller, Anthony D.
Miller, Richard A.
Miluski, Joseph J.
Mixson, Miles E.
Molineaux, Joseph F., Jr.
Molsbee, Neil
Mooney, William A.
Moore, Royal N., Jr.
Morris, Paul D.
Mosher, David K.
Mulcahy, Thomas J.
Mulkern, Thomas R., Jr.
Mulkey, Jesse G.
Murdick, Perry H., III
Murphy, John R.
Nappi, Louis T.
Naugle, Donald G.
Navadel, George D.
Newman, Gale L.
Nichols, Charles H., Jr.
Nicol, Alton E.
Nielsen, Bruce S.
Noble, Robert E.
Notine, Daniel M.
Nugent, Wallace R.
Oakley, Cledith E.
O'Brien, Joseph J.
O'Hayre, John J., Jr.
Olson, Reid H.
Ondrick, Robert M.
Oravits, Joseph J.
Ovelgonne, Walter E.
Overmyer, Robert F.
Paige, Reid B.
Parks, Hugh L., III
Pastrell, Darrell K.
Patrick, Jimmy L.
Payton, Luther L., Jr.
Pederson, Richard J.
Peterson, David B.
Phenegar, Wesley R., Jr.
Pierce, Jerry S.
Polk, Larry J.
Polyak, George R.
Poore, Horace
Pope, Ernie T.
Power, Thomas J.
Powell, Donald A.
Pratt, Thomas M., III
Prewitt, Robert C.
Quanrud, Richard B.
Radcliffe, Eugene T.
Raines, Richard C.
Ramsay, Charles J.
Rasavage, John R.
Ratzlaff, James W.
Rausch, Robert C.
Reczek, Gerald F.
Reed, Robert W.
Reeves, Thomas L.
Regan, Charles D.
Reynolds, Richard C.
Rhinesmith, Gary B.
Rivella, Hermon J.
Roberson, John C.
Robinson, Donald M.
Rodewald, William O.
Rodwell, Roy O.
Roman, Donald J.
Rosenberg, Joseph F.
Roudebush, Tom
Rountree, Lee C.
Rushing, Clifton L., Jr
Russo, Anthony R.
Russell, Francis P., Jr.
Rutledge, Bobby G.
Salmon, Michael D.
Scamehorn, Richard C.
Schenck, Kennell I., Jr.
Schermerhorn, Dale W.
Schmidt, John E.
Seaver, Robert L.
Seymour, Kenneth F.
Shannahan, John K.
Shaw, Phillip E.
Shroyer, David K., Jr.
Shropshire, Jack C.
Silvear, Thomas A.
Silver, Tommy J.
Simon, Clyde C.
Simon, Francis
Simpson, Fred D., Jr.
Simpson, James F.
Simpson, Patrick S.
Sinnott, William T.
Sisley, Frederick E.
Smaldone, Ronald A.
Smith, Ellis F.
Smith, Robert E.
Smyth, Thomas J.
Sotsky, George R.
Spangler, John F.
Spence, Jack R.
Sperry, Charles B.
Sprick, Doyle R.
Steffen, Allan J.
Stehr, Paul W.
Stevens, John D.
Stevenson, Samuel H.
Stewart, Douglas K.
Stewart, Douglas P.
Stoffey, Robert E.
Stoloski, William J.
Stremic, Anthony W.
Studer, Edward A.
Stumpf, Thomas A.
Sudmeyer, Paul T.
Suedekum, Norman F.
Sutherland, Arthur A., Jr.
Sutton, Robert A.
Swenson, Wayne R.
Taylor, Bruce C.
Taylor, Franklin D.
Taylor, Richard H.
Tebow, William J.
Telford, Jacque W.
Thames, Samuel E.
Thien, Robert L.
Thomas, Willard Y.
Thomas, William L.
Thompson, Amos D., Jr.
Thompson, Charles B.
Tiffany, Russell B.
Tilton, Richard C.
Tinker, Alan
Toelle, Alan D.
Toler, Albert E.
Toth, James E.
Tucker, G. B.
Turner, James D.
Uram, Edward T.
VanAntwerp, William M., Jr.
VanNiman, John H.
VanTassel, Gerry L.
Vasko, George E.
Vaughn, Clovis S.
Vindich, Joseph G.
Volz, Carl W.
Vorreyer, Richard W.
Vowell, David E.
Wakefield, Robert H.
Wallace, Harry R.
Wall, Melvin N.
Walsh, Gerald E.
Walters, Warren S.
Wanner, Sanford B.
Ward, Charles L.
Warfield, Harry R.
Warnicke, Edward A.
Washington, Joel
Wasik, Henry J.
Weir, Charles J.
Wells, Jack W.
Wells, Raymond
Weltin, William L.
Welzant, Charles M.
Werner, Robert G.
Wescott, William F.
Westphal, Paul E., Jr.
West, Herman B., Jr.
Whipple, Oliver M.
Whittlesey, Joseph T.
Whiting, Edward R.
Wier, David A.
Williams, Walter L., Jr.
Willmarth, John M.
Wilson, David R.
Wilson, Robert B.
Wogan, Christopher M.
Woodward, Robert L.
Wood, Howard C.
Wright, Ronald W.
Yenerall, Grant L.
Yon, Dandridge H.
York, Geoffrey A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, Billy W.
Albright, Donald A.
Aleksic, Water P.
Alexander, Joseph H.
Ammons, Kenneth L.
Anderson, Clifford H.
Anderson, Gary H.
Anderson, Jesse E., Jr.
Anderson, John E.
Atkins, George W. P., Jr.
Babbie, Earl R.
Bacon, James N.
Baier, James F.
Baig, Mirza M.
Bailey, Alfred D.
Bailey, Edward R.
Baker, Robert L.
Balash, Steve R., Jr.
Bane, Ronald E.
Barnhill, Dwight D.
Bartel, James A.
Bartnick, Stanley J.
*Bartunek, Jack F.
Bass, Murray, Jr.
Bastian, Dean L.
*Bauknight, Harry L.
Baxter, Thomas W.
Beck, Duane C.
Bechler, William R.
Bennett, Allan L.
*Bergbauer, Daniel M.
Bertrand, Horace A., Jr.
Besch, Edwin W.
Bethea, William D.
Betz, Thomas R.
Bierman, Edward O.
Bikakis, Charles N.
Bilyeu, Byron L.
Bivens, Alfred H.
Bland, Richard P. L.
Blythe, Ralph A., Jr.
Bogard, Bobby D.
Boller, Lawrence J.
Boone, Fredrick E.
Boston, John C., Jr.
Bower, James W.
*Bowersox, Robert L.
Bowlby, Samuel W.
Bowman, James H.
Bradbury, Donald L.
Brandtner, Martin L.
Braun, Robert A.
Britell, Claudius J.
Broadwell, Donald N.
Bronson, James V.
Brown, John H.
Brown, Robert J.
*Bryan, Charles G.
Burgess, Richard S.
Burke, Francis M.
Burkley, George W.
Burns, Charles W.
Burns, James P., III
*Burns, John R., Jr.
Burton, Lou L., Jr.
Buske, Kenneth R.
Byers, Larry E.
Carlson, Robert A.
Carroll, Thomas J.
Cassel, Louis A.
Cathell, Peter H.
Cauley, Bernard J.
Cazares, Alfred F., Jr.
*Cheney, Oakley W., Jr.
Clark, Francis S.
Clawson, Roger L.
Clements, Richard F.
Cochran, Bruce A.
Coll, Vincent S.
Collins, William
Conklin, Raymond C.
Conrad, Frederick A.
Copeland, Randolph G.
Core, George E.
Costa, Keith A.
Coulter, Robert S.
Cox, Donald C.
*Cox, Frank O., Jr.
*Crain, John D.
Crampton, James H.
Culver, John L.
Curley, Michael H.
Curry, John E.
Cutcomb, David H.
*Daniel, Ray A.
Darrow, Donnie L.
Davis, Brian P.
Derbes, David G.
Desautels, Ernest J.
Deshler, George O.
Dickerson, Michael G.
Dickson, Bonneau H., Jr.
Diffee, Gerald L.
Diffen, Ray I.
Dilweg, Gary T.
Dixon, Edward E.
Dobak, John D.
*Dods, Walter K.
Dokos, Chris G., Jr.
Dominguez, Michael E. P.
*Doughtie, Nath C.
Douthit, Nathan C.
Dunn, Theodore R.
Dusse, Ronald J.
Dvorak, David S.
Eggleston, George D.
Eirich, Donald G.
Elgin, Arthur C., Jr.
Elpers, David J.
Elrod, McLowery
Ennis, Berlis F.
Enochs, George H.
Eppinger, Edward A.
Erb, Louis F.
Farnsworth, Charles E.
Fehnel, Richard A.
Feitel, Joseph Y., Jr.
Filson, John R.
*Findlay, Raymond F., Jr.
Fisher, Roy E., Jr.
Flessner, Matthew
Forbes, Philip A.
Foster, Karl A.
Fox, Raymond F.
Friedl, Richard C.
Friend, Gerald E.
Friis, David J.
Fuqua, Beverly B.
Gamer, Peter P.
Gann, Robert B.
Gardner, Phillip E.
Garriott, John W.
Gatz, Frederic L.
Gay, Charles B., Jr.
Gaynor, Paul B.
Georgia, Daniel C.
Germer, Henry A., Jr.
Gibbons, Joel W., III
Gibbs, Joseph W., III
Gilbert, Jan R.
Gill, John P.
Gleim, Earl C.
Glover, Douglas
Goodwyn, George W., Jr.
Gorman, Merle W.
Gosnell, Harold C., Jr.
*Greene, Robert W.
Grant, Herbert A., Jr.
Griffin, Wayne G.
Hahn, Warren G.
Hale, Lynn A.
*Hamilton, Robert E.
Handrahan, Robert G.
Hanrahan, James G.
Hanson, Chester E.
Harlan, Robert R.
*Harrer, Dean R.
Harris, Henry W., Jr.
Harris, Richard I.
Harter, Gary D.
Hastings, Barclay
Hatfield, Maynard A.
Hawley, George T.
Hayes, Frank S.
Heil, Thomas C., Jr.
Heinisch, Roger P.
*Henry, Billy E.
Hildebrandt, Earl W.
Hitchcock, Gene R.
Hofmann, David H.
Holman, Robert S.
Hopkins, Harvard V., Jr.
Howe, David T.
Hracho, Eugene E.
*Hudson, Donald R.
Huggin, Gerald C.
Hughes, Richard W.
Hungerford, Ed V., III
Hutton, Lajon R.
Ingebretsen, Carl R.
Jackson, Clifford A.
Jerbasi, John T.
*Johnson, Gene C.
Johnson, Gerald M.
Johnson, Richard A.
Jolley, Hugh S.
Jones, Kenneth N.
Kaster, Stephen H.
Kealey, James A.
Kelley, Reginald C., Jr.
Kelly, Gordon L.
Kemp, Steven J.
Kerr, James A., Jr.
Kerrigan, Richard T.
Kew, Robert J.
Keys, William M.
King, Dennis G.
Kirkpatrick, Joe J.
Kisner, Ned B.
*Kitto, Clyde W.
Knepp, Donald R.
Koenig, Donald M.
Kolbe, Frank P., Jr.
Koontz, Robert P.
Koppang, James D.
Kowalski, Thomas J.
Kraft, Daniel J.
Kreider, James W.
Lamb, Donald L.
Land, Edward J., Jr.
Landes, Burrell H., Jr.
Lantz, Conrad W.
*Larson, Gary M.
Larson, Kenneth P.
Lashlee, Hugh W.
Lee, Vincent R.
Lefeve, David A.
Leggett, James
*Lemay, Ralph E., Jr.
*Lewin, Lawrence S.
*Libkie, Frederick A.
Lindquist, Terry K.
Little, Thomas F.
Lohmeier, Donald L.
*Long, Jules H., Jr.
*Losik, Francis A.
Lowe, James W., Jr.
Luther, Lawrence A.
Lutheran, Joseph A.
Lyman, Donald O.
Lynch, Charles L.
Lytle, William J.
Marshall, Robert D.
Martin, Lawrence G.
Martin, William R.
Massey, Tom E.
May, James S.
Mayers, David, Jr.
McAfee, Ernest W., Jr.
McCain, Charles M.
McCallum, William J.
McClanahan, Garrett W.
*McColl, David K., II
McInteer, Robert C.
McIntyre, William A., III
McKee, Samuel K., III
McKenney, David M.
McLaughlin, Paul A.
McLaurin, Robert L., Jr.
*McNamara, Jack D.
Meck, Robert S.
Meeks, Clarence I., III
Mehl, Spencer P.
Meissner, Howard W.
Metzler, Harry R.
Mickey, Robert B.
Miller, Allen H.
Miller, Dan G.
Mills, James D.
Mitchell, Larry G.
Moore, James L.
Moore, Lawrence R.
Moran, Thomas J.
Morgan, Robert F.
*Mosser, George E.
Mueller, Gerald R.
Murphy, Richard J.
Myers, Oran L.
Nestande, Bruce K.
Newbern, Jay A.
Nolen, Thomas A.
O'Connell, Maurice C.
O'Laughlin, Larry L.
Oliver, Troy R., Jr.
Olson, Joseph C., III
Oots, Samuel E.
Orr, Alan L.
Oxenreider, Lynn F.
*Peet, Christopher
Pegler, Richard N.
Perrin, Richard K.
Peterson, Wayne A.
Pierce, James L.
Pieri, Francis L., Jr.
Presley, Olen D.
Preston, Raymond G.
Prue, David B.
Pruiett, Denis I.
Puaa, En Sue Pung
Puckett, Scott C.

Pynchon, George E.
Quinlan, David A.
Rader, Russell W.
Reagan, Ronald E.
Reams, William H.
Reimer, John H., Jr.
Richardson, Tom V.
Rippelmeyer, Karl
Roark, Richard D.
Robinson, George K., Jr.
Robinson, Lance R.
Roche, William A.
Rogers, Torrence W.
Ross, George C.
Ross, James M.
Ross, Robert A.
Ruyle, James B.
Sadler, Kenneth R.
Sale, Charles L.
Sammis, Norman W.
Sampson, Charles W.
Sanchez, Kelly J.
Sawyer, Carl R., Jr.
Sawyer, John F.
Seaman, Lawrence E., Jr.
Seay, Olen A., Jr.
Sehulster, James T.
Shaver, Wayne E.
Shaver, William C.
Shaw, Walter C.
Shea, James R.
Silva, Lionel M.
Sirois, Benoit J. L.
*Sledge, John W., Jr.
Smith, Gid B.
Smith, James M.
*Smith, Stanley R.
Smith, Vincent M.
Smolenski, Robert J.
Sneed, Richard C.
Snook, Howard M.
Sohm, Jacque E.
Solak, Thomas J.
Solomon, John E., Jr.
Somerville, Gary J.
Spence, Wesley F.
Spevetz, Louis M.
Spolyar, Robert J.
Stacy, Richard M.
Stanton, Donald R.
Steele, James L.
Stefansson, David R.
Stensland, William C.
Stewart, James J.
Stiegman, Donald L.
Strand, Robert H.
Strickland, Anthony R.
Stuart, Phil E.
Sullivan, Harold D.
Sutton, Edward N.
Sweetser, Warren E., III
Swetman, Roderick E.
Szweda, Edward H., Jr.
Taylor, Lawrence A.
Tener, Frederick S., Jr.
Tenney, Joseph R.
Terpak, John B., Jr.
Thomas, Hagar E., Jr.
Thomas, James N.
Thomas, Richard E.
Thompson, Allan
Thompson, James G.
Thompson, Richard K.
Todd, Gary E.
Todd, Harry G.
*Todd, James H.
Todd, John H.
Troutman, Howard P.
Tschida, Rudolph G.
Tull, Martin N.
Tumlinson, James H., III
Tunberg, Karl A.
Turbeville, Bobby G.
Turner, Carlon N.
Uzzelle, George H., III
Vaughan, Jean P. C.
Wallace, Arthur L., Jr.
Wallace, Richard F.
Ward, Sanford D.
Watson, Jack H., Jr.
Watson, John R.
Webster, Steven S.
Weren, Arthur D.
Werner, Evan C.
Whitaker, Allen P.
White, Richard
Whitfield, Howard M.
Wickens, Justin H.
Wilkins, George M.
Williams, Edward B.
Williams, Paul R.
Winston, Herbert T.
*Winter, Richard D.
Wood, Herbert H.
Wright, Floyd K., Jr.
*Yarmy, Richard L.
Young, Gordon K.
Young, Harry C., Jr.
Abele, William R.
Andrews, Donald W.
Brown, Mark T.
Cole, Bobby F.
Comstock, John S.
Connelly, Edmund J., Jr.
Cooper, Gary J.
Driskell, James M.
Dowling, Richard D.
Driver, Robert J., Jr.
Fanning, David E.
Fricker, Jerrell T.
Gallery, Vincent R.
Gentry, Harry R.
Grega, Ronald R.
Jessen, Thomas F.
Johnson, Warren H.
King, Paul F.
Lilley, Melton G.
Marino, Gaetano
Marshall, John C.
Mayers, Joseph C.
McIver, Werner W.
Nardo, Joseph F.
Pope, James H.
Price, Ronald K.
Rhodes, William M.
Rowley, William B.
Sewell, Welton C.
Smith, George W. G., Jr.
Sole, Joseph A.
Stoner, Donald L.
Whittingham, David
Wright, William E.
*Worley, Jerry W.
*Farrington, Francis X.
*Redelman, Roger L.
*Sullivan, James V.
Bloser, Jan R.
*McGraw, Clifford L., Jr.
Graham, Wallace A.
Gazares, Alford F., Jr.
Hollon, Jack A.
Hungerford, Ed V., III
Kromminga, Lynn R.
Link, David A.
Mead, Richard J.
Reitz, Harry J., Jr.
Riblet, William B.
Roberts, Lloyd A.
Raper, Donald L.
Tidwell, Clark H.
Wallace, Robert D.
*Bailey, Richard W.
*Metscher, Walter H.
*Baradat, Armand J.
*Boyd, Granberry D., III
*Hansen, Allen G.
*Reilly, James E.
*Souders, James P.
Steiner, Kenneth J.
Martin, William R.
Bowman, James H.
Collins, William
Costa, Keith A.
Cox, Donald C.
Curley, Michael H.
Dokos, Chris G., Jr.
Dusse, Ronald J.
Foster, Karl A.
Friedl, Richard C.
Friend, Gerald E.
Hopkins, Howard V.
Lantz, Conard W.
Morgan, Robert F.
Mueller, Gerald R.
Turner, Carlon N.
Wallace, Richard F.
Young, Harry C., Jr.
Atkins, James W.
Sanchez, Kelly J.
Snodgrass, Clyde R.
Baker, Robert L.
Kerr, James A., Jr.
McCain, Charles M.
Mills, James D.
Peterson, Wayne A.
Whitfield, Howard M.
Chambless, Edward L.
Meeks, Clarence I.
Core, George E.
Brandtner, Martin L.
Pate, Hugh P.
Van Wert, Paul J., Jr.
Cates, George L.
Babwell, Charles H.
Brooks, Carl E.
Beattie, Richard I., Jr.
Brooks, Robert C.
Buethe, Frank A.
Coleman, Roland W.
Davis, Arthur G., Jr.
Dunn, Bernard
Gacusana, Jose M.
Gresham, James W.
Gruhler, Jean A., Jr.
Hardiman, David W.
Kane, Thomas F.
Long, Edward D.
McCreedy, Edwin J.
Mitchell, Robert W., Jr.
Monette, Roland E.
Pearce, Frank G.
Ray, Revedy C., III
Rivers, John F.
Rose, Allen J.
Shirley, Jerry C.
Smith, Richard P.
Spivey, Bayliss L., Jr.
Taylor, Kenneth T.
Weede, Richard D.
Zappone, Francis L., Jr.
D'Avolio, Gerald D.

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Black, Lois J.
Carlson, Carol J.
Carroll, Nancy A.
Rick, Nancy J.
Roberts, Roberta N.
Schlechert, Dolores A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Gibbon, Edward E.
Wightman, Gene F.
Adams, Robert K.
Sweetser, William B.
Schroder, Henry H.
Allen, Arnold V.
Amos, William H.
Harper, John A.
Edwards, George T.
Overby, Richard C.
Embrey, Almon D.
Scarborough, John A.
Roberson, Frank R.
Gidlewski, Aloysius C.
Fields, Clifford J.
Arnold, Kenneth G.
Rains, Novis I.
Lloyd, Paul V.
Lynch, Walker R.
Goen, Sargent
Norris, Edward S.
Taylor, Thomas G.
Edmondson, William B.
Beard, John B.
Jensen, Kermit R.
Lewis, Raymond E.
Smith, Edward O.
Clement, Joseph E.
Honeycutt, Paul F.
Sketoe, Clayton D.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Buss, Herbert F.
Shirley, Joe D.
Herriotts, Charles I.
McGrath, Cletus P.
Yost, Russell W.
Rozycki, Edmund V.
Boreman, Gilbert H.
Edwards, Robin R.
Virden, Robert W.
Denyer, Samuel A., Jr.
Arthur, Robert O.
Dancy, John P.
Albert, Robert H.
Osimo, Mario C.
Woods, George D.
Skinner, Ned S.
Okonek, Mark V.
Morgan, Lloyd H.
Arnold, Daniel W.
Jones, James F. A.
Girouard, Eli
Hathaway, John A.
Pryor, Charley L., Jr.
Adams, Joseph B.
Brisbois, Donald J.
Wyzykowski, Joseph A.
Jordan, Robert H.
Harris, Jerry W.
Morris, Floyd L.
Zam, Frank S.
Parker, Norman E.
Hodge, William K.
Boudreaux, Robert M.
Pierce, Julius B.
Stutts, Commodore
Hawbecker, Donald L.
Greene, Robert B.
Lamonte, Stanley W.
Harnage, Floyd E.
Nicholson, Edsel W.
Zimba, John P.
Perkins, Burton O.
Riebe, Kenneth W. B.
Duncan, David N.
Harvey, Leonard R.
Greenspan, Leo
Engelhardt, Harold H.
Nault, Charles R.
Martin, Robert E.
Nelson, George B., Jr.
Dick, Boyd W.
Gandy, Austin O.
Kennedy, Clarence E.
Arsenault, Robert W.
Wright, Ira L., Jr.
Thatenhurst, King D., Sr.
Meek, Wendell A.
Tusa, Joe N.
Burke, Richard M.
Miller, Nicholas J., Jr.
Graef, Ralph E.
Deatrick, Curtis L.
Seymour, Dwight W.
Wilson, Warren L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Meyer, William A.
Johansen, Carl, Jr.
Johns, Fred E.
Clabaugh, John W., Jr.
Kozlowski, John
Morris, Frank B.
Powell, Lester E.
Miller, Martin A.
Berry, Norman
Bennett, Joseph L., Jr.
Gomb, Francis F.
Nix, Casey R.
Wilterding, Ashton C.
Elder, James O.
Brown, Robert H.
Harris, James R.
Richards, Irving S.
Russell, Robert A.
Nilsen, Donald A.
Kennedy, Raymond G.
McMillan, William W., Jr.
Reagan, Kenneth H.
Holzinger, Bernard E.
Flaherty, William C.
Tobin, Frank T.
Kulak, Raymond
Black, John R.
Chandler, James D.
Webb, John H., Jr.
Chaput, Roger U.
Taylor, Jack R.
Mann, Horace L.
Huff, Robert R.
Wynant, Neil E.
Olesak, Andrew M.
Walls, George O.
Condon, Raymond W.
Slater, Robert T.
Cushman, Robert L.
Bowen, Myron J.
Capozzoli, John A., Jr.
Cain, John T.
Voorhees, John D.
Griggs, Clarence F., Jr.
Ivey, Billy D.
Kozain, Lawrence E.
Kilborn, Charles R.
Tucker, Willie R. M.
Smith, Darrel H.
Smith, Vernon E.
Pope, Hal E.
Olsen, Thomas R.
Wilder, Raymond C.
Hunt, Robert T.
Norris, William B.
Gentry, Edwin S.
Gordon, John B.
Garrett, Stanley E.
Brown, Elroy L.
Durfee, Norman E.
Pluger, Edwin A.
Wuerth, Milton R.
Dugan, Arthur E.
Massarotti, Dante A.
Munt, Dean J., Jr.
Haydock, Eugene S.
McNamara, William
Waller, Henry J.
Bailey, Graydon L.
Woodson, Duane L.
Hammons, William V., Jr.
Main, Stanley W.
Keller, Robert P.
Crenshaw, John O.
Stergiou, Chris G.
Karrer, Joseph J.
McGrory, John F.
Jones, James W.
Peterson, James H.
Gracey, Koyle D., Jr.
Kerr, Richard A.
Hadley, John A.
Thacher, Robert M.
Connell, James J.
Groom, Robert W.
Freeman, Elaine G.

*Indicates ad interim appointments.

NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Acker, Guilford D.
Adams, David G., Jr.
Alexander, James T., Jr.
*Allen, Roger H.
Allendorfer, Harry C., Jr.
*Allman, John C.
Andrews, Frank A.
Armstrong, Parker B.
Arthur, William A.
Ashcraft, Robert L.
Ashley, James M., Jr.
Augenblick, Richard G.
*Azab, John C.
Bachhuber, Joseph A.
*Bailey, Max P., Jr.
Balis, Theodore L.
Barker, Jonathan A.
Barnhardt, Eugene C., III
*Belcher, Roy S., Jr.
Bennett, Walter F. V.
Bergin, Daniel E., Jr.
Betzel, Albert F.
Betzer, William E.
*Bill, Wells R., Jr.
Binion, Vernon E.
Bishop, Charles B.
Black, Robert G.
Blair, Alfred F.
Blanchard, Frank M.
Boe, Nils W.
Bradshaw, Harold G.
Brango, Nicholas
Brink, John D.
Britner, George F., Jr.
Brown, Galen C.
Brown, Garrison
Brown, Kenneth B.
Bryan, David, Jr.
Buck, Richard H.
Buhrer, Gordon C.
*Bunting, Curtis W.
Bunting, Davis E.
Butts, John "L", Jr.
Cain, James B.
*Cantlon, Clifton E.
Carmody, Martin D.
Carter, Robert R.
Carver, William E.
Cason, Arthur C., Jr.
Caton, Clifford E.
*Celustka, Robert J.
*Chick, Lewis W.

Clarke, Jared E., III
Clarke, Robert A.
*Clifford, John K.
Cole, Philip P.
Conger, James W.
Conner, Andrew B., Jr.
Cook, James L., Jr.
Corkran, Richard L., Jr.
Craig, Russell F.
*Cramer, Donald S.
*Craven, William H., Jr.
Crawford, John W., Jr.
Creed, Donald L.
*Dahlstrom, Vincent A.
Davis, John B., Jr.
*Davis, Lewis E., Jr.
des Granges, Maino
Devine, Richard O.
Dickerson, Vincent M.
Dietz, Willard D.
Dillard, Chester L.
Doner, Landis E.
Dowd, Robert A.
Doyle, Judson C.
Dubyk, William
Duncan, Max C.
Dupre, Marcy M., III
Durand, Paul H.
*Dye, Philip G.
Early, Leo W.
Eastman, Robert S.
Eggeman, Benjamin R., Jr.
Elliott, Ralph E., Jr.
Erb, Leonard
Erwin, Virgil A., Jr.
*Evans, Jack L.
Fair, John W.
Farrell, Eugene H.
Farrell, William F., Jr.
Fichman, Herbert T.
Fink, Christian
Fitzpatrick, Edward G.
Flynn, Russell F.
Forrer, Samuel W.
Forrest, Gaylord T.
Fox, John P., Jr.
Fraser, Leroy B., Jr.
Friedman, Malcolm C.
Froude, Robert S.
Gallin, Alvin L.
Garrett, Wallace H., Jr.
*Garver, Donald L.
Gates, Robert L.
*Gibbons, John P.
*Ginn, Wilbur N., Jr.
*Gladding, Everett B.
Gockel, Bernard N.
*Grainger, Charles H.
Greeley, George R.
Green, David H.
Green, Laurence B.
*Greenlee, Pleas E., Jr.
*Griffin, Charles D.
Grimes, Alton B.
Gulledge, Kenneth E.
Gutting, John P.
Haffey, John J., Jr.
Halpin, Paul D.
Halvorson, George G.
Hamilton, Arthur G., Jr.
*Hankey, John R.
Hanson, Eugene R.
Harbert, Thomas C., Jr.
*Harris, John S.
Hartley, Gordon E.
Harwood, Robert H., Jr.
Haszard, Harry A.
Helme, Charles F., Jr.
Heronemus, William E.
Hill, John C., II
Hinchey, John J.
Hinkamp, Maddox N. P.
Holley, Edward B., Jr.
Holloway, James L., III
Holmes, Donald T.
Hoof, Wayne
Hopley, Eric E.
Hosey, William B.
Howell, Wiley B.
Howerton, Wilfred M.
Hunt, Robert J.
Hurst, William J.
*Hutchinson, John L.
Hyde, Richard W.
James, Jack M.
Jennings, Lewis B.
Jernigan, William A., Jr.
*Johnson, Ace
Johnston, Juel D.
Jones, Bennie W., Jr.
Jones, Samuel G.
Kane, John D. H., Jr.
Kelly, William W.
*Kendrick, David C.
*Keys, James E.
Kinne, Francis E.
Kintner, Edwin E.
Knight, Francis S.
Knight, Robert C.
*Kohler, Karl B.
Kolakowski, Roman
Krantz, William F.
Kurtz, William R.
Lacy, Paul L., Jr.
*Lahodney, William J., Jr.
Lape, Wade W.
*Laurich, James A.
Law, John T.
Lee, Chester M.
*Lee, Florn L.
Lemmon, Robert "H"
Lindbeck, John A.
Lowentrout, Jack L.
Lumpkin, Pickett
Maddex, John W.
Mahler, George H., III
Malone, Eugene I.
*Mansueto, Edmund J.
Margolf, Edgar L.
Marocchi, John L.
Maupin, Owen L.
McCarty, Lindsay C.
*McDowell, William R., Jr.
*McKee, Craig
McMahon, John L., Jr.
McNeal, Horace P.
McNees, Richard B.
McWethy, Robert D.
Meacher, Leo
Meier, Louis L., Jr.
Milano, Louis L.
Miller, Frank E.
Miller, Ward S.
Mills, Richard H.
Mills, Robert G.
Momsen, Charles B., Jr.
*Montgomery, John A., Jr.
Montgomery, William M.
Moore, Michael U.
Moran, William J.
Morin, George F.
Morrow, William B.
Mottern, Robert E.
Mullen, Arthur C.
Munk, Maximilian W.
Murph, John W.
*Murphy, Pleasant L.
Myers, Robert I.
Nash, Norman C.
Nasworthy, George F.
Neff, John L.
*Neill, Dugald T.
Newton, William L.
*Norton, Mohl C., Jr.
Nyburg, Willard L.
O'Brien, Frank H.
O'Bryant, William T.
Oliver, Frederick W.
O'Neal, Justin A.
Osborn, James B.
Payne, Charles N., Jr.
Peddicord, Gerald E.
Pellett, William H.
Peterson, Robert F.
Peto, David C.
*Piper, Max A.
Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
*Pitts, Raymond L.
Poage, Robert B.
Porter, Rufus C., Jr.
Price, Walter W., Jr.
*Price, William M.
Pugh, Paul E.
Pugh, William M., II
Rasmussen, Jonathan Q.
Rawls, William A.
Rawson, Arthur F., Jr.
Reck, Floyd F.
Reed, Dale C.
Reed, Roy E.
Rees, Joseph R.
Rice, Harold E.
Ricketts, Colin J.
Rizza, Joseph P.
Robie, William A.
Robison, Roy J.
Romanick, Frank M.
Rosenberg, Edwin M.
Rowan, John J.
Ruehrmund, Paul L., Jr.
*Runk, Theodore W.
Rusch, William J., Jr.
*Russell, Charles E.
Ruth, Lloyd D.
Sands, Pierre N.
*Savadkin, Lawrence
Savage, Jimmie E.
Saylor, Philip G.
Scarborough, Frank G.
Schremp, James F.
Schroeder, Charles J.
Seitz, Eugene W.
Sewall, Richard M.
Shaw, Claude B.
Sheppard, Charles P.
*Sherman, Vining A.
Shireman, Richard H. Jr.
Sigley, Claredon H.
Simmons, Kendall W.
Simmons, William E.
Sims, William E.
*Sisley, William R.
Slater, Mervin O.
Small, James D.
Smith, Armistead B., Jr.
Smith, Charles E.
Smith, James W.
*Smith, Leroy P.
Smith, Paul B.
Smith, Peter S.
*Soli, Orlan A.
Sorenson, Harry E.
Sparks, Robert R.
Spiegel, William D.
Squires, Lewis W.
Stecher, Lewis J., Jr.
Stokes, Griffith P.
Stone, Howard L., Jr.
Stough, Ben H., Jr.
Strane, John R.
Suerstedt, Henry, Jr.
Sweitzer, Henry B.
Tabor, Travis O., III
*Tallman, Humphrey L.
Tanner, Charles S.
Thienes, Robert L.
Thompson, Harley F.
*Thompson, Robert A.
Timmes, Francis X.
Tully, Joseph M., Jr.
Turner, Carol A.
Turner, Thomas
*Tuttle, John E.
Vincent, Manuel C.
Vita, Harold E.
Voris, Roy M.
Vose, William F.
*Walkinshaw, David J.
Wall, Charles B., Jr.
Warren, Harry S.
Weber, William G.
Weidlein, Leopold
*Weissenborn, Donald E.
Werner, William R.
Whited, Ciro N. V., Jr.
Whitney, Alden W.
*Wilbur, Charles C.
Wilhite, Drewery R.
*Williams, Joe W., Jr.
Williams, Thomas H.
Willis, William P., Jr.
Winslow, Edward H.
*Wirth, Hubert P.
Woods, Mark W.
Woodson, Walter B., Jr.
*Woosley, David G.
Young, Charles M.
Zigler, Frederick W.
Zumwalt, Elmo R., Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

Brown, Loy T.
Custis, Donald L.
Davis, Harold A.
Fuller, Frank D.
Lebherz, Thomas B.
Lee, James H., Jr.
MacPherson, Roderick F. C.
McKane, Andrew, III
Muehe, Charles C.
Santina, Henry
Tratar, Anton A., Jr.
Zarriello, Jerry J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Winston L.
*Anderson, Niels H.
Anderson, Scott K.
*Angelopoulos, John C.
Bjorlo, Lloyd S.
*Botkin, Dwight M.
Coiner, John S.
Corrick, James A., Jr.
*Crane, Frank E., Jr.
*Ellis, Robert L.
Graham, Jack L.
Hennessy, James L. F.
*Ironmonger, Richard
McNeill, Dan C.
*Meilandt, Ralph L.
*O'Toole, Charles W.
Power, Richard T.
*Redavid, Louis R.
Richardson, William C.
Smith, John D.
Zerfoss, Allen B.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Brooks, William E., Jr.
*Buckingham, Herbert W.
Craven, John H.
Ingvoldstad, Orlando, Jr.
Markley, John H.
McManus, Hugh T.
Menges, Harold F.
Noce, William S.
Tubbs, Joseph J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bamberg, Edward C.
Frate, Lawrence P.
Moeller, Griswold L.
Smisek, Joseph J.
Underhill, Edward G.
*Urquhart, James B., Jr.
*Young, James C.

DENTAL CORPS

Bucher, John F.
*Caldwell, Warren C., Jr.
*Castner, David V., Jr.
Hunley, Theodore R.
Kailer, Charles E.
Koch, John A.
McNett, Roy C.
*Parks, Clyde R.
Scofield, Henry H., Jr.
Small, Ernest W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Floyd, Thomas M., Jr.
White, Erwin W.

NURSE CORPS

Burk, Alberta

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Absher, George W., Jr.
*Acton, Thomas E.
Acton, William D.
Adams, Allan M., Jr.
Adams, Emil J.
Adams, Lynn "W"
*Adkisson, Hubert K.
Ahlstrom, Orin J.
*Ales, George A.
*Alexander, Robert J.
*Alford, Ralph M.
Althoff, William B.
*Altz, Leroy V., Jr.
Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
Anderson, James R.
Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
*Andrews, Lyman L., Jr.
Ashley, Linsey S.
Asmundson, Franklin J.
Atkinson, Bert M., Jr.
Atkinson, Edward C.
Aubert, George A.
Auger, Thomas E.
Aulick, Donald M.
Ayers, George "L", Jr.
Babbitt, Franklin G.
Bachert, John O.
Bailey, Gordon W.
Bailey, John B.
Bailey, John D.
Bailey, Keith E.
Baker, Robert J.
*Baker, Royal W.
Bakle, George F.
Baldwin, Lawrence C.
Ball, Edwin L.
Barlow, John F.
Barnes, Robert O.
Barnum, Ralph L.
*Barton, George E.
Bathel, Leonard F.
Baylis, John R.
Bayly, Donald C.
*Beaubouef, James A.
Bellah, James C.
Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
Bennett, Jack W.
Bennett, William O.
Bent, Jack
Bentley, Reuel H.
Bergner, Robert B.
Bergs, Robert A.
Bettis, Alfred M.
Beutler, Albert G.
Bischof, William W.
Blackwelder, Buren L.
*Blade, Dale O.
Blades, Jehu L.
*Blaisdell, Robert J.
Blake, John S.
Blawusch, Dirck E.
Boland, Robert I., Jr.
Bolstad, Daryl B.
Bolton, Jordan T.
Bonewits, Donald G.
Boniface, John G.
*Bono, Vernon C.
Booker, Thomas F.
Borgerding, Howard A.
*Boutin, Alfred V.
*Boutte, Lester H.
Bowen, Llewellyn D.
Bowling, Roland A.
Boyd, Paul C.
Boyle, Paul A.
Bradberry, Gordon D.
*Bradbury, Albert W.
Brady, Robert L., Jr.
Branton, Richard C.
Bremer, Woodson P.
Brite, Murrel C.
Brooks, Richard S.
*Broughton, Walter T., II
Brown, Ian F.
*Brown, John W.
*Brown, Joseph W., Jr.
Brown, Keith F.
*Brownlee, Robert E., Jr.
Brozo, John G.
*Brtek, Frank C.
Brumsted, Robert B.
Bryce, Thomas A.
Buchanan, Fillmore B.
Bucknum, Jack E.
Burhans, John H.
Burki, Arde A.
Burns, William L.
Burrell, Robert E.
Burrill, James T.
Burton, Lester H.
Caldwell, George A., Jr.
Caldwell, Jack
Camp, Herbert E.
Cannon, Herbert "B"
Cantwell, William P., Jr.
Carl, John G.
Carlin, Walter P.
Carneghi, Albert J.
*Carpenter, Edward L.
Carr, Howard W.
Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
Carroll, Thomas F.
Carter, Jack L.
*Carter, Kenneth
Castillo, Edmund L.

*Chansler, Lowell D.
*Charles, John M.
Christensen, Morris A.
Christy, Douglas G.
Clancy, George M.
Clare, James H.
Clark, Angus-Kerr
Clark, Edmund T.
Clark, Robert O.
Clausen, Paul K.
Clayton, Edgar J.
Clegg, George B., III
Clifton, Autry W.
Coble, Reid E.
Codemo, Joseph E.
Cody, Harold R.
Cohan, George M.
Collins, John T.
*Collister, Louis J.
Condren, John F.
*Conger, Elton V.
Connelley, Ernest C., Jr.
*Cook, Harry W.
*Cook, Herbert B.
Cooke, Edward W.
Cooley, Homer K., Jr.
Coulter, Fred W.
Coursin, Jack T.
Crangle, Eugene V.
Cranton, Jack H.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crawford, Robert E.
*Creider, Anthony S.
Cronander, James H.
*Cronenwett, Wilson R.
Crosby, William H.
Cross, Thomas J.
Crozier, Francis J.
*Crumbaugh, Fred R., Jr.
Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
*Curtis, Donald P.
Cushing, Leonard W.
Cushman, Charles H., Jr.
*Custer, Prentice J.
Cutchall, Lee G.
Davis, John A., Jr.
Deacon, William, III
Decker, Edward A.
*Deems, Eugene F.
Dehn, Emerson C.
Deibler, Robert R.
DeMayo, John J., Jr.
DeMent, Henry F.
*Denkler, William A.
Dente, Eugene
Dick, Kenneth S.
Dickey, George L., Jr.
Dietrichson, Warren D.
DiMatteo, Dominic J.
Dise, Robert L.
*Dodge, James D.
*Dolan, William R., Jr.
Doles, Thomas K.
*Donovan, Gerard M.
Doss, Robert F.
Douthett, Richard B.
Dowling, Patrick S.
Downey, Denis J. J.
*Doyle, James T.
Doyle, Philip P.
Duberg, Carl N.
DuBiel, Robert A.
Dudley, Harrison G.
Dugger, John A.
*Dulhagen, John J.
Duncan, Robert C.
*Dunlap, Billy F.
Dunning, Richard A.
Durbin, Stephen F.
*Durtche, Carl, Jr.
Dutra, John E.
Duvall, Richard A.
Eagan, Bryan R.
*Earnhardt, Elmer H.
Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
*Edelman, Sydney
*Edmondson, George H.
*Ellenbrand, Ralph E.
Elliott, Luther H., Jr.
Ellis, Edmund H.
Ellis, George W.
*Elmies, George
Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
*Ennis, Wilbur J.
Enquist, Edwin R.
Enyart, John W.
Ettner, Edward R.
Evans, Jack R.
Evans, James G.
*Everhart, Charles D.
Exum, John D.
Fagan, John F., Jr.
Fagan, Philip J.
Fahrney, Robert H.
Farrington, Richard S.
Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
*Faulkner, Stuart T.
Fay, Robert J.
*Feher, Melvin A.
Felsman, Jack L.
*Ferguson, William P.
Ferrante, John M.
Field, Francis E.
*Fife, Milton E.
Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
Fischer, Richard H.
Fisher, James R. M., II
Fiske, Samuel L.
Fitzgerald, Carl S.
Fitzgerel, John H.
Flack, Roby E.
Fluhart, James H.
Folensbee, Albert H.
Folop, Albert A.
*Forbis, Roy E.
*Forgy, William J.
Forsyth, William D.
Franch, Ardwin G.
Fridge, Herbert E.
*Friedman, Robert
Fries, William D.
Fromknecht, George W.
Furland, Frederick W.
Gaehler, Alfred H.
Gainer, Richard D.
Gaither, Donald
*Gallagher, John J.
Galt, Robert W.
Gano, Hubert D.
Gately, Donald E.
Gatewood, Walter P.
Gaul, Raymond A., Jr.
Gautier, Robert H.
Gavett, Theodore C.
Gavitt, Kenneth W.
*Gawthrop, Wilson R.
Gibbs, Howard B.
Giedt, John G.
Gilles, Donald A.
Gilliam, Gail H.
Gilmour, Robert, Jr.
*Giorgis, Albert S.
Glindeman, Henry P., Jr.
Glowacki, Theodore, Jr.
Gordon, Jack G.
Gortney, William M.
Gossman, Thomas J.
Graves, Luther J., Jr.
Gray, Julian F.
Gray, Robert J.
*Greene, Ernest "G"
Greene, Joseph M.
*Gregonis, Joseph P.
*Griffin, Shade W.
Griffiths, Charles H.
Griswold, Richard A.
Grkovic, Nicholas
Grojean, Charles D.
Guentz, Jack E.
Gulick, Richard I.
Gullette, John G.
Haak, Frank S., Jr.
Hall, Richard P.
Hall, Walter D.
*Hallman, Robert E.
Hamberg, Harold A.
Hambley, Louis C.
Hankins, Wallace W., Jr.
Hanks, Robert J.
Hansen, John E.
Hansen, Theodore W.
Hanson, Donald J.
Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
Harper, George A.
Harris, William F.
Harris, William C.
Hart, Robert R.
Haselton, Frederick R., Jr.
Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
Heberling, Donald A.
Hefferman, James M.
*Heiderer, Robert
Hemler, Frank T.
Henderson, Jerome E.
*Herman, Richard D.
Herzog, John J.
Hess, Charles M.
Heuer, Edward H.
Hicken, Frederick J.
Higgins, Robert T.
Hihn, Don E.
Hill, Charles C.
*Hilton, David E.
Hinchcliff, Lester G., Jr.
*Hodge, Ervin "F"
Hoeller, Warren J.
Hoke, Charles H.
Holland, David B.
*Holt, Albert T.
Hoover, Ralph A., Jr.
Howard, George D.
Howard, William D.
Hubbard, Edward R.
*Huckaby, Donnie W.
*Hudson, George D.
Huff, Andrew F.
Hugus, James E.
Hume, David M.
Hutches, Robert S.
Hylind, Kenneth G.
Ingraham, Mark W., Jr.
Irvine, James F., Jr.
Iverson, Robert G.
Jablonski, Felix J.
Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
Jalbert, Llewellyn E.
*Jenks, Edwin R.
*Jester, Jack A.
Johnson, Charles E., Jr.
Johnson, Charles M., Jr.
Johnson, Dean R.
*Johnson, Gerald
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Keith V.
Johnson, Mortimer C.
Johnston, Frank S.
Jones, Edward G.
*Jones, Harvey B.
Jones, John M.
Jones, Robert F.
*Jones, Robert S.
*Joslin, Harold E.
Joy, Harmon R.
Junod, Louis L.
Kallies, Richard H.
*Karr, Kenneth R.
Karr, Walter G., Jr.
Kaufman, Robert Y.
Kaye, Alan J.
Kearns, John S.
Kelley, Albert J.
Kelly, George R.
Kelly, James J.
Kelly, Leslie D., Jr.
Kennedy, Alfred F.
Kent, John "L"
Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
Kern, Francis X., III
Kidd, Robert A.
Kiley, Donald W.
Killefer, William, Jr.
Kilpatrick, David D.
Kimmons, George W.
Kimzey, Ord, Jr.
King, Franklin T.
King, Herbert T.
Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
Kirklighter, James F., Jr.
Klug, George J.
*Knick, Victor R.
Koch, Ferdinand B.
Komorowski, Raymond A.
Koons, Jack L.
Kranz, Arthur C.
Kulik, Adam P.
Lademan, Dixon
Ladosz, John W.
Lambert, Carl R.
Lane, Dwight A., Jr.
Langille, Justin E., III
*Langland, Robert G.
*Lanzit, Jerome R.
Last, Frank J., Jr.
Laughlin, George W.
Lavelle, Francis M.
*Laws, Walter T.
Layton, Donald M.
Ledbetter, Robert L., Jr.
Legare, Armand F. F.
Leighton, David T.
*Lenson, Robert H., Jr.
Lessmann, Walter G.
Leuschner, Robert J.
Levi, Burna D., Jr.
Lewis, George H.
Lilly, Creighton D.
Lindsay, John R.
Linville, James C.
Lippincott, Lincoln H., Jr.
Long, David A.
*Longlev, Thomas B.
Lonnquest, Theodore C., Jr.
Lowell, John E.
Lowen, Ernest E.
*Lucas, Burke D., Jr.
*Luedtke, Wilbert C.
Lund, Howard R.
Lyon, Harvey E.
Lyon, James O.
Lyons, Kenneth H.
Lyons, Richard T.
Mackintosh, Robert C.
*MacMillan, Harold R.
Macon, Glen G.
Maginnis, Hayden R.
Mahinske, Edmund B.
Malnerich, Joseph N.
Malone, Walter J.
March, James D.
Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
Marshall, Robert C., Jr.
*Masterman, Howard W.
*Masuen, Francis N.
*Maulden, Hoyt P.
Maupin, Elwin C.
Mayer, William S.
Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
*McAndrew, Richard J.
McCall, Robert E.
McCandless, Arlin R.
McCaulley, Henry B.
McCormick, Gordon H.
McDonnell, John C.
McElroy, Robert L., Jr.
*McFarland, Earle T.
McGovern, William
McGrath, Herman G., Jr.
McKenzie, Robert P.
*McVicker, Robert J.
*Mead, Robert W.
Meek, Orville M., Jr.
*Meints, Alvin L.
*Melin, Kenneth L.
Metschel, John J.
Metzger, Daniel T.
Metzger, Robert L.
Meyer, Joseph J., Jr.
*Midgett, Maxton M.
Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
Miles, Warren H.
*Miller, George M.
Miller, John "X", Jr.
Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
*Miller, Lawrence L.
Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
Mills, Ralph B., Jr.
Millsaps, Lewis M.
Minton, Don R.
*Montgomery, Marvin D.
Monthan, George R.
*Moore, James D.
Moore, James A.
*Moore, Robert A.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, William V.
Moran, Thomas L.
*Morgan, Henry S., Jr.
Morgan, Walter N.
Morgan, William H.
Morris, James W.
Morrison, Joseph B.
Morse, Kenneth L.
Morton, William W.
*Moses, Carl W.
Mouton, Edison E.
Mulholland, William P.
Mullen, Theodore W.
Muncie, Wendell B.
Munns, David L.
Murphy, Francis J.
*Murphy, John L.
*Murray, Walter F.
Musial, Fred A.
Nasipak, Valentin
Nasset, Lawrence O.
Nevins, John D.
Newbern, Robert O.
*Newman, Augustus, Jr.
Nicklas, William C., Jr.
Niehaus, Herbert H.
Norin, Robert A.
Norton, James C.
Nott, Hugh G.
Nugent, Corliss R.
*Nutt, Thomas A., Jr.
*O'Brien, Edward F., Jr.
*Odom, James E., Jr.
Offtermatt, Wilbur F.
*Ogier, Herbert L., Jr.
Ohsiek, Robert R.
O'Neal, Alfred C.
*O'Shaughnessy, James D.
*Ostrom, Ellsworth M., Jr.
Overn, John A.
*Packer, Francis A., Jr.
*Padis, Alexander A.
Page, Robert A.
Palkovic, Richard M.
Parker, Edwin J.
*Parker, George A.
Parnell, James M.
Parrish, Harvey S., Jr.
Parry, Loren C.
Pavis, George P.
Pearson, Douglas C.
Pearson, Francis E., III
*Pell, Isaac N., Jr.
Penny, Harmon C.
Perszyk, Joseph S., Jr.
Peters, Bernard
Phelps, Henry E.
Phillips, Chester G.
*Phillips, Richard B.
Pickrell, Robert M.
Pitz, Marcellus T.
Plummer, Philip F.
Plunkett, Roy D.
*Polansky, Lewis J.
Pond, Robert B.
Porter, Edward M., Jr.
Powers, Horace S.
*Price, Arthur W., Jr.
Putnam, Earl B.
*Quarton, Thomas J.
*Quelland, Obed R.
*Rasko, Robert V.
Ratte, Paul W.
Ray, Charles E.
Ray, Troy G.
Reaves, George A., III
Redden, Lawrence E.
Redgrave, DeWitt C., III
*Reed, Irvin W.
Reiff, Glenn A.
*Reilly, Joseph L., Jr.
Reinhart, Leonard J.
Renn, John E.
Richey, Chesley W.
*Richison, Warren C.
*Risley, Clayton E., Jr.
Robertson, Horace B., Jr.
Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Robinson, Winthrop P.
Rock, Clifford "T"
Roemer, Robert F.
Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
Rogers, Harry M.
Rogerson, Reuben G.
*Rooney, Frederick T.
Rose, Albert E., Jr.
*Rossi, Edward C.
Roulstone, Don J.
Roux, Vernon K.
Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
*Rule, John F.
*Rumburg, William H. Jr.
Russ, John, E., Jr.
Russel, Joseph W.
Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
*Sadler, Robert J.
Sailors, Benjamin G.
Sandeford, William H.
Sanderson, James R.
*Sante, Robert D.
Saunders, Walter E., Jr.
Savage, Richard A.
Savage, Stuart, Jr.
Saylor, Beverly
*Scarborough, Harry C., Jr.
Schabacker, Robert B.
Schaffer, Donald R.
Scheuhing, Robert E.
Schirra, Walter M., Jr.
Schlemmer, George S.
Schmidt, Wesley H.
Schneider, Frank J.
Schwemley, Paul A.
Schwitters, Merlin J.
Scott, Richard Y.
Scott, Wiley A.
Seabaugh, Raymond R.
Seargeant, John A.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Seiwert, Ray W.
Sellers, Harry S.
Sells, Warren H.
*Seymour, Earl P.
Shafer, Elroy J.
*Shaffer, James B.
Shane, Elbert B.

Sharp, Wallace E.
Sheil, James E.
Shepard, Everett G., Jr.
Sherfy, John B., Jr.
Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
Short, Merton D.
Shreve, Andrew K.
Sickel, John A.
Simon, Harold W
Simpson, William E.
Skidmore, Edward O.
Skoog, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Edwin P., Jr.
*Smith, Gerald W.
*Smith, Horace G., Jr.
Smith, Hugh W.
Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.
*Smithey, Thurman E.
Snopkowski, Edward L.
Snowden, Macon S.
*Sodke, Henry E., Jr.
Spencer, Paul E.
Sperandio, Joseph L.
Sprague, Albert T., III
Stahl, Lawrence E.
Stanley, Earl W.
Staveley, Ernest
*St. Clair, Robert H., Jr.
Stell, Albert L., Jr.
*Stewart, Ciell
*Stickles, Robert B.
Still, Raymond G.
*St. Jerne, Paul
Stose, John F.
*Stout, Burke W.
Stoutenburgh, Joseph S.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Sullenger, Charles R.
*Sullivan, Joseph E.
Sullivan, William P.
*Swigart, Robert E.
*Tallent, Carson R.
Taylor, John L.
Tesh, Charles P.
*Thigpen, Francis Y.
Thomas, Albert H., Jr.
*Thomas, Alfred J.
Thompson, Bruce R.
Thompson, Harold T.
Thompson, Max E.
Thompson, Robert D.
Tidd, Emmett H.
Tierney, John M.
Tiffany, Emory G.
Tisdale, Robert S.
*Tonkovic, Andrew A.
*Tranter, Thomas L.
Treacy, Edmund J.
Tribble, Robert J.
Trott, Robert J.
Tull, John L. D.
*Tull, Robert
Tully, Claude I.
Turk, Carl F.
Turley, Miles D. J.
*Turnbull, William O.
Tuttle, John S.
Tyler, Robert E.
Ufer, Alfred L.
Uhwat, Robert A. D.
Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
Urquhart, Alexander W., Jr.
Valentine, Andrew J.
VanTrain, William A., Jr.
VanWinkle, Oscar L.
Vardy, Richard S.
*Vaught, William J.
Veling, George M.
Viele, John W.
Waddell, Henry M., Jr.
Walker, Charles W., Jr.
*Walker, Robert G.
Walsh, John A.
*Warfield, John B.
*Warrick, Frank W.
Wash, John L.
Watt, Jesse R.
Weatherford, Jack E.
Weaver, Roy B.
Weaver, Walter C.
*Webb, Charles W.
*Webb, George J.
Webster, Daniel A.
Weidner, Robert E.
Weigel, John J.
Weirich, James E.
Welander, Robert O.
Wertheim, Robert H.
Wessinger, William D.
Westfall, Elmer T.
Wettlaufer, Warren H.
Whalen, William F., Jr.
Wheeler, William L.
*Wheless, John C.
White, Allan E.
White, Arthur T.
White, Ray B.
*White, Robert E.
Whitney, Loren C.
Whittle, Alfred J., Jr.
*Wiggins, James R.
Wilcox, Burr C.
Wilder, James H.
*Wilkins, James C., Jr.
Willett, Elbert H.
Williams, Charles S., Jr.
Williams, "D" Hunt
Williams, Paul H.
Williamson, Robert, II
Willis, Charles H.
Willson, Lawrence E., Jr.
*Wilmarth, Eugene M.
Wilson, Henry R.
Wilson, Richard H.
*Wilson, Ronald O.
Winter, Henry E., Jr.
*Winton, Matthew J.
*Wise, John H.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Wolf, Edward F.
Wolfe, John M.
*Wood, Ellis L.
Wood, Robert D.
Woods, Charles E.
Woolston, John
*Work, David D.
Wyman, Charles L.
Yarbrough, Charles F.
Yarbrough, Herbert A.
*Youmans, Laurens W., Jr.
Young, William B.
Youngblood, Donald K.
Zartman, Walter F.
Zeni, Levio E.
Zyvoloski, Richard A.

MEDICAL CORPS

*Bass, Robert E.
*Beer, David C.
Buechel, Donald R.
*Cruft, George E.
Drips, Robert C.
Dunn, Seldon C.
Durden, Charles S., Jr.
Greene, Lynne T.
*Hayes, William E.
*Kaufman, Paul
Long, James A.
Neptune, Edgar M., Jr.
Noer, Harold R.
Palmer, Robert H., Jr.
Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
Richardson, Fred W.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
Steen, Frank G.
Wilber, Martin C.

SUPPLY CORPS

Armlin, James F.
Bain, Louis E.
Baird, Richard S.
Baker, William R.
*Barger, Conrad A.
*Beckham, John J.
Bevill, Andrew F.
*Boswell, Harold
Brown, Emlin N., Jr.
*Burrus, Elgie L.
Chance, Carl
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Comeau, Reginald B.
Conover, Donald T.
Corley, James O.
*Daniel, Charles, Jr.
*Darrow, Robert W. H.
Dester, John M.
Doucette, Forrest H.
Elkins, Robert H.
*Elmore, John W.
*Fink, William W., Jr.
*Fitchett, George L.
Forrest, James E.
Gillis, Charles L.
Goolsby, Loyd
Gralla, Eugene
Haley, Robert S.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Haslett, Robert H.
Henderson, Robyn H.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Hughes, Thomas W., Jr.
*Josselyn, Allan H., Jr.
*Kelleher, John C.
Knight, Richard H.
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
Leclert, Arthur C.
Lewis, Raymond O.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
*Martin, James R.
*McDugald, Jesse
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
Moore, Vincent P., Jr.
Nickson, Roy E.
Olson, Robert S.
Peffley, John F.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rinetti, Edward J.
*Roche, Francis
*Rodgers, Wallace F.
Schar, Kenneth A.
*Simpson, James F.
Small, Joseph T.
Spargo, Robert A.
*Stafford, Dean C., Jr.
Statia, William W.
Stewart, Robert W.
Surran, Charles R.
Tinney, Richard T.
Tongren, Hale N.
Uskievich, Byron
*Wilson, Wilbur A. G.
Wingo, Rodney K.
Woolard, Kenneth A.
Wright, William D.
Yearick, William A.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Brenneman, Marshall E.
Cloonan, Joseph F.
Deal, Robert L.
Dennis, Arthur W.
*Emerson, James E.
Hayes, Henry H.
Herrmann, Theodore C.
Hopkins, Ralph W.
Hutcheson, Richard G., Jr.
*Keeley, John A.
Lavin, Henry T.
*Parham, Thomas D., Jr.
*Pigott, Charles S.
*Power, Bashford S.
Power, Joseph G.
*Radcliffe, Robert W.
*Ray, Milton U.
Sullivan, Mark
*Trower, Ross H.
Vincer, John D.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, John C.
Ashley, Donn L.
Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.
Bartlett, Robert B.
*Bixby, Paul
*Blevins, "W" "J"
Brantner, William B.
Burton, George W.
*Cunning, David P.
*Daggett, Robert E.
Dennis, Johnnie C.
Diehl, Charles E.
*Divoll, Richard L.
Doyle, Paul J., Jr.
*Eding, Lawrence H.
Farley, Robert J.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
*Gault, Alan C.
Gregory, George W., Jr.
*Hansen, Bernard L.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Heuston, Robert H.
Iselin, Donald G.
Jones, Whitney B.
Kaloupek, William E.
Klingenmeier, Russell J., Jr.
LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
Miller, Charles G., Jr.
More, David C.
*Oldham, Herron
O'Neill, Lawrence F.
Patrick, Donald A.
*Patrick, Jason M.
Peacock, Francis B.
*Pollard, Andrew M.
*Reese, William R., Jr.
Saunders, Edward M.
Seitz, Carl R.
Snow, Arthur W.
Souder, Charles L.
Spangler, William S.
Stiffler, Lloyd E., Jr.
VanLeer, Blake W.
Vaughan, James H., Jr.
Walton, Albion W., Jr.
Yount, George R.
Zirzow, Charles F.

DENTAL CORPS

*Carlson, Theodore E.
Counsell, Lee A.
Dunn, John J.
Hawkins, Kenner F.
Holmes, Corey H.
Mahoney, Jack D.
Samuels, Homer S.
*Scribner, James H.
Stephenson, Thomas D.
Taber, Donald S.
Timberlake, Robert W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Anderson, William F.
Baldridge, Henry D., Jr.
*Bowman, Clarence W.
*Boyd, Thomas A., Jr.
*Brooks, Euris J.
Burr, Leonard W.
Caldwell, Charlie C.
*Carson, Ralph
Chapman, William H.
Civiello, Harold J.
Clauss, Edward L.
*Coggburn, Manfred W.
*Eastman, Robert W.
*Essman, Frederick B.
Ethridge, John W.
*Frazier, Florence M.
*Guidry, Joseph A.
*Hollis, Thomas L.
Hunt, Bernhard H.
Kelly, Joseph A.
*Kinder, James W.
*King, Arthur N.
*LeBleu, Harry W.
*Longest, Nova
*Manley, Woodrow C.
*Martorano, Joseph J.
*Mayberry, Frank L.
*McLellan, David J.
Miller, Lloyd W.
Moore, Daniel D.
*Ottie, Frederick O.
Parker, James H.
*Pedersen, Arthur S.
*Pellarin, Victor L.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ray, Jewel P.
*Raybourn, Byron C.
*Sabbag, George J.
*Shepherd, William H.
*Sinclair, Harry E.
Smith, Forbes H.
Sontag, Frank B.
Sorger, Frank J.
Tennille, Robert M., Jr.
*Tunks, Omar A.
*Wade, Daryle A.

NURSE CORPS

Brown, Mary J.
Scheips, Edna M.
Smoker, Sue E.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

*Abelein, Herman C.
*Adams, Joseph A.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Adler, Robert E.
Ajemian, Andre V.
Aldern, Donald D.
Allen, James A.
Allen, John B.
Allender, Gene T.
Alley, Lester L.
*Alsager, Richard H.
Alvis, John G.
Anderson, Charles L. R.
Anderson, Lyle C.
*Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, Paul L.
Anderson, Stanley J.
Anderson, William J., III
Andrew, Neil H.
Angier, Donald L.
Anglim, Daniel F., Jr.
Antar, Albert
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Armstrong, John E.
Arn, Robert W.
Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Ashmore, Jackie K.
Ashurst, Albert J.
Ashworth, Edgar M., Jr.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Augustine, William F.
Aus, Charles A.
Ausbrooks, Erskine P., Jr.
Austin, James M.
Averitt, Gordon F.
Babbitt, James A., Jr.
*Bachtold, James R.
Bacon, James A.
Baggett, Talmadge S.
Bailey, Gilliam M.
Bain, Robert
Baker, James E., Jr.
Baker, James G.
Baker, Richard L.
Bakke, Harlan J.
Baldwin, Robert A.
Ballew, Richard F., Jr.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
*Barker, Harold D.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnes, Philip A.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrow, Robert W.
Bartholomew, John L.
Bartz, Donald P.
Barunas, George A., Jr.
Bauer, Edward C.
Bauman, Charles J., Jr.
Beasley, James W.
Beates, James K.
Beattie, Thomas T., Jr.
Beatty, Lloyd D.
Beck, Donald M.
Beck, Stanley L.
Beck, Stuart M.
Belk, Reece G., Jr.
Bell, Gerald R.
Benton, Hugh A.
Bergesen, Andrew J.
Bergman, Daniel
Bibby, Lowe H., III
Bickel, William B.
Bigenho, Roy M.
*Bippus, Henry
Birdsong, Harold S.
Biron, Joseph E.
Bish, Arthur A.
Blackwell, Bishop B.
Blasi, Richard R.
*Boakes, William H.
Boone, Robert R.
Borgstrom, Charles O., Jr.
Bouknight, Foy H.
Bowen, Albert S., III
Bowen, Jack W.
*Bowers, Thomas L.
Bowling, William H.
Brady, Allen C.
Brainard, Donald R.
Bramblett, John J., Jr.
Branch, Alvin D.
Breedlove, James E., Jr.
Breen, Matthew J.
Bres, John H.
Brewer, Glenn M.
Bridgham, Russell B.
Briggs, Douglas W.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brodie, Robert, III
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, William T., Jr.
Brown, Bruce W.
*Brown, Peter G.
Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Bryant, William R.
Buck, John A.
*Buck, Robert A.

Buffkin, John W., Jr.
Burgess, Wallace A.
Burke, William J.
Burke, William F.
Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burnett, James A.
Burrows, Herbert J.
Burton, Herbert O.
Busch, Roland G.
Bush, Charles L.
Butts, John L.
Butzen, Thomas P.
Buzzell, Carlisle W., Jr.
Byrd, Paul R.
Caldwell, Earl L., Jr.
Calhoun, William P.
Callahan, Earle R.
Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, William E., Jr.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
Carden, Marshall B., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
*Carlson, Burford A.
Carlson, George R.
Carpenter, Walter H.
Carraway, Terry F.
Carter, Edward W., III
Caskey, Donald L.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Cauffman, Charles E.
Cavanaugh, John P.
Chandler, Albert N., Jr.
Chandler, Hamilton A.
Chapman, Donald E.
Chapman, Howard M. Jr.
Charnas, Steve C.
Chereskin, Howard
Chertavian, Armen
Chesser, Samuel L.
Childers, Donald J.
Childs, John T.
Childs, Richard V.
Christensen, Earl D.
Christenson, Donald A.
*Church, George A.
Church, John H.
*Clarke, John R.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
*Clemens, Robert F.
Coale, William A.
Cobern, Ernest L.
Cole, William F., Jr.
Colenda, Herbert F.
Collins, Charles H.
Collins, Robert S.
Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Condon, Edward J.
Cone, Henry S., Jr.
Conlon, Frank S.
Cook, Carroll T.
Cooney, David M.
Cooper, Carleton R.
Corley, James W.
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornwell, Robert R.
Costigan, Robert A.
Cotter, Charles L.
*Coulson, Eugene R.
Councell, Thomas S.
*Courtney, Robert A.
Crandall, Hal R.
Crawford, Richard N.
Crawley, Don E.
Criner, James E.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
Crosby, Russell U.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Melville D.
Currie, Edgar I.
Dallaire, Richard P.
Dalla Mura, Richard A.
*Dame, Harold E.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Danner, William P.
Davey, Richard B.
Davis, Edward W.
Davis, Jay K.
Davis, Ralph H., Jr.
Davis, William J.
Decook, David W.
Defelice, Edward A.
Degnan, Francis J.
Dellinger, Donald B.
Derby, George K.
Desrosiers, Roland J.
*Dewing, Jay N.
DeWitt, Duane D.
Diers, Charles E.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Dievendorff, Frank
Dill, Charles M.
*Dillahunty, Benjamin P.
Dittmar, Louis C.
*Dix, Robert D.
Dobbins, John B., Jr.
*Dodd, Charles A.
Dodd, Robert L.
Doering, Eugene R.
Doggett, Burton L., Jr.
Donnelly, John D.
Downs, Leslie R.
Duffy, Charles G., Jr.
Duke, Marvin L.
Dumont, Sidney P., Jr.
*Dunaway, Gene T.
Dungan, John D.
Dunn, Robert F.
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Earl, William C.
Easterling, Crawford A.
Eckert, Richard H.
*Eckhout, Wilmot S.
Eckstein, John R.
Edmonds, Hobart J., Jr.
Edris, Richard J.
Edwards, Chester C.
*Ehleringer, Henry G.
Elfelt, James S.
Ellinghausen, Walter A., Jr.
*Ellis, James L.
Ellis, Richard M.
*Ellison, David J.
Englehart, Harry J.
*Erhart, James W.
Erkelens, Clarence
*Estabrook, Robert K.
Estes, Dana, II
*Estes, Leland F.
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Evans, Dorrance O.
Evans, George J.
Evans, LaVerne E.
Fagan, Edward J.
Farrell, John R.
Farren, Merritt C.
*Feit, Harry H., Jr.
*Feldman, Harry G.
Fenton, Robert E.
Fiore, Harold J.
Fite, Albert B.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
Fleming, Michael J. J.
Fleming, William O.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Foley, James E.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Forrester, James E.
Forsyth, Robert J.
Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
Foster, William F.
Fox, Kenneth
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Frei, Donald P.
Fremd, Harry L.
French, Jack T.
*Freund, Charles G.
Friedman, Arthur C.
*Friend, Joseph F.
Frost, William L.
Fuchs, Julius E.
Fuller, Joe E.
Fuller, Robert B.
*Furey, Francis D.
Gaches, John W.
Gale, Robert D.
Galing, Searcy G.
Gallagher, Lawrence E.
Gallagher, Paul A.
Gallegos, Prudenso S.
Gamber, Harold W.
Gardner, Richard C.
Gardner, Richmond
Garner, Charles H.
Garrett, Bernard H.
Garrett, Charles I., Jr.
Garrett, Everett C.
Gearhart, Norman R.
Geiger, Eugene D.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
Gibson, Charles L.
Gilbertson, John E.
Gilchrist, John F., II
Gillcrist, Paul T.
Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
*Gnos, Kenneth R.
Goebel, Herman E., Jr.
*Goodwin, George E.
Goslow, Paul
Gottschalk, Art W., Jr.
Goulds, Ralph J.
*Govan, George W.
Grace, Homer J.
Grady, Edward L., Jr.
Graf, Harry R.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, Thaddeus R.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grayson, William R.
Greathouse, David M.
Green, John N.
Green, Richard W.
Green, Robert E.
Gregg, Robert F.
*Griffin, Jack R.
Grozier, Roy E.
Guffey, Elton E.
Guion, Joseph E.
Haack, Donald E.
Hackett, Robert A.
Haff, William B.
Hahnert, William F., Jr.
Hall, Harrell W.
Hall, Thomas D.
Hall, Timothy K.
Halleck, William L.
Hallett, Edward R.
Hamilton, John W.
Hampton, Charles T.
Hansen, Merle C.
Harber, Russell L.
Hardy, Corydon C.
Harnden, Charles G.
Harper, Lorren G.
Harris, Elvin R.
*Harshbarger, John F.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, Stephen L.
Hart, William D.
Hartell, Ronald D.
Hartigan, Richard B.
*Hartley, Jack H.
Harvey, William T.
*Hassman, Andrew U., Jr.
Hausler, Carl O.
Hayden, Glenn M.
Hayes, Robert W.
*Hayes, Winston R.
Hayman, Robert B.
Haynsworth, Donald D.
Head, John L.
Hedges, Corky J. W.
*Heigl, John T., Jr.
Henrikson, Theodore P.
Heon, Robert H.
Herbert, Thomas J.
Herbig, Henry F.
Herndon, William J., Jr.
Herrin, Holden R.
Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
Hieronimus, Henry M.
Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Highleyman, Searle F.
*Hill, Howard A.
*Hill, James C.
Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
Hinsen, Kenneth L.
Hobbs, James "B"
Hodnett, Robert A.
Hofmockel, John L.
Hogan, Francis W.
Holbrook, Hilliard B., II
Holine, Leif A.
Holland, Alfred D.
Holland, James S.
Holler, Edward R.
Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
Holt, Robert E.
Honey, Arthur C., Jr.
Hoover, Richard M.
Hopf, Elwood J.
Hopper, Richard S.
Hossfeld, James F.
Hounihan, John C.
Hovater, James D.
Howe, Richard B.
*Hubbs, Donald R.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Humphries, George P.
Hunt, Albert M.
Hurd, Russell E.
Husbands, Joseph M.
Ingram, Billy G.
Ingram, John W.
Inman, Bobby R.
Inman, Richard P.
Irby, Charles R.
*Irish, George E.
Irwin, Wayne R.
Ismay, Arthur P.
Jacks, Robert G.
*Jaeger, Adolphus F.
Jarvies, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jeffries, Rollin E., Jr.
Jenkins, Paul J.
Jennings, John S.
Jett, William S., III
Jewell, Darl W.
Johns, Forrest R.
Johnson, Dale C.
Johnson, Joseph J.
*Johnson, Richard C.
*Johnston, Frederick B.
Johnstone, Richard A.
Joiner, Orrin
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, David L., Jr.
Jones, Ray P.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Jubb, Donald E.
Kalakowski, Joseph E.
*Katz, Martin
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keeney, David J.
Keihner, James K.
Keily, Lawrence J.
Kelln, Albert L.
Kelly, Ellis G.
Kemble, John R.
Kennedy, Nevin, III
Kephart, Robert D.
Kerr, Robert G.
Kertz, Jacob D.
Kilmer, Donald A.
Kimball, William A.
King, Cecil
King, William R.
*Kingery, Samuel G.
Kinnaird, Martin J.
Kinsley, Donald T.
Kirchner, David P.
Kirk, John J.
Klabo, Richard T.
Klett, George J.
Knutson, Donald W.
Koch, Richard A.
Kollmorgen, Leland S.
Kosonen, Charles G.
Kozel, William J.
Kramer, Robert P.
Kubel, Samuel R.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Lacy, James E.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, Derwin T.
Larson, Charles D.
Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Leach, Everett N.
Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
Leahy, John P.
Leibold, William R.
*Leis, Alfred C.
Lentz, Charles M.
Leppin, William F., Jr.
Leslie, Maxwell F., Jr.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Lewallen, John D.
Lewis, Charles B.
Lewis, James R.
Liberato, Frank A.
Libey, John D.
Lilienfeld, Joe J.
Lindsay, John D.
*Lipchak, Edward A.
Liston, John M.
Little, James G.
Lockhart, Glenn S.
Lofton, Freeman L.
Longhi, William J.
Love, Henry H., Jr.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
Lowe, Beverley J.
Loyd, Rupert H.
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lunt, Vernon S.
Luskin, Arthur G.
MacAulay, Angus
MacAuley, George W.
MacFie, Richard B.
Mack, Robert P.
Madden, Raymond A.
Maice, Lee, Jr.
Malone, Roy W.
*Marangiello, Daniel A.
Marin, William T.
Marr, William F.
*Martin, Calvin W.
*Martin, William K.
Martin, William R.
Mattioni, Blasco
Maxwell, Daryl O.
Maxwell, Leslie J.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
Mazzolini, John A.
McAlister, George C.
*McAnulty, David J.
McBain, Robert F.
McBurney, William J.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McCoy, Robert B.
McCrary, Dewey W.
McCumber, Harold E.
McDonald, Robert P.
McDonnel, Harold A.
McDonough, William D., Jr.
McFadden, Albert J., Jr.
McFadden, Grafton R.
McGeachy, Francis L.
McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
McGlone, Lawrence H.
McGrath, Harold A.
McGuire, Eugene J.
McKee, Kinnaird R.
McKee, Samuel T.
McKellar, Edwin D., Jr.
McLaughlin, Robert F.
McLaughlin, Dean N.
McLemore, Albert S.
McLoughlin, James
McMurray, William C.
McNally, John H.
*McNerney, James F.
McQuestion, Jack E.
McQuillin, John P.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
Mehl, James P.
Melim, Robert D.
Mench, Leland E.
Merchant, Paul G.
Merritt, Glen C.
*Metcalf, Joseph, III
Mikkelsen, Richard E.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, James P.
Miller, Robert L.
Minnigerode, John H. B.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
*Mitchell, Joe C.
Mitchell, John R. C.
Moffitt, Russel L.
Montgomery, Graden L.
Moore, Larry E.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, Virgil W., Jr.
Morgan, James E.
Moriarty, Peter M.
Morin, Richard J.
Morris, Howard L.
Morris, Robert E.
Morrow, Charles D.
Mow, Douglas F.
Moyer, Donald R.
Mueller, George E.
Mullen, Roger F.
Mullin, James
Munro, Ernest A.
Muros, Ralph L.
*Murray, Douglas V.
Muto, Charles J.
Naylor, Charles K.
Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
Neild, Arthur W.
Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
*Nelson, Harry J., Jr.
Neustel, Arthur D.
Nevius, William B.
*Newlund, Robert L.
Nix, Henry B.
North, Sylvester F.
Nunneley, John K.
Nunneley, James K.
Nyce, William E.
O'Brien, Leo F.
O'Gara, Patrick E.
O'Hara, Jack F.
Ohls, Karl E.
Oldfield, Charles B., III
Oliphant, Don "L"
Olsen, Richard L., Jr.
Olson, Willard R.
Orem, John B., Jr.
O'Riley, Vernon E.
O'Toole, Kevin J.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
Owens, Robert L.
Ozburn, Forrest C., Jr.
Paddock, Charles O.

Padgett, James P.
*Page, Carroll S., Jr.
Paisley, Harrison B.
*Palau, Henry S.
Panciera, Vincent W.
Parks, John T.
Parks, William W.
Parthemer, Lloyd L.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Pattee, Richard S.
Patten, Michael A.
*Patterson, William W., Jr.
Patterson, Jerry C.
Paulk, Joseph M.
Pauly, Donald E.
Pegues, John K., Jr.
Pendell, Carl R.
Pentony, John F.
*Perry, Roger E., Jr.
Pescott, Robert
Peters, Robert E.
Peterson, Loyd G., Jr.
Peterson, Richard E.
*Pette, Donald C.
Pettigrew, Raymond A.
Peugh, Everett R.
Pfeiff, Robert L.
*Pheasant, Alan G.
Phillips, Alan R.
Phillips, Harry E.
*Phillips, Lawrence E.
Phillips, William R.
Pinkerton, Roy "T"
Pinning, Joseph E.
Piraino, Daniel
Pirrone, Anthony P.
Pittman, Jack R.
Pogue, David W.
Pototsky, William J.
Powell, John J.
Powers, Wilbur P.
Prescott, Richard J.
Proctor, Sumner M., Jr.
Prosser, Walter R.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
*Radja, James E.
Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Ramsey, David G.
Ramsey, Walter A.
Rapp, Fred L.
Ray, Thermon L.
Ray, Thomas B.
Read, Garlin R.
Reaves, Joseph C.
Redfield, John M.
Redman, James R.
Reed, Robert K.
Regan, William B.
Reid, Albert R.
Remsen, "T" Schenck
Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
Replogle, Thomas H.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Richardson, Robert L.
Richardson, Richard H.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Robbins, Allan W.
Roberts, Robert T.
Roberts, Robert
Robertson, Douglas B.
*Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
Robinson, Robert B.
*Rockwell, Nevin L.
Rockwell, Richard F.
Rockwood, Jerred R.
Rogers, James O.
Rohde, Robert D.
Root, John B., Jr.
Rough, Jimmie L.
Rowley, Reginald C.
Rubey, William A.
Rubin, Arnold J.
*Rubins, Frederick K.
Rudy, Bryan C.
Rue, Harland J., II
Rueff, Eugene C.
Ruggiero, Michael E.
Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
*Russ, Jack E.
Rutherford, Ralph B.
Rylee, James E.
Salin, Robert S.
Sandberg, William G.
Sarosdy, Louis R.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Saul, Elmer L.
Sayers, Clay S.
*Saylor, Eugene H.
*Schaber, Rolph E.
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schlank, John J., Jr.
Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schuller, Gordon J.
Schulte, Richard J.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schultz, John L., Jr.
Schutz, Walter J.
Schwartz, Sheldon O.
Schwarz, Ira N.
Scull, John D.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
Seay, Wesley H., Jr.
Selby, Donald E.
Self, William H. C.
Semeraro, Angelo P.
Seward, John A., Jr.
Shabe, Gerard P.
Shaffer, Guy H. B.
Shaid, Robert A.
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Shaughnessy, William D.
Shaver, Frank T.
Shearer, Peter S.
Sheely, Donald M.
*Sheffield, Hughie D.
Sherman, Peter W.
Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
Shutty, Michael S.
Sierer, Payson D., Jr.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Sigsworth, David E.
Simcox, James G.
Simmons, Kenneth J.
Simmons, Robert R.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Skube, Edward A.
Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smellie, Rex D.
Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, Douglas J.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Stanford A.
Smith, William F.
Smyth, James M.
Sobieski, Leonard J.
Sollinger, David A.
Solterer, Carl F.
Soracco, David L.
Spencer, John R.
Spencer, Robert W.
Spowart, David J., Jr.
Springer, Howard C.
Stader, John F.
Stafford, Richard M.
Staheli, Gerald D.
Stallings, Alfred K.
Stamey, Claude R., Jr.
Stanley, Gregory W.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Stanley, Richard M.
Starn, Harrison F., Jr.
Steckbauer, Theodore C.
Stein, George D., Jr.
Stenke, George
Stephan, Robert A.
Stephenson, Donald L.
Stevens, Ralph H.
Stewart, Gene R.
Stewart, Merle A., Jr.
Stewart, Rodney L.
Stewart, Thomas P.
Still, Donald A.
Stine, Leon L., Jr.
St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
St. Marie, Joseph
Stocklmeir, Dean
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Storm, John S.
Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Stratmann, Charles I.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strohm, James J.
Stromski, Alexander S.
Stubbs, Robert C.
Stump, John M.
Sullivan, Edward T.
Sundstrom, Alex L.
Surman, William V., Jr.
Surovik, George A.
Swank, Donald E.
Swart, Robert L., Jr.
Szymanski, Andrew G.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, Francis C.
Tennison, Lonnie D.
Tetrick, Claude J.
Thamm, Tom B.
Thomas, Gerald E.
Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Preston G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thompson, Archibald S.
Thompson, William S.
Thomson, William O.
Thornburg, Thomas H.
Tillotson, Ted K.
Tillson, John G.
*Timoney, Gerald P.
*Tinkham, John A.
*Tobias, Ralph W.
Todd, Walter H., Jr.
Tollefson, Norris M.
Tollefson, Charles H.
*Tomb, Paul D.
Tomsky, Jackson M.
Townsend, "G" "E"
Traub, Charles, III
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Trens, Mike J.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
*Troter, Thomas K.
Trout, Thomas W.
*Tucker, Leonard L., Jr.
Turnbull, James R.
Turner, Keith S.
Tuzo, Paul B., III
Uehlinger, John C.
Uhrig, William R.
Ulen, Victor A.
*Utterback, Paul W.
Vahsen, George M.
Vail, Harold W.
Vaillancourt, Richard P.
Vandermolen, Dale R.
VanDeweghe, Raymond
VanHook, Gordon R.
VanReeth, Eugene W.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Voegelein, Gordon R.
VonChristierson, William W.
Vrieze, Edwin H., III
Wadsworth, Francis L.
*Wales, John R.
Wandres, Victor C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Ware, Owen H.
Warner, Brooks F.
*Wartman, Albert C., Jr.
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Wassell, James W.
Waterfield, Willard F.
Waterhouse, Charles N.
Watson, Peter J.
Watson, Thomas W.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Weeks, Robert H.
Wehner, William A.
Weisheit, Burton A.
Welch, Bernard W.
Welch, Clyde R.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wells, William H.
Wenzel, Robert F.
West, Floyd P.
Wettroth, John R.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
Whitaker, Robert M.
White, Maurice G.
White, Steven A.
Whiteleather, Charles H., Jr.
Whitmire, Vivien C.
*Whittemore, Frederick H.
Whyte, Kent E.
*Wigent, Richard A.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wildauer, Paul A.
Wilhelmi, Quentin E.
Wilkinson, Edward L.
Wilkinson, Raymond O.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, John T.
Williams, John D.
Williams, Ross N.
*Williams, Robert L.
Williamson, Donald A.
Willis, Francis R.
Willson, Donald M.
*Wilson, Clarence E.
Wilson, Herbert E., Jr.
*Wilson, William W.
Winberg, William, III
*Winfrey, Harvey M. Jr.
Winfrey, John A., Jr.
Winnefeld, James A.
Wood, Lewis I.
Wood, Stephen C.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Wooden, Neal R.
Worden, Dwight G.
Wright, Merritt R.
Wylie, David C.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yeager, George E.
Yearous, Glenn W.
Yoran, George F., Jr.
Young, Robert A.
*Youngblood, Norman L., Jr.
Zeisel, Richard S.
Zoehrer, Herbert A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to chief warrant officer, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, W–3

Ace, Robert F.
Ayres, Gordon K.
Gilmore, Francis L.
Harkins, Billy M.
James, William B.
Kay, James R.
Keesling, Norman O.
Mitchell, William J.
Norris, Francis C., Jr.
Pangle, Jacob W.
Petersen, James C.
Quinlan, Charles M.

CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER, W–4

Alexander, Silas R.
Baker, Millard T.
Belcoe, Melbert V.
Borgens, John
Byrd, Raymond R.
Cannon, Jesse D.
Carleton, Jack E. L.
Castelli, Ramon P.
Christiansen, Arnold M.
Clooney, William T.
Covington, John R.
Crouch, Kenneth L.
Dingess, Naaman
Doud, Robert H.
Dunnigan, George J.
Egger, Wayne I.
Foster, Orlon C.
Goerner, Ralph T., Jr.
Good, Adolph
Hall, Jimmie C.
Hanson, Harley C.
Hardin, Jasper S.
Harris, Robert S.
Hayes, Jack E.
Hewitt, Albert L.
Hicks, Jeptha B.
Holdgrafer, Ambrose H.
Holmes, Herbert M.
Hunter, Clifford D.
Kasprzak, Edward G.
Locker, John C.
Mauldin, William L.
Maxwell, Frank L.
Mayle, Arthur E.
Miller, Claude W.
Mulkins, Blair D.
Mumford, Lloyd K.
McGinley, James P., Jr.
McKamey, Robert W.
McKim, Mark E.
O'Leary, Robert P.
Smith, Paul J.
Snyder, David W.
Sullivan, Francis E.
Tinnell, Eldridge G.
Turnipseed, Mike W.
Tye, Litton E.
Wilson, Reid
Wolf, Kenneth R.
Woods, Norman G.
Young, Leroy
Zatorski, John F.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Harrison, Elizabeth S.
Truitt, Beatrice M.

SUPPLY CORPS

Barton, Margaret E.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Arenth, Rosemary D.
Barteau, Celia L.
Gore, Mary A.
Kraff, Lorraine
Linderman, Mary J.
Lloyd, Rebecca A.
McKee, Fran
Safford, Charlotte L.

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adsit, Carol A.
Baker, Roberta R.
Barker, Cathryn J.
Burch, Mary J.
Burman, Rita M.
Chapman, Barbara R.
Cheatham, Nonna E.
Davies, Alice L.
Driver, Mary L.
Glover, Elizabeth B.
Grantham, Diana B.
Green, Jeannette E.
Hess, Carleen R.
Higgins, Maria S.
Jackson, Virginia E.
Miller, Sarah L.
Moore, Ida R.
Pea, Mary E.
Rogers, Elaine R.
Skoff, Jordine C.
Vogler, Velma R.
Williams, Barbara M.
Wilson, Margaret A.

Paul Wohl, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Lloyd R. Evans, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the Supply Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Alden, Robert F.
Bambo, Gregory B., Jr.
Brown, Thomas W.
Compton, William H.
Cox, Duane A.
DeNoon, Norman L.

Doe, Burdell F.
Frederick, Keith J.
Gales, George M.
Geraldson, Elmer L.
Gray, Fred, III
Hickman, Thomas W.
Keller, Joseph A.
Kerman, William O.
Louis, David R., Jr.
Masson, Robert H.
McCauley, George K.
Murdoch, Thomas M.
Seidel, Melvin L.
Simmons, James L.
Tarkowski, Donald C.
Thomas, John D.
Vaiana, James C.
Wilson, Claude D., Jr.
Wolfe, Philip W.
Young, Wayne G.

SUPPLY CORPS

Basley, Raymond C.
Brown, Alan S.
Davis, John R.
Doddridge, Benjamin F.
Gavin, Victor M.
Govig, Melvin E.
Tyree, David M., Jr.
Weller, Thomas C., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Podbielski, Victor

NURSE CORPS

Calloway, Emily F.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

LINE

To be captains

Adams, John P.
Allen, Hartsel D.
Alley, Charles J.
Anderson, Elmer D.
Anderson, Herbert H.
Anderson, Roy G.
Andrews, Burton H.
Andrews, Clyde C.
Andrews, Thomas L., Jr.
Auman, Forrester C.
Bacon, Schuyler W.
Badger, Heber J.
Baker, Carl S.
Balaban, Stephen F.
Ball, George G.
Ball, George C., Jr.
Ball, Thomas J.
Bangs, Louis L.
Barackman, Bruce MacD.
Barnhart, Robert E.
Bassett, Henry B.
Baughan, Robert L., Jr.
Bauser, Edward J.
Baxter, Robert J.
Beardall, John R., Jr.
Beauchamp, Ernest M.
Bellis, Charles A.
Bennett, John E.
Benton, Burgin "L"
Bienvenu, Roland G.
Bikle, Burton L.
Bjornson, Gordon B.
Blandin, Victor A.
Borden, Paul F.
Bowell, John H.
Bowen, John S.
Boyle, John E., Jr.
Bradway, William S., Jr.
Brandt, George E., Jr.
Brines, George R.
Brinn, Rufus T.
Brittin, Burdick H.
Brooks, Sidney
Brown, Gordon J.
Brownlow, Paul J.
Bryan, William C.
Buell, Thomas C.
Bunn, Giles F., Jr.
Burbage, Charles L.
Burley, Thomas G., Jr.
Burnett, Louis R.
Byrnside, Benjamin C., Jr.
Cagle, Malcolm W.
Calland, Robert W.
Camera, John A.
Campbell, Donald C.
Cappello, Henry J.
Carlisle, Geoffrey E.
Carlson, Ralph B.
Carmichael, Carl
Carney, Gerald F.
Carpenter, William M.
Carr, Charles H.
Carter, William D.
Chalmers, Norman E.
Chandler, Ralph S.
Charbonnet, Pierre N., Jr.
Christiansen, Arnold R.
Clark, Asa A., III
Clark, Cecil
Clark, Robert B.
Clinton, Jack W.
Coats, Robert C.
Cocowitch, Harry M.
Collingwood, John F.
Combs, Paul C.
Compton, Oliver D.
Compton, Raymond F.
Cone, Davis
Connolly, John M., Jr.
Cook, George C.
Cook, Ralph E.
Cooper, Damon W.
Cooper, James S.
Corcoran, William J.
Corneliussen, Steven T.
Costagliola, Francesco
Cowart, Andrew H.
Cox, Harry C.
Coyle, James J.
Cramp, Kenneth W.
Crawford, Joseph W., Jr.
Crockett, David S.
Crommelin, Quentin C.
Cross, William H.
Crowe, John W.
Cuccias, Francis P.
Cunnare, Francis H.
Daly, George W.
Damon, Arthur H., Jr.
Daniels, Lowell P.
Darby, Lowel E.
Darrah, Charles A.
Davenport, John B.
Davidson, James J.
Davis, Bernard W.
Davis, Maxey B.
Davol, Charles D., Jr.
Delano, Victor
Denegre, Thomas B., Jr.
Dertien, Donald A.
De Venter, Willard W.
Dinneen, John H.
Doherty, John C.
Dolan, John H.
Donahue, John C., II
Donahue, Philip M.
Dorrington, Joseph F.
Douglas, George M.
Dowdell, James S.
Drain, Dan T.
Drake, James P.
Dresser, Kenneth R.
Dreyer, Oscar F.
Drum, Henry W.
Duke, John M., Jr.
Dupzyk, Robert R.
Earnest, Albert K.
Eason, Van V., Jr.
Easterling, Henry McC.
Ebright, Myrton T.
Edelstein, Sam E., Jr.
Eder, Willard E.
Edwards, Frank G.
Edwards, Frederick L., Jr.
Eggen, Arnold W.
Elliott, August W., Jr.
Elliott, James B., Jr.
Englander, Felix L.
Engle, Aubrey D.
English, Elbert H., Jr.
Erdmann, Robert F.
Ereckson, Henry J., Jr.
Evers, Adelbert R.
Fairchild, Dale E.
Fears, Charles L.
Felter, John F.
Field, Henry C., Jr.
Fleet, John P.
Floyd, Joe H.
Flynn, David R.
Foltz, Gayle C.
Fonvielle, Charles D., Jr.
Foster, Edward L.
Foster, Richard E.
Foster, William McA.
Frazier, Walter J.
Freitag, Robert F.
French, Dana P.
Gaddis, Walter D.
Gallagher, Thomas J., Jr.
Garrett, Ned
Garvey, Richard S.
Gee, Roy P.
Gerry, Duane J.
Gibbs, Harry B.
Glassman, David E.
Gooch, Floyd W., Jr.
Gooding, Robert C.
Gordon, Archer R.
Gorman, Frederick E.
Grabowsky, Leon
Gray, Paul N.
Griber, Peter A. M.
Griffing, Charles W.
Gruber, Richard D.
Guillory, Troy T.
Gundlach, William
Gustaferro, Joseph F.
Guy, Robert S.
Hackett, James E., Jr.
Hadden, Mayo A., Jr.
Hagerman, George M.
Hailey, Robert
Hall, Harvey W., Jr.
Haller, Morris E.
Harding, William T.
Hardy, Lewis R., Jr.
Harrell, Robert B.
Harris, Raymond M.
Harrison, Edward W.
Harrold, Clay
Hart, Clarence M.
Hatch, William N.
Hawes, George M.
Hayler, Robert W., Jr.
Hennessey, Thomas V.
Hickman, Howard H., Jr.
Higgins, Edward M.
Hildreth, James B.
Hill, Raymond E.
Hirshfeld, Ross R.
Hirst, William B., Jr.
Hitchcock, John H.
Hodson, Norman D.
Hoffberg, Howard J.
Hokr, Joseph E.
Holm, Stanley R.
Holmes, John L., Jr.
Holmes, Paul L.
Holmes, Wilbur T.
Hopkins, Lewis A.
Horner, Thomas L.
Houghton, James C.
Houser, William D.
Howard, Seth T.
Huey, Enders P.
Hunt, Edward R.
Iarrobino, John H.
Ireland, James M.
Issitt, Donald K.
Ivison, Sterling H., Jr.
Jackson, Clifton E.
Jackson, David H.
Jackson, Harry A.
Jackson, Wyman N.
James, Daniel V.
Jamison, James P.
Jeffery, Robert E.
Johns, Ruben L.
Johnson, Edward B., Jr.
Jones, Joseph M.
Jones, Stuart C.
Jones, William W.
Kalin, Morris I.
Keegan, John P.
Keehn, Robert H.
Kelly, Charles B.
Kennedy, John E.
Kenner, Jack L.
Kern, Donald H.
Kidd, Isaac C., Jr.
Kiefer, Edwin H.
Kilner, John S., Jr.
King, Ira M.
King, Jerome H., Jr.
Kiracofe, Warren C.
Kittler, Fred W.
Kittrell, James R.
Klingaman, Leon C.
Knoche, Ernest J.
Knowlton, Negus W.
Kobey, Albert L., Jr.
Koenigsberger, Charles, Jr.
Kooy, Herman P.
Kosciusko, Henry M.
Kotsch, William J.
Kroger, Bruce G.
Laforest, Thomas J.
Lane, Stanley H.
Lange, Robert V.
Lanterman, William S., Jr.
LaRocque, Gene R.
LaRoe, Edward T.
Larson, Lewis E., Jr.
Lauff, Bernard J.
Leahy, Harold G.
Lee, Norman I., Jr.
Lee, Robert E., Jr.
Leidel, John S.
Lemos, William E.
Lewis, Allen L.
Lewiston, William A.
Lienhard, Bernard A.
Lilly, Percy A., Jr.
Lloyd, Frederic M., III
Lockett, Lawrence S.
Long, Andrew W., Jr.
Lowe, Grady H.
Luce, William T.
Luehman, Earl A.
Lungren, Arthur E.
Lynch, James P.
Lynn, Joseph
Lyon, Hugh P.
McGregor, Stephen H., Jr.
Macklin, Robert D.
MacMillan, Oscar D.
Macri, Guiseppi
Maddocks, William J.
Marquardt, Richard C.
Marshall, James M.
Marzetta, Dante R.
Mason, Frank V.
Mathew, Robert H., Jr.
Matton, William G., Jr
Maxwell, Frederick W., Jr.
Mayer, Lucas B.
Mayher, John R.
McCormick, Thomas E., Jr.
McDevitt, Joseph B.
McDonald, Maxwell "D"
McEntire, Paul W.
McIntosh, David M.
McKee, John R.
McLaughlin, Bernard
McNulty, Willard J.
McQuown, Wymard "B", Jr.
Meadors, William W.
Medley, Russel "C"
Melson, Lewis B.
Menge, Robert F.
Merill, David A.
Messer, John G.
Micheel, Vernon L.
Middleton, Roderic O.
Mildahn, Elwood C.
Miller, Ashton C., Jr.
Miller, Edward G.
Miller, Gerald E.
Miller, Jack A.
Miller, Robert N.
Milota, Robert F.
Minor, Gerald E.
Minton, Robert B.
Mishan, John E.
Mohl, Edgar V.
Moitoret, Victor A.
Molitor, Francis R.
Moore, Howard N.
Moriarty, Thomas J.
Morrison, George S.
Morrissey, Jack L.
Morton, Albert O.
Muckenthaler, Charles P., Jr.
Murphy, Frank McL.
Murphy, Walter P., Jr.
Myers, Fredrick R.
Neese, William G.
Nelms, Kenneth S.
Nelson, Charles E.
Nelson, John B.
Neman, Sol
Newland, John R.
Newsom, John W.
Nichols, Keith G.
Nicholson, William M.
Norrington, William E., Jr.
Norton, Marvin D., Jr.
Norvell, Forrest H., Jr.
Oliver, Ray E.
Oliver, William B.
Olson, Donald K.
O'Neil, Vernon P.
O'Neill, Harold J.
Orme, Samuel T.
Osborne, Manley C.
Osterhoudt, Raymond S.
Ousey, Walter M.
Owen, William D., Jr.
Palmer, Grant A., Jr.
Parisian, Richard W.
Parker, Elwin A.
Parris, Arthur
Paulin, William B.
Pease, Forrest A.
Pendergrass, James T.
Penfold, Jack R.
Pennoyer, Frederick W., III
Pittman, William R.
Plate, Douglas C.
Plemons, Arnold G.
Pollard, Eric W.
Porter, Ebenezer F.
Potter, James A., III
Poulsen, Harold N.
Prince, Mortimer J.
Pugh, Harry M.
Quigley, Donald F.
Quinn, Charles S., Jr.
Rahill, Gerald W.
Rau, Robert E.
Rawlings, Grover L.
Ray, Alan
Rayburn, Joseph H., Jr.
Redmayne, Richard B.
Reeves, Gerald McG.
Reidy, John J., Jr.
Reitz, Spencer
Rex, Daniel F.
Ricks, Robert B.
Rifenburgh, Edward G.
Riley, George B.
Ring, Eli D.
Roberts, Francis R.
Rodin, Harry C.
Rodman, William B., IV
Rood, George H.
Rowen, William H.
Rowney, James V.
Rubel, David M.
Ruder, Frederick J.
Ruefle, William J.
Rush, Charles W., Jr.
Russell, Allard G.
Sallenger, Asbury H.
Salyer, Herbert L., Jr.
Salzer, Robert S.
Sanborn, Francis R.
Sandor, Edward A.
Sanger, Frank M., Jr.
Santry, Jere J., Jr.
Satterfield, Loys M.
Savage, Lowell C.
Saveker, David R.
Scapa, Jacob
Schaible, Theodore C.
Scherrer, Carl L.
Schley, John B.
Schmidt, Henry E.
Schweer, William W.
Seith, William
Sessums, Walter M.
Shallenberg, Lowell W.
Sharratt, George S. H., Jr.
Shaw-Corthorn, George
Shear, Harold E.
Shelton, Samuel M.
Shew, James E.
Shockey, William H.
Showers, Donald M.
Shropshire, Paul H., Jr
Shults, Roy G.
Shutt, Richard G.
Siefert, Jerry R.
Silberstein, Howard J.
Simmons, Kenneth G.
Sims, John H.
Sisk, Hoke M.
Smalzel, Charles W.
Smith, Carl M.
Smith, Charles W., Jr.
Smith, Coleman H.
Smith, Thomas P., Jr.
Smits, Cornelius J., Jr.
Sorensen, Robert E.
Sotos, George P.
Southard, Pemberton
Spencer, John C.
Spitler, Joseph C.
Spore, Burns W.
Stanziano, Arthur J.
Staring, Merlin H.
Starkey, Robert C.

Steen, Kenneth
Sterling, Stoughton, Jr.
Stetson, Thomas H.
Steuckert, Julius F.
Stevens, Paul F., Jr.
Stevens, Wynne A., Jr.
Stone, Frank B.
Stonecipher, Elmer T.
Strieter, Robert M.
Strum, Charles G.
Styer, Charles W., Jr.
Svendsen, Edward C.
Swacker, Stewart W.
Swain, Dean H.
Swayne, Charles B.
Sweatt, Robert A.
Sweeny, James B., Jr.
Sweeny, John
Swenson, Winford A.
Talbot, Wallace L., Jr.
Tappan, Benjamin
Tebo, Kenneth M.
Tenanty, Joseph R.
Terrill, Ralph "B"
Terry, John H.
Thomas, Willis L.
Thompson, Joseph E., Jr.
Thomson, James R.
Thro, John B.
Todd, Forrest A.
Towle, Barnaby L.
Trauger, Robert J.
Traynor, Laurence G.
Tripp, Jack H.
Trudeau, Russell F.
Turner, Thomas A.
Tvedt, Joseph A.
Vail, Powell P., Jr.
Vanderburg, Elden R.
Venne, Antoine W., Jr.
Walkinshaw, David J.
Wallace, John G.
Warns, James T.
Watson, John M.
Wayne, John B.
Weary, Neil S.
Weatherwax, John C.
Welch, David F.
Werth, James M.
Weschler, Thomas R.
Westervelt, John D.
Whatton, James E.
Wheeler, Joseph C., Jr.
Whitaker, Malcolm W., Jr.
Whitman, William A.
Weir, John P.
Williams, Clyde A.
Williams, Robert E.
Windsor, Robert W., Jr.
Witten, Charles H.
Wittmann, Narvin O.
Wolfe, Malcolm E.
Wood, Albert H.
Wood, Harry W.
Worcester, Benjamin F., II
Wright, Clarence C.
Wright, Richard M.
Wyse, Frederick C., Jr.
Zimmerman, Milton A.
Zirkle, Joseph C., Jr.
Zurcher, Clarence J.

To be commanders

Adams, Benjamin W.
Adams, Ollie B.
Adamson, Robert E., Jr.
Ahrens, Alfred H.
Ainsworth, Herbert S.
Ajemian, Baret V.
Aldrich, James H.
Alexander, William H., II
Allen, Raymond W.
Almy, Charles B.
Amick, William C., Jr.
Anderson, Kenneth L.
Apple, Robert E.
Arbo, Paul E.
Arnold, Ernest S.
Arnold, Julian, Jr.
Asbury, David A.
Ashcroft, Jerome L., Jr.
Awtrey, Robert K., Jr.
Ayers, Arnold W.
Bach, Sverre O.
Bacheler, Theodore F.
Bacon, Americus V. H., Jr.
Bagby, Robert G.
Bagley, David H.
Baldwin, Lorenzo W., Jr.
Barber, Lester W.
Barbour, Henry S.
Barker, Arthur, Jr.
Barnes, George J.
Barrett, Frank O., Jr.
Barrow, William B., Jr.
Bartles, William H.
Bartlett, Albert J.
Bartlett, Richard C., Jr.
Barton, Francis D.
Bass, Kenneth L.
Bates, Sheldon "S"
Battson, Arthur LaG., Jr.
Baumann, Edward W.
Baumberger, Harold E.
Bedsole, Donald S.
Behrens, William W., Jr.
Bennett, George O.
Bennett, William L., Jr.
Benson, LaRoyd E.
Bergstedt, William C.
Berkstresser, Charles G.
Berree, Norman R.
Biche, Robert C.
Bicknell, John R.
Biddle, Edward
Biewer, Francis N.
Bird, Robert A.
Blaine, Ralph R.
Blakeman, James McN.
Blalack, Russell E.
Blockwick, Thomas N.
Bogan, Lewis F.
Bohan, Norman C.
Bonnett, Ira W.
Boose, William R.
Boscole, Robert A.
Bothwell, Robert L.
Bouldin, Jack F.
Boyes, Jon L.
Brady, Thomas J.
Breeden, George B.
Bristow, Robert I.
Brittingham, Stanley H.
Broadbent, Harvey, Jr.
Brock, Clarence C., Jr.
Brock, Marvin A.
Brooks, Daniel P.
Brooks, David M.
Brosnahan, James J.
Brouner, Albert M.
Brown, Thomas H.
Bryan, John I., Jr.
Buescher, Joseph H.
Burk, Raymond W.
Burlin, Charles W., Jr.
Burnell, Robert M.
Burnham, Fletcher H.
Butcher, Cecil O.
Butler, Hugh D.
Butler, William C.
Butt, Cyrus H.
Cabell, John B.
Caldwell, Harry H.
Cameron, Alan R.
Campbell, Charles B., Jr.
Campbell, Norman F.
Campbell, William C.
Capriotti, Anthony T., Jr.
Carlson, William S.
Carpenter, Albert P.
Carr, Robert T.
Carruth, Vincent DeP. D.
Carson, Albert C.
Casey, Martin M., Jr.
Casey, William C.
Cassani, Vincent L., Jr.
Castle, Hal C.
Catha, William H.
Cauble, Lawrence M.
Cavanaugh, Robert B.
Chadwick, Walter D.
Chandler, Alfred W., Jr.
Chapman, Tyrus C.
Chapman, William C.
Christman, Thomas J.
Clapp, Atlee F.
Clapp, Clarence M.
Clark, Gilbert L.
Clark, Morris Y.
Clift, Frank W., III
Colopy, Robert E.
Coogan, Robert P.
Cook, Creighton W.
Cook, Robert H.
Cook, William C.
Cooney, Lawrence F., Jr.
Cooper, Thomas H., III
Cornwall, Ernest S., Jr.
Cowdrey, Roy B.
Cox, Donald V.
Craig, Allan H.
Cramer, Shannon D., Jr.
Crandall, Charles N., Jr.
Crawford, Arthur G.
Creamer, John J.
Croft, Alfred R., Jr.
Cron, Robert H.
Crowder, Jonathan J.
Cruise, William H., Jr.
Crutchfield, Paul W., Jr.
Cryan, John J.
Cummings, Harry A.
Cummings, John N.
Cummins, Lawrence D.
Curts, Robert I.
Cutler, Henry O.
Dankworth, Theodore P.
Dannettell, Ralph, Jr.
Davidson, Edward A.
Davis, Donald C.
Davis, John F.
Davis, Robert J., Jr.
Dawson, Howard W.
Deal, Ronald A., Jr.
DeBuhr, Calvin H.
DeBuhr, Claude N.
DeHuff, David
DeLaMater, Stephen T. Jr.
De Largy, John M.
Dennis, Reyburn H., Jr.
DePrez, Richard J.
Dersam, Harold G.
DeWachter, Alphonse E.
Dillard, Thornwell M.
Dixon, Walter J., Jr.
Donaldson, John S.
Donnelly, Grant L.
Donnelly, William E., Jr.
Donovan, John F.
Dormer, Robert L.
Draper, Murray E.
Driscoll, John F.
Dumas, Glenn I.
Duncan, Derwood D.
Duncan, Gordon
Dunning, Harvey K.
Dusek, Charles C.
Dyar, Joseph E., Jr.
Eaton, Russell S., Jr.
Eimstad, Henry A.
Eldridge, Edgar A.
Elliott, Michael M.
Ely, Charles S., Jr.
Emig, Alvin F.
Engen, Donald D.
Engle, Raymond K.
Etter, William P.
Evans, Nicholas A.
Ewing, Harold T.
Fairbanks, John W.
Faubion, Richard D.
Fields, Louis B.
Filiatrault, Alfred C., Jr.
Fitton, Cyrus F.
Fitzpatrick, Wayne N.
Flanagan, William R.
Flannery, William J.
Flory, Edwin B.
Foltz, Ralph E.
Ford, Albert T.
Ford, Raymond E.
Foreman, Robert P.
Forsberg, Francis C.
Foss, Newton P.
Foster, William G.
Fowler, Richard E., Jr.
Frame, Ralph W., Jr.
Fritz, Charles W.
From, John L., Jr.
Furnas, Wendell J.
Gaibler, Richard
Gaiennie, George W.
Gallatin, Robert E.
Gaskin, Edward R.
Gear, Bud B.
Gibson, Richard H.
Gibson, Robert C.
Gibson, William C.
Gilliland, Theodore McE.
Gleason, Wesley A.
Glendinning, Bruce E.
Glenn, Hardy
Godfrey, Jack E.
Godman, Robert
Goodwin, John T.
Gorman, Henry
Goudie, Gene
Grace, Joseph A., II
Graning, Leonard G.
Grant, William W., Jr.
Greer, Howard E.
Grimes, Harold J.
Grosser, John F.
Grosskopf, Homer L., Jr.
Gummerson, Kenneth C.
Gustafson, Boyd E.
Gustafson, Robert B.
Hall, Francis H. S.
Halstrom, Paul R.
Hammett, Wayne E.
Hancotte, John J., Jr.
Hanecak, Richard G.
Hanssen, Henry R.
Harkins, John A.
Hartle, Maurice C.
Harwell, Payton O.
Havenstein, Paul L.
Hay, Lorin W.
Hayden, Charles H.
Heald, Joseph F.
Heard, Jack F.
Heg, James E.
Heller, Frederick J.
Heintz, John W.
Henderson, David W.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Hendrick, William J.
Hennessey, Charles A., Jr.
Herlong, Daniel W.
Herrick, Harvey S.
Herrick, John J.
Herron, Adam A., Jr.
Hickle, Robert E.
Hickman, Charles R.
Hile, William H., Jr.
Hill, Clarence A., Jr.
Hill, Russel S.
Hiller, Harold W.
Hills, Stetson P.
Hipp, Ernest C., Jr.
Hogan, Horace C., Jr.
Hoke, Leonard A., Jr.
Holbrook, James L.
Holloway, Ernest W.
Hollyfield, Ernest E., Jr.
Holmes, Audley W.
Holt, McHenry H.
Holter, Ralph K.
Homyak, James A.
Honour, Walter W.
Hooper, John H.
Horn, Dean A.
Horton, William G.
Howard, Leo T.
Howell, Jay S.
Hulten, Albert P.
Hutzel, Robert G.
Huxford, Richard W.
Ingram, James D.
Jackson, Ralph F.
Jacques, Donald J.
Jakubowski, Thaddeus J.
Jenkins, Henry C.
Jennings, Carl R.
Jennings, Joe C.
Jennings, Major J.
Johnson, Charles R.
Johnson, Clarence R.
Johnson, David A.
Jones, George B.
Jonson, Russell M.
Joslin, Charles L., Jr.
Kane, John C., Jr.
Keller, Robert M.
Kelley, Edmond L.
Kendall, Jack D.
Kendall, Robert J.
Kenny, James P.
King, Benjamin B., Jr.
King, Randolph W.
Kingston, George W.
Kiser, William P.
Kitt, Robert B.
Kleffner, Frank P.
Klein, Theodore G.
Knotts, Sanford L.
Knull, William H., Jr.
Kubicki, Edward
Kunberger, George A.
Lambert, Glenn E.
Landon, James B.
Landry, Adelard F.
Lane, Gene L.
Laney, Jack S.
Lawrence, Emmett B.
Lee, Alan S.
Lee, Kent L.
Lendenmann, Werner, Jr.
Levitt, Ben B.
Lewellen, Robert S.
Lieber, James C.
Lindberg, Donald S.
Linnekin, Richard B.
Little, John C.
Locklin, William H.
Long, Robert L. J.
Loomis, Robert J.
Lovell, Frederick A., Jr.
Lowe, Harry C.
Lowry, James J.
Lupia, Archy L.
Mackey, Clarence E.
MacLeod, Alan R., Jr.
Madden, James J.
Mahoney, George H.
Major, Arthur
Mallick, Edgar E.
Manship, Herbert K.
Markey, Francis H.
Martin, Walter F.
Mays, Dixie J., Jr.
McCabe, Donald C.
McCauley, James E.
McClane, Joseph L., Jr.
McDonald, Robert R.
McElroy, John B.
McHugh, Lee T.
McKinney, Andrew T.
McKinney, Clyde B.
McKinney, John B.
McMahon, Richard E.
McNeela, John P.
McVey, William J.
Mellin, Richard G.
Merrill, Ralph F.
Meshier, Charles W.
Methvin, James R., Jr.
Meyer, Herman E.
Miehe, Frederick W., Jr.
Millar, Donald B.
Miller, Charles L.
Miller, Donald M.
Miller, Jack N.
Miller, Kermit M. E.
Miller, Paul, Jr.
Miller, Rupert S.
Minard, Robert K., Jr.
Monson, Donald W.
Montgomery, George P., Jr.
Moore, Bobbie P.
Moore, Richard S.
Moore, Walter R., Jr.
Moran, George F.
Morris, Robert L.
Mowell, Lawrence V.
Moyer, Eugene H.
Muller, Ragnwald
Muller, Walter E.
Munnikhuysen, Douglas Y.
Munson, John R.
Murphy, Daniel J.
Musial, Joseph S.
Myers, Lawrence St. C.
Naczkowski, Bruno R.
Napier, Edward D.
Neal, Raymond G.
Netting, Robert W.
Nicholas, Philip W.
Niemann, William E.
O'Bryan, George R.
O'Leary, Arthur, C., Jr.
Olive, Robert C.
Olsen, Clifford E.
Osgood, Arthur H.
Pabarcus, John P.
Panther, Richard D.
Paolucci, Dominic A.
Patch, Arthur E.
Patrick, Urey W., Jr.
Patterson, Joseph, Jr.
Patterson, Donald G.
Payne, William E., Jr.
Pearce, Robert N.
Peery, George G., Jr.
Pelletier, Albe J., Jr.
Pennington, Jack H.
Perry, Joe R.
Perry, John E.
Perry, Oliver H., Jr.
Peterson, John E.
Pettitt, Robert B.
Pierre, Emile E., Jr.
Ploss, Richard L.
Poindexter, John T.
Pope, Albert J.
Porterfield, Floyd R.
Potolicchio, Rodney A.
Pressler, William J., Jr.
Prigmore, William B.
Proctor, Erman O.

Prosser, John M.
Ramay, Wayne P.
Rath, Elmer R.
Reeves, Carl G.
Reynolds, Ernest E., Jr.
Rhees, Thomas R.
Rice, James L., Jr.
Rice, Theodore C.
Rich, Clarence E.
Riediger, John R.
Rienstra, Dan "J", Jr.
Riker, Alden S.
Rinesmith, Robert D.
Roberts, John W.
Robinson, Irving A.
Rosania, Hugh J.
Rosemont, Robert K.
Rozier, Charles P.
Rush, Philip J.
Russillo, Alfred G.
Ryzow, Richard A.
Sadler, Stuart T.
Salsig, Edgar B.
Sanders, Nelson W.
Saxon, John S.
Schettino, Frank G.
Schlierf, Gerhard W.
Schmidt, Charles K.
Scholz, Walter E.
Schubert, Russell C.
Scott, Maylon T.
Seeger, Billy F.
Seiler, Aubrey R.
Shead, Theodore M.
Sherman, John O., Jr.
Sherwood, Wilbur G.
Shields, Robert A.
Sims, Coleman W.
Sink, Robert E.
Siple, William L.
Skidmore, Ellis D.
Slawson, Harry F.
Slaymaker, Basil D.
Smiegocki, Robert
Smith, Allen M.
Smith, Augustine W.
Smith, Charles B.
Smith, Leon I., Jr.
Smith, Nicholas J., III
Smith, Richard F.
Snyder, Edwin K.
Snyder, Harry E.
Soisson, Thomas J.
Sonntag, Frank H.
Sparger, John
Spell, Billie C.
Stafford, Carlos B.
Standard, Roy E.
Stanko, John
Stephens, Franklin T.
Stetson, John B.
Stevens, James H., Jr.
Stickles, Albert L., II
Stock, Edward J.
Stockton, Jackson A.
Stokes, Charles R.
Stout, Fred E., Jr.
Stribling, John W., Jr.
Stuart, Jack C.
Stubel, Alvin T.
Sullivan, Richard P.
Sundt, Robert K.
Surface, Wayne D.
Swift, Charles S.
Talley, George C., Jr.
Tamburello, Gaspare B.
Terrill, Scott E., Jr.
Thatcher, Roland C., Jr.
Thomaides, Thomas G.
Thomas, Alvin
Thomas, Charles M., Jr.
Thomas, Robert B.
Thomson, Fred R.
Thorington, Harry S.
Thornbury, Joe W.
Thornell, Enos
Thornhill, Henry E., Jr.
Tingle, Jack E.
Tisdale, Charles H., Jr.
Torbert, John H.
Townes, Herbert L., Jr.
Trautmann, John R.
Trottier, Albert R.
Truxler, Walter A.
Tucker, Charles E., Jr.
Tucker, Charles R.
Tyler, Claude L.
Upshaw, William W.
Vales, Robert F.
Van Acker, Albert
Van Blake, Benjamin J.
Vaughn, Allen A.
Vito, Albert H., Jr.
Wacker, William J.
Wakeland, William R.
Walsh, Thomas W. F.
Walters, Hilmon E., Jr.
Walton, Nelson C.
Wanner, Vance R.
Ward, John G.
Watkins, George C.
Watson, George W.
Webster, David A.
Wendorf, Edward G.
Wentworth, Ralph S., Jr.
Whidden, Wynn V.
White, Willett E.
Whitlock, Duane L.
Wiegard, John A.
Wiemer, Leo G. D., Jr.
Wilde, Norman W. W.
Williams, Clement G.
Williams, Henis J.
Williams, Martin T., Jr.
Wish, James R.
Wohler, Jack L.
Wolf, Robert L.
Wooten, Robert J.
Wrocklage, George M.
Wulf, Robert A.
Yates, Earl P.
Yeich, Lloyd G.
Youman, Harold R., Jr.
Young, Robert J.
Young, Robert J., Jr.
Zaborski, Leonard W.
Zaiser, Warren E.

To be lieutenant commanders

Abraham, Sigmund, Jr.
Abrahamson, Paul E.
Ackiss, James H.
Adams, Clayton R.
Adams, Frank M.
Adelman, Joseph L.
Aeschbach, Warren E.
Aicklen, William J., Jr.
Akins, Joseph W., Jr.
Alberta, Edward T.
Alexander, Charles S., Jr.
Allen, Floyd J.
Allen, Henry L., Jr.
Allen, James B.
Allen, James R.
Ambrose, Robert W.
Amme, Richard D.
Anderson, Arland T.
Anderson, Charles R.
Anderson, James L.
Anderson, John M.
Anderson, Richard W.
Ansel, David D.
Appert, Edward P.
Applebach, Richard O.
Apthorp, Grant B.
Arguelles, John R.
Ashford, Robert "L"
Askew, George V.
Athow, Robert F.
Atkinson, Roy C.
Austin, William H., Jr.
Ayres, James E.
Babineau, Francis E.
Bach, Nicholas R.
Bacon, Francis W., Jr.
Bade, Robert B.
Baekey, Richard A.
Baer, Joseph, Jr.
Bagwell, Wallace B.
Bailey, Daniel L.
Bailey, Emera S.
Bain, John R.
Baker, William F., Jr.
Balfe, John McK.
Bangham, James F.
Banks, Daniel L., Jr.
Barber, Albertus V., Jr.
Barfield, Charlie H.
Barley, Cecil E.
Barnard, Ralph E.
Barnes, Alan F.
Barnes, Dowdell A., Jr.
Barondes, Earl De R.
Barr, James H.
Barr, Robert McK., Jr.
Barry, James H.
Barry, William
Barteluce, John J.
Bass, Richard W., Jr.
Bassett, William E.
Baughman, Fred H.
Bauman, Robert W.
Baxter, James A.
Beane, Edward R.
Bebb, Kenneth N.
Beck, Bartlette A., Jr.
Beck, William, Jr.
Becken, Bradford A.
Becker, Terrill F.
Begley, Robert E.
Bell, John H.
Bell, Miller L., Jr.
Bell, Roy M.
Benson, Harry L.
Berend, John J.
Berglund, Burton E.
Bernier, Raymond R.
Bernstein, Fred J.
Betts, Martin B.
Beyer, Henry J.
Bialy, Benedict B.
Bihr, Richard A.
Bird, Comer H., Jr.
Bird, George B., Jr.
Bird, Gerald T.
Bivin, Homer R.
Blackburn, Edwin R.
Blair, Richard E.
Blank, Carl A.
Blevins, William D.
Bliesener, Arthur B.
Blixt, Melvin D.
Blough, Arthur K., Jr.
Blumberg, David H.
Bodnar, Andrew J.
Boger, Clarence E.
Bolling, Robert L.
Bond, John C., Jr.
Bornhop, Rodney E.
Bott, Alan R.
Bouwman, Fredric G.
Bowden, John L., Jr.
Bowdey, Floyd D.
Bowen, Edwin E.
Bowen, James W.
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowers, Richard L.
Boyack, Maurice R.
Brabant, Robert J.
Bradshaw, Ray H.
Brady, Charles G., Jr.
Brandenburg, George I.
Breen, Thomas J., Jr.
Brenner, Thomas B.
Brewer, William E., Jr.
Bridges, Jack H.
Bridwell, Samuel L.
Briggs, Winston D.
Brittain, Thomas B., Jr.
Brogan, Arnold H.
Bromley, Frederick B.
Brooke, Rupert
Brooks, Wharton H., Jr.
Brower, Robert C.
Brown, Bryan B., Jr.
Brown, Floyd H.
Brown, Lofton C.
Brown, Louis F., Jr.
Brown, Thomas D.
Bruce, John C.
Bruck, Thomas J.
Brumbaugh, Dale C.
Bryan, George H., Jr.
Buck, Maurice D.
Buffington, Richard B.
Burkart, John C.
Burke, Edwin J.
Burke, James A.
Burkett, Alva D.
Bush, Philip R.
Bush, Ward A.
Byington, Ward G.
Caine, Arthur D.
Callaway, John D., Jr.
Campbell, Richard D.
Cantrell, Charles E., Jr.
Carey, Edmond J.
Carlin, James
Carlstead, Edward M.
Carman, Warren E.
Carpenter, Harold L.
Carroll, Kent J.
Casserly, Christopher J.
Causey, Charles W., Jr.
Chadwick, Daniel
Chamberlain, Raymond E., Jr.
Chandler, Donald E.
Chapman, James H.
Chattleton, William D.
Cheek, Glen R.
Chelgren, John L.
Christensen, Jack A.
Christensen, Donald W.
Christiansen, Edward F.
Christoph, Karl J., Jr.
Christopher, Frank J.
Chuilli, Ernest J.
Cislo, Louis
Clark, Carroll D.
Clay, Harold S.
Clement, Marwood R., Jr.
Clement, Robert R.
Clemente, Angelo E.
Clifford, William F., Jr.
Cloonan, Fred M.
Clubb, Reginald D.
Cocke, Edgar M.
Coe, Arthur S.
Coggins, Jack C.
Cole, Kenneth J.
Cole, Russell W.
Collins, Robert M.
Collis, James E.
Colonna, Harry W.
Colot, Peter
Colquhoun, Richard G.
Condon, Vernon W.
Conn, Robert H.
Connelly, John J., Jr.
Cooke, Robert S.
Copenhaver, James B., Jr.
Coppedge, John O.
Corley, Frank W., Jr.
Cort, Walter W., Jr.
Costanzo, Carl J.
Cover, John H.
Craig, Neil
Crane, John W., Jr.
Craven, Phillip R.
Crawford, Bentley B.
Creasman, Jesse C.
Crockett, Charles B., Jr.
Cross, William E.
Crowe, William J., Jr.
Crowley, Herbert D.
Crownover, Miller T.
Cummings, Charles W.
Cummings, Donald E.
Cummings, Edward M., Jr.
Cummins, Peter P.
Curtin, Lawrence J.
Dadisman, Richard "A"
Dahlby, Philip C.
Dale, Robert L.
Dallas, Charles MacD.
Dallmann, Paul H.
Darby, Keith C.
Darcy, Robert T.
Davenport, Thomas T.
Davidson, Alan N.
Davidson, James B.
Davidson, John D.
Davies, James W.
Davies, Robert
Davis, Cabell S., Jr.
Davis, Ray E.
Davis, Theodore F.
Davis, William G.
Dawson, John F.
DeBaets, Donald J.
DeBaets, Ronald M.
De Chow, Claude E.
DeCicco, John M.
Dedman, Tyler F.
Deffenbaugh, Robert M.
de Ganahl, James A.
Degler, Forrest R., Jr.
Denkler, John M.
Denton, Jeremiah A., Jr.
Dermody, Richard J.
De Werd, Theodore J.
Dibble, Henry M.
Dickey, John L.
Dickleson, Robert W.
Dickson, Richard "D"
Diffendorfer, Jarl J.
Dillon, John M.
Dobyns, Robert E.
Doe, Willard C.
Dolan, Eugene F.
Donaldson, Charles E., III
Dorman, "R" "H"
Douglas, Stephen P., Jr.
Douglass, Walter M.
Drabent, Eugene A.
Drago, Jack V.
Drake, John F.
Draz, David I.
Duckett, John P.
Dudley, Calvin C.
Durden, Walter D.
Durkin, Michael F.
Dyer, John C.
Early, Paul J.
Edelson, Burton, I.
Edwards, George D., Jr.
Edwards, Harold L.
Eidson, George V.
Ekas, Claude P., Jr.
Ekelund, Kenneth O., Jr.
Eldridge, Richard A.
Elefante, Frank L.
Elliott, Edward C.
Elliott, Hollie H., Jr.
Ellis, Joseph M.
Ellis, Samuel S.
Elmer, Joseph S.
Elwood, Claire R.
Endebrock, Robert E.
English, James G., Jr.
Enright, John P.
Enright, Robert E.
Estelman, Herman J.
Etcher, Robert W.
Evans, Jack E.
Evans, Joseph D.
Evans, William
Ewing, John R.
Ewing, Paul C.
Falter, Gilbert A., Jr.
Fargo, Robert R.
Farley, James E.
Farris, Frederick A.
Farris, George W.
Farshing, Donald D., Jr.
Faulkner, Doc G., Jr.
Fay, Lawrence J.
Fenn, Richard W.
Ferris, Wilbur G.
Ferry, Reginald V.
Finneran, John G.
Fischer, David W.
Fisher, John H.
Fiske, Clarence O.
Fitch, Robert A.
Fitchko, George W., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Paul F.
Fletcher, Gene C.
Flock, Loren W.
Forehand, Wendell C.
Fortson, Thomas E.
Fossum, Theodor T.
Foster, William L.
Franz, Donald A.
Freeland, Harold H.
Freeman, James
Fritz, Ernest S.
Fry, John C.
Fuller, Jack D.
Fuller, Richard, Jr.
Gallagher, Joseph
Gallagher, Cornelius R.
Garbee, Edwin T.
Gardiner, Richard S.
Gardner, James S.
Gardner, Walter T., Jr.
Garner, Alan S.
Garvin, Wilbur C.
Gary, Stanley P.
Gatts, William H.
Gauntt, Wesley R.
Gay, William W.
Gaynier, James R.
Geary, John T.
Geary, Joseph R.
Gebler, Gerard P.
Geel, Alan J.
Geiger, Robert K.
George, Robert McL.
Georgen, William M.
Gibson, George W.
Gideon, Robert A., Jr.
Gilliland, Frank
Gilmore, Russell G.
Gokey, Noah W., III
Goldstein, David A.
Gorder, Charles F.
Gorman, Donald V.
Gower, Harry T., Jr.
Gower, Robert F.
Grantham, Delbert D.
Grause, Jerome E.
Gravely, Samuel L., Jr.
Graves, Robert F., Jr.
Gray, Leland T., Jr.
Greene, Wallace A.
Greig, Joseph E.
Gresham, John I.
Griffin, Harry J.
Griffin, James W.
Grimes, William E.
Gross, James R.
Grove, George S.
Groves, Thomas E.
Grubbs, Harmon C.
Guertin, Louis H.
Gygax, Rex
Hahn, George C.
Hahnfeld, Arnold A.
Haizlip, John W., Jr.

Hale, Robert F.
Hall, Carl, Jr.
Hall, Donald M.
Hall, James F.
Hallam, Orval K.
Hallett, Oliver S.
Hamilton, Joe
Hamilton, Robert M.
Hancock, David L.
Hann, William
Hanna, Donald L.
Hanson, Edgar G.
Harbottle, Lyman W.
Hare, Guy C.
Hargarten, Robert W.
Hargrave, Seth E.
Harkins, William D.
Harper, John R.
Harris, Jack H.
Harris, William L., Jr.
Harris, William H.
Hart, Harry S.
Hartman, Willard R.
Hathway, Donald LaM.
Hattersley, Julian
Haugen, Edward S.
Haupt, Richard W.
Hawvermale, Joseph R.
Hayes, James W., Jr.
Haynes, William E.
Hays, Seymore T., Jr.
Hazelwood, James M.
Heckert, Nelson E.
Hedbawny, Edward J.
Hedrick, George F., Jr.
Heininger, Howard G., Jr.
Helms, Louis L.
Helton, William A.
Hemmer, Edgar H.
Henderson, James R.
Hendrick, Donald J., Jr.
Henry, Eugene M.
Henry, George L.
Herrick, Carl H.
Herzog, James H.
Hess, John A.
Hickman, Wilbur M.
High, John R.
Highsmith, Frederick L.
Hill, Edward C.
Hill, Elmer R., Jr.
Hill, John W.
Hinden, Harry J.
Hinds, Charles D.
Hinkle, William L.
Hintz, Warren S.
Hoffmann, Henry A.
Hoffmann, Roy F.
Holden, William P.
Hollyer, Richard S.
Holmes, Robert T.
Hoover, John R.
Hornbrook, James M.
Houck, Donald F.
Hough, William L.
Howard, Donnell
Howard, John N.
Howard, Raymond B.
Hoyman, William C.
Hubka, Verne R.
Hubler, Vernon R.
Huddle, Norman P.
Hudner, Thomas J., Jr.
Huling, Harold E.
Hunter, Jack S.
Hunter, Perry F., III
Irving, Robert
Jackson, Lee S., Jr.
Jackson, Thomas E.
Jacobs, Richard "B"
Jahant, John W.
Jameson, James N.
Jandebeur, Harold E.
Jenkins, Merlin F.
Jennings, Verne "H", Jr.
Jermann, Donald R.
Jesse, Harold W.
Jester, Malvern H. L.
Jewett, Frederick F., II
Jex, Donald R.
Johnson, Arnol, Jr.
Johnson, Benjamin T.
Johnson, Francis A.
Johnson, John D., Jr.
Johnson, Lester F., Jr.
Johnson, Philip W.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.
Johnson, Walter F.
Johnston, John W.
Johnston, Richard C.
Johnstone, Frank L.
Jones, Stanley W.
Jones, William M.
Jordan, Glenn D.
Kaetzel, Robert H.
Kaffer, Gerald H., Jr.
Kane, Howard F.
Karlowicz, Mitchell J.
Karnagel, Donald T.
Kauzlarich, Frank P.
Kearney, Stuart D.
Kearny, James D.
Keegan, Earl W., Jr.
Keen, Timothy J.
Keith, Francis L.
Keith, James
Keller, William F., Jr.
Kellersberger, Donald C.
Kelso, Quinten A.
Kennedy, Clarence L.
Keough, Raymond F.
King, Harry W.
King, John W., Jr.
King, Ogden D., Jr.
King, William L., Jr.
Kinser, Ralph H., Jr.
Kirchner, Paul H.
Kirk, George G. E.
Kirkpatrick, James
Kiser, Charles A.
Klein, Melvin E.
Kleist, Roy F.
Klingberg, Franklin N.
Kluger, Raymond P.
Knowles, Cline H., Jr.
Knutson, Albert E.
Koch, Don R.
Kochis, Peter C.
Koehler, Robert H.
Koenig, William H.
Kolar, Robert P.
Kolda, Frank C.
Korb, Frank J.
Kosiba, Richard E.
Kosnik, Joseph T.
Koster, Edwin R.
Kozman, Robert J.
Krauthamer, Richard J.
Krejcarek, Donald J.
Kreutz, Arthur R.
Kruzich, Andrew F.
Kubiszewski, Robert J.
Kwart, Philip
Kwitkoski, Walter J.
La Haye, James D.
Lakey, Keith G.
Lambertson, Tomme J.
Land, Nathaniel B.
Lang, Hugh E.
Langford, John D.
Larcombe, Howard N., Jr.
Larkin, George M., Jr.
Larsen, Bertrand "O"
Larsen, Norman E.
Laskowski, Walter E.
Lauver, George I.
Lawson, Kent W.
Lawton, Lawrence W.
Layman, William H.
Layser, Richard G.
Leach, David C., Jr.
Lebiedz, Edward F.
Leddick, Roth S.
Lee, Earl B.
Lee, Robert E.
Lehnig, Ernest P.
Lember, David B.
Lenihan, Jeremiah E.
Leo, Joseph P., Jr.
Lewis, Harold L.
Lewis, John C.
Lewis, William S.
Lewison, Walter R.
Lindgren, George B.
Long, Douglas L.
Longo, Charles R.
Lott, Jesse P.
Lovett, Vincent D.
Lowans, Warren H.
Lowell, Percival D., Jr.
LuBien, William J.
Luoma, Walter R.
Lurker, Elmer R.
Lynch, Leslie "O"
Lynch, Robert E.
Lyon, Henry J.
Macomber, Mark M.
Macon, Benjamin H.
Mac Onie, Robert T.
Magee, William C.
Maige, George N.
Maley, Leonard
Manganaro, Francis F.
Maragos, George
March, George P.
Marckesano, Louis A.
Marsh, Paul E., Jr.
Martin, Barney
Martin, Claude F., Jr.
Martin, Don McC.
Martin, Frederick V.
Martin, James W.
Martin, Reginald E., Jr.
Martin, Samuel A.
Marvin, Stephen D.
Mathews, John M.
Matthews, Howard L., Jr.
Matthews, Pierce Y., Jr.
Matula, Valentin G.
Maurer, Richard C., Jr.
Mawhiney, William T.
Maxwell, Robert A.
Mayer, Donald R.
Maynard, Allison L.
McAdams, John W., Jr.
McArdle, Robert P.
McBratney, Thomas R.
McCarthy, John E.
McConnell, John H., Jr.
McCord, Wayne S.
McCracken, William H.
McDaniel, Charles B.
McDaniel, William O.
McDonald, Carlton A. K.
McDonald, Nathan F.
McDonald, Wesley L.
McDonald, William M.
McElwain, Richard S.
McGill, John C., Jr.
McGowan, James V.
McGrath, John J., Jr.
McIlroy, Edward E.
McKenzie, Joseph F.
McKenzie, William W., Jr.
McLaughlin, Norman H.
McMahon, James P.
McNary, Johnnie W.
McPadden, Gordon E.
McVey, Don C.
Measel, James G.
Meginniss, Walter M.
Meisenheimer, John L.
Melander, Vincent E.
Merritt, John A., III
Midgette, Oliver F.
Miears, Roy R.
Miles, Bernard L.
Miller, William O.
Mitchell, Eugene B.
Mitchell, Frank A.
Mitchell, John E.
Mone, James V.
Mooney, Rodney T.
Morgan, Clifford L.
Morgan, Daniel
Morgan, Newton H.
Morgiewicz, Daniel J.
Moriarty, Norbert L.
Morris, John R.
Morris, Marion E.
Morris, Max K.
Morrison, Edward B.
Morrison, Wilbur M.
Moss, James L.
Mossburg, Darrell L.
Mulligan, Eugene W., III
Muncie, Maurice O.
Munnikhuysen, Henry F.
Murline, Robert A. H.
Murphy, James J.
Murray, Kenneth A.
Murray, Richard D.
Murray, Stuart G.
Murrill, Robert L.
Mussetto, Bruno
Napior, Arthur D.
Navarrette, Claude, Jr.
Nealon, William G.
Nelson, Clifford
Netherland, Roger M.
Newcomb, Robert C.
Newkirk, Kenneth H.
Nienberg, Robert J.
Nimitz, Charles E. C.
Nivison, William
Nockold, Louis W.
Noll, Robert C.
Nordberg, Delbert W.
Norman, Frederick W., Jr.
Nourse, James A.
Nowers, William E.
Nuss, Jerry J.
O'Brien, Billie E.
O'Callaghan, Edmund W.
O'Connell, Thomas A.
Oddo, Phillip W.
Odgers, Ralph E.
O'Donnell, William F.
Ogden, Samuel B., Jr.
O'Grady, John P.
Ohme, Henry F.
Olds, Corwin A.
O'Leary, Stephen J., Jr.
Olmsted, Paul S.
Olson, Delbert A.
Olson, Raoul M.
Olson, Richard A.
Olson, Robert C.
Opitz, Albert G.
Orbeton, Maurice C., Jr.
Osmer, James W., Jr.
Ostertag, Carl J., Jr.
Ostlund, Eugene W.
Packer, Duncan
Paddock, Richard A.
Palmer, Frederick F.
Palmer, George B., III
Parks, William L., Jr.
Patch, Donald R.
Pavelle, John J., Jr.
Pearson, George R. MacK.
Peebles, George C., Jr.
Pehrsson, Pehr H.
Peniston, Robert "C"
Pentinmaki, Walfred N.
Peoples, George F.
Perdue, Uley F.
Perry, Dale S.
Perry, William J.
Peterson, John P.
Peterson, William S.
Pettee, Warren E.
Pfundstein, Thomas D.
Phillips, Alva L., Jr.
Phillips, Kenneth E.
Phillips, Merrill L.
Pickens, Jackson R.
Pickert, Aloysius J., Jr.
Pitz, Otto G., Jr.
Pline, Joseph E.
Pollard, Robert D.
Pomeroy, Leslie K., Jr.
Pope, John E.
Porter, William W.
Powell, James A.
Powell, Robert A.
Prassinos, George
Presgrove, Charles K.
Price, Mood B., Jr.
Prichard, Reuben P., Jr.
Prum, Bruce E.
Puccini, Joseph E., Jr.
Puckett, Howard M.
Pugh, James McK.
Pullen, Boyd McG., Jr.
Radtke, Robert N.
Rae, William C., Jr.
Raftery, John J.
Ragsdale, Duncan E.
Ragsdale, Homer C., Jr.
Rank, Cyrus "A"
Rappenecker, James C.
Rasmussen, John E.
Ratliff, John "H"
Rauch, Charles F., Jr.
Rawson, Charles E.
Readdy, Francis J.
Reams, Benton E.
Reardon, Francis P.
Rectanus, Earl F.
Reese, Donald H.
Regan, William F.
Reichwein, Fremont E.
Reilly, David R.
Reilly, Jeremiah D., Jr.
Reinschmidt, Warren S.
Renz, Louis T.
Rex, James F.
Reynolds, Milton L.
Rezny, Ivan F.
Rich, Harold G.
Richards, John P. M., II
Riehl, Julian W., Jr.
Rigot, William L.
Riley, Daniel P.
Riley, Edward E.
Rivers, Lee R. P.
Robertson, William D., Jr.
Roche, Robert F.
Rockcastle, Charles H.
Rodgers, Hollis "T"
Roe, Charles R.
Rogers, William Healy
Rogers, William Henry
Rohrer, Leonard V.
Rollins, Henry G., Jr.
Romatowski, Louis A., Jr.
Rose, Charles J.
Rose, Vernon D., Jr.
Ross, Claude M.
Ross, Royal R., Jr.
Ross, Seymour N.
Roth, Emil S.
Rouse, Jerome A.
Ruoti, Anthony
Rusche, Alvin E.
Rush, William A.
Russell, Paul E.
Russell, Wallace L.
Russell, William M.
Ruxton, Robert T., Jr.
Ryder, Donald F.
Ryder, Everett G.
Sanders, Herman J.
Sanders, James E.
Sanders, Wilton T., Jr.
Saubers, Maurice D.
Saul, James O.
Sayre, George A.
Scappini, Mimo L.
Schaefer, William M.
Schafer, John B.
Schloer, Eric G.
Schmoller, James R.
Schniedwind, Robert F.
Schoonover, Ned W.
Schou, Aage J.
Schuknecht, Arnold R.
Schuler, Foster R.
Scott, Robert L.
Scudder, Harold
Seckinger, Neil V.
Seger, Josef McG.
Seidel, George H.
Sell, Carl H.
Sellman, Edmund W.
Sharahan, John J., Jr.
Sharpe, Owen B.
Shaver, William McC.
Shaw, Fletcher H.
Shelton, John P.
Shepard, Philip B.
Sheppard, James C.
Sheridan, Martin J.
Sherman, Harold N.
Shinn, William G.
Shuey, Charles M.
Shugart, Kenneth L., Jr.
Simkins, William A.
Simmons, John A., Jr.
Simone, William B.
Simons, Joseph T.
Sisson, Jonathan A.
Sisson, Luther B.
Slonim, Charles E.
Smith, Bertram C.
Smith, Deming W.
Smith, George K.
Smith, Harold A.
Smith, Howard G.
Smith, James D.
Smith, John C.
Smith, John A.
Smith, Lloyd H.
Smith, Ralph F.
Smith, Robert S.
Smith, Robert H., Jr.
Smith, Robert P.
Smith, Stuart S.
Smith, Wade "K", Jr.
Smith, Wellington P.
Smith, Winfield S.
Snead, Leonard A.
Snure, Robert O.
Snyder, Francis M.
Songer, Jack R.
Soper, Malvern E.
Spahr, Arthur G.
Spangenberg, Walter, Jr.
Spann, Willis L.
Sparkman, Homer A., Jr.
Spencer, William A.
Spoon, Donald D.
Stahl, Douglas
Stanley, Hilton L.
Stark, Richard J.
Stensrud, John D.
Stevens, Jack M.
Stilwell, Edward P.
St. Louis, Joseph A.
Stockdale, James B.

Stone, Francis K.
Stone, John F.
Stone, Robert S.
Stone, Troy E.
Stratmann, William C.
Straton, Andrew C.
Strickler, Robert W.
Strobel, James W.
Strong, George T.
Strong, James T.
Stufflebeam, Jack M.
Sullivan, Elmer D.
Sullivan, John F.
Sup, George C.
Sutcliffe, George H.
Sutliff, Kermit R.
Sweeder, Stanley E.
Sylvia, Henry J.
Tanton, Paul W.
Tarpey, John F.
Taylor, Cecil O.
Taylor, David J.
Taylor, Robert H.
Teasley, William A., Jr
Tell, William M.
Terrass, Milford S.
Terry, Bernard E., Jr.
Thayer, Wirt C.
Thomas, Edward W.
Thomas, Lon C.
Thomas, Paul B.
Thomas, Ralph L., Jr.
Thompson, Elmer N.
Thompson, William F.
Thomson, Neil W.
Thornton, John L.
Thummel, Gerald F.
Thurtell, Frank A.
Timidaiski, James T.
Timm, Fred C.
Titcomb, Edmund B.
Tobin, Daniel P.
Toohill, Donald L.
Toole, Wycliffe D., Jr.
Tripp, Jack L.
Trout, Roscoe L.
Tucker, Ralph McM.
Tuel, Merritt D.
Turner, John C.
Turner, John S.
Ulbricht, Frederick W.
Ulm, Robert B.
Updike, Archie J.
Urban, Henry, Jr.
Urbanczyk, Louis T., Jr.
Usina, Joseph D.
Vaa, Norman A.
Van Atta, Bruce W.
Van Sickle, John R.
Van Tol, John
Van Tuyl, Andrew J., Jr.
Vermilya, Jay "J"
Vermilya, Robert S.
Viney, Irwin J.
Vollmer, Cecil R.
Von Gerichten, Robert L.
von Schrader, Chandle R. L.
Vose, Frederic H. E.
Voves, Martin C.
Waits, Jack E.
Walker, Grant J.
Walker, Grover "C.", Jr.
Waller, William, Jr.
Warde, William A.
Warriner, Victor G.
Warring, Leo B.
Waterman, Jack "E"
Waters, Lowell W.
Watkins, Robert W.
Watt, Gale V.
Weaver, John K.
Weber, Kent J.
Weidman, William K.
Welch, Paul R.
Wellings, Timothy F., Jr.
Wells, Donald M.
Wells, John T.
Wells, John W.
Wellsman, Howard C.
Wenger, Donald B.
Wente, David A.
Wenzel, Harold F.
White, Bernard C.
Whitegiver, Robert B., II
Whittaker, Gordon S.
Whyte, Herbert E.
Wicks, William F.
Wiggins, Bryan D.
Wilda, Gerald L.
Willett, Charles F.
Williams, Buck D., Jr.
Williams, Bernard P., Jr.
Williams, Glenn E.
Williams, Hexter A.
Williams, Joseph L., Jr.
Williams, John G., Jr.
Williams, James S.
Williamson, Robert C.
Wilson, Joseph H., Jr.
Wilson, Kenneth E., Jr.
Wilson, Robert D.
Winslett, Ernest R.
Witkowski, Eugene F.
Wood, Edward G.
Wood, Eugene E.
Wood, William D., Jr.
Woodard, David A.
Woodburn, Edwin C.
Woods, Kenneth
Woods, William L., Jr.
Working, Patrick L.
Wysocki, Walter J.
Yates, Andrew J.
Yates, William K.
Yeatman, Richard P.
Young, Austin V.
Young, Grant C.
Young, Laurence R.
Yuengling, Douglas J.
Zebrowski, Walter T.
Zelov, Randolph D.
Zenni, Martin "M"
Zent, John L.
Zumwalt, Marvin W.

To be lieutenants

Ables, Aubrey E.
Ager, Snowden C.
Agnew, Dwight M., Jr.
Albee, Thomas L., Jr.
Alberts, Richard P.
Alecxih, Peter C.
Allen, George W.
Allen, John S.
Alvarado, Ramon C.
Ammann, Robert E.
Ammerman, Clell N.
Amoruso, Alfred P.
Anderson, Eugene G.
Anderson, Falvie B., Jr.
Anderson, Giles B.
Anderson, Joseph F.
Anderson, Stephen P.
Anderson, Thomas F.
Anderson, Walter S.
Anderson, William P.
Anthony, Morris D.
Artz, Robert C.
Ascherbeck, Gene W.
Ascherfeld, Theodore F., Jr.
Ashby, Donald R.
Asman, Robert K.
Atherton, Raymond
Atkinson, Gerald L.
Atwood, Henry C., Jr.
Aumick, William A.
Austin, James W.
Austin, Robert C.
Aut, Warren E.
Avery, Billy J.
Bailey, Gail R.
Baird, Thomas L.
Baker, Walter F.
Ballow, Lawrence D.
Banfield, Thomas V., II
Barker, George D.
Barker, William St. G.
Barlow, James D.
Bascom, Paul P.
Basford, Michael G.
Bassett, Bradley A.
Baty, Frank O.
Bauman, James R.
Baumgardner, John F.
Baxter, George L., Jr.
Bayne, John P.
Beavert, Alfred F.
Beck, John L.
Beck, Walter R.
Beck, William H.
Beckmann, Archibald B., Jr.
Beckwith, Gilbert H.
Beeson, Robert "O"
Beisel, Gerald W.
Belay, William J.
Bell, James F.
Bennett, Donald C.
Bennett, Phillip L.
Berg, Robert L.
Berger, Ronald A.
Berkhimer, Frank R.
Bernardin, Peter A.
Berthe, Charles J., Jr.
Bibb, Benjamin O.
Bidelspach, Richard L.
Biederman, Robert D.
Biggar, William
Billerbeck, Henry G.
Bilyeu, Roland C.
Bissel, Norman H.
Blackwell, Jack L., Jr.
Blaes, Richard W.
Blaine, Thomas E.
Bock, "E" James
Boland, Bruce R.
Booth, Joseph K.
Bordone, Richard P.
Botshon, Morton
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowling, Charles R.
Boylson, Michael E.
Brackin, John D.
Bradshaw, Frederick L.
Brame, Frank A., III
Brammeier, Charles L.
Brandau, James F.
Brandon, Horace W.
Bravence, John, Jr.
Brennan, John S.
Briner, Robert R.
Brooks, Dennis L.
Broughton, James A.
Brown, Charles E.
Brown, Christopher H.
Brown, Malcolm C.
Brown, Richard B.
Brown, Robert C., Jr.
Brown, Robert H.
Brown, Thomas F., III
Browning, Robert B.
Bruley, Kenneth C.
Brunell, James I.
Buc, Gerald G.
Buchanan, Edward O.
Buchholz, Philip P.
Buckley, John E.
Bull, Norman S.
Bullman, Howard L.
Bunce, Bayne R.
Burger, Francis J., III
Burgert, Reginald D.
Burke, Robert M.
Burkhardt, Lawrence, III
Burnett, Richard W.
Burnett, William McK.
Burnham, Don E.
Burns, Richard F.
Burrow, Billy McC.
Burrows, Hubbard F., Jr.
Burtis, Evenson M.
Bush, Carl D.
Butler, William S.
Byington, Melville R., Jr.
Byrd, Mark W.
Cabanillas, Jose C., II
Cabot, Alan S.
Cade, John W.
Caldwell, Charles B.
Caldwell, Hamlin A., Jr.
Campbell, Donald S., Jr.
Campbell, John D.
Campbell, John F.
Campbell, John L.
Candoo, Charles G.
Cane, Guy
Cane, John W.
Cann, William A.
Canter, Howard R.
Cantwell, Richard B.
Carlson, Don P.
Carson, Louis F., Jr.
Carter, Gerald M., Jr.
Case, Robert W.
Casimes, Theodore C.
Cavicke, Richard J.
Cazares, Ralph B.
Chamberlain, James L.
Chambers, Dudley S.
Charlton, John W.
Cheney, Donald A.
Chidley, Ralph E.
Chisholm, George E., II
Cisson, Arthur
Clark, Charles F., Jr.
Clark, Richard G.
Cleaver, Stephen
Clemens, Paul E.
Clifford, Donald J.
Clopton, Claude A.
Coakley, Walter J., Jr.
Coe, Raymond P.
Colbus, Louis
Cole, Thomas T., Jr.
Coleman, Herman F.
Collier, Byron H.
Collins, Ferdinand I., Jr.
Collins, Robert M.
Collins, William D.
Colvin, William P.
Colwell, Lawrence S.
Conaughton, Robert G.
Conboy, Thomas W.
Conklin, Robert B.
Conner, Lawrence O.
Connolly, Paul P.
Conrad, Glenn T., Jr.
Cook, Russell A.
Cooley, Charles H.
Coor, Lawrence W.
Copeland, Edward C.
Coppess, Robert Y.
Corey, Stuart M.
Corkhill, Thomas M.
Cornell, Gordon C.
Cornell, Robert L.
Cotton, Alfred S.
Courtney, Charles H.
Couillard, James P.
Cowan, Daniel R.
Cowan, Stuart M.
Coward, Alton A., Jr.
Crabtree, Donald G.
Crane, Herbert C.
Crane, Robert D.
Crawford, Roderick P.
Crawford, Robert E.
Crawford, William T.
Crayton, Render
Crider, James A.
Croom, William H., Jr.
Crosby, Frederick P.
Crosson, Harry E.
Crotteau, Roger D.
Cryer, John P.
Cummings, Joseph D.
Cunningham, Marshall E.
Currier, Richard A.
Curtis, Fred M.
Curtis, John G., Jr.
Curtis, Robert E.
Cutchen, Paul O.
Czaja, Bernard F.
Daigneault, Joseph J., Jr.
Daleke, Richard A.
Dalla Mura, Bart M., Jr.
Daly, Paul S.
Damico, Richard J.
Damon, Terry A.
Dana, John B.
Dancer, Jerry D.
Daubenspeck, Richard E.
Davis, Ralph G.
Davis, Ramsey L., Jr.
Davis, Richard C.
Davis, Richard H.
Dawson, Edward H., Jr.
Deam, Norman A.
Dean, Herbert J.
De Boer, Jack "G"
DeHart, William
Deibert, Bernard N.
Delaney, John R.
DeLoach, John W.
Demmin, Lester F.
Dennison, William E.
Derendinger, George L.
Desseyn, Maurice H.
Deuel, Jamieson K.
DeVito, Vincent H.
DeVries, Edgar L.
DiCarlo, Vincent A.
Dickson, George K.
Diehm, William C., III
Diley, Lewis E.
Dillon, Alfred J.
Dillon, John F.
Dilweg, John C.
DiPace, Joseph V.
Dobbs, William D.
Doheny, Vincent
Doney, Robert G.
Donnell, Joseph S., III
Donnelly, Richard F.
Donnelly, Verne G.
Donovan, Daniel E.
Donovan, Philip C.
Dougherty, John E., Jr.
Downing, Thomas P.
Downs, James R.
Dozier, George W., Jr.
Drayton, Henry E., Jr.
Drenkard, Carl C.
Drumheller, Maxley W.
DuBois, Arthur N.
DuBois, George
Ducat, Julian A.
Du Charme, George W.
Dugan, Francis V.
Dugan, Richard F., Jr.
Duke, Robert J.
Dulke, Sylvester M.
Dunn, Alvan N.
Dunn, John F.
Dunning, James A.
Dupree, Richard E.
Durocher, Stephen F.
Dworsky, Alan J.
Easterling, Letson E.
Easton, Ervin R.
Easton, Peter B.
Eckerle, Charles R., Jr.
Edgren, Donald H.
Eels, William R., Jr.
Ehl, James W.
Eidsmoe, Norman E.
Elam, David L.
Elder, Ralph C.
Elliott, Donal W.
Emerson, John R.
Engelfried, Donald W.
Eriksson, Roger V.
Eubanks, Paul D.
Evans, Edwin D.
Evans, Thomas G.
Everett, Lauren R.
Evosevich, John N.
Evrard, William E.
Ewall, Thomas H.
Faddis, James W.
Fagan, Fredric G.
Faron, John F.
Farwell, Warren E.
Fech, Duane V.
Fell, Roy T.
Felling, Thomas A.
Felter, John F.
Ferguson, David E.
Fiedler, Peter B., Jr.
Fields, James E.
Fields, William B.
Fillerup, Raymond McD.
Fink, Jerome I.
Fitzgerald, Michael J.
Fitzsimmons, Robert J., Jr.
Flaherty, Robert M.
Fletcher, John G.
Fletcher, William B., III
Florin, Donald E.
Foard, Wyatte F., Jr.
Foley, Paul R.
Folta, Daniel A.
Fonda, Raymond C.
Forbes, Donald L.
Ford, Daniel R.
Forsyth, James P.
Foster, Clifton G., Jr.
Fox, Henry J., IV
Francke, Robert L.
Frazier, John D.
Frecker, David A.
Frentress, Bowheart "H", Jr.
Frick, Walter B.
Friddle, Frank R., Jr.
Fryberger, Elbert L., Jr.
Frye, Thomas A. W.
Gadberry, Roy K.
Gadolin, Ronald
Gallagher, William R.
Galli, William L.
Gallotta, Albert A., Jr.
Gardner, Bennett
Garlitz, Jerry E.
Gaskill, Richard T.
Gates, Fred H., II
Gatlin, Edwin F.
Gay, David E.
Geary, Jack E.
Gehring, Donald H.
Geronime, Eugene L.
Gholson, Daniel H. L.
Gideon, William C., Jr.
Gillham, Richard D.
Gilliamsen, Donald A.
Gilmore, Joseph M.
Glade, Gerald L.
Glanville, John T., Jr.
Gleim, James M.
Glover, Albert K., Jr.
Glover, Dennis C.
Glovier, Harold A., Jr.
Glunt, David L., Jr.
Gonzalez, Alfred H.
Good, Robert C.
Gordon, Arva F.
Gore, James R.
Graham, Robert F.
Graham, Sidney R.
Grammer, William R.
Grantman, Roger H.

Gray, Basil F., Jr.
Greene, Charles R., Jr.
Greenlaw, William C.
Greenlee, John W.
Greer, William E., III
Greisen, Bernard R.
Grider, Billy F.
Griffiths, Rodney D.
Grobey, John H.
Grose, Robert H.
Grothe, Henry J.
Grunwell, James G.
Guidry, Rodney R.
Gunn, Max C., Jr.
Gunter, Jack R.
Hager, Charles F.
Haggard, Marion Z.
Haggerty, Stewart V.
Hagmann, Albert P.
Hahn, Edward W., Jr.
Hall, Frank S.
Hall, Harry L.
Hall, Howard L.
Hall, John V.
Halladay, Maurice E.
Halladay, Norman E.
Halle, "S" Portland, III
Halloran, John W.
Hamel, Louis H., III
Hamelrath, Walter F.
Hamilton, Clyde E.
Hamlin, Andrew L.
Hamlin, George A., Jr.
Hampe, Barry F.
Hamrick, Franklin G.
Hanigan, Marvin F.
Hankins, Elton E.
Hanson, John I.
Happersett, Paul F.
Hargrave, William W., Jr.
Hargrove, John Q., III
Harms, Stanley J.
Harper, George T., Jr.
Harrell, Max A.
Harris, James C.
Harris, Neil A.
Harrison, Stuart E.
Hart, Robert L.
Hartman, Gerald A.
Harvey, Donald L.
Hatfield, Robert L.
Haverfield, Benjamin F.
Havicon, John W.
Hawkins, Cecil "B", Jr.
Hay, James C.
Hayes, Francis X.
Hayes, James C.
Hazlett, Frederick W.
Helfrich, William P.
Hellinger, Richard L.
Helm, George N., Jr.
Helms, Raymond E., Jr.
Hendrickson, Claude F., Jr.
Hendry, James D.
Henifin, Edward E.
Henson, George M.
Herberger, Albert J.
Herndon, Franklin C., Jr.
Herr, Arthur L., Jr.
Herren, Thomas C.
Herzer, Oscar A.
Hessman, James D.
Heydon, Robert M.
Heyl, William E.
Heyward, Irvine K., IV
Hickey, Edward J., Jr.
Hicklin, William C., III
Higgins, John F.
Higgins, Richard G.
Hilder, Leonard O., Jr.
Hinkle, David R.
Hobbs, Allen, Jr.
Hocker, Walter B.
Hogan, Edward J., Jr.
Hogan, George C.
Hogan, Thomas W., Jr.
Holder, Howard E.
Holderness, Robert T., Jr.
Holland, John C., Jr.
Hollenbach, Richard G.
Hollingsworth, Robert L.
Hollingworth, Roy M.
Holloman, William D.
Holman, Robert A., Jr.
Holmes, Richard B.
Holt, Henry C., IV
Hooper, Benjamin F.
Hope, Herbert A., Jr.
Hopper, Thomas M.
Horn, Charles E.
Horner, John, Jr.
Horowitz, Charles L.
Hosepian, Edward S.
Hovey, Gale K.
Howatt, Gerald J.
Howe, John E.
Howells, David A.
Hryskanich, Paul L.
Hubbard, Henry L.
Hudgins, Thomas B.
Hudome, Harry J., III
Huffer, Maurice W.
Hull, Fred A.
Hume, George A.
Hume, Kenneth E.
Humphrey, Morris L.
Hunter, Charles B.
Hunter, William G.
Hunter, William J.
Hurt, Jonathan S.
Hussey, William T.
Huttinger, Theodore
Hyman, Arnold J.
Ike, Robert C.
Iosue, Philip F.
Ireland, Blair
Jackson, Robert S.
Jauregui, Stephen, Jr.
Jenkins, Gaston J.
Jensen, Carl T.
Jobe, Gordon A.
Jobe, James E.
Johnson, Billie D.
Johnson, David E.
Johnson, Edward D.
Johnson, George P.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, William J., Jr.
Johnston, Fox H.
Johnston, Fred W., Jr.
Joiner, Francis A.
Jolliff, James V.
Jones, Carroll S.
Jones, James F.
Jones, Jerry D.
Jones, Robert F., Jr.
Jones, Robert E.
Jones, Robert L.
Jones, William O.
Jongewaard, Larry L.
Jordan, Stephen W.
Joy, James A.
Juergens, John G.
Jurkowski, Joseph A.
Kaiser, Gilbert J.
Kaltenborn, James C.
Kavanagh, Robert G.
Kearns, William A., Jr.
Keating, John D.
Keele, Wayne, Jr.
Keely, Leroy B.
Keene, Glenn F.
Keene, Thomas J.
Keener, John I.
Keery, Jerry L.
Keith, Clyde R.
Keith, Harold S.
Keith, John D.
Kellaway, Peter W.
Kelleher, Thomas A., Jr.
Kellogg, Edward S., III
Kelly, Richmond K., Jr.
Kennedy, Jack M.
Kent, James F., Jr.
Kiehl, Richard L.
Kilty, Lawrence R.
King, Edward L.
King, Richard B.
Kingsley, Stephen S.
Kinley, Frederic H. M.
Kinne, Loren H.
Kinney, Eugene P.
Kleffel, Walter H.
Klein, Verle W.
Kline, Arlington N.
Klusmann, Charles F.
Knapp, Franklin P.
Kneisl, John F.
Knepler, James L.
Knies, George C., Jr.
Knight, Cecil F.
Kohloff, Donald A.
Kohoutek, James G.
Kois, John R.
Kollmorgen, Frederick J.
Kopacka, William F.
Kother, Charles G.
Kowalskey, Zygmont J., Jr.
Kracha, John K.
Krahn, Chris
Kraus, Kenneth E.
Kraus, Walter S.
Krisciunas, John P.
Kruger, David S.
Krumwiede, Jerold L.
Kugler, Valarius E.
Kujawski, Theodore D
Kunkler, Hilary G.
Kurth, Ronald J.
Lacy, Robert G.
LaGasse, Richard H.
Lambert, Walker W.
Lamore, James F.
Land, Elwood W., Jr.
Lane, William J.
Langelier, Wilfred E., Jr.
Langford, George R.
Langrind, Roy G.
Langston, Thomas J.
Larson, Ralph S.
Lawless, Spencer C.
Lawson, Thomas J.
Learned, Charles W., Jr.
LeClerc, Raymond P.
Lee, Melvin R.
Leedom, Clair E., Jr.
Legett, Thomas R.
Lehman, George W.
Lehr, Ronald F.
Lehto, Robert K.
Leibel, Robert J.
Lenardi, Donald M.
Leonard, John D., Jr.
Leslie, Richard
Lewis, David E.
Lewis, Jesse W., Jr.
Lewis, Martin E.
Lietzan, Ernest W., Jr.
Limroth, David F.
Lindsay, Thomas L.
Lissy, Ernest I.
Livingstone, Philip N.
Loeffler, William H.
Lotze, Herbert E., Jr.
Lucken, Frank E
Lukenbach, Max D.
Lunday, John W., III
Lutz, William R.
Lyding, John F.
Lynch, Will T.
Lynn, John C.
Lyons, Philip
MacAdam, William F.
Mack, John
Mack, Robert E.
Maddox, Iven J.
Manheimer, Donald Z.
Maratea, Ronald "M"
Markel, Douglas S.
Marshall, Brendan P.
Marshall, John Taylor, Jr.
Marshall, John Thomas, Jr.
Marshall, Norman G.
Martin, Edward H.
Martin, James F.
Martineau, Roger J.
Martini, Richard A.
Mason, Ralph A., Jr.
Mason, Ralph S.
Massey, Roger A., Jr.
Master, Carl L., Jr.
Masterson, Kleber S., Jr.
Mathews, Donald R.
Mathis, Harry L., II
Matthews, Paul C., Jr.
Mauer, Tommy L.
Maxwell, John A.
McAdoo, William C.
McArdle, Stephen J., Jr.
McBride, Earl P.
McCaffree, Burnham C., Jr.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McCarthy, Paul F., Jr.
McCarthy, Richard J.
McClellan, Billy L.
McClellan, Parker W.
McClenahan, Richard M.
McClure, Clark A.
McConnell, Cyrus, Jr.
McCracken, John L.
McCrane, Brian P.
McCullough, John A.
McDermott, John J.
McDevitt, Ronald F.
McGonagill, Eber C.
McGown, William A., Jr.
McGuiness, Donald A.
McIntyre, James G.
McKay, Robert W.
McKean, Francis E.
McKee, George R., Jr.
McKenzie, James A., Jr.
McKinlay, Archibald, Jr.
McKinnon, George H.
McKinster, James W.
McKnight, Kent A.
McMahill, Gary A.
McMillin, George W.
McNamara, William L.
McNenny, Patrick "J" S.
Melton, Arthur W.
Melville, Noel
Merkle, George W.
Merritt, Robert L.
Mester, Richard L.
Meyer, Donald J.
Michaels, John R.
Millen, Thomas H.
Miller, Bruce J.
Miller, Bryce N.
Miller, George E.
Miller, Raleigh B., Jr.
Miller, Robert R.
Miller, Russell C.
Miller, Theodore W.
Mitchell, Donald F.
Mitchell, James C.
Mobley, Arthur S.
Mode, Paul J.
Monaghan, James J., Jr.
Montgomery, Kenneth
Montross, Robert W.
Moody, Frank L.
Mook, Joe
Moore, Byron O.
Moore, Hugh A.
Moore, John R.
Moore, Percy J.
Moore, Thomas W.
Morano, Anthony
Moredock, William J.
Morisette, Clement J.
Morris, Charles H.
Morris, James I.
Mortimer, Edward H., III
Morton, Robert R.
Morton, Theodore E.
Moss, David P.
Moss, Jack L.
Motes, Thomas L.
Moye, William B., Jr.
Mudgett, Francis S.
Mudgett, Richard L.
Multer, Richard P.
Mulvany, George M.
Mundt, Werner F.
Murphy, Arthur D.
Murphy, Richard G.
Murray, Thomas F.
Musgrave, "R" "F"
Myers, Lowell R.
Myers, Richard C.
Nagel, Harold A., Jr.
Narowetz, Bruce A.
Nash, Owen W.
Needham, Donald E.
Neel, William M.
Neel, William C.
Nelles, Merice T.
Nelson, Jesse R.
Nelson, Lawrence R.
Newton, John E.
Niemela, George R.
Nightingale, Billy R.
Nix, Walter C.
Noblit, Charles LaR.
Noll, Rolf F.
Noren, Rees E.
Norris, Frederick J., Jr.
Nott, Edward C., Jr.
Nyland, Walter L.
Oaksmith, David E., Jr.
Oberg, Chester R.
O'Brien, John T.
O'Connell, Robert L.
O'Connell, Richard M.
O'Connell, William J.
O'Dea, Paul F.
O'Dell, Jerry T.
Offrell, David W.
Oldmixon, William J.
Oleson, David E.
Olsen, Charles F.
Olsen, Jerome J.
Olsen, Robert M.
O'Malia, Robert J.
O'Malley, David E.
O'Neill, Norbert W.
Ormond, George, Jr.
Orsik, Walter A.
Orsino, Leo A.
Ortmann, Dean A.
O'Shaughnessy, Robert J.
Oslun, William J.
Ostergren, James E.
O'Sullivan, Richard C.
O'Toole, Arthur L., Jr.
Otto, Robert O.
Padrta, Jerry C.
Paganelli, John E.
Palmer, David J.
Parks, Richard E.
Parsons, David E.
Pasztalaniec, Matthew F.
Paterson, Dale R.
Patrick, Julian C.
Patten, Robert S.
Patterson, William Van H.
Patterson, Lee R.
Paulson, Allan G.
Pearl, Harlan R.
Pedigo, Robert E.
Peery, William K.
Perault, David J.
Perkins, Jack C.
Peters, Deane G.
Petersen, Gordon S.
Peterson, Alfred A.
Peterson, Mell A., Jr.
Pettigrew, Joseph H.
Peugh, Dighton
Pfarrer, Charles P., Jr.
Phillips, Paul E.
Philpot, Marvin L.
Phoenix, David "A"
Pierce, Robert K.
Pietrowski, Joseph L.
Pikell, Joseph V.
Pippin, William E.
Pitcher, William E.
Pitfield, David C.
Pitts, David T.
Pitts, David B.
Platner, Fredric W.
Plesur, Jack J.
Polini, Eugene T., Jr.
Pollack, Harold I.
Polsin, Robert W.
Pope, John W. R., Jr.
Poreda, Charles P.
Post, George W.
Post, Jerome
Potosnak, Joseph E.
Potts, Bill H.
Premo, Melvin C.
Price, Carroll R.
Priestley, Joseph R.
Primeau, Don G.
Prosser, Rudolph J.
Pugliano, Ralph J.
Pullen, Luther D.
Puopolo, Michael J.
Purtell, Joseph M.
Quartly, Alexander H. W.
Quillin, Thomas E.
Rademacher, John W.
Raiter, Richard F.
Ramos, Steve LaC.
Ramzy, James R.
Raper, Albert D.
Raunig, David R.
Raysin, Paul E.
Read, Richard R.
Reardon, John R.
Reasonover, Roger L., Jr.
Reese, Franklin W., III
Register, Marvin O.
Reid, John A.
Reinhardt, Jerry B.
Reisinger, John E.
Renninger, Willard H.
Reynolds, James V.
Reynolds, Marvin D.
Rhodes, Thomas B.
Rice, Alan H.
Rice, Donald K.
Richards, Walter E.
Richardson, William C.
Richter, Ronald P.
Rickly, James M.
Riegel, Robert W.
Riendeau, Gerald L.
Ritchie, John K.
Rivers, John B.
Robbins, Paul H.
Robertson, Robert R., Jr.
Robey, George R., Jr.
Robinson, Duane A.
Robinson, William N.
Rockefeller, Harry C., Jr.
Roderick, Daniel W.
Rodriguez, William P.
Roe, Donald W., Jr.
Rogers, Robert B.
Rogers, Thomas D.
Rork, John K.
Rose, Charles C., Jr.

Rose, James S.
Roth, Conrad W.
Rowland, Charles M., Jr.
Ruggles, Kenneth W.
Rumelhart, Max R.
Rupp, Jimmie L.
Russell, Kenneth B.
Ryan, Albert
Ryan, James W.
Ryan, John N.
Ryan, Roger P.
Ryman, Gerald M.
Sabol, Ernest J., Jr.
Salmon, Robert L.
Salva, Fedor R., Jr.
Samonds, John P.
Samples, Loy C.
Sandoval, Silvano F.
Sangster, Robert A.
Sapp, Charles S.
Sawyer, Kenneth R.
Scheurich, Thomas E.
Schibel, Robert L.
Schlemmer, Robert M.
Schlenzig, Robert E.
Schmidt, Gilbert E.
Schoeckert, Robert D.
Schoeffel, Peter VanR.
Schoonover, Charles D.
Schroats, Richard P.
Schultz, Earl E.
Schuppert, Vincent J.
Schuster, Gustave P.
Schwaebe, Charles F.
Scott, Robert W.
Sedlak, Richard K.
Seifert, James R.
Seifert, Robert J.
Seigenthaler, Thomas U.
Selby, Paul F.
Selgrath, James J.
Sellers, John W.
Sesler, Ralph M.
Sewell, Robert L.
Shafer, Don M.
Shanaghan, John J.
Shannon, Edward R.
Shaughnessy, Francis M.
Shearer, Oliver V., Jr.
Shearer, Thomas D.
Sheehan, Robert K.
Sheldon, George E., Jr.
Shelly, Ronald G.
Shewchuk, William M.
Shields, Robert G.
Shimek, Paul, Jr.
Shinholser, Charles E.
Shirley, Milford E.
Shrader, Ebert F.
Shuey, Robert L.
Shultz, Donald E., Jr.
Shumaker, Lawrence A.
Shuman, Edwin A., III
Simia, Richard
Sinwell, Raymond J.
Sisson, Thomas U., Jr.
Siverly, Paul L.
Skarlatos, Paul
Skillen, Robert L.
Slattery, Francis A.
Smidt, Robert L.
Smith, Albert L.
Smith, Allen, III
Smith, Chester R.
Smith, David G.
Smith, Donald P.
Smith, Edward R.
Smith, "H" "O"
Smith, Irvin L.
Smith, James L.
Smith, Leighton D.
Smith, Ralph R.
Smith, Stewart C.
Smith, Walter S.
Sneed, William Y.
Snider, Lloyd H.
Snyder, Edward C., Jr.
Snyder, Sherman R.
Snyder, Virgil C.
Soczek, William
Soderholm, Richard C.
Soltys, Mitchel S.
Sommers, Carl "W", II
Sorenson, Curtis A.
Sottak, Edward J.
Southwick, Charles E.
Spear, John R.
Speirer, Paul E., Jr.
Spencer, Russell E.
Springston, William A.
Spurrier, William W.
Stacy, John O.
Stallworth, Lewis A., III
Stamm, Ernest A.
Starbuck, Thomas H.
Stechmann, Donald H.
Steel, Charles E.
Steele, Francis X.
Steele, Ted C., Jr.
Stefferud, David R.
Steffes, Herbert J.
Steinman, Alfred D., Jr.
Stelter, Frederick C., III
Sterling, Kenneth L.
Stevenson, LeeRoy J.
Stevenson, Donald W.
Stevenson, Peter K.
Stevenson, George L.
Stickling, William R.
Stickney, Harold "L"
Stilwell, Charles H., Jr.
Stock, Merlyn L.
Stoddart, Ronald L.
Stoffel, Michael J.
Stone, Jack W., Jr.
Stone, Robert A.
Stone, Ronald P.
Stoner, Thomas M.
Storck, Bernard F.
Storm, Carroll F.
Storms, James G., III
Stovall, John C.
Strasler, Herbert J.
Stroop, Paul D., Jr.
Strum, Gerard M., Jr.
Stuebben, Richard W., Jr.
Sullivan, John G.
Sullivan, Martin J.
Sullivan, Richard M., Jr.
Sullivan, Russell J.
Sutherland, Terence B.
Sutherland, William P.
Sweeney, John H., III
Sweet, Harry J.
Swenson, Nils A.
Switzer, Anton R.
Switzer, Robert J.
Tanner, Charles N.
Tanner, John P.
Tate, Charles E.
Tate, John F.
Taylor, Arthur C.
Taylor, Harold A., Jr.
Taylor, James D.
Test, Richard "Z"
Thalman, Robert H.
Thayer, Albert J.
Thomas, Benjamin A.
Thompson, Emil S., Jr.
Thompson, James C.
Thompson, Richard L.
Thompson, Richard G.
Thornton, Ray O.
Thrailkill, Chester, Jr.
Thudium, Wayne E.
Thunman, Nils R.
Tibbetts, Herbert E.
Tisdale, Albin A.
Tise, Donald G.
Tolg, Robert G., Jr.
Tom, Joseph
Tondora, Joseph E.
Townley, John L.
Tracy, George W., II
Trask, Ace F.
Treagy, Paul E., Jr.
Trenham, Herbert D.
Trevors, George A.
Trone, Dennis R.
Truman, Ernest W., Jr.
Trygsland, Arnold L.
Tucker, Eli L., Jr.
Tucker, Thomas A.
Tully, William R., Jr.
Turner, Ralph A., Jr.
Ulmer, Donald M.
Ulrich, Charles H.
Vainosky, Thomas M.
VanAntwerp, Richard D.
Vandewater, George L., Jr.
Van Dien, Casper R.
Van Dusen, Harold L.
Van Dyke, Willard H., Jr.
Varhalla, Michael R.
Vatidis, Christopher R.
Vaughan, Evan J., Jr.
Vaughan, Robert R.
Veatch, Philip A.
Vellom, Lee S.
Vernam, Claude C.
Villar, Emmanuel J.
Vogelberger, Peter J., Jr.
VonPerbandt, Louis K.
Vreeland, James M.
Wack, Charles G.
Walck, Claude W.
Walker, Benny R.
Walker, Charles
Walker, Jack O.
Walker, Raymond H., Jr.
Wallace, Dallas L.
Wallace, James D.
Wallace, Richard M.
Wallen, Millard L., Jr.
Walsh, Don
Walsh, Harvey T., Jr.
Walsh, Joseph A., Jr.
Walter, Howard J.
Ward, Charles W. D., Jr.
Ward, Conrad J.
Ward, Hugh P.
Ward, John H.
Warnke, James F.
Warthen, Ronald R.
Watkins, Howard B., Jr.
Watson, George, Jr.
Watson, Robert "M"
Watson, Thomas C., Jr.
Watson, Thomas P.
Watson, Thomas H.
Webb, Haven N.
Webb, James E.
Webb, John B.
Weed, John W.
Weir, Jack T.
Weitz, Paul J., Jr.
Welborn, William P.
Welcome, Allan T.
Wells, John E.
Wells, Peter M.
Welsh, Vincent F.
Wensman, Linus B.
Werness, Maurice H.
Wessel, James E.
West, Denton W.
West, Donald A.
Weston, Gustav R.
Wetzel, James F.
Wetzel, Weslie W.
Whalen, Joseph D.
Whaley, Daniel E., Jr.
Wheeler, Charles G.
Whitaker, James E.
White, Donald J.
White, Irvin L.
White, Raymond L.
White, Robert C.
White, William A.
Wickwire, George A., Jr.
Wiecking, Kenneth D.
Wight, Roy R.
Wigley, William W.
Wildberger, August M.
Wildman, John B.
Wilfert, Eugene N.
Wilford, Donald McK.
Will, John M., Jr.
Williams, Edward O'N.
Williams, John O., Jr.
Williams, Ronel J. D.
Willis, Arthur A., Jr.
Willis, James S., Jr.
Willmeroth, Earl R.
Wilmer, Robert R.
Wilson, David P.
Wilson, David G.
Wilson, Hugh P.
Wilson, William R.
Winchester, Warren H.
Winkowski, John R.
Winn, Velmer A. J.
Winton, Fred "B", Jr.
Wintriss, George V.
Wisniewski, Sylvester S.
Withers, Fred J.
Witthoft, Ronald D.
Wood, David E.
Wood, Fred L.
Wood, Leon G., Jr.
Wood, Noel T.
Wooden, Bruce J.
Woods, Carl J.
Woodward, John L.
Woollard, Edwin F.
Woolway, David J.
Wright, James R.
Wright, Murray H.
Wright, Robert R.
Wright, Ronald A.
Wyckoff, Peter B.
Yarger, Ernest F.
Yarger, Luther D.
Yarwood, John O.
Yates, James L., Jr.
Yenowine, George H.
Yonke, William D.
Young, Harold L.
Young, James E.
Young, Milton E.
Youngblood, Newton C.
Zable, Joseph J.
Zapalac, Robert E.
Zelones, Vincent L.
Zettle, Harold
Zidbeck, William E.
Zimmerman, Robert V.
Zuilkoski, Ronald R.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captains

Anthony, Lynn E.
Ash, Henry T.
Baisch, Bruce F.
Baker, Howard A.
Benson, Victor G.
Brown, Carleton J.
Brown, Robert H.
Burkle, Joseph S.
Connor, Richard B.
Deas, Thomas C.
Dimmette, Robert M.
Dineen, James R.
Dobbins, Richard F.
Draper, Arthur J.
Dunn, Adolphus W.
Egan, John T., Jr.
Esswein, John G.
Fisichella, Rosario A.
Fleck, Robert L.
Fraser, William E.
Geib, Philip O.
Helgerson, Arthur A.
Hering, Alexander C.
Holmes, Alden V.
Honsik, Cyril J.
Hoopingarner, Newman A.
Howard, John W.
Jones, Jack T., Jr.
Kelley, Kenneth J.
King, Robert L., Jr.
Lemmon, Robert H.
Lewis, Charles W., Jr.
Lewis, Garner L.
Lineberry, William T., Jr.
Loeffler, Robert A.
Mackie, Robert W.
Martin, Richard J.
Matthews, Walter S., Jr.
Meyer, Frederick W., Jr.
Nauman, Richard D.
Nordstrom, Harry C.
Ricketson, George M.
Robinson, Donald W.
Rogers, Charles E.
Rush, Anthony P.
Schlang, Henry A.
Semmens, James P.
Spicher, Robert W.
Stevenson, Roger
Valusek, Fred A.
VanPetten, George T.

To be commanders

Bamberg, Paul G.
Brannon, Leland C.
Broaddus, Carl A., Jr.
Burke, Francis W.
Doolan, Paul D.
Drake, Robert M.
Edwards, Donald W.
Flynn, John W.
Gallagher, William J., Jr.
Golbranson, Frank L.
Hubbard, Hampton
Kent, Donald C.
Peckinpaugh, Robert O.
Peters, Earl R.
Sanborn, Neal D.
Sebrechts, Paul H.
Stark, James E.
Trier, William C.
Troy, John W.

To be lieutenant commanders

Allison, Mack E., Jr.
Azeris, Harijs T.
Babalis, William J.
Barnwell, Frank M.
Britton, Joseph H.
Burkhart, Vernon A.
Clarke, Pauline E.
Cooley, Norman V., Jr.
Frew, Mable A.
Gordon, John J.
Hamilton, Warren W., Jr.
Hyams, Vincent J.
Jacoby, William J., Jr.
Lucas, William E.
Lynch, Mary T.
Maughon, James S.
McDonough, Robert C.
Miller, Charles H.
Murphy, James J.
Musgrave, Max E.
O'Connell, Patrick F.
Parkinson, Leonard S. C.
Rossi, Joseph G.
Stephens, David L.
Turchi, Giuseppe
Wilson, David Q.
Winter, William R.
Wood, Matthew W.

To be lieutenants

Aaron, Benjamin L.
Akers, Richard E.
Austin, Frederick L., Jr.
Avery, Gordon B.
Avitabile, Stanton H.
Axe, Paul W., Jr.
Bailey, David W.
Baker, James P.
Baker, William P.
Barrett, Warren M.
Bartlett, Eugene F.
Bartlett, William A.
Bauer, William F.
Baxter, John C.
Beaty, Harry N.
Becker, Matthew K.
Beckman, William R.
Belevetz, David R.
Bemiller, Carl R.
Berry, Juanedd
Billingsley, Frank S.
Bird, Harry H., Jr.
Black, Maurice W.
Black, Robert C.
Blair, Sidney M.
Blais, Bernard R.
Block, Robert C.
Bloom, Joseph D.
Brackett, John W., Jr.
Brandon, Ralph F.
Brock, Richard R. H.
Bromley, Jess W.
Brooks, Robert T., Jr.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Stuart L.
Bucko, Matthew I., Jr.
Busch, Frederick M.
Calhoun, William M.
Cannard, Ralph J.
Castro, Joseph R.
Caulfield, Francis J., Jr.
Cavanagh, James J.
Cavin, William J., Jr.
Cerny, Matthew J., Jr.
Ching, Charles C.
Clark, Samuel S.
Collier, James C. P., Jr.
Coniff, Robert F.
Conkey, George A.
Connolly, Jul› T.
Cook, Roger C.
Cooper, Conrad L.
Cowen, Malcolm L.
Cunningham, John E., Jr.
Cutcher, Robert I.
Dalco, John C.
Day, John R., Jr.
DeBolt, William L.
Dewhirst, Milton C.
Dill, Donald M.
Diorio, Neil G.
Dolan, Robert G.
Dooley, Robert T.
Drum, David E.
Ducker, David E.
Dunçan, Elmore E.

Erie, Norman A.
Evans, Robley D.
Farmer, Billy G.
Fieldson, Thomas L.
Fisch, James M.
Fitzgibbon, Carney, Jr.
Flack, James V., Jr.
Flynn, Peter A.
Freeman, Edward E.
Fuller, Dee L.
Gansa, Alexander N.
Garrison, Robert C., Jr.
Gibbs, John B.
Gill, Kenneth A., Jr.
Goddard, James E., Jr.
Goff, Terry H.
Goller, Vernon L.
Goodman, Maxwell W.
Gragg, Donald M.
Griffin, John P.
Halleen, Wayne I.
Hart, Daniel A.
Hazel, John R.
Hedges, Harold H., III
Hendra, Alan K.
Herring, John H.
Hodge, Warren W.
Hoffman, Donald E.
Hoke, Bob
Holderman, Henry L.
Holmboe, Arthur H.
Hopwood, Herbert G., Jr.
Hughes, Philip C.
Ickler, John L.
Jack, George A.
Jones, Frederic G.
Kelley, Donald L.
Kelley, William S., Jr.
Kennedy, Billy D.
Kern, John D.
Klein, Garner F.
Kostinas, John E.
Kyger, Kent
Lang, Jesse E.
Langsjoen, Ralph J.
Larcom, Gordon D., Jr.
Larson, James A.
Lawlor, Peter P., Jr.
Lawton, George M.
Learey, Kenneth L.
Levin, Howard A.
Levy, Jerome
Lewis, Jay F., II
Lockwood, Richard A.
Long, Virginia A.
Lovecchio, Francis A.
MacDonald, Rodney I.
MacLennan, John C.
Magi, Martin
Martin, George F., Jr.
Mathews, George W., Jr.
McGillis, Thomas J.
McGowan, Edward M., Jr.
McGrory, Thomas P.
McIntyre, James A. A.
McMicken, William H.
Merchant, Raymond J., Jr.
Meyer, Melvin B.
Miewald, John R.
Miranda, Mario C.
Mitchell, George H., Jr.
Moll, Francis K., Jr.
Morgan, Robert I.
Mullins, Wallace R.
Mullins, William J., Jr.
Neal, Royden W.
Neel, Samuel N.
Norton, Richard H.
O'Brien, Bernard E.
Ochs, Charles W.
Oden, George W.
O'Halloran, Patrick S.
O'Lane, John M.
O'Leary, Jay F.
Olson, Robert L.
Page, Larry K.
Palumbo, Ralph R.
Parker, Nelson H., III
Payne, Charles F., Jr.
Payne, Milton L.
Perkins, Robert H.
Pettengill, Howard W., Jr.
Phillips, Darwin D.
Pollard, Harry S. Jr.
Puk, John A.
Pulicicchio, Louis U.
Rack, Robert V.
Ragsdale, Julian L.
Randall, Glenn H.
Reckenthaler, Karl J.
Redick, Lloyd F.
Richardson, Charles R.
Rigsby, Robert E.
Rish, Berkley L.
Roberts, Donald M.
Robl, Robert J.
Roe, Jack M.
Rogers, Donald R.
Rogers, Jerry R.
Rohren, Donald W.
Roof, Roger S.
Rudolph, Samuel F., Jr.
Rumbel, Harold E.
Russotto, Joseph A.
Sargent, Charles R.
Scavo, Vincent J.
Schumacher, William H.
Scott, Augustus B.
Sharpe, Richard G.
Shaskey, Robert E.
Shaw, Spencer W.
Shepard, Barclay M.
Sincox, Francis J., Jr.
Slemmons, Daniel H.
Smith, Ray M.
Smith, Royal A.
Snyder, Harry D.
Stout, Bill D.
Stout, Bob E.
Swartz, Philip K., Jr.
Szojchet, Alvin
Taylor, Thomas E.
Thomas, Lawrence E.
Thomas, William J.
Thompson, Robert L.
Thompson, Richard A.
Thompson, Robert E.
Thorne, Lawrence G.
Tobey, Raymond E.
Tully, John G., Jr.
Tupper, James R.
Ungersma, John A.
Vaught, Richard L.
Viola, Francis V., III
Walklett, William D.
Walter, Eugene P.
Wander, Harry J.
Weir, Gordon J., Jr.
West, William F.
Wheeler, Jock R.
Willard, Donald E., Jr.
Willcutts, Harrison D.
Wilson, Wayne R., Jr.
Wilson, William J.
Wright, Irving V.
Youngs, Luther A., III

SUPPLY CORPS

To be captains

Allen, John P.
Arrighi, Norman L.
Arst, Norton J.
Balch, Richard S.
Ball, Stuart M.
Beyer, Kenneth M.
Bloxom, Elliott
Bonnell, Graham C.
Bradley, Rex A.
Brogan, James M.
Cain, Thomas C., Jr.
Campbell, Robert R.
Cartee, James W.
Christensen, Don C.
Clark, Grover V.
Clark, Robert L., Jr.
Cone, Daniel G.
Cooley, Hollis W.
Custer, John D.
Daray, Jack L., Jr.
Dollard, John T.
Edwards, Robert B.
Evans, Philip W.
Everett, Robert J.
Foster, George S., Jr.
Fowler, Marion V.
Freeborn, Stanley B., Jr.
Gay, William W., Jr.
Graham, John W.
Gregg, William B.
Harrison, Frederick D.
Harvey, James E., Jr.
Helsel, Rolland A.
Henry, George, Jr.
Hirst, John W.
Hobgood, William W.
Howard, Joseph L.
Hughes, William V.
Jepson, Francis E.
Jones, Richard M.
Kahao, Martin J. B.
Knight, Charles L.
La Barre, Carl A.
Lindsay, Peter M.
Linscott, Henry D., Jr.
Lyles, Arromanus C., Jr.
Lynch, James J.
Lyness, Douglas H.
Lyon, Frederick A.
Malloy, John M.
Mann, Arthur W., Jr.
McCarten, George C., Jr.
McCreery, Bernard L.
McCrone, Andrew M.
Peterson, George W., Jr.
Purvis, Theodore B., Jr.
Quinn, Joseph P.
Rainey, Benajah L.
Rieseberg, Robert W.
Rieve, Roland
Roberts, Leo W.
Ross, William H.
Sharp, Evert R.
Shea, Leonard E.
Smith, Bert
Smith, Stuart H.
Spore, James S.
Stern, Theodore S.
Sullivan, John D.
Tobias, Robert H.
Van Der Maaten, Robert R.
Voegeli, George L.
Williams, Richard A.
Williams, Ralph E., Jr.
Zimet, Stanford F.

To be commanders

Barrett, Henry T.
Bayer, John F.
Becker, Charles
Duke, Edwin L.
Fernald, Joseph A.
Garbak, Albert C.
Gardiner, Charles V.
Gaver, Harry L.
Harrington, Bernard C.
Ireland, Charles W.
Jaxtheimer, John C.
Johnson, Herbert L.
Lachicotte, Albert S., Jr.
Leary, Raymond F.
Maas, William C.
Marshall, John C.
McFadden, John P.
McMorries, Edwin E.
Meyer, William H., Jr.
Miller, James
Milliren, Howard C.
Mosolf, Lewis E.
Olson, George E., Jr.
Papageorge, Andrew J.
Paulsen, William N.
Penebaker, George W.
Quarles, Palmer A., Jr.
Randolph, Robert R.
Rehberg, Jerome A.
Reilly, Frank J., Jr.
Rubel, Robert L.
Sanders, Roy N.
Schoggen, Joe G.
Scott, Leroy M.
Sheen, Raymond H.
Siembt, LaVerne L.
Slover, Jay A.
Standish, John C.
Sullivan, Raymond S.
Van Pelt, James C.
Wade, Aredus B., Jr.
Washburn, Dale W.
Windsor, James M.

To be lieutenant commanders

Abrams, Bernard
Allan, Richard T.
Armstrong, William S.
Baker, James J., Jr.
Bandish, Bernard J.
Bateman, Roger I., Jr.
Baumgardner, James M.
Bigham, Robert G., Jr.
Brennan, Jack M.
Brown, Lowell E.
Buben, George
Burgess, Frederick C.
Butler, Arthur G., Jr.
Carlson, John C.
Case, George O.
Charette, Author E.
Cheshure, Joseph H.
Chupalio, Anthony F.
Cohen, John F.
Coon, LeRoy E.
Crouch, Perry B.
Daniels, Hoyle H., II
Day, Robert D.
Dellinger, Charley P.
Depew, Robert W.
De Santo, James V.
Dietz, Howard M.
Donnelly, Joseph A.
Downey, James G.
Evans, Stuart J.
Ferris, Robert H.
Fisk, Calvin W.
Fjelsta, John E.
Fowler, George O., Jr.
Fronke, Robert E.
Fry, Roy A., Jr.
Gaetz, Edward F., Jr.
Gaschen, Fredrick S.
Haines, Donald R.
Hanson, Frank L.
Harris, Melvin W.
Hart, Billy W.
Hatch, James C.
Hatton, Roy E.
Heitmeyer, Richard C.
Hency, Max E.
Hillard, Herbert S., Jr.
Hobkirk, Carl M.
Holfield, Arthur W., Jr.
Holt, Robert O.
Honsinger, Jack E.
Horngren, Earl W.
Hughes, Lowell T.
Huntress, James F.
Hutchison, Marvin S.
Johnson, John T.
Johnson, Karl A.
Johnson, Richard D.
Johnson, Warren B.
Jones, John F.
Jongeward, Keith W.
Kash, William B.
Keenan, Joseph I.
Keller, Bruce W.
Kellogg, Dean L.
Kennedy, Patrick F.
Knight, Reed H.
Knipple, John D.
Kolinsky, Jaromir J.
Kramp, Henry F.
Lake, Donald H.
Laning, George H.
Lindsey, Bob R.
Longmire, Billy R.
Luck, William E.
Marshall, John F.
Martin, Donald V.
Marx, James H.
Maurstad, Alfred S.
Maxon, Ivan B.
McBroom, William M.
McKenna, James E.
Morlan, Robert M.
Murauskas, William A.
Murray, Paul T.
Nash, William T.
Newton, Ernest C.
Nunn, Enoch W.
O'Connor, Thomas J.
Oller, William M.
Orr, Raymond J.
Orrill, Donald P.
Owen, Frank T., Jr.
Pate, Walter T., Jr.
Pillar, Samuel A.
Pistner, Robert G.
Pluto, Raymond J.
Podrouzek, William J.
Polk, Donald E.
Polk, Robert B.
Pope, George S., Jr.
Prehn, John L., Jr.
Primm, Jules R.
Raney, William O.
Rebentisch, Joseph A., Jr.
Riley, George D., Jr.
Roberts, Maynard R.
Ronayne, William D.
Ross, Joel E.
Rossi, Louis P.
Schultz, Jackson L.
Shepard, John C.
Sloan, Waldo D., Jr.
Smith, Carlton B.
Smith, William C.
Starbody, John L.
Thayer, Ernest C.
Thomason, Vernon D.
Thompson, Edwin H.
Thompson, Robert W.
Tice, "J" Philip
Tippin, Jesse R.
Truax, Ernest L., Jr.
Turnage, Robert E.
Tylman, Frank J.
Urban, John S.
Van Osdol, Robert C.
Varney, William G.
Vogel, Robert E.
Vogel, William J.
Waldron, William S.
Walker, Hinton C.
Waller, Thomas C., Jr.
Wasko, Andrew J.
Welch, Gordon E.
Weyrauch, Gerald H.
Wilsie, Roger M.
Wilson, Robert M.

To be lieutenants

Anderson, Richard A.
Anglim, Matthew E., Jr.
Armitage, James H.
Awalt, Richard E.
Babcock, Barry B.
Baglioni, Francis X.
Bartholomew, Charles W.
Bechtelheimer, Robert R.
Bennett, Richard B.
Blackshaw, Joseph R.
Bodart, Cletus W.
Brewin, Robert L.
Brooks, John E.
Brotherton, Curtis W.
Burr, William E.
Byers, Austin L.
Casselberry, Lynn W., Jr.
Caverly, Michael K.
Chapman, Charles B., III
Christenson, Richard D.
Clark, Shelby Van N. T.
Cocking, Rollin J.
Cook, Gerald W.
Cornelius, Jack M.
Cotton, Robert E.
Cronk, Philip W.
Delleney, Jimmie S.
Dollard, Paul A.
Dusenberry, Frank J.
Farrell, James G.
Fekula, Theodore V.
Ferraro, Niel P.
Flood, Peter A.
Fuka, Otto J., Jr.
Graessle, Philip G.
Grise, Norman W., Jr.
Hall, Robert A.
Hanly, Joseph B.
Harkin, James W.
Harless, Charles A.
Harrigan, Thomas F., Jr.
Hawkins, Charles A.
Hensley, Frank M.
Hochmuth, Alvin E., Jr.
Hollowell, Samuel T., Jr.
Horrigan, John W., Jr.
Jesser, Arthur D.
Johnson, Millard J.
Kela, Frederick H.
Klaren, John C.
Kurowski, Raymond J.
Lanphere, Robert J.
Lawrence, Robert W.
LeBlanc, George J., Jr.
LeBlanc, Merrill M.
Lewis, Brian K.
Mantlo, Glendon R.
McCarthy, Leonard D.
McCurdy, Bruce D.
Moore, James W.
Nelson, Alfred B.
Nolan, Frank R.
O'Connor, Robert W.
Ostrom, Lester E.
Parent, Elias A., Jr.
Partridge, John D.
Peek, Luther W.
Peterson, Kenneth A.
Pottinger, Ian G.
Prutzman, William L.
Read, Farra L., Jr.
Ribble, Marland S.
Rice, Harold A.
Richards, Walter T.
Riordan, William H.

Rolfe, James A.
Rose, Rufus E., Jr.
Ross, Howard "T", Jr.
Roth, Richard J.
Sanders, John R.
Savage, William H., Jr.
Sellers, Robert D.
Sevier, Moses T.
Shipley, Maynard K.
Shultz, William E.
Smith, Jay R., Jr.
Springer, Donald F.
Sterner, Norman G.
Stevenson, Ray H.
Strange, Geoffrey G.
Tillery, Preston J.
Topping, James F.
VanValkenburg, Max W.
Velotas, Bill M.
Wagner, John E.
Walker, Edward K., Jr.
Warneke, Grover C.
Weiss, Armand B.
White, Jack A.
Williams, Walter L.
Wilson, Kenneth B.
Wohl, Paul
Young, Robert H.
Zeberlein, George V.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be captains

Albrecht, Herbert C. W.
McComas, Robert F.
Michaels, Emmett T.
Moorman, Julian P., Jr.
Reaves, James E.
Ricker, Richard W.
Salyer, Oswald B.
Schnurr, Herman J.
Stephenson, Marion O.
Weise, John W.
Wright, George A.

To be commanders

Bonner, Robert A.
Cassady, Kermit R.
O'Neill, John J.
Sodt, William G.

To be lieutenant commanders

Agnew, James F.
Arnold, Charles L.
Below, Ralph W.
Connolly, Homer T.
Detrick, Wayne N.
Dunn, Edward J.
Goodman, Garson
Jackson, Raymond E.
Kensta, Felix L.
Lineberger, Ernest R.
Long, Bradford W.
McCarthy, Eugene W.
McDonnell, James T.
Paulson, George I.
Smith, Vincent M.
Sundt, Valery E.
Ward, Leo D.
Williams, Bruce H.
Wootten, Thomas J.

To be lieutenants

Baxter, Roy A.
Bliss, Donald
Brudzynski, Peter F.
Dozier, John W.
Gallagher, Bartholomew T.
Greenwood, Charles L.
Hilferty, Thomas J.
Hinderer, George M.
Jones, Stephen N.
Laurenzano, Roch M.
Lemieux, Ernest S.
Maritato, Victor J.
Meschke, David L.
Milosek, William J.
O'Gorman, Charles F.
Regan, James P.
Seegers, Leonard O.
Snyder, Marvin E., Jr.
Urbano, Francis J.
Vernon, Clarence A.
Walsh, Ronald J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be captains

Allegrone, Charles
Barnett, Thomas E.
Clampet, William T.
Cocke, Thomas P.
Cooke, Frederick A. F.
Culp, Dennis K.
Gill, Samuel C., Jr.
Johnson, Henry J.
Maley, William T., Jr.
McFarland, Wilburn J., Jr.
McLellon, Waldron M.
Merdinger, Charles J.
Neumann, Arthur C.
Norcross, William E.
Pinkerton, Richard D.
Raymond, John M., Jr.
Reilly, Charles A., Jr.
Smith, Spencer R.
Sparks, Robert E.
Stevens, Harry, Jr.
Thomas, Robert E., Jr.

To be commanders

Barnes, George W., Jr.
Burke, John L.
Clarke, John F.
Gibbons, Earl F.
Graves, Lenson W.
Griffiths, William H., Jr.
Hayen, Charles L.
Loeffler, Harry H., Jr.
Minwegen, Arthur P.
Pyles, LaVern, Jr.
Reno, James N.
Roloff, Jerome W.

To be lieutenant commanders

Alberts, Carl D.
Andrews, James D.
Barron, William W.
Bothwell, John R.
Burch, Bobby F.
Butler, Charles W.
Cahill, Harold P., Jr.
Cochran, Joseph DeV.
Curione, Charles
Dewey, Elliot A.
Dunn, Robert H. P.
Ellis, Darl A.
Feinman, David M.
Gentry, William W.
Hoskins, Dalton
Jortberg, Robert F.
LeDoux, John C.
Lennox, Frederick E.
Marron, James P.
Merrill, Bergen S., Jr.
Miller, Robert H.
Nuss, Edward S.
Perkins, Anson C.
Pickett, Eugene L.
Puddicombe, Robert W.
Rumble, James D.
Russell, William F., Jr.
Sears, Kenneth P.
Shockey, Dan N.
Simonson, Nelson C.
Smith, Donald E.
Stacey, Ernest R.
Timberlake, Lewis G.
Wallace, Billy C.
Williams, Richard C.
Williams, Thomas C.
Wilson, William D.

To be lieutenants

Andersen, Charles P.
Auerbach, Ralph W., Jr.
Barry, Richard P.
Berdan, Maurice R.
Block, Norman G.
Brooks, Kenneth D.
Brown, George H.
Bruch, Charles G.
Burger, Henry K.
Collins, James R.
Eager, Walter J., Jr.
Edson, Theodore M.
Gans, George M., Jr.
George, Roscoe D., Jr.
Gibboney, Lloyd H.
Hanlon, Mark Z., Jr.
Hathaway, David B.
Hauck, John W.
Jones, John P., Jr.
Moger, Jack B.
Moore, Fred, Jr.
Morton, Donald A.
Nicholls, William H., Jr.
Nystedt, Russell P.
Oscarson, Edward R.
Petzrick, Paul A.
Pitman, James B., Jr.
Randall, Robert R.
Sherrod, Henry C., Jr.
Smila, William W.
Socha, Albert R., Jr.
Stedman, Ralph S., Jr.
Sweeney, John C.
Sylva, John P., Jr.
Taglienti, Gene S.
Toliver, Jack M.
Tombarge, John W.
Urish, Daniel W.
Wile, Dorwin B.
Williams, Jesse R.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

Bernhausen, Elwood R.
Chudzinski, Joseph G.
DoBronte, Frank
Enke, Loren F.
Gabrels, Wilton R.
Hillis, Walter G.
Lyon, Harvey W.
Mueller, Ray B.
Rhobotham, Frank B.
Stowell, Ralph H.

To be commanders

Bassett, Donald R.
Benson, Lambert A.
Besbekos, George A.
Calton, Melvin L.
Gossom, John N.
Marmarose, Frank A.
Peachey, James B.
Pentecost, John W.
Sorenson, Adrian E., Jr.
Ulrich, George, Jr.

To be lieutenant commanders

Austin, Robert E.
Bartosh, Andrew J.
Brown, Edward H.
Dennis, Harry J., Jr.
Duggan, Norman E.
Elliott, Robert W., Jr.
Enger, Theodore C.
Finnegan, Frederick J.
Hembre, Lloyd E.
Johnson, "C" Paul, Jr.
Knoedler, David J.
Leupold, Robert J.
Mann, William H.
Myrio, Donny A.
Penick, Edward C.
Rau, Charles F.
Sachs, Samuel J.
Schweitzer, John R.
Wilkens, Carl H., Jr.
Zeigler, Paul E.

To be lieutenants

Abate, Edwin G.
Adams, Robert C.
Allman, Daryl M.
Altman, Richard S.
Amato, Angelo E.
Arnold, Charles T.
Barley, Martin A.
Beesley, Charles V.
Begin, Raymond J.
Biron, George A.
Bitter, Norman C.
Boeke, Peter R.
Bryson, William F.
Burch, Meredith S.
Burke, Joseph H.
Casper, James A.
Castronovo, Sam
Cavalaris, Constantine J.
Chesser, Victor L.
Clynes, James T.
Corio, Russell L.
Corsello, Robert W.
Creedon, Robert L.
Desenfants, John A.
Earle, Lewis S.
Eid, Clark N.
Eppolito, John S.
Garrett, Fred A.
Gentry, Jesse T.
Hall, Donald B.
Heppler, Rosco Z.
Hill, Ronald K.
Hillenbrand, Ronald E.
Hodges, Albert P., Jr.
Howe, Robert E.
Hublou, Roland A.
Huettner, Robert E.
Johnson, Ronald H.
Joy, Edwin D., Jr.
Joyner, Charles D., Jr.
Koutouzakis, Henry P.
Leonard, Walter P.
Lessig, John F.
Love, Charles J.
Nable, Raymond D.
Novark, Bruce W.
Penners, Don A.
Perrere, Donald J.
Pinkerton, Robert J.
Pirie, George D.
Richter, Henry E., Jr.
Selby, Vernice B.
Seo, Kenji
Smith, Preston L.
Smith, Vonnie B.
Stallworth, Henry A.
Stocker, Ralph R.
Swaim, Bobby L.
Swenson, James D.
Tanner, Robert L.
Taylor, Carl N.
Thomas, Robert E.
Thompson, Ferris P.
Toolson, James R.
Verunac, James J.
Walters, Ray A.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be captains

Holway, Richard T.
Timberlake, Claude V., Jr.

To be commanders

Beretta, John J.
Burgess, Benjamin F., Jr.
Ferber, Charles W.
Jachowski, Leo A., Jr.
Lester, William F.
McReynolds, Paul M.

To be lieutenant commanders

Combs, Norris K.
Flaherty, Edward M.
Noble, Howard F., Jr.

To be lieutenants

Barrett, Neil K.
Beyer, Charles E.
Brandon, Daniel A.
Brannon, Joe F.
Brownlow, Wilfred J., Jr.
Carpenter, Arden R.
Curto, James C.
Davies, John A.
Dennis, "J" "M"
Devine, Leonard F.
Dietch, Michael M.
Dunbar, Edward S.
Gallaher, Robert E.
Gilbert, Richard S.
Goon, Melvin H.
Hartley, Robert L., Jr.
Holston, Charles A.
Janson, Harold J.
Johnston, James F.
Keesee, Robert C.
Kramer, Stanley H.
Lamb, Jean L.
Long, William L.
McComb, Gordon S.
Miller, Earl F., II
Miller, Harry P.
Morris, Carlton R.
Myers, John D.
O'Connor, William F.
Oleson, Russell H.
Oswald, Charles A.
Reed, John R.
Richardson, James W.
Riser, Ellis W.
Sanborn, Warren R.
Schaffner, Leslie J.
Sloan, Marshall
Smout, Jay C.
Talley, Russel L.
Tatum, Raymond B.
Van Buskirk, Floyd W.
Woodham, James T.

NURSE CORPS

To be captains

Erickson, Ruth A.
Todd, "C" Edwina

To be commanders

Arnold, June E.
Aycock, Martha O.
Becker, Dorothy C.
Benson, Wilma M.
Bulshefski, Veronica M.
Gresko, Mary

To be lieutenant commanders

Bierma, Margery G.
Bridge, Velia C.
Dixon, Nora L.
Eastin, Virginia A.
Houghton, Arline D.
Humphrey, Ruth M.
Hutchens, Juanita F.
Javins, Betty J.
Johnson, June G.
Kahle, Helen D.
Lane, Ira L.
Lariviere, Margaret
O'Barto, Waldena
Palmer, Mildred F.
Papp, Gizella
Perry, Bessie M.
Philipone, Anna
Revis, Marjorie J.
Tollinger, Norma T.
Voth, Rita B.
Vought, Esther J.

To be lieutenants

Davis, Kathryn A.
Emter, Dorothy M.
Fudala, Adeline R.
Greene, Jane S.
Haile, Shirley W.
Hardcastle, Jeraldine N.
Jones, Mary L.
Kelly, Therese M.
Ludwig, Margaret M.
Max, Helen R.
Moriarty, Mary M.
Murphy, Veronica M.
Nagy, Bettye G.
Orr, Wanda S.
Pearce, Martha V.
Pickering, Julia E.
Proto, Theresa M.
Sauer, Mary A.
Spence, Laura D.
Sullivan, Patricia A.
Walker, Helen J.
Warren, Marjorie E.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*James L. Adams
*William R. Aiman
*Michael D. Allen
*Norman A. Anderson
*William W. Anderson
*Terry B. Applegate
*Andre B. Ashley
*Conrad C. Bahr
*William F. Bealer, Jr.
*Reginald E. Bean
*Don M. Betterton

*Timothy L. Blakely
*Jerry K. Brown
*Joseph E. Callahan
*Robert B. Carl
*Dana A. Coe
*John C. Conant
*Steven E. Conner
*Ronald P. Cordes
*Robert G. Costello
*Paul W. Crumlish
*Donald P. Doherty
*Hal J. Drez
*Jack E. Duffy
*John W. Ehrmantraut
*John G. Fabie
*David D. Fagerland
*James M. Ferguson
*Dennis A. Fitzgerald
*Val Gerstenschlager
*George D. Gibbs, Jr.
*Clark E. Goebel
*Bobby F. Green
*Frederick T. Grexton
*John B. Hallmark
*Robert R. Hansen
*Benjamin F. Hehn III
*Hugh C. Henderson
*Frederick H. Hohnbaum
*Stephen J. Johnson
*Herbert W. Jones
*Glynn Q. Lane, Jr.
*Gerald W. Langkammerer
*Thomas S. Lattomus
*Dennis F. Leigh
*William L. Lewis
*Jack W. Lillis
*John G. Lukey
*William P. McCarthy
*James M. McCornock
*Wyatt H. McGee
*Robert L. Madden
*Ted W. Martens
*Dickie R. Matthes
*Stephen A. Moore
*Frank H. Murphy
*Edward M. Neumann
*Donald R. Nielsen
*Dudley G. Oakes
*Thomas H. O'Hara
*Robert C. Ohland
*David B. Osburn
*Larry G. Ostertag
*Julian I. Palmore III
*Richard V. Parish
*Richard J. Pryce
*Edwin O. Rhodes
*Ray "E" Riesgo
*Michael B. Sanson
*Frederick M. Scheinholtz
*Charles R. Schlegelmilch
*Larry C. Schooley
*George L. Schueppert
*Wendell D. Seif
*Don S. Slack
*Ronald A. Smith
*Charles F. Stephan
*George R. Syring
*Robert G. Syring
*John A. Tharp
*David L. Thomas
*Bruce T. Venner
*Thomas B. Ward
*David R. Wyatt

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Fred B. Benson III
*Ralph L. Chappell
*Douglas J. Lary
*James W. Lunn
*Daniel R. Mays
*David B. Turner

*John G. Lukey (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidate) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) are being nominated for both line and Staff Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William A. Berry
*William L. Harvey
*Robert S. Hindes
*Robert J. Jodan
*Jon B. Kasner
*Gary R. Kilday
*James C. Loblaw
*Joel F. Newgen
*John W. Nolan
*Guy E. Pahud
*"J" Dick Pensyl
*Ronald J. Perkocha
*James D. Potter, Jr.
*Allan B. Rogers
*Jerry C. Seyb
*Alan B. Smith
*Frederick G. VanKoughnet
*Douglas M. Webb

*Milton D. Davis (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Stuart Ragland, Jr. (civilian college graduate), to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Richard R. Anderson
*Robert F. Kirk
*Sverre J. Oftedal, Jr.
*Nicholas W. Schmitz
*Jonas Sode

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Donald W. Hopping
*George F. Humbert, Jr.
*Herbert G. Lockhart, Jr.
*James F. O'Neill
*Joseph P. O'Riordan
*Carlos Villafana-Justicia
*Lowell T. York

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Laurence I. Alpert
*Gaspar W. Anastasi
*George F. Brumback
*Eugene J. Colangelo
*Jack M. Roe
*James F. Savage, Jr.
*James L. Shumaker
*Jennings B. Smalley, Jr.
*John D. Tolmie
*Herbert A. Urweider

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Emidio J. Collevecchio
*Ollie V. Hall, Jr.
*Robert D. Haymore
*Stanley E. Pepek

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Angelo R. Chiarenza
*Ralph J. DiClementi

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*George W. Ackley, Jr.
*Richard S. Altman
*David L. Gaston
*Frank H. Kellner
*William D. Kimmel, Jr.
*Samuel S. Lusk
*Rudolph G. McCranie
*Steve Montgomery
*Dorsey J. Moore
*Edward M. Osetek
*Nicholas Passodelis
*George D. Pirie
*Ellsworth H. Plump
*Paul J. Reisman
*Vernice B. Selby
*"O" "L" Shoemaker
*George A. Stanton, Jr.
*Norman H. Tracy, Jr.
*David L. Winegar

*William H. Bromann, Jr., U.S. Navy officer, to be a permanent ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Charles E. Langton, Jr., U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Charles V. Gordon, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Eugene R. Forsht, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the line of the Navy, limited duty only, aviation maintenance, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*James H. Bergstrom, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, and to be promoted to the grade of lieutenant when their line-running mates are so promoted, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Howard J. Alfandre
Donald O. Alford
Herbert F. Allshouse
Robert L. Altman
Richard F. Ambur
John R. Anderson
Robert L. Anderson
Schales L. Atkinson
Ernest Atlas
Marshall E. Atwell
Emil J. Bardana, Jr.
Harry J. Barr
Delano W. Bolter
Robert S. Borden
Eugene M. Brandt
William L. Brannon, Jr.
Willard A. Bredenberg
Lawrence Brettschneider
Jack R. Brewer
John W. Brown
Woody G. Burrow
Stephen T. Bush
George E. Byers, Jr.
Thomas R. Byrd
Marvin G. Caldwell
Richard E. Cannon
Edward F. Cantow
Anthony S. Casimir
Frederick F. Castrow II
David W. Chapman
Ronald L. Christ
Bartley G. Cilento
Harold L. Compton
Douglas R. Cordray
Charles L. Cotten
John C. Council, Jr.
Judson L. Crow
Larry E. Cummins
Ernest P. D'Angelo, Jr.
David R. Davis II
Gerald N. Davis
William E. Deignan
Benjamin G. W. Dew
Michael A. Donlan
James F. Donovan
James P. Drinkard
Neil P. Dubner
Donald F. Duff
Robert R. Duhamel
Julius E. Dunn, Jr.
Ronald C. Erbs
Thomas A. Farrell
William J. Farrell
Robert A. Feeney
Edward J. Finnerty
Darrell E. Fisher
Robert B. Fitzgerald
Peter A. Fleming
Charles D. Fogg
Michael F. Fornes
Frederick J. Frensilli
Arnold M. Frucht
Hugh S. Gallagher
John W. Garden
Donald M. Garland
Edward J. Garvin
Michael L. Gay
William Gee
Gerald F. Geiger
Benjamin F. Gibbs, Jr.
John C. Gibson
Edward C. Gilbert
Andrew M. Giovannini
Joseph G. Gregonis
Paul A. Guiles
Charles H. Hale III
John C. Hall
David J. Hand
Charles A. Hanna
Sigvard T. Hansen, Jr.
Robert S. Harlin
Randall L. Harrington
Dan W. Hibner
John H. Hoertz
Richard M. Hofmann
Hilmon D. Holley, Jr.
John E. Hoye
Royal C. Hudson, Jr.
Robert S. Janicki
Edward M. Jewusiak
Ernest J. Johnson
Walter T. Johnson
William W. Johnson
Edward M. Jones
George R. Jones
Robert W. Joyce, Jr.
Harry I. Katz
Frederic R. Keifer
Cyril F. Kellett, Jr.
John C. Kelly
Harry G. Kennedy, Jr.
Carl P. Kessler
Stephen H. King
Jimmie H. Knight
Marvin M. Krieps, Jr.
Randall A. Langston
Ronald G. Latimer
John C. Leadbeater
Frederick M. Lee
John C. Leissring
Ronald J. Lentz
Lawrence J. Macatee
Robert P. Majors, Jr.
William A. Martin
Sid "F" Mauk
"L" "B" McDaniels
James C. McGlamory
John F. McGrail
Samuel McQueen
David M. McRae
John R. McTammany
James C. Meador, Jr.
Russell W. Melton
Richard M. Monihan
James M. Moorefield, Jr.
Andrew Moreland
James D. Morgan
Thomas J. Murnane
Philip B. Nedelman
Carmine F. Nicholas
Robert D. Nichols
Surl L. Nielsen
Joseph E. O'Donnell
Patrick E. O'Hara
Ronald K. Ohslund
James A. Olsen
Crockett H. Page
Dominick N. Pasquale, Jr.
Joseph Patlovich
Elliott Perlin
Gordon W. Philip
Michael J. Pickering
Robert L. Piscatelli
Harry Porter, Jr.
Raymond L. Portu
Curtis G. Power, Jr.
Pablo P. Prietto
John R. Pulskamp
Kenneth D. Rashid
Ralph E. Reed
James S. Robison
Donald K. Roeder
Albert K. Rogers
Thomas P. Rooney
John B. Runnels
Burton A. Sandok
Richard F. Schiliaci
Wilbur L. Secrist
Allen R. Shade
William C. Silberman
Wendell L. Skinner
Michael D. Smalkin
Thomas K. Smith
James L. Snyder
Frederick A. Spencer
Harlan D. Sponaugle
William W. Spore
Kevin C. Stanton
Stanley "D" Stier
David R. Stoop
Fred J. Stucker
Robert J. Swan
Ronald F. Swanger
Stanley J. Swierzewski, Jr.
Harry R. Tate
Fredric S. Taylor
James Z. Taylor
Richard L. Tenney
William C. Thacker
Robert L. Thompson
William F. Thompson
George B. Tipton
Gary M. Tolley
Kenneth W. Travis
William E. VanBuren
Robert L. Vance
John A. Vaughan
Frederick S. Vines
Christian E. vonDoepp
James Vorosmarti, Jr.
Don J. Wagoner
William H. Wanger
Robert S. West
Florent F. Westfall, Jr.

Cecil B. Wilson
Joseph T. Wilson, Jr.
Joseph H. Winston
David L. Wishart
Joseph L. Yon, Jr.
Gary W. Zelles

The following-named warrant officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be lieutenants

*Lindo E. Agosti
*Robert R. Baker
*Herbert W. Colt
*Joseph G. Dicarlo
*Robert H. Doud
*Ralph T. Goerner, Jr.
*Albert R. Hartgrove
*John A. Hughes, Jr.
*David A. Johnson
*William P. Johnson, Jr.
*Elmer D. Jungblut
*Arthur C. Lembeck
*James B. Lisenbee
*Jack E. Macklin
*Clarence B. Mohler
*Earl L. Nelsen
*Henry J. Niepsey
*James J. Olson
*William B. Pitzer
*Joseph R. Renard
*George J. Risko
*Henry J. Spangler
*William R. Stanberry
*Fred C. Ulmer, Jr.
*James W. Wilson

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

*Walter H. Clayton
*William J. Coats
*James R. Demo
*David J. Egan
*Harry R. Fallers, Jr.
*Eugene F. Meitl

To be ensigns

Arthur P. Brugman
*Clarence A. Dains
*Carl E. Erickson
*Ruddle L. Grice
*Don C. Harrison, Jr.
*Lee C. Jones
*Robert R. Kenion
*Melton L. Martin
*Robert F. Moran
*George E. Smith, Jr.
*James C. Thompson
*Charles E. Tiller

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

*Robert E. Anglin
*Max O. Baird
*James C. Bounds
*William R. Cole
*William P. Craft, Jr.
*Ralph J. Crocker
*Arthur B. Day
*Joseph G. Deiter
*Eugene E. Doty
*Oscar L. English
*Wilfred C. Gagne
*William H. Garing
*George W. Gilbert
*Etsel T. Guest
*James C. Hammock
*George R. Holt
*Alphonse B. Holtel
*Tom A. Lewis
*John H. Makinen
*Robert L. Marshall
*Arthur E. Mayle
*William C. McWhirter
*William P. Mesler
*Thomas H. Moss, Jr.
*Selby B. Riggs
*Luverne E. Vannieuwenhuise
*Aaron L. Wells
*Louis E. Wood

OPERATIONS

*Stewart G. Barbour
*John A. Woolley

SURFACE ORDNANCE

*Everett R. Bacon
*Kenneth A. Ballew
*Frederick F. Bennis
*Donald Blue
*Harvey H. Carpenter
*Robert F. Comstock
*Samuel Cox, Jr.
*Victor L. Ebersole
*Johann P. Feldscher
*Paul H. Fox
*John W. Hall
*Stanley J. Haydon
*Robert L. Jenkins
*Ted J. Lawrence
*Harold P. Lesh
*Edgar E. Lewis
*William A. Lewis
*Fredric C. Magee
*Edward M. Martin
*Wallace G. Murphy
*Walter S. Nickerson, Jr.
*Bernard B. Padget
*Roy E. Parker
*Oscar Peace
*Robert L. Petersen
*Charles S. Russell
*Rudolph J. Schuller
*Alfred Sokolowski
*Harold L. Still
*Thomas I. Suggs
*Henry E. Tullock
*Hubert R. Wendell
*Coleman L. White

CONTROL ORDNANCE

*William A. Berger, Jr.
*Harry D. Christensen
*John R. Clark
*John D. Hancock
*Cecil M. Harrison
*John R. Heckler
*William E. Long
*James D. Manning
*Frank B. Miller
*Eugene R. Thompson

UNDERWATER ORDNANCE

*David J. Andrews
*Leonard L. Auclair
*Raymond F. Foster
*Carroll E. Kinkel
*William C. Merrill
*Henry H. Merritt, Jr.
*John H. Pinning
*George R. Stark

ADMINISTRATION

*Robert E. Balcom
*John Borgens
*Donald J. Bovill
*Martin B. Bruns
*Paul R. Buck
*Edward T. Currie
*Charles H. Greene
*Leland L. Harris
*Grover C. Hinds, Jr.
*John E. Kehoe
*Charles J. Langello
*George A. Lundblade
*Rexford E. Means
*Richard D. Nagle, Jr.
*Frederick T. Pascucci
*Samuel C. Red
*Robert G. Rubenacker
*John F. Phelan
*Earl E. Smith
*Stephen C. Stamos
*Glenn E. Tripp
*Willie E. Tyrone
*Bruce F. Vorce
*Andy N. Whitwell
*Emory H. Wilson

ENGINEERING

*John A. Arnesen
*Samuel F. Bateman
*John L. Booth
*William L. Bovee
*Hugh H. Bush
*Russell C. Cammer
*Rufus R. Cannon
*Frederick P. Cerwonka
*Harry W. Clay
*Gene L. Cleven
*John R. Deboer
*Robert R. Dexter
*Richard M. Edwards
*William L. Edwards
*Oscar W. Ellis
*Elmer F. Falkenbach
*Harry Ferro
*Jack A. Garwood
*Russell W. Golding
*Harrison H. Green, Jr.
*Leroy R. Hagey, Jr.
*Perry E. Hanneman
*Harold J. Heath
*Benjamin O. Hemus, Jr.
*Ralph W. Holte
*Frederick B. Kauper
*Max A. Kenyon
*Andrew Logie
*Herman W. McCabe
*Rudolph Klecky
*Mitchell C. Kunkel
*John C. Locker
*Robert N. Long
*John J. Mastalski
*Robert Mayer
*Irwin R. McLain
*Robert C. Miller, Jr.
*Herschel H. Moore
*Orange J. Moore, Jr.
*Edward O. Neathammer
*Argonne F. Oliver
*Ivan Paulson
*Mack H. Phillips
*James D. Price
*Charles C. Ramet
*Joseph V. Ramsey
*Walter E. Reece
*Jay W. Rider
*Walter D. Robinson
*Carl Roller
*Walstein M. Rouse
*Howard L. Selden
*Henry J. Shotter
*Elliott B. Simpson
*Charles K. Sparrow
*Jesse G. Speer
*Garner Stephens
*Joseph A. Sumskis
*Malcolm E. Townsend
*Charles H. Vervalin
*Arthur C. VonBehren
*Andrew P. Weber
*Harry J. Wonderland
*Steven T. Zakrzewski
*Alfred P. Zaluski

HULL

*Cyrus E Alleman, Jr.
*Jesse D. Cannon
*Lawrence G. Engle
*Joseph O. Frazee
*William N. Garrett
*Earl Hendry
*David C. Holley
*Donzel B. Quinton
*Harold Tweed
*Bernard F. York

ELECTRICIAN

*Carl F. Allen
*Stanley C. Brown
*Chester L. Burns, Jr.
*John H. Dehnbostel
*Andrew Dranchak
*Everett R. Feldt
*Iver O. Hanson
*Andrew T. Malleck
*Emmett S. Mayne
*Charles A. Miles
*Walter L. Philips
*"J" "B" Sorrells
*Clarence D. Spencer
*Frederick M. Spinney
*Alexander C. Trouland, III
*Arthur K. Ullrich

ELECTRONICS

*Norbud L. Beck
*Norman K. Berry
*Dennis N. Bryant
*Jerome W. Christensen
*Chester C. Culp, Jr.
*John J. Furey
*Harold H. Gressman
*William O. Harper
*Louie E. Havens
*Jack E. Hayes
*Henry L. Jarvis
*Raymond D. Kester
*John R. King
*Robert E. Lafe
*Walter D. Laughlin
*John W. Magill
*Lawrence E. McGovern
*Don F. Noakes
*Warren M. Page
*Clarence Poland, Jr.
*Leverett E. Russell
*Albert O. Rustad
*Robert N. Schappacher
*George C. Tyler

CRYPTOLOGY

*Richard M. Allen
*William A. Cleveland
*Robert E. Curtin
*Lois Davidson
*Elmer H. Frantz, Jr.
*Irving W. Goss
*Douglas W. Harold
*Harold N. Harris
*Wilbur Hayes
*Charles K. Lindahl
*Andrew N. Michael
*Rexford G. Parr
*John M. Quesenberry
*Raymond A. Rundle
*Claude A. Sowada
*Earl W. Stewart
*William H. Tremblay
*Owen Unterberger
*Julian P. Wilder
*Douglas A. Williams

AVIATION OPERATIONS

*Jack E. L. Carleton
*Omer T. Culwell
*Manuel D. Hardman
*Roland J. Koch
*James D. Maloney
*Jack W. Spurling

PHOTOGRAPHY

*Morrow J. Allen
*William D. Christopher
*Cecil P. Free
*Donald R. Lawson
*John G. Morford
*Bernard Singer
*Richard K. Thomas

AEROLOGY

*Walter W. Babic
*George F. Buie, Jr.
*Clyde L. Margeson
*Lama D. McCleskey, Jr.
*Ralph A. Wright

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*Larry G. Barr
*Henry J. Beck
*Carl M. Berglund
*James D. Bradfield
*William R. Cantrell
*William C. Davis
*Morton N. Frey
*Vincent L. Hall
*Jackson L. Harris
*Floyd O. Holder
*Henry F. Holman
*Albert J. Leimer
*James O. Lence
*Theodore B. Levieux
*Howard A. MacDonald
*Fred H. Matthiesen, Jr.
*James F. McGregor
*Horace P. Mallory
*Franklin B. Owen
*Wallace B. Richards
*Grover C. Smelley
*Werner W. Thomas
*Alpine D. Weaver
*Richard E. Ziegler

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*Clifton R. Beckett
*Roy E. Blood
*Rosairo A. Caltabiano
*James H. Cooney
*John A. Debell
*Robert E. Forster
*William J. Gamble
*Chester A. Guerry
*George A. Hoffman
*Homer C. Lucas
*Robert W. McKamey
*Lawrence J. McMackin
*Henry L. Moore
*Glen G. Rasmussen
*George A. Regan
*Leonard S. Shope
*Alex M. Sills
*Clarence E. Sutherland

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

*Arthur T. Bennett
*Reid L. Bronson
*Francis H. Cohan
*Herman D. Coots
*Gorden H. Crawford
*Eugene C. Foerster
*James R. Goggin
*Edward H. Gibson
*Leo A. Goodman
*David A. Hathaway
*John E. Haygood
*Keith B. Hill
*William B. Hocutt
*Karl H. Kester
*Guy M. Larmore
*John E. Linder
*Alvin A. Littrell
*William E. Lundberg
*Charles F. O'Connell, Jr.
*John E. Price
*Maurice D. Price
*Robert W. Robida
*Roland M. Roy
*Edward N. Rutledge
*William C. Stead
*Merle E. Strunk
*Henry O. Thomas
*Litton E. Tye
*Harold S. Wicker
*Melvin E. Wyland
*Chester J. Youtkus

SUPPLY CORPS

*Donald L. Alford
*James F. Anderson
*Walter F. Ashe
*Stephen L. Boudreau
*William J. Butler, Jr.
*Meral J. Cathcart
*Charles J. Collins
*Louis P. Colston
*Jefferson B. Couch
*John R. Covington
*Willmont E. Egan
*Ernest J. Facto
*Francis V. Filipowicz
*Donald W. Floyd
*Normand E. Forcier
*Warren O. Freiwald
*Raymond E. Glatz
*David G. Gordon
*Ray J. Gordon
*Milford K. Greenway
*Otto A. Grunwald, Jr.
*Wilbert R. Harpool
*Floyd A. Hawkins
*Isadore A. Herbst
*William E. James
*Joseph R. Joyce
*John G. Kearney
*Harold D. Kellogg
*Harry T. Kelly
*William C. Kersten
*Joseph V. Kossler
*Dale E. Leeper
*John J. McHugh
*John J. Michura
*James L. O'Connell
*Ralph S. Osborn
*Walter A. Pannek
*Melvin F. Pickel
*Byron Reynolds
*Herschel E. Robinson
*Jerome D. Samelson
*James C. Sergent
*Ernest H. Smith
*Edward S. Stammer
*William Stearns
*Harold L. Stewart, Jr.

*Robert S. Stone
*Jack Teague
*Willis M. Tefft
*Howard L. Toms
*Johnnie H. Vinson
*Claude H. Waters
*Samuel A. White
*Hugo C. Wondergem
*Lavern C. Zilla

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Herman W. Filbry
*Ralph K. Jones
*Martin L. Sowle
*Ernest A. Sidney
*Franklin M. Solina
*Victor Young
*Milton W. Zeitzmann

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

*Buford B. Akridge
*Bryan L. Auwen
*Harold G. Bender
*William R. Blades
*Robert B. Companion
*Wilburn C. Finch
*Albert Francescone
*William C. Haney
*George E. Head
*Alfred E. Manson
*Joshua T. S. Johnston
*Grady F. Mesimer, Jr.
*Earl C. Price
*James F. Rankin
*Jack L. Reckler
*Roger C. Smallwood
*George W. Stewart, Jr.
*Charles E. Stith
*Louis M. Tew

SURFACE ORDNANCE

*Gene L. Bieber
*Bernard F. Brislenn
*Noah R. Carder
*John A. Cole, Jr.
*Charles F. Driscoll
*Willis A. Gunnels
*Clarence G. Hager, Jr.
*Robert C. Harding
*Donald G. Hauser
*Lendo G. Renegar
*Johnnie W. Scott
*Leroy P. Selberg
*Carl L. Snyder
*George B. Steere
*Theodore Theodorides
*Austin C. Tilghman
*Henry E. Vongenk, Jr.
*Donald M. Waymire

CONTROL ORDNANCE

*James C. Armstrong
*Jack L. Bell
*Burnett W. Carter
*Harold W. Echternach
*William Geil
*Richard P. Holland
*Russell J. Jensen
*David F. Katusha
*Walter D. Ouzts, Jr.
*Oscar H. Schmidt
*Clyde E. Slaughter

UNDERWATER ORDNANCE

*John W. Koerber
*John O'Brien
*Thomas H. Roberts

ADMINISTRATION

*Edward J. Baydowicz
*Eugene F. Burke
*Alexander D. Cameron
*Ralph W. Cavin
*Harold D. Christie
*Charles A. Clemmons, Jr.
*John T. Dilley
*Milton S. Doane
*Charles W. Everstine
*Melvin C. Freeman
*Charles W. A. Furlow
*James E. Garner, Jr.
*Robert C. Harreschou
*Herbert E. Huntley
*William B. Hutchison
*Leland L. Lydick
*Harold H. Merrill
*Arthur R. Murphy
*Floyd T. Samms
*Robert A. Strouts
*John W. Willis
*Bernard D. Woody
*Paul L. Woollard
*Theodore S. Zagorski

BANDMASTER

*Preston H. Turner

ENGINEERING

*Vincent Bayer
*Thomas R. Block
*Carl A. Bowlby
*Herbert P. Burkhart
*John N. Burton, Jr.
*Lawrence Brown
*Albert C. Cacioppo
*William C. Credille
*Joseph G. Dauber
*John P. Desposito
*Harold W. Dundore
*Harold E. Finsterwald
*James W. Flow
*Ernest O. Graves, Jr.
*Philip V. Hansen
*James R. Harris
*Joel R. Harris
*William O. Jones
*Elmer A. Ledbetter
*Harry G. Lewis
*Russel J. Lukey
*Thomas F. Marr
*Robert C. Mars
*Francis J. Minnock
*Glenn L. Minteer
*Bradford O. Mosher
*Bob J. Nolan
*Alex M. Nunnery, Jr.
*Alexander G. Patykula
*Lonnie R. Redwine, Jr.
*Gerard A. Sobieck
*David E. Taylor
*Beldon H. Trigg
*Bordeau J. Vassar
*"A" "D" Wall
*John M. Wilkerson
*Clifford H. Wood
*Fulton R. Wynn
*Curtis G. Zimmerman

HULL

*Robert F. Erni
*William C. Powell

ELECTRICIANS

*Carl O. Bialock, Jr.
*Benjamin C. Hibbs
*Jack M. Hutchison, Jr.
*Richard Kennedy
*Frederick F. Poyner

ELECTRONICS

*Allen D. Boyes
*Frederick W. Carnes
*Frank T. Chambers
*Wayne E. Conner
*Walter F. Corliss
*Arthur G. Crawford
*Maxie R. Cunningham
*James E. Dean
*Jack H. Dillich
*Arthur W. George
*Jack Hamer
*Roy P. Henderson
*Harley J. Higgins
*Willard D. Inman
*Virgil M. Klotzner
*Ralph R. Leight
*Eugene O. Loomis
*Onofrio Mammelli
*Chester A. Murphy
*John C. Phillips
*Charles D. Ransdell
*Chester J. Skjod
*Marvin H. Suttmann
*Merle E. Tree
*Emil J. Welk, Jr.

CRYPTOLOGY

*Dee Adkins
*Robert D. Arnold
*Robert C. Beverly
*Gordon I. Bower
*Raymond G. Boyer
*William T. Browne
*John F. Cain
*Charles B. Campbell
*Eugene Clark
*Paul W. Cooper
*Robert G. Creed
*Edward S. Custer
*Robert B. Depeyster
*Robert E. Dowd
*Thomas D. Elgen
*James S. Erven
*Robert R. Farrell
*Martin R. Fisher
*Harry R. Fuller, Jr.
*James K. Gordon
*William D. Hawley
*Floyd H. Heindl
*Orville C. Hinz
*Ephraim O. Jacques
*Richard S. Katzenberger
*Walter H. Keasler
*Edwin S. King
*Ralph M. Paul
*Marion L. Piper, Jr.
*Walter A. Rau
*Richard V. Richards
*William J. Sprich
*John R. Urquhart, Jr.
*Harry W. Weiss
*John M. Wolfe

AVIATION OPERATIONS

*Henry J. Bouchard
*Walter L. Broyles
*Robert M. Hylton
*William L. Kurtz
*Paul E. Montgomery
*Frank A. Shelton
*James A. Thomas

PHOTOGRAPHY

*Charles W. Clark
*William J. Collins
*Richard R. Conger
*Harold R. Conklin
*Keith G. Riley
*Moo T. Soohoo
*Walter L. White
*Mack Wright

AEROLOGY

*Robert E. Bass
*Frank L. Jones
*Francis J. McGayhey

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*Judson M. Brodie, Jr.
*William J. Uber

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*Henry T. Baker
*Joffre P. Baker
*Robert A. Begg
*Robert E. Biggs
*Richard E. Brandt
*Everett R. Buck
*Jack W. Chase
*Harold R. Cowden
*Wilson H. Crone, Jr.
*Robert M. Donaldson
*Richard W. Dristy
*Charles C. Finch
*Paul A. Hair
*Clarence H. Harris
*Alexander H. Hilliard
*Theodore A. Johnson
*Walter Kachuck
*John F. Kralemann
*Mack S. Lanham
*Victor McCauley
*Lee O. Parks, Jr.
*Lyman N. Price
*William P. Roberson
*William K. Snow
*Raymond E. Strong, Jr.
*George L. Thompson
*Frank M. Turner
*David L. Walsh
*Albert G. Wickham
*John H. Wieting
*John A. Willett, Jr.
*Robert M. Worster

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

*John O. Butterbaugh
*Royal B. Deland
*Russell W. Harper, Jr.
*William G. Hepburn
*Wesley I. Laroza, Jr.
*Harvey L. Pace, Jr.
*Leroy Peoples

SUPPLY CORPS

*Thomas E. Brooker
*Joe F. Buice
*Donald D. Conquest
*Richard M. Davis
*Robert B. Gage
*Raymond W. Hughes
*Leon A. Jackson
*Donald J. Johnson
*Raymond F. Kasch
*Dwayne E. Kauffman
*Quinton L. McElyea
*Billy L. McLeod
*Leo L. Monroe
*Henry J. Poltack
*John A. Rausch
*Duane T. Riplog
*Charles M. Shorrock
*Everett C. Smith
*Gerald H. Young

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Edward H. Bissen
*Melvin H. Harper
*David E. Landers
*Levon M. Majure
*George A. Marts
*Winfred C. Mathers
*George Moss
*Richard A. Nelson
*Charles L. Neugent
*George L. Sporhase
*John R. Stinson
*Willie C. Wall

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classifications indicated subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

DECK

*Douglas A. Belson
*Robert P. Bishop
*Joe L. Bradshaw
*Willie E. Haley
*Charles P. Helms
*Edward A. Lancaster
*William E. Marckfeld
*James S. Marshall
*Joseph A. Minton
*Peter Orlovich
*Frederick W. Reynolds, Jr.
*Edwin M. Rohr
*Joseph Welenc

OPERATIONS

*James T. Bartleson
*Donald H. Brown
*Edward D. Cowles
*John R. Giglio
*John F. Gilhuly
*Sidney E. Manning
*Charles W. Misuna
*Paul F. Noland
*Gerard H. Wirth

SURFACE ORDNANCE

*James C. Bladh
*Frederick W. Lawrence

CONTROL ORDNANCE

*Raymond H. Harper
*Walter R. McMeins
*Russell F. VanCuran

UNDERWATER ORDNANCE

*Walter W. Bissing
*Robert A. Dube
*Donald R. Hitchcock
*Michael M. Orbovich

ADMINISTRATION

*James L. Barrett
*Donald F. Boehnke
*Granvel L. Harrison
*Billie F. Lindsey
*Charles J. Maloney
*Thomas F. McNamara, Jr.
*William E. Pink
*Raymond A. Remillard
*Robert E. Rhodes
*Wyatt F. Straughn
*James M. Thompson

ENGINEERING

*Kenneth W. Fritsche
*John G. Grienenberger
*Jack M. Howard
*John L. Hughey
*Thomas V. Keener
*John J. Sharp
*Hamilton R. Sullivan

HULL

*Jack G. Bell

ELECTRICIAN

*Charles J. Wilkinson
*Joseph G. Zimmerman

ELECTRONICS

*Leo F. Carr
*Francis L. Cummings
*Ralph E. Evans
*John C. Ferrell
*Eugene M. Hall
*Stanley P. Lopes
*Glenn H. Mitchell
*Richard J. Nowatzki
*Richard W. Poole
*Thomas C. Reppert
*Obil J. Webb, Jr.

CRYPTOLOGY

*Wallace L. Bolczak
*Russell A. Davis
*William E. Denton
*Baxter D. Green, Jr.
*John B. King
*Daniel L. Mendel, Jr.
*John P. Morse
*Richard J. Winston

AVIATION OPERATIONS

*Middleton Eason
*Otis G. Kight
*Kenneth E. Rogers

PHOTOGRAPHY

*Oscar W. Arsenault
*William S. Juby, Jr.

AEROLOGY

*Glen N. Drummond, Jr.
*Durward B. Holden

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*James A. Correll
*"J" "L" McClain
*Leslie H. Ovre
*Charles Vedral, Jr.
*Thomas O. Williams, Jr.

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*William F. Bradshaw
*Michael A. Columbo, Jr.
*John W. Kiss
*Willis R. Plummer
*Harry S. Richard
*David N. Smith
*Robert W. Stickelberger

AVIATION MAINTENANCE

*James A. Bates
*Clifton H. Blank
*William F. Broderick
*Henry C. Butler
*John L. Chambers, Sr.
*Elmer A. Chipparoni
*Robert D. Duff
*John A. Edwards
*William W. Eggleston
*Leon E. Eichenlaub
*Sylvester Q. Grounds
*William W. Haycock
*Norman J. Howerton
*Milton T. Hurst
*Richard S. Liss
*Raymond C. Martin, Jr.
*Lester S. Owenby
*Berchman E. Rogero, Jr.
*Robert J. Surber
*Villard C. Sledge
*John W. Witten
*James C. Zapalac

SUPPLY CORPS

*Darry V. Baca
*Emory E. Bolton
*Clifford N. Brinkerhoff
*Marion H. Cox
*James G. Keller
*Charles I. T. McDowell
*Robert E. Naughton
*William E. Smith

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Merrill M. Cooper
*William M. Ivie, Jr.
*Theodore S. Myers
*Herbert E. Stangl

MARINE CORPS

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Franklin H. Baker
Frederic C. Barber
Richard I. Beattie, Jr.
Jack W. Becker
Robert C. Brooks
Robert T. Bruner
Frank A. Buethe
Keith E. Carlson
Roland W. Coleman
Wayne F. Coulter
Arthur G. Davis, Jr.
Thomas R. Dove
Bernard Dunn
Charles S. Forbes
Jose M. Gacusana
James W. Gresham
Jean A. Gruhler, Jr.
David W. Hardiman
Thomas F. Kane
Gregory W. Lee
Edward D. Long
Albert F. Lucas, Jr.
Edwin J. McCreedy
Robert W. Mitchell, Jr.
Roland E. Monette
Robert L. Padgett
Frank G. Pearce
William K. Poston, Jr.
Revedy C. Ray III
John F. Rivers
Allen J. Rose
Jerry C. Shirley
Troy T. Shirley
Richard P. Smith
Bayliss L. Spivey, Jr.
Robert B. Starke, Jr.
Kenneth T. Taylor
William R. Warren
Richard D. Weede
Francis L. Zappone, Jr.

The following named (Army Reserve Officers Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Peter E. Byrne

The following named (meritorious noncomissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*McLowery Elrod
*Arthur L. Houston, Jr.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers, Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James D. Care
Theodore L. Gatchel

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers, Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John O. Ahlquist
Robert C. Atchley
Robert A. Atkins
George F. Barbour
Harold T. Barraclough
Robert C. Barrier
Edwin Bean, Jr.
Frank A. Bendrick
Francis B. Brady
Philip O. Brady
Ronald F. Calta
Robert C. Cavin
Glenn S. Chambers
Jack A. Chapman
John W. Chowen
Ernest L. Cody, Jr.
Terence P. Connell
John E. Conrad, Jr.
Richard L. Costa
Jerome J. Crowley III
Roderic S. Daley
Marcel F. Dastugue III
Albert S. Daughtridge, Jr.
Peter G. Demetriades
Brinton N. Devilling
Ronald S. Dobies
James R. Doyle
James C. East
Walter J. Egger
Thomas H. Eubanks, Jr.
Peter Eustratiades
James W. Fagan
Ken Falkenberg
Thomas P. Fidelle
Jon T. Flint
Noret E. Flood, Jr.
John F. Follett
Bruce A. Fosnocht
Harley J. Francis, Jr.
James H. French
Dennis O. Gallagher
Dayne G. Gardner
James W. Garner
Terrance A. Gibbons
Julian H. Gignilliat
George K. Gill
Theodore A. Gleason
Ronald K. Golemon
David J. Gore
Allan A. Gorski
Benjamin W. Greene, Jr.
William R. Greenwood
Edgar H. Grubb
James G. Grunwaldt
John P. Halvorsen
John S. Hamlon
Glen L. Hampton
*Charles F. Harbison
Andrew D. Harris
Ernest A. Harris
John R. Hassler
Garner R. Hastings
Frank W. Hathcock
Roger C. Heigel
Kim F. Heller
Frederic P. Henderson, Jr.
Gordon E. Hendricks, Jr.
John D. Hess
Thomas E. Hewitt
John L. Hoerner
Claude M. Holifield, Jr.
Alwin G. Holland, Jr.
Sanders H. B. Hook
Robert A. Hopper
Charles T. Huckelbery
William C. Hunter
Edmund J. Irvine, Jr.
Harry E. Jennings, Jr.
Gerald W. Johnson
Philip L. Johnson
Richard E. Johnson
Newell M. Jones
Robert N. Kaff
Jon D. Keady
Francis T. Keough
William J. Kitchen
Ronald W. Kleiboeker
Eugene P. Kummeth
Rex M. Lasley
Walter J. Lawson
Martin J. Lenzini
Denton Lotz
John F. Luebben
Dennis E. Lunde
Robert S. Lynch
Hugh A. MacMullan III
Walter S. Mahle
Terrance B. Maloney
David M. Marchand
Joe A. Mauldin
Lynn B. Mayhan
William R. McAdams
Anthony J. McCarthy
Frederick A. McCaughn
John A. McDonald
James G. McDonough
John D. McGehe
George M. McGill
James H. McGinnis, Jr.
James P. McHenry
Robert A. McIndoe
Thomas K. McKeown
Colin A. P. McNease
Robert S. Miecznikowski
Michael J. Mullen
William F. Murphy, Jr.
Robert C. Nickel
Roy L. Nolen III
Jay R. Norman
Larry R. Ogle
Edward S. O'Keefe, Jr.
David R. Parker
Richard Parker
*Hugh P. Pate
Alva E. Peet, Jr.
Ronald E. Pettis
Fred A. Phelps
Jerry A. Philpott
Charles W. Porterfield
John R. Puckett
Charles C. Post
Herbert R. Quarles, Jr.
Jon N. Rachford
Bruce M. Rahm
George R. Rea
Peter M. Reber
Robert L. Rentto
Charles S. Robb II
Clifford E. Roberson
Frank W. Robert
Dayton L. Robinson, Jr.
John W. Robison
Richard W. Roll
Mike Roulier
William P. Rounds
James A. Saunders, Jr.
Donald L. Sayer
Delbert L. Schulzke
Alexander D. Segars, Jr.
Karl J. Seitz, Jr.
Jack T. Seymour
William C. Sharp
Charles H. Shelton
Lundie L. Sherretz
Wade B. Shrivalle, Jr.
Samuel R. Sims
Willard E. Slack
Todd M. Sloan
Frank W. Smith
Paul J. Smith, Jr.
Phillip R. Smith
Claude K. Snow
Denman T. Snow
Alexander J. Sobieski, Jr.
Frank R. Soderstrom
John A. Speicher
Robert E. Steward
Alan C. Stone
Eric R. Straumanis
Thomas C. Terrell
Francis A. Thomas
Sidney E. Thomas
Orville M. Thompson
Raymond S. Thompson III
Bruce D. Thoreson
John J. Toman
William E. Tripp, Jr.
Larry W. Trowbridge
Paul A. Vanderberg
Robert M. Varn
Robert L. Ventrees
Benny D. Wagner
John F. Walker III
David A. Warman
Robert F. Weaver, Jr.
Frederick L. Webber
Thomas A. White
Robert N. Whitesel
Walter H. Whitley
Frederick J. Wiele
Daniel B. Williams
John A. Williams
Duane A. Wills
Willis A. Wilson, Jr.
Benjamin T. Windham
Wilton K. Witzgall

*Indicates ad interim appointment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Public Education in a Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17, 1961

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the recess of the 86th Congress, I had the honor to deliver the principal address at the dedication of the new high school in my home town of Lexington, Va. I paid tribute on that occasion to Dr. William Henry Ruffner, who brought to reality Jefferson's dream of a broad public school system to enlighten the people on their duties and obligations as free citizens in our representative democracy.

Were Ruffner or Jefferson alive today, they, I am sure, would want our public school system also to enlighten our children to the dangers our civilization faces from the godless ideology of communism, which already has enslaved roughly half the world's people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks I made at the Lexington High School dedication on November 6, 1960.

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

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRACY

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the dedication of the Lexington High School, Lexington, Va., November 6, 1960)

The determination of our colonial ancestors to be free gave birth to a new nation dedicated to constitutional liberty. The cur-

rent threat of an alien, anti-God ideology to our liberty makes our choice next Tuesday of a national leader a momentous one, emphasizing the political wisdom of Thomas Jefferson, who said, "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it away from them, but to inform their discretion by education." The vital need of public education in a democracy was recognized by a Lexington man—Dr. William Henry Ruffner, who may properly be called the father of our present public-school system. That fact gives added pleasure to the privilege of joining with you in the dedication today of this new and splendid Lexington High School.

Lexington and Rockbridge County have been marked by their interest in education ever since they were settled in the middle of the 18th century.

Washington and Lee University had its origins in Augusta Academy, which was founded in 1749 in the adjoining county of Augusta; and in Liberty Hall, which was established in 1776 near Timber Ridge and moved to Mulberry Hill near Lexington in 1782. In 1796, Liberty Hall Academy received from George Washington the shares of stock in the James River Co. given him by the State, which he declined to accept for his own personal use, just as he had declined to receive any pay during the Revolution. The institution was soon named Washington Academy, and in 1813 it became Washington College. Washington and Lee University, like its neighbor in Lexington, the Virginia Military Institute, has had a long and honored history.

One of the most distinguished graduates of Washington College was Dr. William Henry Ruffner, who received from that college the bachelor of arts degree in 1842 and the master of arts degree in 1844. His father, incidentally, had been first a professor and then president of the college. Dr. Ruffner studied at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, and at Princeton. He was for 2 years chaplain and a student at the University of Virginia. From 1851 to 1870, Dr. Ruffner served as a preacher, in Philadelphia and in Virginia, and engaged in farming.

On March 2, 1870, Dr. Ruffner, on the basis of recommendations from Robert E. Lee and other prominent friends, became the first superintendent of public instruction of Virginia, a position created in the Virginia Constitution of 1870. He served in this position until 1882. In 1884 he was appointed the first president of the first Virginia normal school at Farmville. He served there until 1887, when he retired to Lexington and lived here until his death in 1908.

Dr. Ruffner's task as the first superintendent of public instruction of Virginia was a major undertaking. Nothing like it had ever been tried in Virginia.

Thomas Jefferson, in his proposed code of Virginia laws in 1776, devised a broad school system, with education available for all children in the early grades, secondary education for those children capable of benefiting from it, and colleges and a university for those who were qualified for advanced academic education. This proposal was never enacted. The Virginia school laws of 1796 and 1846 were permissive only; no counties established schools under the 1796 law, and only nine counties did so under the 1846 law. Except for the literary fund, established in 1810 for the support of free schools, and the University of Virginia founded in 1819, public education in Virginia, as distinguished from private academies and private colleges, consisted in 1870 largely of a few endowed elementary schools and a few neighborhood old field schools.

Within a month of his appointment, Dr. Ruffner submitted a report recommending a plan for the introduction of the public free school system. He drafted a bill embodying this proposal with the aid and advice of Prof. Jonathan B. Minor, of the University of Virginia. The bill, S.B. 150, was introduced by Col. Edmund Pendleton, representing Botetourt, Roanoke, Craig, and Giles Counties. Colonel Pendleton and Maj. Henderson M. Bell, who represented Augusta County, steered the bill through the two houses without weakening amendments. The bill became law on July 11, 1870.

Dr. Ruffner and the board of education then had to appoint about 1,400 county superintendents and district school trustees. The county superintendents had to take a census of school population, determine the number and location of schools, provide school accommodations, and appoint teachers. The first schools were opened in November. By the end of the school year, there were more than 2,900 schools, more than 3,000 teachers, and about 130,000 pupils.

Dr. Ruffner, in his report for 1876, recognized that statistics showed only quantity. They could not show the quality of education. He knew that the tremendous quantitative growth of the Virginia school system was only important if and to the extent that it provided good education. His principal concern was the merit and quality of the education provided.

Dr. Ruffner's reports show his understanding of the value of public education and its importance in a democracy. He shared the views of our former superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Davis Y. Paschall, who in a brilliant speech last month on "Education for Citizenship," said of the importance of education in a democracy: "This establishes a major responsibility for our educational system at all levels, and particularly in those studies that involve an understanding of the basic principles underlying our form of government and our economic way of life."

Public education is important in a democracy for many reasons. Democracy is based upon a belief in the dignity and rights of the individual. This belief necessarily leads to the belief that each individual should have a full opportunity to develop his abilities. Free public education is the only way to give this opportunity to all.

Our Biblical traditions are the source of our belief in the dignity and the rights of the individual. Our constitutional government and our free enterprise system spring from this same belief. These Biblical traditions and a deep concern for education were brought by the early settlers of Rockbridge County and Lexington from Scotland. Like the earliest settlers at Jamestown and the earliest settlers of New England, their first concern was a church, the next a school, to advance learning and perpetuate it for posterity. They did not want their children or their neighbors' children to grow up unable to read the Bible.

In a democracy, government represents the will of the people. This is so in a simple democracy like a Greek city state, or in a carefully contrived and delicately balanced democracy like ours, where the will of the people is expressed through their various representatives in the several branches of the State and Federal Governments. In either case, it is an axiom, as Jefferson wrote to Washington, that the people, whose will is to be carried out, must be informed and educated. "Such a responsibility," said Dr. Paschall, "recognizes that American destiny is already being molded in the classroom. The hope or the disillusionment; the glory or the despair; the statesman or the demagog; the patriot or the traitor; the sunshine of a republican form of government or the blackness of authoritarianism—are all there in potential."

The early settlers of Rockbridge County and Lexington knew the religious and ethical basis for public education. They knew the philosophic need for public education in a democracy. While primarily seeking religious freedom, those Scotch-Irish and Pennsylvania Dutch pioneers also knew that public education is essential to the fullest development of the economy of an area or a nation.

That fact was fully recognized by Dr. Ruffner when he said in 1870: "No money expended in public affairs brings back a larger or surer return of prosperity than the money expended in the education of the people."

In 1957, a legislative commission submitted a report to Governor Stanley and to the general assembly on ways to promote industrial development in Virginia. "Of all the normal functions of State and local governments," the commission said, "that may affect and influence industrial development favorably, or unfavorably, none is more important than education at both the secondary and college levels."

In 1959, the committee on education of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce made a study of education in Virginia. This showed a close relationship between educational and economic levels. The board of directors of the chamber were told that "It's just plain cash register arithmetic that more business at more profit can be done where more people are better educated."

Dr. Ruffner's reports contain many interesting discussions of the problems he faced and the principles he followed. I want to mention a few of these which are particularly relevant to our present situation, and to the new Lexington High School.

In creating and establishing the public school system in Virginia, Dr. Ruffner said he was guided by what he called "the established doctrine of liberal government, that power should be distributed, and should always be kept as near to the people as is consistent with the end to be subserved." The Rockbridge County School Board and the Lexington Town School Board have worked hard to reach a cooperative arrangement to build and operate this new high school, to serve the town of Lexington and the Buffalo, Kerrs' Creek, and central districts of the county. This kind of cooperation could not be compelled by law from Richmond. It could not be compelled by law from Washington. It could only grow out of the kind of local responsibility and interest that was advocated by Dr. Ruffner.

Dr. Ruffner knew the disadvantages of very small schools. "The community which divides its patronage among many disconnected little schools," he said in 1872, "is needlessly butchering the education of its children, and that, too, at double the cost of a good system."

Dr. Ruffner was speaking primarily of the one-room, one-teacher school. In the last 10 years, the Rockbridge County School Board has eliminated all of its one-, two-, and three-room elementary schools. It has built five new modern elementary schools, and expanded several others.

The disadvantages of the high school, too small to provide a satisfactory curriculum or satisfactory facilities, were pointed out by Dr. Conant, of Harvard, in 1959 in his report on "The American High School Today" and by the Spong Commission in its 1960 report to Governor Almond and the general assembly.

The new Lexington High School shows the benefits of increased size. Fifty-four units are offered by the new school, compared with 40½ offered last year. New courses in vocational agriculture, distributive education, and foreign languages are being offered, and the eighth grade program has expanded. There are now 25 teachers, compared to 17 last year. It is easy to see how these changes have improved the quality of education offered.

Dr. Ruffner was also aware of the problem of the comprehensive high school. Like Jefferson when he was drafting his 1776 bill, Dr. Ruffner knew that providing an equal opportunity for each student to get the education best suited to him did not mean giving every student the same education. "Is a true educational course," Dr. Ruffner asked in 1876, "one and the same for the boy who breaks off at the second book of Caesar to go to the plow or the plane, and the boy who goes on through college into law or theology?" Dr. Conant and the Spong Commission also were aware that the comprehensive high school must be capable of handling students with different needs and interests.

This new high school now offers a full college preparatory course with 25 units in such academic subjects as mathematics, science, Latin and French. It also offers vocational programs in 5 different fields, with a total of 21 units in those fields.

Dr. Ruffner's reports emphasize the importance of teachers and teaching. "School laws, taxes, officers, buildings, apparatus, books, grading," he said in 1872, "are all in vain without good teachers."

Dr. Ruffner instituted examinations for teachers. He set up teachers' institutes. He was responsible for the creation of the first State normal school at Farmville. I have no doubt that Dr. Ruffner would have approved the recommendations of the Spong Commission report for regular and advanced teacher training. The staff of the Lexington High School, I am sure, will take full advantage of the many opportunities for advanced training, such as the summer institutes in science and mathematics under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation, and the summer institutes in foreign languages under the National Defense Education Act.

Dr. Ruffner's emphasis on the importance of the teacher and those immediately in charge of education makes it appropriate to consider how fortunate Lexington has been in this respect. In 1897, only 3 years after the first public high school in Lexington had opened in what is now the Ruffner Elementary School building, Mr. Harrington Waddell, an honor graduate of Washington and Lee University and a charter member of the Washington and Lee Phi Beta Kappa Chapter, became the supervising principal of the Lexington public schools. Mr. Waddell served in this position until 1943, 46 years of constructive and effective leadership. During this period under his leadership and in subsequent years under the leadership of able and dedicated successors, the schools of Lexington and Rockbridge County have moved forward to provide increasingly effective education for their students.

Rockbridge County and the town of Lexington are reaching the final stages in a 10-year, $3½ million program of school improvement. This program has made it possible to improve the teaching in the elementary schools and in the new high schools.

These efforts make it clear that the people of Lexington and of Rockbridge County are still moved by the same deep concern for education which the first settlers of the area, and Thomas Jefferson, Robert E. Lee, and Dr. Ruffner all felt.

May the dedication of this new school building be characterized by a grateful acknowledgment of our indebtedness to school leaders of the past and a determination to carry forward their work in the spirit of George Washington, who said in his Farewell Address:

"Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

But this, my friends, is not enough. We have here in Lexington a priceless heritage handed down to us from God-fearing progenitors who has grasped the true meaning of education.

Our knowledge of the physical sciences has outstripped our knowledge of the social sciences and no one can with confidence predict that there will never be an all-out nuclear war. The sum of the matter is this: America may well face annihilation unless, in heart and purpose, we turn back to the fountainhead of all learning—the Father of Light who illuminated the understanding of our ancestors. In the immortal Book, taught in all of their schools, it is written:

"Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding"; for "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom. Her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Deuteronomy 8: 11: *Beware that thou forget not the Lord Thy God.*

Almighty God, upon whom we lean for strength and unto whom we look for hope, may we earnestly devote ourselves to the task of bringing unto all mankind the blessings of the more abundant life.

Grant that, living in an expanding universe, we may find our hearts enlarging with a greater concern for the welfare of humanity and a longing to help men and nations cultivate a friendly and fraternal relationship.

Show us how we may give consolation and courage to all who are tempted to surrender to futility, feeling that they are the victims of a conspiracy of wicked and untoward circumstances.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 16, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

PROCEEDINGS ON FRIDAY NEXT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

The Chair has had many inquiries by Members with reference to the proceedings on Friday next. The Chair has been requested to announce to the House that all Members who expect to go out on the official platform will assemble here in the Chamber of the House at 11 o'clock Friday morning. In order to go out on the official platform, it will be absolutely necessary for each Member to display his official ticket. The Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies feels that this is an entirely reasonable regulation.

If a Member does not have his ticket, it will be impossible for him to get his seat, for there will be no opportunity to join the procession after it leaves the House. There are no tickets available to ex-Members for this platform, inasmuch as the seating capacity is limited.

The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover, and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair is further requested to announce that no children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

So if you expect to be in the procession and get a seat on the platform, it will be wise for you to be in the Chamber at 11 a.m. on next Friday.

The Chair further announces that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will act as Speaker pro tempore on next Friday.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 17, 1961.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the Clerk's office at 12 o'clock meridian on January 17, 1961, and said to contain the message of the President of the United States with reference to the agreement with the Government of Italy, negotiated pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

AGREEMENT WITH GOVERNMENT OF ITALY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

To the Congress of the United States:

In December 1957 the heads of government of the nations members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization reached agreement in principle on the desirability of achieving the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive