

gram be considered, not called the Interstate System, but perhaps increases on the ABC system? What additional needs are there defensewise? These are all going to have to be looked at. Then you have the other interesting question of reimbursement of these

States for toll roads, this 2,400 miles I mentioned, that has already been inserted into the Interstate System, and those States have lost that mileage at the very outset of the program—are they entitled to bonus mileage? Are they entitled to any reimburse-

ment of any kind, and that is a very debatable question and hotly contested in Congress. But, I don't think that there is any question but what the highway program after 1972 is going to continue to go forward on a long-range planned basis.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 15, 1963)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Our Father God, at the day's beginning in this hushed and hallowed moment, we pause to proclaim our faith that Thy truth, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, is marching on to its coronation, even amid the perplexities and bafflements of these terrific days.

In the midst of events so colossal on the confused world's stage, O God, who sitteth above the flood of man's insanity, lift us into the only greatness we shall ever know by using us as the channels of Thy purpose and intent.

Solemnize us with the consciousness that beyond the appraisals of men, regarding what we do and say here, there falls upon our record the searching light of Thy judgment.

In these days of great peril and of critical decisions, as Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs face powers of darkness which have not Thee in awe, save us from all shortsighted policies whose reaping may bring a harvest of horror for our children's children. Give us to know clearly, and to follow faithfully, the things that belong to our peace, and to the peace of the whole world.

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

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

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

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.

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 58)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the President's message on mental health, sent to the Congress today, has been read

in the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the message be waived by the Senate, and that it be appropriately referred.

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

The message was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2439. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and provide certain services to the Boy Scouts of America for use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour for the introduction of

bills and the transaction of routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a request for a morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

OBJECTION TO MEETINGS OF SENATE COMMITTEES TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will object to any meetings of Senate committees during the day.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] to be an observer on the part of the Senate at the United Nations Cultural and Scientific Technological Conference, to be held in Geneva from February 4 to 20, 1963.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

MAP ON PRINCIPAL ELECTRIC FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1962

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the map "Principal Electric Facilities in the United States, 1962" (with an accompanying map); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT, 1926, TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS ON STATUS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of construction, alteration or acquisition of public buildings (with an accompanying report); 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:

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

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled and to the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to cope with the large volume of blowdown timber on the Pacific coast and to increase the cut from over-mature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as:

"1. Depreciated currency;
"2. Low stumpage rates;
"3. Noncompetitive bidding;
"4. Less costly and restrictive forest practices;

"5. Lower wage rates;
"6. High tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada;

"7. Low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; and

"8. A Cooperative Government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities; and

"Whereas there is no longer any justification by reason of a trade agreement between Canada and the United States for exempting Canadian lumber from the requirement that all foreign imports be marked; and

"Whereas without foreign imports being marked it is difficult to be certain that the Executive orders requiring the use of domestic lumber in certain installations will be obeyed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring), That the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an

equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President, Vice President, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 11th day of January 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 22d day of January 1963.

"W. E. DREVLON,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"ROBERT H. REMAKLUS,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas approximately two-thirds of the land area of the State of Idaho is federally owned and contains approximately 3¼ million acres set aside for primitive and proposed wilderness areas; and

"Whereas the economy of the State of Idaho is based upon its agriculture, forest products, mining, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and hydroelectric power; and

"Whereas excessively large and unmanageable primitive and wilderness designations are very restrictive to full utilization and do not permit the Federal Government to develop wisely the natural resources of the State of Idaho for the continuation and expansion of its natural resource industries; and

"Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State of Idaho is its growing tourist trade and wild life attractions; and

"Whereas the denial of ready access to these areas to the tourist trade, to the citizens of Idaho and to industry is detrimental to the State's present and future growth and prosperity; and

"Whereas water supply, game habitat, forest productivity and recreational opportunities for all are increased with good forest management in contrast to the very limited use of wilderness areas; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho needs the development of lands and its resources to create a broader base for its taxing units and to increase employment for its people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we are most respectfully opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive or wilderness type areas in the State of Idaho and respectfully request that all primitive and wilderness areas in the State of Idaho be re-

viewed and studied to determine and establish their greatest use potential; and be it further

"Resolved, That we oppose Federal enactment of legislation, and existing rule and regulation designating authority, embodying the principle of establishing excessive wilderness areas of limited use which would deny to the natural resources industries, including recreation, the right to develop wisely natural resources and would also be to the detriment of the people of the State of Idaho and the Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the present agencies administering all Federal lands do so with the view of developing the full multiple use of the lands to further the general welfare and the economy of the State of Idaho and the Nation; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the speaker of the house and to the president of the senate of the following States: Washington, Oregon, California, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and that these States are hereby urged to take similar action in their respective legislative bodies.

"Passed the house on the 21st day of January 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 24th day of January 1963.

"W. E. DREVLON,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"ROBERT H. REMAKLUS,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Wallace, Idaho, favoring the enactment of legislation to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign lumber manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the President of the United States of America, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America not to ban or permit the banning of the use of MH-30 in the culture of tobacco, or permit any reduction in the support price of tobacco treated with MH-30.

I ask that the concurrent resolution be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON TOBACCO

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the President of the United States of America, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America not to ban or permit the banning of the use of MH-30 in the culture of tobacco, or permit any reduction in the support price of tobacco treated with MH-30

Whereas farming is one of the major industries of South Carolina and tobacco is one of the most economically important parts of the agricultural industry and since it does not lend itself readily to mechanization it has received fewer benefits from the modern advances of technology and other phases of our economy; and

Whereas farmers and especially tobacco farmers have been hurt by the rising costs of production and especially by the rising cost of labor; and

Whereas the recent discovery and development of MH-30 has been a tremendous boon in the culture of tobacco; and

Whereas recent protests alleging that the use of MH-30 on tobacco has been injurious to the quality of tobacco, but no definite or positive proof that the use of MH-30 is in fact injurious to tobacco has been made available to farmers and tobacco growers; and

Whereas the banning of the use of MH-30 will adversely affect the economic status of tobacco farmers and will force many of them out of the industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America, the President of the United States of America, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America are hereby memorialized, requested, and urged not to ban or permit the banning of the use of MH-30 in the culture of tobacco or permit any reduction in the support price of tobacco treated with MH-30; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States of America, the U.S. Senators and Members of Congress from South Carolina, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa; and

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Mr. Pavlos G. Trovas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Ronald Whiting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 689. A bill for the relief of Lila Everts Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 690. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Pendells Salvaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 691. A bill to require public hearings to be held in each State affected by a proposed agency rule, if timely protest is filed with the agency after notice of the proposed rule is published in the Federal Register; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself and Mr. FONG):

S. 692. A bill to establish Federal agricultural services to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 693. A bill for the relief of Kurush Shahbaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 694. A bill to increase the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia; 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. CASE:

S. 695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angela Puccio;

S. 696. A bill for the relief of Ruth Cliver;

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Misako Moriya;

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Song Wan Young; and

S. 699. A bill for the relief of Gerardo Labay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Rosarinha Cardoso; and

S. 701. A bill for the relief of Anne B. Mason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 702. A bill relating to domestically produced fishery products; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 703. A bill to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 704. A bill for the relief of Richard Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 705. A bill for the relief of Andreas Galis;

S. 706. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Pires; and

S. 707. A bill for the relief of Angelo DeSimone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; and

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to residence require-

ments for voting in presidential elections; and

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. SCOTT):

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20-26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR COMMISSIONERS, SUPERINTENDENT, AND DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, late in the last session of Congress a dispute developed between the Senate and House conferees over an increase in the salary for the Superintendent of Schools, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, and the District of Columbia Commissioners.

The Senate conferees on the teachers' pay bill took the position that the salary increase adopted by the Senate for the School Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent was a modest one. We were convinced, however, that these two dedicated school officials whom I have just mentioned, would not want the teachers' salary bill lost in conference over any dispute with regard to their salary. The Senate receded from its position with the understanding that the matter would be seriously considered in this session of Congress.

On January 17, 1963, Representative McMILLAN, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, introduced a bill, H.R. 1931, which is similar to the bill I am introducing today. My bill increases the salary of the two school officials higher than provided for in H.R. 1931. Both measures make the increase retroactive for the District of Columbia Commissioners, the Superintendent of Schools, and Assistant Superintendent of Schools to the effective date of the salary increase bill for teachers which was January 2, 1963.

Thus, Mr. President, I introduce the salary increase bill today because I believe that it is completely justified and also because it keeps faith with the understanding which was reached by the Senate and House conferees last year when the matter was under consideration.

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

The bill (S. 694) to increase the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of

Schools of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FLYING OF THE FLAG OVER THE HULK OF THE U.S.S. "UTAH"

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill directing the Secretary of the Navy to have a flagpole erected over the hulk of the U.S.S. *Utah*, which lies half-submerged off Ford Island at Pearl Harbor, and to direct that the colors be raised and lowered each day in tribute to the 54 men and officers who lie entombed there as a result of Japanese military action on December 7, 1941. I have asked the Secretary of the Navy to take administrative action in this respect, and he has advised me that congressional authorization will be necessary because the U.S.S. *Utah* had been decommissioned when attacked.

Mr. President, many glowing tributes have been written these past 21 years to the brave men who died in the Japanese sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Particularly have there been numerous tributes to the men who went down on the U.S.S. *Arizona*—1,102 of them—and who are still entombed in her charred hulk. These men were the first of our World War II dead—the first of our many heroes—and it was a proud and grateful nation which erected a memorial over the *Arizona*, and directed that the colors should be flown there every day.

But, until this past December, few people realized that the same recognition had not been given to the 54 other officers and men who also lost their lives in that infamous attack on Pearl Harbor—the 54 officers and men who lie entombed in the half-submerged hulk of the U.S.S. *Utah*.

Although I knew of the entombed men and had seen the *Utah* lying half-submerged in Pearl Harbor, and although I felt that something should be done to recognize and honor the dead aboard the *Utah*, I did not get around to doing something until the Navy Times, and its able editor, Mr. Bill Kreh, called the forgotten 54 of the U.S.S. *Utah* to the attention of the American people, and again to my attention. At once I went again to Pearl Harbor to see the U.S.S. *Utah* for myself and found its great hulk still lying awash less than a mile from the *Arizona* which lies beneath its magnificent memorial. But the *Utah* flew no flag and on it was only a small marker in memory of its heroic dead. At once I agreed to head the crusade to give the men of the *Utah* the recognition of our flag along with the other Pearl Harbor dead—and it is a privilege to introduce a bill to do so today.

It is one of the ironies of history that the *Utah* was an unarmed target ship on Pearl Harbor Day. It had been decommissioned and its great guns removed. But the *Utah* still had the contour and the battleship gray of a massive

warship, and the Japanese targeted on her just as fiercely as on the other battleships lying at anchor. Scores of bombs and torpedoes were sent her way, bombs and torpedoes which could have been used to sink other ships which were later used to help bring the Japanese Empire to its knees. But the U.S.S. *Utah* took the bombs instead, and its crew died for their country just as surely as the men on the fully armored ships.

By special dispensation, a flag flies over the sunken *Arizona*, and properly so. But the Navy insists that this flag is for all of the Pearl Harbor dead. This implies that if a flag were flown also over the *Utah* it would detract from the flag and the memorial over the *Arizona*. I do not agree. The *Utah* is on the opposite side of Ford Island out of view of the *Arizona*. It is a separate ship in a separate location. Moreover, there are separate flags flying over other Pearl Harbor dead who are buried in the land cemeteries nearby—and the *Utah* is just as much a military cemetery as any plot of ground containing graves and the granite markers and flowers. Flying the flag over the *Utah*, and raising and lowering it each day, would give it the similar recognition which its men deserve.

Even though the *Utah* spent her last days as a target ship, this does not detract from her proud history. Commissioned in 1911, she was once the best of the U.S. Navy. During World War I she served as a convoy ship, and in 1918 was one of the escort vessels which guarded President Wilson on his way to Europe. In the early 1920's the *Utah* served as the flagship of the Atlantic Fleet. And in 1928, she carried President Hoover home from a good-will trip to South America. In 1930, the *Utah* was converted to a target ship, radio controlled, which meant she could be operated by radio from another command ship. During mock battles the *Utah* even laid down her own smokescreen. The people of Utah were proud of her during every one of her years of service to this country.

Since the articles written by Bill Kreh have appeared in the Navy Times, and in Parade magazine, I have received thousands of letters, post cards, petitions, notes, and memos from all parts of the country supporting me in my efforts to commemorate the dead of the U.S.S. *Utah*. They have come from people in all walks of life—from Navy men of all ranks, from people who were at Pearl Harbor on that fateful day, and from people who have visited there since, and from a cross section of housewives, business executives, schoolchildren, and their teachers, retired citizens, and young people—in groups and as individuals.

A woman in Hialeah, Fla., Miss Doris L. Draper, has written a song dedicated to the U.S.S. *Utah*, and sent it to me. Any number of Americans have dedicated poetry and blank verse to the men of the *Utah*. A young lady suggested a commemorative stamp. There has been a great national outpouring of sympathy and support for my efforts.

One letter which I received recently was from Mr. F. E. Foster, executive vice president of the American Monument Association, at Olean, N.Y. It makes a dignified and restrained offer of a suitable granite memorial to be placed aboard the *Utah*. The association would finance designing, fabrication, furnishing the material, and transporting and erecting the memorial on the deck of the *Utah*. I shall recommend that this generous offer be considered, and that the names of the men who lie entombed in the *Utah* be engraved upon it. This is a roster of them as I received it from the Department of the Navy:

OFFICERS KILLED ON U.S.S. "UTAH" DECEMBER 7, 1941

Rudolph P. Bielka, lieutenant commander.
John E. Black, lieutenant, junior grade.
Herold A. Harveson, lieutenant junior grade.
David W. Jackson, ensign.
John G. Little III, lieutenant junior grade.
Charles O. Michael, lieutenant commander.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL KILLED ON U.S.S. "UTAH" DECEMBER 7, 1941

S2c. William D. Arbuckle.
F3c. Joseph Barta.
S1c. Virgil C. Bicham.
F1c. John T. Blackburn.
S2c. Pallas F. Brown.
F3c. William F. Brunner.
OC2. Feliciano T. Bugarin.
S2c. George Chestnutt, Jr.
S2c. Lloyd D. Clippard.
F1c. Joseph U. Conner.
F1c. John R. Crain.
S1c. David L. Crossett.
F2c. Billy R. Davis.
S2c. Leroy Dennis.
SM1. Douglas R. Dieckhoff.
S2c. William H. Dosser.
S1c. Vernon J. Eldsvig.
QM1c. Melvyn A. Gandre.
BM2c. Kenneth M. Gift.
S2c. Charles N. Gregoire.
S2c. Clifford D. Hill.
Bkr1c. Emery L. Houde.
S1c. Leroy H. Jones.
SC2c. William A. Juedas.
Y3c. John L. Kaelin.
GM3c. Eric T. Kampmeyer.
F1c. Joseph N. Karabon.
S1c. William H. Kent.
GM3c. George W. La Rue.
S2c. Kenneth L. Lynch.
S2c. William E. Marshall, Jr.
EM3c. Rudolph M. Martinez.
S2c. Marvin E. Miller.
S2c. Donald C. Norman.
F2c. Orris N. Norman.
EM2c. Edwin N. Odgaard.
CSK(PA). Elmer A. Parker.
SC3c. Forrest H. Perry.
S1c. James W. Phillips.
MM1c. Walter H. Ponder.
SF3c. Frank E. Reed.
S1c. Ralph E. Scott.
F1c. Henson T. Shouse.
SM1c. George R. Smith.
S2c. Robert D. Smith.
S2c. Joseph B. Sousley.
F3c. Gerald V. Strinz.
CWT(PA). Peter Tomich.
F3c. Elmer H. Ulrich.
F3c. Michael W. Villa.
FC1c. Vernard O. Wetrick.
F1c. Glenn Albert White.

Although I have received many petitions and letters from groups of adults and from members of service organizations, chambers of commerce, and other

citizens groups, offering support for my efforts in behalf of the *Utah*, I have been most touched, I believe, by the many petitions and letters I have received from schoolchildren and young people. Almost every child in the sixth grade at Vernal, Utah, has written, each expressing in the student's characteristic way his patriotism and love of his State and country.

One of them, Rosa Rae Millican, 11 years old, gravely pointed out:

I think that the colors should at least be flown over the *Utah*, because we respect our State as much as the people of Arizona respect their State.

Ken Gordon, a ninth-grader at the Jonas E. Salk, Jr., High School in Levittown, N.Y., sent me a petition, 39 pages long, and signed by 1,300 students and teachers. Other schools which have sent petitions, or individually written letters from one or more classes include: Fairless Senior High, Navarre, Ohio; third grade, Oak Forest Elementary School, Houston, Tex.; St. Mary's School, Taylor, Tex.; sixth grade, Russellville School, Russellville, Tenn.; Corbett Public Schools, Corbett, Oreg.; Boyceville Junior High, Boyceville, Wis.; fifth grade, Columbus Avenue School, Freeport, N.Y.; Boyerton Area Schools, Pennsylvania; Olive Branch Junior High, New Carlisle, Ohio; Dixie Hollis High School, Clearwater, Fla.; and the eighth grade, Eighth Ward Elementary School, Clinton, La.

College and university students have been equally as active. I have received letters or petitions from representatives of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.; McNeese State College, Lake Charles, La.; University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak.; State University College at Brockport, N.Y.; Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa; University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Mercer University, Macon, Ga.; Radford College, Radford, Va.; and the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah.

It is a temptation to ask that all of the splendid individually written letters I have received be printed—they are a heart-warming demonstration of patriotism and fairmindedness of the American people. Since this, of course, is not practical, I ask unanimous consent that a few of these letters—a cross section of opinion and comment—be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, December 7, 1963, will be the 22d anniversary of the sinking of the *Utah* in the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Long before that anniversary date it is my hope that the colors of our country will fly proudly from that great ship to honor the men still aboard who gave their last full measure of devotion that this Nation of free men be not driven to slavery and submission. I ask early and favorable action on this bill. I ask not for an elaborate or costly memorial structure. I ask

only for a simple standard from which our national emblem will fly daily for all to see and to remember and to honor. I ask only the recognition which is lovingly given to honor our military dead wherever they lie this world over.

Other Senators may wish to join me as cosponsors. I ask that the bill lie at the desk for 1 week for the addition of names of cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 703) to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXHIBIT 1

QUOTATIONS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED

Mr. Reuben John Eichman, Springfield, Ohio: "I was one of the fortunate members of the crew aboard the U.S.S. *Utah* that survived the Japanese attack December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor. A great deal of appreciation to you for taking up the battle to see these men are given an honor they most certainly deserve. I have made an appeal to the citizens of Springfield, Ohio, to also make an appeal to the U.S. Government to do what is possible for the U.S.S. *Utah* and her crew that are still entombed aboard."

Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Villa, Long Island, N.Y.: "As the parents of Michael Villa, one of the 54 dead of the complement of the U.S.S. *Utah* at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, I believe that it is a shame that their deaths have not been memorialized by the flying of the U.S. flag and appropriate tablet with their names at the location of the remains of said ship at Pearl Harbor. I and my wife Anna wholeheartedly support your movement."

Pasquale J. Siracusa, Newark, N.J.: "I am in firm agreement with you and your cause. The honor of the 54 men who lost their lives on the *Utah* should at least be repaid by the honor of the flag they died for. It is true that the *Arizona* had most of her men aboard and the quantity of lives lost was great, but the individual still remains prominent in this case. The 1,102 total lost on the *Arizona* is nothing other than 1,102 individuals as are the *Utah's* 54. How could anyone have such fantastic ideas as to think that the colors over the *Utah* would diminish the image of the *Arizona* in the public mind? I say let the public decide for themselves whether or not these lonely 54 should go unnoticed. This image they speak of would be amplified rather than diminished. We should never let them forget that more ships than the *Arizona* went down, and that more men than the *Arizona's* were lost. The officials say the *Arizona* memorial is a tribute to all the men whose lives were lost at Pearl Harbor. But this is an indirect tribute, these are not unknown sailors, their names are on file. There is no greater honor than to be buried by the flag, excepting to die for it. I join you in your fight."

Richard M. Davis, Chicago, Ill.: "I have never been to your State of Utah, Senator; I am from Framingham, Mass., but the difference means nothing. We, as people, should be thankful to these 54 men of the U.S.S. *Utah*, as well as the U.S.S. *Arizona*. Their undying devotion to duty, let alone their country, should not be and cannot go

unrewarded. If I can help in any way possible, I will do so with honor."

Don Mack Dalton, attorney, American Fork, Utah: "Again you are right and I congratulate you for your honest endeavor to honor the 54 boys entombed in the battleship *Utah*. To some this may appear to be a little thing—not noticed, but to you it is showing big. Fifty-four men in a steel cemetery, under water, without appropriate honor, seems to me to be a revolting thing. We are proud, of course, that the *Arizona* with its 1,102 men is honored, but honor should not be so insincere that it will not reach less than a mile away."

Andrew A. Lazzara, Chicago, Ill.: "The *Utah* has been denied any sort of memorial because of rules and regulations. If we deny these brave men we make all our war memorials only hollow shells of what they should be, to deny a handful is to deny all."

Eugene W. Metcalf, San Marino, Calif.: "Twenty-one years ago I was an officer aboard the U.S.S. *Tucker* (DD374) moored just forward of the U.S.S. *Utah*. I had classmates on board and regret the memory of watching her capsize. In 1951, while passing the *Utah*, I was upset to see that no recognition had, as of that date, been given to the ship or its personnel, and advised the Navy League, Navy Department, and friends in the service regarding my feelings. If there is anything I may do to further assist you in your efforts, I would be only too happy to do so."

Arthur C. MacCollum, Metuchen, N.J.: "As a young apprentice machinist I worked on many parts of the *Salt Lake City* and the *Utah* at Camden, N.J., in the American Brown Boveris Corp., now known as the New York Shipbuilding Co. She was a fine cruiser and carried our standards as long as they commissioned her and most assuredly must have recommissioned her during the lead-up to World War II. If she was good enough to carry them then she most certainly should carry them now, holding our dead entombed irrespective of any adding or detracting from the *Arizona*. You know, we are not a class-distinction nation, despite what many here in the free living world would like to perpetuate to their own advantage, so I say raise a flag by all means over that warship and honor the dead in their country's service, not to the detriment of the *Arizona* but as a sister ship with buddies aboard and brothers also."

Edward R. O'Brien, Vienna, Va.: "My son, Kevin O'Brien, saw Mr. Kreh's article in the Washington Post of December 2. He felt that his Boy Scout troop could do something toward furthering your proposal. Kevin, therefore, went before the troop last night and read the article to the boys. When he finished, each patrol in turn, Apaches, Flaming Arrows, Fox, Rattlesnake, Stag, and Wolf, came forward and signed the attached letter. I have added my name to the list, as did our scoutmaster, James Vawter. I'm sure my boyhood friend will not feel any less honored than now should 54 more of his Navy buddies be afforded some proper tribute. My friend still serves aboard the U.S.S. *Arizona* as one of her eternal crew. With the best of luck and success in your bid to provide a fitting memorial."

Mrs. J. A. Olivias, Crestline, Calif.: "Were I the mother of one of the 54 men on board the *Utah*, I would be crushed to think my dead son, who also gave his life for his country, lay so forgotten. My prayers are with you in this cause."

Richard F. Salmon, Oak Forest, Ill.: "To join you in your drive to put a flag on the *Utah*, I put the attached paper on the bulletin board in our truck shop at Cummins, Ill., Engine Sales Corp. in Chicago. You will note there are signatures of our customers

from other States who have helped in the cause."

Barry Sagendorf, Whippany, N.J.: "It is my sincere hope, Senator, that the Representatives in Congress from my State shall support you in your justified campaign to raise this Nation's emblem over the masthead of the *Utah* as a fitting memorial to those that lie within her hulk. May I wish you overwhelming success in your efforts."

Mrs. Frank Radin, Amityville, N.Y.: "My husband and I were quite moved by the article in the Parade section of our newspaper. My husband served in the Korean war and received the Bronze Star. He is also a member of the DAV. We both feel that those men who died aboard the *Utah* deserve some kind of tribute. The American flag flies over the remains of the men killed in all parts of the world. It is only fitting and proper that these men should have their country's flag fly over their burial ground."

Dale T. Bradford, Fayetteville, Ark.: "This is to cast my vote for honoring in an appropriate manner the 54 officers and men that died on the U.S.S. *Utah* December 7, 1941. As many of us know, the U.S.S. *Utah* was serving as a target ship during the time of Pearl Harbor. This, however, does not detract or lessen the glory of the service of this great ship, officers, and men. I was stationed on Ford Island and in full view of the U.S.S. *Utah*, U.S.S. *Arizona*, U.S.S. *California*, U.S.S. *Tennessee*, U.S.S. *Maryland*, U.S.S. *Oklahoma*, U.S.S. *Pennsylvania*, and U.S.S. *Nevada*; all except the *Pennsylvania* were tied up alongside of Ford Island. The *Pennsylvania* was in drydock on December 7. It would seem to me that the daily raising and lowering of the colors on the U.S.S. *Utah* would be the least that our country could do to remember the men that lost their lives on December 7, 1941. Wishing you success in your efforts to accomplish your mission in this regard."

Mrs. W. L. Sederquist, Modesto, Calif.: "I am sure your thoughts and campaign to have our Stars and Stripes raised over the remains of the battleship *Utah* are echoed by every red-blooded American who has or has not seen Pearl Harbor with the remains of those two ill-fated battleships. My husband and I had these strong thoughts as we took the harbor cruise and felt the need of such a memorial for both ships."

James B. Herd, St. Louis, Mo.: "It is unthinkable to me that a memorial should not be erected for any Americans who died in the service of their country as did the men of the *Utah*. It certainly is not too much to request that the names of the *Utah's* crew be appropriately commemorated and that the flag for which they willingly died be flown above them. I join you in your effort to rectify this disgrace."

Mrs. Douglas Holman, La Grande, Oreg.: "My whole family agrees that a banner of a grateful nation should fly over the bodies of these 54, too long neglected, heroes of the 'day of infamy.' They have, indeed, waited too long for the honor they deserve."

Mrs. Mary Anne Tohtz, Midland Park, N.J.: "I would very much like to endorse the idea of raising the U.S. flag over the *Utah*. One of the young men entombed there was a very close friend of mine, and his death was the first personal tragedy in my then young life. I believe, too, that there should be some kind of memorial plaque with the names of the men listed. The young man referred to above was William D. Arbuckle. So far as I know there is no one of his family left. His mother died within a short time after the Pearl Harbor tragedy."

Walter S. Hayes, Perrysburg, Ohio: "As an ensign during the fall of 1918 I served on the Big U while she was stationed in Bantry Bay, Ireland. I am most interested in this proposition of yours and if I can

be of service in this undertaking, do not hesitate to call on me. One of my prize possessions is a picture of the entire crew of the *Utah* taken during the summer of 1918 just prior to our departure for Bantry Bay. I also have a couple of copies of the Big U, a publication put out by the crew during this period."

Thomas M. Shea, Wendover, Utah: "Please accept the signatures of both my wife and myself as we have always believed there should have been a flag or some sort of memorial for the U.S.S. *Utah*. Maybe the *Utah* was not in commission at the time, but the men were, and we believe that they should be honored as you have suggested. How well I know that these men should be honored, as I worked on Ford Island and worked on raising the *Oklahoma* and trying to raise the *Utah*."

Mr. and Mrs. Carroll J. Meador, Moab, Utah: "Yes, we certainly do think a flag should be raised over *Utah's* war dead, in the battleship *Utah*. It's such a little thing to do for those who gave their lives for their country."

Richard Blackburn Black, rear admiral, U.S. Naval Reserve (retired), Woodbridge, Va.:

"It will interest you to note that Mrs. Black saw one of the torpedoes released which struck the *Utah*. We were awakened by the first detonations of the attack in our home at Pearl City on the east side of Pearl City Peninsula. During our drive to the submarine base gate where she and my son dropped me on my way to my battle station on Ford Island, Mrs. Black said, 'While you were in the house dressing and I was in the front yard I saw something fall off of one of the planes just outside the mullet-pond wall in front of the house.' When I asked her what sort of thing fell off, she said, 'I don't know, but it was almost as large as the plane and it went through the water.' Later, checking the time of certain events, we were sure that this was a torpedo destined to strike *Utah*. A few minutes later, as we passed along the fence just outside the sub base gate we saw *Arizona* exploding and burning and *Oklahoma* on her side just going over. Still later, from my station on Ford Island, I saw *Nevada* with her Sunday flag at her staff and all her antiaircraft guns blazing steaming at high speed around Ford Island to her rendezvous with the bombs and torpedoes which caused her to beach near the harbor entrance. I never hear 'The Star-Spangled Banner' but I see that brave sight again. Allow me to wish you and the State of Utah the greatest success in this worthy mission."

Robert W. Nolte, Urbana, Ohio:

"My letter to you sir, will be of little value, but it makes me, and I know it will also make thousands of other Americans who will read the story of the 'Neglected Heroes,' in Parade magazine, a little ashamed that the United States has not for 21 years bestowed at least the same honor as we gave the U.S.S. *Arizona* and her crew, on their 'day of infamy.' My sincerest regards toward your fine proposal to have Old Glory forever fly over the battleship *Utah* and her last crew."

Michael Nemeoh, Litchfield, Ill.:

"My name is Michael Nemeoh. I'm 15 years old. I live in Litchfield, Ill. I say your idea is very good about raising the flag above the U.S.S. *Utah*. Myself, I would like to be the one to raise the flag, but I know this is impossible."

Blanche M. Justesen, Manti, Utah: "My son, Maj. Wayne I. Justesen, retired, was 12 hours late entering Pearl Harbor on that fateful day. He could have been one of those who never came back. By all means, do all in your power to see that honor is paid those

brave men who died on the battleship *Utah*. It's tragic, but thousands of Utahans do not know of this neglect."

Alan Wolfley, Detroit, Mich.: "I very definitely second and commend your efforts to make the heroic battleship *Utah*, now lying at Pearl Harbor, all but forgotten, a national shrine. If it takes an elaborate memorial, I am for that and will gladly donate to a private citizen fund. If it takes merely the flying of our flag over the remains, by all means let's do it."

Lt. David J. Wright, U.S. Navy, FPO, San Francisco, Calif.: "I support your contention to honor U.S.S. *Utah*, lying awash in Pearl Harbor. To see her so is a sad sight, indeed, but a grim and almost necessary reminder, along with *Arizona*, of the continuing price and awareness required to maintain our heritage. To leave her lying in the mud, unhonored, does not do us credit, sir."

Cpl. Bruce D. McPhee, U.S. Marine Corps, Port-au-Prince, Haiti: "I am writing to let you know that I stand behind you 100 percent in your endeavor. As a member of the naval service, one might think me prejudiced, but, I believe that regardless of the number of national shrines, and the proximity of their locations, one will not detract from the others."

Burrell M. Ketchersid, minister, Chattanooga, Tenn.: "I agree with you that the U.S. flag should fly over the remains of the battleship *Utah* and the 54 neglected heroes entombed therein. It seems rather strange that this matter has so long been neglected, and I sincerely trust that your efforts will be rewarded with success as you seek to have this wrong righted."

Mrs. George B. Modell, Chicago, Ill.: "This is to inform you that we, the Gold Star Mothers of Illinois, do agree with you that at least a flag be raised over the *Utah* and this should have been done long ago."

James H. Melton, McNeese State College, Lake Charles, La.: "I agree also that the Stars and Stripes should fly over the sunken battleship, the U.S.S. *Utah*. Is the price of a simple flagpole too great for a Nation such as ours that spends millions on foreign aid? We should not forget our dead."

John J. Williamson, Alameda, Calif.: "I believe that this is a noble gesture on your part to honor these heroes. I have enclosed some poetic prose that will explain my feelings in this matter. Please feel free to use it in any way you desire. I hope it will be of help in accomplishing the desired project."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two joint resolutions, each of which contains a proposed constitutional amendment. I am pleased that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who is one of the most active supporters of constitutional reform, has joined with me as cosponsor of these measures.

The purpose of these proposed amendments is to correct a situation which now exists whereby the executive or legislative branch of our Government might be paralyzed, either by the inability of some future President to discharge the duties of his office, or by the death of a large number of the Members of the House of Representatives as a result of a national disaster.

On January 23, 1963, I introduced as Senate Joint Resolution 28 a proposed

constitutional amendment which would place in the President's Cabinet the power of deciding the beginning and termination of any Presidential inability. This is essentially the solution which Attorney General Rogers and Attorney General Brownell advanced during the Eisenhower administration. It would remove in advance any uncertainties as to what procedure would be followed in case one of our Presidents should become disabled.

I feel that the best plan is to adopt an amendment which would set out in detail exactly what should be done if a President should become unable to discharge his duties. But if we are unable to pass an amendment which deals with the problem in detail, I favor in the alternative a constitutional amendment which would give Congress the power to deal with such a situation, so that the executive branch of government would not be hopelessly paralyzed in the event of a prolonged inability of one of our Presidents to discharge his duties.

Therefore, I am today introducing, as an alternative to Senate Joint Resolution 28, a separate joint resolution which has the support of the American Bar Association, the New York State Bar Association and the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. It would merely authorize Congress by legislation to provide a method for determining the commencement and termination of an inability of the President. As our Constitution stands now, no individual or governmental body has this authority, and the result is a potentially dangerous situation, which should be eliminated by means of an appropriate amendment to the Constitution.

I am also reintroducing a joint resolution which has passed the Senate on three different occasions. It would authorize State Governors to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives temporarily whenever the total number of vacancies in the House exceeds one-third of its total membership. This might result, for example, from a nuclear attack.

During the first 161 years following the ratification of our Constitution, it was unimportant that no provision was made for the appointment of temporary Members of the House of Representatives to fill vacancies created by the death of Members. There was always ample time to hold special elections to fill these vacancies.

However, since September 1949, when Soviet Russia detonated its first nuclear bomb, the grim possibility has always existed that a national disaster might cause the death of a third or more of the Members of the House of Representatives, and Congress would be unable to act for many months, while special elections were being held.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] in the introduction of several proposed constitutional amendments dealing with the operations of the Government and eligibility for voting.

None of the amendments we are proposing would alter the basic spirit of the Constitution or change the character and structure of our governmental system. However, all reflect the need to adapt our fundamental law to new conditions and problems, some of which could not have been anticipated in 1789. While the amendments vary in importance and urgency, all would be desirable supplements to the 23 amendments already adopted to attune the Constitution to changing national and world situations.

Two of the amendments are designed to encourage the participation of more Americans in the electoral process. The first of these would establish uniform residence laws for voting in presidential elections. Under present conditions, millions of qualified Americans who change their residences prior to an election are unable to vote for President because of unreasonable and conflicting State residence requirements. The number politically dispossessed by these requirements is constantly growing because of the increased mobility of our population. There is no justification for denying these Americans a voice in the selection of our Nation's Chief Executive. The only way to deal with this problem in a uniform manner is by the adoption of a constitutional amendment which would preserve every qualified citizen's right to vote despite his change in residence, as long as he satisfied registration requirements in his new area. According to some estimates, the adoption of the amendment we are proposing would have affected as many as 8 million qualified voters in the last presidential election.

The second voting amendment would extend the right to vote to every otherwise qualified citizen over the age of 18. It is our judgment that a man or woman old enough to fight for his country—especially in view of the expanding educational opportunities available to all Americans, certainly deserves a voice in the selection of the Nation's leaders. Despite the attention we justifiably center on the problems of juvenile delinquency, I believe that the overwhelming number of our Nation's youth is more mature and better educated today than at any time in our history. They are as much concerned with the welfare of their country and as well informed about the issues in election campaigns as other voters. Permitting them to vote in elections would show our faith in their judgment and instill an even greater sense of responsibility in them. Our proposed amendment would welcome these young Americans into the ranks of the electorate when they pass their 18th birthday.

The third amendment we are proposing makes provision for appointments to the House of Representatives in situations in which a third or more of its Members have been killed. This is essential if Congress is to be able to function during a period of national disaster. In the age of nuclear weapons, this is a situation which must be faced now and not after catastrophe has struck.

Our final amendment would authorize Congress to provide by legislation for the determination of Presidential inability in cases in which the capacity of the President is in controversy. This question also takes on special urgency in this perilous era. We have previously suggested different detailed plans for coping with the inability problem, but have now joined together in a plan simply authorizing legislation on this subject in an effort to break a stalemate which has blocked action in the past. We hope that a spirit of compromise will prevail and that this amendment will be presented to the States for ratification during this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of the two joint resolutions which I am introducing and of which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is a cosponsor. I assume that he either has asked or will ask that the joint resolutions be introduced by printed in the RECORD also.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I do ask unanimous consent that, following this colloquy, these two resolutions be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolutions, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the joint resolutions introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. KEATING), were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

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

“ARTICLE —

“In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the said office shall devolve on the Vice President. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then be President, or in case of inability, act as President, and such officer shall be or act as President accordingly, until a President shall be elected or, in case of inability, until the inability shall be earlier removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide.”

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives.

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

"ARTICLES —

"SECTION 1. On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds one-third of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of sixty days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution.

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

The joint resolutions, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER), were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to residence requirements for voting in presidential elections.

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

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote in any election held in any State or in the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States for the purpose, in whole or in part, of choosing electors of President and Vice President shall be denied the right to vote for such electors in such election because of any residence requirement of such State or such District, as the case may be, if such citizen has resided in such State (or the political subdivision thereof with respect to which the requirement applies), or in such District, as the case may be, for a period of at least ninety days preceding such election.

"SEC. 2. Any citizen of the United States who has been a resident of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or the District constituting the seat of the government of the United States for a lesser period than that required for voting in an election for electors of President and Vice President, and who is otherwise qualified to vote in such election, shall nevertheless be entitled to vote in such election, if he was either eligible to so vote in another political subdivision of the same State, or in another State, or in such District, immediately prior to his change of residence, or if he would have been eligible to so vote if he had continued to reside in such place until such election."

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

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

"ARTICLE —

"The right of citizens of the United States, who have reached the age of eighteen years, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL ACTORS' EQUITY WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the week of May 20 to 26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week.

Mr. President, Actors' Equity was founded 50 years ago on May 26, 1913. Today it represents about 13,000 professional actors in the United States and Canada. Its founding purpose, which has been carried out to this day, is to advance, foster, and benefit all those connected with the art of the theater. As the organizational arm of actors and performers in the legitimate theater, Actors' Equity has fulfilled the twin functions of protecting and securing the rights of its members while striving for betterment of the cultural life of our Nation. It stands for the highest artistic ideals of our country.

It is therefore a great privilege for me, Mr. President, to present this joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) designating the week of May 20-26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Actors' Equity Association now represents approximately 13,000 professional actors who reside and perform in the United States and Canada; and

Whereas Actors' Equity Association was formed in order to "advance, promote, foster, and benefit all those connected with the 'art of the theater';" and

Whereas Actors' Equity Association has provided responsible and creative leadership

in the field of the performing arts while it has encouraged and reflected the artistic ideals of our country; and

Whereas in fulfilling its function of protecting and securing the rights of actors and performers in the legitimate theater, Actors' Equity Association has materially enhanced and inspired the cultural life of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 20-26, 1963, is hereby designated as National Actors' Equity Week, in recognition of the outstanding contribution which Actors' Equity Association has made to the cultural life of our Nation.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO AMEND THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mr. PROUTY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to amend rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate for the purpose of proposing that the question of bringing debate to a close shall be decided by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting and also by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn.

Such amendment to the Standing Rules of the Senate shall read as follows:

"RULE XXII

"1. When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—

"To adjourn.

"To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.

"To take a recess.

"To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

"To lay on the table.

"To postpone indefinitely.

"To postpone to a day certain.

"To commit.

"To amend.

Which several motions shall have precedence as they stand arranged; and the motions relating to adjournment, to take a recess, to proceed to the consideration of executive business, to lay on the table, shall be decided without debate.

"2. Notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, at any time a motion signed by sixteen Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and one hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yeas-and-nays vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by three-fifths of the Senators present and voting and also by a majority vote of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than one hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business."

ness, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

"3. The provisions of the last paragraph of rule VIII (prohibiting debate on motions made before 2 o'clock) shall not apply to any motion to proceed to the consideration of any motion, resolution, or proposal to change any of the Standing Rules of the Senate."

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE—AMENDMENT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I intend to offer at the appropriate time a proposal for a Senate rules change which would correct a serious injustice.

I have already given notice, in accordance with rule XL, that it is my intention to move to amend the standing rules of the Senate for the purpose of adding a new rule which will guarantee minority Senators the adequate number of staff members on committees and subcommittees they so badly need at the present time.

Although Republicans constitute over one-third of the Senate, they have at their disposal only a small percentage of the total number of committee and

subcommittee staff members. In analyzing hearings, in studying bills, and in developing new concepts and new policies, the minority labors under a serious handicap, because of the staffing situation.

The need for a congressional minority to keep the majority on the path of reason and good sense is sharply pointed out in an essay by Walter Lippmann. Lippmann says in part:

The democratic system cannot be operated without effective opposition. * * * The party in power should never outrage the minority. That means that it must listen to the minority and be moved by the criticisms of the minority. A good statesman, like any other sensible human being, always learns more from his opponents than from his fervent supporters. For his supporters will push him to disaster unless his opponents show him where the dangers are.

When there is an improper imbalance of majority and minority rights, to the extent of the imbalance, democracy perishes.

I do not ask that Republican Senators be allowed the same privileges as those of the majority party Senators, but I do feel that they are entitled to some minimum guarantees if our two-party system is to have any meaning.

These are the guarantees I seek:

First, that 40 percent of the professional and clerical staff members of committees be assigned to the minority.

Second, that 40 percent of the funds authorized for hiring temporary employees on select and special committees

or subcommittees be used for staff members selected by the minority members of each group.

Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment to the Humphrey substitute. I shall call up the amendment at the appropriate time; and I ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

SUMMARY OF MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORTS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, I submit a summary of monthly personnel reports on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government issued during the recess of the Congress. These reports were concerned with employment and payrolls during the period August to November 1962, inclusive.

In accordance with the practice of several years standing, I ask unanimous consent that the summary, together with a statement by me, be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

Personnel and pay summary, August through November 1962

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In November numbered—	In August numbered—	Increase (+) decrease (—)	In October was—	In July was—	Increase (+) decrease (—)
Total ¹	2,498,179	2,512,190	—14,020	\$1,316,906	\$1,221,740	+\$95,166
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,428,209	1,436,487	—8,278	737,424	689,351	+48,073
Department of Defense	1,069,970	1,075,712	—5,742	579,482	532,389	+47,093
Inside the United States	2,330,618	2,347,276	—16,658			
Outside the United States	167,561	164,923	+2,638			
Industrial employment	567,655	573,638	—5,983			
Foreign nationals	170,222	170,286	—64	27,513	27,113	+400

¹ Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1962, and comparison with August 1962, and pay for October 1962, and comparison with July 1962

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	August	Increase	Decrease	October	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	108,390	110,834		2,444	\$51,969	\$51,266	\$703	
Commerce	29,843	31,392		1,549	19,296	18,323	973	
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,836	78,638		802	39,587	38,589	998	
Interior	61,953	64,050		2,097	33,040	34,169		\$1,129
Justice	31,953	32,271		318	21,326	20,001	1,325	
Labor	8,799	8,855		56	5,392	4,934	458	
Post Office	589,284	590,632		1,348	281,297	256,445	24,852	
State ^{1 2}	41,117	40,802	315		21,455	19,349	2,106	
Treasury	83,704	84,332		628	50,579	46,894	3,685	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	334	334			244	232	12	
Bureau of the Budget	462	485		23	435	395	40	
Council of Economic Advisers	49	59		10	43	46		3
Executive Mansion and Grounds	78	75	3		40	36	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	26	23	3		23	22	1	
National Security Council	40	46			35	31	4	
Office of Emergency Planning	426	483		57	382	400		18
President's Commission on Campaign Costs ³		1		1	(⁴)	1		1
Office of Science and Technology	46	27	19		27	22	5	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1962, and comparison with August 1962, and pay for October 1962, and comparison with July 1962—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	November	August	Increase	Decrease	October	July	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	26	27		1	\$23	\$19	\$4	
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	393	435		42	83	87		\$4
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,958	6,932	26		5,356	4,967	389	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	609	599	10		412	391	21	
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	831	843		12	617	596	21	
Civil Service Commission.....	4,156	4,162		6	2,475	2,373	102	
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts.....	7	7		1	6	5	1	
Commission on Civil Rights.....	87	88		1	52	52		
Delaware River Basin Commission.....	2	2			2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	270	273		3	192	187	5	
Farm Credit Administration.....	238	237	1		182	164	18	
Federal Aviation Agency.....	45,153	44,880	273		31,078	29,544	1,534	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	6	7		1	4	4		
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,430	1,523		93	1,033	977	56	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,242	1,264		22	840	790	50	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	1,201	1,210		9	847	751	96	
Federal Maritime Commission.....	192	179	13		143	129	14	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	390	379	11		353	321	32	
Federal Power Commission.....	1,029	1,011	18		739	657	82	
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,132	1,129	3		809	741	68	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	73	67	6		59	49	4	
General Accounting Office.....	4,631	4,704		73	3,139	2,900	239	
General Services Administration.....	32,063	32,214		151	15,903	15,187	716	
Government Printing Office.....	7,125	7,028	97		4,310	4,017	293	
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13,525	13,528		3	8,663	8,022	641	
Indian Claims Commission.....	23	24		1	20	27		7
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,398	2,418		20	1,710	1,598	112	
James Madison Memorial Commission.....					(a)			
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	25,389	24,817	572		19,092	16,592	2,500	
National Capital Housing Authority.....	418	416	2		196	185	11	
National Capital Planning Commission.....	48	52		4	37	38		1
National Capital Transportation Agency.....	79	83		4	84	59	25	
National Gallery of Art.....	319	319			140	135	5	
National Labor Relations Board.....	2,004	1,982	22		1,418	1,283	135	
National Mediation Board.....	139	135	4		120	103	17	
National Science Foundation.....	989	861	128		616	555	61	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission ¹		4		4		3		3
Panama Canal.....	14,914	14,825	89		4,946	4,676	270	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.....	48	50		2	31	33		2
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,026	2,094		68	1,170	1,117	53	
Renegotiation Board.....	203	194	9		161	153	8	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	162	165		3	107	105	2	
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,408	1,368	40		972	861	111	
Selective Service System.....	6,797	6,812		15	2,279	2,129	150	
Small Business Administration.....	3,168	3,220		52	2,106	1,938	168	
Smithsonian Institution.....	1,312	1,338		26	692	679	13	
Soldiers' Home.....	1,038	1,047		11	349	349		
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission.....	55	59		4	46	43	3	
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	26	25	1		22	22		
Tariff Commission.....	271	280		9	209	234		25
Tax Court of the United States.....	151	151			123	112	11	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	18,357	18,553		196	11,979	11,274	705	
Texas Water Study Commission ²						12		12
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	106	99	7		115	70	45	
U.S. Information Agency.....	11,398	11,277	121		5,217	4,686	531	
Veterans' Administration.....	177,248	177,024	224		80,862	76,055	4,807	
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	581	724		143	127	134		7
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,428,209	1,436,487	2,029	10,307	737,424	689,351	49,285	1,212
Net change, excluding Department of Defense.....			8,278				48,073	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2,036	1,971	65		1,608	1,466	142	
Department of the Army.....	390,168	395,508		5,340	205,472	185,152	20,320	
Department of the Navy.....	345,248	348,446		3,198	195,436	183,800	11,636	
Department of the Air Force.....	307,281	305,073	2,208		163,837	150,374	13,463	
Defense Atomic Support Agency.....	2,087	2,084	3		1,097	1,029	68	
Defense Communications Agency.....	278	210	68		164	107	57	
Defense Intelligence Agency.....	284	250	34		194	145	49	
Defense Supply Agency.....	21,039	20,616	423		10,565	9,257	1,308	
Office of Civil Defense.....	1,009	1,004	5		779	779		
U.S. Court of Military Appeals.....	40	40			34	32	2	
Interdepartmental Activities.....	20	35		16	17	18		1
International Military Activities.....	59	59			45	35	10	
Armed Forces Information and Education Activities.....	421	415	6		223	195	28	
Total, Department of Defense.....	1,069,970	1,075,712	2,812	8,554	579,482	532,389	47,094	1
Net change, Department of Defense.....			5,742				47,093	
Grand total, including Department of Defense³.....	2,498,179	2,512,199	4,841	18,861	1,316,906	1,221,740	96,379	1,213
Net change, including Department of Defense.....			14,020				95,166	

¹ November figure includes 16,341 (estimated, pending completion of reporting process revisions now in progress) employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,810 in August and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 4,190 (estimated) of these trust fund employees and the August figure includes 3,795.

² November figure includes 841 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 895 in August and their pay.

³ Subject to revision.

⁴ Revised on basis of later information.

⁵ Agency abolished Nov. 1, 1962.

⁶ Less than \$500.

⁷ Ceased to exist Sept. 1, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 87-12.

⁸ Ceased to exist pursuant to Public Law 85-843.

⁹ Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

¹⁰ Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658) as follows: Agriculture Department, 9,394, and Interior Department, 2,963. If in subsequent months employment reported under provisions of this act become widespread among Federal agencies, it will be shown in a special table in this report.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1962, and comparison with August 1962

Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	107,216	109,714	—	2,498	National Capital Planning Commission.....	48	52	—	4
Commerce.....	29,203	30,749	—	1,546	National Capital Transportation Agency.....	79	83	—	4
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	77,243	78,102	—	859	National Gallery of Art.....	819	819	—	—
Interior.....	61,442	63,554	—	2,112	National Labor Relations Board.....	1,970	1,949	21	—
Justice.....	31,614	31,915	—	311	National Mediation Board.....	139	135	4	—
Labor.....	8,693	8,747	—	54	National Science Foundation.....	976	850	126	—
Post Office.....	587,831	589,186	—	1,355	Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission ⁶	—	4	—	4
State ^{1,2}	10,315	10,551	—	236	Panama Canal.....	167	172	—	5
Treasury.....	83,090	83,724	—	634	President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.....	48	50	—	2
Executive Office of the President:					Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,026	2,094	—	68
White House Office.....	334	334	—	—	Renegotiation Board.....	203	194	9	—
Bureau of the Budget.....	462	485	—	23	St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	162	165	—	3
Council of Economic Advisers.....	49	59	—	10	Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,408	1,368	40	—
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	78	75	3	—	Selective Service System.....	6,646	6,658	—	12
National Aeronautics and Space Council.....	26	23	3	—	Small Business Administration.....	3,118	3,173	—	55
National Security Council.....	40	46	—	6	Smithsonian Institution.....	1,207	1,327	—	30
Office of Emergency Planning.....	426	483	—	57	Soldiers' Home.....	1,058	1,047	11	—
Office of Science and Technology.....	46	27	19	—	South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission.....	55	59	—	4
President's Commission on Campaign Costs ³	—	1	—	1	Subversive Activities Control Board.....	26	25	1	—
Independent agencies:					Tariff Commission.....	271	280	—	9
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	26	27	—	1	Tax Court of the United States.....	151	151	—	—
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	7	8	—	1	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	18,355	18,551	—	196
Atomic Energy Commission.....	6,924	6,901	23	—	U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.....	106	99	7	—
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.....	609	599	10	—	U.S. Information Agency.....	3,180	3,106	74	—
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	830	842	—	12	Veterans' Administration.....	176,243	176,010	233	—
Civil Service Commission.....	4,152	4,158	—	6	Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	1,365,452	1,374,378	1,564	10,490
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	5	5	—	—	Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....	—	—	8,926	—
Commission of Fine Arts.....	7	6	1	—					
Commission on Civil Rights.....	87	88	—	1	Department of Defense:				
Delaware River Basin Commission.....	2	2	—	—	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,976	1,913	63	—
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	270	273	—	3	Department of the Army.....	337,957	343,322	—	5,365
Farm Credit Administration.....	238	237	1	—	Department of the Navy.....	321,132	324,526	—	3,394
Federal Aviation Agency.....	44,170	43,907	263	—	Department of the Air Force.....	278,903	278,450	453	—
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	6	7	—	1	Defense Atomic Support Agency.....	2,087	2,084	3	—
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,428	1,521	—	93	Defense Communications Agency.....	259	203	56	—
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,240	1,262	—	22	Defense Intelligence Agency.....	284	250	34	—
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	1,201	1,210	—	9	Defense Supply Agency.....	21,039	20,616	423	—
Federal Maritime Commission.....	192	179	13	—	Office of Civil Defense.....	1,009	1,004	5	—
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	390	379	11	—	U.S. Court of Military Appeals.....	40	40	—	—
Federal Power Commission.....	1,029	1,011	18	—	Interdepartmental activities.....	20	36	—	16
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,132	1,129	3	—	International military activities.....	39	39	—	—
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	4,547	4,616	—	69	Armed Forces Information and Education Activities.....	421	415	6	—
General Accounting Office.....	32,053	32,204	—	151	Total, Department of Defense.....	965,166	972,898	1,043	8,775
Government Printing Office.....	7,125	7,028	97	—	Net decrease, Department of Defense.....	—	—	7,732	—
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13,346	13,347	—	1					
Indian Claims Commission.....	23	24	—	1	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	2,330,618	2,347,276	2,607	19,265
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,398	2,418	—	20	Net decrease, including Department of Defense.....	—	—	16,658	—
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	25,376	24,805	571	—					
National Capital Housing Authority.....	418	416	2	—					

¹ November figure includes 2,741 (estimated, pending completion of reporting process revisions now in progress) employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,891 in August.

² November figure includes 553 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 609 in August.

³ Subject to revision.

⁴ Revised on basis of later information.

⁵ Agency abolished Nov. 1, 1962.

⁶ Ceased to exist Sept. 1, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 87-12.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1962, and comparison with August 1962

Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	1,174	1,120	54	—	Selective Service System.....	51	154	—	3
Commerce.....	640	643	—	3	Small Business Administration.....	450	47	3	—
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	593	536	57	—	Smithsonian Institution.....	15	11	4	—
Interior.....	511	496	15	—	Tennessee Valley Authority.....	2	2	—	—
Justice.....	339	346	—	7	U.S. Information Agency.....	8,218	8,171	47	—
Labor.....	106	108	—	2	Veterans' Administration.....	1,005	1,014	—	9
Post Office.....	1,453	1,446	7	—	Virgin Islands Corporation.....	581	724	—	143
State ^{1,2}	30,802	30,251	551	—	Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	62,757	62,109	862	214
Treasury.....	614	608	6	—	Net increase, excluding Department of Defense.....	—	—	648	—
Independent agencies:									
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	386	427	—	41	Department of Defense:				
Atomic Energy Commission.....	34	31	3	—	Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	60	58	2	—
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	1	1	—	—	Department of the Army.....	52,211	52,186	25	—
Civil Service Commission.....	4	4	—	—	Department of the Navy.....	24,116	23,920	196	—
Federal Aviation Agency.....	983	973	10	—	Department of the Air Force.....	28,378	26,623	1,755	—
Federal Communications Commission.....	2	2	—	—	Defense Communications Agency.....	19	7	12	—
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	2	2	—	—	International military activities.....	20	20	—	—
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	84	88	—	4	Total, Department of Defense.....	104,804	102,814	1,990	—
General Accounting Office.....	10	10	—	—	Net increase, Department of Defense.....	—	—	1,990	—
General Services Administration.....	179	181	—	2					
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13	12	1	—	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	167,561	164,923	2,852	214
National Labor Relations Board.....	34	33	1	—	Net increase, including Department of Defense.....	—	—	2,638	—
National Science Foundation.....	13	11	2	—					
Panama Canal.....	14,747	14,653	94	—					

¹ November figure includes 13,600 (estimated, pending completion of reporting process revisions now in progress) employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,919 in August. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The November figure includes 4,190 (estimated) of these trust fund employees and the August figure includes 3,795.

² November figure includes 258 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 236 in August.

³ Subject to revision.

⁴ Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during November 1962, and comparison with August 1962

Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	November	August	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Department of Defense:				
Agriculture.....	3,765	3,739	26		Department of the Army:				
Commerce.....	5,562	5,727		165	Inside the United States.....	¹ 141,938	² 143,836		1,898
Interior.....	7,584	8,658		1,074	Outside the United States.....	¹ 4,552	² 4,400	152	
Post Office.....	251	252		1	Department of the Navy:				
Treasury.....	5,201	5,193	8		Inside the United States.....	198,218	201,353		3,135
Independent agencies:					Outside the United States.....	1,282	1,264	18	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	247	269		22	Department of the Air Force:				
Federal Aviation Agency.....	2,972	2,905	67		Inside the United States.....	135,061	135,460		399
General Services Administration.....	1,764	1,699	65		Outside the United States.....	1,184	1,052	132	
Government Printing Office.....	7,125	7,028	97		Defense Supply Agency:				
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	25,389	24,817	572		Inside the United States.....	1,993	2,068		75
Panama Canal.....	7,512	7,572		60	Total, Department of Defense.....	484,228	489,433	302	5,507
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	162	132	30		Net decrease, Department of Defense.....			5,205	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	15,312	15,490		178	Grand total, including Department of Defense.....	567,655	573,638	1,167	7,150
Virgin Islands Corporation.....	581	724		143	Net decrease, including Department of Defense.....			5,983	
Total, excluding Department of Defense.....	83,427	84,205	865	1,643					
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense.....			778						

¹ Subject to revision.² Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of November 1962 and comparison with August 1962

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	November	August	November	August	November	August	November	August	November	August
Australia.....	1	1							1	1
Canada.....	35	36					35	36		
Cuba.....	65	60					65	60		
England.....	3,320	3,290			100	91	3,220	3,199		
France.....	22,455	22,439	18,505	18,751	11	11	3,939	3,677		
Germany.....	81,058	80,990	68,838	68,045	87	87	12,733	12,858		
Greece.....	266	261					266	261		
Greenland.....	163	128					163	128		
Japan.....	53,009	53,687	18,986	19,278	14,404	14,478	19,619	19,931		
Korea.....	6,218	6,212	6,218	6,212						
Morocco.....	2,417	2,568			783	763	1,634	1,805		
Netherlands.....	52	54					52	54		
Trinidad.....	563	560			563	560				
Total.....	170,222	170,286	112,547	112,286	15,948	15,990	41,726	42,009	1	1

¹ Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government decreased 14,020 during the period August through November 1962. The total in August was 2,512,199. In November there were 2,498,179 civilian employees.

Employment by civilian agencies of the Federal Government showed a net decrease of 8,278 during the period from August through November 1962, decreasing from 1,436,487 in August to 1,428,209 in November. Civilian employment in the Department of Defense decreased 5,742 during the same period, decreasing from 1,075,712 in August to 1,069,970 in November.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 16,658 from 2,347,276 in August to 2,330,618 in November. Outside the United States civilian employment increased 2,638 from 164,923 in August to 167,561 in November. Industrial employment by Federal agencies decreased 5,983 from 573,638 in August to 567,655 in November.

In July the Federal civilian payroll was running at an annual rate of \$14,661 million, and in October it was running at an annual rate of \$15,803 million.

These figures summarize compilations of monthly personnel reports certified by executive agencies to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures since Congress adjourned October 13, 1962.

In addition to this regularly reported civilian employment, there were foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas,

excluded from usual personnel reporting, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid. These numbered 170,286 in August and 170,222 in November, a decrease of 64.

IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL DUTIES ON CERTAIN IMPORTED CATTLE, BEEF, AND VEAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on January 28 I introduced S. 557, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas. I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators CURTIS and DOMINICK be included as cosponsors of this measure the next time it is printed.

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

REVISION OF FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on January 28, I introduced on behalf of myself and 13 of my colleagues, the

bill (S. 559) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor at its next printing.

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

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that yesterday the Senate received the nomination of Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

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. RANDOLPH:

Address by Postmaster General J. Edward Day delivered at Charleston (W. Va.) Chamber of Commerce dinner for members of the West Virginia Legislature, January 29, 1963.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Television address by President Kennedy in tribute to the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, on January 31, 1963; also a news item from the Washington Post of February 4, 1963, relating to the election of Dore Schary as chairman of the Anti-Defamation League.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN SHOVELING OUT THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY TO CONGRESSMAN ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the loose manner in which the administration has been shoveling the taxpayers' money out to Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

During the past 12 months various agencies of the Government have been scrambling around to see who could give Mr. POWELL the most favorable deal.

Last summer on the front page of every newspaper were accounts of Mr. POWELL's European vacation with his lady friends, where he attended all the night spots of the European capitals on a tax-paid junket that was financed through the State Department.

There was no excuse for the State Department's ever having approved this unnecessary junket. The State Department is in no way obligated to finance any such extravaganzas by any Member of Congress.

While the State Department was financing Mr. POWELL's and his lady friends' trip to Europe, however, other agencies were determined not to be outdone.

For example, on August 1, 1962—just 4 months prior to the election—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made an outright grant of \$250,000 to Mr. POWELL and his associates. This \$250,000 grant allegedly was made to Mr. POWELL for the purpose of developing the nucleus of a domestic peace corps. The fact that a domestic peace corps has, as yet, not been approved by Congress did in no way deter the Department from financing such a project. They merely tapped an appropriation which had been approved under Public Law 87-274 for the study of juvenile delinquency.

One official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare attempted to justify this questionable grant to Mr. POWELL from the Federal Treasury by explaining that he thought Mr. POWELL with his experience could make an outstanding contribution toward solving the juvenile delinquency problem.

For the administration to authorize a grant of \$250,000 from the Federal Treasury to be placed at the disposal of Congressman POWELL under the guise that it would help to combat the juvenile delinquency problem is an insult to the intelligence of the American taxpayers.

Mr. POWELL, whose escapades have been on the front page of every news-

paper for several months, could well be recognized as an authority on "adult delinquency," but most certainly he is not the caliber of a man who the American people would want to set an example for the youth of our country.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of February 15, 1962, signed by Mr. Nestingen, Acting Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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

SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Washington, D.C., February 1, 1963.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in response to your letter dated January 21, 1963, regarding a Federal grant of \$250,000 to Associated Community Teams, Inc.

Enclosed is a statement by Bernard Russell, special assistant to the Secretary, which should clarify your questions as well as those raised by Mr. Davenport on the telephone.

Thank you for your interest in this program. If I can be of any further help to you, please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely,

IVAN A. NESTINGEN,
Acting Secretary.

REPORT ON ASSOCIATED COMMUNITY TEAMS, INC.

(By Bernard Russell, special assistant to the secretary for juvenile delinquency)

Associated Community Teams, Inc., first submitted an application on May 15, 1962. The application was withdrawn after consultation with staff since it overlapped with another project in Harlem. The proposal was then redrawn requesting a grant "to sponsor in the central Harlem community the development of (1) a domestic peace corps, and (2) an urban service corps program as an outgrowth of the domestic peace corps. This will require the development of a program for the effective training of professional and lay personnel who will be competent to design and conduct the several programs involved in the domestic peace corps concept. The urban service corps is conceived as an evolving phase of the domestic peace corps, in which peace corps trainees would eventually gain the skills and competence for supervising youngsters recruited into the urban service corps." This proposal was reviewed by a technical review panel composed of experts outside of Government who recommended approval. The grant was approved on August 1, 1962.

The incorporators of Associated Community Teams, Inc., are the following five people: Adam Clayton Powell, Congressman, minister; Livingston L. Wingate, associate counsel for labor-management, Committee on Education and Labor; David D. Jones, deputy commissioner of correction; Jawn A. Sandifer, attorney, civic leader; and Jose Ramos Lopez, assemblyman, New York City.

Attached is a list of the board of directors who elect their own officers. The officers are Mr. Andrew Tyler, president; Miss Evelyn Cunningham, secretary; and Mr. David Jones, treasurer.

Associated Community Teams, Inc., has offices at 179 West 137th Street in New York City. They were awarded this grant under Public Law 87-274, section 4.

Accounting reports on projects under this program are required to be filed at the end of each year's experience, or within 3 months

after expiration of the grant, whichever comes earlier.

An audit is being conducted at this time on the grant issued to Associated Community Teams, Inc., which is part of an interim audit we are conducting for all our projects.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I cite an example of Mr. POWELL's influence with this administration under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Long-term loans totaling nearly \$11 million at interest rates as low as 3½ percent have been approved to Mr. POWELL and his associates.

Three loans totaling \$10,838,000 have been approved for the construction of a housing development and the purchase of hotels, the total cost of which, based on the administration's own records, was to be only \$8,588,000.

Not only were these loans sufficient to cover 100 percent of the acquisition cost of the properties in question, but in one instance the loan approved was for exactly double the acquisition price.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD two letters both signed by Mr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, one dated November 14, 1962, and the second dated December 18, 1962, in which these loans are more fully described.

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

HOUSING AND HOME
FINANCE AGENCY,

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., November 14, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your letter of October 23, 1962, requesting a record of all loans which have been approved for Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation, or other company (sic) with which he is connected.

With respect to the Federal Housing Administration program of insured mortgages, Commissioner Neal J. Hardy advises me that in the small homes program (one- to four-family residences), he is not able to immediately identify any loans which have been insured in the name of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Jr., or related companies. I am sure you will understand that since there are approximately 3½ million small home mortgages insured by the FHA, it is not possible to say with certainty that Representative POWELL has not been the mortgagor in an insured mortgage.

With respect to multifamily housing operations, there are presently three proposals before the Federal Housing Administration. One application in formal processing is a section 221(d)(3) project for lower income occupants. The essential facts are as follows:

The Ilad, Bronx, N.Y. project No. 012-55002NP, section 221(d)(3): Below market interest rate, 3½ percent; 358 units, 24-story; mortgage, 100 percent, \$4,938,000; sponsor, Morris Park Senior Citizens Housing Council, Inc. (instrumentality of the Abyssinian Baptist Church); eligibility of nonprofit approved September 3, 1962; builder, Robert Chuckrow Construction Co.

In addition, there are two firm proposals before the FHA involving mortgages under section 231 to provide housing for the elderly as follows:

1. Hotel 2400, Washington, D.C. (rehabilitation), project No. 000-38003-NP: 407 units,

8-story; acquisition price of property, \$2,250,000 plus; requested mortgage amount, \$4,850,000; interest 5½ percent plus one-half of 1 percent mortgage insurance premium. Application was found feasible at \$4,500,000 subject to enactment of legislation granting tax abatement. Processing will be undertaken upon formal advice from mortgagee.

2. Douglas Hotel, Newark, N.J. (rehabilitation): 183 units, 8-story; acquisition price of property, \$1,400,000; interest 5½ percent plus one-half of 1 percent mortgage insurance premium. Preapplication analysis is now underway. The submissions necessary to determine eligibility of nonprofit mortgagor not complete at this time.

In regard to your request for the financial statement accompanying the applications, it is our opinion that the FHA is legally precluded from disseminating information of this type which is submitted by private parties on a confidential basis in support of applications for mortgage insurance.

In connection with the two projects involving rehabilitation, Commissioner Hardy informs me that the proposals involve loan amounts which will exceed the acquisition cost of the property by reason of the costs incidental to repairing and converting the property to its new use. By law, the amount of mortgage cannot exceed the acquisition cost or as-is value whichever is lesser, plus the cost of rehabilitation; or the value of the property as rehabilitated whichever is lesser.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

HOUSING AND HOME
FINANCE AGENCY,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., December 18, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reference to your letter of December 4, 1962, wherein you request additional information pertinent to the three proposals now pending before the Federal Housing Administration sponsored by affiliates of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL.

Your questions will be answered in the order presented.

The first relates to proposed legislation necessary to obtain tax abatement for Hotel 2400 in the District of Columbia. On August 1, 1962, the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, introduced bill H.R. 12757, copy of which is enclosed. If passed in its present form, it appears this bill would provide for complete abatement of real estate taxes unlimited as to time.

The second question relates to financing details of the three projects. In relation to the ratio of loan to acquisition cost of Hotel 2400 and the Douglas Hotel, our rules require that the loan not exceed the acquisition cost, plus cost of rehabilitation. Processing in FHA has not yet reached the point where their estimate of rehabilitation cost is available and thus we are unable to furnish you with the amount of loan that would be eligible provided the tax legislation is obtained. FHA Commissioner Hardy informs me the Douglas Hotel proposal has not proceeded beyond the initial preliminary stage and there is no representation as to a firm acquisition cost at this time.

The third property known as The Iliad is proposed construction and not rehabilitation, thus the acquisition cost will relate to land only.

Information is not available as to disbursements since no mortgagor corporation has been created nor closing obtained in any of the three mentioned cases and is not expected before the summer of 1963.

The answer to question three is, of course, in the affirmative as a result of section 227 of

the National Housing Act wherein cost certification is required.

In answer to (a), (b), (c), and (d), I am informed the FHA has had no previous experience with this sponsoring group.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in addition to approving these loans, the administration gave its support to H.R. 12757, introduced on August 1, 1962, the sole purpose of which was to exempt from all District of Columbia real estate taxes one of the properties listed above—the Hotel 2400, in Washington, D.C.

I quote one paragraph from this bill as endorsed by the administration. This paragraph follows a description of the property known as the Hotel 2400 in the District of Columbia:

It is hereby exempt from all real property taxation so long as the same is owned by and used to carry out the purposes of the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation.

I ask unanimous consent that this administration-sponsored bill, H.R. 12757, which would give Mr. POWELL this favored tax exemption, be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was 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 all that certain plot, piece, or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon, lying and being in the District of Columbia and known and described as follows: Lot 99 in the combination made by Kennedy Brothers, Incorporated, of lots in block 6, Meridian Hill; as per plot recorded in liber Numbered 55, folio 162, of the records of the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia; and, also, all of the lots 100 in the combination made by Kennedy Brothers, Incorporated, of lots in said block 6, Meridian Hill, as per the plat recorded in liber numbered 56, folio 16, of the aforesaid surveyor's office records; excepting the part thereof condemned and taken for alley purposes by proceeding in district court case numbered 1535 in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; which land is designated on the records of the Assessor of the District of Columbia for taxation purposes as lots 903 and 920 in square 2571, is hereby exempt from all real property taxation so long as the same is owned by and used to carry out the purposes of the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation, Incorporated, and is not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia", approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1091; D.C. Code, secs. 47-801b, 47-801c, 47-801e).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, while these three agencies were shoveling out the taxpayers' dollars to Mr. POWELL and his numerous operations, we find that the Treasury Department, over on the other side of the street, was still carrying Mr. POWELL on its books as delinquent in his Federal income taxes for the years 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955.

While the Treasury Department states that, as yet, it has not accepted a compromise for the settling of these taxes, I

find no evidence where the Department is really trying to collect the money.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of a letter signed by Mr. Mortimer Caplin, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, under date of December 31, 1962, in which he outlines Mr. POWELL's delinquency in Federal income taxes.

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

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This refers to your letter of December 5, 1962, concerning Representative ADAM C. POWELL. For the sake of clarity I am repeating the inquiries contained in your letter, with our response directly beneath each question.

1. Question: The total amount of back taxes which Mr. POWELL owed, along with the amount of the penalties and the accrued interest due as of that date, broken down by years.

Answer: The amount of back taxes owed by Mr. POWELL has not been finally determined. The Federal Government notified the taxpayer that it proposed to assess certain deficiencies against him for the years 1949 through 1955. The taxpayer has petitioned the U.S. Tax Court for a hearing on these matters. The records of the Tax Court reveal the following:

Docket No. 2850-62: The taxpayer was notified on April 18, 1962, that the Government proposed to assess the following deficiency against him for the taxable year ended December 31, 1951:

Tax.....	\$7,442.12
Fraud penalty.....	3,721.06
Estimated tax penalty.....	533.34
Total.....	11,696.52

Docket No. 2851-62: The taxpayer was notified on April 18, 1962, that the Government proposed to assess the following deficiencies against him for the taxable years ended December 31, 1949, 1950, 1952, 1953, 1954, and 1955:

	1949	1950
Tax.....	\$5,512.41	\$2,643.34
Fraud penalty.....	2,756.20	1,321.67
Estimated tax penalty.....	515.66	408.31
Total.....	8,784.27	4,373.32
	1952	1953
Tax.....	\$6,203.00	\$2,141.59
Fraud penalty.....	3,101.50	1,070.80
Estimated tax penalty.....	346.75	37.87
Total.....	9,651.25	3,250.26
	1954	1955
Tax.....	\$940.69	\$1,124.81
Fraud penalty.....	470.35	562.41
Estimated tax penalty.....	131.06	30.21
Total.....	1,542.10	1,717.43

2. Question: Has Mr. POWELL filed timely tax returns in each of the years beginning with 1950 through 1962? If not, so indicate.

Answer: Mr. POWELL has filed individual tax returns for the years 1950 through 1961. The return for 1962 is not due to be filed

until April 15, 1963. The transcript of accounts received from our field office does not indicate that the returns for the years 1950 through 1961 were delinquent when filed.

3. Question: Have there been any compromise settlements on income taxes made by the Federal Government with Mr. POWELL or any of his companies during the past 10 years?

Answer: There have been no accepted offers in compromise with Mr. POWELL during the past 10 years.

I hope that this satisfactorily answers your questions. If I may be of further assistance, please let me know.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, summarizing this report, we have this situation: Mr. POWELL has been delinquent in his income taxes on 7 of the years since 1949, and he is still being carried as a delinquent.

Notwithstanding this tax delinquency, three agencies of the Government were vying with each other as to which could curry the most favor with Mr. POWELL by opening the doors of the Federal Treasury.

The State Department, with no strings attached, freely financed Mr. POWELL's tour of the nightclubs in Europe.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare tapped a fund which had been approved by the Congress for the control of juvenile delinquency, and made an outright grant of \$250,000 to a foundation which Mr. POWELL and his administrative assistant, Mr. Wingate, had organized just 8 days before the receipt of the gift.

The officials of this agency were not quite clear as to whether they thought Mr. POWELL would spend this money in studying the juvenile delinquency problem or whether he would use it to organize a domestic peace corps in Harlem. There is one point on which they did agree—that the money would be spent at Mr. POWELL's discretion, and apparently without any exercise of control by the Federal Government.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency, the third Government agency, was equally generous; it approved three loans totaling nearly \$11 million on property which was being purchased for approximately \$8.5 million, and, as further evidence of the administration's philanthropy, it endorsed a bill which would provide complete exemption from all real estate taxes on one of these properties as long as it was owned and controlled by Mr. POWELL's outfit.

THE NEW YORK CITY NEWSPAPER STRIKE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the newspaper strike in New York City remains unresolved, although at this time the parties—so we are informed by the press, and I know this personally—are in negotiation, or at least are carrying on discussions with the mayor of New York, in an effort, if possible, to arrive at a settlement agreement.

Mr. President, this is not, perhaps—it is a question, but perhaps it is not—the kind of dispute which involves the national health and safety, as does, for example, a strike at a missile base, a defense facility, a communication, or a public-utility enterprise. Nevertheless, this strike is verging upon a national disaster. The newspapers of New York City are, in a real sense, national publications which express most importantly points of view, and report news of vital interest, not only in New York City, but throughout the Nation. They are read and consulted throughout the Nation and throughout the world.

In addition, New York City itself—much the largest city in terms of its being a center, not only of population, but also of business, finance, commerce, and communications—is suffering intolerable losses. Whatever may be the technical definition of a strike involving the public health and safety, the public interest is perilously at stake.

I deeply believe that the people of New York are becoming understandingly impatient about the lag in the disposition of this matter. In a most important way I believe that what happens in New York will have a highly important effect upon what happens here and what happens in our State legislature in terms of the way in which collective bargaining is to be dealt with and the interest in and participation by Government in that process.

In short, I rise today to express my feeling—and I deeply believe it is the feeling of the people of my city and State—that the time has come to settle the New York City newspaper strike. The parties are meeting for that purpose, and any aspect of public responsibilities and the public interest which is involved in bringing about a settlement should be impressed upon them now. I rise for that purpose, and express the expectation that both management and labor will see their public duty. The trial of strength has gone on long enough, it seems to me, to satisfy anyone. The time has come to bring the question to a conclusion. I hope that as the parties go through their deliberations today, they will be impressed with the fact that the public wants the strike settled, which is my view. If it is not settled, I deeply believe the public will feel aggrieved, and, as it always does, will find ways through those of us in public life and otherwise to express in a very practical way its dissatisfaction with the fact that the strike has been allowed to go on for so long.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to state that I anticipate that a statement in which Senators will be interested will be made at approximately 12 o'clock today. I think that we have gone long enough in our discussion of the proposed change in rules. Frankly, the Senate has wasted entirely too much time. I hope that whatever Senator may have the floor at 12 o'clock will show me the

courtesy of yielding to me at that time for the purpose, if it is at all possible, of presenting a motion which may bring the question to a conclusion. I make that announcement at this time merely to put the Senate on notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

OUR PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL FOR PAY RAISE IN OUR ARMED FORCES DESERVES SUPPORT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in regard to the President's message asking the Congress to provide a pay raise for the men in our Armed Forces, I rise to state that I am in full accord with this proposal. The President asked us to raise the pay of the men in our Armed Forces by approximately 14 percent. These men have not received any pay increase in 5 years.

Having been a private and also an officer in the Armed Forces and a Reserve officer in peacetime, very frankly I state that servicemen, enlisted or drafted, are underpaid and have been underpaid.

Civil service employees of the Federal Government have, of course, done a great deal better. They have received two pay increases since 1958. In fact, their raises seem to come automatically. The simple truth of the matter is that our military men have been and are underpaid. This is certainly so in comparison with what is handed out so readily to civil service employees. In many instances civilians working under military officers receive higher compensation than the officers.

Moreover, these civilians are protected by dozens of civil service regulations and built-in privileges. They enjoy a 40-hour workweek, in many cases less, sick leave, and many, many other benefits. There are no courts-martial for them if they happen to disobey orders, as I am sure happens on occasion. When they do, it is quite often excused by saying they have psychological problems, domestic difficulties, or a personality disorder.

On the other hand, our servicemen have none of these guarantees which have become hallowed in the stone tablets of the Federal bureaucracy.

The men who form our military might, pilot our airplanes, and spend days on end underseas in our atomic-powered submarines deserve a pay raise. We enjoy the freedoms we have due to those who for the most part do their duty—or their dying—under the old slogan which our sophisticates would do well not to scorn too much, "for God and country."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Many servicemen trained in critical specialties have been leaving the Armed Forces for civilian life. This has resulted in the spending of additional millions of taxpayers' money in training their replacements.

For instance, some 133,600 enlisted men are leaving the Navy this year, and

this service will also require 12,000 new officers. It requires 40 months to train the nuclear-qualified personnel for a modern submarine and 36 months to train a Polaris missile technician. An enlisted man's first enlistment is usually almost over before he is completely trained.

In these areas—in the electronics ratings—the Navy is able to reenlist only 11 percent of its qualified people. The others, attracted by the far shorter work hours and the much higher pay available in civilian industry leave the service just as they are becoming useful.

This is an unfortunate situation for our Government.

A police patrolman or a fireman in New York City has a beginning salary of \$5,600 a year. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters starts a 1-ton-truck driver at \$513 a month. A chief petty officer in the Navy—and the petty officers in our Navy perform very important duties—one who has 20 years of experience, married, with two children, receiving both commuted rations and quarters allowances, has an income of \$5,670, less than the lowest paid truck-driver.

It is a fact that the chief petty officer has retirement benefits and medical protection. However, so do the policeman and the union truckdriver in our society today.

Mr. President, these are just a few examples of the situation that is prevalent in all branches of our Armed Forces.

More men would make the Armed Forces their career were salaries to be adjusted upward. As a result, we would not only save taxpayers' money in the long run, but have a more efficient, well-trained modern Defense Establishment.

Whether the pay increase should amount to 14 percent is a matter for congressional study and action. Both officers and men are entitled to raises, but let us start at the bottom—not with the generals. I was amazed to read in Newsweek magazine of February 4 the report that a senior officer with the rank of colonel was angry enough to ignore the caution against writing complaints to headquarters.

As I understand it—

He said—

all the raise I will get is about \$45 a month. This is almost insulting.

Mr. President, if I were Secretary of Defense, I would say to this colonel, if I could locate him, "Buster, if you feel that way, you get out—and quick."

Mr. President, selective service, or conscription, expires this year. If we make a service career more attractive to our youth and to those young men already in the Armed Forces, we might hope to end peacetime conscription. We might be able to build a large, strong, professional Defense Establishment, fully trained, and always alert. We have an excellent one now, but I feel that we could improve on it. In that event, we would no longer have to rely on 6-month draft enlistments and a large pool of untrained, uninterested, and unwilling reservists. We can bring this about by raising the standard of living of our mili-

tary personnel to a level at least commensurate with their civilian counterparts.

This pay raise proposal, advocated by the President, is worth careful consideration and final approval by the Congress.

GOVERNOR SCRANTON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, SETTLES PHILADELPHIA TRANSIT STRIKE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, after others had tried their hands and failed, Gov. William W. Scranton, ably assisted by his attorney general, Walter E. Alessandrini, succeeded in ending the transit strike in Philadelphia. The Governor's tact and firmness have earned him the gratitude of Philadelphia's involuntary pedestrians and the respect of all Pennsylvanians.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD stories of this successful settlement, from the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin.

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

SCRANTON'S FIRM GRIP IN TRANSIT STRIKE PUTS PHILADELPHIA BACK ON RAILS

(By Saul Kohler)

HARRISBURG, February 2.—This is the inside story of the settlement of the PTC strike. But more than that, it is the story of a man who made his move at precisely the right time. Not too early and, as it turned out, not too late.

This is the story of Gov. William W. Scranton, who called both sides together in his office and, despite the fact he knew none of the negotiators personally, soon had all of them eating out of his hand.

One high union official, who described himself as a rock-ribbed Democrat, asked for an autographed photo of the Governor before leaving Harrisburg Friday night.

The role played by the Governor was summed up best by Michael J. Quill, international president of the Transport Workers Union, soon after he arrived here last Tuesday.

"Mr. Scranton has a complete grasp of the situation," Quill said, and he was right. For days before Scranton intervened, he had been briefed thoroughly on the strike situation every few hours. His eyes and ears were Attorney General Walter E. Alessandrini, who brought regular and complete reports to the executive offices after talking to mediators who were seeking a settlement.

On Tuesday morning Scranton acted. He had read an editorial on the front page of the Philadelphia Inquirer, entitled "A Cry for Help: End Strike Now." The editorial pointed up the gravity of the situation.

After a meeting with his staff, the Governor made his move.

But between Tuesday morning and Friday night, there were crises galore.

This, then, is the story of these crises and how they were handled.

There was no question but that the two top negotiators are rough customers. There is Quill, the fast-quipping labor leader with a brogue and a shillelagh, who—within the confines of the union's conference room—breathed from an oxygen mask and slipped pills under his tongue.

Then there is Douglas M. Pratt, president of National City Lines and former head of PTC, who bows his head, speaks softly but decisively and about whom everyone says:

"I'd hate to play poker with him."

These are men of different types, and though Scranton is younger than both, they found in him a man to whom they could

tell their troubles. He listened, and he acted, going from side to side as though he were a mediator instead of the State's chief executive officer.

It's amazing to those who sat in the Governor's reception room through the long negotiations that any State business was accomplished during the 4 days of strike talks. But Scranton did it. Perhaps he considered this strike one of the most important pieces of business on his desk.

He knew he had a job to do and realized soon that he had hurdles to clear. The biggest one was Philadelphia Mayor James H. J. Tate, who was adamant about his opposition to a PTC fare increase.

Scranton had summoned Joseph Sharfsin, chairman of the public utility commission, to Harrisburg from Pittsburgh, and neither the Governor nor Sharfsin could—or would—guarantee the company the increase it has requested from the commission.

This meant, then, that Tate had to be convinced—and he was. Although the mayor retained his opposition to any rise in the school fare, he softened somewhat on the cash and token fares. Once he did, the strike was as good as settled.

Here is a day-by-day log of the high points of the negotiations in Harrisburg:

TUESDAY

The Governor decided to intervene. He didn't storm in, he was well acquainted with the situation. The negotiators glared at each other and waited for Scranton to speak.

The Governor spoke softly but decisively. Thirty minutes later, he had both sides negotiating again. In half an hour, he had become the focal point of the talks. The union and the company were convinced they could come to him with their gripes.

Scranton promised them he would be available so long as they were talking. He waited for something to happen Tuesday night, but nothing did.

This was the first of the crises—getting both sides together—but it came close to being ruined.

WEDNESDAY

The guidelines having been drawn the night before, there was a somewhat better understanding of the situation and the differences which had kept the parties locked in verbal combat.

But the whole thing almost went out the window when the principals left Harrisburg. Quill went to Philadelphia to report to the executive board of local 234. Pratt went to New York, and from there was going home to Chicago.

It was apparent that nothing could be done without Pratt, especially since the PTC executive committee had rejected a union-approved contract 5 days earlier.

The pros were betting that Quill wouldn't be back either. But Iron Mike had promised the Governor he would negotiate in good faith, and he kept his word.

After a short collective bargaining session, the mediators and Alessandrini informed the Governor that nothing was being accomplished without Pratt.

For 90 minutes, they looked for the National City Lines president. He was located at New York's Idlewild Airport and Scranton placed a call for him. Either Pratt didn't hear himself being paged or he was refusing to answer the telephone.

Finally, the Governor asked airport officials to announce over the public address system who was calling. Pratt answered the phone.

One of Scranton's aids reported "the Governor leaned on Mr. Pratt hard." Indeed, he is reported to have told the transit executive that if he didn't return to Harrisburg, he alone would be responsible for the strike's continuation.

Pratt agreed to come back Thursday morning.

The second mountain had been scaled. But soon there was to be a third.

Scranton flew to New York to address a Republican fund-raising dinner. Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller sent his airplane, and with the Pennsylvania chief executive flew members of his staff and John O'Donnell, counsel for TWU.

The Governor and the union lawyer—who was "hitching a ride home"—discussed the situation on the flight. Scranton had come into the picture without a clear-cut solution, but on the flight he learned something he hadn't realized: that both the company and the union thought he had the answer in his hip pocket.

O'Donnell never returned to the negotiations, but Scranton flew back the next morning feeling a little stronger and a little more confident that he had done the right thing—at the right time.

THURSDAY

The whole business almost collapsed because of the State supreme court decision on the receivership sought by the city. Both sides wanted to quit talking and go home, pending a decision by the court.

It was Scranton who kept them talking while the court deliberated. Had the decision upheld the receiver, Pratt and his team would no longer have been the bargainers. The Governor appealed to them to stay on until they were sure.

This was the Bill Scranton who campaigned so effectively for the Governor's chair—which by this time was a hot seat.

You couldn't figure him. One minute he was warm and smiling, listening to somebody's troubles. The next minute he was dignified and precise, demanding the respect his position deserves.

The court decision came through, rejecting the receivership, and Pratt was the man with whom the union had to do business. This being settled, the negotiations began again. But the parties were in separate rooms in the attorney general's suite of offices.

The Blue Shield matter was discussed. The question of the 42 trolleys with two employees aboard was taken up. These were the stumbling blocks at this point.

The no-layoff clause, which former Mayor Richardson Dilworth is credited with having arranged by his decision to buy the company for \$75 million, had been just about settled.

And the time came to discuss money.

Scranton called Sharfsin, who was in Pittsburgh on commission business. The chairman boarded a plane to Harrisburg and landed at 8:33 p.m. He was met at the airport, 6 miles from the Capitol, by William G. Murphy, secretary to the Governor, and State Trooper Antavilla, Scranton's bodyguard.

Less than 20 minutes later Sharfsin was in the Governor's office. For 2 hours, they talked. They discussed the petition for a fare increase, the suspension of the increase and PUC's decision not to lift the suspension pending the public hearings.

Sharfsin is reported to have told the Governor that although he could not and would not pledge himself or his fellow commissioners to any fare increase, he would see to it that the hearings were speeded up so the final decision could be made sooner than usual.

Scranton also was shown figures and reportedly was told that on the basis of evidence taken so far, the company was entitled to relief.

It is significant that as soon as he finished his talks with the Governor, Sharfsin strode out of the executive suite, and went to his hotel room. Under the public utility law, the commission may not concern itself with labor disputes, only with rates and services.

But Scranton had heard enough from the PUC chairman to convince him that this was the time to call in Mayor Tate.

And here, the Governor knew, was another peak to be climbed.

FRIDAY

It all started at 12:30 a.m., when the Governor put in a call to Tate at home, telling the mayor he thought it was time for the Philadelphia chief executive to be on the scene.

Tate arrived with Turnpike Commissioner John F. Byrne, an official of the Democratic city committee and a public member of the PTC executive committee. It was Byrne who had cast the only favorable vote on the earlier agreement.

They went into Scranton's office at 10:30 a.m., and Tate never emerged until the time came to announce the settlement 10 hours later.

"What the Governor did was to convince Tate that this was the time for him to get himself out of the 'box' into which he had backed himself," an aid in the Governor's office said.

Pratt insisted on a guaranteed fare increase. The Governor insisted that he couldn't have it guaranteed, that if his petition had merit it would be approved. Sharfsin was called back and restated both his own position and the utility law.

Tate had to be convinced. Finally, after much telephoning and several conferences with advisers, the mayor softened on the cash and token fare opposition, though he refused to budge on the opposition to the 4-cent school fare increase sought by PTC.

Through all this, Quill lay on a couch in the attorney's general office. Fares did not concern him.

By 1 p.m., the situation was clearing up. There were minor matters to be settled, and this was accomplished by the Governor and the mediators working with Alessandrini. The company and union were kept apart, with the intermediaries going from room to room.

At 6 o'clock, it looked as if the show was over. Quill was due to go on television with a telephone report from the negotiations. Ten minutes later, the union leader was telling his audience that the strike was solid, that Pratt was trying to fire 42 infirm conductors and that Pratt was selling the people of Philadelphia down the river.

Pratt and two of his aids walked down Capitol Hill to a hotel and spent 20 minutes cooling off. Then they came back to find a knotty problem in connection with the wording of the successor clause affecting the ailing conductors who serve as second men on certain trolley lines.

Scranton, himself a lawyer, asked to see the wording of the clause. When it didn't reach him right away, he walked across the hall and ordered the principals to move faster.

Minutes later, he looked at the legal wording. He summoned Pratt and the company attorneys, and they initialed it.

By this time, it was reported, Byrne was arguing that the negotiations be concluded in Philadelphia, where they had begun.

This was rejected by both Pratt and Quill, who expressed utmost confidence in the Governor.

Quill insisted the PTC executive committee approve the agreement before it was signed by the union, and telephone calls were made to Edward Hopkinson, Jr., in Philadelphia, and C. Frank Reavis.

[From the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Feb. 3, 1963]

ALL ROSES SO FAR FOR SCRANTON—NEW GOVERNOR STARTS OFF BY WINNING FRIENDS (By Duke Kaminski)

HARRISBURG.—The fledgling administration of Governor Scranton closed out its third week and everything seemed to be coming up roses.

Since this is the First Lady's favorite dance tune, developments on Capitol Hill appeared to be following the script.

The PTC strike ended after 4 furious days of Scranton-inspired negotiation with Attorney General Walter E. Alessandrini doing much of the ball carrying.

Tardy motorists beamed as the Governor ordered a 15-day extension of deadlines on auto inspections and driver license renewals.

Rural school directors grinned from ear to ear as the administration rushed to enact a 1-year moratorium in local district reorganization.

Even Senate Democrats got into line by finally confirming the last two of Scranton's cabinet choices.

Bingo lovers cracked corn when the Governor said incoming State Police Commissioner E. Wilson Purdy would not raid their penny ante parties.

Conservationists were enchanted when Mines Secretary Harris Beecher Charnbury announced that he favored tougher State controls than those proposed by the Governor himself on anthracite mine stripping.

The Governor, with only one-eighth of his term behind him, continued to be a political charmer.

To the distress of downtown beaneries, he was eating with the other hired help in the capitol cafeteria—waiting in line, carrying his tray and exchanging pleasantries with the cooks and waitresses.

No trooper barred public access to him during his luncheon.

FIRST NAME BASIS

The Governor appeared to be going out of his way to be on first-name terms with just about everyone including newsmen who earlier were involved in a minor flap with his staff over editing the transcript of his press conference and requiring appointments for interviews with his staff.

Even Democratic holdovers on the payroll, who know their day of reckoning is coming appeared to be impressed.

There were a few people, of course, who were grouching.

A few hardback Democrats muttered about an indefinite threat to push Pennsylvania back into the 19th century.

Then there were 106 disappointed out-of-State groups who had sought the Governor as their Lincoln Day speaker.

Instead, the Governor promised his services to four Pennsylvania groups including one in Germantown.

The Governor will make two Lincoln speeches on the normal February 12 birth-date of the great President and two more the next day.

The Governor, who has high doubts on any Republican upending President Kennedy in 1964, went off to New York City and said some kind things about front-running Nelson Rockefeller.

His New York speech keyed progress and enthusiasm as the cornerstones of his administration.

POSITIVE ENTHUSIASM

"We must be positive, so we can be enthusiastic," he declared.

There is no question as to the current enthusiasm of the administration.

And certainly it will be needed in the days ahead.

Unemployment in mid-January rose by 64,000 to 430,000.

If there's a State-level answer to unemployment, no one has yet come up with one.

Then, there are some 90,000 public school-teachers waiting around for pay raises and just about everyone with their fingers crossed on the need for new taxes.

If Scranton can carry his administration's enthusiasm through the remaining seventy-nine eightieths of his term, he's certain to end up as one of Pennsylvania's gubernatorial immortals.

THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION ON THE PROPOSED SENATE RULE CHANGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it has been widely reported—and I think generally accepted—that at the beginning of the filibuster now in progress there were at least 57 Members of this body who were prepared to vote for the imposition of a limitation on debate by three-fifths of the Senators.

The administration undoubtedly was most active as to the retention of certain rules changes affecting the Committee on Rules in the other body, and accepted modestly the credit for having won that victory. I suggest to them that if they are really interested in the civil rights fight, they have another opportunity to accept credit for another victory, and, in my judgment, there are many members of the President's party who are prepared to vote for an amendment relating to three-fifths—sufficient, with the aid of the members from the Republican party, to provide the needed majority.

If the majority is forthcoming, in my judgment it will be because the administration has passed the word that it really wants to do something to change the rules. If the majority is not forthcoming it will be difficult for the public to understand why the administration was so interested in effecting continuation of certain desirable rules in the other body and so disinterested in doing anything about the change in the Senate rules.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, the acting minority leader, just said relative to Presidential interference in the affairs of this body.

What the House does and what interpretation the President places on any action taken in the House is, of course, his own business; but, so far as this body is concerned, no intervention or interference by anyone in the executive branch will be welcomed. The Senate will attend to its own business. It will assume its full responsibility and make its own decisions.

COLORADO RIVER DISPUTE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, yesterday I inserted in the RECORD part 1 of a series of four articles in the San Diego, Calif., Union on the dispute between the United States and Mexico over salt in the Colorado River. Today I ask unanimous consent to insert the second article in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON.—The Colorado River rises clear and cold in northern Colorado at the Continental Divide. Before it empties into the Gulf of California 1,400 miles away it passes through some of the most spectacular scenery in the world.

Some other things happen to the Colorado before it reaches the gulf, however. As it moves into what is known as its lower basin its waters are dammed and used to generate power, to provide a domestic water supply for most of southern California, and to irrigate

some of the most famous farmland in America—the Imperial Valley and the Coachella Valley in California and the Yuma Valley and lower Gila River Valley in Arizona.

The river water is diverted out over the fertile acres of onetime desert, allowed to sink into the soil, and then, to avoid water-logging the fields, it is conveyed back to the river or, in some cases, to the Salton Sea.

The water which goes back to the river is called return flow and with each reuse it extracts salts from the soils it has irrigated. As the salts accumulate in the water each succeeding farmer who uses it must apply a greater quantity of water to leach the salt out of his soil.

The pattern is set: Irrigation increases the amount of dissolved salt in the river. The more salt, the more water it takes to irrigate. Department of Agriculture experts say that when the salt in water reaches 3 tons per acre-foot the water applied to the land must be doubled to avoid a gradual poisoning of the soil with salt.

("The use of water that has an excessive amount of salt has already returned to the barren desert millions of acres of land in the West. In the Euphrates Valley and in other great areas of the world, millions of acres have been destroyed because of the use of waters too highly impregnated with salt," Senator Sheridan Downey, of California, during U.S. Senate hearings in 1945 on the Colorado River Treaty.)

The basic problem of salinity in the Colorado was foreseen many years ago but it became an international problem almost overnight in October of 1961 when the Mexican Ambassador complained to the U.S. State Department that the water being received by Mexico under the treaty provisions had become so heavily loaded with salt as to be unusable for irrigation in the Mexicali Valley.

Mexico pointed the finger at the activities of the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation District, a division of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Gila River project. Mexico accused Wellton-Mohawk of dumping into the river water which had a salt content far in excess of what could normally be expected from return flow.

Wellton-Mohawk, like so many irrigation districts of the West, operates with its own elected directors, but it was financed with Federal funds and is a Federal reclamation project. Wellton-Mohawk draws about 450,000 acre-feet of water a year from behind the federally built Imperial Dam and it applies this water to about 62,000 acres of land in Arizona's Gila River Valley.

If Wellton-Mohawk were the usual irrigation district the experts say she would receive water containing about 900 parts per million of salt and return water to the river containing about 2,300 parts per million. Instead the water which the district puts back into the river reaches a level of about 6,000 parts per million.

Wellton-Mohawk is in an unusual situation. It lies in a closed valley. Deep under its floor is a layer of gravel which, as the result of years of irrigation without adequate drainoff, has built up into a vast underground pool—perhaps 3½ million acre-feet—of very salty water.

Hydraulic engineers say the Colorado River water, first applied to the Wellton-Mohawk fields in 1952, sank down to swell the salty pool. Since the underground water could not be allowed to rise and drown the fields, the irrigation district has used pumps, about 75 of them, to pump water from the pool and discharge it via a cement-lined canal into the Colorado.

It is at this point that Mexico screams foul. She acknowledges that under the terms of the 1944 treaty she is bound to accept return flow water as well as virgin flow from the river. But Mexico insists that the mixture which Wellton-Mohawk is pouring back into

the Colorado is not the return flow of the water it got from behind Imperial Dam but instead is brine which has been lying for years in Wellton-Mohawk's vast agricultural cesspool.

The record of expert testimony before the U.S. Senate in 1945 when the treaty which Mexico was under consideration shows that the engineers anticipated the problem of increased salt as development of the river progressed. But the record shows, too, that the engineers based their calculations on the assumption that the irrigation projects would operate on the normal pattern of use and return flow—maintaining a salt balance but not flushing out the accumulated salt of years of closed irrigation.

Officials of our State Department are confident that they could defend increased salinity in the Colorado caused by normal irrigation practices. But they seem worried about what will happen if an International Court takes a look at the Wellton-Mohawk operation.

Wellton-Mohawk returns about four times the amount of salt to the Colorado that it receives. It is, in fact, sweetening its underground pool of salty water with the relatively fresh Colorado River water. There are those who say Wellton-Mohawk is creating a valuable new resource—a huge nonevaporating reservoir of water. For this reason and others, including cost, Wellton-Mohawk directors have balked at the suggestion that the district install a tile drainage system which would siphon off the Colorado River before it reached the underground pool and return it to the river in a fairly sweet state.

Engineers say at the present rate of pumping it will take about 40 years to dilute Wellton-Mohawk's underground water supply to an acceptable level.

Mexico is understandably hoping for an earlier solution.

Next: Negotiating a treaty is something like buying a used car.

REDUCING THE STOCKPILE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the editorial in the Washington Post of February 4, 1963, entitled "Shaving the Stockpile." I am glad to see this commendatory editorial regarding the work of the Stockpiling Subcommittee, of which I am proud to be a member. Digging out the facts on the stockpile has been a long and difficult process. It has been possible because of the energy, diligence, and fairness of the senior senator from Missouri, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the chairman. He deserves the gratitude of the Congress and the Nation.

I am glad that his good work is recognized in this editorial and I am sure that the recommendations finally made by the Stockpiling Subcommittee will be sensible, and fair to both the Government and industry.

I ask unanimous consent to enter this editorial in the RECORD.

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

SHAVING THE STOCKPILE

There have been no blockbusters dropped in Senator SYMINGTON's concluding hearings on the defense stockpile, but new details have been disclosed about known abuses. It was useful to have Arthur S. Flemming, the Defense Mobilizer in the Eisenhower administration, confirm again the lead and zinc were purchased during the 1950's to support prices and help the industry. The melancholy chronicle of dubious contracts and questionable intercession by Cabinet officials

has been lengthened but the narrative is by now familiar and Mr. SYMINGTON has proved his point.

What needs to be done is to cleanse the Augean stables and to revise purchasing procedures thoroughly. Senator SYMINGTON is preparing legislation to this end. As a first step, he would consolidate the management of an \$8.9 billion stockpile now administered in four distinct categories. The largest is the \$6 billion national stockpile, which can only be disposed of through cumbersome procedure involving 6 months' notice of sale and permission of Congress.

In addition, there is the Defense Production Act stockpile, acquired at \$1.5 billion; the \$1.1 billion supplemental stockpile; and the \$99.8 million Commodity Credit Corporation stockpile acquired through bartering. Grouped under a single administrator, the four stockpiles could be systematically reduced if the President were given flexible authority with the express safeguard that no sales be authorized that dislocate markets or injure industry.

Obviously the need to avoid reckless dumping means that some of the vast inventory will be around for years. But varying methods can be used to shave down a stockpile that now cost \$17.4 million annually in storage charges alone. The rubber industry, for example, has accepted the principle of using stockpile stores in the manufacture of goods procured by the Government. We now have about \$800 million worth of superfluous rubber—and this is a material that can deteriorate within 10 years.

Another formula might be resale of commodities to the industry itself—a procedure that aluminum producers have suggested for their commodity. With adequate pricing safeguards, this might be a useful technique. In those cases in which world market prices might be drastically reduced, offset payments might be considered to foreign producers who are understandably nervous about the ruinous plenty locked in the storage bins.

But whatever Mr. SYMINGTON proposes and Congress enacts, one safeguard is mandatory. For years, the stockpiles accumulated in secret and routine commercial contracts were blanketed with classified stamps. Many of the contracts that lacked the normal renegotiation clauses and other features essential to protect the public interest were spawned in secrecy. Mr. SYMINGTON's investigation has made an impressive case for the right to full scrutiny of public business. The true scandal of the stockpile is that so much was spent on so many superfluous things with the public knowing so little.

SALUTE TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on January 18 an impressive galaxy of talent donated their services in a salute to President Kennedy. It was a blockbuster of a show.

An excellent review of the sparkling occasion was made by Les Carpenter in the January 23 issue of *Variety*. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

KENNEDY BOFF STANDUP COMIC—BANISH GREMLINS FROM D.C. SHED

(By Les Carpenter)

WASHINGTON, January 22.—Show business looked good, the talent shimmered, the acoustics were perfect, the jinxed armory was tamed. It was all an exciting smash entertainment. Thus may be summed up last Friday night's salute to the second anniversary of the Inaugural of President John

F. Kennedy and Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. If the earlier culture program made culture dull because locally inaudible, this redeeming event put showmanship back in good repute. True, the auspices this time did not have the dread of a feedback due to closed circuit. The entertainment was confined to the drill shed.

And the National Armory, site of many a muster of the political elite, never looked lovelier or sounded its syllables so perfectly. (There were newsreel items on New York video stations Saturday night.)

This time the production was worthy to be put before a President. And considering the success, plus the money which rolled in to the Democratic Party at \$100 per ticket (those who went to the preshow dinner paid \$1,000 each), it could well restore a U.S. "command performance" tradition, badly dented by the closed circuit thing.

Richard Adler, producer and director of the JFK-LBJ salute (he spent 7 weeks on it), conquered the sound difficulty with an army of technicians and an assembly of electronics rivaling Cape Canaveral. It might have been costly, but it shows what can happen when the experts are brought in. It was loud and clear. Quality of the sound, in fact, left nothing to be desired.

The ugly premises were transformed into a dazzling sight, as well, with a multitude of balloons and glittering streamers.

LOTS A SENTIMENT

Politically motivated or otherwise, every performer on the bill put heart into his/her act. (On the "I Love Jack" note, Gene Kelly, who emceed along with Kirk Douglas, introduced himself: "I'm a part-time dancer and a full-time Democrat." When it was Douglas' turn, he quipped:

"Mr. President, we are honored that you have so much interest in our business and that you read *Variety* every week. We are trying to reciprocate. We have Jayne Mansfield reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

But the hit of the show turned out to be the President himself, who is now established as the best standup comedian outside of the "New Acts" files. With his skill at accenting and timing gag lines, he received the loudest yokes of the night. "The \$100 per plate dinner," he said, "was originated 30 years ago in the days of the Roosevelt New Deal. We have revolutionized that by removing the dinner. But we are hanging on to the \$100. The day will come when we will let you go."

(The latter referred to charges that Government employees were forced by arm twisting to divvy up for \$100 tickets. One such Federal worker in the crowd was overheard: "I'd applaud but I can't use my arm anymore.")

TOP EV AND CHARLIE?

Vice President JOHNSON also thanked the talent at the end of the show, telling the crowd: "The Republican Party has the Ev and Charlie Show. But look what we've got. Weren't they great?" There was another ovation for the cast.

Producer Adler lost three members of his cast for illness or other reasons, Danny Kaye, Judy Garland and Cyril Ritchard. But the blend of talent remaining was a variety bill of excellence from the opening by Yves Montand (Gallic favorites in French) to the rousing windup, excerpts from George Balanchine's "Stars and Stripes" by the New York City Ballet.

Two arias by Australian Soprano Joan Sutherland, with the orchestra under the baton of her husband, Richard Boyngie, set off the longest applause, but it was obvious all night that the crowd liked everybody.

George Burns and Carol Channing were a major hit with their high style return to oldtime vaudeville, a segment of their nitery act. There was such laughter that their carefully timed allotment of the show by Adler (11 minutes) ran 3 minutes over.

LOOKERS

Britain's Shirley Bassey who belts her numbers with high charged feeling sang, "I Had a Dream," "Everything's Coming Up Roses," and "Nearness of You." Broadway's Diahann Carroll, magnificently gowned, was well received after "Love Walked In," "Poor Little Rich Girl," and "You're Nobody Until Somebody Loves You." (She had not made the Madison Square party last May to J.F.K.)

Carol Burnett had plenty of comic freshness in a skit based on an old idea. She was a princess making a television film wherein she was to drink a toast to President Kennedy on his inaugural anniversary. She, of course, misused the first few times and then began to feel the effect of the booze. As executed by the amusing Miss Burnett, it had more razzle-dazzle than any ordinary alcoholic scene.

Antonio and his Flamenco Ballet Espanol was heel pounding mucho grando, with a rousing pace in the staging.

Peter, Paul and Mary were effective as representatives of American folk singers. Among their four numbers were "This Land Is My Land" and "Lemon Tree."

Larry Galbart and Bart Shevlove wrote the gags for Kelly and Douglas. (One by Douglas, related to what show biz is willing to do for J.F.K.: "Darryl Zanuck, during the Cuban crisis, volunteered to send 30,000 of his own troops.")

John Reardon opened vocally with "The Star-Spangled Banner."

The skill and mother hen care for details by producer-director Adler were in evidence throughout. Apparently, no film was made of the complete show, although all three TV networks were there and shot segments. They are for use only on news shows, according to the understanding here.

The show ran 2 hours and 45 minutes with no intermission.

INAUGURAL ANNIVERSARY SALUTE LINEUP

- Produced and staged by Richard Adler.
1. "Star Spangled Banner," John Reardon.
 2. Anniversary Overture; Hal Hastings, conductor; orchestrated by Sid Ramin.
 3. Gene Kelly (writers: Larry Galbart, Bart Shevlove).
 4. Yves Montand; Robert Castella, conductor.
 5. Antonio and his Flamenco Ballet Espanol, with Carmen Rejas.
 6. Shirley Bassey; Raymond Long, conductor.
 7. George Burns and Carol Channing; Robert Hunter, conductor.
 8. Peter, Paul, and Mary.
 9. Kirk Douglas (same writers as Kelly).
 10. Joan Sutherland; Richard Bonyge, conductor.
 11. Carol Burnett, assisted by Dick Altman.
 12. Diahann Carroll; Peter Matz, conductor.
 13. New York City Ballet; excerpts from "Stars and Stripes"; choreography by George Balanchine; costumes by Karinska; Robert Irving, conductor; music by John Philip Sousa; orchestration by Hershy Kay; featured soloists, Allegra Kent, Arthur Mitchel, Edward Villella.
 14. Anniversary finale.
 15. Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States.
 16. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States.
- Associate producer, Jerome I. Meyers; musical director, Hal Hastings; lighting, Sam Leve; decorations, Robert Rowe Paddock; production stage manager, Chet O'Brien; sound, Phil Romone; production assistant, Paul Blaustein; assistant production stage managers, Ira Cirker, Bob Bostwick.

SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM GRADUATION NIGHT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a highly successful Senate youth program came to a delightful conclusion last Friday evening. I was privileged—along with the high school students who participated and the sponsors of the program—to listen to an excellent address which on that occasion was delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]. Senator PELL was cochairman of the Senate youth program, along with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Senator PELL's comments to the students who were in attendance were highly instructive and most interesting. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM GRADUATION NIGHT
(Speech by Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, at the closing dinner of the Senate youth program)

Tonight might be described as graduation night for you all as this dinner concludes the most worthwhile undertaking known as the Senate youth program in which you have been participating.

I want to thank those who have been responsible in making this program, the first of its kind, such a resounding success. Because the program was so challenging and stimulating, many contributed of their time and talents generously. It would be difficult to single them out individually. The principal debt of gratitude is owed to Randolph Hearst and his fellow trustees of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation, without whom this whole week of yours would not have occurred. Without them, this week would have been just like last week. But, because of this week, next week, and all your weeks hereafter will be different because of the increased knowledge and awareness this trip will have brought you. I thank Ira Walsh of the Hearst Foundation and Cora Prifold and the American Political Science Association for all the spadework they did in bringing about this week. I thank my fellow Senators, all of them who took of their time to be with the interns from their own State and, more especially, our Senate youth program cochairman Senator COOPER, our ex-officio members, Senator HUMPHREY, majority whip, and Senator KUCHEL, minority whip, and our fellow Members, Senators CURTIS and JORDAN. And, finally and most particularly, I thank my own administrative assistant, Ray Nelson, without whom I could not have had an intern program to start with and without whom I could not have done what little I have done to be of help to the Senate youth program.

I sincerely hope that it has done much to encourage you fine young people, representing as you do the young people of your own age throughout our country, in participating in government and politics. Our Nation and our two-party system will only be as strong and vibrant as we make it. In our youth is our future as a country and a society. I have termed this program "Project Political Awakening."

The future of our country in great part depends on the amount of interest, enthusiasm, and participation that our young people display in taking part in politics, government, and public service at all levels.

I am very concerned that they do not fully appreciate or understand our heritage

and the necessity for their playing a lively and responsible role in the future. I feel too often, unfortunately, they look upon men in public life, particularly those who are politicians, as people they do not want to emulate.

Our great heroes of the past, more often than not, have been politicians. If we are to continue to be great in the future as a nation, our heroes of the future, I hope, will continue to be well represented by politicians. And, don't forget, to be a statesman, you must be a successful—and dead politician.

I have seen the enthusiasm and work of a small group of young people in my own campaign who gave of their time and talents and know what a job they can do when motivated.

Aware of the need to stimulate the interest of young people, and because I feel a responsibility to do something myself, I have conducted my own internship program involving college and high school students. By this summer, about 100 young men and women will have gone through my office during a 2½-year period.

As Ray Nelson has already described to you, I understand, the program, I will not go into further details except to say that my staff has enjoyed having them, being stimulated in turn by their enthusiasm and interest.

I might add that when they leave at the end of an altogether too brief week, they never fail to mention their surprise at the great amount of work that goes on in a Senator's office, and the long hours put in by staff members. This is quite a common thing throughout the Senate.

The overwhelming majority, in fact nearly all of the young people in our high schools today, I am sure, could not answer simple questions as to the names of their Senators and Congressmen, Governor, and other State officials. Indeed, I would wager that practically all have never really read the Constitution and the Bill of Rights with interest or so they understood it. In fact, even amongst you selected students, how many of you know the name of your own State representative?

Unfortunately, as we all know, the word "politician" has a bad connotation in our society today. Our citizens too often look down upon those who serve and want nothing to do with public service, politics, and government. I remember the remarks of Artemus Ward "I am neither a politician, nor do I have any other bad habits."

But, politics is here to stay. It has been with us since society first began to form. There is politics in everything, your schools, public institutions, clubs, indeed, in your own home. Essentially, it is working with people—the relationships of people brought to a fine art in the field of government.

But, this is a two-way street. It is up to us who serve as well as up to those who elect. Politics and public service are a challenge, indeed, a responsibility.

How often I have heard the expression "I didn't bother to vote—what good would it do?" Anyone who says this has forfeited his right to criticize. Unfortunately, those who didn't bother to vote would wonder what happened if they were ever part of a society ruled by a dictator.

In other parts of the world, people remember only too well. And, they turn out today in vast numbers at the polls compared to our poor showings.

I have seen many fine people in government, dedicated, sincere, trying to do a good job. Many of these people are not greatly rewarded financially. But if that were their goal alone, they would never have gone into public service. We do not live by bread alone.

Can the quality of men in government be improved? Of course, it can. There is always room, and need, for improvement.

Why do men seek public office? For varying reasons. These are the reasons of public conscience, the desire to serve, to give of themselves. And, there are the reasons of accomplishment, power, influence, recognition, and rewards, tangible and intangible, that go with it. And, most of us are impelled by a mixture of the two.

However, I make no apology for this. This is human nature at work. Again, this has been politics at work since the beginning. What we want to stimulate is the giving of oneself as well as that of seeking to achieve and accomplish. This can be done at many levels of government. Become a part-time politician. Support the two-party system. Pick the party of your choice. There are many opportunities and much need. Work at the ward level, ring doorbells, drive on election day, seek to register new voters, run for office at the city council or school committee level. Don't let the goal ever be too big. If you ever want to do and are old enough to do so, do so. Run. Don't be discouraged by being called too young. You have nothing to lose. And, you will be amazed how often you will win. There is a lot in the old phrase, "Ask and ye shall receive." If you don't try, you won't succeed.

Perhaps there are some serving in politics who are less qualified than others. And, for this they may fairly be criticized if they fall short in their public duty. But why are they there in the first place? The answer is simple. Because they were put there, too often by the indifference and refusal of others in the community to share the responsibility of government.

So, who is more to blame? The one less qualified and serving, or those more qualified, and refusing. I think the one serving deserves the tribute that at least he tried, he was willing. The others deserve nothing but the quality of the government they get.

And how often we have heard about the "crooks in city hall." And, about how they are filling their pockets. And how they are robbing the taxpayers blind. And at times, individuals are singled out for condemnation, subject of vicious rumors, of slander, and libel.

If there are crooks in city hall, turn them out. If they fill their pockets at your expense, how foolish of you to let them. If you have knowledge of crookedness in city hall, you have an equal responsibility to do something about it, either in legal recourse, or in helping turn the rascals out. But, don't criticize without offering a positive contribution or solution. That is just being negative.

My young friends, there are many drones in the world. Because of them, because of their refusal to accept responsibility, your opportunities will be greater.

Seek out responsibility, take risks, welcome adversity as a blessing in disguise. Life is not easy, nor is it meant to be. And, above all, don't be afraid to care. Rather, care, care passionately, and do something about it.

A society and a nation that knows sacrifice also knows discipline. They, too, are blessings in disguise. They make and mold a people. They are too often qualities denied us individually and as a whole.

We have two parties in this country. And there are those in between the two, and some even to the extremes of both. And within our two parties there is diversity of opinion and direction. In fact, as Professor Burns points out in his "Deadlock of Democracy," we have four parties. But, perhaps because of this diversity, we change our governments through orderly elections, and not through coup d'état, or revolution. In fact, ours may be a new nation, but it is one of the oldest governments in the world today.

When I was your age, I and others blamed the older generation for the problems of the

world. Today we are becoming the older generation, and it is your turn to observe, criticize, and, unfortunately for us, replace us in turn.

This has been a fine program. I hope to see it repeated, and others like it. But, much remains to be done.

I believe that in the years ahead, our schools, particularly at the high school level, and into the colleges, too, should encourage knowledge and participation in politics and government.

I even go so far as to propose we should think seriously about introduction into the curriculum, possibly in the senior year of high school, of a subject of realistic political activity, not just theory alone, as a mandatory credit course.

I think in terms of teachers, with specialized training, perhaps at summer sessions, instructing in this area, with mandatory attendance by the students at their city and town council meetings, school committee sessions, courts, other municipal affairs, and even at the State legislatures, if possible.

I would encourage talks and lectures by leaders of political parties, and by elected and appointed officials, at State and local levels.

And, I would propose also that such programs be done by the States, not through the Federal Government, so that we can have the continued great diversity of opinion, belief, and background that has gone into our politicians from the south, north, east, and west of our Nation.

Above all else, though, care about the course of events, care about conditions in the world, in your State, in your community. Care passionately. And do something to remedy the conditions about which you care.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR PASTORE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am proud and happy to know that my senior colleague, Senator PASTORE, will be chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as I know my colleagues are.

Senator PASTORE will do an outstanding job in this demanding job and will carry out his responsibility in the excellent and distinguished way in which he has carried out every responsibility that has ever been assigned to him.

It is with great pleasure that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the Woonsocket Call lead editorial of January 21, 1963, entitled "Senator PASTORE Can Handle the Job." This editorial truly reflects the respect and regard held throughout Rhode Island for Senator PASTORE.

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

SENATOR PASTORE CAN HANDLE THE JOB

The selection of Senator PASTORE as chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee of Congress should do more than fill his Rhode Island constituents with pride. It should also make them feel a bit more secure in the knowledge that such a vital committee will be guided by his particular abilities.

Obviously the committee is one of the most sensitive, or at least deals in a highly sensitive area. The chairmanship rotates between the House and Senate and last year the senior Senator from Rhode Island was the vice chairman.

It is possible that Senator PASTORE knows more about atomic energy and its international ramifications than any other Member of the Congress. It was he who laid the groundwork for agreements negotiated by this country with 40 other nations to which

we have supplied atomic techniques and nuclear materials.

The field of atomic energy covers a far wider range than the layman can visualize. But Senator PASTORE has pretty much grown up with it and his background is invaluable. Certainly the people of Rhode Island have made a contribution to the cause by putting the talents of Senator PASTORE at its disposal.

During his 12 years in the Senate the Rhode Islander has been regarded as one of its workhorses. In fact the new chairmanship assignment brings to four the number of Senate committees he heads. He is chairman of the Subcommittees on Communications and Textiles under the Senate Commerce Committee, and of the legislative subcommittee under the Senate Appropriations Committee. None of these is a sinecure. And aside from these chairmanships he is a member of five other subcommittees.

Quite frequently we complain of the archaic system the Senate has of promoting only through seniority. Very often it is impractical. The selection of Senator PASTORE, however, is one occasion where the right man was picked for the right job—at the right time.

Senator PASTORE's new duties will not be without multitudinous problems and, indeed, they will weigh heavily as a responsibility for they so involve the Nation's welfare. But we doubt whether a man with any more stamina or any keener intellect could have been found to carry them out. The choice is a good one not just for Rhode Island, but for the United States.

NEGOTIATIONS FOR BRITAIN'S ENTRY INTO THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, all too often events in this complex world are baffling because we persist in examining them from our own viewpoint. This most certainly has been the case with the lamentable collapse of negotiations for Britain's entry into the European Common Market.

Most of us in the West have become so imbued with the spirit of North Atlantic unity over the past 18 years that it has seemed almost inconceivable to us that the French Republic and her President whom we have come to admire so much, could think in any other terms. There has, however, been another point of view, a distinctly French point of view and, right or wrong, it has, for the moment, prevailed.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, the distinguished dean of American columnists, has analyzed and explained this French view in his usual lucid style in a recent issue of Newsweek magazine. It is the kind of analysis we must have if we are to adjust effectively to the realities in Europe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Gaullist Explosion," by Walter Lippmann, from the February 4 issue of Newsweek, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GAULLIST EXPLOSION

(By Walter Lippmann)

To understand General de Gaulle and his recent actions, we have to look at the world through very different spectacles than those we have been using. For he is at odds with almost all of our postwar policy, and he is

determined to dismantle the main structure of Western policy which has been built up since the cold war began.

This decision has long been maturing in his mind. General de Gaulle is a conservative in the high European tradition, which means that he regards as alien such 19th century developments as mass democracy and representative government, free enterprise, collective security, and the search for international peace. For him the old nations are the enduring elements of civilization, which leads him to believe that the cold war with Bolshevik Russia is only a passing moment. The old Russia, in his view, will outlive the Bolshevik conquest as France has outlived the Nazi conquest.

Though General de Gaulle is, of course, staunchly anti-Communist, he has never been overawed by the manifestations of Communist power, and he has always regarded the cold war as a brief moment in the history of our civilization. Thus, he has no doubts that eventually, perhaps sooner than we dare to suppose, Russia will be ready for a peace with the West. His deep purpose in creating all this commotion is to make sure that when the eventual peace from "the Atlantic to the Urals" is made, it will be he and not the American President who makes it.

The critical fact is that General de Gaulle regards the cold war as temporary, whereas the other Western leaders act as if it were virtually permanent. For them the division of the world is the shape of the world. The object of policy is to withstand communism and at the same time to create on this side of the Iron Curtain a flourishing civilization. To do this, the West must organize the non-Communist nations.

Because General de Gaulle has never believed that the cold war is permanent, he has never liked the array of postwar institutions. To his way of thinking, the movement toward Western unity is shot through with sentimentality and meddlesomeness. It is unnecessary because the Communist menace is overestimated. Communist Russia is not strong enough to conquer the West and, as General de Gaulle might well say now, Khrushchev has at last admitted it.

UNCIVILIZED AMERICA

Furthermore, the institutions that are being created depend on the support and leadership of the United States. The United States is not, in General de Gaulle's mind, civilized enough to lead Western civilization. And so, now that he is the undisputed ruler of a rich and stable France, he has declared himself the opponent of the whole structure of Western postwar policy.

To be sure, he recognizes that for some years to come NATO as a military alliance is needed. But he has little use for the integrated NATO establishment and has withdrawn the greater portion of the French forces from the NATO command. He is opposed to the European Economic Community whether it is conceived as supranational with Jean Monnet and Paul-Henri Spaak or with Mr. Kennedy and Macmillan as the center of a trading area extending over Europe and the Americas.

He is opposed to the Atlantic community. I find this a little hard to take. For France has twice been saved because she belongs to the Atlantic community which Americans have crossed the ocean to defend. But General de Gaulle resents the influence in European affairs which these expeditions to Europe have given the United States. He is, of course, opposed to the United Nations used as a bridge connecting the old established powers with the new countries. He is opposed to suspending nuclear tests. And he is opposed to our policy of talking and talking with Mr. Khrushchev about disarmament, Laos, Berlin, or anything else.

And so, we ask ourselves whether this great man who has so often been right can now

be totally wrong. I, for one, would not say so. His error, which is serious, is to watch the horizon without paying sufficient attention to the foreground. No doubt it is true that eventually there will be an accommodation with Moscow. This will probably come by the evolution of the Soviet Union, by the changing balance of power, and, it may be, by the pressure of Red China. But the time for that accommodation has not yet arrived. What De Gaulle chooses to ignore is that détente is more likely to arrive if the unity of the Western World is growing than if its unity is shattered and disrupted.

TIGHT LITTLE EUROPE

The more generous the frame of Western unity, the better able will the West be to make this kind of accommodation. The tight little Europe which General de Gaulle wants has no room for Great Britain and Scandinavia. But also, it has no room for the East European nations which will eventually be returning to Europe.

No doubt many of the fragments of the postwar arrangements are obsolete. Moreover, the original motive, which was fear, is diminishing. Nevertheless, the main structure of cooperation is not a mere cold-war instrument but is good in itself and carries with it the promise of a much better and more spacious life for multitudes of men.

And so, for what seems to us good reason, we shall have to oppose the opposition of General de Gaulle. If we are mistaken in thinking that there is a strong tide running in favor of Western unity, we shall fail. But there is no reason to think we are mistaken. Even within the small continental community of the Six, there is reason to think he is an isolated leader. Western Europe, except for Dr. Adenauer personally, is overwhelmingly opposed to a Gaullist Europe in which the great popular parties—the Christian Democrats, the Liberal Democrats, and the Social Democrats—will be pushed aside while the critical decisions are made in the Elysée Palace in Paris.

THE PROVIDENCE (R.I.) JOURNAL-BULLETIN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, few cities in the United States can take such pride in an unbroken tradition of outstanding journalism as does the city of Providence in my home State of Rhode Island. And few cities can anywhere duplicate the fine, journalistic tradition represented by the Providence Journal and its sturdy journalistic offspring, the Evening Bulletin.

The Providence Journal's proud history as a leader in the morning newspaper field dates back to 1829, and over the years it became not only the leading news organ of Rhode Island, but, in the view of many, the conscience of all New England.

On January 26, 1863—just 100 years ago last month—in response to the news demands of the Civil War, the Journal Co. entered the afternoon field with the publication of the first issue of the Evening Bulletin. In the century which has followed, the Bulletin has outgrown its parent in size and circulation, and in its own way, has at least matched the Journal's traditions of excellence, integrity and journalistic enterprise.

Last week the Journal commemorated this notable anniversary by devoting its entire Sunday supplement of January 27 to the story of the Evening Bulletin's first century. It was an exciting story told in the clear and straightforward

style of an oldtime New England editor, Mr. David Patten. It was, however, far too long a story to be retold here, and I ask only that the brief forward to the supplement, by John C. A. Watkins, president and publisher of the Journal-Bulletin, be reprinted.

And since newspapermen are often their own worst critics, it seems especially appropriate to call attention at the same time to a congratulatory editorial which appeared in the columns of one of the Bulletin's most vigorous competitors, the Providence Visitor, weekly publication of the Roman Catholic diocese of Providence.

As the Visitor is first to acknowledge, these newspapers have not always seen eye to eye, and they certainly have sprung from different traditions. Nevertheless, the Visitor's editorial bears testimony to the fact that their differences have been far outweighed by their mutual respect and by their common interest in the welfare of the Rhode Island community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Bulletin Century," by John C. A. Watkins, from the Providence Sunday Journal of January 27, be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "A Century of Distinction," from the Providence Visitor of January 25, 1963, be printed in the RECORD. I commend both of these articles to all those who would have faith in the power and ability of the press not only to endure and survive, but to grow constructively with the times.

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

THE BULLETIN CENTURY

(By John C. A. Watkins)

Just 100 years ago, the Evening Bulletin came into being to bring the latest news of the Civil War to Providence. It is significant that the first issue of the newspaper carried a local news story of paramount interest—the sacking of Rhode Island's own General Burnside as commander in chief of the Army of the Potomac.

On the opening day of its long life then, the Evening Bulletin assumed the character—an absorbing interest in local news—that was to mark it throughout the years and that distinguished it right down to yesterday's issue in which Rhode Island teenagers read, as usual, several pages of news of their own activities. The daily Journal was a healthy institution when its younger brother was born and its coverage always has spanned the world—from our own state-house to Washington and Calcutta.

But the Evening Bulletin has been preponderantly local. From the outset, it has been interested primarily in the doings and sayings of the people and in the size and shape, the color and movement of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations. Its coverage of local news has been exhaustive, and to some occasionally may seem almost overwhelming. The newspaper has probed into dark corners of the local scene, possibly to the embarrassment of someone now and then, but to the overall benefit, we hope, of our State and its people.

It is a satisfaction that many businesses have grown and prospered with the Bulletin by drawing on the strength of its local news coverage and in turn making it possible for that news coverage to get even better. Many of these businesses have made news of their own through the advertising col-

umns—not that the two kinds of news knowingly have ever been mixed or confused for the eyes of the reader.

The general history of the Evening Bulletin that is printed in this special issue of the Rhode Islander was written by the knowledgeable hand of David Patten, for many years managing editor of both the Bulletin and the Journal and now living in retirement, but most definitely not in torpor. Mr. Patten has scanned the records, and he has talked at length to many people who were and are intimately associated with the past and present of these newspapers. Parts of the narrative come alive under Mr. Patten's hand because he was there. Much of it has never been published before.

But through the whole story runs the inconsistent theme of the Evening Bulletin's pressing concern with local news. For 100 years the newspaper has been what it started out to be on its first day—the unabashed chronicler of Providence and of Rhode Island.

[From the Providence Visitor, Jan. 25, 1963]

A CENTURY OF DISTINCTION

The Providence Evening Bulletin is 100 years old tomorrow. The Visitor, 88 years young, offers its congratulations. In the newspaper business, it's the survival of the fittest, and the Bulletin has not only survived but come off as one of the country's best. The Bulletin has always been an organ of strong convictions, and with many of them the Visitor could not agree; but it also has had many fine convictions, from which the community has benefited. The Visitor has frequently tilted with the Bulletin, but perhaps not so often as it has concurred—as it does at the moment, for example, in pressing for no increase in Rhode Island racing, the campaign against bookies, fair housing, and the ad rem obscenity statute. And as to a friend the Visitor turned to the Journal-Bulletin for physical aid last June when because of a press breakdown the Visitor was printed on the Journal-Bulletin presses. The Visitor remembers with satisfaction, conversely, coming to the Bulletin's aid in the hurricane of 1938 when one of its issues was printed on Fenner Street. These are pleasant reflections on the happy occasion of the Bulletin's anniversary. We may hope that time will tend to extend them. We wish the Bulletin and its sister paper the Providence Journal many more years and the wisdom that comes with them.

THE DOCTRINE OF COUNTERFORCE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, one of the most incisive writers today is Claude Witze, senior editor of the Air Force/Space Digest, and one of the most incisive articles he has even written is in the current issue of Air Force/Space Digest, the February 1963 issue.

I invite the attention of all Members of the Senate and the House to it—especially members of the Armed Services Committee—and I invite the attention of the Secretary of Defense to it.

I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD.

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

FAREWELL TO COUNTERFORCE

(By Claude Witze)

In early 1963, as the Kennedy administration passes the halfway mark in its stewardship, the schism between the military and civilian hierarchies in the Pentagon is moving toward a climax.

This division is both unfortunate and unnecessary. But, unless checked, it poses a threat to our security, looms as a barrier to

domestic political harmony, and frustrates our diplomatic efforts.

An important facet of this Pentagon schism, and one that is a disappointment particularly to scores of lifelong Democrats, is the growing evidence that it is the civilian secretariat, not the uniformed column, that takes the conservative point of view. The military, for so many years pictured as hide-bound to obsolete methods and weapons, are the people eager to break technological frontiers. In an ironic switch, it is the civilian leadership which wishfully thinks of fighting the next war in terms of the last one.

The most alarming manifestation of the situation was delineated on these pages last month, when the editor of *Air Force/Space Digest* reported that the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is being tacitly replaced by one of nuclear stalemate, that a strategic ceiling will replace our umbrella of strategic superiority if the present trends in doctrine and weapon system development continue.

To this report it can be added that the active Chiefs of Staff, the heads of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, do not approve of the change in strategy. They are unanimous in their support of a doctrine of strategic superiority. And they consider this superiority to be essential if their forces are to retain the flexibility needed to hold potential conflict to some level of violence lower than a nuclear holocaust involving all-out exchange of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

In contrast, the administration now obviously believes that superiority is not necessary, that it is undesirable because it is provocative and that it is meaningless because nuclear war is unthinkable. No other conclusion can be drawn from recent events. Equally clear is the position of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara as the President's chief strategic adviser, overshadowing—indeed, censoring and subjugating—the opinions of our military experts.

When we turn our backs on the requirement for strategic superiority we are abandoning the counterforce doctrine which Mr. McNamara himself enunciated at Ann Arbor only last June. By definition, a counterforce capability is expensive to buy and maintain. It calls for a large arsenal of weapons and a variety of means to deliver them. It requires a sophisticated mixture of manned and unmanned systems, with all of that force combat ready and a substantial part of it on alert.

In his Ann Arbor speech, Secretary McNamara said our objectives, which means targets, in the event of a nuclear war "should be the destruction of the enemy's military forces, not of his population." Our strength would not be used for a first strike, for America is pledged never to perpetrate a Pearl Harbor, but for retaliation only. Thus our strategic force must be large, powerful, and protected—to be able to survive a blow and then to seek out and destroy the enemy's well hidden and hardened weapons.

The slow erosion of our ability to carry out this counterforce doctrine and, in fact, our deliberate intention to replace the necessary strategic superiority with strategic stalemate, are clear in decisions already made and our plans for future decisions. These decisions are being explained to the American people in terms of budgetary and technological doubletalk. The budgetary argument is considered good because it is related to every man's pocketbook and close to the heart of Congress in a tax-cutting year. Technological arguments have the further merit of being, for the most part, beyond the comprehension of the general public and thus requiring no documentation beyond a simple statement.

Probably the best way to explain what is being done is to cite, as we have again and again, the Cuban crisis. The admin-

istration viewpoint was cogently expressed by Walter Lippmann, who said in a Paris speech that the confrontation showed "the importance of conventional military power when nuclear power has been balanced and neutralized. The United States prevailed in Cuba because, after nuclear power had been neutralized, it had powerful conventional weapons."

Our military leaders know better. U.S. nuclear power was not neutralized or balanced in the Cuban affair. The United States had superiority. It was plain and simple and President Kennedy at the outset made it credible, and therefore effective. He told the world we would use this power on Russia itself if missiles were fired at us from Cuba. It was Russia's nuclear power that was neutralized and it was our strategic superiority that did the trick.

This is not to derogate the role played by conventional systems, mainly those of the Navy and Air Force, in the Cuban showdown. But it should be clear that these alternates to total war can be exercised only under an umbrella of strategic superiority.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay has pointed out repeatedly, particularly in testimony on Capitol Hill, that budget trends in recent years indicate a progressive retreat from this posture of strategic superiority. President Kennedy's fiscal 1964 defense budget is on its way to Congress as these words are written, and the trend is expected to continue.

Manned strategic systems, with their innate flexibility, appear doomed. From the projected pattern of research-and-development expenditures for strategic systems over the next 5 years it is clear that we are unilaterally freezing technology at the level of Polaris and Minuteman. One report says the outlay for the R. & D. effort will drop from \$2 billion to two-tenths of a billion in the next 5 years. The strategic potential of space is being overlooked entirely.

The impression has been made, and encouraged, that the doctrinal argument involves only the Air Force. This is at worst an untruth, at best an oversimplification. It happens that our strategic systems, with the single exception of Polaris, all are assigned to the Air Force. Hence, a policy calling for nuclear stalemate of necessity has its greatest impact on Air Force missions and programs.

Until 1963, however, there had not been any sign that the other chiefs, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler of the Army; Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., of the Navy; and Gen. David M. Shoup of the Marines, might lend support to General LeMay in his expression of concern over the trend. Indications now are that strategic superiority is gaining support from all three services, and the Air Force does not stand alone.

This change of heart undoubtedly was brought about by the recent palaver, on both a national and international level, over the Skybolt air-launched ballistic missile. Skybolt was killed because it did not conform to the new strategic policy. The decision had international repercussions because the weapon was promised by us as a substitute for British development of its own air-launched ballistic missile. Lack of Skybolt forces Great Britain into agreement with our new policy. The budgetary arguments against Skybolt are dubious, since Britain now has to build a fleet of Polaris-armed submarines. The technological arguments advanced against Skybolt have been spurious from the beginning.

Much the same can be said for the RS-70 Mach 3 airplane. Its price tag was high, although expert witnesses testified that the Russians would have to spend even more to find a defense against it. Other witnesses, equally expert, have sworn that the system is within the state of the art and that it involves far fewer unknowns than the ICBM did nearly a decade ago when it was ordered into high-priority development. But both

the RS-70 and the Skybolt are inconsistent with the new strategic policy of nuclear stalemate. That is why they are not wanted by the administration.

As a matter of fact, other advanced manned aerospace military systems, which might operate in either the atmosphere or space, are equally incongruous to the new policy. In the new budget this is expected to result in denial of USAF requests for improved air defense systems, and at least four more F-4C wings for the Tactical Air Command. In the research-and-development area there will be minimum allowance for a long look at the potentials of space. USAF's Dyna-Soar project now is expected to suffer and, in the long run, it's a good bet that the TFX variable-sweep fighter will go the route of the RS-70 and Skybolt. A nuclear-armed TFX would also be inconsistent with the nuclear stalemate philosophy.

This report would be remiss if it did not lay some emphasis on the pregnant suggestion that the stalemate policy constitutes a significant step by the United States toward some degree of unilateral disarmament.

In the January issue of Harper's magazine there is an outline by P. M. S. Blackett, a British physicist, of the early steps he considers essential to achieve a disarmed world. Blackett's main thesis is that a complete shedding of arms is urgent and that the West must change its military policies in order to achieve the goal. There is a striking parallel between Blackett's recommendations and our current trend toward nuclear parity. Parity, in fact, is what Blackett recommends. Superiority, of the kind that made our Cuban venture possible, is viewed by this scientist and Nobel Prize winner as a provocative menace. Like a great many of his fellows in the cult now influencing military strategy on the basis of computer techniques, he consistently underestimates the risks, with a fervor approaching that of India before the Chinese swept across the Himalayan Mountains. He does not admit that a disparity in basic aims and methods might be a significant factor in the power relationship between the Soviet bloc and the free world. He implicitly views the United States as a mirror-image of the U.S.S.R.

Blackett points to our current strategic superiority—he credits us with a 3 to 1 advantage over the Soviets—and says that a reduction by percentage, therefore, would not be acceptable. It follows that the first step toward disarmament is to reduce the strategic nuclear forces of both sides to the same equal and low level. A couple of dozen invulnerable missiles on either side would do. The author, who underestimates the power of the executive branch in the U.S. Government, then speculates that President Kennedy of necessity faces delays getting Congress to approve nuclear parity. He says that the American military, which he views typically as a self-serving monster, will fight the approval by convincing Americans that arms control is preferable to disarmament because it will be less disruptive to the economy.

Blackett contends that the goal must include approximate parity in both nuclear and conventional forces, then lends support to the Kennedy-McNamara effort to restrain England from exercising independence in the area of nuclear capability.

Professor Blackett views with alarm the McNamara Ann Arbor pledge to avoid attack on enemy cities, a pledge that is a commitment to a counterforce strategy. He laments the fact that counterforce strategy necessitates forces that are overwhelmingly superior and recognizes that it makes slim the chances for nuclear parity as a first step toward disarmament. He then lists four reasons why U.S. policy, up to now, has been in favor of counterforce. Not one of these reasons even suggests the possibility of a Soviet

attack on us or our allies. The deterrent effect of superiority is dismissed as a minor argument. He expresses hope that the Kennedy administration, with its effort to bring the U.S. military more firmly under civilian control, will find a way to replace nuclear superiority with nuclear parity.

There is an undeniable parallel between the Blackett recommendations and what our force structure is pointing toward in the next several years by the McNamara budget planning.

This is not to say that an individual Briton, or a group of Britons, is dictating the shift in our policy. There are Blacketts holding influential positions in the U.S. Government. As pointed out in this magazine last September, the critics of counterforce capability fear its fertilizing effect on the arms race. They warn it may be provocative. They hold that it is technically infeasible and that it is not realistic. They are receiving sound support in the Pentagon from Mr. McNamara's own budgetary and technological experts, who are providing specialized and diversionary excuses to change the force structure without admitting that the goal is a strategic policy which adds up to a unilateral disarmament program.

Realistically, it must be admitted that scientist Blackett's sympathizers in this country are more sophisticated than he in the American political arena. Congress has shown a minimum of interest in strategic policy, a maximum of interest in the hardware of weaponry, its technical feasibility, and its price. Yet it also is true that Congress seeks to mold strategic policy when it authorizes the adoption of weapon systems and tries to force the executive branch to spend the appropriated money. Recent years are heavy with examples of how the will of Congress has been frustrated, despite the fact that it has been consistently more aware of the nature of our peril than the White House and Pentagon secretariat.

There has been mention here of the effect of the Pentagon schism on our diplomatic efforts. The furor in England and France has been so well publicized there is no need to repeat the details. Edmund Taylor, writing from Paris in the Reporter, says that we won in Cuba we have thrown away in Nassau. He comes up with a French suggestion, not entirely a joke, that the White House should forget about a direct telephone line to the Kremlin and get a closer link to Europe.

It is clear we have not fooled our allies, and it is likely, Taylor reports, that the final result of Nassau will be the loss of prestige and possibly the fall of the Macmillan government, the torpedoing of Britain's entry into the Common Market, and the further widening of the rift between France and America, thereby reducing the Atlantic Alliance to an empty shell.

It is interesting that only last June, on a visit to West Point, President Kennedy cautioned the cadets that they had to be more than soldiers and understand the foreign policies of nations all over the world. There is a good chance that today's military chiefs, all of them, have a firm understanding of why the British and French are upset at our espousal of nuclear stalemate. Like the French and British they would be justified in some mystification about a policy that sanctions a military risk in Cuba but refuses to take a technological risk that may be essential to national security.

On this point, there is no competent observer who doubts Russia can and will take technological risks to improve its military stature. These chances can be taken in such fields as ballistic missile defense, anti-submarine warfare, military space systems, the improvement of guidance or warheads. Once we freeze our own technology at the level of the Polaris and Minuteman systems and drain away our strategic flexibility, Mos-

cow needs but a single and possibly modest breakthrough to upset the stalemate and achieve superiority.

Realization of this threat must be common to all dedicated American military men. The realization, for reasons already explained, is most vivid to USAF. The example here, let it be made clear, is not that of the cavalry officer who clung to his horse or of the lamented admiral who held the battleship invincible. The requirement is for progress, not stagnation; it is for technological advances to meet threats as yet themselves undeveloped.

The schism in the Pentagon is between this kind of military progress and the most conservative effort to turn back the clock by arguing that costs are excessive and the technology is beyond us. This progress has been with us at least since Kitty Hawk and Alamogordo. The Russians will not let us stop.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII— CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9, to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 18 Leg.]

Aiken	Hartke	Morton
Allott	Hayden	Moss
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bayh	Hill	Muskie
Beall	Holland	Nelson
Bennett	Hruska	Neuberger
Bible	Humphrey	Pastore
Boggs	Inouye	Pearson
Brewster	Jackson	Pell
Burdick	Javits	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Cannon	Keating	Ribicoff
Case	Kefauver	Robertson
Church	Kennedy	Russell
Clark	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Cooper	Lausche	Scott
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Simpson
Curtis	Long, La.	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Stennis
Dominick	McCarthy	Symington
Douglas	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	McGee	Thurmond
Engle	McGovern	Tower
Ervin	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Mecham	Yarborough
Goldwater	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Miller	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Monroney	
Hart	Morse	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], and the Senator from

Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me so that I may ask consent to speak as in the morning hour without his losing the floor?

Mr. ERVIN. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Florida without my losing the floor and without any subsequent remarks I may make being counted as a second speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

RATIFICATION OF THE POLL TAX AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak as in the morning hour on some important information which has just come to me. I will confine myself within the 3-minute limitation as in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope that all Senators read in the Washington Post this morning the very fine editorial expressing the hope that ratification of the anti-poll tax amendment—which, if ratified, would become amendment No. XXIV of the Constitution—will be proceeded with without delay and be accomplished this year. I was happy to note that editorial, for which I express my gratitude.

I express my own appreciation, and I wish to say for the record that every Senator, except one, who was helpful in the adoption of the amendment in the Senate last year, has again been helpful in bringing the subject to the attention of his own legislature and other State authorities. The same has been true, in the main, as to new Senators.

I am indeed glad that that kind of cooperation on a completely bipartisan basis has continued.

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

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the able and distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the able and distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], in that order, without my losing the floor and without having any remarks that I may make now or later being counted as a second speech.

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

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, along the line of what the distinguished Senator from Florida has just said, word has come to me that the New York State Legislature yesterday ratified the amendment to which the Senator has referred. I am gratified that this has been done, and that New York is one of the first States to take this action.

I express the hope that the legislatures of the other States, most of which are in session this year, will take similar action.

I know how indefatigably the Senator from Florida has worked to get this legislation through the Senate and to contact those of us who might be able to help in the State legislatures to get the amendment ratified. It was a pleasure for my colleague and me to urge such action upon our Governor and State legislature. I am very happy to be able to make this announcement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina will yield to me again on the same terms on which he has yielded to me previously, I should like to express my gratification and appreciation to the Senators from New York. I would appreciate his doing so.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Florida under the same conditions.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do express my deep appreciation to the distinguished junior Senator from New York and also to the distinguished senior Senator from New York, both of whom have been very active, not only last year in the submission to the States of the anti-poll tax amendment, but also this year in recommending its prompt ratification to the Governor and the leaders in the Legislature of the State of New York.

I am grateful that the State of New York, has, as we are informed by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], become the third State to ratify the amendment. The earlier two States were Illinois and New Jersey. The Legislature of New Jersey ratified the amendment by the unanimous vote of both houses; and the Legislature of Illinois by overwhelming votes in both houses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask the distinguished Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Illinois upon the same conditions under which I yielded to the distinguished Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appreciate the gratitude which the Senator from Florida has shown the States of Illinois, New Jersey, and New York. I should like to inquire if the Florida Legislature has ratified the constitutional amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, might I have the right, upon the same terms, to advise the Senator from Illinois that

the Florida Legislature has not ratified the amendment? The Florida Legislature will have its regular session beginning in April. The special session which adjourned only recently dealt with the troublesome question of reapportioning the legislature, a highly controversial subject. I personally requested the Governor not to put the constitutional amendment before that session of the legislature for practical reasons which are evident.

I am glad to advise the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the Governor of Florida will, in his message to the regular session of the legislature of the State of Florida, in April, recommend the early ratification of the amendment.

I also advise the Senator from Illinois that the Senators from Florida expect to appear before the legislature and request that ratification. Of course, we cannot control our legislature, but we are doing everything in our power to bring about the ratification of the amendment by the State of Florida.

I wish again to express, as I have in my earlier statement, my deep appreciation to the State of Illinois for having been the first State to ratify the amendment. I hope and believe that both Senators from Illinois had a part in that very constructive result. I certainly am grateful for their activity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Florida may have equal fortune.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President—

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield to my good friend, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], without losing my right to the floor and without having anything which I may say now or hereafter on this occasion count as two speeches by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Texas is recognized.

DEATH OF DR. WALTER SPLAWN, DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR AND PUBLIC SERVANT, LOSS TO NATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 17, 1963, Dr. Walter Marshall William Splawn, a Texan and one of our most distinguished educators, an author of texts on economics, and a dedicated public servant, died at the age of 79.

Dr. Splawn once served as a member of the Texas Railroad Commission, was president of the University of Texas from 1924 to 1927, and served for nearly 20 years as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. He was called by one public official in Washington "The last great liberal on the ICC—always working for the public interest." He had a remarkable career in public service, was author of some of our most beneficial regulation laws, and was once counsel to Sam Rayburn's committee in the House of Representatives.

His signature is on my University of Texas law degree. After Dr. Splawn re-

tired from the ICC in 1953, blind, his scrawled notes came to me through the years, encouraging me in all of my hard campaigns. He lived and served in the great tradition of Jim Hogg, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, John H. Reagan, and Tom Campbell.

His was an interesting life, and one that few living Americans can match in governmental achievements.

Walter Marshall William Splawn was born at Arlington, Tex., on June 16, 1883. His father, William Butler Splawn, was born in North Carolina, and his mother, Mary Marshall—Collins—Splawn, was born in Alabama. The son received his early education at Decatur College, from which he graduated in 1904. He then studied law at Baylor University and received his bachelor of laws degree in 1906. Yale University conferred upon him the bachelor of arts and master of arts degrees in 1908. He obtained his doctor of philosophy degree from the University of Chicago in 1916. The Howard Payne College has conferred upon him the doctor of laws degree.

He was instructor in English at Decatur College in 1906 to 1907, and a teacher in the Fort Worth, Tex., high school in 1909 to 1910. He read law in the offices of Buck, Cummings, Doyle & Bouldin, at Fort Worth, and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1909. From 1910 to 1912 he was instructor in social science in Baylor College. From 1912 to 1915 he practiced law at Fort Worth. He returned to Baylor University in 1916 as professor of social sciences. He was dean of its summer school in 1917 to 1919, and became dean of the university in 1918. In 1919 he became professor of economics at the University of Texas and held that post until 1928. From 1924 to 1927 he was president of the University of Texas, and in 1927 to 1928 was director of research in social science there. In 1929 he became dean of the Graduate School of the American University at Washington, D.C. He relinquished that post upon becoming a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. While at the University of Texas he served for a time as a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas. In 1927 he was chairman of the board of arbitration of western railroads and groups of employees. He was also a referee under the Settlement of War Claims Act.

Dr. Splawn attracted widespread public attention by his work as special counsel for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. He made a survey of railroad holding companies, which resulted in the Interstate Commerce Commission being given power to regulate them. He then made a survey of holding companies in the power and gas public utility field. This survey was followed by the enactment of the Securities Act of 1933, the Stock Exchange Regulation Act of 1934, and the Public Utility Act of 1935. On April 6, 1934, he made a recommendation to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives that there be a thorough investigation of telegraph and telephone companies, and that they be subjected to strict Federal control. He also made a

study of communications for the Interdepartmental Communications Committee, upon the basis of which recommendation was made to the President for the establishment of a Federal commission to regulate communications operations. This eventuated in the enactment of the Federal Communications Act, and the establishment of the Federal Communications Commission.

Dr. Splawn at one time advocated the creation of six or seven regional Federal commissions to relieve the Interstate Commerce Commission, which he considered to be then "overburdened, overworked, and well-nigh overwhelmed by the great number of cases presented each year."

Commissioner Splawn was appointed to the Commission by President Roosevelt on January 8, 1934, for the term ending December 31, 1940, to succeed Commissioner Brainerd whose term had expired. He was renominated by President Roosevelt to succeed himself on December 19, 1940, for the term ended December 31, 1947, and was renominated by President Truman on January 14, 1948, for the term expiring December 31, 1954. Commissioner Splawn served as Chairman of the Commission during the calendar years 1938 and 1951.

Almost immediately after his appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission he was named Vice Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on Aviation, and requested by the President to make a survey of all phases of civil, commercial, and military aviation, similar to his communications survey.

At the time of his retirement from government service on June 30, 1953, after having served with great distinction for 19 years as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, his fellow members on the Interstate Commerce Commission presented Dr. Splawn with the following eloquent testimonial:

JUNE 30, 1953.

HON. WALTER M. W. SPLAWN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BROTHER SPLAWN: Having reached the age of three score years and ten and having decided not to request Presidential exemption from the statutory provisions requiring retirement at that age, you are now leaving the Commission after more than 19 years of able, devoted, and diligent service, including two terms as Chairman. As your colleagues, we are loath to record this termination of our official relations; but as your friends we avail ourselves of this opportunity to assure you of our continuing high regard and to express our earnest hope that the future may bring you the complete fulfillment of your aspirations.

Your career prior to your appointment on the Commission was both varied and distinguished. A classical scholar, you had specialized in the law, in economics, and in sociology. Then first as teacher and later as administrator you achieved a national reputation in the field of education. It was with this background that you were called upon to serve the public in other important lines of endeavor as a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas, as chairman of the Board of Arbitration of Western Railroads and Groups of Employees, as a referee under the Settlement of War Claims Act, as special counsel for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives of the United States, and, finally, as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In the consideration of numerous, intricate, and momentous problems of transportation regulation you have contributed exceptional experience, high intellectual attainments, and untiring energy. The results of your labors on the Commission for almost a score of years will be recorded and treasured as a rich contribution to the Commission's resources, traditions, and achievements. We shall miss you. May your years ahead be many, happy, and fruitful.

Cordially,

J. Haden Alldredge, William E. Lee, Charles D. Mahaffie, William J. Patterson, J. Monroe Johnson, Richard F. Mitchell, Hugh W. Cross, James K. Knudson, Martin K. Elliott, Anthony F. Arpaia.

The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously adopted a resolution, on his retirement in 1953, commending the distinguished public service of Dr. Splawn, as follows:

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY SENATOR CHARLES W. TOBEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, FOR CONSIDERATION AND ADOPTION BY THE FULL COMMITTEE IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, JULY 7, 1953, IN COMMENDATION OF THE SERVICES AS A PUBLIC SERVANT OF THE HONORABLE WALTER MARSHALL WILLIAM SPLAWN, FORMERLY OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Whereas the retirement of the Honorable Walter Marshall William Splawn from membership on the Interstate Commerce Commission became effective June 30, 1953, concluding 19 years of public service as a member of this Commission; and

Whereas Dr. Splawn's contributions to the commonwealth have taken many other forms during his notable career, such as professor of social sciences and dean of Baylor University, professor of economics, and later president of the University of Texas, dean of the graduate school of the American University in Washington, D.C., member of the Railroad Commission of the State of Texas, chairman of the board of arbitration between management and employees of the western railroads, a referee under the Settlement of War Claims Act, special counsel of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, vice chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on Aviation, and as an author in the fields of economics and transportation; and

Whereas the results of his outstanding work in the fields of public utility regulation, especially as it concerns railroads and communications facilities, are still of great effect; and

Whereas Dr. Splawn has added greatly to the luster of the Commission as an independent, objective, and detached agency of Government, through his devotion to his work, his mastery of the materials of that work, his scholarly approach and great integrity; and

Whereas we of this committee who have followed his career on the Commission with particular interest have long been convinced that Dr. Splawn has achieved for himself a position of great eminence in the field of public service and a deserved reputation as one of the truly outstanding members of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its long history: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the United States Senate express its fulsome commendation of Dr. Walter Marshall William Splawn on the occasion of his retirement from the Interstate Commerce Commission for his great contributions to the public welfare; that the committee express its deep respect for Dr. Splawn the man, for his integrity, courage, and independence, and for the masterful qualities of his mind; and

that the committee wish him Godspeed and continued happiness and satisfaction in whatever he may undertake for the benefit of his fellow men.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, voiced his sorrow over the passing of Walter M. W. Splawn, who was twice Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission during his 19 years of service, stating:

Walter Splawn was one of the great architects of our laws regulating securities, utilities, transportation, and communications, dedicating his life to legislative and administrative service of the national interest and of that of safeguarding the consumer and investor.

I mourn his passing as both mentor and friend. Although he had become blind and had retired from Government activities in 1953, his interest in national economic policies never abated and he continued to benefit the Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House with his wise counsels.

During the 1930's, Mr. Splawn was a consultant to the House committee where he had an important role in drafting the Securities and Exchange Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, the Federal Communications Act, Railroad Holding Company Act, Trust in Securities Act, and other important legislation. It was as a member of the House that I came first to know him and to admire his brilliant talents and humanistic approach to legislation.

Mr. Splawn's contributions to a more dynamic America will live long after all of us are gone. I grieve over his departure at the age of 79 and express my deepest sympathy to his family.

Dr. Splawn was a Mason, a Baptist, a member of the Cosmos Club, and belonged to the American Bar Association, the American Economics Association, and the Southwestern Political Science Association.

He was the author of "Introduction to the Study of Economics," 1922; "The Consolidation of Railroads," 1942; "Government Ownership and Operation of Railroads"—which he advocated—1928.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorials and articles printed in the RECORD: "Dr. Splawn Passes in Washington," from the Austin (Tex.) Statesman of January 18; "Splawn Rites Set in Virginia," from the Austin (Tex.) Statesman of January 18; "Dr. Splawn Rites Set in Virginia," from the Austin (Tex.) American of January 18; "Dr. Walter Splawn, 79, Ex-University of Texas President, Dies," from the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News of January 18; "Notebook: Dr. Splawn," from the Austin (Tex.) American of January 19; "Walter Splawn Dies, Former Head of ICC," from Washington Evening Star of January 18; "Walter Splawn, Ex-Interstate Commerce Commission Chief," from the Washington Post, January 18; "End of a Remarkable Career in Public Service," Tariff World, January 26.

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

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Jan. 18, 1953]

DR. SPLAWN PASSES IN WASHINGTON
WASHINGTON, D.C.—Dr. W. M. W. Splawn, president of the University of Texas from

1924 until 1927, died here Thursday morning after a long illness.

From 1934 until June 1953, he was a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington, and served twice as Chairman of the ICC, in 1938 and in 1951.

Dr. Splawn returned to the University of Texas in 1955, at the request of Dr. Logan Wilson, to record his recollections of his administration as president of the university to go into a history of the University of Texas.

He was born in Arlington, Tex., and educated at Decatur Baptist College, Baylor University, Yale University, and the University of Chicago.

A social science professor at Baylor early in his career, Dr. Splawn also practiced law in Fort Worth before going to the University of Texas as an economics professor in 1919. He took leave of absence from the university to serve on the Texas Railroad Commission for a time.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Jan. 18, 1963]

SPLAWN RITES SET IN VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Funeral services for Dr. Walter M. W. Splawn, a Texan who was Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission for years, will be held Sunday at Purcellville, Va.

Burial will be at Lincoln, Va.

Dr. Splawn died Thursday at his home in Washington after a long illness.

He also was a onetime president of the University of Texas, a lawyer recognized as an expert on railroad law, an economist, and author.

He leaves two daughters, Mrs. Joe H. Munster and Mrs. Thomas E. Taylor, both of Lincoln, Va.

Splawn was a native of Arlington, Tex. He took a degree from Decatur Baptist College in 1904 and Baylor University in 1906, subsequently doing graduate work at Yale and the University of Chicago.

He joined the University of Texas faculty in 1919, became president in 1924 and served in that capacity for 3 years.

Splawn was appointed to the ICC in 1934 and retired as its Chairman in 1957. Then, despite blindness, he returned for a time to teach at Decatur Baptist College.

State laws which he formulated as a member of the Texas Railroad Commission served as a model for the Federal railroad reorganization laws of 1922.

As a consultant to the House Interstate Commerce Committee in the early 1930's, he was largely responsible for the drafting of the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Truth in Securities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, and the Federal Communications Act.

All of these were initiated during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He was a close friend of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn who, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, sponsored the regulatory legislation on which Splawn worked.

During the late 1920's, Splawn served as Chairman of the Western Railroad Board of Arbitration and referee of the War Claims Settlement Act.

His books include "Introduction to the Study of Economics," "Government Ownership and Operation of Railroads," and "Consolidation of Railroads."

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Jan. 18, 1963]

DR. SPLAWN RITES SET IN VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Funeral services for Dr. W. M. W. Splawn, 79, president of the University of Texas from 1924 until 1927, will be held Sunday in Purcellville, Va. Burial will be in Lincoln, Va.

Dr. Splawn, who also served on the Texas Railroad Commission and who was a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for 29 years, died in Washington Thursday morning after a long illness.

He was Chairman of the ICC twice, in 1938 and in 1951.

Dr. Splawn returned to the University of Texas in 1955, at the request of Dr. Logan Wilson, to record his recollections of his administration as president of the University of Texas to be part of a comprehensive history of the university.

Born in Arlington, Tex., and educated at Decatur Baptist College, Baylor University, Yale University, and the University of Chicago, Dr. Splawn was a social science professor at Baylor early in his career. He practiced law in Fort Worth before going to the University of Texas as an economics professor in 1919.

He took leave of absence from the university to serve on the Texas Railroad Commission.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Jan. 18, 1963]

DR. WALTER SPLAWN, 79, EX-UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS PRESIDENT, DIES

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Walter M. W. Splawn, 79, one time president of the University of Texas and for years Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, died at his residence here Thursday after a long illness.

A native of Arlington, Tex., he was graduated from Baylor University in 1906 and did advanced studies at Yale and the University of Chicago. After joining the University of Texas faculty in 1919, he served as president there from 1924 to 1927. He was appointed to the ICC in 1934.

Surviving him are two daughters, Mrs. Joe H. Munster and Mrs. Thomas E. Taylor, both of Lincoln, Va. Funeral services will be held Sunday in Purcellville, Va. Burial will be in Lincoln.

Splawn, an economist, author, attorney, and educator, also was an authority on railroad law.

The Texas railroad laws which he formulated as a member of the State railroad commission served as a basis for the Federal railroad reorganization laws of 1922.

As a consultant to the House Interstate Commerce Committee during the early 1930's, he was largely responsible for the formulation of the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Truth in Securities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, and the Federal Communications Act. All of these were initiated during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

He was a close friend of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn who, as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, sponsored the regulatory legislation on which Splawn worked.

During the late 1920's, Splawn served as chairman of the Western Railroad board of arbitration and referee of the War Claims Settlement Act.

Splawn retired as Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1957, and despite blindness, returned to Decatur Baptist College, from which he had received a degree in 1904, as a teacher.

His books include "Introduction to the Study of Economics," "Government Ownership and Operation of Railroads," and "Consolidation of Railroads."

He was a member of the American Bar Association, American Economic Association, Southwestern Political Science Association, the Masons, and the Baptist Church.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Jan. 19, 1963]

NOTEBOOK: DR. SPLAWN

The death in Washington of retired Dr. Walter M. W. Splawn revived memories of

his service in Austin to both the University of Texas and the State government.

Professor of economics at the University of Texas, he took leave to serve, by appointment of the Governor, as a member of the Texas Railroad Commission. He returned to the university, but in the role of its president, serving in that office from 1924 to 1927.

He went to Washington, and for nearly 20 years, until 1953, served as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission. He was twice Chairman of the ICC. Dr. Splawn is author of one of the leading textbooks on the economics of rail transportation.

After his retirement from the ICC, Dr. Splawn again returned to the University of Texas briefly in 1955, on invitation of then President Logan Wilson, when he recorded his memories and experiences as president of the university to be part of a history of the institution.

Dr. Splawn was an extremely slender, frail man. He wore thick eyeglasses, and in his later years was nearly blind. He has been described by associates as "all intellect."

Native of Arlington, Tex., student in Decatur College, Baylor University, graduate of Yale and the University of Chicago, Dr. Splawn was a Texan who helped give stature to higher education in his State, and who also turned his ability to the field of public administration, State and Federal. His was a useful life.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 18, 1963]

WALTER SPLAWN DIES, FOREVER HEAD OF ICC

Walter M. W. Splawn, 79, who served for 23 years on the Interstate Commerce Commission and retired as its Chairman in 1957, died of a heart ailment yesterday at his home, 3138 Connecticut Avenue NW.

An economics professor, attorney, and author, Mr. Splawn was president of the University of Texas during 1924-27.

As a member of the Texas Railroad Commission, he helped to formulate Texas railroad laws that served as a basis for Federal railroad reorganization laws in 1922.

In 1929 he was appointed dean of the Graduate School and the School of Political Sciences of American University here, a post he held briefly before accepting an appointment as professor of economics at the university.

NATIVE OF TEXAS

Born in Arlington, Tex., Mr. Splawn was graduated in 1904 from Decatur Baptist College where he returned to teach, although blind, on his retirement in 1957. He earned his law degree at Baylor University in 1906, received his master's degree at Yale University in 1908, and his doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1921. The subject of his doctorate was "The Railroad Commission of Texas."

He practiced law in Fort Worth, then taught social science at Baylor and economics at the University of Texas.

In addition to his American University work in the late 1920's, he served as chairman of the Western Railroad board of arbitration and was referee of the War Claims Settlement Act. In the latter position, he investigated millions of dollars worth of claims by German, Austrian, and Hungarian nationals against the U.S. Government.

He wrote several books, including "Government Ownership and Operation of Railroads," in 1929; "Consolidation of Railroads," and "An Introduction to the Study of Economics."

MEMBER OF COSMOS CLUB

A member of the Cosmos Club, Mr. Splawn also was a Mason, a Baptist, and belonged to the American Bar Association, the American Economics Association, and the Southwestern Political Science Association.

He leaves his wife, Zola, of the Connecticut Avenue address; and two daughters, Mrs.

Thomas E. Taylor, of Lincoln, Va., and Mrs. Joe H. Munster, of Cleveland.

Services will be at 2 p.m. Sunday at the Hall Funeral Home, Purcellville, Va. Burial will be in Lincoln Cemetery.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1963]

WALTER SPLAWN, EX-ICC CHIEF

(By William J. Raspberry)

Walter M. W. Splawn, twice Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and former president of the University of Texas, died of a heart ailment yesterday at his home, 3133 Connecticut Avenue NW.

The 79-year-old economist, author, attorney, and educator was an authority on railroad law. The Texas railroad laws which he formulated as a member of the State railroad commission served as a basis for the Federal railroad reorganization laws of 1922.

A consultant to the House Interstate Commerce Committee during the early 1930's, Mr. Splawn was largely responsible for the formulation of the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Trust in Securities Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, the Utility Holding Company Act, and the Federal Communications Act, all initiated during the administration of President Roosevelt.

He was a close friend of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn who, as chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, sponsored the regulatory legislation on which Mr. Splawn worked.

Born in Arlington, Tex., he was graduated from Decatur Baptist College in 1904, earned his law degree at Baylor University in 1906, took his master's degree at Yale University in 1908, and received his doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1921.

After practicing law in Fort Worth for a time, he taught social science at Baylor and economics at the University of Texas, where he was president from 1924 to 1928.

During the late 1920's he served as chairman of the Western Railroad board of arbitration and referee of the War Claims Settlement Act.

Mr. Splawn retired as Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1957 and, despite his having become blind, returned to Decatur College as a teacher.

He was a member of the American Bar Association, the American Economic Association, the Southwestern Political Science Association, the Masons, and the Baptist Church.

Surviving are his wife, Zola, and two daughters, Mrs. Thomas E. Taylor, of Lincoln, Va., and Mrs. Joe H. Muster, of Cleveland.

[From Traffic World, Jan. 26, 1963]

END OF A REMARKABLE CAREER IN PUBLIC SERVICE

Laid to rest in a cemetery in Lincoln, Va., the afternoon of January 20, after a funeral service in Purcellville, Va., were the mortal remains of Dr. Walter M. W. Splawn, who died the morning of January 17 at his residence, 3133 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., at the age of 79. Not only because of his outstanding record of performance as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission for 19 years (until his retirement on June 30, 1963, after he had reached the age of 70), but because of various other achievements and demonstrations of intellectual superiority, Dr. Splawn was admired by thousands as truly an eminent servant of the public.

He attained national prominence as an educator prior to his service on the ICC. He was professor of social sciences and dean at Baylor University, Waco, Tex., and later (in the years 1924-27) was president of the University of Texas, at Austin. Subsequently he was a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas, chairman of the board of arbitration of western railroads and groups of employees, a referee under the Settlement of

War Claims Act, and special counsel for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the U.S. House of Representatives, when the late Sam Rayburn was chairman of the committee. Dr. Splawn was appointed a member of the ICC in 1934. He was Chairman of the Commission in 1938 and 1951.

When he became an ICC member, his eyesight had failed to the point that he was unable to read; assistants had to read to him the numerous letters, documents, newspaper and magazine articles, books, etc., that required his attention or attracted his interest. In the course of his service on the Commission he became totally blind. Yet he did not falter in his work as a Commissioner. He was brilliant mentally; his memory was wonderfully retentive. Testifying before committees of Congress, he could refer to any of several statistical tables that might be attached to the prepared statement he was "reading" and he could pick out with astonishing accuracy certain of the figures in those tabulations as he developed the point he was making.

The printed record of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's hearings in 1949 on S. 2113, a bill to clarify the status of freight forwarders and their relationship with motor common carriers, includes testimony by Dr. Splawn. In oral testimony he referred to tables of figures covering nine pages of the book. We quote only a small part of his discussion of the statistical compilations:

"I offer the statistical summary of revenues, expenses, and selected statistics of some 56 companies, I think it is, with an income of \$100,000 a year or more. May I call attention to some of the outstanding statistics? You take first the revenues: The total revenue collected from shippers by freight forwarders for 1948 is shown to be about \$264 million. For 1947 it was \$25 million less, \$239 million. The number of tons originated by the freight forwarders (was) 4,087,000 in 1948 and 4,527,000 tons in 1947, a decrease in tons handled, 1948 under 1947, of about 440,000 tons. In 1947 there were over 18 million shipments; in 1948, over 17 million shipments.

We were present when Dr. Splawn presented those figures from memory; we can testify that he received no prompting from anyone. It was one of many amazing performances by Dr. Splawn as a memory expert. But the respect he gained among his colleagues and on Capitol Hill was based on qualities of greater depth. In a special session of the Commission on June 30, 1953, the day of his retirement, Dr. Splawn was honored by his fellow Commissioners. They gave him a scroll, the inscription on which included these words:

"As your colleagues, we are loath to record the termination of our official relations; but as your friends we avail ourselves of this opportunity to assure you of our continuing high regard. In the consideration of numerous, intricate, and momentous problems of transportation regulation you have contributed exceptional experience, high intellectual attainments, and untiring energy."

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee shortly thereafter adopted a resolution in which it said that "Dr. Splawn has added greatly to the luster of the Commission as an independent, objective, and detached agency of the Government, through his devotion to his work, his mastery of the materials in that work, his scholarly approach and great integrity. The committee added that Dr. Splawn had "achieved for himself a position of great eminence in the field of public service and a deserved reputation as one of the truly outstanding members of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its long history." In a statement he issued January 18, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, described Dr. Splawn

as "one of the great architects of our laws regulating securities, utilities, transportation, and communications," and said that "Dr. Splawn's contribution to a more dynamic America will live long after all of us are gone."

There will always be a need for men of Dr. Splawn's moral and intellectual stature to fill positions of responsibility in the Federal Government.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII— CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Mark Twain is reputed to have said:

Truth is precious. Use it sparingly.

But I do not propose to take Mark Twain's advice. Instead, I expect to be rather extravagant in the use of truth, both in the amount of the dosage which I should like to give to the Senate and also in the number of words which I expect to employ in administering it.

I expect to look to history, despite the fact that some of my brethren have said we should not look back to the words of Jefferson or Washington or the other great men of the past.

Mr. President, I am not the only person who has some veneration for history. The founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, said, on one occasion:

History informs us of what bad government is.

One of my purposes in looking back to history is to let Senators know what some may have forgotten. In times past, we have had some bad government in our great Republic.

The great French philosopher Lamar-tine said:

History teaches everything, even the future.

One of the reasons I expect to look backward to history is that we may know from the history of the past what the future may be.

The great German philosopher Von Schlegel emphasized that point. He said:

A historian is a prophet looking backward.

The reason I wish to look back to history is the hope that we might avoid the misfortune which George Santayana predicts for those who ignore the lessons of history. He said:

Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

So I look to the past, that is, to history, because I want the Senate to look to the future and appreciate what the result might be, if the Senate should repudiate all of its history since 1789, and change rule XXII so that Senators can be silenced in the hope that impatient men and organizations will get their way.

When the rulers of a nation ignore the lessons of history, they condemn their nation to repeat the mistakes of the past.

I wish our country to have a great future. I wish my five little grandchildren and their contemporaries to enjoy life in a nation which has institutions that safeguard the people against governmental tyranny. Every time a new Congress comes to Washington, we repeat the performance we are witnessing concerning rule XXII. I am convinced that there is no popular demand abroad in our land for a change in rule XXII. I think that the effort which is made every 2 years by those who seek to change the rule and to destroy the only thing that makes the Senate a distinctive legislative body comes from a few organizations dominated by impatient and, I fear, sometimes intemperate men. If it were not for such organizations, dominated by impatient and, as I fear, sometimes intemperate men, the Senate could proceed immediately to its work whenever a new Congress convenes.

We live in a rather dangerous age for America, because we have abroad in our land many men who give their allegiance to what may be called the cult of conformity. For some strange reason those men no longer put value on such things as the right of any American to dissent from the views of the majority. If they had their way, they would compel every American to quit thinking his own thoughts and to adopt theirs, and they would compel every American to conform his actions to their wishes rather than to his own honest convictions.

We sometimes see the cult of conformity accepted among men in high places. The impatient organizations which demand that the Senate lay aside its work every 2 years and discuss a proposed change in rule XXII apparently suffer under the delusion that if they could find some way to keep Senators from pointing out the folly of some of the notions they entertain, they could induce the Senate to put their ideas of conformity into law and impose them upon all the American people. They suffer under a delusion, because I think the reason Members of the Senate will not vote for their proposals is that Senators recognize that the proposals are unwise.

I do not know what effect my turning to history on this occasion may have on the minds of other Senators. I am compelled to confess, however, that it has enabled me to escape, at least temporarily, from some of the confusion which has been engendered of late by the pronouncements of theoretical economists.

The other day I read some utterances of theoretical economists. In substance, they said that when government spends more than it receives in revenue, government has an "active deficit" which can be of great benefit to the country. But when government receives in revenue less than it spends, government has a "passive deficit" which indicates a sluggish condition of the economy and is harmful to the country.

Ever since I read that pronouncement of theoretical economists, I have been more or less in a state of confusion, because I have been totally incapable of comprehending the precise difference

between government spending more than it receives in revenue and government receiving in revenue less than it spends.

It has enabled me, however, to comprehend the moral in the story which I heard many years ago about the annual meeting of the Society of Theoretical Economists. The treasurer of the society made his annual report concerning the fiscal affairs of the organization. His annual report disclosed that the society had a deficit of \$25. One of the members of the organization arose and said, "Mr. President, it is a shame for us to leave this deficit lying idle in our treasury when it could be put to so much good use." He said, "I therefore move that we give our deficit to the Red Cross, which is a great organization that brings relief to our people in times of disaster." Another member of the Society of Theoretical Economists arose and said, "Mr. President, I would not like for the other members of our great organization to think that I do not hold the Red Cross in proper respect. I agree that the Red Cross is a fine organization which brings relief to our people in times of disaster. But there are other great organizations, and I think we could do much more good with our deficit if we divided it among several of these organizations which minister to human needs." He said, "There is the Salvation Army. It is a great organization which looks after those who are supposed to be down and out." He added, "Mr. President, I make a substitute motion. I move that we divide our deficit between the Red Cross and the Salvation Army so that each of these organizations can put it to good use."

As I have stated, there is a controversy about rule XXII every time a new Congress meets.

I have been much intrigued by the reasons given in times past, during my service in the Senate, by those who seek a change in this rule.

When I first came to the Senate the proponents of change in rule XXII said that we should change the rule because the southerners thwart the will of the Senate. I do not claim to be an expert in mathematics, but I have not been able to comprehend how anyone can delude himself into believing that 22 southerners can thwart the will of 78 other Senators. As a matter of fact, rarely do 22 southerners stand together on this proposition. Usually several secede from the Confederacy. The charge that a few sinful southerners who never number more than 22 can thwart the will of 78 other Senators is preposterous. It always makes me think of the story which I have told before in the course of these discussions.

I think all Senators have enjoyed at times seeing the cartoons which depict Jiggs and his wife Maggie. On one occasion one of these cartoons showed Jiggs and Maggie on a visit to Spain. They were walking along the streets of Madrid when Maggie became irritated with Jiggs and proceeded to visit her irritation upon his person. It happened that a few days before Jiggs had learned about the existence of a society in Spain called the Kazooks. The Kazooks were

composed of married men who had developed some idea of forming a self-protective organization to guard themselves against injury at the hands of their wives. Jiggs had become a member of this organization. Each Kazook had taken a blood oath to come to the relief of any brother Kazook when that brother was threatened by his wife and gave the word of distress, "Kazook." On this occasion when Maggie started to vent her irritation upon Jiggs, Jiggs remembered this fine and great organization which he had joined, so he gave the word of distress, "Kazook." The cartoon then showed about a thousand fellow Kazooks running to Jiggs' assistance. The cartoon then depicted the fact that Maggie took her umbrella and laid all the Kazooks out. The last picture in the cartoon on that occasion showed Jiggs in the hospital, all bandaged up, and philosophizing thus, "The idea behind this Kazook Society is pretty good, but the trouble with the society is it hasn't got enough members."

That is one trouble about the southern Members of the Senate. I think it would be a good thing for the country if there were more of them in the Senate, provided they entertained the same sound views on all subjects that I do. I am bound to confess, however, they do not all do that.

When I first came to the Senate the excuse was that rule XXII had to be destroyed, that the freedom of debate that has existed in the U.S. Senate since George Washington was inaugurated as President, had to be abolished, to keep 22 sinful southerners from thwarting the will of all other Senators. That excuse became somewhat threadbare when a person used only a little mathematics, so the proponents of rules change abandoned that insupportable contention as the basis for demanding a rules change.

The next thing the proponents of rules change did was to come in at the beginning of a session of a new Congress with a very eloquently phrased document saying that the rules of the Senate had to be changed, particularly rule XXII, because the rules of the Senate were conceived by the minds and written by the hands of men who were sleeping in "the voiceless silence of the dreamless dust." The proponents of rules change evidently came to the conclusion that there was no wisdom on earth until the present generation arrived.

I may be guilty of some heresy in saying this, but I happen to entertain the view that there was a considerable amount of wisdom on this earth before my colleagues and I reached this earth or reached the U.S. Senate; but the proponents of rule changes came in at the opening of the particular Congress to which I refer with the demand that the rules of the Senate be rewritten, and particularly rule XXII, because they were conceived by the minds and written by the hands of dead men.

This movement did not get very far in that particular Congress, because, after some days of debate, it slowly began to dawn upon certain Members of the Senate that the Ten Commandments were brought down off Mount Sinai by Moses, and that Moses had been sleeping the

everlasting sleep on the top of Mt. Nebo for many generations. So that conviction, which came to Members of the Senate as the debate progressed, tended to weaken the contention that the rules of the Senate had to be changed merely because some of them had been written by men who had passed into the Great Beyond.

Then, after some days of debate, it occurred that those who embrace most of the great religions of the earth, and particularly Christianity, received their religious doctrines from the Man of Galilee and His successors, such as St. Paul. It dawned upon the Senate, after some days of debate, that the Man of Galilee, St. Paul, St. Peter, and the rest of the apostles and disciples, had vanished from human life many centuries ago. The realization of that truth tended to minimize the appeal of those who urged that rule XXII ought to be changed, and that other rules of the Senate ought to be rewritten because they had been conceived by the minds and written by the hands of men now dead.

It was further called to the attention of the Senate, during the debates on that occasion, that the barons who exacted Magna Carta from King John at Runnymede in about the year 1215 had also descended into the "voiceless silence of dreamless dust" many generations and centuries ago; and even those who did not like documents such as the Senate rules, which had been conceived in the minds and written by the hands of men now dead, had to concede that there were some things in Magna Carta that they were not willing to rewrite.

As the debate on that occasion continued, the contention that the rules of the Senate had to be rewritten because they were conceived in the minds and written by the hands of men now dead became even weaker. It suddenly dawned upon the proponents of rule changes in that session that Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, as well as all the men who framed the Constitution of the United States, were likewise sleeping in the "voiceless silence of dreamless dust." So the effort to rewrite the rules of the Senate, and particularly rule XXII, because they were written in part by the hands of men now dead, lost its driving force; and the majority of the Senate decided that perhaps, after all, the Ten Commandments, the Gospel, Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the rules of the Senate had much virtue in them notwithstanding that the hands which wrote those great documents or those great rules originally had crumbled into dust in the grave.

The next argument that was made to justify a change in the rules was that rule XXII prevents majority rule. This argument is based fundamentally on the proposition that the way the Government ought to be conducted is not on the basis of debate, not by reason, not by adherence to principles, not by correctly appraising the welfare of the

American people, but by counting the number of noses on one side and the number of noses on the other side of a proposition.

So the proponents of rule change say, "We want majority rule. We want to count the noses on this side of the question and the noses on the other side of the issue and decide the issue on that basis, without debate, without reasoning together, without determining on which side wisdom lies and on which side folly is to be found."

Mr. President, the Founding Fathers were great students of the history of men's bitter struggle for the right of self-rule. They knew that man had wrested every right he had in this area—the right of freedom, the right of freedom of speech, the right of freedom of religion, the right of self-government—from tyrants. Anyone who reads the Constitution of the United States and studies the speeches and writings of the men who framed that immortal document, and anyone who studies the debates which raged around the ratification of that document by the States, and anyone who reads "The Federalist" knows that the Founding Fathers were seeking to establish a government to preserve liberty and prevent tyranny.

We are told on the floor of the Senate by some of the proponents of the proposed rule change that our Government does not work fast enough, that it does not pass laws fast enough, and that it is not efficient enough. Those who make those assertions overlook one thing which was well known to the Founding Fathers, and that is that if we want an efficient government, we must have a dictatorship. If the Founding Fathers had been concerned primarily with establishing an efficient government, they would not have established a House of Representatives and a Senate; they would have established only one legislative body. One legislative body can pass a law a great deal faster than two legislative bodies. However, the Founding Fathers knew that any one legislative body can make mistakes. Therefore they created the Senate, in order that the Senate might remedy the mistakes in legislation committed by the House, and they created the House, in the hope that the House might cure any errors which the Senate might make in legislation.

Some days ago the able and distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] called to our attention the historic incident when Jefferson returned from France and had a conversation with George Washington, who was the Presiding Officer of the Constitutional Convention. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson were drinking coffee on that occasion. Thomas Jefferson, in accordance with the fashion of the day, had poured some of his coffee into the saucer to cool it.

Thomas Jefferson asked George Washington why the Convention had created the Senate, instead of reposing all legislative power in the House of Representatives. George Washington replied: "The Convention created the Senate in

order that it might do the same thing that your saucer is doing. You are cooling off your hot coffee in your saucer. The Constitutional Convention created the Senate in order that the hot legislation passed by the House might be cooled before it is poured down the throats of the people of America."

The Founding Fathers did two things to preserve liberty and to prevent tyranny. They used what is properly called the doctrine of the separation of governmental powers in the Constitution. They also inserted in the Constitution what we know as the system of checks and balances. Why did the Founding Fathers do that when they drafted our Constitution and created the Government of the United States? They did it because they had read the history of man's long and bitter struggle to escape from governmental tyranny, and they had found this lesson written in letters of blood on each page of history: "Government itself is the deadliest foe of liberty."

The Founding Fathers separated the powers of government in a twofold manner. In the first place, they separated the powers of government between the Federal Government and the States by assigning to the Federal Government the powers necessary to be exercised on a national level, and by preserving to the States the powers which in equity and in good conscience ought to be exercised on the local level. They employed the doctrine of the separation of powers in the second sense by separating the powers of the Federal Government among the executive department, the legislative department, and the judicial department of the Federal Government.

In their wise efforts to establish a government under which men could remain free, and a government of laws rather than of men, they also inserted in the Constitution what we call the system of checks and balances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me without losing his right to the floor, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and so that I may have the floor when the quorum call is concluded, with the understanding that then the floor will revert back to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ERVIN. Upon that understanding and also upon the understanding that what I may say afterward may be counted as a part of the same speech and not as a second speech.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me for a unanimous consent request, before he yields to the majority leader?

Mr. ERVIN. With the understanding that I do not lose the floor by so doing. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania with that understanding, and then I will yield to the majority leader on the same terms.

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

THE MANAGEMENT OF NEWS BY THE GOVERNMENT—THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have discussed in the Senate before the basic rights of the American people, particularly their right to know what their Government was doing. As other Senators may recall, I have itemized several occurrences in the past few years which indicate a trend in Washington to manage the news in a manner which often borders on outright censorship.

Furthermore, I have been concerned with some developments in our foreign policy, particularly the attitude the present administration displays in matters of the Middle East. Although we have a huge stake in that area of the world, the present administration too often seems to equate oil rights with human rights and is sadly neglectful of the one country, Israel, on whom we can depend. After my most recent exchange with the Department I concluded publicly that it was taking a pro-Arab position.

Today I should like to call attention of the Senate to the most recent abuse of the people's right to know, which happens to be in this area of Middle Eastern affairs.

Merriman Smith of United Press International reports to the Philadelphia Bulletin that Milton Friedman of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, an American news service which is accredited to the Capitol Press Galleries, was refused admittance to a State Department background briefing session on problems involving refugees in the Middle East. Apparently the State Department disagreed with recent dispatches which had been filed by Mr. Friedman, who many of us know to be a careful and accurate reporter.

The story further states that Robert C. Strong, director of the Department's Office of Near Eastern Affairs, told him that he was considered a foreign agent.

This is more than an affront to an American news correspondent. It is a reflection upon all the newspapers which subscribe to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency and should serve as a warning to the public generally.

A Government official can call a secret background session to suit his own needs, invite persons in whom he has confidence, and the rest of the press—and the public—be damned.

My office has been in touch with the State Department today and confirmed the accuracy of Merriman Smith's account of this matter. I have been assured that there was no anti-Semitism involved in this matter. But the facts remain that Mr. Friedman learned of this briefing session before it was held, spoke with Mr. Strong and others in the Department and was intentionally not invited even though this information was brought to the attention of Mr. Lincoln White of the State Department's Bureau of Public Affairs.

I personally object strongly to this kind of news management and this reflection upon the integrity of a fine news

correspondent, and I urge others to do likewise.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the Merriman Smith article at this point in the Record.

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

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Feb. 3, 1963]

BACKSTAIRS AT THE WHITE HOUSE—NEWSMAN BARRED FROM BACKGROUND BRIEFING—REPORTER FRIEDMAN NOT WELCOME AT STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Merriman Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The other night President Kennedy went to a glittering dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel here marking the 50th anniversary of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. During the course of the evening, the President received the league's 1963 Democratic Legacy Award.

In accepting the award, the Chief Executive said, "It is a proud privilege to be a citizen of the great Republic, to hear its songs sung, to realize that we are the descendants of 40 million people who left other countries, other familiar scenes, to come here to the United States to build a new life, to make a new opportunity for themselves and their children."

During the nationally televised entertainment program before the President's speech, one of the featured songs, "We Want No Irish Here," told of the days when the Chief Executive's own forebears also encountered intolerance, prejudice, and discrimination.

Leaning over the rail of the balcony at one end of the ballroom and listening intently was Milton Friedman, a proud birthright American and longtime Washington correspondent for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, an American organization which deals primarily with news concerning Jews of many nations. The agency naturally carries many items of news to and from Israel.

Only a short time before the President's speech to the 50-year-old league, which was established in 1913 "to stop . . . the defamation of Jewish people," Friedman heard that State Department specialists on the Near East were about to have a private background briefing for select reporters on problems involving refugees in an area of intense interest to Arabs, as well as the people of Israel.

The State Department is part of Friedman's regular beat. He tried to get into the briefing, but was discouraged.

According to the reporter, Robert C. Strong, director of the State Department's Office of Near Eastern Affairs, told him the Department regarded Friedman as a foreign agent, that the Department was displeased with some of his recent dispatches, and that he dealt too emotionally with matters involving Israel.

For these reasons, according to the correspondent, he was informed that he was not welcome at the background session. And thus he was not admitted to a briefing session which he felt vital to his coverage of the news for the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

Friends of the reporter pointed out that the press officers of the State Department privately were quite regretful about Strong's decision, but apparently they could not overrule him.

While there well could be other circumstances and considerations involved—any reporter can be barred from any background session for just about any reason if the Government official in charge so desires—this incident could be heard from long after the joys of the Anti-Defamation League banquet have faded.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII—CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the majority leader on the terms he has suggested.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, debate on the pending motion has proceeded, with only brief interruptions, since January 15. Nineteen speeches have already been made. Under the rule granting each Senator the right to speak twice on a matter before the Senate, most of the Senators who have been heard in opposition to the motion may speak again. Altogether, about 13 speeches remain to those opponents of the motion who are likely to speak again. On the basis of past experience, it seems unlikely that a vote on the motion will come this week or perhaps next week.

Assuming that we can eventually bring Senate Resolution 9 before the Senate, Senators should be aware of the parliamentary possibilities open to Senators who are in opposition to the resolution. It is disclosing no secrets to say that the following motions would be in order: Motions to refer to committee; motions to refer with various instructions; a motion to postpone indefinitely; motions to postpone to various days certain; motions to amend the resolution, and so forth. I recognize that these motions may be tabled; nevertheless, there is nothing to prevent a Senator from speaking at great length and in offering such a motion at the conclusion of his remarks.

There is nothing to prevent the making of numerous points of order, the calling of live quorums, motions to adjourn, and so on.

I remind Senators that the word "dilatatory" appears in the Senate rules only in connection with the proceedings once cloture has been adopted.

I trust that the Senate will understand that I am not making threats by describing the legislative situation in this manner, but that I am merely outlining what the situation is to the best of my ability.

The prospects for prompt action on this matter are not especially good, to put it mildly.

Mr. President, I will support Senate Resolution 9; and I will vote against a tabling motion, which I shall present tomorrow, at 2 o'clock. Assuming the motion to consider the resolution will not be tabled, I shall ask Senators to join me

this afternoon, ahead of time, in having a cloture petition ready. Senators can expect—after the tabling motion is defeated, as I anticipate it will be—a cloture vote on Thursday, 1 hour after the Senate convenes. Should the result of that vote be reasonably close to the required two-thirds, I shall confer with proponents of the resolution as to the best course of action for the Senate. Needless to say, I recognize the gravity of the decision we shall then have to make. I also recognize my own responsibilities in the matter, and I will not shirk them.

During the period when the motion is before us, Senators should be prepared to attend the debates on the floor.

For the reasons I outlined last week, I shall object to having committees meeting during the sessions of the Senate. I shall not call a meeting of the Democratic conference to approve or disapprove vacancies on the steering and policy committees, nor shall I call a meeting of the Democratic steering committee, to fill other committee vacancies, until this question has been resolved. Consequently, for some time, we shall not be able to assign new Members to committees or to fill the present vacancies on our policy and steering committees.

If it becomes necessary, we shall lengthen the sessions each day, although I do not anticipate round-the-clock sessions.

We shall meet 6 days a week. There will be live quorums; and Members should be prepared to cancel out-of-town engagements, in order that we may quickly secure those quorums.

Our experience last year has convinced me that cooperation is essential to any progress whatsoever; and if the debate continues into next week, Senators should be prepared to forego the usual Lincoln Day recess.

Mr. President, I have certain responsibilities in this body, and I intend to perform them. We are in one of those situations—which have occurred throughout our history—in which a determined group which is urging change has met an intractable opposition to change.

The vote on applying cloture to the motion will tell us whether those who urge change should continue to press for it, given the difficulties which will attend their efforts. I see my task, and the task of all others concerned with orderly, progressive government, to keep the Senate functioning as an arm of that government.

Mr. President, let me say, once again, that it is my intention to offer a tabling motion tomorrow; and I shall offer it as close to the hour of 2 o'clock as possible, so that all Senators may be informed and be on hand.

It is my further intention this afternoon to file a motion for cloture; and, on that basis, Senators should be on notice that a vote on the question of cloture will be taken on Thursday next.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader wheth-

er this statement has been made pursuant to a meeting held this morning by the proponents of the rule change, or whether he is making it on his own responsibility.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question, I must state that, in effect, I am doing it on my own responsibility. However, within the past 10 minutes I have had some conversations with certain Senators who are in favor of the proposed change in the rule, and they have told me that it is their preference that a tabling motion first be made. I have agreed to what they wanted done, although it was my original intention not to offer a tabling motion—because I can see certain difficulties therein—but only to offer a motion for cloture. However, aside from that, this was my own independent judgment, and I take full responsibility for the statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader another question: I apprehend that this is a firm program; that the tabling motion definitely will be offered on Wednesday; and that the cloture petition will be completed and filed this afternoon, and, under the rule, the motion would come up for vote on Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois is correct; and I hope the Senate as a whole is aware of the firm commitments made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask one further question: If the tabling motion fails—and I share the conviction of the majority leader that it will fail—and assuming that the attempt to apply cloture fails, what can we foresee for the remainder of the week? I ask this question because many Senators have made commitments with respect to the Lincoln Day period, and they would be going into the field to make speeches.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my intention—if the motion for cloture does not receive approximately 60 votes in its favor—that the first cloture motion will mark the end of this debate, so far as I am concerned; and I will then make a motion to adjourn.

However, if the vote is fairly close—say, 60 or more—it will be my intention to offer a second motion on cloture, on the day when the first cloture vote is had; and that would mean that the second vote on cloture would come next Saturday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that would be definite, I assume?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot be too definite about the second vote on cloture, because once the vote has been taken, I think it only fair that I meet with the proponents of the resolution, seek their advice and counsel, and be guided—as far as possible—by their wishes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the majority leader will yield further, I make these interrogations only so that notice will be given to all Senators who have commitments to be away from Washington for the Lincoln Day period—in order that they may know what will happen in the Senate, and also may know about the possibility of a Saturday session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Illinois has stated the question correctly.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that in all fairness I should state what I believe to be the position of one Senator in regard to what is to be done. I believe that when the motion to table was lost, on the basic constitutional question, the initiative in connection with this matter properly passed to the majority leader and to the other Members of the majority; and while we could make known to him our views and desires—as I and other Members have done, quite properly—I should like again to express my appreciation, as one Member, for the fact that whenever the majority leader can do so, he makes life very easy for us, in paying some attention—if he can do so consistent with his views and conscience and duty—to what we would like.

But I believe it should be made clear that the Senator from Montana is exercising the leadership prerogative and responsibility, because I feel that with the defeat of the motion, the other day, the initiative passed to the majority leader, in order to determine, within his responsibilities, what could be done in order to bring about an actual vote on the proposed rule change.

For myself, I could not sign a cloture petition, because I think that would compromise my conscience as to the constitutionality of such procedure, inasmuch as I believe that the majority has a right to close debate, and I have argued that many times. But when presented with that issue, I shall vote for cloture.

I thank the majority leader for his understanding, but I did wish to make clear my feeling that this was his initiative, and I was very pleased to hear him say that he has made his decisions in pursuance of his leadership responsibility.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from New York. May I add that although I shall offer the motion to table, I am in favor of the Anderson proposal and shall vote against the motion which I shall offer.

I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the frankness with which the majority leader has presented the question. I believe I could answer the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] by saying to him—I know he would respect my word on it—the able majority leader came to me at least 2 days ago and outlined the procedure he has presented as a general suggestion to see what some of us thought of it. So it could not have exactly come from another meeting this morning.

I compliment the majority leader in striving to talk frankly with Senators. As for myself, I hope that regardless of how we come out on motions to table or on cloture petitions, we ought to say to those who desire to keep speaking engagements next week that we will work out some way whereby they can keep them.

I recognize that it is said that there is a responsibility on the part of Senators to be present in the Chamber. But when

a Senator has come to the Senate expecting to return home for the normal Lincoln's birthday speeches, he ought to be told fairly frankly that he can safely plan to go, and that he can be reasonably sure that his presence will not be required here. For a great many years our Republican friends have gone home. The Senate has not been torn apart by their going home. We expect at a later date to be given freedom to fulfill our engagements.

I assure the majority leader and the minority leader that I shall not try to hold Senators here and keep them from speaking engagements which they may have next week.

It is a fine thing for Senators to go home and meet their constituents. Most Senators who run into trouble do so because they have not gone home and told the folks whom they represent what is going on in Washington.

We have perplexing questions relating to taxes and many other things. It would do us all good to go home and seek the advice and counsel of our neighbors and friends on those important questions. I pledge to the majority leader that I for one will not interfere with his program of trying to get to some sort of decision on the question by the end of this week. It is not conclusive at all. We can find ways of discussing it together and reaching a method by which Senators on the Republican side can keep their speaking engagements, which I believe are important to keep.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the frank, candid, and fair statement of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. I always appreciate his advice and counsel, not only on the present occasion, but over the years.

I must say in all fairness, however, that if the question is not settled this week, Republican Senators and others who have made plans to be absent to fulfill speaking engagements should consider seriously the cancellation of those plans or the keeping of such engagements at their own risk.

This is not a Republican or a Democratic question. This is a senatorial question, which includes all Senators. We ought to face our responsibilities in that respect.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. Over the years the so-called Lincoln's birthday recess has lengthened in both directions from February 12. Commitments have been made for as early as Thursday and Friday of this week. The question becomes a slightly delicate one in cases in which such commitments have been made.

In view of the fact that there is no business on the Senate calendar, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what he would propose to do if the cloture petition should fail on Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Lincoln's birthday is on February 12, which is next Tuesday. If the question is disposed of—and what I am about to

say is not a carrot being held out to Senators, I assure them—it would be my suggestion that the Senate recess from Friday, February 8, until Tuesday, February 12, and then recess from Tuesday, February 12, until Friday, February 15. We would then resume normal business on Monday, February 18.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader submits his proposal for 3-day recesses which would start on Thursday night, but if a second cloture petition were filed on Thursday, in the normal procedure the vote on the second cloture petition would come on Saturday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would. Of course, it would mean that we would not be able to start the so-called Lincoln Day recess until consideration of the question now before the Senate is completed, because the Senate will remain in session until it is finished one way or the other, even though it will work hardship on some Senators who have longstanding commitments. I feel that it is our responsibility collectively and together to operate this institution in that fashion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a suggestion to the majority leader. If a second cloture petition were filed on Thursday, the vote would obviously come on Saturday. If the Senate could come in at an early hour on Saturday, that vote could be the first and immediate order of business after a quorum had been developed. The question would then come to a vote. A Senator could then catch an early afternoon plane, affording Senators an opportunity to meet some of their commitments on Saturday night.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I see by the look on the face of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that he has a comment to make on the proposal. I yield to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am afraid that my look is one of confusion. It is difficult to understand the present proceeding. The other day I stated that there had been more unusual and peculiar approaches, starts and stops, filling and backing, on the particular resolution now being debated than I have ever seen in my experience in the Senate, which covers a number of years. It all goes to show what trouble we get into when we depart from the usual and ordinary procedure of submitting such questions to the appropriate committee and letting the committee conduct hearings and go through the due course of parliamentary operations and procedures that are usually followed with respect to bills and resolutions.

I am all the more confused by the statement of the distinguished majority leader that someone had asked him to make the motion to table, but having made the motion, he would vote against his own motion. I believe he repeated that statement twice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe he stated, though, that the proponents of the resolution had suggested that he make the motion to table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. I had considered it myself. I

had thought that it would be inadvisable to do so because I can see some consequences which might not be too favorable to the proponents of the present proposal. But I feel that they are entitled to that consideration, and I was glad to comply with their request.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there has been so much unusual procedure in the manipulations of this resolution that I cannot say I am surprised to hear that even the majority leader intends to make a motion that would go against his own beliefs. I must confess that that is a somewhat new procedure in the Senate. I have seen it only once before in my career here. Some Senator moved to adjourn in order to get the advantage of a quorum call. To get the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn, he voted against his own motion.

We have heard many unusual suggestions with respect to the power of the Vice President to terminate debate in the Senate in his discretion, and in so doing to completely bypass committees. We have heard so many other strange suggestions that I do not know what kind of hocus pocus our friends who are pressing the question have cooked up for us in persuading our leader to make the unusual motion to table and then to vote against his own motion.

For my part, as I have stated here several times, a motion to table is the most summary and brutal form of gag rule or cloture, and I am always very reluctant to vote to table. In these circumstances I shall join the distinguished Senator from Montana and vote against the motion to table. I shall follow his leadership. I call on all the friends of freedom of debate in the Senate to vote against the motion to table, because we do not know just what peculiar proposal may evolve itself from a motion that is made whereby in effect the man kills the child of his own tongue and brain. And he does it without instructions from on High, such as Abraham had when he prepared Isaac as a burnt offering. He will give birth to the motion, and then offer it as a sacrifice or a burnt offering, without having had an admonition from any source other than from the proponents of this very unusual resolution and this very remarkable procedure.

So, if there were any considerable vote to table, I suppose we would hear a clamor in the Senate from three or four of our opponents who have rewritten the rules in their own minds under their own hands claiming that the vote meant the Vice President had to do something; or perhaps that the majority leader was under compulsion to take some peculiar step; or that the minority leader, forsooth, should abandon his conviction in the matter and make some motion he was bound to oppose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of this because of the unusual situation that arises from a byplay, whereby the Senate majority leader strangled the creature of his own mind and his own position.

Mr. President, in these circumstances I think all those in favor of orderly procedure in the Senate and in favor of freedom of debate in the Senate would be

well advised to join the majority leader and to vote against the motion to table so that we might proceed in an orderly fashion.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MANSFIELD addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether it is his suggestion that we make this vote unanimous; that every Senator vote against the motion to table.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it would restore a slight air of tranquillity in this Chamber to have a unanimous vote, with all of us showing our distinguished leader the complete unanimity of our support by voting with him against his motion to table. It may be an experience he will not have again for a long time. It would make him feel good to have the support of all 99 of his colleagues, all voting with him against the summary gag motion to lay on the table.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The only thing that would make me feel good would be to get rid of this question one way or the other, and get down to the business of the Senate in the matter of legislation, committee assignments, and committee business of various kinds.

The support given to the majority leader by the distinguished Senator from Georgia is something that I had anticipated but had not known, and was one of the reasons why I was personally against offering a motion to table.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that the Senator does not object to my voting with him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. When a Senator makes a motion, and then objects to another Senator supporting him in his motion, I say we shall have seen everything, Mr. President in unusual and bizarre parliamentary practice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But we are operating within the rules of the Senate, are we not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed. The motion to table is in order.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from Georgia that while my inclinations were the same as those of the majority leader in reference to the motion to table—in fact, I advised against it, among those with whom I am associated, and I told the majority leader that if I were his personal attorney I would advise him against it—nevertheless, because he is a fine man and because he is our leader he has accepted the decision of a group of Senators who are interested in a change in the rules. The majority of that group requested the majority leader to make the motion to table.

On one occasion the Senator from Minnesota had been requested to make the motion to table. I refused to do it—but not because I did not want to vote with my good friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator would like to be right at least once.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator would like to be always right. He also would like to be with the Senator from Georgia as often as possible but this time it is difficult, since our views hardly coincide on this matter.

I say to the Senator that the only unusual procedure I see lies in the unusual situation which prevails, according to the rules of the Senate.

Under Senate rule XIV, the resolution was placed on the calendar. The resolution is on the calendar for the purpose of being acted upon. Under the rules of the Senate, a motion was made for the consideration of that resolution.

It is most unusual for any Senator to object to a motion to consider in this body. Thousands of measures are passed in the Senate; and the very first motion which is made with respect to them is, "I move, Mr. President, that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution." or "Senate Resolution 9."

That is the usual thing. The unusual thing is the objection.

If the Senator from Georgia wants to know why the Senate is in such disarray on these matters, all he has to do is to examine his own objection and the other objections made to the pending Anderson motion. They were all made under the rules of the Senate.

The Vice President—who knows the rules of the Senate, who has told us about the rules of the Senate, who does not want to be a dictator of the Senate—ordered the resolution placed on the Calendar. In short, the motion to consider was made under normal procedure.

So what is unusual? What is unusual is that Senators who were so co-operative in 1959 have become quite obstinate in 1963. That is what is unusual.

With all the great charm and graciousness and gentlemanliness of our good friends from the South, they have lost a little of that magnolia aroma and magnolia spirit, and have taken on, I might say, some of the toughness of the pine cone of the frigid North.

I hope that Senators will permit us to follow the usual and ordinary course, and to act within the rules. There is a simple way to do that. We can vote on the Anderson motion to consider Senate Resolution 9.

What would be usual after that would be to debate the substance of the resolution. That is the usual procedure.

So the unusual parade before us has been headed by those who now give us dissertations and lectures on the unbelievable disarray of the Senate and the unusual procedures which are being followed here.

Let the Record be clear that when a Senator votes against tabling he means that he believes the matter is worthy of consideration. Under the precedents of the Senate, a vote against tabling is an indication that the Senator is for the measure.

Mr. President, according to the leader, there is to be one other vote. I thank the leader for his helpfulness and for his courtesy. He has been very patient with us. He knows my views on this question. I have been in close touch with him.

I want to see this dispute brought to an end. I have made it crystal clear that I do not want to see this debate carried on indefinitely, to the embarrassment of any Senator, or, more importantly, to the detriment of the business of the Senate. I am prepared to make that statement anywhere. I believe we ought to come to a conclusion on this issue.

What will be the real test vote on cloture? I do not have any doubt. I do not think we ought to go around trying to pretend what we have or what we do not have in terms of strength. I do not believe there are enough votes in this body to invoke cloture. I wish there were.

But I do believe that a majority of this body wants a change in the rule. The regrettable thing is that a majority, after many weeks of discussion, is being thwarted by a rule in the Senate rule book which some of us believe is unconstitutional.

Mr. President, the only way we are going to determine whether a majority of this body wants a change in the rules along the line that the Senator from New Mexico has proposed—which is a very modest change, a very conservative change; which surely is no radical departure from what we now have—is by the result of the vote on the question of invoking cloture.

I want the record to be clear. This will be another tough vote, because many people do not believe in invoking cloture. Nevertheless, if 51 Members of the Senate vote to invoke cloture on Thursday next, it ought to well be understood that 51 Members of this Senate believe that a rules change is in order.

I think more than 51 Members of this Senate will so vote. But I say to the majority leader that I do not believe that we have the 67 votes which are required to invoke cloture, or the votes of two-thirds of those present and voting which are required.

I can assure the majority leader now that if we do not show the kind of strength which approximates 60 votes, this Senator will feel that it is time to bring this matter to a halt.

I want to point out the precedent for the tabling motion. A motion was made by the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], to table the pending Mansfield-Dirksen amendment prohibiting arbitrary or unreasonable voter registration tests, in the 2d session of the 87th Congress, last year. The majority leader does this in his role of leader. I do not think we ought to make any special point of it except to say it is done to show the measure of strength. At that time, on his motion to table the pending Mansfield-Dirksen amendment prohibiting arbitrary or unreasonable voter registration tests and providing that citizens who have completed six grades in an accredited school would be considered as literate for the purpose of State literacy or interpretation tests in registering to vote in Federal elections, the result was yeas, 33, nays, 64.

One of those voting "yea" was the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The Senator from Minnesota did not vote to table.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for clarifying the RECORD.

(At this point Mr. McGovern assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Minnesota for so candidly disclosing his plan, even though he violates the accepted and ancient rules of the indoor sport called poker by showing his hand.

If there seems to be such great concurrence in the belief that there will be a vote against the motion to table, why not have the vote right now, and save much time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would like to consider that suggestion, but absent Senators are entitled to at least 24 hours' notice.

I yield now to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I merely want to say that in this rush to come to a vote on the motion to table, I hope some of us will be able to insert in the RECORD information as to how some of these same Senators voted on a motion to table in 1953, made by the then majority leader, Senator Taft. I think Senators will find that many Senators who now intend to vote for the motion to table were anxious to vote against the motion to table at that time.

The RECORD will show how they voted in 1957 on a motion submitted by the then majority and minority leaders. They led the fight on the motion to table. It is so horrible to vote against a motion to table now, but it was all right at that time. Again in 1959 similar questions were raised.

On the point made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I point out that nobody tried to tie up the Senate for weeks and not give Senators an opportunity to look at the question and decide it. Every Senator who was in favor of a change in the rules stood by and said, "This is proper; this is reasonable." I do not know why the situation is so extraordinary now. It is customary for the majority leader to lay the proposal before the Senate and have the question debated. Now we have established a precedent in this Congress whereby every time the majority leader moves to proceed to the consideration of a measure, an attempt will be to engage in a 2- or 3-week filibuster. This procedure will come back to plague the Senate.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On May 9, in the 87th Congress, 2d session, on the pending Mansfield-Dirksen amendment, when the majority leader announced he would vote against his own motion and against tabling, on that motion there were in favor of the motion to table 33 votes and 64 votes against tabling. The Senator from Montana was against tabling. The Senator from Minnesota was against tabling. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was for tabling a motion iden-

tical with the type that is to be made tomorrow by the majority leader.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is important that we recognize that these things are strange. For 10 years Senators have been voting one way. Suddenly, when they realize that a motion to table is to be made, they decide that they are going to change sides. I do not think anyone will be fooled by this procedure. These are different times. We have not been permitted to proceed to the consideration of a motion to change the rules, but a motion to table will be lodged against it. It opens the door to all sorts of peculiar results. If Congress is to continue in session until the middle of October or the first of November, it will be for no other reason than the fact that there was a filibuster against the motion to take up.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no such thing as a friendly motion to table. The rule book says "motion to table," and that means a motion to kill. One cannot, out of a great burst of friendship, vote to kill, and then say, "I did not mean to kill." I have never been in that unhappy position. I have joined the majority leader, but I have joined him with my eyes open, because there is no such thing as a friendly, qualified motion to table.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the Senator from Illinois that I am reminded of the story of the boy who went to the zoo and saw a giraffe and said, "There's no such animal as that." It so happens that there is such a thing as a friendly motion. The Senator from Montana has made it, courageously and honestly, on previous occasions. To state now that, to expedite the Senate's business, or to advance the work of the Senate, or in order to permit friends to keep engagements, he will make a motion and vote against it, will not confuse anybody or mislead anybody.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I joined the majority leader before. I knew exactly what I was doing. The rule book does not say "qualified motion to table."

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think the rule book classifies any motion as friendly or anything else. Many motions are made for the purpose of bringing matters to the floor. I do not know how they should be distinguished; I only say that the majority leader and the minority leader, exercising their consciences, have done it before, and no Senator has criticized what was done before.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Any Senator who votes against the motion to table that is coming up tomorrow will be voting to keep the resolution before the Senate; voting, in effect, that he thinks it is a good measure. If he does not want it, he can vote for the tabling motion. If a Senator votes to table, he votes to bury it without flowers; he votes to put it down deep; he votes to put it on the hard table. If a Senator wants to vote to keep the measure alive because he thinks it may have some merit, he should

vote against tabling. I shall be interested in seeing who will vote against tabling.

Mr. ANDERSON. I recognize that what the Senator from Minnesota has said is true. I know that a motion to table is a motion to kill. I ought to know, because I have the scars on my throat from 1953 and all the other times when a motion to table effectively killed the proposal to give Members of the Senate the right to adopt their own rules. I read about a bill being introduced to make it possible for people in certain parts of the country to vote. The Senate can give some consideration to Senators having a right to vote if we have an opportunity to vote on the proposal being made to change the rules, and not merely on a motion to table, to test constitutionality, and every other issue before the Senate. I think it is too bad.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have been greatly interested in the construction of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, in his best professional manner, as he delivered his version of the effect of the coming vote to the Senate.

I know of no right that any Senator has to construe the vote of any other Senator, even though the Senator who makes the construction is the assistant majority leader of the Senate.

We all construe our own votes. In my opinion, a Senator certainly would not be standing on his rights as a Senator if he were to allow another Senator the power and privilege of construing the effect of his vote or even his intent in voting any way he may desire.

The question of consistency has been brought into discussion. Senators have stated that the Senator from Georgia and other Senators have been inconsistent. I am not afraid of being inconsistent. I do not claim to have a great mind, but I remember that it was Emerson who had said that consistency was the hobgoblin of small minds. Therefore, I have never sought to be consistent.

I am willing to lay my consistency in this matter on the line for comparison by any fair-minded Senator with the consistency of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Mexico.

Those two Senators, the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New Mexico, in 1959 voted for a rule that provided that the rules of the Senate shall continue in effect from one Congress to the next Congress unless they are changed as provided in the rules of the Senate.

Now Senators try to avoid every rule in the rule book in order to get a vote on this question in the most unusual manner that has ever been seen in the Senate. I match my consistency against that of any Senator who possesses a record like that.

Senators voted in 1959 that the rules carry over from one Congress to the next. Yet in 1963 they say the rules do not apply at all. They say, "Here is a new rule. We are going to substitute something that is not in the Constitution or in the rules but which we think should be there, to the effect that a majority of the Members of the Senate can vote a gag rule in the early days of a session."

I was also interested to hear the Senator from Minnesota say, "If a Senator votes a certain way, he votes against a fair and reasonable cloture proposal with respect to three-fifths of the Senate, which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico."

I suppose if I wished to construe something I might say that the Senator from Minnesota has abandoned his majority cloture proposal. I have not heard him mention it for 2 weeks. Every time he rises to speak on this subject he talks about the cloture proposal that has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico, "this very modest change, which is from 67 to 60." He does not mention the one that he has offered, which represents the difference between 67 and 51, which is 16, or more than twice the number he has referred to in the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator may have overlooked that fact and may have forgotten about it in the very lucid outpouring of his beautiful rhetoric, but the Senator from Georgia has not forgotten it. We all know that that majority gag rule is lurking in the background, and the Senator from Georgia knows that the Senator from Minnesota has so arranged things that his proposal will be voted on before the Senate has an opportunity to vote on the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is just as right as he can be.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know I have not spoken on a majority rule cloture proposal because we cannot even get the predicate, the basis of the whole subject, before the Senate for discussion. We must first adopt the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to proceed to the consideration of the proposal, before we can proceed to the consideration of the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota in the nature of a substitute. We cannot even offer our proposal until that is done. If the Senator from Georgia is so worried about the fact that I have not spoken on the majority cloture rule proposal, in which we have been joined by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], there is an easy way to take care of the situation.

Let us vote on the Anderson motion to take up Senate Resolution 9. Then we will offer the substitute for the Anderson resolution and the Senate will vote on the substitute. We understand what it is all about.

Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator may understand what it is all about according to his interpretation. The Senator from Georgia has his own ideas on that subject. While I do not undertake to lecture the Senate as to the effect of a vote, I have my own ideas about these matters. It is much more common to oppose the consideration of a proposed bill or resolution than for a Senator to vote

against his own motion. The Senator from Montana has produced a record, which apparently I have forgotten, or I did not catch the full significance of it. I am fully aware of what I am doing now, and I will join the Senator from Montana in voting against the motion to table. I may have made a mistake previously in that regard, but I shall not make the same mistake again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to add another clarification. I misjudged the full ramifications of the section of rule XXXII which was approved in 1959. I would not support such a proposal today. We now have two public confessions in this body. This is the second time that I have joined the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely say to the Senator from Minnesota that my mistake was procedural; his mistake was constitutional. There is certainly a slight difference between the two mistakes that were made.

I have heard a great many things read into certain votes. A great many references have been made as to what has transpired in this year or last year. I shall avoid anything that might give the appearance of making an excuse for what I have done. I will be well advised to go along and support our grand leader in his vote on the tabling motion. Then we can take up the cloture motion and vote on it, too, and we can determine at that time what the future holds. I shall await with interest the construction the Senator from Minnesota will place on the various votes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Methinks there are too many St. Pauls in this body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish the majority leader would now recapitulate for the Senate precisely what the course will be, the motions that will be offered during the week, and whatever else the program will be.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its deliberations today, it recess to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

MOTION TO TABLE—MOTION FOR CLOTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I can obtain the floor at approximately 2 o'clock tomorrow—and I anticipate that I will—it will be my intention at that time to offer a motion to table the pending motion of the Senator from New Mexico to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9.

Later today I will submit a motion for cloture, which I now have before me. The motion will be voted upon on Thursday next. If the vote is reasonably close at that time, no second motion for cloture will be filed.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. When the Senator says "reasonably close," does he use the construction of the Senator from Minnesota, that 51 would indicate that the motion should be held here indefinitely,

or does the Senator have some other number in view? We should like to know, so that we may make our plans accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the vote is less than 60 for cloture, my opinion would be that we ought to lay it aside.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If it were 60 or above, after consultation with those who are the proponents of the resolution before us, we would have to decide what to do. But if I do submit a second motion for cloture, it will be on Thursday, immediately after the vote on the first one. Then it would be my thought that the Senate could meet early Saturday morning, as the Senator from Illinois has suggested. If cloture were once again defeated, I should think that would end the matter for this session.

The Senate will convene at 10 o'clock for the remainder of this week or, if need be, earlier, and will meet on Saturday next, depending on events in the meantime.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion for cloture and ask that it be read.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana said several times he would yield to me. I have relinquished the floor each time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will wait until the cloture motion has been read, I shall be happy to yield to him.

Mr. President, I ask that the motion for cloture be read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule requires the Presiding Officer to state the cloture motion to the Senate. Without objection, the Chair will ask that the clerk read the cloture motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 9, to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

MIKE MANSFIELD, FRANK CHURCH, EDWARD V. LONG, GEORGE McGOVERN, EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, CLAIR ENGLE, HARRISON WILLIAMS, BIRCH BATH, JOHN O. PASTORE, LEE METCALF, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, THOMAS MCINTYRE, FRANK E. MOSS, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, PAT MCNAMARA, VANCE HARTKE.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATORS TO SIGN CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DONN] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be allowed to sign the cloture motion which is now at the desk.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am much interested in rule XXII. I deeply regret that the majority leader feels he must make the motion to lay on the table tomorrow. I make that statement in this spirit: I intend to vote to lay the motion on the table, but that does not influence me as to what my future votes on this question will be. I do not agree at all with the interpre-

tation given by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that this vote is an indication pro or con as to my feelings on the Anderson proposal. I shall vote to lay the motion on the table because I believe this body should, after thoughtful debate, have an opportunity to proceed with its business.

I was the first one to suggest an amendment of rule XXII, in 1947, on a motion to take up, which was not at that time subject to cloture. I made a similar motion in 1949. It was adopted with a different plurality, a constitutional two-thirds in 1950, and was further amended in 1959 to its present form.

I believe the purpose of rule XXII is to permit the Senate to have an opportunity to vote. The pending motion has been debated for a long time. I know the majority leader feels, as I do, that the Senate should get down to its business. I shall vote to lay this motion on the table, because I believe that the Senate should get on with its business. I think that we who will vote to lay this matter on the table are being put in a very false light, because the question is not concerned with what we shall vote on at a later date.

At the present moment, I intend to vote for cloture in the same spirit, but how I shall vote on the question itself, if cloture shall be voted, is another matter. But I make this statement because I think we have delayed action on the pending motion, rightly or wrongly—and every Senator is entitled to his opinion—for too long a time.

The Senate should get on with its business. I say very sincerely to the majority leader that a motion tomorrow to lay on the table will not help matters, because obviously such a motion will be rejected; and when it has been voted down, a motion for cloture will come before the Senate. It seems to me that a vote on cloture would carry out the objective of the majority leader.

I also most respectfully call this point to the attention of the majority leader. If he files a second cloture motion, and it is not adopted, and he then moves that the Senate adjourn, there is nothing on the calendar of the Senate for consideration. There being no committee meetings, there cannot be anything on the Senate Calendar; therefore, there will be no business for the Senate to take up if a motion to adjourn shall be agreed to—as I hope would be the situation if the second cloture petition should fail.

I have the utmost respect for the majority leader. I know how he feels about closing up these matters. Still, I think a motion to lay on the table is a difficult one for those of us who feel the Senate should get action, regardless of what that action shall be, after a reasonable time for debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. I appreciate his comments. I assure him that he has described the policy which the leadership intends to pursue.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I strongly approve the position taken by the distinguished

Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that at this time a motion to lay on the table should be defeated, and, if possible, by as nearly unanimous action of the Senate as may be obtained. My reason for taking that position is perhaps a little different from some of the other reasons which have been stated.

The senior Senator from Florida will not favor a motion to lay on the table, under present conditions at least, because he believes that every Senator who feels as he does has the right to be heard to the full under the rules, which is twice upon this question, before such a summary cloture proceeding should be invoked as that which would result from the motion to lay on the table.

The second point I wish to make is this: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] insists that under rule XIV the present effort is directly in accordance with the rules. That is one view. But I invite the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the fact that the method which he prescribes to amend the rules is one which has not been followed customarily. Customarily, the regular procedure of reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration has been followed, and that is in accordance with the rules. I ask the Senator to read rule XXV, section 10, subsection (e), which places within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration "matters relating to parliamentary rules."

Certainly on a question as far-reaching and controversial as this, it seems to me, on the very face of things, any commonsense approach to this problem should have followed the customary course of referring such a resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, allowing Senators to express their views at a hearing, and also allowing the public to appear and express its views on the proposal.

So instead of being under the rules, simply because rule XIV permits a resolution to come up after lying over a day, to the contrary, the infraction of the rules proposed, is much greater, because the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration which is clearly existent, is not recognized at all, nor is the fact that any proposal of such a serious nature would customarily be referred to the appropriate committee which has jurisdiction, which would therefore have the opportunity to act in accordance with the rules and the procedure of the Senate.

Some of us have not been so fortunate as to be invited to make Lincoln Day speeches throughout the Nation; but on the strength of the fact that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle had been so invited, and pursuant to the practice which has existed in the Senate, at least as long as I have been here—and I believe this is my 17th year—we have availed ourselves usually of the opportunity to be away on Monday and Tuesday of next week, February 11 and 12.

As the distinguished majority leader well knows, the senior Senator from Florida availed himself of the opportunity to be away from the Senate on Feb-

ruary 12, Lincoln's birthday, because he has received many invitations to attend the State fair in Florida on the day of the largest attendance at that fair, when it is expected that half a million people will be present. The Senator from Florida has been honored by being invited to take part in the proceedings of that day.

The Senator from Florida hopes that the solicitude and tenderness which exists on the part of some of his colleagues toward the other side of the aisle will also cause them to take note of the fact that not only the Senator from Florida, but also several other Senators who have the good fortune, or the misfortune, to be up for election next year, have arranged to be absent from the Senate on February 11 and 12, because of the unfailing custom of the Senate to permit the Republican Members of this body the courtesy of absence on those 2 days, and perhaps other days, to make Lincoln's Birthday addresses.

I merely express the hope that such cause as I have just now expressed is entitled to some consideration by our brethren in the Senate, just as much as the cause of our distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who certainly have every right to expect to be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate during those 2 days, and also to be assured that no important business will be transacted during that time.

Regardless of the outcome of the well-laid plan as to what shall be done during the remainder of this week, I hope the majority leader will, from the generosity of his heart, give consideration to those of us who have longstanding arrangements to be absent on the 11th and the 12th, so that we may continue with our plans and may be absent then without being subjected to the possibility that during that period of time this important measure will come up for a vote.

I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I sympathize with the Senator from Florida. But I certainly can make no commitment to him or to anyone else. The rules under which we are operating have been laid down; and so far as the Senate is concerned, its business comes ahead of the engagements of individual Senators. I am as sorry as anyone could be to make this statement; but I intend to see to it that the business of the Senate comes first, and is attended to, and that this issue is disposed of one way or the other. I think we have wasted 4 weeks already, and I do not look forward to having another week wasted.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is the intention of the distinguished majority leader to have the Senate vote, pursuant to his cloture motion, on Thursday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his customary generosity and consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield, in order that I may make a statement, if it is understood that he may do so without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, as requested, to the Senator from Minnesota, without losing my right to the floor and without having the preamble of my speech—only half of which has been delivered—counted as one speech and the remarks I shall make hereafter counted as another speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator from North Carolina that I would not want that done. In fact, I am certain that his speech will be scholarly and informative, and I am afraid it may be slightly persuasive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, regarding motions to table, I merely wish to point out that of course there is a difference of opinion as to what is meant by a vote in favor of such a motion.

However, at the last session a number of motions were made to table certain amendments which were offered to the communications satellite bill. I merely say that anyone who wishes to examine that record will find that when there was a desire to end the debate and to kill the amendments offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] or the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] or other Senators, motions to lay on the table were made.

Let us clearly understand that such motions to lay on the table were made merely because that was the easiest way to bring the issue to a head and to obtain a determination as to the will of the Senate.

The Senate voted on the Mansfield motion to lay on the table the Morse motion to discharge the Rules Committee from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 24. That resolution would, in effect, have permitted cloture to be had by a majority vote, instead of by the affirmative votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting. I point out that all those motions were made during our consideration of the communications satellite bill. That vote was 70 yeas, 14 nays, and 16 not voting; and the RECORD shows that among the "yeas"—in favor of tabling the motion—were the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], myself and 67 other Senators, as listed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What conclusion does the Senator from Minnesota draw from that, except that the Senators he has named were in favor of having that particular matter tabled at that time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is always prudent. He is a good Senator and an experienced and able legislator and public servant. He knows better than I do—because he has had more experience—that there is only one explicit purpose in voting in favor of a motion to lay on the table;

namely, to do away with, get rid of, kill, and table whatever substantive measure or motion has been offered. That is the purpose of a motion to lay on the table.

Other interpretations can be placed on it, if that is desired; but I would be willing to take my case to a court and to state that precedent and experience demonstrate that a motion to lay on the table is made as the most convenient method of both choking off debate and killing the pending proposal.

On August 10, a motion was made to lay on the table the Kefauver amendment or motion that the Senate consider S. 1552, the drug bill. That happened during the debate in connection with our consideration of the communications satellite bill: At that time the same Senators I have already named voted in favor of tabling. The vote was 70 yeas and 13 nays.

That process continued day after day. I do not recall the exact number, but considerably more than 20 motions to lay on the table were made in connection with our consideration of the communications satellite bill and the amendments offered to it. There is not one Member of this body who, if put under oath, would not admit that this procedure offered the most convenient and positive way to maintain the communications satellite bill, to defeat every amendment which was offered to it, and to bring about the decision quickly and decisively. That is why the motions to lay on the table were made.

Lest there be any doubt about that, let me say that I attended all the conferences which related to the communications satellite bill, and I know the procedure which was agreed upon and the method which was to be used to kill the amendments offered to that bill. I know why I voted in favor of the motions to lay on the table: I did so because I felt that was the only way by which we could bring forth a communications satellite bill which would not be riddled and torn apart by amendment after amendment.

Finally, Mr. President, today I heard the statement that we are offering all kinds of motions in order to prevent the taking of a vote. But, Mr. President, that is not the case. Our purpose in offering the motions is to obtain a vote. To prove that I should like the Senate to vote, before I yield the floor I shall request unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

I have not offered it yet. I said that before I yielded the floor I would do that.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator for the purpose of his making a statement, but not for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then I will return later and make the request.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina allow the Senator from Minnesota to yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I will not yield for a unanimous-consent request, but I ask unanimous consent that I may

yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota so that he may yield to the able and distinguished Senator from New York without my losing the floor, or without having my remarks counted as the completion of the preamble to my speech or part of a second speech. I will yield provided I have the unanimous consent for that purpose.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is very essential, and I believe it is our duty, between now and tomorrow, to put into focus the reasons and the bases for the motions.

First, I have no doubt that no one will be confused by any votes which are cast against the motion to table, which as my colleague from Minnesota has already pointed out, is so unusual, out of context, and out of the voting pattern or basic advocacy of the particular Senators who may cast them.

What we are trying to show, I believe—and I would deeply appreciate the Senator's confirmation of what I am about to say—is that a majority of the Senate wishes to change the rules, at least to the extent of providing for a 60 percent cloture provision, and that that majority is being frustrated, defeated, and stopped in its tracks by the fact that the Senate cannot—and we have argued the question completely—unravel itself on the constitutional question as to whether we can do it without recourse to these very rules themselves in closing off debate.

The controversy has not been settled in the present Congress—not at all. The RECORD will show that notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the Senate wished to change the rules, the majority was defeated, frustrated and prevented from doing so. The question will then go out to the country as to whether that is the way in which the country wants its business run.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has stated the situation very well, and I fully concur.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I should like to pay a sincere tribute to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. Bipartisan activity can do a great deal, and the Senator has so demonstrated. I have rarely seen as much harmony, accord and bipartisan effort, whatever may have been the internal differences, and as frustrating and unhappy as is our endeavor.

What we have seen is a battle; it is not the war.

What we want to go out to the country in every way that we can demonstrate is the fact that a majority of the Senate, notwithstanding all the arguments of the Senator from Georgia and other distinguished Senators, cannot work its will when a determined minority seeks to prevent it from doing so.

Knowing the processes of American public life as I do, I deeply feel that that is the only way to rouse the country to its perils, not only on questions of civil rights—and there is a peril on civil rights; I am not a bit ashamed of the fact that it is a civil rights issue and ought to be, a great one—but on every other question that comes before the

Senate. I am grateful to the Senator for his indulgence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Finally, I point out that those who are seeking to change the rule are seeking to do so within the rules of this body. They are seeking to do it in a method which is prescribed by the rules.

I recognize that the ordinary procedure is for a motion, a resolution, or a bill to be referred to a committee. The Senator from Florida is quite correct about that procedure. The same rules provide also that a Senator may motion up a bill or a resolution. Under rule XIV, which was argued at some length on the opening day of the present Congress, Senate Resolution 9 was placed on the calendar, within the rules, within all the order of this body, and motion was made in the most traditional and customary manner to have it considered.

The Senator from New Mexico has made a telling point here when he stated today that if every bill that is on the calendar is to be argued when the motion to consider is made, we shall never get our work done. We will be here month after month attempting to bring up a bill.

While the Senator from Minnesota has disagreed with measures, he has never attempted to use the rules of the Senate to prevent bringing up a bill.

For example, I was opposed to the so-called proposed tidelands legislation. Yet I went before the policy committee of the Democratic Party and assured the policy committee that, while I opposed the measure, I surely would not be a part of what I considered to be a dilatory action by preventing consideration of the measure.

I believe that measures ought to be considered on their merits. That is my conviction. Others have their point of view, and they are entitled to it. We have rules that presently permit us to argue at length a motion to consider a particular resolution or bill. It would seem to me that we would be well advised in this body to permit the motion to consider to be a normal procedure, readily accepted, and if there is to be debate, that the debate be on the substance of the measure itself.

What must the people of the United States think when they discover—if they discover—the confusion involved in the present argument? All we have been talking about all the time is whether or not we can even debate a resolution which is ordered placed on the Calendar for the action of the Senate. All of the speeches that have been made are on the resolution itself. Yet the argument, the actual point of order that is here before us, is on the motion to take up the resolution. So I do not feel that I am unorthodox or out of line, nor do I feel that I have engaged in any kind of practice which is beyond the limits of parliamentary debate.

I consider that what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have been trying to do is so traditional that it is as much a part of our Republic as are the Stars and Stripes that we see behind the Presiding Officer. To take

up a motion or a bill in a parliament or in the Congress is as normal as the Fourth of July, and to deny people the opportunity even to take up a bill for debate and consideration is unusual, abnormal, and the burden of proof rests upon those who take that position.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has been very courteous. I thank him.

TURKS REMAIN FAITHFUL TO NATO AND UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I regret that a story published in the Washington Post and Times Herald, of February 4 has cast doubt upon the solidarity of one of our staunchest allies on the periphery of the Soviet empire. The article, from the London Observer News Service, treats the forthcoming visit of a Turkish parliamentary delegation to the Soviet Union as an indication of a possible rapprochement between Turkey and the Soviet Union—a rapprochement caused at least in part by alleged dissatisfaction with Western aid coupled with financial blandishments from Moscow. I ask unanimous consent that the article referred to be published at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am personally satisfied, Mr. President, that the author has placed an entirely erroneous interpretation upon the Turkish parliamentary visit. The Turks are not turncoats, and they have shown no evidence of the economic opportunism that characterizes the policy of some nations. Any assertion to the contrary is particularly unfortunate when viewed in the context of the current turmoil within the Western alliance.

It is a fact that a Turkish parliamentary delegation plans to visit the Soviet Union this spring. It is a fact that this is the first such visit in many years. It is likewise a fact that ever since the overthrow of the extremely anti-Soviet government of Annan Menderes the Soviet Union has lost no opportunity to dangle attractive offers of credits and other forms of assistance before the new rulers in Ankara.

But there is no truth whatsoever to the allegation that the Turks visiting Moscow "will be authorized to discuss economic matters." The Turkish Government has taken pains to assure our Ambassador in Ankara, Mr. Raymond Hare, one of our most distinguished Foreign Service officers, that the objectives of the visit in no way contravene or compromise NATO policy. Indeed, no substantive conversations with the Russians are contemplated, although the Kremlin will undoubtedly do its best to pry Turkey loose from its present and prospective relations with the OECD.

Furthermore, let us not be misled by references to the Russo-Turkish treaty of friendship in 1921. It would be foolish, of course, to repose blind faith in the non sequitur that, since the Turks and the Russians have clashed repeated-

ly over the centuries, today's Turk will remain an inveterate enemy of Moscow. This type of pseudohistorical argument should never be taken seriously by our policymakers. Traditional enemies often contract alliances when objective circumstances change; traditional friendships are often wrecked for the same reason. A treaty of friendship between the revolutionary governments of Ataturk and Lenin was a not unnatural accommodation between two countries which at that particular juncture of history were ostracized from Europe. Indeed, the treaty of 1921 bore striking similarities in this regard to the much more significant Soviet-German rapprochement at Rapallo. Each treaty was an adjustment, however shocking, from the point of view of the Western Allies, to the radically altered circumstances that followed World War I. Today the Soviet-Turkish treaty is irrelevant.

The Turkish Government, Mr. President, has left no doubt that the circumstances binding Turkey to the West have not changed essentially since the end of World War II. By no means has the Kremlin formally abandoned its claim, inherited from czarist imperialism, to fortify the Turkish Straits and to acquire the right of free, unhindered transit for its warships to and from the Black Sea. Those Russians who once dreamed of planting the cross atop Saint Sophia now want to crown this edifice with the hammer and sickle. Crude Soviet pressure to this end has given way to the more subtle pressure of economic offers.

The Turkish Government, however, consciously maintains that the solution of its economic problems—and the success of its 5-year plan—lies with the West. The Turks are relying heavily on U.S. assistance and on the support of an OECD consortium. Far from resenting the speed with which Greece normalized its relations with the Common Market, Turkey understands that Greece had to press her claim to associative status before the Turkish claim could be acted upon seriously. Considering her own lower level of economic development and her political problems, Turkey had no choice but to let Greece take the lead in negotiating with the Common Market. Discussions between Turkey and the Market are proceeding normally, I am informed. The proud land of Ataturk has no hankering to become entangled in the meshes of Soviet economic imperialism.

Mr. President, I bring this article to the attention of Senators as an example of speculative, misleading reporting which has done a disservice to the excellent relations between loyal allies.

Mr. President, we have a particular obligation and responsibility at this time, in the light of recent developments in the Western alliance, to see to it that every statement we make is thought through as to its consequences, and that we seek in every way possible to strengthen the alliance by words of reassurance rather than to use words which are subject to misinterpretation.

I recognize that we need always be concerned about dangerous possibilities

in the struggle between the Western bloc of nations and the Soviet bloc and its satellites; but, Mr. President, we shall only be playing into the hands of the Soviet Union if we permit ourselves to be unduly suspicious of and doubtful about allies who have proved themselves to be staunch friends.

Our relationships with Turkey are good. We have problems. We are free countries. The people in Turkey face tremendous economic difficulties and many serious political problems.

The answers to those problems cannot be found in the spreading of doubt and suspicion between faithful allies. Instead, a quiet, determined, thoughtful, careful negotiation and diplomacy between these allies is needed.

We need Turkey as an ally, and Turkey needs the United States. The fact that Turkey's parliamentarians may be visiting the Soviet Union should be no more disconcerting to the United States than the fact that many Americans have visited the Soviet Union. High officials of this Government, high officials of our military departments, prominent Americans in private life, and parliamentarians—Members of the Senate and of the House—have visited the Soviet Union by the dozens. That does not mean we are giving in to Russia. It means we are learning. It means we are trying to achieve a better understanding of the Soviet Union. It means that possibly we can learn something about the apparatus which governs the Soviet Union, and about its economic and social development.

I raise my voice in this body today, Mr. President, because we have enough trouble already due to the developments between France and Great Britain, about the Common Market. This has strained the Western alliance. Nothing could be more disastrous than for this kind of tension to spread and for doubt to be raised in the councils of this Government or even in public opinion about the faithfulness and the loyalty of an ally who has stood fearlessly on the very border of the Soviet Union.

We are far away. The Turks were the bravest of all men who served in Korea. The Turks have stood with us as faithful allies in the Mediterranean. They are under the very nose of the cannon of the Soviet Union, right under the powerful atomic weapons of the Soviet Union, and they have not flinched a muscle.

Talk about being "eyeball to eyeball"—this is whole body to whole body. The Soviet Union is right up against Turkey.

The Turks have been faithful. Why? Because they can trust us. Trust is a mutual matter. Not only can they trust us, but also we must trust them.

If we have reasons to be concerned, I believe Mr. Raymond Hare, our distinguished Ambassador, a man whom I know and whom many Members of the Senate know, will give us the first alarm. If there is reason to be concerned, then the first effort must be made by the representatives of our Government in the State Department and by the representatives of our Government in the Defense Department.

I, for one, am not going to contribute anything to this alleged misunderstanding.

ing. I should like to contribute only something to erase misunderstandings or doubts.

Mr. President, I bring this clipping and story to the attention of the Senate—and I hope to the attention of many of the people of this country—because I want the word to get to Turkey that, first, we are appreciative of them; second, we trust them; and, third, we are a faithful ally.

The Soviet Union needs to know that this country does not let its friends down, that we can be trusted, that the power of this country is right on the border of the Soviet Union with the alliance we have with Turkey and NATO.

NATO is our shield of strength. It is the greatest defense structure which has ever been created, in modern times or in ancient days. Anything that weakens NATO weakens the United States, and threatens our very existence.

For these reasons we have been concerned in recent days about difficulties in the alliance. I say once again that the alliance is big enough and strong enough to withstand these differences. It is big enough and strong enough to stand even a contest of wills between strong minded men, so long as the United States of America maintains its perspective, maintains its leadership, and maintains its faithful trust in its allies.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1963]

TURKISH DELEGATION TO VISIT SOVIET IN MAY

ANKARA.—A Turkish parliamentary delegation will leave in May for a tour of the Soviet Union—the first such delegation to visit Russia in 30 years.

For 16 years, since Stalin's clumsy demands for joint Russo-Turkish control of the straits linking the Mediterranean with the Black Sea and Soviet territorial claims in eastern Turkey, Turkey has been solidly bound to the West. She is a member of two Western alliances, NATO and the Central Treaty Organization, and has been so strongly supported by the West that she has been able to ignore Moscow's threats. Indeed, during the Menderes period in the 1950's, Ankara hardly even condescended to reply to the Soviets' frequent warning notes.

NOT NATURAL ENEMIES

It is often mistakenly assumed, however, that all Turks are congenitally and irrevocably hostile to Russians. It is too often forgotten that in 1921 the Turkish leader Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and Lenin were close friends and allies in their common struggle against the West, and that the Russians supplied money, material, and arms for the Turkish war of independence. In March 1921 Turkey and Russia signed a treaty of friendship which, after several renewals, lasted to the end of the 1930's.

Since the 1960 coup d'etat and hanging of the former premier, Adnan Menderes, the Soviets have made great efforts to improve relations with Ankara. In March 1961 there was an interesting exchange of messages between Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and President Gurel on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Turco-Russian treaty of friendship.

These were Soviet initiatives, but they have already borne fruit with Turkey's neighbor Iran, which has moved nearer to agreement with Moscow by guaranteeing, despite its alliance with the West, not to permit Western bases on its territory. It is interesting to note that the Soviet diplomat credited with achieving the Russian success in Iran has now been posted to Ankara.

NOW DISSATISFIED

Turkey is dissatisfied with the West at the moment because of uncertainties over financial support for its 5-year plan. The Turks are annoyed at both the amount and the credit terms proposed, while, on the Western side, there have been doubts about Turkey's intentions of financing her own share of the plan. Thus the persistent Russian offers of long-term credits are bound to seem attractive to the Turks. According to reliable sources, members of the parliamentary delegation invited to Moscow in May will be authorized to discuss economic matters.

A further cause of Turkish dissatisfaction is the continued refusal, or at least postponement, of her application to join the Common Market. Turkey's motive is much less economic than political: it is a symbol of the passionate desire of modern Turkey to be part of the European Community.

The Turks feel bitter that Greece, with an economy and a geographical situation not much different from Turkey's, should have been admitted almost immediately to association, whereas Turkey, which applied at the same time, is made to wait at the door.

This is a question of which people in the West, amid the din about Britain's entry into the Common Market and other matters, are hardly aware, but which may well be of great importance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for yielding.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII— CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it was a pleasure to yield to my good friend from Minnesota. I thank him for his advice as to how those of us who are opposed to changing rule XXII should vote. In return for that advice, I would like to offer him some advice which I think is much better, and it is that if Senators are impatient with the procedures here, those who favor the rule change might withdraw their proposal, and thus do a good service for the country, and also permit the Senate to go about its business. I think my advice to the Senator from Minnesota is much better than the advice he gives those of us who oppose a rule change.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have always been moved by the advice of the Senator from North Carolina, because it is advice that comes from one who not only has had long experience, but who has kindness and graciousness.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not suppose I will follow the advice of the Senator from North Carolina willingly or voluntarily, but I may be forced to.

Mr. ERVIN. I am always hopeful that preaching sound doctrine will get converts, and I refuse to abandon the Senator from Minnesota to his own devices, notwithstanding the fact that he has announced he may follow his own advice rather than my advice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I have been hoping that, by what limited talents of persuasion I may have, I may be able to convince the Senator

from North Carolina; but I am afraid there will have to be weeping at the door, because I do not think I have been successful. But the Senator from North Carolina has impressed me. He does not convince me, but he impresses me. But I would like to get him to impress me as to other measures, because he is more impressive about other measures than he is in this instance.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator. If he will remain in the Chamber, I will call attention to much more material than I have already presented, because when I yielded to the majority leader, I was about half way through the preface to my remarks.

Mr. President, when I yielded the floor to the majority leader in order that he might announce his plans for the immediate future, I was discussing the third reason which is assigned by proponents of rule change for their proposals, which is that the rule in its present form prevents majority rule. I had discussed the separation of Government powers inserted in the Constitution by the Founding Fathers to protect our country from governmental tyranny, and was about to discuss the system of checks and balances which were placed there by the Founding Fathers for like purpose.

The Constitution provides that all the legislative power of the Federal Government is vested in the Congress, but the Founding Fathers wanted to put some check on possible abuses in legislation by the Congress, so they vested in the President the power to veto measures. Then, in order to put a countercheck upon the President and thus prevent the President from vetoing wise legislation as distinguished from foolish legislation, the Founding Fathers inserted in the Constitution the provision that Congress could override Presidential vetoes by a two-thirds vote.

Another illustration of the system of checks and balances placed in the Constitution by the Founding Fathers to prevent governmental tyranny is found in the provisions which say that the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, but that the Congress shall have control of power of the purse and make appropriations for the Army and Navy, but that no appropriation made by the Congress for the Army or the Navy shall endure for more than 2 years.

The purpose of that provision was to prevent a President from being able to become a dictator by control of the Armed Forces of the Nation.

I could go on at great length to point out how careful the Founding Fathers were to draw a Constitution which would prevent oppression of the people by any governmental power.

One of the finest documents on government, particularly on the American system of government, was written by a Frenchman who visited America and acquired a very profound knowledge of our system of government, and who already possessed a profound knowledge of human nature. I refer to Alexis de Tocqueville's book "Democracy in America." This is a book which contains some very sage advice for those of us who believe

the Founding Fathers were wise in recognizing that the most important thing they could do for the benefit of their fellow Americans was to establish a system of government which would be devoted primarily to the preservation of liberty, rather than efficient government.

We talk about majority rule, which, as I have said, in the eyes of those who disagree with us who think we should debate public questions, is regarded as a counting of noses rather than the use of human reason and human powers of persuasion. Such majority rule is fraught with danger. De Tocqueville, on page 259 of volume 1 of his "Democracy in America" which I hold in my hand, said this concerning the fact that majorities cannot safely be trusted:

A majority taken collectively is only an individual, whose opinions, and frequently whose interests, are opposed to those of another individual, who is styled a minority. If it be admitted that a man possessing absolute power may misuse that power by wronging his adversaries, why should not a majority be liable to the same reproach? Men do not change their characters by uniting with one another; nor does their patience in the presence of obstacles increase with their strength.

That is a very sage observation. I am very much impressed by what the writer said, that the patience of men does not increase with their power. I believe there are illustrations in the Senate which indicate that even some of the fine Members of the Senate are somewhat impatient.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. They wish to put their reform into effect before the sun goes down and are willing to destroy the only thing that makes the Senate a distinctive legislative body in order to do so. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that the greater the power becomes, the more intolerant, and even contemptuous, the majority, or the person possessing the power, becomes of those elements who do not have the power.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is absolutely correct in the question he has propounded to me. That is why the Founding Fathers sought to set up a government which would prevent the tyranny of the majority. They had studied the history of man's long struggle for the right of self-government, and they had found, as a result of reading that history, that no man or set of men on this earth could be trusted with unlimited governmental powers.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. Will he refer again to the book from which he has been reading?

Mr. ERVIN. I have been reading from the book entitled "Democracy in America," written by Alexis de Tocqueville. I will read another passage on this same subject. He is discussing the unlimited power of the majority. I now read from page 260:

Unlimited power is in itself a bad and dangerous thing. Human beings are not competent to exercise it with discretion.

God alone can be omnipotent, because His wisdom and His justice are always equal to His power. There is no power on earth so worthy of honor in itself or clothed with rights so sacred that I would admit its uncontrolled and all-predominant authority. When I see that the right and the means of absolute command are conferred on any power whatever, be it called a people or a king, an aristocracy or a democracy, a monarchy or a republic, I say there is the germ of tyranny, and I seek to live elsewhere, under other laws.

In my opinion, the main evil of the present democratic institutions of the United States does not arise, as is often asserted in Europe, from their weakness, but from their irresistible strength. I am not so much alarmed at the excessive liberty which reigns in that country as at the inadequate securities which one finds there against tyranny.

Here one of the securities against tyranny is rule XXII of the U.S. Senate, which provides that the votes of two-thirds of the membership of the Senate are required to silence those who wish to speak for the welfare of their country. The proponents of the rule change seek to destroy the last remaining security to guard the liberty of America.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has not the Senator found by experience that the more we permit such transgressions upon the tradition of checks and balances, such as the right of free speech, the greater is the temptation for a majority leader, or someone who is in a position to exercise power in this body, to go even further and more or less arrogate unto himself additional powers by using the powers he already has? In other words, is there not the temptation to use power to build additional, greater power on top of it?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. Although a Member of the Senate is not supposed to speak in a disparaging manner about the House of Representatives, I cannot forbear thinking that we have in the House of Representatives an illustration of what the Senator from Louisiana refers to. In the House a system of rules has grown up under which it is almost impossible for the average Member to get an opportunity to make a speech. When he does get the opportunity to make a speech, ordinarily he cannot speak for more than 5 minutes. Under what is called the closed rule a Member cannot even get the right to offer an amendment to a bill. The more power that is given to an individual the more power he wants, and the less liberty he is willing to give to other people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that even in the present debate, those who contend that the rule should be changed, so that 60 percent would be able to silence 40 percent if they were successful, would proceed to use the 60-percent rule, whereas previously 67 percent was required, in order to silence the remaining 33 percent; and that then they would proceed to make a subsequent rule change to reduce the percentage to 55 or 50 percent?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. That is what I believe is the objective of some Senators

who are supporting the so-called Anderson proposal.

Cloture by 60 percent is only one step on the road to a system of cloture under which 51 percent of the Senate would deprive the other 49 percent of the Senate of their right to represent their States in the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator familiar with the identity of some of the various groups and organizations, some of them very high-minded organizations, and some of them very practical, down-to-earth groups, who seek to get their way?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. I stated at the outset of my remarks that I thought that, in the last analysis, there is no pronounced demand from the country at large for any change in the Senate rules; on the contrary, the demand comes, every time a new Congress assembles, from three or four organizations which are dominated by very impatient and, as I said, sometimes intemperate men. In other words, they want to impose their will upon the American people before the sun goes down. We are in a peculiar situation in America today. We used to have legislative bodies which passed laws to regulate the external actions of people when such external actions injured other people. We have today in the United States an almost overpowering demand from these impatient organizations for the passage of laws which would impose on all men the legal duty that they think thoughts similar to what they are thinking, and commit such acts as those who are pressing for the changes want them to commit. They would destroy freedom of speech and freedom of thought for everyone who disagrees with them. In other words, they belong to the cult of conformity.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the fact that some of these groups and organizations are in the position of being able to contribute a large number of votes and sometimes large amounts of money to the campaigns of those who are running for office?

Mr. ERVIN. There is no question about it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator know of any of the impatient groups of persons who would be satisfied with a 60-percent gag rule in the Senate?

Mr. ERVIN. They would not be satisfied, certainly not for more than overnight. They would be back the next day asking for a 55-percent gag rule or a 53-percent gag rule.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Or a 50-percent gag rule.

Mr. ERVIN. Or a 50-percent gag rule.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My impression has been that none of these people would be satisfied at this moment with less than the power of a majority. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not his impression that some of those in the labor movement, some of whom are good

friends of this Senator, would like to see those with whom they have influence in this body control the Senate in the way they operate their labor unions?

Mr. ERVIN. Certainly. Some of those men have tremendous power. Not only can we not trust men with unlimited governmental power; we cannot trust men with unlimited power to control the Government—at least, we cannot do so safely.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Cannot the Senator see that there is a great distinction between a situation in which a labor union leader who felt that someone was causing trouble or dissension in the union might order the sergeant at arms to grab him by the seat of his pants and throw him out the rear door, and the way the U.S. Senate is operated?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; but I do not believe that even a union ought to be operated like that. As a member of the Rackets Committee, I recall that we found that some locals had placed men on the payroll in order to throw out of union meetings men who disagreed with the policies of the local.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. While I feel certain that most labor unions are not operated in that fashion—particularly the best ones—is it not true that some labor organizations do have the power to silence members at any time the presiding officer wishes to do so?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. As the Senator from Louisiana says, a great majority of American organizations, whether they be unions or other types of associations, have an understanding of the American system. They understand that men have the right to freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and the other great freedoms.

I thank the Senator for his observations.

I shall read one more extract from page 269 of De Tocqueville's book entitled "Democracy in America." It relates to the dangers of majorities. De Tocqueville said:

If ever the free institutions of America are destroyed, that event may be attributed to the omnipotence of the majority.

I have discussed three of the reasons advanced for asking for rule changes. The first was that a rule change is needed because there is a danger that a few simple Southerners, who at most never constitute more than 20 percent of the membership of the Senate, are controlling the other 80 percent. As a matter of mathematics, that contention is without foundation.

Then I discussed their contention that the rules of the Senate should be changed because some rules of the Senate, like the Ten Commandments, the Bible, Magna Carta, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and George Washington's Farewell Address to the American people, were written by men whose hands have crumbled into dust in the grave.

The third reason given for a change was that rule XXII prevents majority rule in the Senate.

There was another argument, which was made a few years ago. It was said that the Senate was a kind of govern-

mental atom, sailing aimlessly upon the sea of chaos. It was said that the Senate, like the House of Representatives, had no rules at the beginning of a new Congress; that the Senate is not a continuing body; that actually it had no rules and had to adopt rules at the beginning of a new Congress.

If I may change the metaphor, the proponents of a change in the rules were saying, in effect, that the Senate was like Josh Billings' mule: It "didn't kick according to no rules"; and the reason why the Senate could not act was, that like Josh Billings' mule, the Senate had no rules.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] will remember that there were several weeks of debate, during which those who proposed rule changes did most of the speaking. They said that since the Senate had no rules, the majority of the Senate had constitutional power to change the rules or to adopt rules at the beginning of a Congress, but did not have that power at any other time in a Congress. Of course, that argument had no validity, for two reasons. In the first place, the Senate came into existence in 1789. It adopted rules in 1789. It has had the rules ever since 1789, and those rules have been changed on several occasions.

The Senate has always proceeded according to those rules at the beginning of each new Congress, as well as at the later stages of each Congress. So the proponents of a rule change who said the Senate had no rules were confronted with the fact that the Senate had had rules long before they were born, and that the Senate had always regarded those rules as continuing from session to session.

Another obstacle confronted those who advanced this argument. They argued that the Senate could change its rules by a majority vote at the beginning of each session, but not later in the session. It is an obvious absurdity that the Constitution of the United States changes its meaning from the first part of a session to other stages of a session. The constitutional truth is that the Senate is empowered to make the rules of its own proceedings, and this provision of the Constitution applies at the beginning of a session and during every day of the session. So far as the Constitution itself is concerned, it applies when there is no session of Congress, because the Constitution does not change from day to day, as the advocates of this very fantastic proposal contend.

I shall discuss another reason that is given for the proposed rule change. Some of the proponents stand upon the floor of the Senate and say that the reason why a change is needed in rule XXII is that under the rule the Senate cannot give any consideration to so-called civil rights bills. There is a great deal of propaganda in the world. Those who advocate changes in the rule have been listening to their own propaganda for so long that they have actually reached the point where they accept it.

Their propaganda reminds me of a custom we have in the rural areas of North Carolina. At certain times of the

year, it is customary in North Carolina for people whose relatives are buried in the little country cemeteries to meet and clear out the weeds which have grown up. It happened on one occasion that a man, somewhat like the Senator from North Carolina, who was somewhat opposed to too strenuous physical work, attended a gathering at a little country churchyard to assist in removing the weeds from the cemetery. Being opposed to strenuous physical labor, he hired a boy named George to go along with him and do his work for him. George was down on the ground, pulling the weeds off the grave. All at once he burst into laughter.

The man who had employed him said, "George, what are you laughing about?"

George said, "I am laughing about the funny words written on this tombstone."

George's boss said, "I don't see any funny words written on the tombstone."

George said, "Boss, just look there at what it says. It says, 'Not dead but sleeping.'"

The boss said, "I don't see anything funny in that."

George said, "He ain't foolin' nobody but himself."

When the proponents of this rule change tell us that it is necessary to change the rule in order to have civil rights bills considered, they are fooling nobody but themselves. If they will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they will not fool even themselves very long.

The truth is that since Attorney General Brownell came here with a so-called civil rights bill in 1957, the Senate has spent more of its time debating, on the floor of the Senate, about civil rights than it has about the survival of the Nation. During that period the Senate spent more of its time voting on so-called civil rights bills than it spent in voting on any other type of measure, except perhaps the 100-odd amendments offered last year to the satellite communications bill.

Mr. President, Senators talk about civil rights bills, but I point out that in the 86th Congress alone the great pile of civil rights bills which I now show to Senators was introduced—in only that one Congress, although it is said that nothing can be done about such bills without changing the rules. I may have lost some of those bills since 1960, when I weighed them; but at that time they weighed 5 pounds and 3 ounces. Some Senators said it was necessary to have those bills enacted in order to control the sins of a few sinful southerners.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not correct that in some cases one or two Senators had put their names on as many as 100 different bills with which they wanted to change the South?

Mr. ERVIN. I am not sure about that; but I know that on one occasion I called the attention of a Senator to the fact that I had found 41 of his bills in

that package which weighed 5 pounds and 3 ounces; and the Senator from Georgia said that was entirely an underestimate of the zeal of that particular Senator, because he had 50-odd bills of that sort.

Mr. President, I want Senators to contrast the space taken up by the great number of so-called civil rights bills introduced in that one Congress, in the attempt to deal with the supposed sins of a few sinful southerners, with the space occupied by the Holy Bible, which the good Lord gave us in order to deal not only with the sins of the sinful southerners, but also with the sins of the sinful northerners, easterners, and westerners, if such there be, and also with the sins of those who live in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, Australia, New Zealand, and the islands of the sea. I ask Senators to observe the size of the great pile of so-called civil rights bills which were introduced in that one Congress, whereas the Holy Bible, which was given us to take care of all the sins of all the people on earth in all generations is much, much smaller. I ask Senators to compare them in size.

Let us measure them. The Bible is less than 1½ inches in thickness, whereas this great package of so-called civil rights bills is almost 3 inches thick; and as I have said, all of them were introduced in the 86th Congress only.

First, Mr. President, some Senators say they are unable to have their civil rights bills considered. But in 1957 a civil rights fight was carried on in the Senate. It began in June, and ended on August 29; and the six large volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I now place on my desk contain all the words which were spoken on the floor of the Senate and all insertions made at that time in regard to those so-called civil rights bills. We might compare the words spoken in the Senate on those civil rights bills with the words of the men who were inspired by the Good Lord to write the Bible. When we compare them, what an amazing contrast.

Mr. President, on February 24, 1960, the then majority leader and the then minority leader arose on the floor of the Senate and said that Members of the Senate had been craving an opportunity to introduce some civil rights bills and have them voted on by the Senate. The two leaders said they had selected the little Stella School District bill, which dealt with a situation in Missouri; they said that any Member of the Senate who wished to offer a civil rights bill as an amendment to the Stella School District bill could do so. What happened, Mr. President? In the next few days Senators offered—as amendments to the Stella School District bill—the great pile of so-called civil rights bills which I now exhibit to Senators. I want Senators to contrast the size of this large pile of so-called civil rights bills with the size of the Constitution of the United States. The little booklet I now hold in my hand includes a copy of the Constitution of the United States; the Constitution occupies only 22 pages of the total of 256 pages in this booklet. But the civil rights bills which some Senators then tried to tack

on to the poor little Stella School District bill, in 1960, cover 396 pages.

The Senate began the debate on those bills on February 24, 1960; and the debate continued, and Senators argued about those bills and debated them and voted on them from February 24, 1960, until April 9, 1960. I now display to the Senate the numerous volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contain all the words spoken by Senators during that period of time; and I believe it will be rather interesting to Senators to compare the thickness of this large pile of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS with the thickness of the Good Book which contains the words of the Lord. This large pile of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS is nine and a half inches thick. I am certainly glad that when the Good Lord saw fit to give us the Book which would tell us all we need to know about our sins on this earth and about how we can get to heaven, he was not as verbose as the Members of the U.S. Senate were between February 24 and April 9, 1960, because if the Good Lord had been that verbose, we would never be able to read the Bible, even if we devoted all our time to it between the cradle and the grave.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would not it be fair to say that each one of those pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and each page has three columns in small print—contains many more words than those to be found on the average page of the Bible—with the result that the debate over the Stella School District bill probably was the subject of 10 times as many words as all those to be found in the Old Testament and the New Testament, combined?

Mr. ERVIN. That is very easy to see, from a quick inspection. The words of the Bible are printed in type five or six times larger than the type used in printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Furthermore, it is said by some Senators that they had no chance to have votes taken on those civil rights bills. Yet these volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD show that between February 24 and April 9, 1960, the Senate had 45 yeas and nays votes on matters relating to those so-called civil rights bills, and, in addition, had 29 voice votes—making a total of 74 votes which during that period of time were cast in the Senate on matters dealing with those so-called civil rights bills.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, to anyone who believes that the Senate has not spent more of its time on so-called civil rights bills since 1957 than it has on questions of the survival of our Nation, I suggest that he read the bills and CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS which I have exhibited here. In the course of the debate later I shall undertake to read some of those bills and show that if they had been enacted into law in accordance with their terms, the constitutional and legal systems of the United States and every constitutional and legal safeguard erected by the Founding Fathers and

the Congress to protect the people from governmental tyranny would have been destroyed as far as the advocates of civil rights bills could destroy them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now yield to the able and distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] for a speech with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor or to have my speech counted as a second speech.

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

THE NATIONAL DEFICIT

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, increasing Federal expenditures and an almost continual deficit year after year in the national budget presents a very serious situation. It could well weaken the entire economic structure of this Nation. The past has been bad enough but the outlook for the future is even more dismal.

During the last year of the Eisenhower administration, for example, the request for Federal spending, including all obligatory authority, for fiscal year 1962 was approximately \$81 billion. The request by President Kennedy for fiscal year 1964 for Federal spending, including all obligatory authority, is \$108 billion. Thus, in a 2-year period, Federal spending has increased by \$27 billion.

While Federal expenditures are being sharply increased, it is now proposed that income taxes be lowered resulting in a decrease of income to the Federal Government from this source of more than \$13 billion.

The deficit for fiscal year 1963 is estimated to be approximately \$8 billion. We will be fortunate, indeed, if the deficit next year—fiscal year 1964—can be held to \$14 billion.

If the slightest recession occurs, which is always a possibility, it would mean deficits far beyond the \$14 billion figure. The outlook for the future is indeed an alarming one. I doubt very much if the present policy continues that we can avoid runaway inflation. Of equal seriousness is the effect it could have on the balance of payments and our gold reserve.

Mr. President, all this means that we in Congress are going to have to make a determined effort to cut Federal expenditures wherever possible. This can and must be done.

All the requests for spending by the executive department are not nearly as urgent and necessary as they would have us believe. During the closing days of the last session, the Bureau of the Budget sent over more than 75 different requests for supplemental appropriations. After making sizable cuts, the last supplemental bill called for appropriations of more than \$550 million, as it passed the Senate.

Mr. President, in almost every instance representatives of the departments of the Federal Government, testifying in behalf of those supplemental appropriations, claimed that they were so urgently needed that they could not possibly wait until the new Congress convened in January of 1963.

Mr. President, one would think from listening to those urgent pleas for money last September that the country would be in deep trouble if the money were not appropriated right away. Some of the funds undoubtedly were necessary. The point I am trying to make is that time has proven most of this money was not needed.

Because of problems that arose between the House and the Senate during the closing days of the last session, the supplemental appropriation bill never was approved by Congress. Mr. President, the very fact that neither the Bureau of the Budget nor any department of Government has renewed the requests for these appropriations to this date certainly would indicate that their requests were not nearly as urgent as they would have us believe last fall.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I commend the Senator for mentioning the supplemental appropriation bill which failed of enactment last October because of the unwillingness of the House to grant a conference on the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. It is to that particular supplemental bill that the Senator is referring, is it not?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator is correct. The bill was considered by the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] is chairman, and the senior Senator from North Dakota was the ranking Republican member.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as I recall, the hearing on that supplemental appropriation bill consumed several days. The Senator from North Dakota was very diligent in his attendance upon his duties and in attendance at hearings of the subcommittee. The Senator from Florida tried to be equally diligent and was present for most, if not all, of the hearings.

Is it not true that the bill reported by the Senate subcommittee of which the Senator from North Dakota and myself are members, passed the Senate in the amount of \$550 million and represented urgent requests by the various departments, but the bill as passed represented only a portion of the urgent requests which were made of us during that hearing?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator is correct. Largely, through the efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Florida, the subcommittee made sizable cuts in the requests.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator if he would object if I referred at the present time to several of those supplemental items which were said to be particularly urgent, and without which, we were told, the agencies involved could not operate until Congress returned.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I shall be happy to have the Senator do so. At

the time of the hearings last September I was troubled by statements of what would happen if certain appropriations were not approved. One request in particular related to money that would enable the administration to put into operation the new Trade Act. We were told that some industries would be hurt and would require Federal assistance. We were told that they could not exist without assistance through those appropriations. Six months have elapsed since that time and no requests have come to Congress since for that money.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since the Senator has mentioned the money requested because of the Trade Act, I shall refer to those appropriations first. There were three requests. The first request was for \$1,450,000 for the Secretary of Commerce to carry out functions of that Department directed toward enforcing of the new trade bill.

Second, there was a request for \$3 million for the Small Business Administration for trade adjustment loans and guarantees to prevent businesses and workers from sustaining severe losses due to the operation of the Trade Act.

Third, we received an urgent request for \$1 million for the Department of Labor so that it could do its part in surveying the losses of labor and in making sure that labor was promptly compensated for losses sustained by reason of the operation of the Trade Act.

Does not the Senator recall those three items in the bill to which he has referred?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes, I do. I recall that the importance of the Federal Trade Act was stressed. We were told that it had to be put in operation as soon as possible in order to protect the vital interests of the United States. But again no appropriations were made, and it is strange that no requests have been made since Congress convened for that program. If the administration believed that the Federal Trade Act was important and the appropriation was necessary, I wonder why we have not received a further request. Perhaps some other subject—maybe a rule change in the Senate—is more important to the administration than the Federal Trade Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I concur with that conclusion. It seems a reasonable one. We are now in the second month of the new year. After having lost about 4 weeks of Senate sessions, we find that we have passed no measures. More particularly, speaking as chairman of that subcommittee—and I think I am speaking correctly for the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—there has not come to our attention any request for supplemental appropriations at the present session of Congress to take care of the items represented by the earlier requests which were included in that \$550 million bill which was not enacted. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. So far as I know, they have decided that these appropriations are not necessary at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I say to the distinguished Senator, in order to be entirely fair on the record, I have discussed this subject twice, as I have told the distinguished Senator, with the new Director of the Budget, who just recently assumed the duties of that office. He has explained to me some of the difficulties with which he is faced; which difficulties, I am sure, he is doing his best to overcome as promptly as possible. I understand that we shall be receiving a supplemental request in the near future; I hope within the next day or two.

The fact is, is it not, that if these various requests, and others which I shall mention, had been as critical as they were painted to us last year the country almost would have come to an end by this time by reason of the appropriations not having been provided; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. I think some of the appropriations probably were necessary and were necessary last fall, but certainly they were not as urgent as they were pictured to the Senate. If they had been, surely a request would have been made by now for the Congress to appropriate the money.

Mr. HOLLAND. Another request, as the Senator will remember, was for an item of \$30 million to meet the increase in the payment of the Government to retirees, which increase had been voted by the Congress and approved by the President some time last fall. The Senator remembers that item, does he not?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. The law was passed. The people are entitled to the payments, but the payments are being withheld because no appropriation has been made.

Mr. HOLLAND. Another item which I recall had to do with agriculture. I ask the Senator if he recalls an item of \$12.3 million to make good the salary increases for employees of the Government in the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture, which is certainly an important Service?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There is no finer Service in the Government than the Extension Service. The appropriation would have put the people in the Extension Service on the same basis as all other Federal employees, had it been provided.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. As I recall, there was another item of \$5 million to put the employees of the co-operating State experiment services on the same basis as other employees; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. That is an equally fine service.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the distinguished Senator if he does not recall that last year we passed a bill greatly increasing the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration, and that the supplemental bill carried \$1.5 million so that the Administration could operate in carrying out its new responsibility. Does the Senator remember that item?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. That does seem to be an important program. Either it has been

possible to make savings on some other programs to take care of it, or the program may not have been put into operation, waiting for appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask if the distinguished Senator remembers that another item in that supplemental bill was \$35 million for the Office of Education, for its defense educational activities, for contributions to student loan programs at the various colleges and universities of the country? Does the Senator remember that item?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes, I do. I have had many inquiries from students and university presidents asking what happened to that program.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has had some inquiries of the same kind. He also is beginning to receive inquiries from many retired people who live in his State, who have received payments after the date that the new retirement level was authorized, but for which funds were not appropriated, who cannot understand why they are not receiving their additional money.

I hope the Senator has not been receiving a large number of those inquiries because they are particularly distressing.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Many people of North Dakota who have retired have gone to Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The State of Florida is glad to have them, even with their additional troubles.

I think it was wrong to pass a law stepping up retirement pay of civil servants who have retired after long years of service, and then not make the money available. Since January 1, no request has been made to make the money available that I am aware of. It seems to me that does not even need discussion; it is so very wrong, in essence.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This is a commitment of the Federal Government, which it should meet.

Mr. HOLLAND. Various other projects will have to be considered, as well. For instance, I understand the Department of Justice will need additional funds for the payment of fees of witnesses appearing in the Federal courts because of the increased judgeships which have been created. The Senator will recall, the Senate has approved and confirmed many nominations for additional district judges and other judges in the Federal judicial system.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes. It seems to me to be an urgent matter, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, without belaboring the matter further, and also thanking the Senator for his enduring so many questions, is it not true that the point is that the agencies either asked for many emergency items last fall before they were emergency items or else they have forgotten about those emergencies since the first of the year, in that they have not yet sent to us any requests for these items to be considered by our committee and by the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator is correct. I think probably it is a little of both. I am sure many of

the appropriations were not necessary, but others were very necessary.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the statement the distinguished Senator has made. I think a great many of the appropriations were necessary. I have not named the largest of all, which certainly is necessary. That is the item to supplement the payments to welfare clients in the various States, as a supplement to State payments. My recollection is that the request was for \$350 million for that purpose, although I understand from the Bureau of the Budget that the revised figure will be only \$210 million.

Does it not seem to the Senator that this is a matter which should be recognized promptly, or for that matter should have been recognized ahead of time, so that the funds will be on hand to meet the shortages in payments to the States when the States are trying earnestly to take care of their people who are on the welfare rolls?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes. It is unbelievable that requests such as that would have been passed over for the past 6 months. Even now no urgent request is being made of the Congress to make the funds available.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall that at the time the conference was refused on the bill in the other body statements were made on the floor, which appear in the Record, indicating that action on these items would be an item of first business as soon as Congress convened in January, so that people would not have to worry about receiving the money due? Does the Senator remember that?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is correct. I remember it very well.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator will join me in grieving over the fact that someone, either in the administrative agencies or in the other body, or in both—or perhaps we ourselves—has been neglectful in the taking care of these just claims which were left uncared for when the supplemental bill last fall was shunted aside without passage.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Florida for his very appropriate comments.

I think the Congress has learned a lesson. In the future, members of the Appropriations Committees probably will not be greatly moved if the administration asks for another 75 or more supplemental requests during the closing days of a session.

When it comes to practical operation of its own affairs, the Democratic Party holds \$1,000 and \$100 fundraising dinners and steps up its campaign party contributions in order that the party machinery itself will be debt free and in sound fiscal condition.

But when it comes to the American people, the party disregards the practical approach in favor of a high-spending, deficit-financed dream which has never worked in the past, and will not work now. The \$98 billion budget, combined with tax reduction, and the enormous, planned deficit, is nothing more

than a calculated plan of inflation. Actually what the Democratic administration did during the past month was, first, to offer the American people what it termed a \$13.6 billion tax break, and, second, a fortnight later, take it all back when it presented a huge budget.

The administration defends its huge budget on defense, at least to a large degree, and states that there are no places in the budget where money could be saved without damaging the defense posture of the Nation. Cuts can be made in this budget as well as most others.

But this is not according to the facts. In the fiscal year 1961, spending for other than defense purposes amounted to \$34 billion, and the estimated fiscal 1964 budget calls for \$43.3 billion—an increase, Mr. President, of \$9.3 billion.

The increase in nondefense spending includes many new and questionable domestic programs. The money for these programs, plus some of the increases in nondomestic programs, offers a fertile field for savings.

Just to keep the record straight, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time a chart submitted to the Congress on January 17, 1963, by Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, which shows nondefense spending since 1954.

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

<i>Increased nondefense spending</i> [Other than defense spending, in billions]	
Fiscal year:	
1954.....	\$20.5
1955.....	23.6
1956.....	25.5
1957.....	25.0
1958.....	27.1
1959.....	33.8
1960.....	30.8
1961 (1st Kennedy year).....	34.0
1962.....	36.6
1963.....	41.3
1964 (estimated).....	43.3

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1963, p. 537.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the main point I am trying to make is that during the closing days of the last session we were told that the more than 75 items in the \$550 million supplemental appropriations bill were badly needed, that it was urgent that Congress take action before it adjourned, and that the departments administering these various programs could not possibly wait until the next session of Congress. Mr. President, here it is a month after Congress convened, and still nothing is done toward considering all of these budget requests. I can only conclude that either this one-half billion dollars in appropriations was not necessary, or the present leadership is not giving it a very high priority.

This top priority apparently is being given to changing the rules in the Senate when there is no major piece of legislation pending in Congress for which the proponents of the rule change could even claim a rule change was necessary. It seems to me that we have spent enough time trying to change the rules of the

Senate when there is little, if any, need for it. There are a great many issues that Congress should be giving serious consideration to. I hope that we can get on with the business of the Senate soon.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. HOLLAND. I made that request simply so the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] might return to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. HOLLAND. I withhold my request.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished and able Senator from Oregon, without losing the floor, and without having any remarks I make on the pending matter counted as another speech.

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

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I just read on the ticker an account of a statement by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Democratic whip, in which he suggested that we should undertake public hearings on the various allegations which are being made concerning an alleged Russian buildup in Cuba that supposedly threatens the security of the United States.

The story states that, in the opinion of the Senator from Minnesota, we should have public opinions with regard to the matter; that Mr. McCone, head of the CIA, should be called as a witness; that other administration leaders should be called as witnesses. I only rise to associate myself with the suggestion of the Senator from Minnesota. I think there should be public hearings.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I say I think we have reached such a point in the charges and countercharges with regard to the subject matter that the American people are bewildered and confused. As I have said so many times, American foreign policy belongs to the American people, and any administration is but the trustee of the people's foreign policy. The American people cannot judge this situation unless they know the facts. The time has come, in my judgment, when there should be a full public disclosure of whatever we know about what is going on in Cuba.

Oh, I know, Mr. President, the old argument might be made that it might involve some top secret information; but I repeat, labeling something top secret does not make it top secret. We must run risks in a democracy. I would much rather run the risk of having the people know about the facts of our foreign policy than run the risk of having the

Russians know and the American people not know.

So I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

I make one other suggestion. I think the time has come, in view of all the charges and countercharges that have been made—and I have rechecked the transcript—to release to the public the transcript of record made by the Foreign Relations Committee. I presided over most of those meetings, which were held shortly after the Bay of Pigs operation, where we had before the committee the top officials who had so much to do with the ill-fated incident. We heard witnesses from the Pentagon and the Department of State and the head of the CIA, the then Director, Allen Dulles. I have reread the transcript. I do not know of a single thing in that transcript that the people of the United States are not entitled to know.

When the transcript was taken it was understood by the witnesses that it was an executive session, and therefore its release now may be said to be some breaking of faith or understanding with those witnesses. But things have been said in public by administration officials that alter the picture. The public interest has to come first, always. The question now is whether the public interest is best served by releasing the text so there can be an evaluation of that transcript in light of developments subsequent to its token.

It happens to be my opinion that the release of that transcript would put at rest, once and for all, a good many of the partisan charges being made about the President of the United States in regard to what happened at the Bay of Pigs. The impression has been created, through partisan political charges, that the President of the United States had promised American Air Force cover of the Bay of Pigs operation. It never was true. And it never was true that Dwight Eisenhower had any such plan in connection with the Bay of Pigs.

We do not hear very much from the partisans about the fact that most of the Bay of Pigs operation was prepared and planned by the Eisenhower administration to the tune of expenditures of \$40 million, whereas the Kennedy administration spent in the neighborhood of \$5 million.

The Kennedy administration made a great mistake in picking up the mistake of the Eisenhower administration and associating itself with that mistake, but this great President of ours was big enough to assume responsibility for what happened.

Here is one Senator who does not think it is fair for us to leave in the secret files of the Foreign Relations Committee a transcript of record which was made shortly after the unfortunate Bay of Pigs project, and which, in my judgment, answers the partisan libel of the President that he withdrew American air coverage of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

I say again it never was promised. Apparently a part of the confusion arises from the fact that the Cuban exiles who made the invasion had their own air force. It is true that every craft in that

air force came, in the first instance, from the United States, because they were American planes. It is true that the Cuban exile air force made a strike on one day against the airbase at Havana. It is true that the Cuban exile air force planned to make a strike the next morning. The first one had not been too successful. It had not knocked out as many of Castro's planes as it was expected to. It is true that there was discussion of this matter in the inner councils of the United Nations, when many allies were greatly concerned about reports that had reached New York, and that the second strike was postponed a few hours.

To quote one of the Cuban invaders as saying they were promised control of the air does not mean they were promised American air cover.

As we know, the Cuban exiles ran into a Castro air force that he apparently was not known to possess. What irony it is that the air force of Castro consisted of effective fighter planes which the United States had supplied to Fascist Batista before his overthrow. Those American fighter planes which had been supplied to Batista had been captured by Castro. He brought them out, and that surprised people. It was that air force that practically demolished the Cuban exile air force.

But, Mr. President, that is far different from giving to the American people the impression that at any time the Government of the United States promised to bring the American Air Force in as a cover for the invasion. Had that promise been made, it would have constituted an act of war, and it would have taken this Republic outside the framework of international law and made us an aggressor nation, in violation of one Latin American treaty after another to which we had affixed our signature.

I discussed this international law feature on April 24, 1961, in my speech in the Senate. I pointed out that if there had been carried out what it was alleged was planned we would have been convicted before the world as an aggressor nation, committing an act of war in violation of treaty after treaty. In my speech of April 24 I asked, "Where would our allies have been?" We might have had two or three Caribbean nations stand with us, but all of Latin America would have left us.

It is so easy for these Monday morning quarterbacks, with partisan speeches, to confuse this whole issue.

Let me say that I believe the time has come, irrespective of the fact that the transcript was taken in executive session, because the national welfare is more important, that the American people are entitled to know what Allen Dulles did say, are entitled to know what the Chief of Staff did say, are entitled to know what the Secretary of State did say, and are entitled to know what every other important witness who appeared before our committee did say as to what happened in connection with the Bay of Pigs, what the plans were, and what went awry.

I speak only for myself. I have not the slightest idea whether the other

members of my committee agree with me. I have my own responsibility to my own State.

I close by saying what I have been heard to say so often about what is basic to democratic government: In a democracy there is no substitute for the full public disclosure of the people's business. This Cuban matter is clearly becoming a matter of business of the American people, and so paramount in its importance that the people are entitled to know the facts.

To the American people I say: "You, too, have a responsibility of citizen statesmanship. The time has come for the American people to make clear to their Government and the officials of their Government in both parties, 'Give us the facts. We can take them. We can judge them. We can then follow whatever course of action, as a free people, we believe should be followed.'"

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXII— CLOTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 9) to amend the cloture rule of the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have thus far today discussed the reasons assigned by the proponents of the proposed rule change to justify their position. I respectfully submit that for the reasons I have already stated none of those arguments made in favor of the rules changes is valid. I shall now devote myself to showing that the history of our country shows the advisability of having safeguards which will prevent hasty and impatient and intemperate action by those in positions of authority. It was my purpose to refer to American history for a striking illustration of the desirability, nay, the necessity, of protecting the people of this Nation against impatient and intemperate actions on the part of their officials.

Rule XXII of the Senate is one of the few restraints left. Many of the great Senators of the past have stated that no good legislation has ever been prevented by the rule of the Senate permitting free debate, but that, on the contrary, much bad legislation has been prevented by this rule.

I call attention to a similar rule that is in the Constitution of the United States. First I wish to read from section 4 of article II of the Constitution these words:

The President, Vice President, and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors.

It will be noted that this paragraph in the Constitution sets forth three conditions, and three conditions only, for which a President, a Vice President, or a civil officer of the United States can be impeached. They are: treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

The other provisions of the Constitution relating to impeachment are found in subsections 6 and 7 of section 3 of

article I of the Constitution. I read subsection 6 of section 3 of article I:

The Senate shall have the sole Power to try all Impeachments. When sitting for that Purpose, they shall be on Oath or Affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside: And no person shall be convicted without the Concurrence of two thirds of the Members present.

Subsection 7 of section 3 of article I reads as follows:

Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law.

I shall later discuss these constitutional provisions in more detail. At present, however, I wish to emphasize that the provision of subsection 6 of section 3 of article I of the Constitution, which prescribes that "no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present," is the only thing which saved the United States at one of the most crucial hours of its history from witnessing a total blackout of constitutional government.

In speaking for the retention of rule XXII in its present form, I say it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the two-thirds provision of rule XXII may serve like subsection 6, section 3, article I of the Constitution, and some day again prevent a total blackout of constitutional government in the United States.

The scene which I propose to discuss in this connection was enacted in this very Senate Chamber. If it had not been for the two-thirds provision of subsection 6, section 3, article I, and the courage of a handful of Senators, constitutional government in the United States would have been destroyed on the very floor of the Senate.

In order to discuss this subject, I shall have to go back a little into American history. On one occasion on this continent and in this Nation a terrible fratricidal war occurred, in which thousands of the flower of the youth of our land, both in the South and in the North, died. My study of American history has convinced me that that terrible war and its carnage would never have occurred if it had not been for intemperate and impatient men in the North and impatient and intemperate men in the South. If ever there was an event which ought to teach all Americans the virtue of patience, it was that terrible war and the terrible carnage it caused.

One of the great men in American history was Abraham Lincoln. I often wonder what would have happened to Lincoln, after Lee's surrender, if he had not fallen by an assassin's bullet. I suspect that perhaps he would have been more maligned at the hands of Members of Congress and at the hands of the American press than any other man in our history. Sometimes a tragic event, such as Lincoln's assassination, spares the man who suffers such an event from great future tragedy. Abraham Lincoln was a merciful man. He was a man who loved his fellow men.

After the surrender of Lee at Appomattox, the question naturally arose as to what was to be done to adjust the relations between the Union and the 11 Confederate States. Lincoln had a very fine plan for the rebuilding of the relationship between the Union and the 11 so-called Confederate States. I shall read a brief statement of his plan from page 804 of the Concise Dictionary of American History, which was edited by Wayne Andrews and published by Charles Scribner's Sons:

In his proclamation of December 8, 1863, President Lincoln offered pardon, with certain exceptions, to those who would take oath to support the Constitution of the United States and abide by Federal laws and proclamations touching slaves. When oath-takers equal in number to one-tenth of the State's voters in 1860 should "re-establish" a government in a seceded commonwealth, Lincoln promised executive recognition of such government without commitment as to congressional recognition. Both the "plan" and the whole southern policy of Lincoln were denounced as far too lenient, and there followed a storm of controversy with the radical Republicans who by their control of Congress prevented any settlement of this vital question during Lincoln's life. The hopeless deadlock between President and Congress was seen in the Radical Wade-Davis bill which Lincoln killed by a pocket veto. After this Lincoln issued a proclamation (July 8, 1864) explaining that he could not accept the radical plan as the only method of reconstruction and was promptly answered by Wade and Davis in a truculent manifesto.

It would be quite interesting to know why Lincoln pocket-vetted the Wade-Davis bill. Those who advocate majority rule on the spur of the moment and in haste ought to ponder the Wade-Davis bill which Lincoln denounced and vetoed.

Now I read a very brief description of the provisions of that bill, from the "Encyclopedia of American History," by Richard B. Morris, on page 246:

The Wade-Davis bill, which was passed by Congress on the 4th of July 1864, represented the congressional blueprint for reconstruction. It required a majority of the electorate in each Confederate State to take an oath of past as well as future loyalty as a condition precedent to restoration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Was not that condition tantamount to disfranchising almost every honorable white man in the South?

Mr. ERVIN. That condition precedent to restoration, under the Wade-Davis bill, would have prevented any of the 11 Southern States from again being admitted to their rights as States of the Union, because that bill required the taking of an oath of both present loyalty and past loyalty; and a majority of the people of the Southern States could not have truthfully taken such an oath. This is very well illustrated by the situation in the State of North Carolina. In 1860, North Carolina had a total population of approximately 629,000, count-

ing all the men, women, and children, and both the white people and the Negro people. Out of that population, North Carolina had sent into the Confederate Army 125,000 of its men and boys—a number far in excess of the total electorate of that State. Under that condition of the Wade-Davis bill, it would have been impossible for any more than a very negligible part of the electorate of North Carolina to have taken the oath required by the terms of the bill as a condition precedent to readmission as part of the Union. In fact, the bill was designed to prevent any of the Southern States from being readmitted to the Union.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the electorate had been restricted to the small element who had been against the Civil War and had opposed the position of their State in that connection—and I believe that at that time such persons were called "Buffaloes"—

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it be possible, by thus restricting the electorate to former slaves and "Buffaloes," to permit the State of North Carolina ever to return into the Union?

Mr. ERVIN. I believe that bill required a majority. So I do not think that, under that bill, any of those States could have secured readmission to the Union. In fact, I think the bill was designed to prevent their readmission, because Senator Wade turned out to be a violent opponent of anything reasonable in connection with reconstruction.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it be fair to assume that the purpose of that bill was to prevent North Carolina and the other Southern States from being readmitted at all to the Union, in so far as representation in the Senate was concerned? Instead, would a proper construction or interpretation of that bill be that it was intended to limit the electorate to former slaves and to persons unsympathetic with the position of those States during that war?

Mr. ERVIN. I think the idea of reconstructing them on the basis finally adopted had not then come into existence. I think the proposal then under consideration was advanced on the basis of the electorate authorized in 1860.

Mr. President, a moment ago, when I said that perhaps the assassin's bullet spared Lincoln from much abuse and suffering, I had in mind the fact that even during his lifetime he was maligned by the authors of the Wade-Davis bill and by the other supporters of that bill for his wise action in vetoing it.

After the assassin's bullet felled Lincoln, Andrew Johnson, the Vice President during Lincoln's administration, who was a native of North Carolina, succeeded Lincoln in the Presidency. At that time there was in existence what was known as the Joint Committee on

Reconstruction. It was composed of six Senators and nine Members of the House of Representatives, and was dominated by Thaddeus Stevens, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania. That Joint Committee acquired domination over Congress; and it was not long before the Joint Committee found itself able to ride roughshod over Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives who did not agree with its plans.

Some day, Mr. President, history will recognize that Andrew Johnson was one of the truly great men of America. When he became President of the United States, he undertook to carry into effect Lincoln's plan for the so-called reconstruction of the Confederate States. Andrew Johnson made a slight modification in the plan, in that he added a provision that those who had been disqualified as electors in those States by the Lincoln plan for reconstruction of the States should include those who owned \$20,000 or more in property. But Andrew Johnson did a superb job in carrying out that plan, which, in effect, provided that the persons residing in those States who were qualified to vote by State laws should establish a State government, should outlaw the debts incurred by the Confederate States for war purposes, and should approve the laws and the amendment abolishing slavery.

Andrew Johnson was privileged to act, by reason of the fact that Congress was not in session at the time he assumed the Presidency and at the time he undertook to put into effect Lincoln's plan for reconstruction. Before Congress assembled in December 1865, all of the 11 Southern States, except Texas, had reorganized their State governments in accordance with the presidential plan of reconstruction and were maintaining law and order within the borders of their States and were operating civil courts for the trial of civil and criminal cases. The last Confederate soldier had laid down his arms and returned to peaceful pursuits. The people of the Southern States were looking forward to resuming their old place in the Union.

But Congress met. Congress immediately entered into a controversy with Andrew Johnson, claiming that the Congress, and not the President, had the power to reconstruct the governments in the Southern States.

About that time the Supreme Court of the United States entered the picture by handing down the most courageous decision ever rendered by that body. I refer to the decision in *Ex parte Milligan*.

Ex parte Milligan was a case which involved a civilian who was a resident of the State of Indiana. He had been tried before a military commission created by President Lincoln as Commander in Chief of the Army. Milligan had been convicted of treason and other charges and had been sentenced to death. Milligan's attorneys filed a petition in the circuit court for habeas corpus, contending that the courts of Indiana were open for the trial of criminal cases, that Milligan was not within the jurisdiction of the military commission, and that Milligan was surrounded

by the protection of the constitutional provisions which required indictment by a grand jury and conviction by a petit jury before he could be punished for the charges preferred against him.

Milligan was defended in the Supreme Court of the United States on the review of the habeas corpus proceeding by Jeremiah Black, one of the greatest lawyers of America. The opinion of the Supreme Court in *Ex parte Milligan* was written by one of the greatest judges our Nation has ever known—Judge Davis, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. He was known not only for his great legal learning and his devotion to constitutional government, but also for his great courage, which never failed him.

Before reaching the main body of his opinion, Judge Davis set out some of the facts. Incidentally, his opinion is reported in 4 Wallace. The case begins at page 1 and runs through to page 142. The opinion of Judge Davis covers only a portion of those pages. It begins on page 107 and ends on page 131. It is an opinion which every person who believes in constitutional government ought to read and reread.

Beginning on page 118, Judge Davis said:

The controlling question in the case is this: Upon the facts stated in Milligan's petition, and the exhibits filed, had the military commission mentioned in it, jurisdiction, legally, to try and sentence him? Milligan, not a resident of one of the rebellious States, or a prisoner of war, but a citizen of Indiana for 20 years past, and never in the military or naval service, is, while at his home, arrested by the military power of the United States, imprisoned, and, on certain criminal charges preferred against him, tried, convicted, and sentenced to be hanged by a military commission, organized under the direction of the military commander of the military district of Indiana. Had this tribunal the legal power and authority to try and punish this man?

No graver question was ever considered by this court, nor one which more nearly concerns the rights of the whole people; for it is the birthright of every American citizen when charged with crime, to be tried and punished according to law. The power of punishment is, alone through the means which the laws have provided for that purpose, and if they are ineffectual, there is an immunity from punishment, no matter how great an offender the individual may be, or how much his crimes may have shocked the sense of justice of the country, or endangered its safety. By the protection of the law human rights are secured; withdrawn that protection, and they are at the mercy of wicked rulers, or the clamor of an excited people. If there was law to justify this military trial, it is not our province to interfere; if there was not, it is our duty to declare the nullity of the whole proceedings. The decision of this question does not depend on argument or judicial precedents, numerous and highly illustrative as they are. These precedents inform us of the extent of the struggle to preserve liberty and to relieve those in civil life from military trials. The founders of our government were familiar with the history of that struggle; and secured in a written constitution every right which the people had wrested from power during a contest of ages. By that Constitution and the laws authorized by it this question must be determined. The provisions of that instrument on the

administration of criminal justice are too plain and direct, to leave room for misconception or doubt of their true meaning. Those applicable to this case are found in that clause of the original Constitution which says, "That the trial of all crimes, except in case of impeachment, shall be by jury;" and in the fourth, fifth, and sixth articles of the amendments. The fourth proclaims the right to be secure in person and effects against unreasonable search and seizure; and directs that a judicial warrant shall not issue "without proof of probable cause supported by Oath or affirmation." The fifth declares "that no person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on presentment by a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." And the sixth guarantees the right of trial by jury, in such manner and with such regulations that with upright judges, impartial juries, and an able bar, the innocent will be saved and the guilty punished. It is in these words: "In all criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence." These securities for personal liberty thus embodied, were such as wisdom and experience had demonstrated to be necessary for the protection of those accused of crime. And so strong was the sense of the country of their importance, and so jealous were the people that these rights, highly prized, might be denied them by implication, that when the original Constitution was proposed for adoption it encountered severe opposition; and, but for the belief that it would be so amended as to embrace them, it would never have been ratified.

I now come to the portion of this opinion which I think contains the greatest judicial language ever uttered on this continent. Judge Davis continued:

Time has proven the discernment of our ancestors; for even these provisions, expressed in such plain English words, that it would seem the ingenuity of man could not evade them, are now, after the lapse of more than 70 years, sought to be avoided. Those great and good men foresaw that troublous times would arise, when rulers and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper. The history of the world had taught them that what was done in the past might be attempted in the future. The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism, but the theory of necessity on which it is based is false; for the Government, within the Constitution, has all the powers granted to it, which are necessary to preserve its existence; as has been happily proved by the result of the great effort to throw off its just authority.

Then, after discussing the fact that men in naval and military service were subject to trial by military courts rather than by juries in civil courts, Judge Davis says:

All other persons, citizens of States where the courts are open, if charged with crime, are guaranteed the inestimable privilege of trial by jury. This privilege is a vital principle, underlying the whole administration of criminal justice; it is not held by sufferance, and cannot be frittered away on any plea of State or political necessity. When peace prevails, and the authority of the Government is undisputed, there is no difficulty of preserving the safeguards of liberty; for the ordinary modes of trial are never neglected, and no one wishes it otherwise; but if society is disturbed by civil commotion—if the passions of men are aroused and the restraints of law weakened, if not disregarded—these safeguards need, and should receive, the watchful care of those instructed with the guardianship of the Constitution and laws. In no other way can we transmit to posterity unimpaired the blessings of liberty, consecrated by the sacrifices of the Revolution.

Judge Davis then proceeded and showed that in the military trial Milligan had been denied his constitutional rights to be indicted by a grand jury before he could be put on trial, and his constitutional right to a trial by jury, and held that his trial before a military commission was a nullity under our Constitution.

As I speak in favor of the retention of rule XXII, which is one of the safeguards erected not for the benefit of individual Senators but, as former Senator Joe O'Mahoney said, "for the benefit of our country," I cannot help thinking that we ought to heed the words of Judge Davis when he said:

Those great and good men—

Who drew up our Constitution—and the same applies to the great men who wrote the rules of the Senate—

foresaw that troublous times would arise, when rulers and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper.

As I have said, in my judgment this was the greatest decision ever handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States. It proclaims a great constitutional principle. It was written by a judge of the highest legal learning, of the greatest character, and of the staunchest courage.

When this decision was handed down the Joint Committee on Reconstruction and the other radicals in the Congress of the United States, and a considerable portion of the American press, heaped vituperation upon the Supreme Court of the United States. As a result of this decision the radicals, in control of the Congress, concluded that the Supreme Court of the United States had entered into a conspiracy with the President, Andrew Johnson, to thwart the will of the radicals.

They came to that conclusion because the purpose in the minds of the radicals was to destroy the State governments which had been erected in the Southern

States under the Presidential plan of reconstruction, and to establish military government in the South.

So, in July 1866 the radicals in Congress enacted a law for the purpose of keeping President Johnson from filling any vacancy on the Supreme Court. At that time there was one existing vacancy, and President Johnson had designated as his appointee for the vacancy Henry Stanbery, one of the greatest lawyers this country has ever known. When the bill was brought up in the Congress, one of the Representatives, who was piloting the bill through the House, was asked if the bill was intended to keep Stanbery from becoming a member of the Supreme Court. He frankly said, "Yes; and to prevent further appointments from being made by President Johnson."

The bill would have reduced the number of judges on the Supreme Court Bench by two, so as to take care of the then existing vacancy and those which might occur in the future during Johnson's Presidency.

Not only did the radicals in Congress make this proposal to prevent President Johnson from filling vacancies on the Supreme Court, but they began to demand that the Supreme Court be reorganized. They threatened to take away all of the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, and some of them went so far as to threaten to abolish the Supreme Court by constitutional amendment.

The radicals in Congress had such complete control over Congress that they would undoubtedly have been able to carry out their threat, so far as Congress was concerned, to enact a proposed constitutional amendment by a two-thirds vote, with a view to abolishing the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is not altogether surprising that some of the members of the Supreme Court began to lose their courage. The Court handed down only two other courageous opinions in this period. One was the decision in the case of *Cummings against Missouri*, and the other was the decision in *Ex parte Garland*.

The first of these decisions involved the law of the State of Missouri. The legislature of that State had enacted a law providing that no man could practice his profession unless he was able to take an oath to the effect that he had never aided the Confederacy in any way.

It is a rather strange thing that the Missouri law was applied to a preacher. Cummings was a preacher, and he undertook to preach the gospel. For some reason, the legislature of Missouri thought it was better for sinners to go to the devil than to be brought to the Lord through the agency of a minister who could not take an oath that he had not aided the Confederacy in any manner. It is a rather strange conception that the State legislature could ever reach the conclusion that a man ought not to be able to preach the gospel of Christ if he had had anything to do with the Confederacy. The legislature of Missouri had evidently forgotten something of the record of Saul of Tarsus, who became Paul, the great apostle to the gentiles.

The other case involved one of the great lawyers of this Nation, Augustus

H. Garland, who was noted for his appearances in many cases before the Supreme Court of the United States.

In those two cases, the Supreme Court, which had not been frightened entirely away from courageous action by radicals in Congress, held that the law of Missouri and a Federal statute enacted by Congress which attempted to apply the same rule to attorneys were *ex post facto* laws and therefore unconstitutional.

But thereafter too much courage was not exhibited by the members of the Supreme Court, with the possible exception of Judge Davis, Judge Grier, and one or two others, because, as Benjamin R. Curtis, a great lawyer from Massachusetts, wrote about this time, "The Congress, with the acquiescence of the country, has subdued the Supreme Court as well as the President."

In other words, the radicals in Congress had threatened to impeach members of the Supreme Court or to rob them of their jurisdiction, and even to abolish the Court by a constitutional amendment, because they were displeased with the courage the Court had displayed in *Ex parte Milligan*, in *Cummings against Missouri*, and in *Ex parte Garland*. That was the way they dealt with the Supreme Court.

Just to elaborate on that particular point, let me say that the radicals in Congress took control of the Congress and rode roughshod over those Members of Congress who dared to oppose them. They subdued the Supreme Court to such an extent that it practically withdrew from the constitutional field insofar as the Southern States were concerned. They prevented the Southern States from defending themselves by denying them representation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Then they undertook to enact laws under which they would take charge, through military forces, of local government in all of the Southern States except Tennessee. Tennessee was allowed representation in the Senate and in the House, while the other 10 Southern States were denied such representation, because Tennessee had ratified the 14th amendment and the other 10 Southern States had rejected the 14th amendment.

In March 1867 the radicals, who controlled Congress, passed the most monstrous legislation ever passed in American history.

I refer to the so-called Reconstruction acts under which all Southern States, except Tennessee, were placed under military government. Also at that time a statute was enacted which was directed against President Johnson. I refer to the Tenure of Office Act.

President Johnson had inherited, as a part of Lincoln's Cabinet, the Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, who proved himself to be in alliance with the radicals in Congress and unfaithful to his chief, the President.

The radicals in Congress were afraid that President Johnson would do what any person in his situation desired to do, and remove Stanton from office as Secretary of War. Therefore, Congress passed the Tenure of Office Act, which provided in substance that the President could not remove from office any ap-

pointee whose appointment had been confirmed by the Senate. Andrew Johnson felt that this act was unconstitutional, and he removed Stanton from his post as Secretary of War. That act on his part was the chief cause of his later impeachment by the House of Representatives, controlled as it was, by the radicals.

I come now to the Reconstruction acts, which I consider the most monstrous and unconstitutional legislation ever enacted in this Nation.

I should like to read from a book written by one of my former teachers of history, Dr. J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, entitled "Reconstruction in North Carolina." The book was published at Columbia University in 1914. But before I read a passage from that book, I wish to state that the 10 Southern States, when they were represented by legislatures elected by voters possessing constitutional qualifications, that is, qualifications prescribed by State law, all rejected the 14th amendment.

I now read from pages 216 to 219 of "Reconstruction in North Carolina":

The fate of the 14th amendment, when submitted to the North Carolina Legislature, has been noticed.¹ It met with rejection in all the other Southern States except Tennessee. When Congress met in December 1866 enough of the Southern States had rejected the amendment to show the prevailing opinion in the South, and consequently the question at once arose as to what policy should be adopted. The uncertainty in regard to this became less as the remaining Southern States in turn rejected the amendment. Consequently, in February 1867 it became a determined fact that the State governments, as organized by the President, should be superseded by others organized under military authority; that the political leaders of the Southern States should be disqualified from taking part in the reorganization of the governments; and that the right of suffrage should be extended to the Negro by national legislation, in utter defiance of the constitutional right of the individual States in the matter.

I digress from a reading of the text to say that in North Carolina there had been an election in 1865, conducted under the presidential plan for reconstruction, and the State government had been reestablished by its people, with officers coming largely from those North Carolinians who had opposed secession from the Union. The State Legislature of North Carolina, like the State legislatures of other Southern States, had ratified the 13th amendment prohibiting slavery, and had outlawed the Confederate debt, and had also accepted in good faith all the other conditions prescribed by the presidential plan for reconstruction.

This Government had been in existence for approximately 2 years when the first of the Reconstruction acts was passed.

I now resume my reading from "Reconstruction in North Carolina," by Dr. Hamilton:

In pursuance of this determination, the act of March 2, 1867, "to provide for a more efficient government of the rebel States," was passed. It was vetoed by the President, but was passed over the veto on the same

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 187.

day. Declaring in the preamble that no legal State governments or adequate protection for life or property existed in the 10 "rebel" States, the act provided that these States should be divided into 5 military districts, each under an officer of the army of not lower rank than brigadier general, and made subject to the military authority of the United States. North Carolina and South Carolina formed the second district. The commander of each district was required to protect all persons in their rights and to suppress insurrection, disorder, and violence. In the punishment of offenders, he was authorized to allow the civil tribunals to take jurisdiction, or if he deemed it necessary, to organize military commissions for the purpose. All interference with such tribunals by the State authorities was declared void and of no effect. It was further provided that the people of any of the said States should be entitled to representation whenever they should have framed and ratified a constitution in conformity with the Constitution of the United States. This constitution must be framed by a convention elected by the male citizens of the State, regardless of race, color, or previous condition, with the exception of those disfranchised for participation in rebellion or for felony. Those persons on whom disabilities would be imposed by the proposed 14th amendment were disqualified from holding a seat in the convention and from voting for delegates. The constitution thus framed, and containing the provision that all persons whom the act of Congress made electors should retain the electoral franchise, must then be approved by Congress. Whenever representatives should be admitted, the portion of the act establishing military governments would become inoperative so far as concerned the State in question. Until the completion of this reconstruction, the existing civil governments were declared provisional and liable at any time to modification or abolition.

On March 23, a supplementary act was passed. The original act left the whole matter of the initiation of reconstruction very indefinite. The supplementary act provided that the district commanders should cause a registration to be made of all male citizens who could take a required oath as to their qualifications as electors. The election of delegates to a convention should then be held by the commanders. For the sake of giving at least an appearance of following the will of the people, the act provided that the question of holding a convention should be submitted to them at the same time. Unless a majority of the registered voters took part in the election and a majority in favor of holding the convention resulted, no convention should be held. Provision was made for boards of election composed only of those who could take the ironclad oath. Finally, it was provided that a majority of those registered must take part in the voting on the ratification of the Constitution in order to make it valid. This act was also vetoed by President Johnson and promptly repassed by the required majorities.

In July, Congress met again. In the meantime Attorney General Stanbery had sent to the President an interpretation of the act, which closely restricted the power of the military commanders. At once another supplementary act was passed, as an authoritative interpretation of the former acts. It gave the commanders full power to make any removals from office that they might see fit, and authorized the boards of registration to go behind the oath of an applicant for registration whenever it seemed to them necessary. District commanders, the boards of registration, and all officers acting under either were relieved from the necessity of acting in accordance with the opinion of any civil officer of the United States. The executive and judicial officers referred to in the

imposition of disabilities were declared to include the holders of all civil offices created by law for the administration of justice or for the administration of any general law of a State. An extension of time for registration was authorized, and also a revision of the lists of registered voters before the election. This act, as was now the customary thing, had to be passed over the President's veto.

Such was the most important legislation enacted for the restoration of the South. Questions of precedent and of constitutional law were alike disregarded in their passage, and justification found for all.

Mr. President, I have read a synopsis from Dr. Hamilton's book, setting forth the provisions of the Reconstruction acts. These acts provided for military government in the South. They provided that the South should be garrisoned. A garrison was stationed in my hometown until 1874, if my recollection of history serves me aright. I have heard older men in my county tell how they had to go through the ranks of soldiers of the army of occupation in order to vote in 1868, and see their natural leaders, on whose advice they had relied in times past, sit on rail fences and not vote because they were disfranchised.

The gentleman in charge of each of those five military districts was given the power to decide whether civilians should be tried by military commissions or in civil courts. They were given the power to remove from office any of the State or local officials who had been placed in office under Presidential reconstruction. They were given charge of the election machinery of those States and charge of the elections and of registration of voters. They were even excused by act of Congress from paying any attention to any advice they received from any civil authorities at the National or State level.

Of course, those States tried to get an interpretation of the Reconstruction acts and to get a decision from the Supreme Court of the United States as to their constitutionality. The first of these attempts was made on April 5, 1867, when three great lawyers, Robert J. Walker, Augustus H. Garland, and William H. Sharkey, applied to the Supreme Court for leave to file a bill in equity to enjoin "Andrew Johnson, a citizen of the State of Tennessee and President of the United States, and his officers and agents appointed for that purpose, and especially E. O. C. Ord, assigned as military commander of the district * * * from executing or in any manner carrying out the acts of March 2 and 25, 1867."

The Supreme Court refused to allow those attorneys, who were representing the State of Mississippi, to file such a bill in equity in the Supreme Court; and that first attempt to secure a decision in regard to the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts failed. On April 15 the Supreme Court held that it would not permit a bill in equity to be filed, because it did not wish to pass on the delicate issue as to the power of the Court to control Executive acts; and, therefore, the Court denied the leave sought.

A few days later another application was made to the Supreme Court for permission to file a bill in equity to challenge the constitutionality of the Recon-

struction acts; and the Supreme Court granted that application. However, after argument, a few days later the Court entered a decision dismissing the suit—on the ground that it called for adjudication, not of the rights of persons or property, but of rights of a political character affecting the sovereignty or corporate existence of a State; and the Court said it had no jurisdiction over such a controversy.

Then it appeared possible that by a curious twist of fate a case which did reach the Supreme Court of the United States would require the Court to pass on the constitutionality of a statute which the radicals had passed in Congress on February 5, 1867, for the benefit of Federal officials and so-called loyal persons in the South. That statute was so phrased that it gave the Federal circuit courts jurisdiction in all cases in which any person was restrained or deprived of his liberty, in violation of the Constitution or in violation of any treaty or law of the United States. It happened that at that time there was in Vicksburg, Miss., an editor, named McCardle, who had published in his newspaper an editorial criticizing the military government then in vogue in Mississippi and in other Southern States. The radicals in Congress had no respect for the right of freedom of speech, which was supposed to be secured by the first amendment of the Constitution to persons who disagreed with them; and McCardle was arrested, at the instance of the military authorities, for speaking ill of them. He was imprisoned, and was held for trial before a military commission. He applied to the circuit court for habeas corpus for his release, on the ground that his arrest and detention under the Reconstruction acts violated the Constitution. When the circuit court refused to grant him his liberty, he appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. He was asserting a constitutional right as a person; and the Supreme Court of the United States clearly had jurisdiction of his case, and the case clearly made it necessary—if the Supreme Court was to discharge any judicial function whatever—for it to rule on the constitutionality of the Reconstruction acts. That situation sent a good deal of fear into the hearts of the radicals who then controlled Congress because their actions showed time and time again that they were conscious of the unconstitutionality of the Reconstruction acts. So the radicals introduced in Congress a bill which provided that in any case involving the constitutionality of an act of Congress, unless two-thirds of the judges of the Supreme Court agreed that the act was unconstitutional, the Court could not hand down such a decision. That bill was defeated because of the terrible criticism it received at the hands of the American bar.

So, at the instance of Thaddeus Stevens, the radicals then introduced in the Senate a bill which forbade the Supreme Court of the United States to take jurisdiction of any case in law or equity which arose out of the Reconstruction acts. That bill also caused a violent

reaction in the press and among the lawyers of the North, and the bill was laid aside.

Finally, the McCordle case was argued before the U.S. Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court took it under advisement. When that happened, the radicals saw it was necessary for them to take some drastic action immediately. As I have pointed out, McCordle had done nothing except exercise his right of free speech, and he was applying for a writ of habeas corpus to free him from his imprisonment—which he claimed was illegal and unconstitutional—under the Reconstruction acts. He was seeking the greatest right of all—the right to secure the liberty of a person against unlawful imprisonment—that had ever been developed in any legal system on the face of the earth.

So what did the radicals in Congress do in their attempt to keep the Supreme Court of the United States from handing down a decision as to the constitutionality of the Reconstruction acts under which McCordle was arrested and held for trial, before a military tribunal, for exercising the right of freedom of speech and for condemning something which ought to have been condemned? The radicals in Congress succeeded in having passed a statute which robbed the Supreme Court of the United States of its jurisdiction to review habeas corpus proceedings brought under the act of 1867.

Mr. President (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair), in that connection, a certain amount of criticism can justly be leveled at the Supreme Court of the United States, because the Court had heard arguments in that case and had taken the case under advisement before that measure was brought up in Congress, and the bill was passed through the House, in the first instance, by a sneak action, in which a Member of the House obtained unanimous consent to have the House take up a bill, then on the calendar, which had no relationship to this matter. It was taken up, following a statement that it was an innocuous bill, but then the bill was amended so suddenly in that way that scarcely any other Member of the House knew what had happened. The bill was then passed by both Houses of Congress, but was vetoed by President Johnson, and it was passed over President Johnson's veto, in the course of a heated debate in which the opponents of the bill—such as Senator Reverdy Johnson and others—correctly characterized the bill, and in no uncertain terms condemned the action of the radicals in having it passed.

So the Supreme Court missed a glorious opportunity to hand down a decision on that act. On the contrary, apparently the majority of the Court postponed action so that Congress could act, thus enabling the Court to escape making a decision. That statement does not apply to some of the judges, because some of them wanted to take action.

The bill was passed by the Congress while the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson was in progress in this very

Senate Chamber. The greatest exhibition of courage of the most sublime character ever given by any President of the United States was given by Andrew Johnson at that time. He was actually being tried at the instigation of the radicals who controlled Congress in an impeachment proceeding which could have resulted in his removal from office and his inability ever to occupy another office under the Federal Government. Despite that fact, Andrew Johnson signed a magnificent statement vetoing the act of Congress which robbed the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to review the McCordle decision. He said in his great veto message:

It will be justly held by a large portion of the people as an admission of the unconstitutionality of the act on which its judgment may be forbidden or forestalled, and may interfere with their willing acquiescence in its provisions, which is necessarily harmonious and efficient execution of any law.

In other words, at the very time when his political life was at stake in the impeachment proceeding, that President, a man who had fewer opportunities in life than any other man who has attained that high office, had the courage to veto the bill which most of his judges had assisted in passing through the Congress.

(At this point, Mr. BREWSTER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. ERVIN. Some time ago I said that I favored the retention of the two-thirds requirement of rule XXII, because the history of the Nation showed that at one time the constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds vote to remove a President had prevented the total blackout of constitutional government in the United States.

Let us stop and think a moment of that impeachment proceeding. The Members of Congress who were controlled by the radicals knew that Andrew Johnson had not done anything to merit impeachment. They knew that Andrew Johnson had not been guilty of treason. On the contrary, they knew that Andrew Johnson had been trying to save the Constitution and constitutional government from destruction at their hands. They knew that Andrew Johnson had not been guilty of bribery. They knew that Andrew Johnson had not committed any high crime or misdemeanor. They knew that the only offense of which Andrew Johnson was guilty was his fidelity to the oath which he had taken to uphold the Constitution of the United States. They knew that the only thing they really had against Andrew Johnson was that he had vetoed acts of Congress which were entirely inconsistent with the Constitution and which were absolutely repugnant to free government in the United States.

Those were tragic days. The greatest tragedy lies in the fact that they showed that partisans will yield to temptation in times of stress and turmoil. This entire tragic story illustrates beyond any doubt that if liberty is to be preserved in our Nation, there must be some safeguards which will restrain impatient and intemperate acts on the part of those in authority in times of stress, strain, and turmoil.

Despite the fact that all of the Members of the House of Representatives knew that Andrew Johnson had not committed treason, bribery, or any high crime or misdemeanor as grounds for impeachment under the Constitution, the House of Representatives, by an overwhelming majority, impeached him on false charges, the main charge being that he had violated the Tenure-of-Office Act. Incidentally, at this point, I add that Andrew Johnson made repeated efforts to obtain a decision from the Supreme Court of the United States as to the validity and constitutionality of the Tenure-of-Office Act. He was unable to obtain such a decision because, as Benjamin R. Curtis has said, the radicals subdued the Supreme Court, at least temporarily.

Andrew Johnson was the only public official in our Nation who was able to stand between a radical Congress and a complete blackout of constitutional government in the United States.

So he was impeached, because he was resisting the radical Congress and its unconstitutional measures. They reasoned that if they could get rid of Andrew Johnson and remove him from office, he would be succeeded, in all probability, by Senator Wade, one of the chief leaders of the radicals, who would do the will of the radicals.

Impeachment proceedings were brought against Andrew Johnson in the House of Representatives. He was tried in the Senate Chamber. In all human probability, Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, as the Presiding Officer at the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson, sat in the seat now occupied by the Presiding Officer.

Chief Justice Chase was a man of rare ability. As Chief Justice he did many things which manifested his courage. He presided over the impeachment trial of Andrew Johnson in an extremely fair and legal manner. However, I feel that he missed greatness by a narrow margin, because of his ambition to be President of the United States. On rare occasions he had a tendency to fail to match his great ability with what was right. He yielded to the temptation to trim his sails to fit the political winds.

The trial occurred in this Senate Chamber.

Subsection 6 of section 3 of article I of the Constitution saved this Nation from a most disgraceful event. That was because it provides that when the Senate of the United States sits as a court of impeachment the person being impeached cannot be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the Members present.

Andrew Johnson was saved from impeachment by the vote of one Senator, because those voting for his conviction lacked one vote of having the constitutionally required two-thirds majority.

The President of the United States has written a very fine chapter in his book entitled "Profiles in Courage," on one of the Senators who voted with the minority. The President writes of Edmund G. Ross. It has always seemed to me there was another Senator who voted with the minority who deserved great credit. I think the other Senator was James W.

Grimes, a Member of the Senate who had a stroke of paralysis and who had himself carried into this Chamber in order that he might vote against the unjust impeachment of a President of the United States who was standing between a radical Congress and complete destruction of constitutional government in America.

At the risk of being somewhat tedious, I shall read what the President said about this trial and particularly what he said about Senator Edmund G. Ross. It is a stirring chapter. It is a stirring chapter because it deals with a man who had the courage to vote with the minority for what was right in the face of what was probably the greatest popular demand for an unjust act that this country has ever witnessed:

In a lonely grave, forgotten and unknown, lies "the man who saved a President," and who as a result may well have preserved for ourselves and posterity constitutional government in the United States—the man who performed in 1868 what one historian has called the most heroic act in American history, incomparably more difficult than any deed of valor upon the field of battle—but a U.S. Senator whose name no one recalls: Edmund G. Ross of Kansas.

I digress for a moment to say that if the radical Congress had been successful in the conviction of Andrew Johnson and had removed him from office this would have set a precedent for other partisans and other radicals in the control of the Congress to follow, and we might have seen constitutional government in this country become as unstable as it is in many other parts of the Americas.

I resume the reading of the President's article:

The impeachment of President Andrew Johnson, the event in which the obscure Ross was to play such a dramatic role, was the sensational climax to the bitter struggle between the President, determined to carry out Abraham Lincoln's policies of reconciliation with the defeated South, and the more radical Republican leaders in Congress, who sought to administer the down-trodden Southern States as conquered provinces which had forfeited their rights under the Constitution. It was, moreover, a struggle between executive and legislative authority. Andrew Johnson, the courageous if untactful Tennessean who had been the only southern Member of Congress to refuse to secede with his State, had committed himself to the policies of the Great Emancipator to whose high station he had succeeded only by the course of an assassin's bullet. He knew that Lincoln prior to his death had already clashed with the extremists in Congress, who had opposed his approach to reconstruction in a constitutional and charitable manner and sought to make the legislative branch of the Government supreme. And his own belligerent temperament soon destroyed any hope that Congress might now join hands in carrying out Lincoln's policies of permitting the South to resume its place in the Union with as little delay and controversy as possible.

By 1866, when Edmund Ross first came to the Senate, the two branches of the Government were already at each other's throats, snarling and bristling with anger. Bill after bill was vetoed by the President on the grounds that they were unconstitutional, too harsh in their treatment of the South, an unnecessary prolongation of military rule in peacetime or undue interference with the authority of the executive branch. And for

the first time in our Nation's history, important public measures were passed over a President's veto and became law without his support.

But not all of Andrew Johnson's vetoes were overturned; and the radical Republicans of the Congress promptly realized that one final step was necessary before they could crush their despised foe (and in the heat of political battle their vengeance was turned upon their President far more than their former military enemies of the South). That one remaining step was the assurance of a two-thirds majority in the Senate—for under the Constitution, such a majority was necessary to override a Presidential veto. And more important, such a majority was constitutionally required to accomplish their major ambition, now an ill-kept secret, conviction of the President under an impeachment and his dismissal from office.

The temporary and unstable two-thirds majority which had enabled the Senate radical Republicans on several occasions to enact legislation over the President's veto was, they knew, insufficiently reliable for an impeachment conviction. To solidify this bloc became the paramount goal of Congress, expressly or impliedly governing its decisions on other issues—particularly the admission of new States, the readmission of Southern States and the determination of senatorial credentials. By extremely dubious methods a pro-Johnson Senator was denied his seat. Over the President's veto Nebraska was admitted to the Union, seating two more anti-administration Senators. Although last minute maneuvers failed to admit Colorado over the President's veto (sparsely populated Colorado had rejected statehood in a referendum), an unexpected tragedy brought false tears and fresh hopes for a new vote, in Kansas.

Senator Jim Lane, of Kansas, had been a conservative Republican sympathetic to Johnson's plans to carry out Lincoln's reconstruction policies. But his frontier State was one of the most radical in the Union. When Lane voted to uphold Johnson's veto of the civil rights bill of 1866 and introduced the administration's bill for recognition of the new State government of Arkansas, Kansas had arisen in outraged heat. A mass meeting at Lawrence had vilified the Senator and speedily reported resolutions sharply condemning his position. Humiliated, mentally ailing, broken in health and laboring under charges of financial irregularities, Jim Lane took his own life on July 1, 1866.

With this thorn in their side removed, the radical Republicans in Washington looked anxiously toward Kansas and the selection of Lane's successor. Their fondest hopes were realized, for the new Senator from Kansas turned out to be Edmund G. Ross, the very man who had introduced the resolutions attacking Lane at Lawrence.

There could be no doubt as to where Ross' sympathies lay, for his entire career was one of determined opposition to the slave States of the South, their practices and their friends. In 1854, when only 28, he had taken part in the mob rescue of a fugitive slave in Milwaukee. In 1856, he had joined that flood of antislavery immigrants to "bleeding" Kansas who intended to keep it a free territory. Disgusted with the Democratic Party of his youth, he had left that party, and volunteered in the Kansas Free State army to drive back a force of proslavery men invading the territory. In 1862, he had given up his newspaper work to enlist in the Union Army, from which he emerged a major. His leading role in the condemnation of Lane at Lawrence convinced the radical Republican leaders in Congress that in Edmund G. Ross they had a solid member of that vital two-thirds.

The stage was now set for the final scene—the removal of Johnson. Early in 1867, Con-

gress enacted over the President's veto the tenure-of-office bill which prevented the President from removing without the consent of the Senate all new officeholders whose appointment required confirmation by that body. At the time nothing more than the cry for more patronage was involved, Cabinet members having originally been specifically exempt.

On August 5, 1867, President Johnson—convinced that the Secretary of War, whom he had inherited from Lincoln, Edwin M. Stanton, was the surreptitious tool of the radical Republicans and was seeking to become the almighty dictator of the conquered South—asked for his immediate resignation; and Stanton arrogantly fired back the reply that he declined to resign before the next meeting of Congress. Not one to cower before this kind of effrontery, the President one week later suspended Stanton, and appointed in his place the one man whom Stanton did not dare resist, General Grant. On January 13, 1868, an angry Senate notified the President and Grant that it did not concur in the suspension of Stanton, and Grant vacated the office upon Stanton's return. But the situation was intolerable. The Secretary of War was unable to attend Cabinet meetings or associate with his colleagues in the administration; and on February 21, President Johnson, anxious to obtain a court test of the act he believed obviously unconstitutional, again notified Stanton that he had been summarily removed from the office of Secretary of War.

While Stanton, refusing to yield possession, barricaded himself in his office, public opinion in the Nation ran heavily against the President. He had intentionally broken the law and dictatorially thwarted the will of Congress. Although previous resolutions of impeachment had been defeated in the House, both in committee and on the floor, a new resolution was swiftly reported and adopted on February 24 by a tremendous vote. Every single Republican voted in the affirmative, and Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania—the crippled, fanatical personification of the extremes of the radical Republican movement, master of the House of Representatives, with a mouth like the thin edge of an ax—warned both Houses of the Congress coldly: "Let me see the recreant who would vote to let such a criminal escape. Point me to one who will dare do it and I will show you one who will dare the infamy of posterity."

With the President impeached—in effect, indicted—by the House, the frenzied trial for his conviction or acquittal under the Articles of Impeachment began on March 5 in the Senate, presided over by the Chief Justice. It was a trial to rank with all the great trials in history—Charles I before the High Court of Justice, Louis XVI before the French Convention, and Warren Hastings before the House of Lords. Two great elements of drama were missing: the actual cause for which the President was being tried was not fundamental to the welfare of the Nation; and the defendant himself was at all times absent.

But every other element of the highest courtroom drama was present. To each Senator the Chief Justice administered an oath "to do impartial justice" (including even the hotheaded radical Senator from Ohio, Benjamin Wade, who as President pro tempore of the Senate was next in line for the Presidency). The chief prosecutor for the House was Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, the "butcher of New Orleans," a talented but coarse and demagogic Congressman from Massachusetts. (When he lost his seat in 1874, he was so hated by his own party as well as his opponents that one Republican wired concerning the Democratic sweep, "Butler defeated, everything else lost.") Some 1,000 tickets were printed for admission to the Senate galleries during the

trial, and every conceivable device was used to obtain one of the four tickets allotted each Senator.

From the 5th of March to the 16th of May, the drama continued. Of the 11 articles of impeachment adopted by the House, the first 8 were based upon the removal of Stanton and the appointment of a new Secretary of War in violation of the Tenure of Office Act; the 9th related to Johnson's conversation with a general which was said to induce violations of the Army Appropriations Act; the 10th recited that Johnson had delivered "intemperate, inflammatory, and scandalous harangues * * * as well against Congress as the laws of the United States"; and the 11th was a deliberately obscure conglomeration of all the charges in the preceding articles which had been designed by Thaddeus Stevens to furnish a common ground for those who favored conviction but were unwilling to identify themselves on basic issues. In opposition to Butler's inflammatory arguments in support of this hastily drawn indictment, Johnson's able and learned counsel replied with considerable effectiveness. They insisted that the Tenure of Office Act was null and void as a clear violation of the Constitution; that even if it were valid, it would not apply to Stanton, for the reasons previously mentioned; and that the only way that a judicial test of the law could be obtained was for Stanton to be dismissed and sue for his rights in the courts.

I digress at this point to say that since that time the Supreme Court has held in many cases that a President has the constitutional power to remove from office any person he appoints to an office, regardless of whether that persons' appointment has been confirmed by the Senate. So the position of Johnson's lawyers in the impeachment proceedings that the Tenure of Office Act was unconstitutional has been confirmed many times.

I continue to read:

But as the trial progressed, it became increasingly apparent that the impatient Republicans did not intend to give the President a fair trial on the formal issues upon which the impeachment was drawn, but intended instead to depose him from the White House on any grounds, real or imagined, for refusing to accept their policies. Telling evidence in the President's favor was arbitrarily excluded. Prejudgment on the part of most Senators was brazenly announced. Attempted bribery and other forms of pressure were rampant. The chief interest was not in the trial or the evidence, but in the tallying of votes necessary for conviction.

Twenty-seven States (excluding the unrecognized Southern States) in the Union meant 54 Members of the Senate, and 36 votes were required to constitute the two-thirds majority necessary for conviction. All 12 Democratic votes were obviously lost, and the 42 Republicans knew that they could afford to lose only 6 of their own Members if Johnson were to be ousted. To their dismay, at a preliminary Republican caucus, six courageous Republicans indicated that the evidence so far introduced was not in their opinion sufficient to convict Johnson under the articles of impeachment. "Infamy," cried the Philadelphia Press. The Republic has "been betrayed in the house of its friends."

But if the remaining 36 Republicans would hold, there would be no doubt as to the outcome. All must stand together. But one Republican Senator would not announce his verdict in the preliminary poll—Edmund G. Ross, of Kansas. The radicals were outraged that a Senator from such an anti-Johnson stronghold as Kansas could be doubtful. "It

was a very clear case," Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, fumed, "especially for a Kansas man. I did not think that a Kansas man could quibble against his country."

From the very time Ross had taken his seat, the radical leaders had been confident of his vote. His entire background, as already indicated, was one of firm support of their cause. One of his first acts in the Senate had been to read a declaration of his adherence to radical Republican policy, and he had silently voted for all of their measures. He had made it clear that he was not in sympathy with Andrew Johnson personally or politically; and after the removal of Stanton, he had voted with the majority in adopting a resolution declaring such removal unlawful. His colleague from Kansas, Senator Pomeroy, was one of the most radical leaders of the anti-Johnson group. The Republicans insisted that Ross's crucial vote was rightfully theirs and they were determined to get it by whatever means available. As stated by DeWitt in his memorable "Impeachment of Andrew Johnson," "The full brunt of the struggle turned at last on the one remaining doubtful Senator, Edmund G. Ross."

When the impeachment resolution had passed the House, Senator Ross had casually remarked to Senator Sprague of Rhode Island, "Well, Sprague, the thing is here; and, so far as I am concerned, though a Republican and opposed to Mr. Johnson and his policy, he shall have as fair a trial as an accused man ever had on this earth." Immediately the word spread that "Ross was shaky." "From that hour," he later wrote, "not a day passed that did not bring me, by mail and telegraph and in personal intercourse, appeals to stand fast for impeachment, and not a few were the admonitions of condign visitations upon any indication even of lukewarmness."

"Throughout the country, and in all walks of life, as indicated by the correspondence of Members of the Senate, the condition of the public mind was not unlike that preceding a great battle. The dominant party of the Nation seemed to occupy the position of public prosecutor, and it was scarcely in the mood to brook delay for trial or to hear defense. Washington had become during the trial the central point of the politically dissatisfied and swarmed with representatives of every State of the Union, demanding in a practically united voice the deposition of the President. The footsteps of the anti-impeachment Republicans were dogged from the day's beginning to its end and far into the night, with entreaties, considerations, and threats. The newspapers came daily filled with not a few threats of violence upon their return to their constituents."

Ross and his fellow doubtful Republicans were daily pestered, spied upon and subjected to every form of pressure. Their residences were carefully watched, their social circles suspiciously scrutinized, and their every move and companions secretly marked in special notebooks. They were warned in the party press, harangued by their constituents, and sent dire warnings threatening political ostracism and even assassination. Stanton himself, from his barricaded headquarters in the War Department, worked day and night to bring to bear upon the doubtful Senators all the weight of his impressive military associations. The Philadelphia Press reported "a fearful avalanche of telegrams from every section of the country," a great surge of public opinion from the "common people" who had given their money and lives to the country and would not "willingly or unavenged see their great sacrifice made naught."

The New York Tribune reported that Edmund Ross in particular was "mercilessly dragged this way and that by both sides, hunted like a fox night and day and

badgered by his own colleague, like the bridge at Arcola now trod upon by one army and now trampled by the other." His background and life were investigated from top to bottom, and his constituents and colleagues pursued him throughout Washington to gain some inkling of his opinion. He was the target of every eye, his name was on every mouth and his intentions were discussed in every newspaper. Although there is evidence that he gave some hint of agreement to each side, and each attempted to claim him publicly, he actually kept both sides in a state of complete suspense by his judicial silence.

But with no experience in political turmoil, no reputation in the Senate, no independent income and the most radical State in the Union to deal with, Ross was judged to be the most sensitive to criticism and the most certain to be swayed by expert tactics. A committee of Congressmen and Senators sent to Kansas, and to the States of the other doubtful Republicans, this telegram: "Great danger to the peace of the country and the Republican cause if impeachment fails. Send to your Senators public opinion by resolutions, letters, and delegations." A member of the Kansas Legislature called upon Ross at the Capitol. A general urged on by Stanton remained at his lodge until 4 o'clock in the morning determined to see him. His brother received a letter offering \$20,000 for revelation of the Senator's intentions. Gruff Ben Butler exclaimed of Ross, "There is a bushel of money. How much does the damned scoundrel want?" The night before the Senate was to take its first vote for the conviction or acquittal of Johnson, Ross received this telegram from home: "Kansas has heard the evidence and demands the conviction of the President."

"D. R. ANTHONY AND 1,000 OTHERS."

And on that fateful morning of May 16 Ross replied:

"To D. R. ANTHONY AND 1,000 OTHERS": I do not recognize your right to demand that I vote either for or against conviction. I have taken an oath to do impartial justice according to the Constitution and laws, and trust that I shall have the courage to vote according to the dictates of my judgment and for the highest good of the country.

"E. G. Ross."

That morning spies traced Ross to his breakfast; and 10 minutes before the vote was taken his Kansas colleague warned him in the presence of Thaddeus Stevens that a vote for acquittal would mean trumped up charges and his political death.

But now the fateful hour was at hand. Neither escape, delay or indecision was possible. As Ross himself later described it: "The galleries were packed. Tickets of admission were at an enormous premium. The House had adjourned and all of its members were in the Senate chamber. Every chair on the Senate floor was filled with a Senator, a Cabinet Officer, a member of the President's counsel or a Member of the House." Every Senator was in his seat, the desperately ill Grimes, of Iowa, being literally carried in.

It had been decided to take the first vote under that broad 11th article of impeachment, believed to command the widest support. As the Chief Justice announced the voting would begin, he reminded "the citizens and strangers in the galleries that absolute silence and perfect order are required."

But already a deathlike stillness enveloped the Senate Chamber. A Congressman later recalled that, "Some of the Members of the House near me grew pale and sick under the burden of suspense"; and Ross noted that there was even "a subsidence of the shuffling of feet, the rustling of silks, the fluttering of fans, and of conversation."

The voting tensely commenced. By the time the Chief Justice reached the name of

Edmund Ross 24 "guilties" had been pronounced. Ten more were certain and one other practically certain. Only Ross' vote was needed to obtain the 36 votes necessary to convict the President. But not a single person in the room knew how this young Kansan would vote. Unable to conceal the suspense and emotion in his voice, the Chief Justice put the question to him: "Mr. Senator Ross, how say you? Is the respondent Andrew Johnson guilty or not guilty of a high misdemeanor as charged in this article?" Every voice was still; every eye was upon the freshman Senator from Kansas. The hopes and fears, the hatred and bitterness of past decades were centered upon this one man.

As Ross himself later described it, his "powers of hearing and seeing seemed developed in an abnormal degree.

"Every individual in that great audience seemed distinctly visible, some with lips apart and bending forward in anxious expectancy, others with hand uplifted as if to ward off an apprehended blow * * * and each peering with an intensity that was almost tragic upon the face of him who was about to cast the fateful vote. Every fan was folded, not a foot moved, not the rustle of a garment, not a whisper was heard. * * * Hope and fear seemed blended in every face, instantaneously alternating, some with revengeful hate * * * others lighted with hope. The Senators in their seats leaned over their desks, many with hand to ear. It was a tremendous responsibility, and it was not strange that he upon whom it had been imposed by a fateful combination of conditions should have sought to avoid it, to put it away from him as one shuns, or tries to fight off, a nightmare. I almost literally looked down into my open grave. Friendships, position, fortune, everything that makes life desirable to an ambitious man were about to be swept away by the breath of my mouth, perhaps forever. It is not strange that my answer was carried waveringly over the air and failed to reach the limits of the audience, or that repetition was called for by distant Senators on the opposite side of the Chamber."

Then came the answer again in a voice that could not be misunderstood—full, final, definite, unhesitating, and unmistakable: "Not guilty." The deed was done, the President saved, the trial as good as over and the conviction lost. The remainder of the roll-call was unimportant, conviction had failed by the margin of a single vote and a general rumbling filled the Chamber until the Chief Justice proclaimed that "on this article 35 Senators having voted guilty and 19 not guilty, a two-thirds majority not having voted for his conviction, the President is, therefore, acquitted under this article."

A 10-day recess followed, 10 turbulent days to change votes on the remaining articles. An attempt was made to rush through bills to readmit six southern States, whose 12 Senators were guaranteed to vote for conviction. But this could not be accomplished in time. Again Ross was the only one uncommitted on the other articles, the only one whose vote could not be predicted in advance. And again he was subjected to terrible pressure. From "D. R. Anthony and others," he received a wire informing him the "Kansas repudiates you as she does all perjurers and skunks." Every incident in his life was examined and distorted. Professional witnesses were found by Senator Pomeroy to testify before a special House committee that Ross had indicated a willingness to change his vote for a consideration. (Unfortunately this witness was so delighted in his exciting role that he also swore that Senator Pomeroy had made an offer to produce three votes for acquittal for \$40,000.) When Ross, in his capacity as a committee chairman, took several bills to the President, James G. Blaine remarked: "There goes the

rascal to get his pay." (Long afterward Blaine was to admit: "In the exaggerated denunciation caused by the anger and chagrin of the moment, great injustice was done to statesmen of spotless character.")

Again the wild rumors spread that Ross had been won over on the remaining articles of impeachment. As the Senate reassembled, he was the only one of the seven "renegade" Republicans to vote with the majority on preliminary procedural matters. But when the second and third articles of impeachment were read, and the name of Ross was reached again with the same intense suspense of 10 days earlier, again came the calm answer, "Not guilty."

Why did Ross, whose dislike for Johnson continued, vote "Not guilty"? His motives appear clearly from his own writings on the subject years later in articles contributed to Scribner's and Forum magazines:

In a large sense, the independence of the executive office as a coordinate branch of the Government was on trial. If * * * the President must step down * * * a disgraced man and a political outcast * * * upon insufficient proof and from partisan considerations, the office of President would be degraded, cease to be a coordinate branch of the Government, and ever after subordinated to the legislative will. It would practically have revolutionized our splendid political fabric into a partisan Congressional autocracy. This Government had never faced so insidious a danger * * * control by the worst element of American politics. If Andrew Johnson were acquitted by a non-partisan vote * * * America would pass the danger of partisan rule and that intolerance which so often characterizes the sway of great majorities and makes them dangerous.

The "open grave" which Edmund Ross had foreseen was hardly an exaggeration. A Justice of the Kansas Supreme Court telegraphed him that "the rope with which Judas Iscariot hanged himself is lost, but Jim Lane's pistol is at your service." An editorial in a Kansas newspaper screamed:

"On Saturday last Edmund G. Ross, U.S. Senator from Kansas, sold himself, and betrayed his constituents, stultified his own record, basely lied to his friends, shamefully violated his solemn pledge * * * and to the utmost of his poor ability signed the death warrant of his country's liberty. This act was done deliberately, because the traitor, like Benedict Arnold, loved money better than he did principle, friends, honor and his country, all combined. Poor, pitiful, shriveled wretch, with a soul so small that a little pelf would outweigh all things else that dignify or ennoble manhood."

Ross' political career was ended. To the New York Tribune, he was nothing but "a miserable poltroon and traitor." The Philadelphia Press said that in Ross "littleness" had "simply borne its legitimate fruit," and that he and his fellow recalcitrant Republicans had "plunged from a precipice of fame into the groveling depths of infamy and death." The Philadelphia Inquirer said that "They had tried, convicted, and sentenced themselves." For them there could be "no allowance, no clemency."

Comparative peace returned to Washington as Stanton relinquished his office and Johnson served out the rest of his term, later—unlike his Republican defenders—to return triumphantly to the Senate as Senator from Tennessee. But no one paid attention when Ross tried unsuccessfully to explain his vote, and denounced the falsehoods of Ben Butler's investigating committee, recalling that the general's "well-known groveling instincts and proneness to slime and uncleanness" had led "the public to insult the brute creation by dubbing him 'the beast.'" He clung unhappily to his seat in the Senate until the expiration of his term, frequently referred to as "the traitor Ross," and complaining

that his fellow Congressmen, as well as citizens on the street, considered association with him "disreputable and scandalous," and passed him by as if he were "a leper, with averted face and every indication of hatred and disgust."

Neither Ross nor any other Republican who had voted for the acquittal of Johnson was ever reelected to the Senate, not a one of them retaining the support of their party's organization. When he returned to Kansas in 1871, he and his family suffered social ostracism, physical attack, and near poverty.

Who was Edmund G. Ross? Practically nobody. Not a single public law bears his name, not a single history book includes his picture, not a single list of Senate "greats" mentions his service. His one heroic deed has been all but forgotten. But who might Edmund G. Ross have been? That is the question—for Ross, a man with an excellent command of words, an excellent background for politics, and an excellent future in the Senate, might well have outstripped his colleagues in prestige and power throughout a long Senate career. Instead, he chose to throw all of this away for one act of conscience.

But the twisting course of human events eventually upheld the faith he expressed to his wife shortly after the trial: "Millions of men cursing me today will bless me tomorrow for having saved the country from the greatest peril through which it has ever passed, though none but God can ever know the struggle it has cost me." For 20 years later Congress repealed the Tenure of Office Act, to which every President after Johnson, regardless of party, had objected; and still later the Supreme Court, referring to "the extremes of that episode in our Government," held it to be unconstitutional. Ross moved to New Mexico, where in his later years he was to be appointed Territorial Governor. Just prior to his death when he was awarded a special pension by Congress for his service in the Civil War, the press and the country took the opportunity to pay tribute to his fidelity to principle in a trying hour and his courage in saving his Government from a devastating reign of terror. They now agreed with Ross' earlier judgment that his vote had "saved the country from * * * a strain that would have wrecked any other form of government."

Those Kansas newspapers and political leaders who had bitterly denounced him in earlier years praised Ross for his stand against legislative mob rule: "By the firmness and courage of Senator Ross," it was said, "the country was saved from calamity greater than war, while it consigned him to a political martyrdom, the most cruel in our history. Ross was the victim of a wild flame of intolerance which swept everything before it. He did his duty knowing that it meant his political death. It was a brave thing for Ross to do, but Ross did it. He acted for his conscience and with a lofty patriotism, regardless of what he knew must be the ruinous consequences to himself. He acted right."

I could not close the story of Edmund Ross without some more adequate mention of those six courageous Republicans who stood with Ross and braved denunciation to acquit Andrew Johnson. Edmund Ross, more than any of those six colleagues, endured more before and after his vote, reached his conscientious decision with greater difficulty, and aroused the greatest interest and suspense prior to May 16 by his noncommittal silence. His story, like his vote, is the key to the impeachment tragedy. But all seven of the Republicans who voted against conviction should be remembered for their courage. Not a single one of them ever won reelection to the Senate. Not a single one of them escaped the unholy combination of threats, bribes, and coercive tactics by

which their fellow Republicans attempted to intimidate their votes; and not a single one of them escaped the terrible torture of vicious criticism engendered by their vote to acquit.

William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, one of the most eminent Senators, orators and lawyers of his day, and a prominent senior Republican leader, who admired Stanton and disliked Johnson, became convinced early in the game that "the whole thing is a mere madness."

The country has so bad an opinion of the President, which he fully deserves, that it expects his condemnation. Whatever may be the consequences to myself personally, whatever I may think and feel as a politician, I will not decide the question against my own judgment. I would rather be confined to planting cabbages the remainder of my days. Make up your mind, if need be, to hear me denounced a traitor and perhaps hanged in effigy. All imaginable abuse has been heaped upon me by the men and papers devoted to the impeachers. I have received several letters from friends warning me that my political grave is dug if I do not vote for conviction, and several threatening assassination. It is rather hard at my time of life, after a long career, to find myself the target of pointed arrows from those whom I have faithfully served. The public, when aroused and excited by passion and prejudice, is little better than a wild beast. I shall at all events retain my own self-respect and a clear conscience, and time will do justice to my motives at least.

The radical Republicans were determined to win over the respected Fessenden, whose name would be the first question mark on the call of the roll, and his mail from Maine was abusive, threatening, and pleading. Wendell Phillips scornfully told a hissing crowd that "it takes 6 months for a statesmanlike idea to find its way into Mr. Fessenden's head. I don't say he is lacking; he is only very slow."

Fessenden decided to shun all newspapers and screen his mail. But when one of his oldest political friends in Maine urged him to "hang Johnson up by the heels like a dead crow in a cornfield, to frighten all of his tribe," noting that he was "sure I express the unanimous feeling of every loyal heart and head in this State," Fessenden indignantly replied:

"I am acting as a judge * * * by what right can any man upon whom no responsibility rests, and who does not even hear the evidence, undertake to advise me as to what the judgment, and even the sentence, should be? I wish all my friends and constituents to understand that I, and not they, am sitting in judgment upon the President. I, not they, have sworn to do impartial justice. I, not they, am responsible to God and man for my action and its consequences."

On that tragic afternoon of May 16, as Ross described it, Senator Fessenden "was in his place, pale and haggard, yet ready for the political martyrdom which he was about to face, and which not long afterward drove him to his grave."

The first Republican Senator to ring out "not guilty"—and the first of the seven to go to his grave, hounded by the merciless abuse that had dimmed all hope for re-election—was William Pitt Fessenden of Maine.

John B. Henderson, of Missouri, one of the Senate's youngest Members, had previously demonstrated high courage by introducing the 13th amendment abolishing slavery, simply because he was convinced that it would pass only if sponsored by a slave-state Senator, whose political death would necessarily follow. But when the full delegation of Republican Representatives from his State cornered him in his office to demand that he convict the hated Johnson, warning that Missouri Republicans could

stomach no other course, Henderson's usual courage wavered. He meekly offered to wire his resignation to the Governor, enabling a new appointee to vote for conviction; and, when it was doubted whether a new Senator would be permitted to vote, he agreed to ascertain whether his own vote would be crucial.

But an insolent and threatening telegram from Missouri restored his sense of honor, and he swiftly wired his reply: "Say to my friends that I am sworn to do impartial justice according to law and conscience, and I will try to do it like an honest man."

John Henderson voted for acquittal, the last important act of his senatorial career. Denounced, threatened, and burned in effigy in Missouri, he did not even bother to seek reelection to the Senate. Years later his party would realize its debt to him, and return him to lesser offices, but for the Senate, whose integrity he had upheld, he was through.

Peter Van Winkle, of West Virginia, the last doubtful Republican name to be called on May 16, was, like Ross, a "nobody"; but his firm "not guilty" extinguished the last faint glimmer of hope which Edmund Ross had already all but destroyed. The Republicans had counted on Van Winkle—West Virginia's first U.S. Senator, and a critic of Stanton's removal; and for his courage, he was labeled "West Virginia's betrayer" by the *Wheeling Intelligencer*, who declared to the world that there was not a loyal citizen in the State who had not been misrepresented by his vote. He, too, had insured his permanent withdrawal from politics as soon as his Senate term expired.

The veteran Lyman Trumbull, of Illinois, who had defeated Abe Lincoln for the Senate, had drafted much of the major reconstruction legislation which Johnson vetoed, and had voted to censure Johnson upon Stanton's removal.

But, in the eyes of the Philadelphia Press, his "statesmanship drivelled into selfishness," for, resisting tremendous pressure, he voted against conviction. A Republican convention in Chicago had resolved "That any Senator elected by the votes of Union Republicans, who at this time blanches and betrays, is infamous and should be dishonored and execrated while this free government endures." And an Illinois Republican leader had warned the distinguished Trumbull "not to show himself on the streets in Chicago; for I fear that the representatives of an indignant people would hang him to the most convenient lamppost."

But Lyman Trumbull, ending a brilliant career of public service and devotion to the party which would renounce him, filed for the record these enduring words:

"The question to be decided is not whether Andrew Johnson is a proper person to fill the Presidential office, nor whether it is fit that he should remain in it. Once set, the example of impeaching a President for what, when the excitement of the House shall have subsided, will be regarded as insufficient cause, no future President will be safe who happens to differ with a majority of the House and two-thirds of the Senate on any measure deemed by them important. What then becomes of the checks and balances of the Constitution so carefully devised and so vital to its perpetuity? They are all gone. I cannot be an instrument to produce such a result, and at the hazard of the ties even of friendship and affection, till calmer times shall do justice to my motives, no alternative is left me but the inflexible discharge of duty."

Joseph Smith Fowler, of Tennessee, like Ross, Henderson, and Van Winkle, a freshman Senator, at first thought the President impeachable. But the former Nashville professor was horrified by the mad passion of the House in rushing through the impeach-

ment resolution by evidence against Johnson "based on falsehood," and by the "corrupt and dishonorable" Ben Butler, "a wicked man who seeks to convert the Senate of the United States into a political guillotine." He refused to be led by the nose by "politicians, thrown to the surface through the disjointed time * * * keeping alive the embers of the departing revolution." Threatened, investigated, and defamed by his fellow Radical Republicans, the nervous Fowler so faltered in his reply on May 16 that it was at first mistaken for the word "guilty." A wave of triumph swept the Senate—Johnson was convicted, Ross's vote was not needed. But then came the clear and distinct answer: "not guilty."

His reelection impossible, Fowler quietly retired from the Senate at the close of his term 2 years later, but not without a single statement in defense of his vote: "I acted for my country and posterity in obedience to the will of God."

James W. Grimes, of Iowa, one of Johnson's bitter and influential foes in the Senate, became convinced that the trial was intended only to excite public passions through "lies sent from here by the most worthless and irresponsible creatures on the face of the earth" (an indication, perhaps, of the improved quality of Washington correspondents in the last 87 years).

Unfortunately, the abuse and threats heaped upon him during the trial brought on a stroke of paralysis only 2 days before the vote was to be taken, and he was confined to his bed. The Radical Republicans, refusing any postponement, were delightedly certain that Grimes would either be too sick in fact to attend on May 16, or would plead that his illness prevented him from attending to cast the vote that would end his career. In the galleries, the crowd sang "Old Grimes is dead, that bad old man, we ne'er shall see him more." And in the New York Tribune, Horace Greeley was writing: "It seems as if no generation could pass without giving us one man to live among the warnings of history. We have had Benedict Arnold, Aaron Burr, Jefferson Davis, and now we have James W. Grimes."

But James W. Grimes was a man of great physical as well as moral courage, and just before the balloting was to begin on May 16, four men carried the pale and withered Senator from Iowa into his seat. He later wrote that Fessenden had grasped his hand and given him a "glorified smile. * * * I would not today exchange that recollection for the highest distinction of life." The Chief Justice suggested that it would be permissible for him to remain seated while voting—but with the assistance of his friends, Senator Grimes struggled to his feet and in a surprisingly firm voice called out "not guilty."

Burned in effigy, accused in the press of "idiotcy and impotency," and repudiated by his State and friends, Grimes never recovered—but before he died he declared to a friend: "I shall ever thank God that in that troubled hour of trial, when many privately confessed that they had sacrificed their judgment and their conscience at the behests of party newspapers and party hate, I had the courage to be true to my oath and my conscience. Perhaps I did wrong not to commit perjury by order of a party; but I cannot see it that way. I became a judge acting on my own responsibility and accountable only to my own conscience and my Maker; and no power could force me to decide on such a case contrary to my convictions, whether that party was composed of my friends or my enemies."

Mr. President, I have read the very dramatic story written by the President of the United States about the occasion in the Senate when a rule requiring a two-thirds vote in the Senate saved the reputation of the Senate and constitu-

tional government in our Nation. In light of that circumstance, with that warning of history before me, I expect to stand for a rule of cloture which will require a two-thirds vote of Senators to silence any Senator who feels that his duty to his country and his God, and to his conscience, demands that he stand upon the floor of the Senate and say what he believes he should say.

There is an old saying that, "The saddest epitaph which can be written for the loss of any right is that those who had the saving power failed to stretch forth a saving hand while there was yet time."

In closing, I appeal to Senators to remember this tragic event from the history of our past and to stand by a rule of the Senate which will require a two-thirds vote before any Senator can be prevented from speaking what he honestly believes in his heart is necessary for the welfare of his country.

RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 15), 1963:

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be senior surgeons

David Frost Patricia K. Roberts
Raymond T. Moore Wesley W. Wieland

To be surgeon

Paul G. Smith

To be senior assistant surgeons

Scott I. Allen Stuart C. Nottinghamham
Ronald L. McCartney Raphael T. Nussdorf
William P. McElwain S. David Rockoff
Will L. Nash Bruce I. Shackter
Milton Z. Nichaman Leland L. Sprague

To be dental surgeon

Edward A. Graykowski

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Richard R. Baker James V. Petersen
Meade E. Butler Keith J. Ryan
Richard Q. Dunn John W. Topping, Jr.
Donald W. Johnson Dale S. Pyke

To be senior sanitary engineer

John H. McCutchen

To be sanitary engineer

Theodore C. Ferris

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Oscar E. Dickason
Rodger L. Leupold
Albert C. Printz, Jr.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Fred O. Bridges
Troy Marcelino
Walter S. Smith

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Robert Frankel

To be assistant pharmacists

Donald E. Hill
John J. Lucas
Donnie L. Powell

To be senior scientist

Richard B. Eads

To be scientist

Thomas W. Haines

To be senior assistant scientist

McWilson Warren

To be sanitarian

Francis J. Goldsmith

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Donald R. Johnston
Gerald J. Karches
Arthur L. Kenney

To be assistant sanitarians

Joseph Lovett
Thomas C. Rozzell

To be veterinary officer

Robert L. Rausch

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Calvin E. Sevy

To be nurse officers

Agnes Des Marais
Mary J. McGee
Marjorie E. Myren

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Marion N. Keagle

To be senior assistant therapist

Gordon S. Pocock

To be assistant therapist

Richard S. Mazzacone
Herbert R. Pruett

To be health services officer

Viola L. Cunningham

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Richard D. Grundy

To be assistant sanitary engineer

William A. Felsing, Jr.

To be senior veterinary officer

Lauri Luoto

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Juanita M. Barkley

To be senior assistant health services officer

Martha G. Barclay

III. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons

Morton G. Miller
Roger W. Schuler

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Allen Doorn
Earl F. Pierce, Jr.

To be assistant sanitary engineers

John J. Henderson
Thomas C. Tucker

To be assistant therapists

C. Douglas Billion
James L. Witt

IV. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant therapist

Richard S. Mazzacone

IN THE MARINE CORPS AND NAVY

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of colonel:

Campbell, Robert A. Prowell, James P.
Payne, John S. Peltzer, Vernon A.
Maguire, James B., Jr. Sachs, Carl A.

Hahn, Peter H.
Baughman, Lewis D.
Hay, Hardy
Dowell, Gelon H.
Maas, John B., Jr.
Teller, Robert W.
Irish, Hugh J.
Leineweber, Thomas M.

Fisher, Thell H.
Matsinger, Henry
Grady, Thomas T.
Curtis, William W.
Wolf, George P., Jr.
Hood, Webster R.
Anderson, Robert W.
Bartram, Vernon L.
Neville, Robert B.
Codrea, George
Dutton, Thomas C.
Fairburn, Robert R.
McBroom, Robert B.
Reynolds, Walter E., Jr.

Juett, James G.
Barrett, Drew J., Jr.
Cochran, Robert L.
Barrett, Charles D.
Lawrence, James F., Jr.
Ridlon, Walter J., Jr.
Bright, Cruger L.
Sims, William J.
Wolverton, George D.
Peters, Herbert A.
Walter, Howard L.
Richards, Samuel, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Miller, William T. Barber, Billy H.
Stahlstrom, Harry A. Fox, James G.
Booker, Jesse V. Stirling, Harold H., Jr.
Moore, Harry R. Dupre, Paul J.
Peevey, Nathan B., Jr. Gallagher, Burnette R.
Crapo, William M., Jr. Young, Frank R.
Gibson, John A., Jr. Reece, Josef I.
Doxey, Donald T. Davis, Stanley
Stanfield, James C. James, William C., Jr.
Ronald, Robert C. Stephenson, Lyle S.
Leland, Harry E., Jr. Ostby, John L.
McPartlin, Charles E. Yerkes, Robert W.

Victor, James E., Jr.
Limberg, Robert D. Knauf, Robert C.
Blankenship, Clifford McRobert, Perry P.
P. Turner, Byron C.
Cotton, James T. Watson, Paul B., Jr.
Sumerlin, Earl B., Jr. Allen, Robert L.
Lavoy, John H. Rupp, George R.
Ciampa, Emilius R., Jr. Bell, Robert T.
Selbert, Kenneth D. Gourley, Norman W.
Blakely, James A., Jr. Cloud, Guy M.
Gallo, James A., Jr. Biehl, William, Jr.

Page, Leslie L. Mayer, Henry
Riley, David Cordes, Alfred M.
Barney, Irvin J. Canan, Christopher M.
Poppe, Elery G. Lewis, Edward L., Jr.
Hickey, Thomas R., Jr. Campbell, Charles I.

Waltz, Herbert R. Jr.
Doty, William C., Jr. Jefferson, James M., Jr.

Kostich, Alexander
Whitaker, James L. Shields, Robert F.
Carlock, Robert O. Rinehart, James H.
Morel, Oscar J. Dove, Charles E.
Daze, Louis R. Healy, Robert M.
Gentry, Tolbert T. Smith, Leland R.
Hopkins, Donald S. Lillie, James L., Jr.
Dimond, Neil Sanders, Roger M.
Shook, Frank A., Jr. Callen, George W.
Lauer, Stewart R. Traynor, William L.
Crew, Charles E. Taylor, Richard M.
Hall, Harold K. Magon, Walter E.
Aynes, James P. Malcolm, Joseph W., Jr.

Bauman, George F. Holcombe, James V.
Doherty, John J. Perry, Jack E.
Redmond, Walter L. Garrotto, Alfred F.
Stingley, Elmo J. Davis, Dellwyn L.
Long, Edwin B. Morrison, William R.
Mackel, Edward H. Dunlap, Jack
Brandon, Lawrence H. Cox, Lewis J.
Pippin, Franklin N. Bennett, Eugene N.
Prestridge, John G.

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.
Schraver, 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, Emidio
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.
Morton, 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.
Slay, Robert D.
Fellingham, Richard J.
Clary, Matthew A., Jr.
La Spada, John F.
Barrineau, William E.
Kellogg, Wilbur C., Jr.
Mariades, James P.
Cooper, Milton B.
Holzbauer, Joseph F.
Fallon, Eugene B.
Smith, Edgar L.
Kelm, Robert M.
Pearce, James T.
Rash, Richard S.
Fenton, Donald L.
Dorsey, James A.
Edelmann, George J.
Jr.
Rowe, Carroll D.
Cline, Richard W.
Bland, Richard L.
Rooney, John J.
Fink, Gerald
Muller, Godfrey
Crew, Erskine B.

Rifle, James C.
Berger, Ernest J.
Bowen, Ralph E.
Artnak, Edward J.
Hart, Henry
Armstrong, Charles B., Jr.
Williams, Royce M.
Fornonzi, Benjamin A., Jr.
Coleman, Thomas A.
Hodde, Gordon V.
Oglesby, Edward D.
Ritter, Darrell L.
Davis, Raymond R.
Willis, Robert L.
Maloney, Emmons S.
Slaton, Clyde H., Jr.
Geissinger, Robert S.
Waskom, Wendell M.
Takala, David O.
Hinshaw, Don M.
Sienko, Walter
Urell, John
Aldworth, James
Johnston, Thomas J., Jr.
Herndon, John L.
Stien, Laurence J.
Beach, William L.
Cassidy, Earl W.
Gillis, Alexander J., Jr.
Winneberger, George L., Jr.
Maire, Gerald J.
Eldridge, William W., Jr.
Shields, John E.
Davis, Oliver R.
Moore, John T.
King, George J.
Allen, Norris D.
Huffstutter, Hardy V., Jr.
Miller, Lewis L.
Denny, Rex C., Jr.
Dykes, Kenneth T.
Hall, W. C.
Stewart, Walter C., Jr.
Sullivan, John W.
Dennis, Nicholas J.
Gould, Charles H.
Williams, Lynn F.
Albers, George H.
Smith, Jerry B.
Seabaugh, Paul W.
Zorn, Elmer J.
Snapper, John N.
O'Hara, Frank J., Jr.
Boswell, Charles E., Jr.
Ritter, Leland C.
Lovette, Lenhew E.
Stender, Bernard J.
Daniel, Walter E.
Githens, Daniel P., Jr.
Brown, Williams P.
Zitnik, Robert J.
Barden, Arnold W.
Leis, Sylvester F.
Roark, Walter N., Jr.
Mulvihill, Thomas E.
Hines, Cloyd V.
Campbell, Marshall S.
Tucker, Lud R.
McGlade, Lawrence
Voth, Stanley B.
Elder, Thomas G.
McCain, Warren E.
Stewart, Grover S., Jr.
Connell, Herschel G.
Jernigan, Curtis D.
Olsen, Willard C.
Mason, John B.
Robertson, Robert S.
Cavalero, John H.
Weaver, James R.
Walker, William L.
Bushnell, Richard H.
Foss, Donald H.
Haley, Harold L.

Whitlock, Roy B.
Hanes, John V.
Crooks, William M.
Heitzler, Joseph S.
Koster, Edward A.
Stanton, Eldon C.
Wolf, Howard
Tomlinson, Francis K., Jr.
Kuprash, George
Leon, James
Watson, William D.
Childers, Lloyd F.
Browne, John
Mixon, Herman L.
Tweed, McDonald D.
Calhoun, Loren W.
Harrell, William F.
McCormick, Herbert F.
Clark, Truman
Clarke, Thomas W.
Nelson, Joseph A.
Blanchi, Rocco D.
Hunter, Harry, Jr.
Champion, Cecil L., Jr.
DiFrank, Joseph, Jr.
Sparling, Walter E.
Hitchcock, Paul L.
Quinn, William R.
Dunwiddie, Stanley G., Jr.
Jones, Elwin M.
Bass, Julian G., Jr.
Somerville, Daniel A.
Shank, James W.
Engelhardt, Lloyd J.
Corcoran, Clement T.
White, Thomas A.
Costello, Keith W.
Goebel, Jerome L.
Kelly, William D.
Schwartz, Leo R.
Harris, William S.

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:

*Rodenberger, Wesley
H.
*Jannell, Manning T.
*Bronleewe, Loren K.
*Johnson, Irving R.
*Freitas, Joseph L., Jr.
*Ottmer, Walter E.
*Gill, John R.
*Temple, Jack W.
*Dekeyser, Charles F.
*Stout, Marvin R.
*Alberts, Howard K.
*Deeds, William E.
*Pultorak, Joseph
*Wilson, Robert R.
*Rollins, John J.
*Boll, Joseph L.
*Scheffer, Cornelius
*Moise, Frank V., Jr.
*Seaman, Milford V.
*Roe, Murray O.
*Goode, Charles L.
*Hirt, Paul L.
*Fitzmaurice, Charles P.
W.
*Moody, Richard E.
*Sparkman, Thomas B.
*Patton, Walter B.
*Goldston, Eugene V.
*Filippo, John J.
*Ramseur, Franklin F., Jr.
*Chamberlin, George E., Jr.
*Hanson, Harry B.
*Ecklund, Arthur W.
*Flegener, Kenneth G.
*Corley, Ruel H., Jr.
*Trager, Earl A., Jr.
*Roley, William H.
*Ashton, Clark
*Losse, Robert N.

Curtis, Paul F.
Gleason, Thomas E.
Vale, Sumner A.
Roeder, Horton E.
McCulloch, William L.
Blanchard, Don H.
Joens, Ray N.
Dionisopoulos, James G.
Gasser, James C.
Tope, Lyle V.
Opeka, Francis C.
Mullane, Raymond W.
Smith, Burneal E.
Gibson, George A.
Mendenhall, Herbert E.
Rainer, Mark A., Jr.
Taylor, Robert W.
Spielman, Harvey E.
Hixson, Wilmer W.
David, Maurice A.
Williams, James F.
Schick, Edwin S., Jr.
Schwenk, Adolph G.
Vickers, Earl K., Jr.
Matthews, Lyle B., Jr.
Blue, Miller M.
Mample, Richard H.
Affleck, William R., Jr.
Crompton, Wallace W.
Zeugner, Robert
Odenhal, Joseph T.
Hess, Theodore D.
Horgan, Thomas J., Jr.
Snell, Albert W.
Bailey, Almarion S.
Wydner, Charles E., Jr.
Farmer, Chester V.
Evans, Daniel R.
Lanagan, William H., Jr.
Poage, Jay V.
Watterson, Donald E.

*Ludden, Charles H.
*Flynn, John P., Jr.
*Johnson, Danny W.
*McGee, James M.
*Street, Lewis C., III
*Boyle, Patrick D.
*Latta, Arthur W., Jr.
*Lynch, Duane G.
*Furimsky, Steve, Jr.
*Bowen, Ernel D.
*Murray, Edward D.
*Silverthorn, Russell L.
*Slack, Arthur B., Jr.
*Lucas, Burton L., Jr.
*Sherwood, James M.
*Cosgrove, William P.
*Kranice, Francis R.
*Brigham, George A.
*Graf, David P.
*Peterson, Richard F.
*Dayson, Patrick J.
*O'Callaghan, Thomas P.
*Ezell, Don D.
*Barber, Stewart C.
*Mildner, Theodore J.
*Lafond, Paul D.
*Koehnlein, William F.
*Judd, Amo F.
*Sartor, Louis J.
*Smith, George H.
*Alford, Bennett W.
*Kelly, Joseph J.
*Brandel, Ralph E.
*Ladutko, John
*McGlynn, Raymond J.
*Green, Carleton M.
*Janiszewski, George
*Reeder, James H.
*Ingram, Alfred L. V.

*DeBarr, John R.
*Kirchmann, Charles S.
*Bland, Kenneth R.
*Webb, James O.
*Ettenborough, Robert B.
*Shea, William E.
*Wadsworth, Thomas B.
*Webb, Marshall A., Jr.
*Daskalakis, John A.
*See, Charles M.
*Shuford, Robert L.
*Metzger, Theodore E.
*Platt, Robert M.
*Burke, Thomas W.
*Barrett, James B.
*Schwartz, John L.
*Kelly, William D.
*Girard, David D.
*Cuneo, John E.
Hill, Franklin A.
Kluckman, Wilson A.
Weizenegger, James A.
Chapman, Fred D.
Kearns, Timothy J.
Timme, William G.
Pickett, Philip G.
Schening, Richard J.
Primrose, Richard A.
Misiewicz, John
Hewlett, Marvin M.
Kritter, Eugene J., Jr.
Palatas, Michael V.
Funderburk, Ray
Zaudtke, Wilbur K.
Young, Robert E.
Lorence, Herbert M.
Graeber, William G.
Cooke, Morris D.
Fenton, Clayton C.
Uskurait, Robert H.
Condra, James E.
Demas, John G.
Roland, Harold E., Jr.
Harris, Frank W., III
Rice, Knowlton P.
Vuilleumot, Floyd L.
McCraith, James K.
Haigwood, Paul B.
Herod, Jack
Noble, Richard F.
Paris, Euclid P.
Calvert, Robert W.
Nesbitt, Cleon E.
DeNormandie, Frank R.
Taves, Alfred C.
Keller, Gene S.
Ammer, Henry G.
Fischer, Henry, Jr.
Smith, William L.
Benskin, George H., Jr.
Johnson, Tracy N.
LaRouche, Charles R.
Chambers, Franklin R.
Hoff, Frank X.
Wallace, Charles M., Jr.
McMahon, Clare R.
Lynk, Edward H. P.
Reid, James H., Jr.
Rodney, Glenn W.
Westphall, Howard A.
Butler, Jack H.
Boyd, Clarence W., Jr.
Judge, Clark V.
Burroughs, Charles R.
Mills, Neil B.
Edwards, Paul M.

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:

*Sasser, Ruthledge S.
*Darnell, James B.
*Knack, Frederick J.
*Shuman, William H.

Rose, Maurice
Poillon, Arthur J.
James, Curtis A., Jr.
Humphreys, Richard D.
Sullivan, Charles H.
Hendricks, Clayton V.
Thomas, Robert J.
Dahl, Clarence G.
Smith, Richard E.
Kiser, Harrol
VanCantfort, Rollin F.
Parsons, Harold L.
Rieder, Alvin R.
Goss, Joseph A.
Randolph, Richard J., Jr.
Spaulding, Jack D.
McNaughton, George C.
Young, Robert F., Jr.
Harris, Howard H.
Easter, Edward V.
Boles, Jack F.
White, Jack D.
Barrett, Roscoe L., Jr.
Fagan, William S.
Phillips, Jack B.
Bey, Robert T.
Keyes, Edward B., Jr.
Hunter, Clyde W.
Bailes, Lonnie P.
Kerrigan, William E.
McLennan, Kenneth
Linn, Joseph W.
Olson, Fredric O.
Holt, Thomas J.
Valdes, Edmund
Good, George F., III
Reid, Ernest R., Jr.
Shepherd, Lemuel C., III
Gover, Robert L., Jr.
Babe, George A.
Koler, Joseph, Jr.
Bradley, Lawrence J.
Shanahan, Thomas C.
VomOrde, Ewald A., Jr.
Foyle, Robert A.
VanZuyen, William M.
Lerond, Jack M.
Hall, Donald L.
Munn, Charles R., Jr.
Heffernan, Neal E.
DeLong, Earl R.
Snyder, Joris J.
Miniclier, John F.
Langley, Charles F.
Barde, Robert E.
Anderson, Robert V.
Robinson, Dayton, Jr.
Bennett, Nalton M.
Stavridis, Paul G.
Barr, John F., Jr.
Palmer, Kenny C.
O'Connell, John P.
Redman, Charles B.
Perrich, Robert J.
Carpenter, Stanley H.
Rodes, Nye G., Jr.
Sloan, James A.
Savage, Richard A.
Weiler, Paul
Middleton, Austin B., Jr.
Brier, George R.
Spark, Michael M.
Parnell, Edward A.
Heinemann, Hermann
Curwen, Bertram H., Jr.

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:

*Sustad, Jeanette I.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Rodes, Nye G., Jr.
Rapp, David A.
Sloan, James A.
Walker, William T.
Coffman, Raymond P.
Jr.
Wilson, Robert H.
Eastman, Robert E.
Edwards, Roy J.
McGrall, Arthur F., Jr.
Savage, Richard A.
Woodruff, Paden E., Jr.
Ives, Merton R.
Weller, Paul
Peabody, Clifford J.
Eagle, Joseph N.
Middleton, Austin B.
Jr.
Hunter, Daniel B.
Brier, George R.
Rogers, Harry L., Jr.
Hall, William D.
Markham, Edward J.
Jr.
Spark, Michael M.
Richards, Wayne E.
Meyer, Edward B.
Parrott, Robert E.
Arford, Jack O.
Parnell, Edward A.
Heinemann, Hermann
Swanda, Donald F.
Plaskett, William, Jr.
Green, Thomas N.
Schimmenti, Joseph A.
McCarthy, Stewart B., Jr.
Dowlearn, Donald W.
Steinway, Robert A.
Dicus, William A., Jr.
Ziegler, Leland E.
Curwen, Bertram H., Jr.
Norfolk, Ira P.
Hanifin, Robert T., Jr.
Mazucca, Paul, Jr.
Hecker, James S.
Segner, Donald R.
Whitebread, Robert C.
Reed, Jack L.
Schreier, William J.
White, William J.
Miller, Robert T.
Bousquet, Arthur R.
New, Noah C.
Pytko, Albert R.
Lillich, Gerald L.
Tooker, Donald K.
Morgan, James L.
Drury, John W.
Fredericks, Harold D.
Morrison, Karl D.
Davis, William J.
Dawson, Thomas E.
Fox, George C.
Hunt, Forest J.
Shutler, Philip D.
Izzo, Robert E.
Galbraith, Thomas H.
Arkland, Ezra H.
Jesse, William L.
Kliefoth, George C.
Messina, Anthony V.
Belbusti, Albert F.
Timmes, Edward A.
Simpson, Parks H.
Steed, Robert E.
Buck, John
Pietl, Jerome N.
Walsh, John J.
Henry, Kenneth W.

Tardif, Donald W.
Lucy, Robert M.
Snow, Melvin W.
Crowley, Richard W.
Waldrop, Floyd H.
Cottran, Charles A.
Vernon, Thomas E.
Harris, Jack W.
Bunnell, Charles F., Jr.
Pearson, Martin
Holt, Edward Y., Jr.
Evans, Donald L., Jr.
Murphree, Thomas E.
Flores, James R.
Jaworski, Edmund W.
Puckett, Eugene R.
Petska, Jack J.
Westerman, Jack
Schneeman, Charles J., Jr.
Young, Edwin M.
Zorack, John L.
Lenfer, Guenther W.
Durning, Robert H.
Cohoon, Jack A.
Rice, Kenneth E.
Hill, Robert E.
Davis, Ernest K.
Carper, Esten C., Jr.
Uffelman, Paul R.
Vosmik, Joseph M.
Chiappetti, Donald A.
Brady, Byron F.
Marousek, Lawrence A.
Buckson, John M.
Mooney, Arthur R.
Caridakis, George
Marlowe, William H.
Gardner, Marvin D.
Cummings, Brian J.
Cowling, David R.
Purdum, Frederick K.
Masterpool, William J.
Blank, Howard G.
Erickson, Loren T.
Young, James R.
Post, Robert J.
Smith, Robert N.
Hess, John J.
Worster, Lyle H.
DuCharm, Roy M.
Bush, Clayton O.
Marks, Billy C.
Damm, Raymond C.
Cashion, Dana B.
Howland, Willis T.
Arkadis, Nicholas D.
VanCleve, Roy R.
Clifton, William R.
Murphy, Edward S.
Roeder, Raymond E., Jr.
Johnson, Richard M.
Hopkins, Frederick W.
Sivert, Patrick G.
Hittinger, Francis R., Jr.
Smith, Edward E.
Garm, Philip J.
Trapnell, Nicholas M., Jr.
Deptula, Edwin A.
Thompson, Carl B., Jr.
Swords, John J.
McCloskey, Donald V.
Sullivan, Ralph E.
Paradis, Eugene J.
Newsom, Rolfie D.
Hudson, Floyd G.
Counselman, John D.
Christolos, John N.

O'Keefe, Keith
Edler, William S.
Harrell, James E.
Kavakich, Nicholas
Rudzis, Edwin M.
Stemple, James W.
Snelling, Edward W.
Moore, Ben A., Jr.
Muir, Joseph E.
Ruggiero, Alexander
S.
Schryver, Hugh C., Jr.
Gastrock, Joseph K.
III
Crocker, William G.
Hanlon, Edmund W.
Stewart, Gerald H.
Morrow, Richard C.
McAlee, George E.
Kleess, George J.
Fields, Paul R.
Covert, Bert R., Jr.
O'Connell, James P.
Sigmon, Emmett B.
Jr.
Brimmer, Donald R.
Marchette, Donald E.
Sharon, Donald W.
Jones, Donald R.
Stuart, Vaughn R.
Cahill, John J. H.
Gallman, James R.
Jr.
Phelps, Laurence M.
Jr.
Alderman, Harry L.
Werner, Robert F.
Fly, Jerry D.
Wirth, LeRoy K.
Dickey, Robert R., III
Collins, Edward E.
Brown, Travis D.
Kenyon, Joris F.
Nolan, Jack L.
Carey, Richard E.
Hall, Edward C., Jr.
Sisson, Donald D.
Coffman, Harold L.
Utter, Leon N.
McPoland, Edmund C.
King, Ethmer W.
Aitken, Hugh S.
Adams, Nate L., II
Scott, Kenneth M.
Doezema, Richard M.
Reames, John A.
Pollock, Edwin A., Jr.
Duncan, Edward F.
Starek, Robert H.
Morris, Edward C.
Sevillian, Robert C.
Hermes, Jack M.
Cunliffe, Bruce F.
Kelley, David D., Jr.
Eddy, Roger I.
Newton, Minard P., Jr.
Williams, Kenneth C.
Degernes, Mayhlon L., Jr.
Glasgow, Joseph M.
Strauley, Wesley E.
Hetrick, Lawrence W.
McCarthy, R. Michael
Gibson, Tom L.
McClure, Mack R.
Eason, Raymond S.
Salvo, Victor A.
Heyer, Wallace A.
Allen, Merle W.
Jenkins, Morris N.
Mason, Ronald A.
Zimmerman, Cullen C.
Winter, Robert M.
Balzer, George T.
Roe, Patrick C.
Brown, Dale L.
Wayerski, Joseph R., Jr.
Andersen, Frank R.
Tief, Francis W.

Cooney, Orville D.
Yerger, William P.
Holmes, Page H.
Finney, Henry F.
Doster, Grover C., Jr.
Cole, Doyle H.
Siegfried, William G., Sr.
Engesser, Robert B.
Volney, Frank, Jr.
Lundin, Herbert V.
Mooney, Thomas G.
Seaman, James B.
Baxter, John E.
Campbell, William W.
Bahner, Robert H.
Osserman, Stanley J.
Cory, Orie E.
Geddes, David G.
Shortsleeves, Vernon C.
Fuller, George E.
Troxler, George W.
Schoenberger, Leonard
Kelly, Hercules R., Jr.
Vogt, Timothy S.
Smith, George W.
Skvaril, Warren J.
Gunning, Thomas I.
Taft, Leonard C.
Kapetan, Nick J.
MacLean, James H.
Ashley, Maurice C., Jr.
Taylor, Robert W.
Needham, Robert C.
Jackson, Mallett C., Jr.
Miller, John H.
Nolan, Harry J.
Pearl, Roger W., Jr.
Sherman, Warren C.
Wentworth, William
Johnson, John M., Jr.
Barrie, Raymond L., Jr.
Malden, Robert F.
Francis, Richard H.
Saunders, William F., Jr.
Brown, Ralph H.
Reissner, Pierre D., Jr.
Tubbs, Henry W., Jr.
Dawe, Harold L., Jr.
Kennington, Charles R., Jr.
Schwieck, Kenneth W.
Hall, Wayne L.
McElroy, Robert L.
Lubka, Basile
Sturgell, Charles B.
Jones, Charles M. C., Jr.
Hunt, Robert G., Jr.
Gober, James R.
Hatch, Harold A.
Sparks, William F.
White, Thomas B., Jr.
Roberts, Dwight E.
Briden, Derrell C.
Parsons, Tom D.
Hayward, George E.
Henzel, Hans W.
Sheppe, Richard W.
Lindell, Alan M.
Deen, Thomas J., Jr.
Conroy, John F.
Merrill, Willard D.
Taylor, Joseph Z.
Hoover, Miles M., Jr.
Scruggs, Robert L.
Turner, Kenneth E.
Hoppe, Henry, III
Ringwood, Thomas E., Jr.
Wilson, James S.
Speckart, Eugene O.
Devine, Lewis H.
West, Richard H.
Opfar, Charles H., Jr.
Killeen, Calhoun J.
Lockhart, Robert L.

Schled, John P.
Heppert, John R.
Riegert, Theophil P.
Troen, Luther G.
Gagne, Walter A., Jr.
Cook, Andrew B.
Belden, John G.
Bassett, William D., Jr.
Commiskey, Henry A., Sr.
Carver, Ivil L.
Anderson, Tilton A.
Snipes, Thomas G.
Woods, Harry D.
Haynes, George A. P.
Beard, Wendell O.
Whiting, Charles S.
Lawrence, Randlett T.
Jarman, Charles V.
Englehart, Samuel E.

Wall, Theodore R.
Waller, Littleton W. T., II
Merritt, Max A.
Townsend, Jack E.
Karukin, David S.
Ogilvie, Bruce C.
Musgrove, Edgar F.
Haggerty, John W., III
Miller, Richard R.
Eyer, Clyde L.
Harris, Allen S.
Magness, Byron L.
McCarthy, John F., Jr.
Grabowsky, Fred
Smith, Albert C., Jr.
Dickson, John R.
Petersen, Willard S.
Greenstone, John R.
Eykyn, Richard G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Schauppner, Ernest
G.
*Annas, Themistocles
T.
*Thompson, William
A.
*Jordan, Branch
*Shippin, William D.
*Farley, William F.
*Epps, Thomas B., Sr.
*Start, Raymond J.
*Dillon, Jimmie L.
*Gelster, Herbert H.
*Lindenmuth, Donald
L.
*Poorman, Donald W.
*St. Germain, Donald
C.
*Johnson, Joe L.
*Wilson, Charles W.
*Vugteveen, Harold L.
*Seissiger, John E.
*Thornton, Dale
*Elstner, Earl T.
*Knapp, Charles W.
*McIntyre, Philip G.
*Koethe, Frank R.
*Rehbus, James R. A.
*Hill, Billy J.
*Smola, John K.
*Burin, Michael
*Walker, Phillip C.
*Winfield, Charles R.
*Glancy, Robert F.
*Ford, Charles T.
*Visage, Billy F.
*Seymour, Rufus A.
*Costello, Frank P., Jr.
*Baker, Charles E.
*Eckmann, Ronald P.
*Cook, Gorton C.
*Donnelly, Thomas E.
*McCaffrey, Joseph J.
*Barth, Olav
*Coleman, Joseph E., Jr.
*Allison, James O.
*Newmark, Charles C.
*Rilling, Fred C., Jr.
*Farnsworth, Francis
W., Jr.
*Colleton, Francis X.
*Wright, Herbert L.
*Iverson, Rhonald D.
*Welland, Joseph K.
*Haggard, Robert G.
*Johnson, Lee R.
*Wills, Daniel
*Kaasmann, Bernard
A.
*Diamond, Donald L.
*Barrett, Richard C.
*Cahill, Edward D., Jr.

*Smith, Richard B., Jr.
*Johnson, Robert C.
*Wickham, John C.
*Plauche, Brockman
L.
*Lee, Kurt C. E.
Hoffman, Olin V., Jr.
Vanderswag, Irwin J.
Ferguson, Robert W.
Hannan, James E.
Krieger, Roy E.
Gutheinz, Joseph R.
Walsh, Ronald L.
Day, John R.
Williams, Kenneth W.
Buckon, William E.
Carroll, John T.
Maher, James E., Jr.
Patrick, Victor E.
Day, Warren H., Jr.
Henn, Howard R.
Steele, Raymond B.
Hollingshead, John S.
Bolles, Rudolph W.
Price, Joseph V.
Vaught, Richard H.
Hyslop, Kenneth D.
McKee, Roland D.
Gray, Alfred M., Jr.
Buckman, John G.
Roberts, Stanley G., Jr.
Farrington, Norman
C., Jr.
Enoch, John T.
Kern, Richard J.
Burritt, Richard R.
Shinbaum, Marvin S.
Allen, Terence M.
Ward, Guy W.
Hoffner, Charles W.
Guay, Gerald F.
Oden, Thomas S.
Wilson, George M.
Huguenin, Sidney A., Jr.
Bell, Ray H.
Lyons, Robert J.
Sanford, Dale W.
Romano, Carlo
Bonsall, William O.
Haight, William P.
Gaut, Donald L.
MacInnis, Joseph A.
Anderson, William D.
Albers, Vincent A.
Holmes, Lee M.
Fortmeyer, Raymond
D.
Froncek, Richard A.
Bergmann, Henry C.
Metzko, John J.
Fulham, Donald J.
Helsel, James F.

Reedy, Thomas M.
Lindell, Clifford A.
Bodnar, Nicholas K.
Wagner, Douglas A.
Crist, George B.
Williams, Justin, Jr.
Ripley, George H.
Weinert, Frederick R.
Moody, Ralph F.
Ammentorp, Warren L.
Critz, Richard L.
Gregory, Rawley M.
Gipson, Sam M., Jr.
Hyndman, Gerald H.
Gray, D'Wayne
Bailey, Earl W.
Crews, Eugene E.
Fisher, Lawrence W.
Herbert, Clayton G., Jr.
Scott, John A.
Coulter, Richard W.
Macy, William T.
Reich, Nathaniel N.
Stanley, John R.
Roche, John F., III
Rochford, Edward J., Jr.
Gaffen, Malcolm C.
Snell, Bradley S.
Runkle, Harry M.
Shoults, Eugene E.
Folsom, Charles A.
McManus, Walter J.
Butler, Owen J.
Mullen, Arthur L., Jr.
Shanahan, James L.
Hefty, Milton T.
Faulk, Samuel G.
Tribe, Stanley G., Jr.
Keeling, Harold J.
Brown, Thomas S.
Berg, Donald R.
Bowser, James R., Jr.
Gould, John F., Jr.
Goggins, Thomas P.
Perea, Horacio E.
Gustitis, Bernard V.
Andrillunas, Francis
Riley, William E., Jr.
Hutter, Harold H. J.
Hennegan, Joseph E.
Luley, Ronald E.
Otteraaen, Robert M.
Gray, Thomas F.
Aspinwall, Glen S.
Knobel, William H.
Buran, Philip F.
Johnson, Oliver K., Jr.
Oliver, Joseph H., Jr.
Phillips, Rhys J., Jr.
Spence, Allan J.
Sautter, Melvin H.
Polakoff, Gerald H.
Smith, Robert H.
Bethel, William F.
McMillan, David R., Jr.
Manning, Martin F.
Lindsay, Prentice A.
Rogers, William W.
Olney, Herbert F.
Dunwell, Ronald P.
Morgan, Thomas R.
Roberts, William C., Jr.
McCamey, Robert E.
II
Gibson, Charles R.
Gentle, Vincent J.
Click, James C.
Daley, Richard F.
Lutz, Theodore J., Jr.
Edebohls, Hans G.
Henry, Charles W. J.
Kummerow, Ray G.
Litzenberg, Homer L.
III
Wilson, William C.
Plummer, James R.
Price, Kenneth R.
Allen, Albert N.

Colby, Dwain A.
Kansler, Raymond H.
Taylor, Harry E.
Geiger, William J.
Budd, Talman C., II
Ruthazer, Warren C.
German, Paul K., Jr.
First, Ralph D.
Olds, James H.
Brewster, Albert E., Jr.
Taber, Richard D.
Lawler, George P.
Morrill, David W.
Neilson, Roger B.
Kyle, John S.
Rudolph, William E.
Lonergan, Harold S.
Townsend, Edward J.
Berke, Duwain E.
Parker, Evan L., Jr.
Olsen, Herbert F.
Hall, Bobby R.
Culligan, Thomas M.
Klinedinst, James C.
Gunther, Donald E.
Alexander, Dan C.
McInnis, Robert W.
Bailey, Garnett R.
Malmgren, Everett L.
King, James P.
Elmwood, Robert E.
Griffin, Thomas L., Jr.
Gagliardo, Joseph P., Jr.
Shilan, Arthur B.
Chapell, Donald R.
Johnson, Edward C.
Braddon, John R.
Flynn, John J.
Milbrad, Robert L.
Heath, Francis J., Jr.
Zeigler, Lewis I.
Hayden, William K., III
Enderle, Rodolfo R.
Campbell, Laurence A., III
Bengele, Charles M., Jr.
Bowron, Walter F.
Hallisey, William J., Jr.
Bancroft, John V.
Weir, Kenneth W.
Crist, Raymond F., III
Huerta, Genaro
Gillick, Richard O.
Dean, John M.
Blanton, Harold L., Jr.
Morgenthaler, Wendell F. C., Jr.
McCandless, John R.
Danielson, Darrell C.
Pirhalla, Paul P.
Laning, Edward A.
Slee, Don J.
Jones, Vernon E.
Fontenot, Karl J., Jr.
Saul, Jacques L.
Cottom, John W.
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.
Cash, Richard A.
Thomas, Spencer F.
Christopherson, James W.
Borjesson, Stanley G.
Hofstetter, Robert E.
Field, Wells L., III
Huerlimann, Ernest A., Jr.

Lavigne, Arthur W. J.
Graham, Edward T., Jr.
McLane, Donald C., Jr.
Steinberg, Melvin J.
Jones, Robert I.
Johnston, Paul M.
Dorman, John F.
Munson, James D.
Thompson, Alva F., Jr.
Davis, Jack W.
Gale, John R.
Bucher, William E.
Mickle, Don A.
Andrus, Kermit W.
Drovedahl, Robert
O'Brien, John A.
Kuci, Richard A.
Harris, John B.
O'Brien, William J.
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.
Cox, John V.
Johnson, Floyd J., Jr.
Fibich, Michael J., Jr.
Moser, Charles F.
Morris, Wilbur J.
St. Amour, Paul A. A.
*Willis, Maxey A.
*Craumer, Luther C.
*Lloyd, Paul V.
*McCormick, Charles A., Jr.
*Holliday, John H.
*Johansen, Carl, Jr.
*Wilkinson, DeRonda A.
McKonly, Norman E.
Yeater, Otto L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Seal, Cecil O.
*Newman, Jack W.
*Amick, Donald D.
*Layman, Daniel F.
*Graham, James H.
*Palonis, Anthony J.
*Anderson, James L.
*Baker, Jesse G.
*Luttge, William G.
*Skinner, Richard F.
*Gidley, Ross E.
*Dubois, John H.

*Greibenstein, Edward E., Jr.
*Parker, Roy I.
*Ridgway, George A.
*Day, Leslie P.
*Ratigan, James W.
*Matson, Kenneth S.
*White, John L.
*Vuckovich, Joe
*Baker, Thomas
*Mullen, Joseph E., Jr.

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:

*Watson, Patricia A.
*Hayes, Theresa M.
*Ray, Irene L.

*Halvorsen, Marie J.
*Moroney, Ellen B.
*Wrenn, Jenny

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Sieger, Joseph, Jr.
Viera, Daniel J.
Howard, John G.
Terrell, Daniel E., Jr.
Schmidt, Laveen D.
Damone, William F.
Marting, Henry A.
Babski, Bruce S.
Jerrill, James D.
Fischer, Robert W.
Tyson, Charles J., III
Cooper, Robert M.
Brackett, Richard C.
Rocha, Thomas, Jr.
Colbert, Arthur B.
Stice, Ray B.
Fry, Robert L.
Milligan, James F.
Fortie, Ralph
Dewell, Jack L.
Brause, Bernard B., Jr.
Chaney, Guy R.
Poster, Roger D.

Wheelock, Richard J.
Cretney, Warren G.
Jackson, Harold L., Jr.
Martinelli, Joseph W.
Kutchmarek, Jene R.
Alchroth, Donald T.
Andersen, James V.
Ernst, Vincent M., Jr.
Lee, Richard P.
Mead, John E.
Blakeman, Wyman U.
Stewart, Ray N.
Brandon, Virgil B.
Beaver, Carl J.
Hubner, John
Warn, Lloyd K.
Lavelle, John B.
Micheels, Herman M.
Wright, Frank H.
Shea, Speed F.
Kron, Ronald W.
Overturf, Charles D.
Svoboda, Theodore D.

McDonald, Oliver G.
Johnson, Victor J., Jr.
Prather, James E., Jr.
Teichmann, David A.
Latall, Raymond F.
McBride, James P.
Peck, Matthew B., Jr.
Moriarty, James M.
Sherman, James R.
Redman, Carroll G.
Gebson, Clarence U.
McCaughy, Douglas A., Jr.
Gascoigne, Donald G.
D'Angelo, Samuel E., III
Leipold, Robert D.
Lovell, Earl F.
MacDonald, George N.
Ross, William H., Jr.
Brown, Rangeley A.
Keck, Louis K.
Taylor, Hosea E., Jr.
Herber, John A.
Patterson, Frederick D., Jr.
Black, Charles H.
Edwards, Raymond W.
Marosek, Joseph E.
Collier, James G.
Ladd, Bobby T.
Bell, Roy L.
Coombe, Donald E.
Block, William E.
Murray, Michael P.
Miller, Clarence B., Jr.
Hubbard, William D.
Gipson, Thomas J., Jr.
Williams, Donald G.
Knowles, Charles H.
Doser, Joseph G.
Timmons, Dwight R., Jr.
Shirley, Joe W.
Carson, William G., Jr.
Reese, Clifford E.
Dereng, Chester P.
Snyder, Robert L.
Ledet, Rodney H.
Reisinger, Frederick J.
Mundell, Wilbur L.
Ghubilato, John J.
Wojcik, Donald
Lang, Richard H.
Schaefer, Donald A.
Larson, Eddis R.
Hughes, Ralph L.
Daniels, Claude M.
Wilcox, Kenneth H.
Warner, James W.
Moore, Thomas R.
McCarthy, John J.
Creighton, Robert W.
Farley, Bob W.
Waunch, Donald S.
Garrison, Marvin T., Jr.
Peterka, Bert W.
Summers, Bennie W.
Gillon, Robert A.
Reichert, John P.
Forbes, David T., Jr.
Markwitz, Leonard R.
Heim, Donald C.
Wells, James A., Jr.
Gowdy, Richard J.
Jorgenson, Conrad A.
Hertberg, Edward C.
Toyeas, George E.
Herther, Herbert M.
Clayson, Holly
Gallagher, Gerald F.
Mura, Michael
Sypniewski, William A.
Donnelly, Joseph A.
VanManen, Charles M.
Fillmore, Walter D.
Boalch, Dennis F.
Jaross, James
Cummins, Billy R.
Wise, Robert C.

Bishop, Daniel G.
Saxton, Patrick J.
Grattan, Roland N.
Hedrick, Joseph C.
Bridges, Robert L.
Dinnage, Merritt W.
Smith, Harry E., Jr.
Murphy, Dennis J.
Hopkins, Joseph E.
Haskins, Jack
McGuire, William D.
Gardner, Grady V.
Frey, Francis X.
Cochran, James R. W.
Martin, Gene H.
Collins, John J.
Stapleton, Cleo P., Jr.
Redelfs, John E.
Archbold, John C.
Earles, Marcie J.
Keller, Donald E.
Quigley, Richard B.
Turner, Leon B.
Riney, Francis
Ritts, Robert O.
Andrews, Rol E.
Pierce, Edward R.
Fuetterer, Paul W.
Cote, Normand A.
Stark, Alfred E.
Chinner, John W.
Deutschlander, Herman C.
Crowley, James A.
Ledbetter, Walter R., Jr.
Roder, Henry W.
Jones, Thomas W.
Beach, Richard J.
Ritchie, Richard G.
Begnaud, Pierre H.
Buschhaus, Ernest W.
Weatherford, Edwin G.
Bustos, Robert G.
Crandell, John E.
Ryan, Patrick J.
Kent, Gary D.
Dewey, Henry C.
DeLaughter, Carl W., Jr.
Burt, Wayne F.
Gasparine, Louis, Jr.
Armstrong, Richard F.
Rosenthal, Joseph S.
Goller, Winston O.
Godby, Lawrence J.
Carroll, Daniel I.
Draayer, Lloyd J.
Stephens, Arthur C., Jr.
McKenna, George X.
Ryder, James N.
Rubrecht, William W.
Kress, Herbert W.
Coit, Francis E.
Forhan, James F.
Thompson, Milton G.
Reid, Robert D.
Bergstrom, Carl F., Jr.
Anderson, Arthur R., Jr.
Dillow, Walter R.
Cornish, John F., Jr.
Proctor, Ralph D.
Todd, Larrance M.
Stendahl, Walter R., Jr.
Clewes, John E.
Dunn, Russell M., Jr.
Wieland, Richard A.
Medina, Thomas J.
Riddell, William R., Jr.
Norton, Jerome L.
Blanc, Richard J.
Bond, Henry J.
Murphy, Edmond J.
Lottsfeldt, Peter F.
Dunn, John D.
Fogo, Wallace E.
Pierce, James D.
Boozman, Paul G.

Furstenberg, Lawrence Peterson, Perry M.
Rowe, Donald L. Lytle, Dan J. C.
Snider, Howard L. Henderson, Ted R.
Charlton, Albert K. MacPherson, Robert T.
Smith, Donald G. Williams, Clifton C., Jr.
Prather, Richard L. Townsend, Thomas A.
Dean, Clyde D. Matthews, Frederick A.
Carr, Gerald P. Jones, Robert C.
McKinstry, William E. Lukeman, Anthony
Sanford, Glen Self, William R. Lacey, Fred E., Jr.
Bradshaw, Harvey D. Spreitzer, Richard L.
Kirby, Robert W. Friedrichs, Phillip B.
Stephens, Willard M. Badeker, Roger W.
Jones, Paul R., Jr. Carlson, Gary L.
Slepicka, Alois A. Stratford, William K.
Spencer, Noel W., Jr. Ready, Bobby J.
Barstow, Charles A. Hamlin, Thomas M.
Smith, Lloyd W., Jr. Hagerty, Roger C.
Gannan, Henry R., Jr. Coleman, Ellsworth P.
Egan, Martin J., Jr. Belt, James L.
Harrison, Jerry M.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Stingley, Patrick R. *Acott, Richard D.
*Piel, Mervin A. *Ades, Robert E., III
*Psaros, George C. *Esdrensen, Danny A.
*Black, Harry *Henry, Norman E.
*Simon, Clyde C. *Legge, John B.
*Albro, Raymond C., Jr. *Hansston, Jack F.
*Lecky, Timothy B. *Neal, Robert G., Jr.
*Linnemann, John A. *Huebner, Anthony C.
*Rogers, Jack J. *Martin, Robert J.
*Booher, Robert B. *Blackington, Robert C., Jr.
*Doran, Robert R. *Griggs, William J., Jr.
*Reynolds, Charles A. *Reynolds, Angus S., Jr.
*Lasseter, Lee T. *Gerard, Charles G.
*Conley, Charles K. *Salas, Francisco U.
*Hoar, Joseph P. *Hammack, Tommy R.
*James, Robert L. *Murray, James W.
*Haupt, Hans S. *Powell, Ferrell F., Jr.
*Kiene, Christian F. *Gleason, Richard E.
*English, John P. *McIntyre, Melvin J.
*McCrindle, Ronald B. *McNally, Paul F.
*Ramzel, David R. *Dunn, John L.
*Dunn, John L. *Embry, John P. J.
*McMahon, Bernard *Laughlin, William S., Jr.
*Brooks, Robert P. *Walsh, Gerald E.
*Marada, Joseph P. *Hart, George R.
*Slater, John P. *Bottesch, Terrence M.
*Wells, Richard C. *Lewis, Robert D.
*Treadwell, Russell P. *Hoffman, Richard L.
*Millice, Kenneth P., Jr. *Davis, Jay M., Jr.
*Squillace, Gaetano F. *Moore, Royal N., Jr.
*Horner, William H., Jr. *Makeever, Harrison A.
*Fassler, Gerald D. *Payton, Luther L., Jr.
*Lessard, Paul F. *Amick, Lewie E., Jr.
*Angus, Thomas P. *Poore, Horace
*Mann, Elliot F. *Gailey, Lloyd E.
*Redding, William P., Jr. *Pederson, Richard J.
*Bates, William S. *James, Joseph L.
*Tardy, James S. *Thien, Robert L.
*Revell, Joseph E. *York, Everett E.
*Hughes, Laurice M. *Roman, Donald J.
*McSweeney, Harold R. *Kynion, Kaye M.
*Pyne, Richard S. *Arnold, Curtis G.
*Gardner, George L. *Cook, Ernest T., Jr.
*Johansen, Peter J. *Weir, Charles J.
*Finstahl, Vernon E. *Cooper, Harlan C., Jr.
*Blaul, Daniel J. *Overmyer, Robert F.
*Hagan, James T., III *Lovell, John H., II
*Wheeler, Eugene L. *Rigg, Richard J.
*Fagerskog, Henry D. *Duffy, Patrick E.
*Chererson, Robert S. *McLaughlin, George D., Jr.
*Palmer, Billy J. *Gardner, Benjamin W.
*Johnson, Gerald L. *Sisley, Frederick E.
*Solon, John M. *Shaw, Phillip E.
*McGaw, William A., Jr. *Catoe, Christopher
*Nielsen, Daniel F. M., Jr. *Czerwinski, John J.
*Jones, Arthur L., III *Shuman, William D.
*Barnsley, William C. *Summerlin, Billy M.
*Hester, Charles E. *Kieselbach, Philip J.
*Marshall, William H.

*Rivella, Hernon J. *Wood, David V.
*Drury, Michael C. *Dominguez, Marino T.
*Burnette, Robert D. *Taffe, Henry W.
*Morris, Calvin M. *Stevens, John D.
*Davis, William G. *Chase, William E.
*Collison, Walter N., Jr. *Daugherty, Charles L., Jr.
*Sutton, Verl D. *Cox, George F.
*Howell, Gordon E. *Baldwin, William S.
*Lindauer, Jerry D. *Juddkins, Paul G.
*Curl, James R. *Browne, Edward R.
*Rebstock, Werner F. *Wakefield, Robert H.
*Tiffany, Russell B. *Phenegar, Wesley R., Jr.
*Taylor, Madison L. *Foster, Edward B.
*Welty, Michael F. *Prewitt, Robert C.
*Floyd, William C. *McElroy, Theodore R.
*Sullivan, Louis *Bowman, Bruce B.
*Smartz, Joseph J. *Stevenson, Samuel H.
*Ledeboer, Willis D. *Hoevar, Francis A.
*Hocevar, Francis A. *Ross, James W.
*Ross, James W. *Switzer, Merrill A., Jr.
*Scialdone, Frank, Jr. *Seed, Richard J., III
*Jersey, David E. *Stremow, George J.
*Mokler, Edward M. *Ayers, James W.
*Thompson, Daryl W. *Read, Harold D.
*Osmondson, Eugene L.
*Paganelli, John J. *Ruane, Joseph D.
*O'Brien, Richard V., Jr. *Leonard, William H.
*Foti, Joseph G. *Lemon, Douglas W.
*Miller, Earl J. *Stewart, Douglas P.
*Appazzato, Ralph J. *Alford, Donald F.
*Hughes, Richard D. *Walters, William H.
*Ross, David L. *Carlton, Richard L.
*Bailey, Gene E. *Grubbs, Wendell O.
*Ondrick, Robert M. *Simpson, Patrick S.
*Caton, James R. *Meissner, Howard W.
*Turner, James D. *Lewis, Floyd C.
*DeMartino, Pasquale W.
*Knight, James R. *Chaimson, Ross C.
*McDonough, Michael R.
*Reed, Robert W. *Miller, Donald E. P.
*Ditto, John H. *Warfield, Harry R.
*Abney, Robert D. *Alexander, Charles R.
*Stoffey, Robert E. *Merrihew, Ronald E.
*Bishop, Richard A. *Huffman, Donald R.
*Notine, Daniel M. *Nappi, Louis T.
*Krebs, John F. *Collins, Carl G.
*Alexander, Robert B. *Keith, Charles R.
*Burkhart, Arthur E. *Horton, Samuel M.
*Kelly, Daniel A. *Kerwin, Paul C.
*Stumpf, Thomas A. *Rutledge, Bobby G.
*Martin, Raymond H. *Tutarrow, James H.
*Fugate, Ray A. *Berchiolli, Kent V.
*Alley, Rodney H., Jr. *Marshall, William H.

Allen, James R. Cooper, Matthew T.
Vowell, David E. Dean, Bennett R.
Sweeney, Smith Thibault, Dale R.
Wiggins, Stanley C. Wunderlich, Leonard A.
Warnicke, Edward A. Reczek, Gerald F.
Walters, Warren S. Bowles, Ray W.
Salmon, Michael D. Kirkham, James H.
Smyth, Thomas J. Miller, Anthony D.
Cormack, Donald H. Mulkey, Jesse G.
Hanthorn, Russell L. Manazir, Charles H.
Dalberg, James E. Raines, Richard C.
Shroyer, David K., Jr. Brown, Larry K.
Sudmeyer, Paul T. Ludwick, William B.
Huffcut, William H., II
Olson, Reid H. Dulaney, Richard L.
Bohr, Harper L., Jr. Beckwith, William H.
Curd, James H. R. Maley, Fredric W.
Lengauer, George T., Jr. Wilson, Robert B.
Gilligan, Adrian Rushing, Clifton L., Jr.
Hogaboom, Pieter L. Featherston, Robert K.
Robinson, Donald M. Merriss, William D.
Renner, William A. Toth, James E.
Lanigan, John D. Breitenbach, Roy G.
Stewart, Douglas K. Austin, Randall W.
Thompson, Amos D., Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*McDorman, Leroy D., Jr. Bloodworth, John M.
Bridges, Larry W. *Seymour, Kenneth F. Dearth, Wayne R.
*McCraner, James N. McGee, David O.
*Smith, William W. Robinson, Frederick J.
*Davidson, James U. Waibel, Leonard C.
*Hart, Robert W., Jr. Butler, John W.
*Kohnen, Hubert

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:

Roberts, Roberta N. Carlson, Carol J.
Schleichert, Dolores A. Rick, Nancy T.
Houser, Peggy S. Carroll, Nancy A.
Broetzman, Marie M. McDuff, Colleen M.
Vertalino, Carol A.

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:

Addams, William A. Antonille, Russell T.
Asanovich, Elie M. *Albright, Donald A.
Aleksic, Walter P. Jr. Alexander, Joseph H.
Allison, Charles R. Ammons, Kenneth L.
Anderson, Clifford H. Anderson, Gary H.
Anderson, John E. Andrews, Louis P.

- Baker, Robert L.
Balash, Steve R., Jr.
Baldwin, Larry L.
Bane, Ronald E.
Barnhill, Dwight D.
Bartel, James A.
Bartnick, Stanley J.
Bass, Murray, Jr.
Bastian, Dean L.
Baxter, Thomas W.
Beaudoin, Leonard J., Jr.
Bechtol, Bruce E.
Bechtol, Joseph A. L.
Beck, Duane C.
Bennett, Allan A.
Bennett, Elizabeth A.
Bennett, Jesse D., Jr.
Bergman, Donald D.
Bergstrom, Alfred R., Jr.
Besch, Edwin W.
Betha, William D.
Betz, Thomas R.
Bierman, Edward O.
Bikakis, Charles N.
Bilyeu, Byron L.
Blvens, Alfred H.
Bland, Richard P. L.
Blythe, Ralph A., Jr.
Boller, Lawrence J.
Bomkamp, Norman H.
Bowden, Howard J.
Bower, James W.
Bowers, Gene W.
Bowlby, Samuel W.
Bowman, James H.
Bradbury, Donald L.
Brandtner, Martin L.
Braun, Robert A.
Britell, Claudius J.
Broadwell, Donald N.
Bronson, James V.
Brooks, Carl E., Jr.
Broome, Eugene F.
Brown, John H.
Brown, Robert J.
Burgess, Alan E.
Burgess, Richard S.
Burke, Francis M.
Burkley, George W.
Burns, Charles W.
Burns, James P., III
Burton, Lou L., Jr.
Byers, Larry E.
Carlson, Robert A.
Carroll, Thomas J.
Cassel, Louis A.
Cathell, Peter H.
Caulley, Bernard J.
Cavallaro, Joseph M.
Cazares, Alfred F., Jr.
Cerney, William F.
Chambless, Edward L.
Ciccone, Ronald G.
Clark, Francis S.
Clark, John L., Jr.
Clawson, Roger L.
Clements, Richard F.
Cochran, Bruce A.
Coll, Vincent S.
Collins, William
Conklin, Raymond C.
Connor, Briah K., Jr.
Conrad, Frederick A.
Cooke, John P.
Cooper, William J.
Copeland, Randolph G.
Core, George E.
Costa, Keith A.
Coulter, Robert S.
Cox, Donald C.
Craig, Frederick B.
Crampton, James H.
Crawford, Ronald W.
Culver, John L.
Curley, Michael H.
Cutcomb, David H.
Dabney, William H.
- Daniel, Jack N.
Darrow, Donnie L.
Daubenspeck, Lynn A.
Davey, Judith A.
Davis, Brian P.
Derbes, David G.
Desautels, Ernest J.
Deshler, George O.
Despotakis, John A.
Dickson, Michael G.
Dickson, Bonneau H., Jr.
Diffen, Ray I.
Dillweg, Gary T.
Dobak, John D.
Dodd, George G.
Dokos, Chris G., Jr.
Donnelly, Francis L.
Douthitt, Nathan C.
Duncan, Hubert G.
Dunn, Theodore R.
Dusse, Ronald J.
Edgell, George P.
Eggleston, George D.
Elrich, Donald G.
Elgin, Arthur C., Jr.
Elpers, David J.
Elrod, McLowery
Ennis, Berlis F.
Enochs, George H.
Eppinger, Edward A.
Erb, Louis F.
Everill, Peter D.
Farnsworth, Charles E.
Farrington, Daniel O.
Fehnel, Richard A.
Feitel, Joseph Y., Jr.
Ferris, Roger E.
Filkins, Eleanor E.
Filson, John R.
Flaherty, John P., Jr.
Flynn, Robert G.
Forbes, Philip A.
Foster, Karl A.
Fox, Raymond F.
Friedl, Richard C.
Friend, Gerald E.
Friis, David J.
Fuller, Donald
Fulmer, Mark T.
Fuqua, Beverly B.
Gale, Robert T.
Gamer, Peter P.
Gann, Robert B.
Gardner, Phillip E.
Garriott, John W.
Gatz, Frederic L.
Gay, Charles B., Jr.
Gaynor, Paul B.
Germer, Henry A., Jr.
Gibbons, Joel W., III
Gibbs, Joseph W., III
Giff, Urban L.
Gilbert, Jan R.
Gill, John P.
Gillespie, Gary L.
Gleeson, Richard
Glover, Douglas
Goodwyn, George W., Jr.
Gorman, Merle W.
Gormley, Joan C.
Gosnell, Harold C., Jr.
Grant, Herbert A., Jr.
Greene, Bruce A.
Griffin, Wayne G.
Grubbs, William A., III
Gruner, John M.
Gruning, Charles R.
Guy, John W.
Hahn, Warren G.
Hale, Lynn A.
Handrahan, Robert G.
Hanson, Chester E.
Harblson, Charles E.
Harlan, Robert R.
Harris, Henry W., Jr.
Harris, Richard I.
Harter, Gary D.
Hatfield, Maynard A.
- Hathaway, John A.
Hawley, George T.
Hayes, Frank S.
Heil, Thomas C., Jr.
Heinisch, Roger P.
Helm, John H.
Hendricks, Nelson P.
Hildebrandt, Earl W.
Hitchcock, Gene R.
Hock, Kemper L.
Hofmann, David H.
Holdaway, Karl S.
Holman, Robert S.
Hopkins, Harvard V., Jr.
Houlahan, Thomas J.
Hracho, Eugene E.
Huggin, Gerald C.
Hughes, Richard W.
Hungerford, Ed V., III
Hutchison, Samuel G.
Hutton, LaJon R.
Ingebretsen, Carl R.
Jackson, Richard D.
Jerbasi, John T.
Jessen, Donald W.
Johnson, Donald W.
Johnson, Gerald M.
Johnson, Richard A.
Johnson, Robert L.
Jones, Kenneth N.
Jordan, Gregory W.
Judd, David W.
Kealey, James A.
Keefe, Edmund M., Jr.
Kelly, Francis D.
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.
Kish, Julius P., III
Kisner, Ned B.
Klapinsky, Raymond J.
Klingler, Donald P.
Knepp, Donald R.
Knestis, James F.
Koenig, Donald M.
Kolbe, Frank P., Jr.
Koontz, Robert P.
Kowalski, Thomas J.
Kraft, Daniel J.
Kreider, James W.
LaFon, Robert W.
Lamb, Donald L.
Landes, Burrell H., Jr.
Lantz, Conrad W.
Larson, Donald H.
Larson, Kenneth P.
Lee, Vincent R.
Lefevre, David A.
Leggett, James
Leiker, Robert
Lewan, Lloyd S.
Lindley, Edward A.
Lindquist, Terry K.
Little, Thomas F.
Lohmeier, Donald L.
Lokken, Wesley A.
Loveland, Gary N.
Loving, Francis L.
Lowe, James W., Jr.
Lumsden, James L.
Lusk, Rudolph F.
Luther, Lawrence A.
Lutheran, Joseph A.
Lutton, John M., Jr.
Lynch, Charles L.
Lytle, William J.
MacDonald, Gerald E.
Mackie, Nancy J.
Manning, Douglas R.
Marshall, Robert D.
Martikie, Erwin J., Jr.
Martin, William R.
- Massey, Tom E.
Matson, Claude A.
May, James S.
May, Joel A., Jr.
Mayers, David, Jr.
Mays, Miles C.
McAfee, Ernest W., Jr.
McCain, Charles M.
McCallum, William J.
McClanahan, Garrett W.
McClellan, Gary C.
McDonald, John C.
McIntyre, Robert C.
McIntyre, William A., III
McKee, Samuel K., III
McKenney, David M.
McLaughlin, John L.
McLaughlin, Paul A.
McLaurin, Robert L., Jr.
Meck, Robert S.
Meeks, Clarence I., III
Mehl, Spencer P.
Metzler, Harry R.
Miller, Allen H.
Miller, Dan G.
Mills, James D.
Mitchell, Larry G.
Mize, Alfred L.
Moore, James L.
Moore, Lawrence R.
Moran, Thomas J.
Morgan, Robert F.
Morley, Guy H.
Mueller, Gerald R.
Murphy, Richard J.
Myers, Oran L.
Nestande, Bruce K.
Newton, David B.
Niotis, John D.
Nolen, Thomas A.
O'Byrne, Elton C.
O'Connell, Maurice C.
O'Laughlin, Larry L.
Olin, John H., Jr.
Oliver, Troy R., Jr.
Olson, Joseph C., III
Oots, Samuel E.
Opean, Michael I.
Orr, Alan L.
Otto, Milton C.
Oxenreider, Lynn F.
Parks, John R., Jr.
Pate, Hugh P.
Pearson, Jeremiah W., III
Pease, Mark C.
Peat, Harry C., Jr.
Pennell, Robert M.
Perrin, Richard K.
Peterson, Wayne A.
Pinson, Joseph W.
Presley, Olen D.
Pretera, Richard A.
Price, Charles E.
Prouty, Russell C.
Prue, David B.
Puaa, En Sue Pung
Puckett, Scott C.
Pynchon, George E.
Quinlan, David A.
Ransom, Albert J.
Raper, Donald L.
Rasmussen, Robert J.
Reagan, Ronald E.
Reams, William H.
Reed, Robert M.
Reimer, John H., Jr.
Reusse, Edward O.
Richardson, Jimmy D.
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.
Roth, Ronald K.
Roy, Barbara J.
Ruffini, James R.
Ruyle, James B.
Sabater, Jaime, Jr.
Sadler, Kenneth R.
Sale, Charles L.
Salmon, Lawrence R.
Sammls, Norman W.
Sampson, Charles W.
Sanchez, Kelly J.
Sawyer, Carl R., Jr.
Sawyer, John F.
Schwab, William F.
Scrivner, James D.
Seaman, Lawrence E., Jr.
Seely, Rae C.
Schulster, James T.
Shaver, Wayne E.
Shaver, William C.
Shaw, Walter C.
Shea, James R.
Sherwood, Susan H.
Silva, Lionel M.
Simpson, Jerry I.
Sirois, Benoit J. L.
Slater, John H.
Sloan, Robert W.
Slone, Hardy A.
Smelich, Walter R.
Smith, Gid B.
Smith, James M.
Smith, Vincent M.
Smolenski, Robert J.
Sneed, Richard C.
Snodgrass, Clyde R.
Snook, Howard M.
Sohm, Jacques E.
Solak, Thomas J.
Solomon, John E., Jr.
Somerville, Gary J.
Spence, Wesley F.
Spevetz, Louis M.
Spolyar, Robert J.
Stacy, Richard M.
Steele, James L.
Stefansson, David R.
Stensland, William C.
Stewart, James J.
Stegman, Donald L.
Strand, Robert H.
Strickland, Anthony R.
- Studds, John A.
Stull, Jay W.
Sturkey, Charles E.
Sullivan, Harold D.
Sumler, Lamar
Sutton, Edward N.
Sweeney, William T.
Sweetser, Warren E., III
Sweetman, Roderick E.
Sypult, Robert P.
Szweda, Edward H., Jr.
Taylor, Lawrence A.
Teiles, John, Jr.
Tener, Frederick S., Jr.
Tenney, Joseph R.
Terpak, John B., Jr.
Thomas, James N.
Thompson, Albert K.
Thompson, Allan
Thompson, James G.
Thompson, Richard K.
Tilley, William A., Jr.
Todd, Gary E.
Todd, John H.
Troutman, Howard P.
Tschida, Rudolph G.
Tull, Martin N.
Tumlinson, James H., III
Tunberg, Karl A.
Turbeville, Bobby G.
Turner, Carlton N.
Uzzelle, George H., III
VanWert, Paul J., Jr.
Vaughan, Jean P. C.
Wallace, Arthur L., Jr.
Wallace, Richard F.
Walters, Hugh L.
Ward, Sanford D.
Watson, Jack H., Jr.
Watson, John K.
Watson, Robert C.
Webster, Ralph D.
Webster, Steven S.
Weren, Arthur D.
Werner, Evan C.
Wheeler, Karen G.
Whitaker, Allen P.
Whitfield, Howard M.
Wickens, Justin H.
Wilkins, George M.
Williams, Paul R.
Winston, Herbert T.
Wood, Herbert H.
Wright, Floyd K., Jr.
Young, Gordon K.
Young, Harry C., Jr.

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:

- Abbott, Thomas C.
Acree, William R.
Adams, David H.
Adams, Richard G.
Anderson, Robert R.
Angli, John F.
Arbogast, William L.
Arick, John C.
*Ariss, David W.
Arnold, Mordecai R.
Atkinson, Al R.
Austin, Lowell E., Jr.
Austin, Stephen W.
Ayala, Isaac
Bacon, Maurice S.
Bannigan, Vincent W., Jr.
Banning, Maurice R.
Barner, Wayne A.
Barth, David R.
Baxa, Ernest G., Jr.
Beckley, James F.
Beitel, Richard T.
Bell, William F.
Bellows, Bruce A.
Bergman, Craig A.
- Beyer, Malcolm K., Jr.
Bierman, James W.
Blanks, Charlton H.
Blot, Harold W.
Bolster, Robert W., Jr.
Bourgeois, Kenneth L.
Brabham, James A., Jr.
Bremer, Darwin E.
Brentlinger, Richard A.
Bricker, Peter W.
Bridges, Charles R.
Brodeur, Gerald P.
Buch, Alan D.
Burgin, Robert A.
Burke, John G.
*Cadwalader, George
Calkin, James F.
Campbell, Jack R., Jr.
Capitanio, David A.
Carpenter, Charles L., Jr.
Carroll, Ronald J.
Carter, Marshall N.
Carter, Richard H.

- Carter, Thomas L.
Caskey, Robert D.
Celmer, Lawrence J.
Chamberlin, Henry B., III
Chambers, John A.
Chambers, Russell A.
Chang, Melvyn H.
Chapman, Arthur C.
Chesson, John W.
Chipman, Sydney E.
Chittenden, Thomas J.
Choate, Thomas W.
Christy, Donald E.
Clark, Gary D.
Clement, Donald A.
Clemmons, Robert F.
Climo, William H., Jr.
Collins, Eldridge R., Jr.
Collins, Emmett B.
Collins, Randy J.
Conoley, Robert O.
Cook, Frederic W.
Cossaboon, Everett E.
Cox, Edward V.
Coyle, Edward L.
Craney, Dennis W.
Cullen, William E., Jr.
Currie, Herbert L.
*Curtis, Charles B.
DaGrosa, John B.
Dailey, Paul B., Jr.
Davis, Sheridan
Dawson, Robert G.
Dees, Wilton F.
DeGroot, Robert H.
DeHart, Earl R., Jr.
Dennis, Chadwick H.
Dennis, Robert M.
*Derry, James O.
Dickson, Ted O.
Dillon, Thomas J., Jr.
Doty, Leonidas, III
Douglas, David J.
Dove, Thomas R.
Dow, Charles W.
*Downs, Michael P.
Draude, Thomas V.
Drez, Ronald J.
Driscoll, Steven J.
Drummond, John F.
Duffy, Peter A.
Dumont, Thomas J., Jr.
Dunphy, William W.
Eastman, James E.
Edmunds, Richard L.
Egan, Francis X.
Eiff, Ralph T.
Ellis, Daniel J.
Emanuel, Roy N.
Enockson, John O.
Erwin, Harold A.
Everroad, John D.
Fairfield, Rupert E., Jr.
Falkenbach, Robert W.
Falkenberg, Ken
Farrell, Patrick G.
Ferrante, Frank
Fetzer, James H.
Filo, William R.
Florillo, Michael, Jr.
*Fisher, Thomas V.
Flowers, Walter E.
Focht, George A.
Foltz, Gary E.
Ford, Michael E.
Forlano, Anthony J.
Franzwa, Robert E.
Frese, Frederick J., III
Fritz, David H.
Furleigh, James R.
Fye, Carl R.
Gage, William R.
Gallagher, Thomas D.
Gallagher, William T.
Galloway, James W.
Garner, Robert E.
Garten, Ronald C.
Garwick, Gerald G.
- Gay, George R.
Geddes, Roland T.
Gedris, Joseph R.
Gentry, John R.
Gibson, Robert F.
Gill, George K.
Gill, Gerald L.
Glad, Andrew D.
Glass, Eugene M.
Goehring, John A.
Goodwyn, Ben R.
Gordon, Charles R.
Gorman, James
Gray, William B.
Green, Geoffrey E.
Green, Jerry M.
Green, Larry S.
Greenfield, Howard E., Jr.
Greer, Jan P.
Griffin, William R.
Grisler, D'Arcy E.
Groot, Roger D.
Guidry, Norman R.
Guinn, Robert L.
Hadden, Lon D.
Hadden, John A.
Hadley, Arnold N.
Hahn, Joseph J., Jr.
Hammond, Benjamin G.
Harbaugh, Thomas E., Jr.
Harborth, William M.
Hardaway, James D.
Harman, Milton L.
Harrington, Robert F.
Hassinger, Edward J.
Hastings, Garner R.
Hayden, James B.
Hearney, Richard D.
Hehnen, Mark T.
Heinz, Hans R.
Helm, Hugh H.
Hemphill, Frederick H., Jr.
Henderson, Frederick P., Jr.
Henderson, Porter K.
Hennessy, John M.
Hesser, William A.
Hewitt, Thomas E.
Hickok, James B.
Hicks, Gerard R.
Higgins, Howard W.
Hinman, Martin N.
Holbrook, James H., Jr.
Holleran, Martin P., Jr.
Holmes, Curtis E.
Honeywell, James A.
Horn, Thomas R.
Howatt, Franklyn J.
Howell, Jefferson D., Jr.
Hurdle, Patrick M.
Irons, Jerrold T.
Jackman, Richard B.
Jacobson, Kenneth R.
Jacoby, Jimmy K.
Jarboe, Robert L.
Jardine, Theodore J.
Jenkins, John L.
*Jennings, Harry E., Jr.
Jensen, Harold B., Jr.
Johnson, Alford B.
Johnson, Jimmy L.
Johnson, Ken H.
Johnson, Robert E.
Johnson, Weston L.
Jolley, John N., Jr.
Jones, Douglas A.
Jones, Lloyd C.
Jones, Patrick J.
Jones, Philip T.
Jordan, David M.
Keller, Gerald J.
Kenny, James P.
- Kerney, James L.
Kerr, Wendell H., Jr.
Kolb, James G.
Kosciw, Thomas L.
Kott, Stephen J.
Kratcoski, Eugene L.
Krulak, William M.
Kszystyniak, John E., Jr.
Kuchinkas, Richard J.
Kunkel, Donald J.
Kuzela, Edward V.
La Duca, Nicholas J., Jr.
Lamb, Charles T.
Larson, George H.
Lau, James
La Voo, John A.
Lehr, Antone D.
Levasseur, James H.
Levine, Michael D.
Lindberg, Perry C.
Lindstrom, William A.
Lingenfelter, Theodore P.
Link, Louis A.
Linkonis, Bertram L.
Lloyd, Calvin A., II
Lorch, Robert E.
Lucci, Michael J.
Luebke, William R.
Luster, Dale A.
Lynch, William D., Jr.
Madalo, Michael
Maddox, Robert W.
Madonna, Raymond C.
Mahoney, Hugh D.
Mannila, Richard R.
Marks, David E.
Martin, Arville D.
Martin, Eugene J.
Martinsen, Richard C.
Matlack, John G.
Matthews, Frederick R.
McAllister, Thomas C., Jr.
McCarter, James W., Jr.
McCoy, Charles B.
McDermott, Patrick L.
McDonough, Edward J.
McGee, James L.
McGowan, Michael J.
McKee, Roger G.
McNeal, Robert J.
McNutt, Paul V.
*McVay, Kenneth A.
McPherson, Richard G.
*Meadows, Charles L.
Mecham, Steven G.
Merrell, Thomas H., Jr.
Miller, Donald G.
Miller, Jon
Miller, Richard P.
Mirtz, Phillip J.
Mitchell, Neil F.
Mixon, Aaron M., III
Moeller, Paul A., Jr.
Moody, Joe D.
Moore, Alfred H.
Moore, Ned A.
Morgan, Jerry L.
Morin, James J.
Morris, Donald
Morrisey, Richard T.
Morrow, Russel E.
Mortensen, Ivan R.
Mulford, Charles G.
Mullen, John J., Jr.
Mulligan, Dennis K.
Muncie, Donald R.
Murray, John A.
Myers, Karl L.
Negron, William P.
Neill, John E., III
Nelson, Arnold R.
Nelson, Sigurd E.
Neyman, James L.
- Nissenson, Leonard
Noland, Kenneth E.
Nordquist, Myron H.
North, Bruce A.
Novak, Paul D.
Oberndorfer, Gerald J.
Obert, Carroll K.
O'Dell, Donald O.
Odle, William J.
Orfanedes, George C.
*Oss, Merton J.
Overstreet, Richard C.
Palka, Fred
Palmer, Richard K.
Parker, David R.
Patraitis, Chester J.
Pearce, Frank G.
Pearson, James O., Jr.
Pelner, Joseph J., Jr.
Perz, Vernon J.
Peters, Eric G.
Pfalzgraf, John R.
Pleva, James F.
Posey, Franklin H.
Poss, Willard B.
Preuss, Charles F.
Price, Donald L.
Rachford, Jon N.
Rahm, Bruce M.
Reasoner, Frank S.
Reed, Thomas J.
Richardson, David G.
Rintye, Edward D.
Ripley, John W.
Risler, Eugene S., III
Robertson, James C.
Roberts, Joseph T., III
Robertson, Munro V.
Robinson, Jerry C.
Roll, William R.
Romine, Richard A.
Rouleau, Eugene J.
*Rowe, Peter J.
Roulier, Mike H.
*Rudeen, Paul E., Jr.
Rupertus, Patrick H.
Russell, Leo K.
*Russell, William E.
Ruth, George W.
Rutledge, Earl R.
Sage, Henry J.
Sanchez, Herbert M.
Sarsfield, Patrick J.
Schara, Earl M., Jr.
Schlitz, Gordon M.
Schmidt, Arthur J., Jr.
Schreck, Edwin E.
Schulz, Richard W.
Schwartz, John R.
Scott, Denver D.
Selwitschka, William J., Jr.
Shafer, Francis L., Jr.
Shallene, Frank M.
Shaw, Charles T.
Shepherd, James A.
Sherman, John B.
Shockey, Donald K., Jr.
Simons, Gary F.
Sketoe, James G.
Smith, Loring E.
Smith, Phillip R.
Smith, Willie A.
Soechting, Steven A.
Sommers, Alfred E., Jr.
Sorensen, Charles R.
Sramek, John S., Jr.
Stanat, Christopher W. J.
Staples, Robert D.
Stevenson, Robert R.
Stiven, James F.
Stowell, David W.
Stumpf, William W.
Sullivan, John P. T.
Tait, Glenn S.
Tarnopolsky, Walter
Tatum, Reiss P.
- Tatum, William T., Jr.
Thompson, David E.
Thompson, Gary D.
Topken, Peter W.
Trudeau, James L.
Updegrave, Kenneth R.
Uyeda, Theodore Y.
Valentine, Igor R.
Vardell, William W.
Varn, Forest N.
Ver Eecke, Richard W.
Vick, Delle A., Jr.
Walsh, Philip J.
Watt, Lewis C.
Wauchope, Douglas J.
Wells, James E.
Westendick, William A.
- Wheeler, Carl B.
Whitfield, George A.
Wilkenloh, William C.
Wilkinson, Morgan L.
Williams, Leslie A.
Williams, Robert D.
Williams, Russell D., Jr.
Windham, Dale D. M.
Wood, Walter E.
Woolley, Dennis R.
Wroblewski, Edwin A.
Wyly, Michael D.
Wyser-Pratte, Guy P.
Yale, Carl R.
Yarnell, James H.
Yost, James L.
Yung, Carl H.
- 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:
- *Baker, Clyde G.
Goeke, Henry K.
Winchester, Cecil V.
Sparks, Thomas, Jr.
Anderson, Thomas E.
Hoffman, Robert C.
Willis, Maxey A.
Tillis, James G.
Smith, Robert E.
Tallentire, Gilson A.
- 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:
- Volle, Leslie E.
Holden, Howard
Cinotti, William J.
Leahy, Paul H.
- Conner, Terrance A.
Becker, Alfred E.
Olesak, Andrew M.
Van Doren, Howard W.
- 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:
- Lawrence, John E., Jr.
Dalbey, Roland M.
Piontek, Edward
Nelson, Delbert L.
Wiese, James J.
Richards, Daniel W.
Bracken, Wallace D.
Hurd, Archer D.
Ockuly, Eugene J.
Craig, Alvin L.
Morgan, Roger G.
Smith, Charles W., Jr.
Bishop, John W.
Myers, Paul A., Jr.
Hedrick, Joe P.
Omdahl, William H.
Hiestler, Willington A., Jr.
Favreau, Robert D.
Mauri, Enrique A.
Stowell, James H.
James, Fred L.
Allen, Kenneth E.
Taylor, Charles C.
Downes, Edward A. G.
Baker, Paul R.
Fenwick, George W.
Mattox, Leon
Gardner, Thomas R.
Paquette, Joseph R.
Clem, Kenneth W.
Doran, Bernard R.
Ketring, Walter R., Jr.
Backo, Joseph L.
Fager, Wendel P.
Schlondrop, William C.
Keroack, Bernard W.
Lott, L. J.
Merry, Bion E.
Shank, Paul S.
Lisenby, William E.
- Johann, Joseph A.
Georgia, Barry J.
Hanna, Richard J.
Keyes, Roy C.
Doyle, Duane R.
Fifer, Billy J.
Bowen, Eugene A.
Champion, George W.
Prato, Sam J.
Folsom, Clyde W.
Taylor, Thomas F.
Redican, Thomas E.
Miles, John J.
Thraikill, Allen B.
De Meo, Angelo C.
Russell, Richard S., II
Gronert, Kenneth A.
Cline, Maurice G.
Weatherly, Richard E.
Humm, Edmond R.
Newman, Ronald D.
Duncan, Emmett D.
Gurney, Joseph R.
Drawdy, Joseph C.
Johnson, Dan E.
Weber, David C.
Raymond, Dale
Williams, John C.
Millman, Glenn P.
Duncan, Dorris A.
McConnell, Harold V.
Innerarity, Vernon E.
Coyle, Edwin J.
Baschnagel, Walter T.
Driscoll, William F.
Hollis, James F.
Gibson, Ernest L., Jr.
Loof, Charles J., Jr.
Worcester, Floyd B.
Stone, Joe W., Jr.
Hufnagel, Edward A., Jr.

Mucci, Anthony
Stroup, Guy S.
Huggard, Byron L.
Waldenville, Alan W.
Pearce, Arthur R.
Fetchko, John B.
Lichty, Randall W.
Henderson, Jack R.
McWhorter, Robert J.
Preston, Thomas R.
Lambert, Frank A.
Hurley, Daniel J.
Grice, Marshall M., Jr.
Girvin, Bobby G.
Gabriel, Billy K.
Claus, Roger J.
Capelle, Paul W.
Gwaltney, William J.
Garibay, Antonio F.
Mulherin, Byron J., Jr.
Dangler, Joseph C.
Chance, James M.
Grose, Lester R.
Riggs, Robert K.
Nyeen, Charles O.
Nyenbrink, Henry W.
Montana, Douglas W.
Perry, Leon E.
White, Louis L.
Maguire, Paul B.
Werner, David B.
Morlarty, Michael E.
Acosta, Louis
Chavez, Lonnie S.
Bunting, Jerry E.
Lee, James N.
Simpson, Billy E.
Kuchinsky, Peter, Jr.
Paschen, Charles W.
Brandt, George H., Jr.
Bowden, Holland C.
Ferguson, Raymond J., Jr.
Clark, James A.
Scaplehorn, William E., Jr.
Harry, Lawrence E.
Hicks, Billie E.
Oakley, Howard C.
Reuschling, Richard R.
Harrison, Ronald C.

The following-named officers for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

*Country, John C.
*Holmes, James H.
Johnson, Wendell A.
Kee, Charles E.
Marshall, Frances

SUPPLY CORPS

*Arthur, Harry B.
*Beckmeyer, Harold E.
Blankinship, Grover F., Jr.
Brademan, Royce A.
Burkhead, Franklin
Cook, Glover H.
Cornell, Alexander H.
Daley, Clement E.
Dawson, Thomas H., III
*Diggle, Raymond H.
*Dowd, Wallace R., Jr.
*Eckfield, Kenyon C.
*Ernst, Clayton W.
*Foster, Thomas E., Jr.
Fuiton, Clyde E.
*Furtwangler, Leo E., Jr.
Hackett, John J.
Hamblen, Eunice A.
Hempson, Donald A.
Herron, John C.
Hopwood, Alonzo L.
Huebner, Dale C.

Whisler, Theodore L.
Nicolai, Peter W.
Underwood, Howard L.
Fischer, George A.
Sakret, January T., Jr.
Kelly, James R.
Beaver, Dale S.
Steele, John M., Jr.
Mockenhaupt, Robert J.
LaRue, Billy B.
MacFarlane, Robert W.
Roberts, Morris R.
England, Joe H.
Ashmore, Kent D.
Sutherland, Frank R.
Deibert, Glen A.
Pierse, Donald E.
Targett, Donald H.
Wieden, Clifford, Jr.
Stubbe, Harry F.
Ashe, Thomas D.
Rosta, Stephen J.
Capps, Carl G.
Ross, Richard L.
Pitts, Thomas E.
Heusner, Robert A.
Olson, Robert V.
Johnson, Kenneth E.
Olsen, James G.
Clinch, Ralston S.
Hainsworth, John J.
Kenner, George F.
Peltzer, Benson, Jr.
Porter, Bebe B.
Worley, Robert L.
Pope, Robert E.
Dietz, Robert G.
Hazlett, Donald L.
Long, Charles E.
Guthrie, Clarence L., Jr.
Simons, Frank J., Jr.
Humphreys, Allyn A.
Davis, Ray Y.
Gray, Edwin T.
Rodgers, John H.
Golden, John J.
Noonan, William, Jr.
Hassen, Lyle C.
Tidwell, Edwin D.
Miller, Robert D.

Robison, Dale M.
*Sanders, Allen B.
*Schmeder, Charles E.
Scheela, Jerome J.
*Scott, John A.
Sheehan, William J.
Slettvet, Richard M.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Brink, Frederick W.
*Cahill, Richard A.
Elliott, Robert E.
*Ernstmeyer, Milton S.
*Ferris, James S.
Garrett, Francis L.
*Gendron, Anthony L.
Hemphill, Edward J., Jr.
Jones, Oliver W.
*Kapalczynski, Eugene J.
*Loneragan, Vincent J.
Lyons, Earle V., Jr.
*Sargent, Gerald H.
*Schneck, Robert J.
*Swinson, Jesse L.
*Tuxbury, Vernon W.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Anderson, Nelson R.
*Busbee, Greer A., Jr.
*Castanes, James C.
*Cunney, Edward G.
Dillon, John "G"
Dougherty, John A.
Engram, Robert C.
*Hobson, Harold E.
Johnson, Edwin E.
*Trzyna, Zbyszko C.
*Turner, Charles W.

DENTAL CORPS

*Colby, Gage
*D'Vincent, Richard "C"
*Knapp, Victor P.
Mazzarella, Maurice A.
Troxell, Richard R.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Austin, Paul L.
*Kuntz, Robert E.
*Mann, Charles F.
Swanson, Robert W.

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

Alken, Robert A.
Akins, Joseph W., Jr.
Alberta, Edward T.
Alexander, Charles S., Jr.
Alford, Zeb D.
*Allen, James Brent
Allen, James
Blakeslee
Almonrode, Roland H.
Ambrose, Robert W.
Ames, Lionel E., Jr.
*Anderson, Arland T.
*Anderson, John M.
*Ashford, Robert "L"
Athow, Robert F.
Austin, William H., Jr.
*Ayres, James E.
*Babineau, Francis E.
Bacon, Francis W., Jr.
*Bade, Robert B.
Baer, Joseph, Jr.
Bagwell, Wallace B.
*Bailey, Emera S.
Ball, George F.
*Banks, Daniel L., Jr.
*Barber, Albertus V., Jr.
*Barfield, Charlie H.
*Barfield, Norwood R.
Barley, Cecil E.
*Barnes, Robert J.
Barondes, Earl D.
*Barr, Leon V.
*Barr, Robert M., Jr.
*Barry, William
*Barteluce, John J.
Bass, Richard W., Jr.
Baughman, Fred H.
*Bauman, Robert W.
Bebb, Kenneth N.
Beck, Lester H.
Beck, William, Jr.
Becker, Terrill F.
Begley, Robert E.
Bell, John H.
Benson, Harry L.
Berglund, Burton E.
*Bernstein, Fred J.
Betts, Martin B.
*Beumer, Everett H.
*Bihr, Richard A.
*Bird, Comer H., Jr.
*Bird George B., Jr.
*Bivins, William "F"
Black, Charles H.
*Blair, Richard E.
*Bliesener, Arthur B.
*Blixt, Melvin D.
*Blumberg, David H.
Bodnar, Andrew J.
*Boger, Clarence E.
*Bohner, Jack L.
*Bond, John C., Jr.
*Bott, Alan R.
Boushee, Frank L.
Bowen, Edwin E.
Bowen, James W.
*Boyack, Maurice R.
*Brabant, Robert J.
Bradley, Claiborne S.
Bradshaw, Ray H.
*Brady, Charles G., Jr.
*Briggs, Winston D.
Brimmer, Herbert H.
*Brisco, Kenneth B.
Brooks, Wharton H., Jr.
*Brower, Robert C.
*Brown, Floyd H.
Brown, Lofton C.
*Brown, Louis F., Jr.
*Brown, Thomas D.
Bruce, John C.
*Buck, Edward G.
Buck, Maurice D.
Bunganich, John, Jr.
*Burke, Edwin J.
Burkett, Alva D.
*Bush, Philip R.
Bush, Ward A.
*Butler, John E.
Byrd, William J.
Cantrell, Charles E., Jr.
*Carey, Edmond J.
*Carlin, James
Carlstead, Roger
Carlstead, Edward M.
Carman, Warren E.
Carr, Herbert W.
Carraway, Bertram R.
*Carroll, Kent J.
Carter, Rodney B.

*Casserly, Christopher J.
*Chattleton, William D.
*Cheek, Glen R.
Chelgren, John L.
*Christensen, Jack A.
Christoph, Karl J., Jr.
Chullin, Ernest J.
*Cislo, Louis
*Clark, Carroll D.
Clark, William E.
Clay, Harold S.
Clement, Robert R.
Clemente, Angelo E.
Clifford, William F., Jr.
*Clymer, Roy E., Jr.
Cocke, Edgar M.
Coggins, Jack C.
*Cole, Russell W.
*Collins, Robert M.
*Condon, Vernon W.
Connelly, John J., Jr.
*Cooke, Robert S.
Cope, Harland B.
Corley, Frank W., Jr.
*Corley, James W.
Corrigan, Paul T.
Cort, Walter W., Jr.
Cover, John H.
*Craig, Neil
*Craven, Phillip R.
*Crawford, Bentley B.
Crawford, Wayne H., Jr.
*Creasman, Jesse C.
Crispin, Robert E.
*Cross, William E.
Crouter, Robert W.
Crump, Frank L., Jr.
*Cummings, Donald E.
Cummings, Edward M., Jr.
*Curtin, Lawrence J.
Dadisman, Richard "A"
*Dahlby, Philip C.
*Dale, Robert L.
Dallmann, Paul H.
Darcy, Robert T.
*Davenport, Thomas T.
*Davidson, James B.
Davies, James W.
Davis, Cabell S., Jr.
*Davis, William R.
*Davis, William G.
*Dawson, John F.
DeBaets, Donald J.
DeBaets, Ronald M.
DeChow, Claude E.
Decker, Harvey L.
Dedman, Tyler F.
Deffenbaugh, Robert M.
*Degler, Forrest R., Jr.
*DeHart, Turner
Denkler, John M.
Dermody, Richard J.
Dibble, Henry M.
Dickleson, Robert W.
Doe, Willard C.
Donovan, Walter J.
*Dorman, "R" "H"
Douglas, Stephen P., Jr.
Doxey, Robert C.
*Draz, David I.
Dudley, Calvin C.
*Durden, Walter D.
Durfos, Robert E.
*Durkin, Michael F.
Dyer, John C.
Early, Paul J.
Edelson, Burton I.
Edwards, George D., Jr.
Edwards, Maurice M., Jr.
Eidson, George V.
Ekas, Claude P., Jr.
Eldridge, Richard A.
*Elliott, Edward C.
*Elliott, Hollie H., Jr.
Elmer, Joseph S.
Engle, Calvin R.
*Enright, John P.
*Evans, Jack E.
Ewing, John R.
*Ewing, Paul C.
Fargo, Robert R.
*Farris, George W.
Faulkner, Doc G., Jr.
Fay, Lawrence J.
Fenn, Richard W.
Ferris, Wilbur G.
Fisher, John H.
*Fitchko, George W., Jr.
*Fletcher, Gene C.
Flood, Robert H.
Fogarty, Francis C.
Foulds, Donald D.
Foxgrover, James H.
Foxwell, David G.
Franklin, Isaac N., Jr.
*Fransen, Arnold J.
*Franz, Donald A.
Freeland, Harold H.
*Freeman, James
Fry, John C.
Fuller, Jack D.
*Fuller, Richard, Jr.
*Gallagher, Joseph
*Gallagher, Cornelius R.
Gammon, James M.
*Garbee, Edwin T.
Garlinghouse, Bruce B.
Garner, Alan S.
Garvin, Wilbur C.
*Gaunt, Richard H.
*Gauntt, Wesley R.
Gauthier, Gene F.
*Geary, Joseph R.
Gebler, Gerard P.
Geiger, Robert K.
Gibson, George W.
Gideon, Robert A., Jr.
*Gilliland, Frank
*Gilmore, Russell G.
*Ginn, John O.
*Gokey, Noah W., III
Goldman, Peter J.
*Goldstein, David A.
Gorder, Charles F.
Gorman, Donald V.
Gormley, Robert H.
*Grause, Jerome E.
*Gravelly, Samuel L., Jr.
Graves, Robert F., Jr.
*Gray, Joseph W.
Green, Norman K.
*Greene, Wallace A.
Greig, Joseph E.
Griffin, Harry J.
Gross, James R.
*Groves, Thomas E.
Gurney, Sumner
Hale, Claude E.
Hale, Robert F.
*Hallam, Orval K.
*Hamilton, George
*Hamilton, Joe
*Hamilton, Robert M.
*Hanna, Donald L.
*Harbottle, Lyman W.
Hargarten, Robert W.
Harkins, William D.
*Harper, John R.
Harrier, John H.
Harris, Jack H.
Harris, William H.
Harrison, James L., Jr.
*Hart, Harry S.
*Hattersley, Julian
*Haugen, Edward S.
Haupt, Richard W.
Hawvermale, Joseph R.
*Hayes, James W., Jr.

- Haynes, Kenneth G.
Hazelwood, James M.
Heckert, Nelson E.
*Heesacker, Bernard A.
*Heinberg, Wolf
*Heise, Frederick J.
*Heller, Glenn G.
*Henderson, James R.
*Herrick, Carl H.
*Herzog, James H.
*Hess, John A.
*Hesse, Theodore S.
*High, John R.
Highsmith, Frederick L.
*Hill, Edward C.
Hinden, Harry J.
*Hinds, Charles D.
Hodder, Arthur J., Jr.
Hoffman, Richard A.
Hoffmann, Henry A.
Hoffmann, Roy F.
*Holden, William P.
Holland, John P.
Holshouser, Jesse A., Jr.
Holton, Wallace C.
Hornbrook, James M.
*Houck, John F., Jr.
*Hough, William L.
Howard, Donnell
*Howard, John N.
*Hubka, Verne R.
*Hubler, Vernon R.
Huddle, Norman P.
Huling, Harold E.
Hunter, "H" Reid
*Ives, John R., Jr.
Jackson, Donald C., Jr.
*Jackson, Thomas E.
*Jacobs, Richard "B"
Jagoe, William H.
Jahant, John W.
Jefferson, Harry P.
Jennings, Verne "H," Jr.
*Johnson, Benjamin T.
*Johnson, Francis A.
Johnson, Harvey J.
*Johnson, John D., Jr.
*Jordan, Edward V.
*Jordan, Francis P.
*Kaffer, Gerald H., Jr.
*Kalasinsky, Frank
*Karnagel, Donald T.
Kearny, James D.
*Keegan, Earl W., Jr.
*Keen, Timothy J.
Keenan, Paul C., Jr.
Keener, Bruce, III
*Keith, James
*Keller, William F., Jr.
Kelly, Eugene F.
*Kelly, William F.
Kelso, Quinten A.
*Kennedy, Clarence L.
*Keough, Raymond F.
Kern, John S.
King, John W., Jr.
*King, William D.
*King, William L., Jr.
*Kington, Joseph E., Jr.
*Kleczewski, Marion J.
*Klein, Melvin E.
Kline, John L., Jr.
*Klingberg, Franklin N.
Knutson, Albert E.
Koehler, Robert H.
Koenig, William H.
Kojm, Leonard R.
Kolda, Frank C.
Krejacsek, Donald J.
*Kreutz, Arthur R.
Lang, Hugh E.
- Lansden, Humphrey B.
*Larsen, Bertrand "O"
Larsen, Norman E.
*Lauver, George I.
Lawson, Kent W.
Lawton, Lawrence W.
Lebediez, Edward F.
*Lee, Earl B.
Lee, Harry B.
Lember, David B.
*Lemeschewsky, Andrew A.
*Lemmon, Donald D.
Leo, Joseph P., Jr.
Lewis, Chantee
Lewis, William S.
*Lindgren, George B.
*Longo, Charles R.
Lott, Jesse P.
*Lowans, Warren H.
*Lowell, Percival D., Jr.
Lynch, Robert E.
Lyon, Henry J.
MacOnie, Robert T.
*Madill, William G., Jr.
*Magee, William C.
Maige, George N.
Manganaro, Francis F.
Mangold, John F., Jr.
*Maragos, George
Marsolais, Lawrence D.
*Martin, Claude F., Jr.
*Martin, James W.
*Martin, Reginald E., Jr.
*Martin, Samuel A.
*Mathews, John M.
Matthew, William M.
Maurer, Richard C., Jr.
*Mawhiney, William T.
Maxwell, Robert A.
McArdle, Robert P.
McClinton, Robert B.
McConnell, John H., Jr.
McCook, John A.
McCord, Wayne S.
*McDaniel, William O.
McDonald, Carlton A. K.
*McDonald, Nathan F.
McDonald, William M.
McElwain, Richard S.
*McGill, John C., Jr.
McGonagle, William L.
McGrath, John J., Jr.
McGraw, Donald L.
McGravy, Joseph L.
*McKenzie, William W., Jr.
McKinley, William
McLaughlin, Norman H.
*McMahon, James P.
*McMakin, Charles H., Jr.
McNary, Johnnie W.
Measel, James G.
*Meisenheimer, John L.
*Melander, Vincent E.
*Midgette, Oliver F.
*Miechurski, Thomas A.
Miko, Charles R.
Miles, Bernard L.
*Miller, William O.
Milligan, Donald F.
*Mitchell, Eugene B.
Mitchell, Frank A.
Mitchell, John E.
*Mone, James V.
*Mooney, Rodney T.
Morgan, Clifford L.
*Morgan, Newton H.
*Morgiewicz, Daniel J.
Morris, Marion E.
- Morris, Max K.
Morrison, Edward B.
Morrison, Wilbur M.
Mott, William R.
Mulligan, Eugene W., III
Munly, Richard E.
*Murline, Robert A. H.
*Murphy, James J.
Murray, Richard D.
Murrill, Robert L.
*Mussetto, Bruno
Navarrette, Claude, Jr.
Nealon, William G.
*Negele, John H., Jr.
*Nelson, Clifford
Netherland, Roger M.
Newcomb, Robert C.
*Newkirk, Kenneth H.
*Nienberg, Robert J.
*Nockold, Louis W.
Norman, Oliver L., Jr.
*Nourse, James A.
Nowers, William E.
Nuber, George E., Jr.
O'Brien, Leo F.
*Oddo, Phillip W.
*O'Grady, John P.
Olds, Corwin A.
O'Leary, Stephen J., Jr.
Olson, Delbert A.
Olson, Robert C.
*Orbeton, Maurice C., Jr.
Osborn, Neri, III
Osmer, James W., Jr.
Ostlund, Eugene W.
*Palmer, Frederick F.
Parish, George R., Jr.
Parks, William L., Jr.
Patterson, Randolph F.
*Pavelle, John J., Jr.
*Peebles, George C., Jr.
*Pefley, John W.
Pehrsson, Pehr H.
*Peoples, George F.
Perdue, Uley F.
*Perkett, Arthur J., Jr.
Perry, Dale S.
*Perry, William J.
*Peterson, John P.
*Peterson, William S.
Pfeiffer, Willard D.
*Phillips, Alva L., Jr.
*Phillips, George W., Jr.
Phillips, Kenneth E.
Pickens, Jackson R.
Ploof, Kenneth
Pope, John E.
*Porter, William W.
Powell, Robert A.
Prange, William L.
*Prassinos, George
*Presgrove, Charles K.
Price, Mood B., Jr.
Prichard, Reuben P., Jr.
*Prum, Bruce E.
Puckett, Howard M.
*Pullen, Boyd M., Jr.
Pyle, Robert E.
Radtke, Robert N.
*Ragsdale, Homer C., Jr.
*Rank, Cyrus "A"
Rasmussen, John E.
Rauch, Charles F., Jr.
Rawlins, Robert D.
Rawson, Charles E.
*Reardon, Francis P.
Rectanus, Earl F.
Reichwein, Fremont E.
*Renz, Louis T.
Reynolds, Milton L.
Rideout, Joseph M., III
*Riehl, Julian W., Jr.
Rigot, William L.
Riley, Daniel P.
- Robertson, Bruce W.
*Robertson, William D., Jr.
Rockcastle, Charles H.
*Rogers, William H.
Rohrer, Leonard V.
*Rollins, Henry G.
Rose, Meyer H.
*Ross, Royal R., Jr.
Ross, Seymour N.
*Rouse, Jerome A.
Ruehrmund, James C.
*Ruoti, Anthony
Rusche, Alvin E.
*Rush, William A.
Russell, Paul E.
Russell, Wallace L.
*Ryder, Donald F.
Sanders, James E.
Sapp, Earle W.
Saubers, Maurice D.
Scappini, Mimo L.
Scafefer, William M.
*Schloer, Eric G.
Schniedwind, Robert F.
*Schou, Aage J.
Scoggins, Marvin C., Jr.
Scott, Robert L.
Scudder, Harold
*Seger, Josef M.
*Seidel, George H.
*Sell, Carl H.
Sellman, Edmund W.
*Shanahan, John J., Jr.
Shaver, William McC.
*Sheppard, James C.
*Shinn, William G.
Short, Edward A.
Shugart, Kenneth L., Jr.
Simmons, John A., Jr.
Simons, Joseph T.
Sisson, Jonathan A.
Skelly, Harold F.
Burkhart, Vernon A.
Slater, Robert W.
*Smith, Bertram C.
Smith, Deming W.
*Smith, George K.
Smith, Harold A.
*Smith, Howard G.
*Smith, John A.
*Smith, Lloyd H.
*Smith, Ralph F.
Smith, Robert H., Jr.
Smith, Robert P.
*Smullen, Orville A., Jr.
*Soper, Malvern E.
Spangenberg, Walter, Jr.
Spoon, Donald D.
Spry, Warren L.
*Stahl, Douglas
*Stensrud, John D.
*Stephens, Alvis H.
*Stephens, Lawrence B.
*Stillwell, Edward P.
*St. Louis, Joseph A. R.
Stone, John F.
Stone, Troy E.
*Straton, Andrew C.
*Strong, George T.
*Stroux, Peter M.
Styer, Robert T.
Sullivan, Elmer D.
*Sullivan, John F.
*Sumney, Frank F.
*Sup, George C.
*Sutton, Thomas L.
*Sylvia, Gerald
*Sylvia, Henry J.
*Tarpey, John F.
*Taylor, Cecil O.
*Taylor, David J.
Taylor, Dean, Jr.
*Tedholm, Charles E.
Tell, William M.
- Terrass, Milford S.
Terry, Bernard E., Jr.
Thomas, Edward W.
Thomas, Lee R., Jr.
Thomas, Lon C.
*Thomas, Ralph L., Jr.
*Thomas, Robert H.
*Thompson, Elmer N.
Thompson, Robert K.
*Thompson, Thomas N.
Thomson, James
Thummel, Gerald F.
Timidalski, James T.
Tobin, Daniel P.
*Toole, Wycliffe D., Jr.
Trout, Roscoe L.
Trusso, Sebastian
*Tuel, Merritt D.
*Turner, John S.
*Ubricht, Frederick W.
Ulm, Robert B.
Underwood, John "L," Jr.
*Urban, Henry, Jr.
Urbanczyk, Louis T.
*Usina, Joseph D.
Vermilya, Jay "J"
Vermilya, Robert S.
Vollertsen, Russell A.
Vollmer, Cecil R.
Voves, Martin C.
Wadsworth, Dwight
*Waits, Jack E.
Walker, Grant J.
*Walker, Grover "C," Jr.
*Walsh, Francis R., Jr.
Ward, Edgar F.
- Ward, "J" "D"
Warde, William A.
Warriner, Victor G.
Warring, Leo B.
*Waterman, Jack "E"
*Watkins, Robert W.
*Weber, Kent J.
Wegner, William
Weidman, Robert M., Jr.
*Weidman, William K.
Welch, Edward F., Jr.
Welch, Paul R.
Wellons, Alfred G., Jr.
*Wells, John T.
*Wellsman, Howard C.
*Wente, David A.
Wenzel, Harold F.
*Wicks, William F.
*Wilcox, Charles L.
Wilda, Gerald L.
Williams, Bernard P., Jr.
Williams, Glenn E.
Williams, Hexter A.
*Williams, James S.
*Williams, William H.
*Williamson, Robert C.
Wineman, Gordon L.
Winkler, Cornelius, Jr.
*Winslett, Ernest R.
Witkowski, Eugene F.
*Wood, Eugene E.
*Woodard, David A.
*Woods, William L., Jr.
*Wyand, Donald M.
Yates, Andrew J.
Yates, William K.
*Young, Grant C.
Zelov, Randolph D.
*Zenni, Martin "M"

MEDICAL CORPS

- Allison, Mack E., Jr.
Babalis, William J.
Barnwell, Frank M.
Burkhart, Vernon A.
Clarke, Pauline E.
*Egan, John F.
Frew, Mable A.
Hyams, Vincent J.
*Jacoby, William J., Jr.
*Lucas, William E.
Maughon, James S.
*McDonough, Robert C.
*Myers, Willis S.
*O'Connell, Patrick F.
*Paslay, Jefferson W.
*Wilson, David Q.
*Winter, William R.

SUPPLY CORPS

- *Abrams, Bernard
Abern, James R.
Allshouse, Thomas J.
Baumgartner, James M.
Benson, Bruce A.
Bow, Joseph R.
Chapman, John A., II
Chesure, Joseph H.
*Dellinger, Charley P.
*Downey, James G.
*Ferris, Robert H.
Fisk, Calvin W.
*Fry, Roy A., Jr.
Grechanik, Walter
Haines, Donald R.
*Handforth, Carlos H., Jr.
*Harris, Melvin W.
*Harvey, Hobart D.
Hatch, Bobby L.
Havener, Millard F.
Heasley, Gail L.
Heitmeyer, Richard C.
Hency, Max E.
Hereford, James D., Jr.
*Hillard, Herbert S., Jr.
Holt, Robert O.
Honsinger, Jack E.
*Huntress, James F.
Hutchinson, Marvin S.
*Jankovsky, Norlin A.
*Johnson, Richard D.
*Jones, Joseph B.
Jongeward, Keith W.
*Keller, Richard C.
*Kellogg, Dean L.
*Kennedy, Patrick F.
Keyser, Carroll R.
*Kimball, Jack F.
*Knobel, Roland J., Jr.
Kraus, Walter L.
Lake, Donald H.
*Lent, Robert E.
*Lindsey, Bob R.
Longmire, Billy R.
Manion, Uriel V., Jr.
Maurstad, Alfred S.
Maxon, Ivan B.
McCabe, John N.
*McKenna, James E.
*Murray, Douglas S.
Nash, William T.
Nunn, Enoch W.
Nunnally, Roy S.
O'Connor, Thomas J.
Olin, William C.
Oliver, James C., Jr.
Ortland, Warren H.
Ouellette, Joseph F.
*Owen, Frank T., Jr.
Park, Jack M.
*Pate, Walter T., Jr.
Pawlowski, Thomas J., Jr.
*Pflueger, Paul J.
*Phelps, Gordon W., Jr.
*Pluto, Raymond J.
*Pope, George S., Jr.
*Primm, Jules R.

Rainey, Richard L.
Reichert, Harold H.
Reynolds, William J.
*Robison, John T.
*Ronayne, William D.
Ross, Joel E.
Ryder, John K.
*Schanze, Fred, Jr.
Schultz, Jackson L.
*Sloan, Dale F.
Spalding, Joseph E.
Stephens, Samuel S.
*Sueur, Charles A.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Anderson, Robert E.
Agnew, James F.
Below, Ralph W.
*Boyer, Arthur C.
Caldwell, Ralph G.
Detrick, Wayne N.
Duncan, Henry C.
Dunn, Edward J.
Hammerl, Paul C.
Hunter, William M.
Killeen, James J.
Lineberger, Ernest R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Burch, Bobby F.
Butterfield, Ossian E.
Curlione, Charles
*Dearth, Keith H.
Dewey, Elliot A.
Floyd, Archie E.
Held, Charles C., Jr.
*Hoskins, Dalton
*Jasper, Paul R.
Jortberg, Robert F.
Ledoux, John C.
Miller, Robert H.
Nims, William E.
*Nuss, Edward S.

DENTAL CORPS

Allen, Ethan C.
Austin, Robert E.
Bartosh, Andrew J.
*Brown, Edward H.
Charles, Thomas J., Jr.
Cohen, Robert
Corthay, James E.
*Dennis, Harry J., Jr.
Duggan, Norman E.
*Elliott, Robert W., Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

*Combs, Norris K.
Noble, Howard F., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

*Brennan, Mary P.
*Cohan, Patricia G.
Cornelius, Dolores
*DeMariano, Helen J.
Emery, Lura J.
Finn, Mary V.
*Gallagher, Eleanore M.
Houghton, Arline D.

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

Abe, Henry H.
*Abele, Henry F.
*Abercrombie, Jerry T.
*Abrahams, Thomas P.
Abrahamson, Dean A.
Abrom, Richard M.
Adamson, Edwin C., Jr.
Adcox, James R.
*Addams, John F.
Adler, Ronald E.
Adorney, Frank
Ahlgren, Kenneth L.
*Alhquist, Stanley W.

Aiau, Harvey C. K.
Aitcheson, George A., Jr.
Albee, Thomas L., Jr.
*Albers, William P.
*Albertson, William H.
Albertson, Norman
Albright, Richard K.
Alderson, James M.
*Alexander, Marvin W.
*Alexander, Robert C.
Alexander, Charles F.
Alexander, Adelaide L.
Alford, Darius M.

Alford, William J.
*Aldredge, Donald L.
Allen, George W.
*Allen, William D.
Aillingham, James R.
*Allison, Arnold W.
Almberg, Francis J.
*Altee, Thomas M.
*Altmeyer, John M.
Andersen, Alexander R.
*Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Curtis O.
*Anderson, David W.
Anderson, Ernest J.
*Anderson, Forrest P.
Anderson, Kenneth E.
*Anderson, Robert P.
Anderson, Robert N.
Anderson, Richard N.
Anderson, Samuel B.
Andrassy, Michael F.
*Ankrum, Glenn E.
*Apted, George L.
*Archambault, Jackson L.
*Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Armstrong, Philip M., Jr.
Armstrong, Stephen O., Jr.
*Arnheiter, Marcus A.
Arnold, Robert B.
*Asbacher, Martin A., Jr.
*Ash, Leonard "C"
*Ashley, Bruce H.
Atkinson, Robert J.
Aubuchon, Harvey
*Aucoin, Leonard L.
Augustine, Grant, III
Austin, Carl G.
*Avery, James C., Jr.
*Avrit, Richard C.
*Babcock, Donald E.
*Backes, Ronald J.
*Bacon, John L.
Bagby, Hallam O.
*Bailey, George T.
Bailey, Joe E.
Bailey, William R., Jr.
Baker, Halbert E.
*Baker, Robert O.
*Balderston, Buele G.
Baldwin, Charles C.
*Ball, Courtland D., III
Banham, Herbert G., Jr.
*Banks, Sidney M.
Banta, Robert
Barber, William H.
*Barke, Arthur R.
*Barnes, Donald K.
Barnes, Harry G., Jr.
Barnes, Harold
*Barnes, John B.
*Baron, Charles R.
Barrett, Thomas D.
*Barry, Thomas M.
Barth, Joseph J., Jr.
*Barthelenghi, George H., Jr.
Bartlett, Frederick R.
*Bassett, Jerry S.
Bassett, Melvin S.
Bates, Carl M.
Battaglino, Joseph M.
Bauchspies, Rollin L., Jr.
*Bauer, Bruce A.
*Baum, Joseph H.
Bayer, David A.
Bayne, John P.
Beat, Robert S.
*Beaulieu, Reo A.
*Beaumont, Eugene A. G.
*Beaver, Alfred S.
Beaver, John T.
*Beck, Donald A.
Beck, William H.

*Becker, Glynn R.
*Beers, Robert C.
Beeton, Harvey J.
*Behnken, Clifford R.
*Bein, George E.
Bekkedahl, Clifford L.
Belechak, Stephen C.
Bell, Bill J.
*Bell, William R.
*Belton, Jack G.
*Beneto, Manuel A., Jr.
*Bengel, Audrey L., Jr.
Benner, Leslie W., Jr.
*Bennie, Donald B.
*Bentley, William C.
Bergbauer, Harry W., Jr.
Berge, Charles W.
*Berge, Norman K.
*Berger, James K.
*Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
Bernier, William G., Jr.
Berry, Richard C.
*Berry, William H.
Besio, Louis F.
Best, Eddie F.
*Bethke, Earl E., Jr.
Beuris, Charles B.
Bingham, Joseph L.
Bird, Charles F.
Bird, Joseph W., Jr.
Bishop, Richard D.
Bittick, Marshall V., Jr.
*Bivens, Arthur C.
Bjork, Kenneth S.
*Blackington, Richard N.
*Blackmore, Thomas A.
Blackwood, Robert G.
Blanchard, Robert C.
*Blandine, Robert E.
*Blaszczak, Walter J.
Block, Stanley H.
Block, Steven
Blouin, Stanley G., Jr.
Blundell, Peveril
Boaz, George L.
*Bodding, Paul F., Jr.
Boggs, Steve V.
Boguszewski, Frank S., Jr.
*Bolster, Harry E.
*Borthwick, Robert B.
Bostwick, Charles G., Jr.
*Botsko, Ronald T.
Bottenberg, Foster L.
Botts, Ronald H.
Bowen, Thomas J.
Bowling, Charles R.
Bowling, David H.
Bowling, Roy H.
*Bowman, Lawrence F.
*Boyd, John H., Jr.
*Boyer, Walton T., Jr.
Boyer, William E.
Boyett, Stephen G.
*Boyle, Darrell D.
Boyle, Henry F., Jr.
Boywid, Edward T.
Bozell, Rex K.
*Bozeman, Henry G.
*Brabec, Richard C.
Bradbury, John I.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.
Brady, Bernard F.
Braun, William K. G.
*Breaux, Fred J., Jr.
*Bredestegge, Joseph J., Jr.
Breedlove, James D.
Brewer, Cleon H.
*Bridge, James A., Jr.
Bristol, Robert B.

*Britton, William L.
Brodhead, Edward M.
Brooks, Darrell H.
Brooks, Edwin H., Jr.
Brown, Cloyde I.
Brown, Dennis A.
Brown, Donald D.
Brown, Frederick P.
*Brown, George A.
Brown, George P.
*Brown, Harold
Brown, Kenneth R.
*Brown, Larry J.
*Brown, Lloyd H.
*Brown, Walter H., Jr.
*Browning, Siras D.
*Bruce, George W., Jr.
Brummage, Richard L.
*Bruning, Richard A.
*Brunskill, Robert J.
*Brunson, Wright "A", Jr.
Buc, Gerald G.
Buc, William J.
*Bucher, Lloyd M.
Buckholdt, Robert A.
Buckley, James R.
*Bucy, John T., Jr.
Bueck, Robert K.
Bull, Joseph L., III
*Bullard, John R.
*Bullock, William A.
*Burdon, Eugene R.
Burgess, James A.
*Burke, William C.
Burkhardt, Lawrence, III
Burris, Raymond M.
*Burris, John R.
Burrow, Billy M.
*Burt, Thomas E.
Busey, James B.
Bushong, Brent
*Butcher, Nathan T.
Butcher, Paul D.
*Butler, Archie P., Jr.
*Butler, Charles T.
Butler, Harold E.
Butner, Oscar W., Jr.
*Butrym, Stanley B., Jr.
Butz, John T.
Byberg, Robert C.
Byrne, John A., Jr.
*Byrnes, Robert E.
Cagle, James B.
Calkin, Cecil R.
*Callaghan, Joseph M.
Callicott, Jack D.
*Cameron, Kenneth R.
*Cameron, Norman A.
Cammall, John K.
*Campbell, Edward L.
Campbell, George R.
Campbell, Hugh J., Jr.
Campbell, Hugh T.
*Campbell, John A.
*Campbell, James B.
Campbell, Jack
Campbell, Robert J.
*Campbell, William N.
*Canfield, Gerald I.
*Cann, Tedford J.
Cannell, Donald T.
Cannon, David E.
*Canon, George A., III
Cantillon, Henry C.
Cantwell, Richard B.
*Carelli, Francis L.
*Carey, William R.
*Carl, William T.
*Carlin, Robert J.
Carlson, Olof M., Jr.
*Carlson, Ronald F.
Carmody, Cornelius J.
*Carnevale, Angelo M.
*Caron, Robert R.
*Carosia, Joseph J.
Carothers, Philip "F", Jr.

*Carr, John H.
Carr, Nevil P.
Carr, Roland J.
Carrington, James H., Jr.
Carroll, James F.
*Carter, James D.
Carter, Robert D.
Carter, Winfred G.
*Carterette, Robert T.
*Cash, Eugene J.
*Cashman, Michael, II
*Cassen, John S., Jr.
*Cassidy, Thomas J., Jr.
Castro, William B.
Cate, Thomas R., Jr.
*Causey, Donald F.
Cave, David B.
*Cave, Thomas H.
Cavitt, William M.
*Chadwick, John K.
*Champlin, Gerald B.
*Charest, Alexis N.
*Charest, Philip G.
Chase, Edgar M.
Chase, Robert T., Jr.
*Chase, Warren A.
*Check, Robert T.
Chesley, James F.
Chezem, Norman B.
Childs, George M.
Chin, Donald
*Chisum, Albert, Jr.
Christensen, Raymond J.
Christie, William G.
*Christon, Paul W.
*Clark, Donald E.
*Clark, Edwin B.
Clark, George K.
*Clark, Lynn R.
Clark, Philip K.
Clark, Richard G.
Clark, Robert A.
*Clark, Stanley D.
*Clarkin, James J.
Clayman, Samuel W.
Clemens, Eugene M.
*Clements, Billy R.
*Clew, William M.
Clingspeel, William K.
*Clinton, Thomas G.
Cloud, Benjamin W.
Cobb, Richard S.
*Coe, David C., Jr.
Coffin, George R.
*Cole, Edgar E.
*Cole, William S., Jr.
*Coleman, James O.
Coleman, Michael T.
Coleman, Thomas R.
Colgan, John G.
*Collier, Larry D.
*Colligan, Thomas R.
*Collins, Philip K.
*Combs, Martin F.
*Corney, Robert W.
Compton, Charles R.
Conn, Clayton "J"
Connolly, John J.
Connolly, Timothy W.
Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Conroy, Robert O.
Coogan, Richard D.
*Cook, Charles L.
Cook, Harry K.
Cook, Vernon H., Jr.
*Cooley, Arthur W.
Cooper, Andrew N., Jr.
*Cooper, Donald H.
Cooper, Lowell H.
*Cooper, Robert G.
Cooper, Tommy G.
*Corbett, Eugene A.
*Corley, Bennie L.
Cormier, Conrad R.
*Cornell, Arthur F.
*Coscina, Michael A., Jr.

- *Coskey, Kenneth L.
 *Coston, Stanford W., Jr.
 *Cottrell, Walter N.
 *Cotugno, Paul J.
 *Coughlin, Eugene F.
 *Coughlin, Paul G.
 *Cour, Edward E.
 Cox, Floyd E.
 Cox, Gerald W.
 Crabb, Eugene V.
 *Crader, Clifford L.
 Craig, Earl C.
 *Crain, James D.
 Crandall, Alan W.
 *Crane, Leonard B., Jr.
 *Crater, Ray F.
 Crawford, Bobby C.
 Crawford, Kerrins M.
 *Crawford, Nace B., Jr.
 *Crepeau, George A.
 Cricchi, John V.
 *Cringlaw, Douglas L.
 Critz, Merrill E.
 Crockett, Thomas L.
 Cronkrite, Donald W.
 Crook, Richard W.
 Cross, Charles H.
 Crumpler, Benton E., Jr.
 Cuccias, Leo P.
 Culbert, Joseph M., Jr.
 *Culver, Eugene A.
 *Cunningham, Edward F.
 *Curl, Kent W.
 *Curry, Thomas E.
 *Curtis, Fayne E.
 Dagdigian, James J.
 Dally, Hubert D., Jr.
 Dally, David F.
 *Dalton, Charles W.
 Dalton, Richard V.
 Daly, Harry P., Jr.
 Daly, Richard G.
 Daniels, James M.
 *D'Arville, Edmond J.
 Davenport, Philip C.
 Davidson, Charles H.
 *Davis, Bill N.
 *Davis, Frank E.
 Davis, George K.
 *Davis, Henry J., Jr.
 Davis, John B.
 *Davis, Noble J., Jr.
 Davis, Robert C., Jr.
 Davis, Russell E.
 *Davis, Walter J.
 *Day, Arthur R.
 Deal, Walter C., Jr.
 Dearcot, Michael E.
 *Dearman, Kermit E.
 *Debit, Dion G. B.
 DeBolt, Frank C.
 DeFeo, Modestino R.
 DeHart, William
 Delaney, William A.
 DeMaris, Darryl A.
 DeMartini, Edward J.
 Demonbreum, James R.
 Dempsey, Gerald M.
 *Denman, Charles C., Jr.
 Dennis, Aubrey D.
 Derda, James R.
 Derda, James R.
 Desrocher, Marvin P.
 *DeTonnancourt, Arthur E.
 Devereaux, John R., Jr.
 Dey, Gordon J.
 *Dick, Joseph L.
 Dickman, Jerry A.
 Dickson, John A.
 *Dickson, William T.
 Dierdorff, Loren M.
 Diesel, Charles N.
 *Dietz, Richard J.
 *DiGiacomo, Joseph G.
- Dillard, Marvin B.
 *Dillingham, Paul W., Jr.
 *Dimon, Charles G., Jr.
 *Dinola, Michael J.
 Divilbiss, Dallas R.
 *Dobyns, John E.
 Dodds, Robert M.
 *Dolan, William R.
 Domingue, William A.
 *Donaldson, Robert S.
 Donaldson, Robert J.
 *Donnelly, Raymond D., Jr.
 *Donnelly, Robert G.
 *Donnelly, Richard F.
 *Donohue, David P.
 *Donovan, James F.
 *Doolittle, James E.
 Dorland, John E.
 *Doroshuk, John, Jr.
 Dorsey, Arthur G., Jr.
 *Douglas, Jack R.
 *Douglass, James G., Jr.
 Dowd, Francis X.
 *Dowds, Donald H.
 *Dowe, Robert M., Jr.
 Dowe, William J., Jr.
 Downs, James R.
 *Doyle, William J.
 *Drain, John F.
 Drake, William L.
 Drees, Morris C.
 Dreghorn, Richard T.
 Drew, Russell C.
 Drummet, Richard C.
 *Drummond, Scott E., Jr.
 Dubino, Andrew D.
 Dubois, Roland H.
 Duff, Robert G.
 *Duffy, Bernard A.
 *Duffy, Joseph A., Jr.
 Duhrkopf, Don J.
 Duke, Marshal D., Jr.
 *Dunaway, John A., Jr.
 Dunbar, Vance O.
 *Duncan, Dale W.
 *Dunkin, Ray L.
 Dunlop, Thomas E.
 Dunn, John F.
 Durant, Michael
 Durant, Thomas W.
 *Durbin, Peter
 Dwyer, George M.
 Eberhart, Robert S.
 Eckerd, Kenneth C.
 *Eckhouse, Morton A.
 Eddy, Denver D.
 Edwards, Donald L.
 *Edwards, Forrest L.
 *Edwards, Jerry J.
 *Edwards, William R., Jr.
 Eibert, Don C.
 Eichinger, Joseph C.
 Eldridge, David B., Jr.
 *Eller, Richard L.
 Elliott, Orville G.
 Ellis, Davis E.
 *Ellis, George D., Jr.
 *Elmore, John F., Jr.
 Elmore, John E.
 *Elster, James M.
 *Emerson, Jesse R., III
 Emry, John O.
 Engelbrecht, Richard H.
 *Englander, Owen
 English, Francis W., Jr.
 Erickson, William K.
 *Erwin, Donald E.
 Evans, Albert L.
 *Evans, Boyce "D"
 *Evans, David W.
 Evans, George J.
 Evans, Richard B.
- Evans, Robert C.
 *Evans, Thomas B.
 Eyres, Thomas D.
 *Falconer, Alastair S.
 *Fall, David R., Jr.
 Fanning, William M.
 *Farber, Karl H.
 *Farnham, Charles G.
 *Farris, Don M.
 *Fawcett, Craig R.
 *Feeks, Edmond M.
 Fehl, Frederick C., Jr.
 Fell, Roy T.
 Fellows, Charles D.
 *Felt, Donald L.
 *Felt, Joseph A.
 *Fenn, Dan E.
 Ferguson, William W.
 *Ferguson, Ernest W.
 *Fernandes, James E.
 Ferrazzano, Fred J.
 *Fette, Estal J.
 *Field, Harford, Jr.
 Fiene, Donald F.
 Filkins, William C.
 Fliteau, George L.
 Fimian, James J.
 *Finneran, William J.
 Finney, Jack L.
 *Fischbein, Ernest
 Fischer, David H.
 Fischer, Edward J.
 Fisher, John C.
 *Fisher, Paul J.
 *Fisher, Russell H.
 *Fitzgerald, Thomas W., Jr.
 Fitzgerald, David E.
 *Fitzpatrick, Edward C.
 Flatley, John E.
 *Fleischmann, William H., Jr.
 Fleming, Raymond T., Jr.
 Flom, Hewitt O.
 *Florance, John E., Jr.
 *Foley, Edmund F.
 Folz, Charles E.
 *Fong, Chong S.
 Font, Carlos G.
 Forsman, Arvid E.
 Fossum, Paul G.
 Fox, Charles W., Jr.
 Fox, Richard V.
 Frank, Benjamin L.
 Frankfield, Robert T.
 Fraser, George K., Jr.
 *Fraser, Robert "E"
 *Frederick, Donald R. A.
 Frederick, John L.
 Freed, Maitland G.
 *Freeman, Linus W., Jr.
 *Freeman, Robert W.
 French, Fred H.
 French, Henry A.
 Freund, Herman C.
 Frick, Joseph F.
 *Friedel, Gordon W.
 *Friesen, George A.
 *Friesen, Floyd A.
 *Fudge, David A.
 Furey, Laurence T.
 *Furgerson, John A.
 *Furmanski, John A.
 *Gall, Daune M.
 Gallagher, Hugh L.
 Gallagher, Robert S.
 *Gallipeau, Richard W.
 Gallup, Shelley P.
 Galvin, Bernard J.
 Gandy, John D.
 Garcia, William V.
 Gardner, Louis J.
 Gardner, Ruel E.
 Garnett, Walter W.
- *Garrett, John E.
 Garver, Hollis V.
 *Gatewood, Tommy L.
 Gatterman, Raymond D.
 *Gavazzi, Robert R.
 Gedney, George, Jr.
 *Gennette, Robert L.
 Gentry, Osby Z., Jr.
 Gentry, Timothy P.
 Gherrity, Patrick F.
 Gibber, Philip "F"
 *Gibbs, Charles E., Jr.
 Giberson, William A., Jr.
 Gibson, Robert B., Jr.
 Gigliotti, Felix P.
 *Gildea, Joseph A.
 *Giles, Thomas N.
 *Gillette, Halbert G.
 Gilmore, Arthur H.
 Gilroy, John W., Jr.
 *Giovannetti, William C.
 *Gjertson, Glenn R.
 Glasgow, Thomas A.
 *Glaves, Robert H.
 *Glazier, Alvin S.
 Gleason, Joseph P.
 *Gleim, Ernest H.
 *Glickman, Walter
 Goben, Robert D.
 *Godfrey, Forrest J.
 *Golde, Morton
 *Goldner, Robert R.
 Gomer, August W.
 *Good, Ronald P.
 *Gooden, Richard O.
 *Goodfellow, John
 *Goodman, Kelsey B.
 Goodrich, John R.
 *Goodwin, Frank O., Jr.
 *Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
 *Gorman, Hugh J., Jr.
 Goschke, Erwin A.
 *Gowing, Richard M.
 *Gradel, Robert
 Graf, Frederic A., Jr.
 Grahler, Walter H.
 Granger, Russell P.
 Graveson, George L., Jr.
 Gray, Charles A.
 *Greeley, Michael T.
 *Green, Thomas B.
 Greene, William F.
 *Greenwood, Eugene I.
 Greer, Marvin S., Jr.
 *Greer, Wayne C.
 Gregory, Donald G.
 *Gregory, George B.
 Grelwe, William H.
 *Gress, Donald H.
 *Grich, Richard J.
 *Grier, Robert W., Jr.
 Griffith, Webster
 *Griggs, Norman E.
 *Groenert, Frederick E.
 Groff, Noel E.
 *Gross, Arthur J.
 Grouby, Edward A., Jr.
 Guess, Malcolm N.
 Gunning, Patrick J.
 *Gurnsey, Ronald A.
 Guzman, Indalecio
 Haas, Kenneth R.
 Hack, Arthur J., Jr.
 *Hackney, Benjamin F., III
 Hagberg, Roy V.
 Hageman, Roger H.
 Hager, Charles F.
 Haggquist, Grant F., Jr.
 Hahn, Edward W., Jr.
 *Hahn, Frederick, Jr.
 *Hairston, Thomas F.
- Hall, Donald L.
 Halsey, Charles H., Jr.
 *Halverson, Richard K.
 Hamaker, Laurence P., Jr.
 *Hamel, James K.
 *Hamilton, Glenn D.
 Hamm, Clement D., Jr.
 *Hammock, John W.
 Hammond, Russel J.
 Hampton, Winfred F.
 *Hamrick, Thomas D.
 Hangartner, Lyle G.
 *Hannula, Brian K.
 *Hansard, Stonewall
 *Hansell, Emerson L., Jr.
 *Hansen, Norman T.
 *Hansen, Rodney V.
 Hanson, Albertlea
 Harlow, David L.
 Harney, Russell F.
 *Harns, John H.
 Harper, George T., Jr.
 Harper, William W.
 *Harris, Dennis C.
 *Harris, James
 Harris, James Wesley
 Harris, James C.
 Harris, Neil A.
 *Harris, Richard A.
 *Harrop, Robert D.
 Hartnagle, Eugene F.
 Hartranft, Richard J.
 Harwood, John B.
 *Haslam, Edward H., Jr.
 Hassett, Joseph K.
 Hatch, Harold G.
 *Hatcher, Robert E., Jr.
 Havens, Stanley L.
 Havird, Lloyd B.
 Hawk, Arthur L.
 *Hawkins, Richard M.
 Hayes, Albert M., Jr.
 Hayes, Jerome B.
 *Hays, Estel W.
 Haywood, Jesse H.
 Headland, Carl B.
 Headrick, Billy J.
 *Heasley, Waldo L.
 Hebbard, Leroy B., Jr.
 Heft, James O.
 Heisel, Lawrence L.
 *Helgemoe, Raymond A.
 Helgeson, Harry E., Jr.
 *Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
 Helms, Ronald L.
 *Henderson, Charles G.
 Henderson, Jerry E.
 Hendrick, David R.
 *Henley, John R.
 Hennessey, Aloysius G., Jr.
 Henriquez, Joseph S.
 Henson, James D.
 *Henson, John M.
 *Herkner, Richard T.
 Hernan, Peter J.
 *Herring, Edwin L.
 Herriott, Donald M.
 Higginbotham, Allen B.
 Higgins, Byron R.
 *Higgins, Hugh W.
 *Higgins, Raymond F.
 Higgins, Thomas G.
 High, James T., Jr.
 Hill, Frank W.
 Hill, James J.
 Hill, Marshall E.
 Hille, Edward W.
 *Hilz, Harold J.
 Hinden, Stanley
- Hinman, Albert H.
 *Hipp, Ronald N., Jr.
 *Hoch, John E., Jr.
 Hodge, Sidney T.
 *Hodges, James W., Jr.
 *Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
 Hogan, Walter V.
 *Holbert, William H., Jr.
 *Holcomb, Gordon B.
 *Holcomb, "M" Staser
 *Holder, Luther C.
 *Holian, James J.
 *Holland, Elbert R.
 Holland, James N.
 *Hollen, Frederick M.
 Hollenbach, William T.
 Hollingsworth, Robert L.
 Holly, Daniel T., Jr.
 Holmes, Harold C., III
 *Holt, Ivey B., Jr.
 Holt, John J.
 *Holt, Kenneth N.
 Holt, Philip R.
 *Holway, Nathan C.
 *Hoover, John S.
 Hope, Edgar G., Jr.
 Hopkins, Earl E.
 *Horan, Robert A.
 *Horton, Edward R.
 Horton, Robert L.
 Hoskins, Bill J.
 *Hoskovec, William B.
 Hostettler, Stephen J.
 *House, Edward C.
 *Houston, Albert W.
 *Howard, Albert W., Jr.
 *Howard, Donald L.
 Howell, Franklin M.
 *Howell, Harry E.
 Howell, Roswell L.
 *Howey, Robert E.
 Hoyer, James M., II
 Hoyt, Richard L.
 Hozey, Ira D., Jr.
 Hubal, Augustine E., Jr.
 Hubbard, Clifford R., Jr.
 *Hubbard, Samuel W., Jr.
 Hubbell, Walter B.
 Huber, John J., Jr.
 *Hudson, John P., Jr.
 Huffman, Malcolm L.
 Hughes, George A.
 *Hughes, Kenneth P.
 Hughes, Ronald E.
 Huisman, Roland K.
 Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
 Hullryde, Donald
 *Humber, Marcel B.
 *Humphreys, Felton "M", Jr.
 Hunter, Charles B.
 Hurd, John B.
 *Hurley, Robert J.
 Hussey, Clifton M.
 Hyde, Deloss C.
 *Ingraham, Talcott L., Jr.
 *Irrgang, Carl H.
 *Isaacks, Marion H.
 Isaacs, Allen L.
 *Jacobs, Edward J.
 *Jacobs, Edward J., Jr.
 James, Joe M.
 James, Joel L., Jr.
 *Jamison, Billy D.
 *Jasper, Charles R.
 Jefferis, Allen S.
 *Jellison, Robert K.
 *Jenkins, Folsom
 Jensen, Clifford V.
 Jeter, Norman L.
 *Johnsen, Roy M.
 Johnson, Alfred C., Jr.
 Johnson, Arne C.

- Johnson, Bert W.
 *Johnson, Dale W.
 Johnson, Eldon D.
 *Johnson, Oren D.
 *Johnson, Robert G.
 Johnson, Robert E.
 *Johnson, Theodore F.
 *Johnson, William R.
 *Johnston, George T.
 *Johnston, John M.
 Johnston, James I.
 Jonasz, Fredric
 Jones, Alfred L., Jr.
 Jones, Arthur L., Jr.
 *Jones, Donald W.
 *Jones, Donald S.
 Jones, Henry R.
 *Jones, Robert C.
 Jones, Robert H.
 *Jordan, James S.
 Joy, Bernard I.
 Kaiser, Dean E.
 *Kane, Charles K.
 Kane, Paul E.
 Karcher, Robert K.
 Karge, Ronald E.
 *Karpaitis, Anthony J.
 Kastelein, Cornelius
 *Kattmann, Roger H.
 *Kauderer, Bernard M.
 Keely, Leroy B.
 Keenan, Richard L.
 *Kehoe, Thomas R.
 *Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
 Keith, William H.
 Kelley, Alfred G., Jr.
 *Kelley, Roy A.
 *Kelly, James F.
 *Kelly, James M.
 *Kelly, John S.
 Kelt, William N.
 *Kendrick, William O.
 *Kennedy, William E.
 Kent, James F., Jr.
 Ketzner, Harry T.
 Kiddle, Bradley D.
 Killebrew, Carl W.
 Killian, Donald J.
 *Kimzey, Walter F.
 King, Donald E.
 King, John E., Jr.
 King, Julian B.
 *Kinsley, Harry W., Jr.
 Kirkpatrick, Hollis H.
 *Kirksey, Robert E.
 Kirtley, Daniel J.
 Kish, Steven E.
 Klar, Norman
 *Klee, Robert E.
 *Kling, William T.
 *Knapp, William R.
 Knepper, Donald E.
 Knerr, Donald O.
 Knies, George C., Jr.
 *Knight, Charles H.
 *Kniss, Donovan E.
 Knoerr, Don H.
 Knowles, George I.
 Koci, Vaclav H.
 Kostoch, Walter B.
 *Kratz, Marshall L.
 *Kretschmann, Curt H.
 Krisman, Frank A.
 *Krochmal, Alfred F.
 Kruse, Charles H., Jr.
 *Krusi, Peter H.
 Kube, Cleo J.
 Kugler, Kenneth D.
 Kuklinski, Steve T.
 *Kunstmann, Clarence M.
 *Kurzenhauser, Alfred
 Kuttler, Manfor D., Jr.
 *Kutzieb, Robert E.
 LaBarre, Richard E.
 *Labeau, Thomas J.
 Laceyfield, Joe V.
 *Lage, Robert L.
 Lahr, John J.
 Laib, Ernest E., Jr.
 *Lake, Walter W.
 *Lamb, David C.
 *Lamb, Marion G.
 *Lamm, William A.
 *Lancaster, William L., Jr.
 *Landers, John D.
 Landers, Robert J.
 Landersman, Stuart D.
 *Lane, Archie G.
 Lane, Robert E.
 Lane, Terry L.
 *Lang, James M.
 Lange, Kenneth B.
 *Langer, Donald A.
 Langner, David S.
 *Langston, John L.
 *Lanphear, Roy E.
 Lardis, Christopher S.
 *Larsen, John H.
 *Lashbrook, Durwood E.
 *Latham, William B.
 *Latta, Robert L.
 Lauber, Ronald M.
 Lauber, William C.
 Laughlin, Gerald F., Jr.
 *Lavender, Robert E.
 Law, Vincent G.
 Lawler, Frederick W.
 Lawler, James C.
 Lawler, William A.
 Lawrence, Donald S.
 Lawrence, Keith D.
 Leaman, Richard E.
 Leavitt, Horace M., Jr.
 Leckie, William O., Jr.
 Lee, Earl C.
 Leenerts, Roland E.
 Lehto, Robert K.
 Leitner, Lorayne A.
 Lemen, Ura B.
 *Lemmon, Virgil J.
 *Lenahan, Robert P.
 Lent, Willis A., Jr.
 Lentz, Lindley A.
 Leonhardi, Roger L.
 Levenson, Lee E.
 *Levey, Sanford N.
 Levin, Burt L.
 Lewis, Dewey T.
 *Lewis, Robert
 Lewis, Willis I., Jr.
 *Lewit, Howard L.
 *Lichlyter, Stanford E.
 *Lightsey, Elvin G., Jr.
 *Limbaugh, Harold D.
 *Limerick, Christopher J., Jr.
 Lina, Robert A.
 Lind, Anton F.
 Lindsay, Gilbert M.
 Lindsay, Robert B.
 *Lipford, Charles E.
 *Lloyd, Theodore L., Jr.
 Locke, Barrie B.
 *Lodge, Billups E.
 *Logan, Joseph B.
 *Lohr, Chester H.
 *Longman, Richard D.
 *Lorden, Lawrence R.
 *Lorge, Eugene P.
 Lott, Carl D.
 Lott, William A.
 Lough, Gordon K.
 Lowry, George C.
 *Luthin, Richard B.
 Lyman, John S., Jr.
 *Lynch, William A.
 Lynch, William C.
 Lyon, Peter W.
 Lytle, Donald E.
 MacAdam, William F.
 MacClary, David B.
 *MacGregor, John
 Machak, Peter N.
 Mack, Chester M.
 *Mackenzie, William W., Jr.
 MacKinnon, James C., III
 *Mahony, Wilbur J.
 Mallinson, William K.
 *Mallory, John S.
 *Mangin, Joseph N., III
 *Manion, James H.
 Manke, Leo O.
 *Mann, Horace D., Jr.
 Margeson, Alan "J"
 *Markham, Lewis M., III
 *Markley, Edward K.
 Markoskie, John V.
 Marks, Stanley J.
 Marriott, Jack L.
 Marsh, William C.
 Marsha, Patrick P., Jr.
 Marshall, Jack L.
 *Marshall, Robert M.
 *Martin, Alan F.
 Martin, Charles
 William, Jr.
 Martin, Charles
 Wesley, Jr.
 *Martin, Donald E.
 Martin, Donald F.
 Martin, James K.
 Martin, Robert C.
 Martini, Richard A.
 *Mason, Wesley R.
 Matsis, George R.
 Matheson, Eugene C.
 *Mathews, Bobby D.
 *Mathews, Donald W.
 *Mathews, Thomas H.
 Mathis, Glen A.
 Matthews, William B., Jr.
 *Mattson, Donald J.
 *Mauldin, Richard A.
 Maxim, Rodney E.
 May, Robert E.
 *Mayberry, Thomas A., Jr.
 Mays, Clayton P.
 *McAlevy, John H.
 McAlister, Roger C.
 *McAuliffe, John H.
 *McBrayer, John E., Jr.
 McBride, Thomas K.
 McBurney, Cleland V.
 McCabe, Billy E.
 McCall, Walter H.
 McCanna, Marvin G., Jr.
 *McCardell, James E., Jr.
 McCartney, Rodney F.
 McCarty, Charles M.
 McComb, Robert B.
 *McConnell, Donald L.
 McConnell, Giley R., Jr.
 *McCormack, William E.
 McCrane, Brian P.
 McDaniel, Johnny B.
 *McDonald, Clovis K.
 *McDonald, Raymond T.
 McDowell, Curtis G.
 McElrath, Thomas W.
 *McGathy, Charles L., Jr.
 McGovern, Joseph J.
 *McGrath, William D.
 McGreevy, Walter J., Jr.
 *McKay, John H.
 *McKee, Jack V.
 McKenna, Gerard A.
 McKenna, Patrick
 McKenzie, Jon C.
 McKeown, William G., Jr.
 McLaughlin, Bernard R.
 McLin, Robert D.
 *McLuckle, James D.
 McMahon, Thomas J.
 *McMurtry, Robert A., Jr.
 *McNaughton, James M.
 *McNett, William T.
 McNulty, James F.
 McQuesten, John T., Jr.
 *McVay, Donald H., Jr.
 McWaters, William A., Jr.
 *Meacham, Arthur J.
 Mead, George R.
 *Meador, William A.
 Meighan, John M., Jr.
 Melton, Edward C., Jr.
 Menadier, Michael J.
 Meredith, Stuart T.
 Mergat, Andrew G.
 Merwin, Paul L.
 Mesler, Robert A.
 *Metzler, Donald M.
 *Mhoon, John E.
 Middleton, Charles O., III
 *Milano, Vito R.
 *Miles, Richard P.
 Miller, Blount R., Jr.
 Miller, Bruce J.
 *Miller, Clarence W.
 *Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
 *Miller, Grant "W"
 Miller, Hal Y., Jr.
 *Miller, James H., Jr.
 Miller, Joseph J., Jr.
 Miller, Kenneth F.
 Miller, Robert L.
 Millman, Larry
 Millner, Clayton L.
 Mills, James R.
 Mills, James P. W.
 *Mills, Merle E.
 *Miner, Jack B.
 Minetti, Bernard L.
 Mirtsching, Leonard C.
 *Mitchell, Carroll K.
 *Mitchell, Howard C.
 *Mitchell, Joseph S.
 Mitchell, Jerry L.
 Mitchell, James C.
 Mitchell, Lewis N., Jr.
 *Mitchell, Robert C.
 *Mock, Roy L.
 *Monroe, Edward H., Jr.
 *Monroe, Harvey N.
 Monroe, William D., III
 *Mooney, John B., Jr.
 *Moore, Carlton H., Jr.
 *Moore, Clarence E.
 Moore, Earle G.
 Moore, Harrison M.
 Moore, Johnnie R.
 *Moore, Mark H., Jr.
 Moore, Milton W., Jr.
 Moore, Raphael B.
 Moore, Thomas G.
 *Moran, Clifford D.
 *Moran, Thomas M.
 Moranville, Kendall E.
 Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
 *Morford, Dean R.
 *Morgan, Houston M.
 Morgan, John M.
 Morgan, Joseph R.
 *Morgan, Leroy W., Jr.
 Morgan, Robert E.
 *Morin, Ronald D.
 *Morris, Robert D.
 *Morse, Edward A.
 Mosman, Jack H.
 *Moss, Daniel J.
 Moury, Roger F.
 *Muench, Gerald W.
 Muka, Joseph A., Jr.
 Mulcahy, William J., Jr.
 Mullen, Richard D.
 Mulvany, George M.
 Mumford, Charles E.
 Munson, Roger D.
 *Murdoch, Alan G.
 *Murnane, Frederick C.
 Murphy, Elbridge F., Jr.
 Murphy, George A.
 *Murphy, Gordon F.
 Murphy, Robert I.
 *Murray, Joseph E., Jr.
 Musoraffi, Francesco A.
 *Myers, Coleman E.
 Nairon, Harold B.
 *Naschek, Marvin J.
 *Nason, Charles F., Jr.
 Neill, Louis D., Jr.
 Nelson, Charles W., Jr.
 Nelson, George E., Jr.
 Nelson, Herbert F.
 *Nelson, James M.
 Nelson, Keith
 Nelson, Teddy N.
 Nesbitt, Harry J.
 Neth, Fred A.
 Nevarez, Antonio
 Neville, Paul E.
 *Newcomb, James A.
 *Newman, Robert L.
 Nichols, Jack H.
 *Nichols, John F.
 *Nichols, Richard L.
 Nicholson John L., Jr.
 Nielsen, Donald E.
 *Nielsen, George L.
 *Nielsen, Richard
 Nokes, Neil M.
 *Nomady, Verne G.
 Norby, Merlin R.
 Nordhill, Claude
 Nork, John R., Jr.
 *Noyes, Bradford W.
 Nunnally, Edward H., Jr.
 Nuss, Charles R.
 *Nutter, Andrew T. J.
 Nystrom, Frederic L.
 Oaksmith, David E., Jr.
 *O'Connell, John D.
 *O'Connor, Joseph E.
 Oder, John T.
 O'Donnell, Richard J.
 Ogilvie, Robert M.
 *Ogle, William J.
 *O'Hara, John T.
 *O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
 Olander, Darrell W.
 *Olds, Robert B.
 Olear, Joseph P.
 *Olson, Harold L.
 *Olson, Conrad B.
 Olson, Gerard R.
 *Olson, Richard S.
 *Onorato, Ernest D.
 O'Reilly, Charles W.
 *Orell, Quinlan R.
 *O'Rourke, Bernard J.
 O'Rourke, Daniel, Jr.
 *Ortega, Joseph J.
 *Osborne, Arthur M.
 *Osborne, Charles N.
 *Oshea, John A., Jr.
 Oster, John S.
 Ottey, William H.
 Owens, Robert M.
 Owesney, William T.
 *Padgett, Harry E.
 *Page, Jack A.
 *Painter, George V.
 *Pajak, Michael M.
 *Palmieri, John J.
 Paolucci, Donald C.
 Papio, Emil M.
 Pappas, Pete A.
 *Parcher, Stuart M.
 Parker, John T., Jr.
 Parker, Joseph R.
 *Parker, Thomas C., Jr.
 *Parks, Joe
 *Parr, Donald R.
 *Passantino, Sebastian P.
 Paterson, Dale R.
 *Pattee, Arthur W.
 Patterson, William V.
 Patton, Peter W.
 *Paul, David L.
 *Paul, John E.
 Pawley, Sigmund B., Jr.
 Payne, Dean M.
 Peacock, Henry F.
 Pearlman, Samuel S.
 *Peckworth, Dana
 Pedersen, Robert M.
 *Pendergraft, George W., Jr.
 Perkins, James E.
 Perkins, Joseph "A," Jr.
 Perkins, Richard L.
 *Perrault, Mark E.
 *Perry, Lowell E.
 *Perry, Timothy J.
 Persels, Lyle D.
 *Person, Ross H.
 Personette, Alan J.
 Pertel, Joseph A.
 *Pestcoe, Joseph
 Peters, William J.
 *Petersen, Edwin J., Jr.
 Petersen, Leroy E.
 Petersen, Walter R.
 Peterson, Dale A.
 *Peterson, John W.
 *Peterson, Richard N.
 Petit, Pierre A.
 *Petty, William A.
 Pettyjohn, William R.
 *Pfomer, Robert A.
 Phelps, Robert L.
 *Phillips, Charles A.
 Phillips, John T.
 Phillips, Lawrence, Jr.
 *Phillips, Walter M., Jr.
 Pickell, Norman L.
 Pieper, Thomas M.
 Pifer, Charles E.
 Pine, Gordon F.
 Pitkin, Ronald E.
 *Pitts, Paul D.
 Pixley, George D.
 *Place, Allan J.
 *Platt, Ralph E.
 Ploss, John H.
 *Podaras, Nicholas C.
 Poland, James B.
 *Pollum, Edgar W.
 Poore, Ralph E.
 Porter, David N.
 Porter, Robert D.
 *Porterfield, Robert E.
 Potosnak, Joseph E.
 *Potter, Arthur M., Jr.
 *Prentiss, Dickinson
 Preston, Edgar H.
 Price, Frank J.
 Price, Oliver L.
 *Price, Walter P.
 Price, William J.
 Prickett, Bruce L.
 *Priddy, Clarence L.
 Prindle, Charles O.
 Fringle, Donald B.
 *Pritscher, Robert L.
 *Profflet, Clarence J.
 *Pugh, Jack M.
 *Purdum, William H.

- Purvis, Ronald S.
Pyle, Louis W.
Quamme, Lyle D.
Quin, John M., Jr.
Quirk, William J.
Raffaele, Robert J.
Ragsdale, Herbert W.
Ralph, Richard P.
Ralph, Steve, Jr.
Ramsey, Gayle
Rand, Donald H.
Randall, Howard W.
Randall, Howard F.
Ratcliff, Stephen D.
Rawls, Roy J.
Rayder, Daniel F.
Reddick, Robert E., Jr.
Redding, Robert M.
Reed, Charles A.
Reeg, Frederick J.
Refitt, Raymond E.
Reger, William L.
Reid, Richard G.
Reilly, William F.
Reith, George, Jr.
Renegar, Garland M.
Rennie, William B., Jr.
Renn, John R.
Renz, Donald J.
Reynolds, James H.
Reynolds, Robert F., Jr.
Reynolds, Stuart V.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
Rice, Daniel W.
Rice, Gary L.
Rice, Stanley G.
Richards, Lloyd W.
Richards, Robert J.
Richardson, Harold M.
Richardson, Phillip D.
Ricketson, Francis B.
Ridge, James J.
Rieken, Richard G.
Rigney, William J.
Riley, Kenneth J.
Riley, Raymond T.
Ritz, Merlin C.
Roach, Francis L.
Robbins, Noel
Roberson, George D.
Robertson, James L.
Roberts, John W.
Robertson, Coll E.
Robey, Robert V.
Robinson, Percy E., Jr.
Robinson, William A.
Rodgers, Dean T.
Rodgers, Harvey P.
Rodgers, James B.
Rodgers, James R.
Rodgers, Thomas A.
Roe, Charles W.
Roepke, John R.
Roff, Ray, Jr.
Rogers, Charles E., Jr.
Rogers, Gerard F.
Rogers, Ralph E.
Rogers, Warren F.
Roland, Gerald K.
Rollins, James R.
Romano, Matthew E.
Roner, Charles R.
Rorie, Conrad J.
Rose, Hardy N.
Rose, William R.
Ross, Joseph E.
Rossman, Robert H.
Rosson, James W.
Rowan, Thomas C.
Rubb, Milton R.
Ruch, Martin, Jr.
Rudolph, Francis A., Jr.
Ruhlenberger, Roger H.
Runyon, Richard E.
Rusch, John M.
Russ, William A.
- Russell, William F.
Rutzler, Joseph A.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, Thomas J.
Ryan, William A.
Sacks, Harold H.
Sanden, Oscar E., Jr.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sanford, Edward
Santua, Theodore A.
Sapp, Charles S.
Sargent, Richard E.
Sarkisian, Ara
Saubers, Walter F.
Saucier, Gerald
Saunders, Thomas J.
Sawick, Conrad B.
Saylor, Thomas P.
Scarborough, Robert L., Jr.
Schaadt, Douglas D.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
Schaefer, Edward D., Jr.
Schasteen, James C.
Schatz, Francis J.
Schaub, John R., Jr.
Schermerhorn, James R.
Schimsky, John A.
Schmidt, Don D.
Schmidt, Gilbert E.
Schmidt, Walter P.
Schnetzler, Estill E., Jr.
Schroeder, Robert E.
Schulte, Jean H.
Schultz, Eugene D.
Schuman, Martin S.
Schuster, Dale G.
Schutz, Albert C., Jr.
Schwartz, Wallace J.
Schwartz, Robert J.
Scott, Frank P.
Scott, Jack E.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Scully, John J.
Sebring, Leland H.
Seeba, Herman A.
Seitz, Richard L.
Selby, Paul F.
Self, David L.
Semple, William C., III
Sesow, Anthony D.
Seymour, Conrad L.
Shafer, Don M.
Shafer, William J. E.
Shappell, John R.
Sharp, Gail "J"
Sharrah, Ronald L.
Shaw, John H.
Shaw, John G.
Shaw, Warren L.
Shay, Fred L.
Sheehy, Eugene E.
Sheeley, Elmer E., Jr.
Sheets, Jean P.
Sheets, Leonard G.
Sheets, Roger E.
Shemanski, Francis B.
Sherrouse, James B.
Shilling, John D.
Shine, Maurice J.
Shirley, William B.
Shoemaker, James W.
Shrewsbury, Lawrence H., II
Shropshire, Edwin D., Jr.
Shughrou, John J., Jr.
Shuler, Ashley C., Jr.
Shuler, Olin J.
Shurtleff, Bruce K.
Silverman, Arnold M.
Simmons, Arlis J.
Simmons, Clayton M.
Simon, Douglas M.
Simpkins, George C.
Simpson, Philip M.
- Singer, Freeman J.
Siska, Edward
Skeen, Richard R.
Skeltun, Stuart A.
Skerrett, Robert J.
Skillman, Charles F.
Skolnick, Alfred
Skomsky, Louis J.
Skubinna, Myron A.
Slawson, Ralph L.
Slyfield, Frederick J.
Small, Joseph F.
Smevov, Herbert W.
Smiley, Charles B.
Smiley, Douglas I.
Smith, Alfred A.
Smith, David G.
Smith, Delvin W., Jr.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
Smith, James H.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Morgan H.
Smith, Paul J., Jr.
Smith, Robert M.
Smith, Thomas J.
Smith, Thomas G.
Smith, Walton W., Jr.
Smith, William F., Jr.
Smith, William Louis
Smith, William
Lindsay
Smutter, Clarence H.
Snively, Abram B., III
Snow, George M.
Snuffin, Jerry A.
Snyder, Aaron W. S.
Snyder, Fred D.
Snyder, Herman L., Jr.
Solana, Thomas V.
Soldwedel, Eugene L.
Sonnicksen, Ronald G.
Sotherland, Jack L., Jr.
Spanagel, Herman A., Jr.
Spar, Edwin F.
Spargo, Richard A.
Spartz, John N.
Spaulding, Robert E.
Spaulding, Ralph L.
Speelman, Thomas W.
Spiegler, Felix R.
Spohnholtz, James R.
Spradley, Van E.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
Stallings, Clyde, Jr.
Stamps, Robert M., II
Stanard, John D., Jr.
Stanley, Thomas A.
Starcher, Charles W., Jr.
Stark, Gerry L.
Steele, John T.
Steinke, Harris E.
Stephens, Wayne L.
Stevens, Duncan P.
Stevens, Harold F.
Stevens, Jack D.
Stewart, Blair
Stewart, David H.
Stewart, Douglas A.
Stich, John D.
Stierman, Joseph W., Jr.
Stocking, William B.
Strawn, James H.
Struven, Robert L.
Studebaker, Clayton A.
Sturgeon, William J., III
Sullivan, Joseph E., Jr.
Sullivan, Thomas J.
Sullivan, Walter F.
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
Suzan, Frank M.
Sweeney, John F.
Swor, Jerry G.
- *Sykes, Lewis B.
Szpara, Thaddeus J.
Tabler, Benjamin E.
Taipale, Richard G.
Talbot, Frank R., Jr.
Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tall, Charles H., III
Tally, Billy F.
Tappan, Jeremy R.
Tarleton, Joe E.
Taylor, Charles C.
Taylor, Don W.
Taylor, Reeves R.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Templeman, William E.
Tenney, Vincent L.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
Thomas, Donald P.
Thomas, Frederic J.
Thomas, George R.
Thomas, Glenn F.
Thomas, John C.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thompson, George I.
Thompson, Jack C., Jr.
Thomson, Earling R.
Throop, James R.
Thwait, Freddie J.
Tietz, William A.
Timm, Alvin R.
Tinkler, David R.
Tips, David S.
Toland, Hugh J. C., Jr.
Tolson, Richard M.
Tomenson, Robert J.
Tomlinson, Alva C.
Tortora, Anthony M.
Toscano, Eugene M.
Townsend, Marshall N.
Trabue, Howard W.
Trawick, Billy B.
Treat, Richard A.
Trebb, Shannon L.
Treber, Gerald R.
Trebort-MacConnell, Barrie K.
Trowbridge, Vern H.
Trueblood, William E.
Tucker, Alvin E.
Turk, Herman L.
Turner, Sherman W.
Tuttle, George S.
Tuttle, John R.
Uelman, William C.
Ulrich, Charles H.
Umberger, Robert C.
Upshaw, Donald E.
Vaden, Donald E.
Vahlkamp, Eugene W.
VanderGoore, Jacob L.
VanHoof, Eugene R.
VanHorsen, David A.
VanValkenburg, George B.
VanWestendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Veach, Clarence E.
Velazquez-Suarez, Francisco A.
Verich, Demetrio A.
Vernon, Everett L.
Viera, John J.
Vinti, Joseph P.
Vitali, Burt M.
Vogt, Henry L., Jr.
Vohden, Raymond A.
Vojtek, Thomas M.
Volatile, Thomas M.
VonMoll, Francis J.
Voyer, Irving L., Jr.
Wachtel, Joseph J.
Waddington, Jack B.
Wagner, David F.
- *Wagner, James W.
*Waite, Charles E.
*Walker, Henry M.
*Walker, Peter B.
Walker, Peter R.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wall, Richard H.
Wallace, Thomas M.
*Walls, Richard B.
*Walshe, Edward C., Jr.
*Walters, James V.
*Wanamaker, John F.
*Ward, Robert B.
*Warren, Billy R.
*Warren, Thomas C.
*Warthen, Donald
Washchysion, John
*Wasson, John E.
*Waters, George H.
Watson, Max H.
Watson, Wyatt P.
Weaver, James J.
*Weaver, John H.
*Webb, James I.
Weber, Lawrence K., Jr.
*Webster, James M.
*Weddington, George L., Jr.
*Weedon, Robert E.
*Weeks, Alan L.
*Weeks, Wayne F.
Wehling, Michael S.
Wehram, Philip W.
Weinig, Raymond E.
*Welshar, Charles F.
*Weissman, Marvin M.
*Wellings, John F.
*Wells, Don V.
Wells, Walter H., Jr.
*Wenker, William A.
*West, George D., Jr.
*West, Gordon R.
Westmoreland, Ralph M.
Westphal, Lloyd M., Jr.
*Westmore, Horace O., Jr.
Wetrich, Charles R.
*Wetz, James E.
Wheat, Billy V.
*Wheeler, James B.
Wheeler, John R.
*Whiddon, Elmer C., Jr.
Whitcomb, Richard A.
White, Charles E.
White, Donald C.
White, James R.
*White, John E.
*White, Richard E.
*Whittaker, Don J.
Whittier, James F.
Wiederholt, Jerome B.
*Wilbert, John F.
Wildberger, August M.
Wilkins, William R.
Will, Otto W.
*Willenbring, James F.
Willever, Edward L.
Willhauck, Marion
Willhauck, Aaron
Williams, Clyde V., Jr.
*Williams, David W.
*Williams, James B.
*Williams, Kenneth A.
Williams, Louis
Arthur, Jr.
Williams, Louis Alvin
- *Williams, Randall L.
Williams, Ralph T.
Williams, Ralph E., Jr.
Williams, Wallace E.
*Williamson, Robert L.
*Williamson, Harry H., Jr.
*Willis, Jack R.
*Wills, Doane R., Jr.
*Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Wilson, Robert W., Jr.
*Wilson, Samuel B.
*Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
Wilson, William D.
*Wilson, William R., Jr.
Wiltse, Irving M.
Winans, Gilbert L.
*Winfree, Herman D., Jr.
Winslett, John C., Jr.
Wirt, Robert O.
Wisdom, Robert W.
Wise, George M.
Wise, James E., Jr.
*Wise, Peyton R., II
*Witcher, John R.
Witherow, Thomas S.
Withrow, John E., Jr.
Witowski, Charles C.
*Wittrock, Henry L.
Wohl, Paul
Wolf, George C.
*Wolf, James D.
Wolf, William F.
Wolke, Victor B. C.
Wood, Edgar K., Jr.
*Wood, John P.
Woodall, Franklin T., Jr.
*Woodberry, Earle B.
*Woodburn, Craig E.
Wooden, Bruce J.
Woods, Charles S.
*Woods, Paul G.
Woods, Robert C.
*Woodyard, Jon C.
*Worth, Edward R.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Kenneth L., Jr.
*Wright, Richard H.
*Wright, Richard T.
*Wright, William F.
*Wright, William W.
Wuebler, Robert J.
*Wunsch, John R.
*Wynn, Carl E., Jr.
*Yanaros, John O.
Yeager, Donald R.
Yenowine, George H.
*Yoder, Dwane F.
Yoder, William A.
*Young, Alfred A., III
Young, David B., Jr.
Young, Glenn L.
Young, Joseph A.
Youngjohns, Richard P.
Youse, James A.
Zebrowski, Joseph P.
Zick, Richard A.
Zinn, Jack W.
*Zirps, Christos
*Zitani, Genius A.
Zophy, Merle E.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade indicated:

Lieutenant commander, line

Abbott, John
Abdon, Albert L.
Abel, Paul F.
Abelain, Herman C.
Abels, Robert F.
Abromitis, William, Jr.
Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackerman, Warren J.
Ackley, Richard T.

- Adams, Francis McK., Jr.
Adams, Joseph A.
Adler, Robert E.
Agnew, Richard S.
Albers, Hugh W.
Alderman, Edward L.
Aldrich, Robert G.
Alford, Richard L.
Allard, Robert E.
Allen, Benjamin G.
Allen, James A.
Allen, Lawrence R.
Allen, Richard P.
Allender, Gene T.
Alley, Lester L.
Allison, Paul
Allmann, Richard R.
Alsager, Richard H.
Alt, Walter L.
Alvis, John H.
Ambrose, John E.
Andersen, John M.
Anderson, Lee C.
Anderson, Lyle C.
Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, Robert G.
Anderson, Robert J.
Anderson, Roy C.
Anderson, Stanley J.
Anderson, William J., III
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrew, Nell H.
Andrews, Jack B.
Andrus, Jack F.
Angleman, Cornell O.
Anglim, Daniel F., Jr.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Ardinger, Robert H.
Armstrong, John E.
Armstrong, Robert P.
Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, Junius H., Jr.
Arnold, William S. MacK.
Ashmore, Jackie K.
Ashurst, Albert J.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.
Atkin, Wayne H.
Atkins, "A" "J" Martin
Augustine, William F.
Aumack, Robert F.
Aus, Charles A.
Ausbrooks, Erskine P., Jr.
Austin, Carl B.
Austin, Fuller A.
Austin, James M.
Axe, John R.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayers, William R.
Ayes, William H., Jr.
Baarstad, David E.
Babb, James R.
Babbitt, James A., Jr.
Babcock, Robert E.
Bacchus, Wilfred A.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Bachtold, James R.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Bacon, Allan F.
Bading, Herman M.
Badsky, Ted A.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Baggett, Talmadge S.
Bailey, Gilliam M.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, Richard T.
Bailey, William C.
Bain, Robert
Baird, Orle G.
Bajus, John C.
Baker, Norman K.
Baker, Richard L.
Bakke, Harlan J.
Balch, Allen H.
Ballish, Daniel
Balmforth, Stanford C.
Banke, Elmer A.
Barck, Dale E.
Bardecki, Frank J.
Bare, Keith R.
Barie, Arthur H.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
Barker, Franklin H.
Barker, Harold D.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barlow, Cecil G.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnes, Philip A.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barnhart, Robert W.
Barr, Albert T., Jr.
Barr, Max D.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Barrow, John C.
Bartz, Donald P.
Barunas, George A., Jr.
Basso, Robert J.
Bates, George M.
Bates, Richard W.
Baty, Edward M.
Baty, Norman R.
Bauer, Edward C.
Bauerlein, Leo P.
Bauerfeld, Joseph H.
Bauman, Charles J., Jr.
Bausch, Norbert L.
Baysinger, Reaves H., Jr.
Beasley, James W.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Beckman, Kenneth L.
Beckwith, Reynolds
Beeler, James V.
Beesley, Howard L.
Belflower, Harry E., Jr.
Belk, Reece G., Jr.
Bell, James R.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Bellinger, Richard M.
Belter, Robert H.
Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Robert E.
Bennett, Robert W.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Benson, Francis W., Jr.
Benson, Harry L.
Benton, Archie E.
Berger, David W.
Bergesen, Andrew J.
Berglund, Rex R.
Bergman, Daniel
Bergstrom, James H.
Bernhardt, Robert B.
Bernstein, Karl J.
Berthier, Nell E.
Bezore, Eugene
Bickel, William B.
Bigenho, Roy M.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Bilderback, Oral J.
Biles, Joel T.
Billings, John H.
Billings, Randall K.
Bippus, Henry
Birch, Stanley W., Jr.
Bircher, William B.
Birdwell, Carl, Jr.
Bisceglia, Michael
Blackwell, Bishop B.
Blaes, Carl E.
Blaha, Albert J.
Blakney, Walter T.
Blalock, David H., Jr.
Blaney, William C., Jr.
Blasi, Richard R.
Blaskowsky, Carl
Blizard, Floyd H.
Block, Peter F.
Bloomfield, Rollin W.
Blount, Robert P., Jr.
Boakes, William H.
Boehret, Jesse T. D.
Boeing, Charles E.
Bogart, Tudor M.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Boh, Roger M., Jr.
Bolam, Charles D.
Bolger, Philip H.
Bond, John R.
Bonekamp, Fred H.
Bones, Joseph E.
Borgstrom, Charles O., Jr.
Born, Waldo L.
Borst, Francis W., Jr.
Bortner, James A.
Bosley, Donald B.
Boston, Leo
Bouffard, Edward N.
Bourne, William DeW.
Bouslog, Eugene H.
Bowen, Jack W.
Bowers, Thomas L.
Bowers, William W.
Bowersox, Earl C., Jr.
Bowling, William H.
Boyd, David S.
Boyd, Richard C.
Boykin, Rhodes, Jr.
Bradberry, Richard F.
Braddy, Don L., Jr.
Bradfield, James
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bradley, Claiborne S.
Brady, Robert E.
Brainard, Donald R.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Branch, Alvin D.
Brand, Alvin
Brandenburg, Delbert E.
Brandenburg, Robert C.
Brandorff, Paul A.
Brandt, Carl R.
Brannen, Richmond D.
Brannon, John W., Jr.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brantley, William J.
Braun, Joseph J.
Brecka, Joseph, Jr.
Breedlove, James E., Jr.
Bremus, Martin F.
Bres, John H.
Brewer, Thomas J.
Brick, John H.
Bridge, William D.
Briggs, Douglas W.
Briggs, Edward S.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brook, William N., Jr.
Brooker, George G.
Brooks, William T., Jr.
Broughton, William R., Jr.
Brown, Bruce W.
Brown, Charles H.
Brown, Charles O.
Brown, Charles "D"
Brown, James B.
Brown, James W.
Brown, Peter G.
Brown, Robert "C", Jr.
Brown, Walter F.
Brown, Warren R.
Brozena, John M.
Brubaker, Walter Y.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Brummitt, Gerald F.
Brunson, James S.
Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Bryan, Thomas S.
Bryan, William L.
Bryant, Harry F., Jr.
Bryant, Paul G.
Bryer, Bruce A.
Brzenski, Benjamin J., Jr.
Buck, Robert A.
Buck, Roger L.
Buckingham, Winfred L.
Buckmaster, Albert T.
Buechler, Robert G.
Bueg, Stanley H.
Buffkin, John W., Jr.
Bulmer, Robert W.
Burch, Clarence V., Jr.
Burden, James D.
Burgess, William L., Jr.
Burgi, George E.
Burke, William F.
Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burks, Ernest, Jr.
Burnett, James C.
Burrows, Kenneth A.
Burson, Roger T.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Burton, Herbert O.
Burton, James V.
Bush, Charles L.
Bushman, Herman J., Jr.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Butler, Dempsey, Jr.
Butler, James D.
Butler, Kenneth L.
Butts, John L.
Butzen, Thomas P.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Calhoun, William P.
Callaghan, William McC., Jr.
Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Cameron, Clifford R.
Campbell, Donald H.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, Norman R.
Campbell, Richard B.
Campbell, William D.
Campbell, William E., Jr.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Capers, Ellison
Capone, Lucien, Jr.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
Carlson, Burford A.
Carlson, George R.
Carlton, George A.
Carmichael, Robert C.
Carpenter, Ramon L.
Carpenter, James W.
Carpenter, Malcolm S.
Carpenter, Walter H.
Carr, Kenneth M.
Carr, Robert L.
Carr, William K.
Carraway, Terry F.
Carroll, John H., Jr.
Carter, Charles C.
Carter, Edward W., III
Carter, Frank R.
Carver, Edward S.
Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Castle, Ernest C.
Cates, Charles W.
Catterlin, Samuel F.
Cavanaugh, John P.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Cayce, Robert E.
Cecil, Durward L.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
Chalbeck, John A.
Chambers, Horace "B", Jr.
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chandler, Hamilton A.
Chapman, Donald E.
Chapman, Howard M., Jr.
Chapman, Roger A.
Charnas, Steve C.
Cheesman, Thomas P.
Cheesman, Samuel R.
Chevallier, Edmond A.
Chewning, Milton J.
Childress, Michael L.
Childs, Richard V.
Childs, William J.
Chipman, William T., Jr.
Choyce, Charles V.
Christensen, Charles S., Jr.
Christenson, Donald A.
Christiansen, Charles C.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Church, George A.
Clampet, James V.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clark, Glenwood, Jr.
Clark, Robert S.
Clark, Willard H., Jr.
Clark, Wyndham S., Jr.
Clarke, Horace D., Jr.
Clarke, James C.
Clarke, John R.
Clarke, Michael
Clarke, Wade E.
Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
Clarkson, Charlie J., Jr.
Clauzel, Jean S.
Clay, Thomas C.
Clayton, Richard A.
Clemens, Porter E.
Clemens, Robert F.
Cleveland, Arthur W.
Clifford, John G.
Cobb, Warrington C.
Cobb, William B., Jr.
Cochran, James A.
Coffman, Walter W.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Cole, William F., Jr.
Colee, Cecil S.
Coleman, Eddie T., Jr.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerard G.
Colenda, Herbert F.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Collins, Charles H.
Collins, Robert S.
Colvin, Robert D.
Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Comstock, George F., Jr.
Conable, Jack H.
Cone, Henry S., Jr.
Congdon, Robert N.
Conkey, Carlton G.
Conlon, Frank S.
Conniff, William E., Jr.
Connolly, Robert D.
Conolly, Robert C., II
Conroy, Thomas P.
Conway, Thomas J.
Coogan, Joseph E.
Cook, Carroll, T.
Cook, Donald A.
Cook, Karl F.
Cook, Richard M.
Coontz, Robert J.
Cooper, Carleton R.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Jack E.
Cooper, Stanley G.
Corbin, Rex G.
Cordray, Richard P.
Cornell, Kenneth E.
Cornett, Francis E.
Cornwell, Robert R.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Cotter, Charles L.
Coughlin, John T.
Coulson, Eugene R.
Counts, Stanley T.
Courtney, Robert A.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowhill, William J.
Cowperthwaite, John K.
Cox, Sidney S.
Craig, Donald E.
Cramblet, Frank
Cragle, Richard H.
Crawford, Richard N.
Crawley, Don E.
Crosby, Howard S.
Crosby, Russell U.
Crosby, Daniel F.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crow, Vernon L.
Crowell, Stewart P., Jr.
Crown, Otho W.
Crumpton, John R., Jr.
Cuddy, Thomas W.
Cullivan, Daniel W.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Curtin, Theodore A.
Czernicki, Leonard
Dagg, Robert M.
Dahlman, Donald A.
Daley, Bradley L.
Dalla Betta, Aldo
Daly, Norman F.
Dame, Harold E.
Daniel, William A.
Danis, John F.
Danner, William P.
Darus, George H.
Darnell, Donald P.
Daum, Theodore E.
Davi, Jerome A.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Frederick P.
Davis, George H.
Davis, Jack W.
Davis, John M.
Davis, Ralph O.
Davis, Robert H., Jr.
Davis, Thomas E.
Davis, Whittier G.
Davis, William J.
Day, Edward R., Jr.
Day, Lawrence C.
Dearmond, Charles
Deaolph, David E.
Decook, David W.
Defelice, Edward A.
Deibler, Daniel T.
DeJarnette, Hugh M.
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
Dellinger, Donald B.
Delozier, Richard G.
Demasters, John A.
De Mers, William H., II
Demyttenaere, Jules H.
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
Dennis, James M.
Derrick, Arthur C.
Dewey, William E.
Dewing, Jay N.
DeWitt, Duane D.
DeWolf, William W.
Dickins, Richard A.
Diehl, William F.

- Diers, Charles E.
Dietrich, Edward O.
Dillahunty, Benjamin P.
Lillman, Louis W.
Dittmann, George W.
Dittmar, Louis C.
Dix, Robert D.
Dixon, John C., Jr.
Dixon, William J.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Dobbins, John B., Jr.
Dobbs, Lewis L.
Doby, William C.
Dodd, Robert L.
Doering, Eugene R.
Dollinger, Richard E.
Donahoe, Norman K.
Donlon, John M.
Donnelly, John D.
Donovan, James A.
Donovan, Robert S.
Dorenkamp, Kurt F.
Dorris, Claude E.
Dorsey, Laurens
Dotson, William C.
Douglass, Robert McI.
Downs, Leslie R.
Doyle, Richard B.
Draddy, John M.
Dralm, John E.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Dreyer, Royce C.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Driscoll, William T., Jr.
Duck, John C.
Duddleston, Joseph D.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Dugli, James R.
Duke, Marvin L.
Dukes, Warren C.
Dunaway, Gene T.
Dunbar, Norman L.
Duncan, Richard T., Jr.
Duncan, Richard D.
Duncan, Robert D.
Dungan, John D.
Dunn, Alex R., Jr.
Dunn, Delma D.
Dunnam, Neville D.
Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
Dyer, Gerald W.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
Earley, Walter M., Jr.
East, George W.
Easterling, Crawford A.
Eaton, Nelson W.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckersley, Everett S.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Eckert, Richard H.
Eckhout, Wilmont S.
Eckstein, John R.
Edixon, James R.
Edmundson, James E.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Egan, Henry W.
Egger, Donald L.
Ehleringer, Henry G.
Ekelund, John J.
Elfelt, James S.
Ellena, Eugene D.
Ellinghausen, Walter A., Jr.
Elliott, James D.
Ellis, James L.
Ellis, Richard M.
Ellison, David J.
Ellison, LeRoy S.
Ellsworth, William A.
- Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
English, Ernest C., Jr.
Enny, Kenneth E.
Ennis, Robert
Ent, Kenneth E.
Erb, Charles G.
Erhart, James W.
Erikson, Warren W.
Esau, Robert L.
Estabrook, Robert K.
Estes, Dana, II
Estes, Leland F.
Estes, Windom L.
Eustace, Robert J.
Evans, Dorrance O.
Everling, Jack E.
Everngam, John L., Jr.
Eyler, Emil M.
Fagan, Edward J.
Fahland, Frank R.
Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
Farrell, John B.
Fassula, Richard F.
Faulks, Paul S.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald G.
Featherston, Frank H.
Feeney, Harold
Feit, Harry H., Jr.
Fellows, Robert E.
Fendorf, James E.
Fenlon, Leslie K., Jr.
Fenno, Eric N.
Fenton, Robert E.
Ferguson, George D.
Ferrucci, David E.
Field, Robert L.
Fine, Stanley S.
Finke, Eugene I.
Finlay, William A., Jr.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Fiore, Harold J.
Fisher, William R., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Donald T.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fleming, Joseph P.
Fleming, Michael J. J.
Fleming, William O.
Fletcher, James L.
Florence, George D.
Flynn, Donald J.
Flynn, Richard E.
Flynn, William M.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Forrest, Arthur B., Jr.
Forster, William G.
Forsyth, Robert J.
Forsythe, Forrest
Fosnaught, Kenneth D.
Foster, James Roger
Foster, James Richard
Foster, John B.
Foster, Ralph W., Jr.
Foster, Raymond H.
Foster, Wynn F.
Foucht, Richard A.
Fowke, Benjamin B.
Fowler, Arthur D., Jr.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, George A., Jr.
Fox, Kenneth
Fox, Richard T.
Foxgrover, James H.
Fraasa, Donald G.
Frainier, Albert J., Jr.
Franke, Fred A. W., Jr.
Fraser, William F.
Frazee, Joyce M.
Frei, Donald P.
- French, Jack T.
French, Robert D.
Freund, Charles G.
Freitag, David R.
Friedman, Arthur C.
Friesen, Edwin "J"
Frith, William C., Jr.
Fritzke, Herman E., Jr.
Frosio, Robert C.
Frost, Richard A.
Frost, William L.
Frothingham, Edward, Jr.
Frudden, Mark P.
Fry, Gayle "A"
Fuller, Joe E.
Fuller, Robert B.
Fullinwider, Peter L.
Fusco, Arthur S.
Gaches, John W.
Gaddis, George E.
Gaddy, James K.
Gallagher, Lawrence E.
Gallegos, Prudense S.
Galloway, Richard E.
Galyean, Loyd F.
Gardner, Richard C.
Gardner, Richmond
Garland, John C.
Garner, James R.
Garrett, Everett C.
Gartland, John P.
Gates, David E.
Gates, Herbert K., Jr.
Geiger, Eugene D.
Geist, Alvin E.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Ghormley, Ralph McD.
Gibson, Charles L.
Gilbert, Wilmer R.
Gilbertson, John E.
Gilchrist, John F., II
Giles, Claude F.
Gillen, William V.
Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Gire, Harold W.
Goehring, Bernard E.
Goewey, William I.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Golding, William M.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goldman, Roy E.
Goodacre, Russell F., Jr.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles E., Jr.
Goodman, William F.
Goodspeed, Richard E.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Goodwin, George E.
Gordon, John
Goslow, Paul
Gottschalk, Art W., Jr.
Goulds, Ralph J.
Govan, George W.
Grace, Homer J.
Gracey, Jack L.
Grady, Edward L., Jr.
Grady, Morris R.
Graf, Harry R.
Graham, Warren C., Jr.
Grayson, Roy R.
Grayson, William R.
Greathouse, David McL.
Green, John W.
Green, John N.
Green, Richard W.
Green, Robert E.
Greene, John L.
Greene, Leonard B.
Greer, James C.
Gregg, Robert F.
Gregory, George T.
- Gresham, Raymond W.
Griffin, Jack R.
Griffith, Thomas J.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Gross, Bruce F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grote, Joseph C.
Grozier, Roy E.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Guffey, Elton E.
Guild, Michael B.
Guion, Joseph E.
Gully, Robert L.
Gunkel, David L.
Gureck, William A.
Gussow, Milton
Guthe, Douglas B.
Guthrie, William S.
Guyer, Robert A.
Haff, William B.
Hafner, George C.
Hage, Lealand P.
Hahn, William S.
Haley, James V.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Hall, Charles R.
Hall, Donald B.
Hall, Donald P.
Hall, Joseph F.
Hall, Robert
Hall, Robert W.
Hall, Timothy K.
Halladay, Norman L.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hallett, Edward R.
Hallman, Albert B.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hamill, Jerome E.
Hamilton, Harold E.
Hamilton, Kennard R.
Hamilton, William H., Jr.
Hamlin, David R.
Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
Hampton, Charles T.
Hanby, Robert W., Jr.
Hannum, Charles R.
Hanson, Carl T.
Hanson, Richard W.
Hanus, Charles Z.
Harber, Russell L.
Hardenburgh, Chester J., Jr.
Hardgrave, James B.
Hardin, David L.
Harding, Norton D., Jr.
Hardy, Corydon C.
Hardy, Martin E.
Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
Harlan, Donald M.
Harlan, Edgar W.
Harlow, Robert J.
Harper, Lorren G.
Harris, Elvin R.
Harris, John
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Harris, Wade H.
Harrison, James R.
Harshbarger, John F.
Hart, Stephen L.
Hart, William D.
Hartell, Ronald D.
Hartigan, Richard B.
Hartley, Jack H.
Hartshorn, David L.
Hartzell, Robert H.
Harvey, John W.
Hary, Charles P., Jr.
Haskell, William C.
Hassman, Andrew U., Jr.
Hausler, Carl O.
Hawe, Stanley R.
Hawk, James T.
Hawkins, Larry L.
- Hawkins, William H.
Hayden, Glenn M.
Hayes, James "G"
Hayes, Robert W.
Hayes, Stanley M.
Hayes, Winston R.
Hayman, Robert B.
Haynsworth, Donald D.
Hays, Ronald J.
Hecker, Stanley
Heerwagen, David D.
Hegrat, Donald M.
Heigl, John T., Jr.
Helmer, Dale P.
Hemann, John W.
Hemmick, Milburn K.
Henderson, Burton
Henderson, Donald
Henderson, Stanley W.
Hendrickson, Robert C., Jr.
Henning, Harvey S., Jr.
Henning, Robert F.
Henry, Albert G., Jr.
Henry, Martin H.
Herbert, Thomas J.
Herbig, Henry F.
Herndon, William J., Jr.
Herrin, Holden R.
Hibbard, Francis R.
Hibbs, Alvin S.
Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hickey, Charles F.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Hieronimus, Henry M.
Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hill, Allen E.
Hill, Howard A.
Hill, Jackson D.
Hill, James C.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
Hinsen, Kenneth L.
Hirstein, Robert V.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hodnett, Robert A.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hoffman, Samuel D.
Hofford, John L.
Hoffmocker, John L.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hoganson, John H.
Hohn, Henry E.
Holdren, Leland A.
Holgren, Marvin A.
Hollack, Michael
Holland, Alfred D.
Holland, James S.
Holler, Edward R.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Holt, Donald P.
Holt, Robert E.
Holz, John C.
Homan, Bertie G.
Honey, Arthur C., Jr.
Hoover, Lloyd N.
Hoover, Matthew V.
Hoover, Richard M.
Hopf, Elwood J.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Hopkins, Thomas M.
Horan, John E., Jr.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hosemann, Leland J.
Hotes, John L.
Houchins, Lee S.
How, Alfred L., Jr.
Howard, Joseph B.
Howell, Joe P., Jr.
Hower, Floyd E., Jr.
Hubbard, Donald
Hubbs, Donald R.
Hudspeth, Jake W.
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Ray S.
- Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Hugus, Vern K.
Humphrey, John C.
Humphries, George P.
Hunsley, Lindel A., II
Hunt, Donald B., Jr.
Hunt, Harry E.
Hunter, Paul I.
Hurd, Russell E.
Hurt, David A., Jr.
Husbands, Joseph M.
Hussmann, Harry "L," III
Huth, Ralph L.
Hynes, Roy T.
Ince, Eugene St. C., Jr.
Ingram, Billy G.
Inman, Richard P.
Iredale, John P.
Irish, George E.
Irwin, Wayne R.
Isamay, Arthur P.
Jackson, Edward D., Jr.
Jackson, Frederick D., Jr.
Jackson, John G. "W"
Jacobson, Jacob H., Jr.
Jacobson, Robert C.
Jacobsen, George E., Jr.
Jaeger, Adolphus F.
James, John W.
James, Robert C.
Jansen, Alan L.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jasmin, Robert L.
Jefferson, Robert R.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jeffries, Rollin E., Jr.
Jenista, John E.
Jenkins, Paul J.
Jenkins, Ralph A.
Jenks, Albert L., Jr.
Jenks, Shepherd M.
Jennings, John S.
Jennings, William E.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Donald LaV.
Jensen, Wayne LeR.
Jepson, John A.
Jermstad, Ronald H.
Jessen, George E.
Jesson, Charles F.
Jett, William S., III
Jewell, Darl W.
Jewell, Downing L.
Johns, Arthur J.
Johns, Ronald L.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Dale C.
Johnson, Francis C.
Johnson, Henry B.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Jack K.
Johnson, Joseph J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Neal J.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Richard L.
Johnson, Richard "D"
Johnson, Richard C.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Frederick B.
Johnston, Kenneth W.
Johnstone, Richard A.
Joiner, Orrin
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, Francis N.
Jones, Gerald R.
Jones, Harry L.
Jones, Herman W.
Jones, Hubby A., Jr.
Jones, Isaac F., Jr.
Jones, John W.

- Jones, John P.
 Jones, Ray P.
 Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
 Josephson, John V.
 Kagey, Leslie O., Jr.
 Kaiser, Robert C.
 Kaiser, Robert D.
 Kallgren, Bruce M.
 Kampe, John H.
 Kamrad, Joseph G.
 Kananui, William A., Jr.
 Kangas, Robert T.
 Karns, Dane L.
 Karschnia, Paul T.
 Kastner, Thomas M.
 Katcher, Martin J.
 Katz, Martin
 Kaufman, Norman L.
 Kaufman, Richard F.
 Kaune, James E.
 Kay, Howard N.
 Kays, Jack C.
 Kearney, John R.
 Keays, Keatinge
 Keeler, Donald J.
 Keihner, James K.
 Kelly, Lawrence J.
 Keller, Jack E.
 Keller, Robert G.
 Kelley, Bruce E.
 Kellogg, Edward P., Jr.
 Kelly, Roger W.
 Kelly, Ronald T.
 Kelly, William P., Jr.
 Kempf, Cecil J.
 Kennedy, James R., Jr.
 Kennedy, Nevin, III
 Kennedy, Robert W.
 Kephart, Robert D.
 Kernan, William H.
 Kerr, Robert G.
 Kersch, Roger N.
 Kertz, Jacob D.
 Ketchmark, Giles J.
 Kettlewell, John
 Key, Harry N., Jr.
 Kidd, Owen A.
 Kiehl, William A.
 Kiernan, Warren R.
 Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
 Kilcline, Thomas J.
 Kilduff, Thomas F., Jr.
 Kimball, Edwin D.
 Kincade, Richard W.
 King, Robert R., Jr.
 King, Robert A.
 King, Thomas R.
 King, William C.
 King, William R.
 Kingery, Samuel G.
 Kingsbury, Ben P.
 Kinnaird, Martin J.
 Kinnear, George E. R.
 II
 Kinsley, Donald T.
 Kint, John R.
 Kirchner, David P.
 Kirk, John J.
 Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
 Kissick, James W., Jr.
 Kivlen, Alexander L.
 Kjelgaard, Peter D.
 Klabo, Richard T.
 Klapka, Edward J.
 Klein, Peter F.
 Klemm, Vernon P.
 Klett, George J.
 Klimetz, Robert "J" W.
 Kline, Herbert S.
 Klinker, Francis J.
 Kluga, Norbert R.
 Kneale, James E.
 Knecht, Harry B.
 Knoizen, Arthur K.
 Knudsen, Harold F.
 Koach, John H.
 Koch, Richard A.
 Kollmorgen, Leland S.
 Kolmstad, Tom I.
 Komoroff, Robert A.
 Kosonen, Charles G.
 Kost, John D., Jr.
 Koval, Francis P.
 Krag, Robert L.
 Kramer, George
 Kramer, Robert P.
 Krantzman, Harry M.
 Kraus, Rudolf L.
 Kraus, Walter F.
 Krause, Stephen R.
 Kreck, Victor G.
 Kreinberg, Alfred G.
 Kremer, John L.
 Kremidas, William S.
 Kretchman, Frank C.
 Kreiger, Earl R.
 Kriser, Louis
 Krohn, Stanley W.
 Kropf, John F.
 Krueger, Otto E.
 Kubel, Samuel R.
 Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
 Lacy, James E.
 Lafferty, Frederick R., Jr.
 Lally, William K., Jr.
 Lamb, Arthur D., Jr.
 Lamb, Chris W.
 Landis, Arthur, Jr.
 Lane, Charles M.
 Lane, Henry
 Lane, Edward V., Jr.
 Laque, Harold A.
 Larson, Norman O.
 Lasell, Max H.
 Laske, Robert M.
 Lasley, William W.
 Lassen, William V.
 Lassiter, Will E.
 Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
 Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
 Law, Jason P.
 Lawler, Paul D.
 Lawler, Robert L., Jr.
 Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
 Lawrence, John V., Jr.
 Lawrence, William P.
 Leach, Donald B.
 Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
 Leary, Ramon W.
 Lebert, William A.
 Lechleiter, Mark B., Jr.
 Lechner, Thomas F.
 LeDew, Thomas A.
 Lee, Byron A.
 Lee, William W., Jr.
 Lehman, Donald A.
 Leibowitz, Martin M.
 Leis, Alfred C.
 Lemieux, Norman
 Lemon, Robert T.
 Lentz, Charles M.
 Leppin, William F., Jr.
 Leser, John R.
 Lesperance, Albert P.
 Leue, David E.
 Lewis, Charles B.
 Lewis, Daniel A.
 Lewis, James R.
 Lewis, Richard E.
 Lewis, William W., Jr.
 Leydon, Robert L.
 Libey, John D.
 Liles, James E.
 Linder, James B.
 Lindsay, John D.
 Lindsey, Wesley E., Jr.
 Lintner, Richard W.
 Lipchak, Edward A.
 Lisanby, James W.
 Little, James G.
 Llewellyn, William E.
 Lloyd, James L.
 Lockey, Richard H.
 Lockwood, Harold R.
 Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
 Loheed, Hubert B.
 Lombard, Richard L.
 Long, Charles R.
 Longhi, William J.
 Longino, Hugh E., Jr.
 Loomis, Aubrey K.
 Loomis, Thomas A.
 Lord, Warren W.
 Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
 Losey, Willis M.
 Loux, Raymond E.
 Lovata, Albert F.
 Love, Henry H., Jr.
 Lovelace, Robert H.
 Loyd, Rupert H.
 Luff, Charles A.
 Luke, Preston
 Lund, John D.
 Lusk, John G.
 Luykx, Arthur M.
 Luzader, Robert B.
 Lyke, Robert B.
 Lyman, Jack N.
 Lynam, Donald M.
 Lynch, Robert M.
 Lynch, William H.
 Lyne, George C.
 Lytle, James H.
 MacDonald, Clinton D.
 MacDowell, Charles R.
 Machell, Reginald M.
 Mack, Robert P.
 Mackell, Richard A.
 MacKenzie, John D.
 Mackey, Robert R.
 Madera, Harry P.
 Magee, Jack E.
 Magnuson, Roy W.
 Mahon, Richard B.
 Mahoney, Timothy R.
 Maice, Lee, Jr.
 Maier, Charles W., Jr.
 Maier, William J., Jr.
 Maire, Rex E.
 Majesky, John E.
 Mallard, John B., Jr.
 Mallinger, William D.
 Malloy, John E.
 Malm, Frank S.
 Maloney, Thomas E.
 Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
 Mann, Charles L., Jr.
 Mann, Earl
 Manning, Richard T.
 Mantz, Roy T.
 Mape, John C.
 Marangiello, Daniel A.
 Marcellus, Russell A.
 Markham, Walter G.
 Markovits, George P.
 Martin, Hubert A.
 Marr, Harold L.
 Marr, William F.
 Marriner, Richard E.
 Marshall, George W.
 Marshall, John E.
 Marshall, Lee R.
 Martin, Charles E.
 Martin, Gene A.
 Martin, Richard W.
 Martin, Robert J.
 Martin, William L., III
 Martin, William K.
 Mason, Robert C.
 Massa, Emiddio
 Mathews, Ross A., Jr.
 Mathis, Paul J.
 Matson, Willis A.
 Mauney, Thomas C.
 Maxwell, Daryl O.
 Maxwell, Leslie, J.
 May, Donald S.
 May, Harry L.
 Mayfield, Harley D.
 Mayfield, Stanwix G., III
 Mayo, Donald "H"
 Mayo, William H.
 Mazzolini, John A.
 McAnulty, David J.
 McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
 McArthur, John C.
 McArthur, Kenneth V.
 McArthy, Richard L.
 McAvonia, James F., Jr.
 McBride, Jeremiah R.
 McCabe, Gerry M.
 McCallum, Elmer A., Jr.
 McCarthy, James P., Jr.
 McClain, Kirby LaR., III
 McClaran, Stephen W.
 McClure, James R.
 McConeghy, John K., Jr.
 McConnel, Joseph E.
 McConnell, Richard A.
 McCord, John W.
 McCoy, Joseph C., Jr.
 McCrary, Dewey W.
 McCraw, Frank M., Jr.
 McCreight, Major I., III
 McCue, William W.
 McCullough, Carlos d'A.
 McCumber, Harold E.
 McDaniel, Willard H.
 McDonald, Ewing R.
 McDonald, Jack H.
 McDonald, Thomas E.
 McDonnell, Harold A.
 McDonough, William D., Jr.
 McFall, Albert D.
 McFarland, Ralph I.
 McFarland, Milton C.
 McFarlane, William D., Jr.
 McGarran, William E., Jr.
 McGihon, Robert S.
 McGinnis, Thomas P.
 McGinnis, Ted R.
 McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
 McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
 McGlone, Lawrence H.
 McGrath, James J.
 McIntyre, Andrew
 McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
 McKay, Robert B.
 McKechnie, Russell R.
 McKee, Kinnaird R.
 McKee, Samuel T.
 McKellar, Edwin D., Jr.
 McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
 McLain, Roy W., Jr.
 McLaughlin, Robert F.
 McLemore, Albert S.
 McLoughlin, Howard T.
 McLoughlin, James
 McLuckie, William "E"
 McMurray, William C.
 McNabb, Joseph M.
 McNally, John J., Jr.
 McNally, John H.
 McNamara, Thomas W.
 McNeerney, James F.
 McNulty, Gerald
 McQuestion, Jack E.
 McQuillin, John P.
 McQuiston, Edward I., Jr.
 McTammany, John A.
 McVoy, James L.
 Mealy, Daniel N.
 Meanix, William H., Jr.
 Meek, Donald B.
 Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
 Meetze, James C.
 Melim, Robert D.
 Melville, Charles W., Jr.
 Mench, Leland E.
 Merchant, Paul G.
 Merkle, Carlyle "C", Jr.
 Merrill, Warren H.
 Merritt, Glen C.
 Messenger, Frank, III
 Messere, Edward J.
 Messner, James R.
 Metcalf, John T., Jr.
 Metcalf, Joseph, III
 Meyrick, Charles W.
 Michaud, Robert A.
 Middleton, John D.
 Miesner, John A., Jr.
 Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
 Mikles, Arthur H.
 Milani, Albert V.
 Miles, Lee C.
 Miller, Adair
 Miller, Alfred E.
 Miller, Byron K.
 Miller, David B.
 Miller, Dean W.
 Miller, Edmund A.
 Miller, Gerious G., Jr.
 Miller, James P.
 Miller, Jurgen H.
 Miller, Marvin J.
 Miller, Raymond L.
 Miller, Richard A.
 Miller, Roger J.
 Miller, William A.
 Millpointer, Edward D.
 Mills, Joseph E.
 Minnigerode, John H.
 B.
 Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
 Misakian, Harry H.
 Mitchell, Joe C.
 Moberly, Arthur L.
 Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
 Modeen, Donald O.
 Mohlenhoff, William
 Mohr, Charles H.
 Mohrhardt, Robair F.
 Mollison, Oliver S.
 Molzan, Edward W.
 Monroe, Robert R.
 Montague, Lloyd L.
 Montgomery, Graden L.
 Moore, Charles P.
 Moore, Donald E.
 Moore, John F., Jr.
 Moore, Larry E.
 Moore, Ludi A.
 Moore, Robert S.
 Moore, Roderick B.
 Moore, Sumner K.
 Moore, Thomas L.
 Moore, William F.
 Moors, Donald E.
 Moran, Frank J., Jr.
 Morgan, George E., Jr.
 Morgan, Harry W., Jr.
 Morgan, James E.
 Morgan, Joseph R.
 Morgan, Robert E.
 Morin, Gene D.
 Morin, James B.
 Morin, Richard J.
 Morris, Daniel M.
 Morrison, Lewis E.
 Morrissey, John N.
 Moss, Lewis M.
 Moss, Robert
 Mow, Douglas F.
 Moyer, Donald R.
 Mozley, Paul H.
 Muck, Floyd R.
 Mudrock, John
 Mulcahy, John E.
 Mull, Charles L., II
 Mulligan, James A., Jr.
 Mumma, William L.
 Munday, Donald F.
 Munro, Ernest A.
 Muros, Ralph L.
 Murphy, Frank "M", Jr.
 Murphy, James F.
 Murphy, William L.
 Murray, Douglas V.
 Murray, Eugene R.
 Murray, James D., Jr.
 Muto, Charles J.
 Myatt, Bert, Jr.
 Myatt, Paul J., Jr.
 Myer, George W.
 Myers, Charles B.
 Myers, Raymond W.
 Myers, William A., III
 Myrick, James E.
 Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
 Neander, Stanley B.
 Neeley, Guy M., Jr.
 Negron, Delis, Jr.
 Neidhold, Carl D.
 Neidlinger, Carl C.
 Neiger, Ralph E.
 Neld, Arthur W.
 Nelson, Andrew G.
 Nelson, Frederick L.
 Nelson, George G.
 Nelson, Harry J., Jr.
 Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
 Nelson, Robert L.
 Nelson, William R.
 Nemer, Harold
 Netro, Robert J.
 Nettin, Leonard H.
 Nestel, Arthur D.
 Newark, Theodore E.
 Newgard, Douglas L.
 Newlund, Robert L.
 Newman, Fred S.
 Newman, James F.
 Newton, Phinehas S.
 Nichol, Monte B.
 Nicholson, Richard E.
 Nicholson, Jerome E.
 Nickerson, Richard H.
 Nix, Henry J.
 Noble, Thomas I.
 Noblet, Eugene J.
 Noel, Lionel M.
 Nolen, Dan R.
 Nordan, Emile E.
 Norman, Robert D.
 Norris, William J.
 Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
 Notson, Raymond P.
 Nottingham, Robert P.
 Notz, Robert C.
 Nugent, Thomas H., Jr.
 Nulton, Frank I.
 Nunneley, John K.
 Nussbaumer, John J.
 Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
 Nyce, William E.
 Nystrom, Bruce A.
 Oakes, Raymond H.
 Oberholtzer, James P.
 Oberle, Ronald R.
 O'Brien, Charles J., Jr.
 O'Brien, John W.
 O'Connell, William R.
 O'Connor, Francis E.
 O'Donel, James H.
 O'Donnell, George J., Jr.
 O'Drain, John E.
 Odorobina, Stephen R.
 Oesterreicher, John A.
 O'Hara, Jack F.
 Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
 Ohls, Karl E.
 O'Keefe, Patrick G.
 Oldfield, Charles B., III

- Oliphant, Don "L"
 Olmstead, David W.
 Olsen, Richard L., Jr.
 Olsen, Robert C.
 Olson, Lyle R.
 O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
 O'Reilly, Charles C., Jr.
 Orem, Charles A.
 Orem, John B., Jr.
 O'Riley, Vernon E.
 O'Rourke, John J.
 Orr, William E.
 Orrill, Johnny W.
 Ortleib, Edward J.
 Osborn, Robert D.
 Osborne, Dwight G.
 Otis, Burdett A., Jr.
 O'Toole, Kevin J.
 Otten, Henry E.
 Otth, Edward J., Jr.
 Ousterhout, Dean T.
 Overbey, Frank E., Jr.
 Overton, James B.
 Owen, Charles K.
 Owen, Leonard J.
 Owens, Robert L.
 Ozburn, Forrest C., Jr.
 Paddock, Charles O.
 Page, Carroll S., Jr.
 Page, George L.
 Page, James R.
 Page, Louis C., Jr.
 Paisley, Harrison B.
 Palau, Henry S.
 Palazzolo, Anthony L.
 Palmer, Gary H.
 Palmquist, John R.
 Panciera, Vincent W.
 Parce, James R.
 Parent, Gerald "J"
 Parker, Harry M., Jr.
 Parker, James W.
 Parode, Harlan D.
 Parrish, William I.
 Parthemer, Lloyd L.
 Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
 Patterson, Donald W.
 Patterson, Jerry C.
 Patterson, William W., Jr.
 Patton, James E.
 Paul, Milton O.
 Paulis, Joseph J., Jr.
 Paulk, Joseph McD.
 Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
 Peck, Paul A.
 Pedersen, John C.
 Pelton, Eugene A.
 Pelton, Robert L.
 Perry, Roger E., Jr.
 Perryman, Donald B.
 Pester, Benjamin H.
 Pester, Fred J.
 Peters, Charles H.
 Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
 Petersen, Donald E.
 Peterson, Oren A.
 Peterson, Richard J.
 Peterson, Richard E.
 Pette, Donald C.
 Pettigrew, Raymond A.
 Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
 Pezzel, Engelbert G.
 Pfeiffer, King W.
 Pheasant, Alan G.
 Phillips, Alan R.
 Phillips, Charles T.
 Phillips, Harry E.
 Phillips, Lawrence E.
 Phillips, Ralph T.
 Pickering, Richard C.
 Pinzel, Lawrence E.
 Pirano, Daniel
 Pittman, Jack R.
 Place, William M.
 Platze, William A.
 Platzek, Eugene H.
 Pleasants, John B.
 Pond, Richard E.
 Porter, Charles S.
 Porter, Kenneth A.
- Porter, Thomas
 Portnoy, Howard R.
 Post, Harry J.
 Potter, Louis C.
 Potter, William W.
 Potts, Bobby L.
 Pouliot, Jean R.
 Powel, Samuel F., III
 Powell, James R., Jr.
 Prange, Eugene H.
 Prehn, Frederick A., Jr.
 Prescott, Richard J.
 Preston, Frank W.
 Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
 Price, Byron
 Pride, Alfred M.
 Proctor, Sumner M., Jr.
 Profilet, Leo T.
 Provost, Robert D.
 Pstrak, Theodore W.
 Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
 Purdy, Harlan R.
 Purvis, Elvis E.
 Putnam, Charles L.
 Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
 Quarg, William F.
 Quigley, Donovan B.
 Quinn, Jack Q.
 Racy, Louis P.
 Radcliffe, Roderick T.
 Radja, James E.
 Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
 Rakes, Calvin E.
 Ralston, Wesley L.
 Ramsey, Lee McC.
 Rapp, Fred L.
 Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
 Ratliff, William M.
 Rau, William F.
 Rawsthorne, Edgar A.
 Ray, Thermon L.
 Ray, Thomas B.
 Raymer, Gordon E.
 Read, William L.
 Reddick, James P., Jr.
 Redman, James R.
 Redmon, William L.
 Redmond, John G.
 Reed, Robert K.
 Reed, Sherman C.
 Regan, William B.
 Reichel, Alfred J., Jr.
 Reichert, Herbert E.
 Reichl, Charles J.
 Reid, Charles E., Jr.
 Reid, Eugene L.
 Reihel, Eugene J.
 Remsen, "T" Schenck
 Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
 Replogle, Thomas H.
 Resek, Lawrence H.
 Reynolds, Kenneth C.
 Ricci, William J.
 Richards, Homer K., Jr.
 Richards, William L., Jr.
 Richardson, Robert L.
 Riedl, Harold A.
 Rigsbee, John T.
 Riley, Jack DeW.
 Ripley, Robert K.
 Risser, James B.
 Ritter, Franklin O.
 Rivard, Earl J.
 Rivers, Ernest E.
 Roberts, Gerald G.
 Roberts, Liona R., Jr.
 Roberts, Robert T.
 Roberts, Robert "E."
 Robertson, Keith H.
 Robertson, David W.
 Robertson, John W.
 Robins, Clarence O.
 Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
 Robinson, Robert B.
 Robinson, Thomas W., Jr.
- Robisch, Herbert E.
 Rochester, Carl W.
 Rockwell, Frank A.
 Rockwell, Richard F.
 Rockwood, Jerred R.
 Rodgers, James F.
 Rogers, Edward B., Jr.
 Rogers, James O.
 Rogers, Joseph P., Jr.
 Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
 Rohde, Robert D.
 Roman, Paul D.
 Romley, Richard M.
 Roney, James R.
 Root, John B., Jr.
 Rose, Samuel J., Jr.
 Rosenberg, Donald D.
 Rosendahl, Edmund I.
 Rosenquist, Donald E.
 Ross, Donald S.
 Ross, Thomas H.
 Roth, Franklin H.
 Rothrock, George B., Jr.
 Rough, Jimmie L.
 Roulstone, Lawrence M.
 Rowe, John D.
 Rowlands, David M.
 Rowley, Reginald C.
 Rubey, Ervin B., Jr.
 Rubey, William A.
 Rubin, Arnold J.
 Rubins, Fredrick K.
 Ruble, Byron C.
 Rudd, Richard O.
 Rudy, Bryan C.
 Ruggiero, John
 Ruggiero, Michael E.
 Rulis, Robert A.
 Rumble, Maurice W.
 Russ, Jack E.
 Russell, George E.
 Russell, George G.
 Russell, Maclyn K.
 Rust, David
 Rutherford, Ralph B.
 Ruthledge, Howard E.
 Ryan, John J., Jr.
 Ryan, Phillip J.
 Rylee, James E.
 Saari, Aimo M.
 Sabalos, Nicholas
 Salin, Robert S.
 Sample, Richard J.
 Sample, Robert J.
 Sample, Wilbur H.
 Sampson, Jesse E.
 Sander, Richard E.
 Sanders, Ernest D.
 Sandon, Kenneth M.
 Sandsberry, Jack C.
 Sargent, Herbert A.
 Sargent, John C.
 Sarosdy, Louis R.
 Satre, Robert S.
 Sattler, Donald C.
 Sawtelle, William J.
 Sayers, Clay S.
 Saylor, Eugene H.
 Scawthorn, Norman H.
 Schaber, Rolph E.
 Schader, James A.
 Schaub, Robert L.
 Schaufelberger, Albert A., Jr.
 Schenker, Marvin L.
 Schied, Charles F.
 Schlang, John J., Jr.
 Schlofman, Arthur S.
 Schlosser, Frank P.
 Schneider, Arthur F.
 Schnorf, Richard A.
 Schoelen, Lawrence A.
 Scholl, Kenneth C.
 Schorz, Ernest H.
 Schrauth, George M.
 Schrieffer, Walter A.
 Schroeder, Robert A.
 Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
- Schulte, Richard J.
 Schultz, Jesse Z.
 Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
 Schutz, Walter J.
 Schwab, Robert W.
 Schwan, Harold C.
 Schwartz, Richard D.
 Schwartz, Sheldon O.
 Schwarz, Ira N.
 Scott, James H.
 Scott, Melvin L.
 Scoville, Jack
 Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
 Scully, Donald G.
 Seay, Wesley H., Jr.
 Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
 Seelye, Thomas T., Jr.
 Seipp, Thomas M.
 Selby, Donald E.
 Self, William H. C.
 Seligmiller, Harold L.
 Semeraro, Angelo P.
 Seward, John A., Jr.
 Shabe, Gerard P.
 Shacklett, Harry E.
 Shafer, Walter R.
 Shaffer, Guy H. B.
 Shaffran, William "S"
 Shannon, Rickard W.
 Shaprio, Sumner
 Sharpe, William C.
 Sharpe, William K.
 Shartel, Howard A.
 Shaughnessy, William D.
 Shaver, Frank T.
 Shaw, John D.
 Shea, Lewis A., Jr.
 Shea, Paul W.
 Sheehan, Charles A.
 Sheffield, Hughie D.
 Shepherd, Burton H.
 Sheridan, William R.
 Sherin, Joseph E.
 Sherman, Frank E.
 Sherman, Peter W.
 Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
 Shick, George B., Jr.
 Shields, William B.
 Shimmel, Albert F.
 Shine, Eugene F., Jr.
 Shipman, Junious E.
 Shoemaker, Frank J.
 Shrewsbury, Richard M.
 Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
 Shultz, Robert M.
 Shutty, Michael S.
 Simcox, James G.
 Simmons, Kenneth J.
 Simmons, Louis H.
 Simmons, Robert R.
 Simon, Donald R.
 Sims, Harvey K.
 Skirne, Jack D.
 Sizemore, William G.
 Skalla, Derald Z.
 Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
 Skinner, Glenn E., Jr.
 Skinner, William A.
 Skirm, George L., Jr.
 Skorheim, Robert D.
 Slankard, Max L.
 Sleeper, Sherwin J.
 Sliwinski, Daniel J.
 Slusser, Richard C.
 Small, Robert H.
 Smellie, Rex D.
 Smith, Alan Y.
 Smith, Allan R.
 Smith, Carl R., Jr.
 Smith, Chandler G.
 Smith, Charles A.
 Smith, Charles R., Jr.
 Smith, David K.
 Smith, Donald A.
 Smith, Edgar M., Jr.
- Smith, Frederic W.
 Smith, George F.
 Smith, Gerald F.
 Smith, Gordon H.
 Smith, Harold F., Jr.
 Smith, Homer L.
 Smith, James H. B.
 Smith, Jerome W.
 Smith, Leon W.
 Smith, Maurice E.
 Smith, Melbourne L.
 Smith, Paul E.
 Smith, Robert McK.
 Smith, Robert L.
 Smith, Robert P.
 Smith, Robert F., Jr.
 Smith, Robert E.
 Smith, Robert G.
 Smith, Stanford A.
 Smith, Thomas M.
 Smith, William D.
 Smith, William F.
 Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
 Smoot, William N.
 Smyth, James M.
 Snodgrass, Cornelius S., Jr.
 Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
 Snyder, John C.
 Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
 Soberski, Florian L.
 Sobleski, Leonard J.
 Sollinger, David A.
 Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
 Somers, Robert W.
 Somerville, William H.
 Soracco, David L.
 Sorg, George A.
 Sourbeer, Emory R., Jr.
 Southall, Walter E., Jr.
 Southworth, Harrison B.
 Space, David J.
 Sparks, Donald E.
 Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
 Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
 Speer, Paul H.
 Speiser, Jack E.
 Spence, Benjamin E.
 Spencer, John R.
 Spencer, Ralph G.
 Spencer, Robert W.
 Sperling, Bertrand T.
 Spiller, John H., Jr.
 Spowart, David J., Jr.
 Springer, Roy M., Jr.
 Sproull, Harold H.
 Stack, Richard A.
 Stacy, Edward F.
 Stahell, Gerald D.
 Stallings, Alfred K.
 Stalzer, Charles E.
 Stammerjohn, Robert G.
 Stanley, Gregory W.
 Stanley, Richard M.
 Stapp, Aron L.
 Steckbauer, Theodore C.
 Steentofte, Eric H.
 Stein, Earl M.
 Stell, Joe D.
 Stelloh, Reynold F., Jr.
 Stephan, Robert A.
 Stephenson, Claude M.
 Stephenson, Donald L.
 Sterrett, Bailey D., Jr.
 Stewart, Merle A., Jr.
 Stewart, Thomas P.
 Stiegman, Daniel B.
 Stiles, Charles L.
 Stimler, Richard P.
 Stimmel, Robert G.
- St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
 St. Louis, Norman E.
 Stoddard, Clarence W., Jr.
 Stollenwerck, William M.
 Stone, Bruce G.
 Storeide, Arthur J.
 Storey, Joseph D.
 Storm, John S.
 Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
 Strand, John A., Jr.
 Stratmann, Charles I.
 Streich, Paul R.
 Stringfellow, Reid
 Stromberg, Herman A., Jr.
 Strowski, Alexander S.
 Stroupe, Keith K.
 Struyk, Richard
 Stubbs, Robert C.
 Stull, Donald
 Stuyvesant, William R.
 St. Ville, Edward L.
 Styer, Robert T.
 Sudhoff, Herbert A.
 Sullivan, Don M.
 Sullivan, Robert G.
 Summers, Gilbert L.
 Summitt, Clyde W.
 Sumner, Donald A.
 Sundstrom, Alex L.
 Sundt, Wilbur A.
 Surman, William V., Jr.
 Surovik, George A.
 Sutherland, Donald G.
 Swadener, John R.
 Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
 Swanson, Charles A. L.
 Swanson, Charles O.
 Swanson, Peter S.
 Swift, Douglas DeL.
 Switzer, James R.
 Swope, Homer J., Jr.
 Synhorst, Gerald E.
 Tangeman, Stewart E.
 Tarbox, Ronald L., Jr.
 Tarpenning, Duane A.
 Taylor, Benjamin W.
 Taylor, Francis C.
 Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
 Taylor, Robert L.
 Tebo, Ballard W.
 Temple, Charles H.
 Templeton, Stuart N.
 Tennon, Lonnie D.
 Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
 Terry, Harold L.
 Tesch, Bernard, Jr.
 Tetrick, Claude J.
 Thiele, Karl R.
 Thiele, Malcolm H.
 Thom, Norman R.
 Thom, Philip H., Jr.
 Thomas, Bernard K., Jr.
 Thomas, Earle V.
 Thomas, Gerald E.
 Thomas, Harry E.
 Thomas, John K.
 Thomas, Robert L.
 Thomas, Walter R.
 Thomas, William C.
 Thompson, Albert J.
 Thompson, James J.
 Thompson, Robert C.
 Thompson, William B., Jr.
 Thomson, Alexander D.
 Thomson, Richard G.
 Thornburg, Thomas H.
 Thorndike, Robert F.
 Thorp, John H.
 Thurston, Dick W.
 Thyberg, Robert C.
 Tigner, Robert E.

- Tillerson, William E.
Tillson, John G.
Timoney, Gerald P.
Tinkham, John A.
Tipton, Harold F., Jr.
Tobias, David L.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, Walter H., Jr.
Todd, William E.
Tolbert, Robert R.
Tollefson, Norris M.
Tollefson, Charles H.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Tomb, Paul D.
Touch, Ralph J.
Townsend, "G" "E"
Townsend, Marland W., Jr.
Toy, Frank E.
Train, Harry DeP., II
Traub, Charles, III
Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
Tripp, Paul R.
Trommlitz, James R.
Trotter, Thomas K.
Trout, Thomas W.
Tucker, Leonard L., Jr.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Turnbull, James R.
Turner, Keith S.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Underwood, Leland J.
Utterback, Paul W.
Vail, Harold W.
Vaillancourt, Richard P.
Valentine, Robert F.
Vanderbeck, Eugene A.
Vandermolen, Dale R.
VanDeweghe, Raymond
Van Kirk, Robert W., Jr.
Van Kleeck, Justin L.
Vannoy, Rex J.
VanReeth, Eugene W.
Varner, Byron D.
Varner, Eldon P., Jr.
Vaughn, Robert E.
Vayo, Myles P.
Veasle, Robert H.
Veitl, George C.
Venable, Jack D.
Vennings, Elias, Jr.
Villanueva, Xavier V.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vining, Adrian D.
Vinsel, John E.
Vogel, John C.
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vogt, Leonard F., Jr.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseler, Warren P.
Wachtel, John H.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Walchko, Daniel P.
Wales, John R.
Walker, Charles M.
Walker, George D.
Walker, John R.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Waller, Edward C., III
Walters, Robert L.
Walters, Thomas J.
Wamsley, John A.
Ward, Donald S.
Ward, Glenn W.
Ward, James F., II
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Waring, Charles E., Jr.
- Warner, Brooks F.
Warner, Marvin H.
Wartman, Albert C., Jr.
Warwick, William B.
Wasniewski, Emil F.
Waterhouse, Charles N., Jr.
Watkins, Frank T., Jr.
Watkins, James D.
Watson, Peter J.
Watson, Richard K.
Weatherly, Robert T.
Webb, William H.
Webber, James H.
Webster, Dean E.
Weeks, Grady A.
Weeks, Robert H.
Wehner, William A.
Weil, Albert J.
Weisheit, Burton A.
Wells, William H.
Wentworth, Thomas F., Jr.
West, Floyd P.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
White, Grover C., Jr.
White, James A.
White, John E.
White, Joseph P.
White, Robert C.
White, Walter A.
White, Wendell A.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whiteleather, Charles H., Jr.
Whiteman, Frank D.
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitman, Donald L.
Whitmore, Vivien C.
Whitmore, Charles A., Jr.
Whittemore, Frederick H.
Whittlesey, Eugene H.
Wholey, Lloyd C.
Whyte, James D.
Wielki, Eugene J.
Wigent, Richard A.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wild, Robert W.
Wildauer, Paul A.
Wilder, Fred W.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Willhite, Alan S.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Wilkinson, Edward L.
Willard, Daniel D. M.
Wille, James E.
Willey, George H.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Edwin E.
Williams, James E.
Williams, Leland S.
Williams, Peter A.
Williams, Robert L.
Williams, Stanley
Williams, William A., III
Williamson, Donald A.
Williford, James R., III
Willingham, William E., Jr.
Willson, Donald M.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Carl B.
Wilson, Clarence E.
Wilson, James H., Jr.
Wilson, James J., Jr.
Wilson, Joseph W.
Wilson, Ralph E., Jr.
Wilson, Russell F.
Wilson, Thomas H.
Wilson, William W.
- Winberg, William, III
Winfrey, Harvey M., Jr.
Winnefeld, James A.
Winton, John R., Jr.
Wiram, Gordon H.
Wirt, William O., Jr.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisnabaker, Eugene M.
Wissler, John G.
Wolf, John M.
Wolford, Richard S.
Wood, John W.
Wood, Lewis I.
Wood, Peter W.
Wood, Robert C.
Wood, Thomas B., Jr.
Wood, William H., III
Woodard, David J.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Woodbury, Kyle H.
Wooden, Neal R.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woods, Edwin E., Jr.
Woodworth, Charles M.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Woodridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Wooley, Robert T.
Worcheseck, Robert R.
Worden, Dwight G.
Lieutenant commander, Medical Corps
Allen, Robert M.
Alspach, Rodger L.
Anderson, Richard R.
Aquadro, Charles F.
Baggett, Arthur E., Jr.
Barsoum, Adib H.
Baxter, Donald L.
Beckwith, Frederick D.
Bickerstaff, James W., Jr.
Bishop, Calvin F.
Boyce, Charles R.
Britton, Joseph F.
Brodine, Charles E.
Brown, Dudley E., Jr.
Brown, Herbert R., Jr.
Brown, Jacob V.
Brown, James M.
Burke, Erwin L.
Burke, Robert A.
Cady, Gerald W.
Carlton, Carter E., Jr.
Carson, William E.
Cole, Buell C.
Cooper, Merrill M.
Coulter, James A.
Davis, Richard G.
Dean, Harold N.
DeLave, Daniel P.
Dobel, Gerald F.
Donahue, Richard E.
Dungar, Charles F.
Dunn, Thomas S., Jr.
Easterday, Robert H.
Fobes, Clark D.
Gable, Walter D.
Garrison, Joseph S., III
Gass, Michael A., Jr.
Gebhardt, Hellmut C.
Getzen, Lindsay C.
Golden, Patrick E.
Good, Daniel C.
Gorsuch, George E.
Gresham, Richard B.
Grote, Arthur J.
Gunning, Jean-Jacques
Hart, George R.
Hartney, Thomas C.
Hayes, James W.
Henderson, Milton E.
Herrmann, Louis A.
Hinds, Paul A.
Hinton, Benjamin F.
Houk, Vernon N.
Hux, Robert H.
- Wright, David L.
Wright, Merritt R.
Wright, Walter J., Jr.
Wright, William W.
Wright, William B.
Wuest, Carl I.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Wurzbacher, Robert T.
Wylie, Henry K.
Wynn, James H., III
Yates, Vern M.
Yedlicka, Karel E.
Yingling, Abdiel R., Jr.
Young, Randall W.
Young, Robert M.
Young, Robert A.
Youngblade, Charles J.
Youngblood, Norman L., Jr.
Yowell, Grover McC.
Zajichek, Robert A.
Zeisel, Richard S.
Zekan, Charles J.
Zettel, Marcus A.
Ziarnik, Walter P.
Zicht, Austin L.
Ziegler, Frank G.
Zilch, Charles H.
Zimmerly, Arthur, III
Zink, Stewart T.
Zoehrer, Herbert A.
Zoske, Frank H.
- Sacher, Edward C.
Salsbury, Edward M.
Scala, Raymond D.
Scheffstad, Wilbur J.
Schmitz, Nicholas W.
Schrader, William A., Jr.
Schutt, Donald A.
Scott, Daniel J., Jr.
Scott, Lewis P., III
Slemmons, Barton K.
Sowell, Richard C.
Spence, John W.
Spence, William F.
Staggers, Frank E.
Stevenson, Andrew W., Jr.
Taylor, Robert W.
Thomas, Don F.
Lieutenant Commander, Supply Corps
Anderson, William "B", Jr.
Anderson, William W.
Anweller, Calvin R.
Arcand, Albert A.
Armstrong, Edmund S.
Armstrong, George K.
Audino, Joseph R.
Austin, Robert C.
Baker, Clovis M.
Balderston, Lee R.
Ball, Thomas F., Jr.
Barber, Ray C.
Bassing, Bernard E.
Bauer, Robert F.
Baungard, Perry E.
Bayers, John A.
Benfell, Leonard H., Jr.
Bennett, Donald E.
Bennett, William W.
Bergeaux, Floyd E.
Blackwell, Richard B.
Bliss, Roger C.
Bohl, Stanley C.
Borbridge, George F.
Borchert, William H.
Boyd, David T.
Bozewicz, John E.
Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Bridges, Charles D., III
Bristow, John M.
Brock, Leonard E.
Broll, Robert T.
Brown, Everett G.
Brown, Robert M.
Burbank, Donald D.
Butler, Herbert F., Jr.
Carmer, Elwood A.
Carmody, Barry S.
Carpenter, Dan M.
Carpenter, Norman E.
Carrington, James H. H.
Cecll, William F.
Cefalu, Dominic V.
Chadwick, William A.
Chegin, George I.
Chester, Francis J.
Chetlin, Norman D.
Cloutier, Norman L.
Conrad, Stanley J.
Coons, William W.
Coryell, Rex S.
Crabtree, Willard R.
Crozier, Wayne R.
Culwell, Charles L.
Curley, Wilfred B.
Dauchess, Edward G.
Davis, James B.
DeVilbiss, Robert J.
Dickson, Holton C., Jr.
Ditto, Chester L.
Doddy, William F.
Donley, Harold C., Jr.
Donohoe, Thomas J.
Duessell, Harold C.
Dughi, Carl M.
Dunham, Donald J., Jr.
- Thomas, Wendell C.
Trabaud, Lawrence E.
Trettel, Raymond J.
Trostle, Henry S.
Valaske, Martin J.
VanHouten, Robert J.
Vasquez, Mario A.
Viele, Billy D.
Vincent, John T.
Voss, Marilyn W.
Walton, Harry L.
Wiggs, Alfred E., II
Wilson, George L.
Wilson, James E., Jr.
Wire, George E., Jr.
Witchen, Jack M.
Wurzel, John F.
Edson, Stephen R., Jr.
Edwards, Howard R., Jr.
Ely, William B., Jr.
Emery, William T.
Ferrell, Reginald G.
Forehand, Joseph L.
Foster, Paul L.
Frahler, Andrew L.
Fraleigh, Hugh K.
Francis, Evans J.
Francisco, Dick H.
Frelander, Wendell L.
Funk, Raymond W.
Fussell, Theodore J.
Garibaldi, James J.
Ghormley, Robert L., Jr.
Goldfield, Herbert S.
Gore, Austin F., Jr.
Gove, Jack E.
Graham, Robert B.
Greenberg, Edwin G.
Haas, Harold E.
Haberthier, Jack H.
Haley, Richard W.
Halperin, George B.
Hamilton, William C., Jr.
Hammond, James E.
Hamric, Herschel B., Jr.
Hansen, Neil K.
Harvey, Robert R., Jr.
Hausold, Robert P.
Henderson, John M.
Hergeshelmer, Charles H.
Herndon, Paul C.
Higgins, Everett C.
Hudson, Richard S.
Humphrey, Harvey R.
Hutchinson, Arthur E.
Ingram, Thomas J., III
James, Billy M.
Janezic, Louis A.
Johnson, Ernie F.
Johnston, William E.
Jones, Burton H.
Kapp, George H.
Katz, Samuel
Killebrew, Thomas E.
Kocher, Edward M.
Kreissl, Leary B.
Kreyenhagen, Milton E.
Kulczycki, Alfred S.
Lennox, Glines J.
Leonard, William N., Jr.
Leventhal, Robert S.
Levine, Alan Y.
Lewis, Charles L.
Lewis, Frederick W.
Linthicum, Walter E.
Lynn, James W.
Mahaffey, John J.
Mason, Philip J.
Matthews, William H.
May, Thomas J.
Maynard, Frank T.
McClintock, Harry C.

McEneaney, John E.
McNally, Joseph J.
Mehaffey, Donald C.
Mija, Theodore
Mitchell, Billy R.
Mitchell, William F.
Morgan, Donald G.
Morphew, Karol M.
Morrow, David F.
Mulligan, Thomas J., Jr.
Murphy, George A.
Murphy, Ralph F., Jr.
Nicol, Robert G.
Norris, Lowry W.
Offerman, George S.
O'Neill, Harold P.
Owens, Andrew J.
Pattermann, Frank G.
Paul, Charles B., III
Perritt, Paul
Peterman, Edward E.
Pettijohn, Thomas P.
Piazza, Thomas J.
Pollen, James D.
Porter, Orland A., Jr.
Pringle, John B.
Puleo, Joseph A.
Ramey, James B., Jr.
Ratley, James R.
Renne, Raymond B.
Rice, Charles E.
Riley, James E.
Ringhausen, Robert L.
Rippert, Donald J.
Rixey, Charles W.
Roberts, Calvin W.
Roll, Arch C.
Rutter, Frank H., Jr.
Salsman, Thomas E.
Sappanos, Louis M.
Sartor, Alvis D.
Schmidt, Ben R.

Lieutenant commander, Chaplain Corps

Bell, John E.
Berger, John W.
Bergeur, John P. X.
Bodie, Harold D.
Boyd, George T.
Canfield, Robert A.
Carlson, Kenneth W.
Carnes, John H.
Cohill, John W.
Condit, John C.
Conte, James W.
Crawtree, Roger LaV.
Crawford, Jack V.
Croston, Calvin J.
Davis, Joe A.
Dillard, Donald H.
Dimino, Joseph T.
Dodge, John K.
Doermann, Martin J.
Doverspike, Dale E.
Eaton, Hal H.
Feagins, Walter B., Jr.
Ferrerri, Peter J.
Fisher, Jacob A. S.
Flatley, Eugene T.
Fogarty, Daniel F.
Ford, Thaine E.
Forsyth, Willis J.
Frank, Joseph A.
Frimenko, Michael
Fulfer, George W.
Fuller, William C.
Gardner, Calvin G.
Geary, Joseph F.
Geeza, Boris
Gibbons, Martin F.
Gould, John D.
Grabowski, John
Griffin, Gordon H.
Griffin, Jack B.
Hammond, Edward P.
Hardage, Owen A., Jr.
Heaney, Harold V.
Heath, Robert H.
Hershberger, George M.

Scott, Harold K.
Shealy, Oscar C., Jr.
Sherrell, David P.
Simcich, Alfred F.
Smeds, James H.
Smith, Charles McK.
Smith, Herbert R.
Smith, Roy F.
Speer, Wilburn A., Jr.
Stark, Warren H.
Sterner, Francis J.
Stevens, Robert J.
Stratton, Dene B.
Stringfellow, Hart R., Jr.
Stubbs, Raymond C.
Sullivan, John P.
Swenson, Darrell E.
Tapp, James G.
Taylor, James A.
Thomas, Lyle E.
Tracy, George D.
Tripp, Charles
Tucker, Oscar G., II
Tvetta, Reynold C.
Van Malsen, Wesley W.
Vanzee, Elvin L.
Verdow, Richard L.
Vroman, William G.
Wasson, John A.
Webb, Davis L.
Webster, Kenneth B.
Welge, Harry K.
White, George H.
White, Warren P.
Wild, Emmett J.
Williams, Leslie W.
Willis, Robert G.
Wirsing, John A.
Witte, Anton L.
Woodworth, Fred I., Jr.

Richardson, Edward L.
Riess, Paul G.
Rittenhouse, James C.
Roberson, Ronald L.
Romantum, Peter P.
Ryan, Joseph E.
Saeger, Alfred R., Jr.
Samuel, William R.
Seiders, Marlin D.
Sessions, Hal R., Jr.
Shoulders, Harold A.
Sire, Elwin N.
Smith, Richard R.
Smith, William G., Jr.
Solomon, Charles W.
Stewart, Dell F., Jr.

Lieutenant commander, Civil Engineer Corps

Anderson, Richard E.
Bacon, Howard I.
Bartley, Delmar A.
Berger, Arthur W.
Biederman, Richard J.
Bird, David R., Jr.
Birnbau, Philip S., Jr.
Bourne, William A.
Brown, Warren F.
Brown, Wesley A.
Calhoun, Charles W.
Carroll, Robert G.
Carroll, William C.
Church, Archer E., Jr.
Clark, John W.
Clements, Neal W.
Clerc, Louis H.
Courtright, Carl
D'Ambr, Rudolph F.
Davis, Walter E., Jr.
Day, Francis W.
Day, James C., Jr.
DeGroot, Ward W., III
Dickman, Robert E.
Dobson, John F.
Fluss, Richard M.
Foley, Richard L.
Forehand, Paul V.
Galloway, James E.
Gulick, Charles W., Jr.

Lieutenant commander, Dental Corps

Abbott, Paul L.
Ainley, James E., Jr.
Anderson, John "T"
Armstrong, William P.
Atkinson, Ray K.
Baird, Daniel M.
Barrow, Paul E.
Beeler, Grover G., Jr.
Bohacek, Joseph R.
Bowers, Gerald M.
Brokaw, Rodman
Chutter, Reinald J.
Clarke, Homer
Cowen, Charles E., Jr.
Cullom, Robert D.
Davy, Arthur L.
Deaton, Herbert C.
Demaree, Nell C.
Elliott, James R.
Enoch, James D.
Evans, Charles G.
Falcone, Philip R.
Fields, Robert E.
Flagg, Roger H.
Foster, Richard D.
Freeburn, Harold E., Jr.
French, Gordon K.
Garman, Thomas A.
George, Raymond E.
Glasser, Harold N.
Gorman, Walter J.
Grandich, Russell A.
Granger, Ronald G.
Hardin, Jefferson F.
Hays, James W.
Hegley, John H.
Heinkel, Erwin J., Jr.
Hiatt, William R.
Hodson, Harold W.
Hoffus, Edwin L.

Stanley, James H.
Sydow, Paul J.
Taylor, "B" Frank
Tenca, Joseph I.
Terry, Bill C.
Thomas, Julian J., Jr.
Thomason, Robert R.
Thompson, Robert G.
Tow, Herman D., Jr.
Walker, William G.

Lieutenant commander, Medical Service Corps

Adams, Dwight J.
Akers, Thomas G.
Alexander, Ross D.
Arm, Herbert G.
Barkley, Lucien E.
Beam, Walter E., Jr.
Bergquist, Melvin D., Jr.
Berry, Newell H.
Blalock, Jesse P.
Boggs, Clifford W.
Boudreaux, Joseph C., Jr.
Bowe, Warren G.
Bower, Harold R.
Buck, Charles W.
Carr, Charles A., Jr.
Charles, John P.
Courtney, John C.
Damato, Morris J.
Dempewolf, Eugene H.
Denningham, John S.
Dewitt, Richard G.
Douglas, George P.
Duckworth, James W.
Duffey, William S.
Freeman, Noel L.
Fry, George E.
Gaspar, Andrew J.
Gay, Laverne W.
Gehring, Jack H.
Gelman, Martin
Goodrich, Neil E., Jr.
Green, Irving J.
Hanavan, Robert J.
Harvey, Dallas C.
Huber, Godfrey S.
Jones, William H.
Jordan, Robert D.
Kaufman, Louis R.
Keating, Katherine
Kramer, Ernest S.
Lacy, Dexter J.
Laedtke, Ralph H.
Lee, Raymond W.
Levich, Calman

Lieutenant commander, Nurse Corps

Balashek, Helen M.
Barber, Ella
Belezos, Callope M.
Beretta, Gwendolyn L.
Black, Helen J.
Blek, Rachel
Breedin, Louisa F.
Bristol, Katherine J.
Bryan, Frances E.
Bull, Lola C.
Burns, Dolores T.
Carey, Geraldine M.
Carroll, Emma L.
Christ, Gertrude A.
Cleary, Virginia M.
Clemens, Rose M.
Conder, Maxine
Cooney, Mary K.
Copic, Kathryn M.
Coppola, Melanie L.
Corcoran, Anna
Crosby, Nancy J.
Croteau, Marie A.
DalMas, Amelia M.
David, Rose M.
Davis, Betty M.
Davis, Jean E.
Devan, Winifrede
Devaney, Audrey M.

Webb, John J.
Westcott, Maurice E.
Whatley, Thomas L.
Wilson, James McC.
Wooden, Robert A.
Woodland, Everan C., Jr.
Woody, Wilton G.
Zapski, Edward G.

Marsh, William G., Jr.
McCarthy, Daniel F.
McDonough, William A.
McGuire, Francis E.
McIlraith, James D.
McMahon, Talmadge G.
McMichael, Allen E.
McWilliams, Joseph G.
Meyer, William J.
Miller, Edwin B.
Mitchell, Thomas G.
Nice, Armand R.
Nicholson, Earl M.
Palge, Ray F.
Peckham, Samuel "C", Jr.
Petoletti, Angelo R.
Pruitt, John D.
Puckett, Lucien E.
Quinn, John P.
Reed, Robert F.
Rudolph, Henry S.
Sande, Garnet G.
Sanders, James M.
Scales, Thomas N., Jr.
Schlamm, Norbert A.
Schwab, Albert J.
Scrimshaw, Paul W.
Sharp, Robert
Stiles, Thomas R.
Still, Donald E.
Summerour, Thomas J.
Sykes, Stanley E.
Testa, Michele J.
Thompson, Robert E.
Tober, Theodore W.
Van Metre, Milton T.
Walter, Eugene L., Jr.
Warner, Albert D.
Wells, William H.
Werner, Gordon W.
Wheeler, Thomas E.
Zaller, Frank A.

Dial, Thelma P.
Dias, Louise S.
Easter, Mary R.
Eberhardt, Marie
Ellis, Barbara
Feeney, Eleanor T.
Fenn, Bernice E.
Fitz, Barbara O.
Frank, Lillie M.
Fuller, Doris T.
Furmanchik, Helen I.
Gagnon, Eva M.
Gardill, Norma H.
Gormish, Sophia H.
Greer, Goldie D.
Hanes, Eileen
Hanley, Susan M.
Hanson, Dorothy M.
Happ, Nellie L.
Harper, Marchetta
Hart, Anna G.
Herbert, Dellabelle
Hill, Gretchen S.
Hogan, Hazel L.
Hooker, Doris H.
Humphreys, Regina B.
Hundley, Barbara J.
Jakshe, Louise F.
Johnson, Imogene L.
Jones, Eva D.

Kailan, Addie E.
Kalista, Annette A.
Kane, Margaret A.
Kenyon, Helen A.
Kirsch, Rose A.
Kuenzi, Pauline J.
Leoni, Clara J.
Lewis, Betty J.
MacDonald, Patricia H.

Madsen, Gladys
Malloy, Kathleen M.
McGinniss, Sarah C.
Merritt, Lois C.
Miller, Jean L.
Morris, Thekla W.
Morry, Mary R.
Muhlenfeld, Loretta T.
Murphy, Lorraine M.
Nicora, Adeline
Norris, Barbara
O'Brien, Margaret H.
Olund, Anna C.
Parent, Shirley M.
Pechal, Lily M.
Perlow, Marion R.
Pfeffer, Elizabeth M.
Pojecky, Ruth M.
Pommier, Angelina T.
Power, Luisa A.
Ragland, Wilda R.
Rebick, Bette A.
Redfern, Mary V.
Reese, Mary D.
Reid, Johnanna
Reid, May L.
Robinson, Libia G.
Roller, Helen
Rowe, Constance H.
Rowe, Dorothy L.
Scarcello, Julia E.
Schlachter, Wilma R.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*James F. Allen
*Dean H. Batterman
*Max H. Beasley, Jr.
*Samuel E. Bishop
*James W. Bonar
*Louis J. Boos
*LeRoy H. Botten
*Andrew J. Bowen, IV
*Frederick E. Brahmner
*Melvin C. Brent
*Norman L. Bundy
*Michael T. Carey
*David R. Christiansen
*Stanley E. Cowan
*Edward R. Davidson
*Wayne F. Davidson
*Robert L. Dixon
*William J. Doyle, III
*William H. Draper
*Gerald D. Dulz
*Kenneth "O"
Eastman, Jr.
*David M. Ellis
*Alvin L. Franson
*Clark W. Fulton, Jr.
*William B. Gooding, Jr.
*William D. Grasse
*John F. Greene
*John C. Griffin
*David J. Gripka
*Douglas M. Haines
*Richard B. Hamer
*Douglas G. Heggie
*Jack D. Hooks
*William A. Johnson
*Stephen B. Jordan
*Dietger E. Jung
*Michael R. Kozlewicz
*John M. Knight
*Thomas P. Kraker, Jr.
*Louis A. Kressin

Schuh, Lorraine C.
Schultz, Aldona
Seabury, Marion M.
Sefchok, Ann
Serak, Helen
Shearer, Carolyn J.
Shelley, Rita J.
Shelton, Waukie L.
Sheridan, Anne M.
Shields, Dorothy J.
Slate, Faye J.
Smith, Katharine C.
Smith, Mildred M.
Smith, Vivian E.
Snedeker, Mary C.
Stankovich, Melva
Steffens, Gloria M.
Sterling, Gloria J.
Stern, Doris M.
Stewart, Mary G.
Stilwell, Adelaide
Stipe, Gloria J.
Stone, Charlotte R.
Struble, Mary R.
Sullivan, Nancy E.
Surman, Mary S.
Swoboda, Nadean M.
Taylor, Anna S.
Tepovich, Edith E.
Tracy, Dorothea M.
Troskoski, Dolores
Vanatta, Rose L.
Walker, Ruby E.
Walpole, Eva R.
Walters, Anna L.
Warren, Marion E.
Wathen, Mary J.
Wentzel, Mary M.
Williams, Alice K.
Wilson, Marjorie R.
Zabel, Kathryn E.

*Karl G. Kreutziger
*Robert C. Krishfield
*Rudolph V. Krueger
*Lee M. Lippert
*Charles G. Martinache
*Danny L. Meek
*Fred H. Merrick
*Frederick E. Miller
*William T. Millican, III
*George K. Montgomery
*Carl F. Mosler
*Eddie Y. Newcombe
*George H. Ng
*Eugene P. Nicholson, III
*Richard N. Norfleet
*Charles V. K. Ohrenschall
*Charles R. Orr
*William H. Overgard
*Richard L. Palmer
*Jeffrey M. Parsons
*Richard L. Pell
*Dennis W. Peterson
*Harold B. Ray
*William G. Rouse
*Michael M. Sampsel
*Michael H. Savod
*Halary S. Sawicki
*Eric Schaefer
*Stephen M. Schuppert
*Ralph B. Sewell
*Jon L. Shaffer
*James M. Shepard
*Douglas G. Smith
*Robert L. Spence
*Charles M. Staehle
*Karl E. Stahlkopf
*John J. Stauffacher

*Harry A. Stewart, Jr.
*James M. Stewart
*Vernon D. Stocker
*Bernard D. Strittmatter, Jr.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Earnie R. Breeding
*David J. Gripka
*Joel M. Lovstedt
*George A. Nugent

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*David R. Christiansen
*Stanley E. Cowan

The following named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John W. Adams
Franklyn D. Andersen
John H. Bruce
Dennis A. Costarakis
Allan W. Deprey
Paul D. Frazer
Richard F. Geissler
Edward N. Genung, Jr.
John E. Hart
Harley J. Holliday
Harry C. Hooven
Gordon W. Hutt
Jack L. Money

Robert L. Benne (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

The following named (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be permanent ensigns (engineering duty) in lieu of ensigns in the line of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Edward L. Campbell
*John R. Cochran, Jr.
*Thomas W. Weisenburger

The following named enlisted candidates to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*David D. Adkins
*Wayne A. Brown
*Albert L. Buhaly
*Robert P. Clark
*William A. Ferris
*Emile N. Glard
*Franklin D. Gillespie
*Charles M. Green
*Arthur D. Hatten, Jr.
*"S" Douglas Henderson
*William O. Horne
*Larry C. Isenbarger
*Lloyd M. Jenkins
*Thaddeus A. Juda
*Dimitri L. Kalfas
*Roland E. McPeters
*Thomas F. Mackin, Jr.
*James J. Mason
*Patrick R. Patterson
*Donald D. Phillips, Jr.
*Arthur R. Rath
*Jerome D. Rosplock
*Charles L. Rowe
*Clinton E. Schmutz
*Paul R. Shackelford
*Robert E. Smith
*Bobbie L. Thompson
*Frank E. Tomczyk
*John R. Vail
*Joseph E. Warren
*James O. Wilder
*Bernard L. Zetti

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:

*John R. Belasco
*Roy F. Carlson
*John D. Crawford
*Ronald E. Oldfield
*Guy E. Young

Harold D. Maxwell (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a

*William P. Vockel
*Richard A. Webster
*Robert M. Werner
*Curtis J. Winters
*Robert E. Woodman

*Michael H. Savod
*Vernon D. Stocker
*Bernard D. Strittmatter, Jr.

*Richard B. Hamer
*Louis A. Kressin
*Ralph B. Sewell

Jack L. Mundell
Zane W. Northcraft
James R. Proffitt
Robert E. Russell
Merrill C. Sawyer
Lewis P. Shank
Cloyce E. Shirley
Thomas J. Sindorf
Forrest E. Steber
Donald W. Swoyer
Michael Tanner
Ronald G. Walther

temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

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:

*Byron E. Blank
*John M. Smith

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Darwin S. Barrett
*Daniel E. Hayes
*Howard B. McWhorter
*Robert H. Orrahood
*Ralph R. Straub, Jr.
*Herman D. Tow, Jr.

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:

*Daniel G. Badger
*George A. Bloch
*Willie A. Bumgardner
*Henry L. DeGenova
*Richard A. Esposito
*Donald L. Hearon
*Elmer R. Hudson, Jr.
*Robert C. Jann
*Frank J. McCall, Jr.
*Glen P. McGivney
*George E. Monasky
*Richard A. Murphy
*Otis D. Rackley, Jr.
*Ronald W. Scott
*Douglas B. Stalib
*Oscar B. Walker
*Woodrow D. Wheatley
*James E. Yeager

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Cavitt K. Bartley
*Robert A. Middleton III
*Pendleton E. Thomas

Samuel A. Youngman, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary 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:

*LeRoy E. Kurth, Jr.
*James G. Ware
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:

*Paul K. Larive
*Joseph A. Pursch
*Robert J. Schultz
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:

*George H. Caspar
*Robert E. Chapman
*Richard V. Crisera
*Paul W. Jewett
*Robert J. Kelly
*John S. McCabe
*John R. Marnocha
*Jerry A. Phelps

William R. Walker (Naval Reserve officer) to be a commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classification indicated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Supply
*August H. Asseier
*John T. Bober
*George R. Bodge
*William J. Borer
*Robert E. Boyer
*William O. Buckalew, Jr.
*William A. Coffey
*Earl F. Corday
*Charles H. Cornellison
*James T. Cox
*James H. Cox
*James C. Creek
*William R. Davidson
*Ernest Flores
*Norman C. Frates
*Elbert R. Fussell
*Kenneth E. Garrett

*William W. Glass
 *Pabian J. Gomez
 *Clyde J. Hamlett
 *William A. Hammond
 *Earl W. Haubert, Jr.
 *James T. Hixson
 *Willard E. Jones
 *Oriel Lake
 *John B. Leamons
 *Thomas G. Loughran, Jr.
 *Wendell W. Lovingood

Civil engineer

*Max L. Cramer
 *Harold L. Higgins
 *Jack J. Hofmann
 *Kenneth B. Kayton
 *Leverne L. Klaas
 *George W. Partlow

Deck

*Oliver L. Andersen
 *Michael Bacha
 *Bernard E. Burgett
 *Joseph A. Caporicci
 *James C. Carden
 *J. B. Clark
 *Roland F. Cote
 *John O. Cullipher
 *Leroy Davis
 *Donald J. Donahue
 *Herman B. Edwards
 *Joseph A. Friel
 *Maurice C. Greer
 *John H. Gross
 *Alfred Haberman, Jr.
 *Francis G. Hanson
 *Robert F. James
 *Daniel G. Jones

Operations

*Charles Disney
 *Gilbert C. Fergerstrom

Ordnance, surface

*William C. Arnett
 *Louis W. Brugler
 *Stanley W. Chwalek
 *William F. Elrod

Ordnance, control

*John T. Carlin, Jr.
 *George Early, Jr.

Ordnance, underwater

*Edward J. Kellner
 *Stanley Porter

Administration

*Junior E. Britton
 *John C. Burns
 *Richard L. Durren
 *Elmer S. Hutchins
 *Albert N. James
 *James L. Moniot
 *Verne L. Moore
 *Samuel L. Nickens

Bandmaster

*Gerard T. Bowen
 *Richard E. Larson

Engineering

*Arthur H. Bates
 *Paul J. Bechard
 *Lynwood A. Beverly
 *Benton E. Buell
 *Wallace D. Carey
 *Charles P. Carpenter
 *Joe W. Carson
 *Hughie S. Carter
 *Ira S. Clark
 *Robert L. Deming
 *Roy E. Dickerson
 *Clinton E. Dutcher
 *Frank M. Fellrath, Jr.
 *George F. Filina
 *Theodore H. Gemmill
 *Roy L. Hendricks

*Charles P. Luke
 *Lewis E. Mattox
 *James B. Nadal
 *Richard E. Otis
 *Claudious A. Powell
 *John C. Shedd
 *Joseph E. Singleton
 *Aubrey E. Swan
 *Edward D. Swirka
 *Charles P. Wagner
 *James R. Waller
 *Willie R. Wheelless

*Charles R. Saffell
 *Robert F. Schroeder
 *Gig M. Shoemaker
 *James E. Stewart
 *Novis T. Thurmond
 *Joseph M. Wilson, II

*Thomas E. Kavanaugh
 *Kenneth K. Kimble
 *Alfred E. King
 *Rudolph D. Leach
 *Sollie McNease, Jr.
 *Eugene E. McNiff
 *Virgil N. Peacock
 *Howard S. Reeves
 *William E. Smiley
 *James R. Smith
 *Richard M. Stoughton, Jr.
 *Thomas L. Swift
 *Harley V. Taylor
 *George E. Tessier
 *Richard E. Thomas
 *Perry T. Thompson
 *Richard G. Trussell
 *Hilton A. Wylie

Hull

*Floyd A. Duncan
 *Ernest G. Gonzalez
 *John C. Hughes
 *James R. Kraft
 *Edwin B. Moye

Electrician

*John J. Billington
 *James B. Boles, Jr.
 *Lloyd E. Dickinson
 *John E. Ewing, Jr.
 *Delbert E. Franck
 *Clifford H. Hofmann
 *Joseph D. Hohe
 *James W. Huffman
 *Thomas F. Johnson
 *Robert L. Jordan
 *Glenn N. Kamperschroer

Electronics

*Louis R. Benson
 *Warren W. Broome
 *Hal G. Brown
 *John P. Budrevich
 *Elmer S. Burger
 *Edward M. Chatterton
 *Robert L. Copeland
 *Walter A. Dagdigian
 *William H. Davis
 *Ola A. Dodson
 *Hugh P. Gallagher
 *Richard P. Grimes
 *Norman R. Halderman
 *Leo Q. Harvey
 *Charles J. Johnson
 *Charles M. McKellips

Cryptology

*Dayton L. Dersham
 *Robert W. Jones
 *Arthur M. Mann, Jr.

Aviation operations

*Richard L. Evans, Jr.
 *Donald H. Trivett

Photography

*Edward G. Marsden
 *Edward H. Minges

Aerology

*Kenneth L. Cheshire
 *Victor L. Clark
 *Charles J. Hudock

Aviation ordnance

*William J. Dyer
 *Joseph J. Kanicki
 *S. A. Parrish

Aviation electronics

*John H. Benson
 *Carl E. Borman
 *Gerald R. Brayton
 *Charles T. B. Clark
 *Wiot L. Clarke
 *Henry L. Claude
 *Harry M. Edwards
 *Raymond F. Elworth
 *Robert F. Hauser
 *Richard J. Henderson
 *John G. Koerner

Aviation maintenance

*Frans O. Brooks
 *James E. Cochran
 *Daniel G. Gimmel
 *Joseph F. Jaggard

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Gerhard Borst, Jr.
 William T. Hardaker

*Wiley B. Parrish
 *Edmund P. Pendleton
 *Quintin M. Shelp
 *Robert C. Shultz
 *Mack R. Wilcox

*Joseph A. Kesterson
 *Marcel P. Kilmaszewski
 *Herbert E. Kodger
 *Charles A. Kulik
 *Virgil Martin, Jr.
 *Rollace A. Pugh
 *Maurice C. Rexroad, Jr.
 *John R. Sheppard
 *Charles S. Sluss
 *Ernest R. Witte

*Clarence D. Moss
 *Killraine Newton, Jr.
 *Robert H. Nicholas
 *Bernard Orner
 *Horace E. Paul
 *Joseph W. Peironnet
 *Allan C. Peringer
 *William J. Preston
 *Joseph T. Rhatigan
 *Harley M. Rittgers
 *Daniel D. Schuman
 *John P. VanArtsdalen
 *Daniel L. Waters
 *John A. Webster
 *Benjamin W. Wright
 *Leon Wurzel
 *Henry C. Zack

*Marvin L. Segler
 *William K. Taylor
 *Robert B. Toomey

*Robert G. Minor
 *Robert G. Minor

*Robert G. Minor

*William H. Myers
 *Willard L. Riner
 *L. R. Upton

*Frank H. Pennington, Jr.
 *Leonard H. Preston
 *Theodore J. Wilson

*Donald E. LeDuc
 *George Mitchell, Jr.
 *John S. Palmatier
 *James M. Schneider
 *Joel W. Timmons
 *Richard D. Travis
 *Arthur J. Warp
 *Stanley C. Welch
 *Winfield J. Whitcomb
 *Duval S. Woodford
 *Edwin A. Wright

*William N. McKnight
 *Claude F. Peak
 *Randall C. Smith

The following named (Meritorious non-commissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thornton Boyd
 Robert L. Brutke
 John C. Harrison
 Robert S. Huber
 Gerald Hunt
 Edward C. McConaughy, Jr.
 Richard S. McFarlane

The following named (from the temporary disability retired list) for permanent appointment to the grade of CWO W-4 in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William D. Smith

The following named for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Henry D. Barratt
 Duard L. Beebe
 John R. Bell
 Roderick E. Benton
 Bobby G. Carter
 James M. Chance
 Roger J. Claus
 Charles E. Conway, Jr.
 Joseph C. Dangler
 Francis T. Dettrey
 Wilson R. Dodge
 Joseph J. Dzielski
 Elbert A. Foster
 Marshall M. Grice, Jr.
 Leon A. Guimond
 William P. Hamilton
 Billie E. Hicks
 Fred L. James
 Herbert C. Johnson
 Robert L. Jones, Jr.
 Ronald C. Kraus
 "L" "J" Lott
 Kenneth R. Maddox

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:

Charles T. Allen, III
 Donald K. Angel
 Dennis M. Atkinson
 Roy R. Biggers, Jr.
 Donald F. Bittner
 Latham Boone, III
 Gary E. Brown
 Curtis B. Bruce
 Frederick T. Bryan, Jr.
 Bruce Burrows
 Robert J. Butterman
 Carl P. Campbell
 Stanley W. Cheff, Jr.
 John C. Chester
 Richard "W" Coffel
 Millard Cox
 Charles D. Cuny
 Marshall B. Darling
 Thomas B. Delaney
 Carmine J. Del Grosso
 Charles L. Dimmler, III
 William J. Edwards
 Verner Eggit
 Earl W. Elland
 Paul R. Ek
 James G. Freas
 Joseph F. Funaro
 Ronald L. Gatewood
 Samuel P. Gilstrap, Jr.
 Robert H. Goetz
 Christian L. Harkness

*Indicates ad interim appointment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 28: 20: *A faithful man shall abound with blessings.*

Almighty God, we earnestly beseech Thee that our life may be more faithfully and firmly rooted in the spiritual realities. May our character and conduct be brought into close and cordial harmony with the promptings and persuasions of Thy divine Spirit.

We humbly confess that our attitudes and aspirations are frequently selfish and self-centered, as we face a world that has so many desperate needs and longings.

Grant that all the Members of this Congress may bear witness in their personal life to the grandeur and glory of the ideals and principles of our democracy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS,
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the House Administration Committee be permitted to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY,
FEBRUARY 7

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES IS IN A TRAGIC
SITUATION

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it took many years before Nero fiddled while

Rome burned but I am sorry to say that it has taken President John F. Kennedy only a short time after his speech on January 20, 1961, not only to place our country in one of the worst domestic messes it has ever been in, with his tax reduction and tax reform phony programs, but our country, in its foreign policy, has never been in worse shape in its history. I can remember the time when we have been in trouble with our enemies, and that is natural. But today we are knocking off our friends. Today we are making enemies of our friends. Today we are disenchanting our friend to the north; we are disenchanting our friends in England and trying to run General de Gaulle. Just where are we going with that kind of a backward policy, I shall never know. I only say that it is a tragic thing for my country.

OUR PRESENT SITUATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the fact that Members oftentimes use the well for political purposes. I know that that has been going on for a long time and I make no complaint about it. But I would say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] has just engaged in an exaggeration, to use a very polite way of describing his remarks. No. 1: the domestic situation in our country.

The gross national product in the last quarter of 1962 reached its highest point in the history of the United States of America. Corporate profits hit a new record. Money available to the general public hit a new record.

This does not mean that we do not have problems. We do have them and I frankly admit there are problems in our economy. The President is facing up to them, as the gentleman from New York knows. What program, if any, has the gentleman proposed? Whatever it is, he has succeeded in keeping it a secret.

Turning to the situation our country finds itself in internationally. I have never seen an administration which has handled itself with more restraint. The notion that we have done anything to alienate our neighbors to the north is not correct. The notion that we have alienated Great Britain is not correct. As a matter of fact Prime Minister Macmillan met with the President of the United States in the West Indies not long ago and it was a most cordial and fruitful meeting.

The problems of the world in which we live do not lend themselves to easy solutions. I regret the speech of the gentleman. I say to him that we have a dedicated President who understands these problems and who does his homework so that our country will remain free, strong, and at peace. It is very easy to be critical. It is harder to be con-

structive. I would hope we would approach these problems in a nonpartisan spirit rather than a political spirit.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from California's yielding. I just wanted to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that it is not unusual when a Republican stands on the floor who believes in his country and thinks the situation facing the United States is tragic and then is accused of being political. I would say the gentleman from Louisiana should be the last one to accuse a Republican on this floor of being political, because for 10 years I have heard him time and time again make political attacks on the Republicans on this floor. My attack was not political. My attack was on behalf of my country. You talk about the gross national product, but when you deduct \$100 billion of Federal spending, the gross national product looks as phony as a \$3 bill. Further, the ridiculous tax reduction proposal of the President—what he is proposing is that the Government borrow \$12 billion from the people and then give them a tax cut. However, in the second proposal for tax reform, he is going to take the tax reduction away from the low- and middle-income families and make them pay more taxes than ever before. I remember the New Deal and Fair Deal policies of tax and tax and spend and spend, but President Kennedy has introduced a new gimmick. Spend and spend, build bigger and bigger deficits, push the national debt into orbit and reduce taxes, or try to make it look like reducing taxes. Believe me, from my mail and talking to my people back home, they are not being fooled one little bit.

CUBA

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Bay of Pigs we have watched today's decisions on Cuba turn into tomorrow's dilemmas. Confusion and contradiction are keywords.

The United States, the most powerful military and moral force in the world, apparently is hypnotized into immobility while an island in the Caribbean balloons into a major threat to our national security.

Are we to assume that our Government is prepared to permanently accept a So-

viet bastion just 6 jet minutes from Miami?

Are we going to resign ourselves forever to the presence of a pesthole of Soviet propaganda, subversion, and infiltration just 90 miles from our shore?

Or are we going to face the fact that the Soviets are pouring money, men, and military hardware into Cuba with one goal in mind: the ultimate subjugation of the Western Hemisphere?

Communist Cuba threatens the security and domestic tranquillity of the Americas. The American people have a right to know what their Government intends to do.

To that end, and to put a halt to the confusion, contradiction, and speculation which is causing unrest among our Latin American neighbors and lack of confidence at home, I am today introducing a new resolution. It encompasses my House Concurrent Resolution 51, introduced on January 24, to investigate the entire Bay of Pigs episode, and adds the provision that a special joint committee be empowered also to investigate the operations of all our intelligence-gathering agencies.

The past and present situation in Cuba demands it.

U.S. CITIZENS IMPRISONED IN CUBA

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 of this year I directed a letter to Secretary Dean Rusk of the Department of State, as follows:

Since the release of the Cuban prisoners, little if anything has been said about what is happening to the 23 U.S. citizens who are imprisoned in Cuba. Will you please advise me as to what is being done toward securing the release of our own citizens from Mr. Castro's jails.

I would like to report to the House that up to date I have received no reply to this letter. I am not terribly surprised, knowing the difficulties with which the State Department is laboring in all parts of the world, but at least I thought I might get a reply stating that the Department of State is seriously concerned about the imprisonment of our own citizens by Castro.

It does seem strange that millions of dollars of tax-free money can be raised within a few hours to ransom the Cuban prisoners but nothing can be done about our own citizens.

It must be extremely galling to the Marine Corps, whose fine history dates back to the shores of Tripoli, to have to sit idly by while we ransom prisoners from the pirate Castro.

While the administration officials are doubletalking the Cuban situation, either our own Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Affairs should get at the bottom of this powder keg 90 miles from our shores.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS VIEWS ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during the past few days I have offered the papers of several experts on the subject of nuclear test ban negotiations which have been collected by the Republican conference committee on that subject. Following are the views expressed by Mr. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in response to inquiries:

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Strauss, when you were Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission you opposed the moratorium on atomic weapons testing then. As I very well recall, you warned that the Communists would drag the negotiations along for years; that during these negotiations, they would probably cheat by conducting their own underground testing clandestinely and that they would abrogate the moratorium when they felt like it by testing in the atmosphere. Even worse, you feared that they would thus gain on us. Unfortunately, what you predicted came to pass. What is your view in the present situation now that negotiations have been reopened?

Mr. STRAUSS. Mr. Hosmer, there is no satisfaction in being proved right on circumstances as grim as those we face.

We faithfully observed our commitments, stopping testing nuclear weapons from the autumn of 1958 until after the Russians violated the moratorium in September 1961. Even after that violation took place it took us until the spring of the following year to get our tests started again. I am very worried about the present situation. We will be headed into the same kind of imprudent commitments if, at every time the Russians are to talk, we call our test programs off. I was very glad to note that the underground testing program had been reinstated last week. While the Russian people undoubtedly want atomic disarmament as much as we do, we ought to know by now that a promise by the Soviet Government is worthless. This has been demonstrated time after time but seems to make no impression here. It is less than 4 months since the President told us that the Soviet emissaries who called to see him at the White House last fall had attempted flatly to deceive him about Cuba. What possible sense is there in risking our safety on anything they say?

Mr. HOSMER. You say "risking our safety": What exactly do you mean by that?

Mr. STRAUSS. The testing of nuclear weapons is necessary to the improvement of those weapons. We need constantly to improve our nuclear arsenals so that we will be strong in the future as we have been in the past—so strong that an aggressor will be discouraged from attacking us. It has been frequently stated that further testing is unnecessary because weapons cannot be further improved. This was first said years ago, and it is often repeated, but it has often been proved untrue, time and again. The Soviets in their test series in 1961 exploded weapons which demonstrated development in size, if nothing else. The 3-year moratorium worked greatly to their advantage and to our disadvantage.

Furthermore, as it is known that we will not be the first to attack with atomic weapons, it follows that we will be first on the receiving end of an atomic war. Our stockpile must be larger because we may lose part

of it in an attack, and our weapons must be more precise because they will be needed to block an attack that has already been launched.

Some of our weapons will also need to be clean, that is to say, free from fallout, as they may have to be exploded high above our own or friendly territory to destroy enemy missiles already launched at targets in our own country. Test suspension arrests the development of these weapons. This is a severe setback for us, not the Soviets.

Every time we improve the missiles which carry our weapons, we absolutely must test them with atomic warheads to be sure that they work together as an effective system. At our peril, we cannot afford to repeat the tragic mistake we made with torpedoes between World Wars I and II when we had not tested torpedoes with live warheads and its consequence was to send our submarines into the Pacific with torpedoes that would not explode.

Mr. HOSMER. Do you regard the reported easing of the Soviet objection of onsite inspection as a hopeful sign?

Mr. STRAUSS. I saw the report that the Russians had offered three on-site inspections and that this was regarded as a great breakthrough. It is not new. The Soviets proposed the same thing in 1960, and it was totally inadequate then. There are many hundreds of seismic events in the Russian land mass each year. Any of which could be the result of a clandestine weapons test. To be offered the opportunity to inspect three of the many hundreds is meaningless as a safeguard against cheating. Indeed, I am fearful of a compromise at a slightly larger number than three, but still an insignificant number. The figure 10 has been mentioned. In my opinion that would be completely inadequate.

Mr. HOSMER. What about the so-called tamperproof black boxes?

Mr. STRAUSS. There is no such thing as a tamperproof detection device and nothing can take the place of unhampered, on-site inspection by an international team on which our own people would be adequately represented.

Mr. HOSMER. Why do you think we are susceptible to all this pressure to stop our weapons development?

Mr. STRAUSS. Because so many people have been misled into a vast fear of the effect of fallout from nuclear tests. The fallout which would be the result of a nuclear war would be a fearsome thing. The very purpose of our strong weapons posture is to prevent a nuclear war. We test to keep that posture strong. The fallout from tests and the fallout from nuclear war are totally different in magnitude and effect.

There are also a large number of people who think that an agreement to stop testing is equivalent to nuclear disarmament. This, of course, is not true. Indeed, it is a dangerous misconception because it gives a false sense of security.

Naturally, the Russians want us to stop testing. The moratorium was of incalculable value to them. We must not fall into that terrible error again.

CONGRESS A BULWARK FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I resent Roscoe Drummond's article in this week's Saturday Evening Post. His thesis is that

Congress fritters away its powers and shirks its duty.

Whatever may have been the situation in previous years I do not know. But now—today—the 88th Congress is a horse of a different color. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the American people should be thankful that the 88th Congress stands between them and the massive raid upon their pocketbooks that is the present administration's program.

On both sides of the aisle in this House are many men and women who neither fritter away nor shirk their duty. Confronted with reckless fiscal proposals, politically conceived, that would sacrifice the public interest through solicitation of American voters by promises of a share of Federal pork, the salvation of America is going to be the unity of Members of this House from both political parties who refuse to sell America down the river for a political mess of porridge the present President calls progress.

As never before, Congress is besieged with Presidential messages, the cumulative effect of which would be to weaken America's strength and undermine our dollars by spending billions more than we take in. And this is without regard to the existence of the greatest national debt the Nation has ever had, and all in the name of the so-called New Frontier.

Mr. Speaker, the Pied Piper was a piker next to the Kennedys. Unfortunately, it is a trifle difficult now and then to know which Kennedy is playing the flute or calling the tune. But it does not matter as long as the American people realize that the song the Kennedys play is leading America down the road to financial ruin.

THE SITUATION IN CUBA

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, probably the proudest day in the history of this Nation was last October 22d. That day President Kennedy, in the strongest proclamation made by a President in history outside of a declaration of war, squared off his broad shoulders and told the Russians to pull their weapons out of Cuba. We knew at that time that we had a strong man as President; a man who had the guts to tell the biggest military power outside of this country that we would stand for no installation of offensive weapons at our back door.

This buildup had been going on for several years. This administration did not sire Castro, but inherited him. The Communists were allowed to take over Cuba in the last administration. That administration closed its eyes to the threat. But once the present President of the United States had evidence that offensive weapons were being placed in Cuba he made them remove all such weapons. They took them out, and the world knew that the United States was

under the leadership of a great, and strong man.

Today we hear partisan bickering by the Republican Party trying to destroy the image that has been created internationally of the great leadership in this Nation. After 8 years of lackadaisical do-nothing this country had deteriorated internationally to a state lower than it had ever been in its history. Today it is the leader of the world, recognized as such by all nations of the world. We also have a strong national economy; we are going to keep it that way in order to have the respect of the other people throughout the world.

I regret and I deplore the fact that our international policy is now a cause for partisan bickering. Certainly this does not help our relative position in the international scene.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] has touched off something of a controversy that some have tried to label as purely political. He was answered by the acting majority leader. Subsequently the gentleman from New York indicated that what he had to say had not been in the political realm.

I had not anticipated becoming involved in this matter today, but when the gentleman from Tennessee undertakes to say that under the great President Eisenhower, who knows more about war and what to do about it than anybody, and I say so even today—when he undertakes to say our whole position in the world deteriorated in those 8 years under President Eisenhower I cannot keep silent. He knows that is not quite the situation. It does not even approximate the situation. There was talk about the missile gap. Now, on the word of Mr. Kennedy's Secretary of Defense, we know there was no missile gap. There was the charge that we had lost prestige in the world. There was no truth in that either.

As a matter of fact, I am just afraid that wherever we look, whether it be unemployment continuing as high as 5.8 percent after you promised to get rid of it, the cost-price squeeze on farmers worse, FHA mortgage foreclosures greater today than any time in history, the cost of living up for everybody—deficits up—almost every place you look, yes, even abroad, you find increasingly troublesome situations. The gentleman speaks of Cuba.

First, I would point out that when the Bay of Pigs fiasco occurred in 1961, there were many people who thought Republicans should have turned that disaster into political capital.

We thought—and we still think—that to have done so with a new President in office would only have increased the

enormous damage to American prestige which was caused by that incident.

Second, I would like to remind the gentleman that it was Republican Members in this body and the other body who took the lead last year in exposing the Soviet missile buildup and demanding action against it. May I remind him that on September 7 the joint Senate-House Republican leadership asked for a Formosan-type resolution in respect to Cuba. It fell on deaf ears here on the part of the majority for days and days, and then finally you woke up to the fact that you had to do something. Then at last a Formosan-type resolution was adopted. It was Republican inspired, not for political advantage but for the protection and security of our country.

Now, the gentleman speaks of the action that was taken at the White House last October in respect to Cuba. May I say to him that I was there at the request of the President when that announcement was made. You will recall that when he undertook the action, he referred to the Formosan-type resolution that had been adopted by the Congress as the basis for his authority to act. And, I just want to say to the gentleman that as that meeting broke up there had been some controversy there about what to do. I said, "Mr. President, I stand with you."

Now, if that is partisanship, I do not know what "partisanship" means.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. I would like to say to my friend from Indiana that in the 8 years that I have served in the House I have never thought the gentleman from Indiana was partisan in his approach to international affairs. I want to congratulate him for being the leader on his side and giving support to a President, Republican or Democrat, in international affairs, if it became necessary. I always felt that he was that way. I was not referring to him in my remarks. I do not believe that he is a party to that sort of thing. But, I would like to say to him that I think with the press releases that I have read recently emanating from his side of the aisle, the other members of his party are not taking the course that the gentleman from Indiana would like for them to take in international affairs.

Now, in reference to what I said a few minutes ago, I would like to say to my friend from Indiana that I wish he would take the leadership and insist that the members of his party not make inflammatory statements in the international field which may tend to embarrass this country. Surely they cannot have all the necessary facts and may even unwittingly tip the hand of planned action.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if I might conclude, what the gentleman has said in complimenting me will meet with mixed reaction on my side of the aisle, but in any event, the gentleman has brought it up. But, I want to say again that Republican voices were raised in respect to the buildup in Cuba long before the announcement was made by the Pres-

ident, and they were properly made, and today, if the gentleman asks me, I am tremendously concerned about what I believe is a further buildup of military strength in Cuba. I read in the paper that some statements were made by a Member on our side in the other body concerning the buildup, and then I think it was a representative of the State Department or the Pentagon who said, "Well, maybe the gentleman is right."

All I ask is that our Government take whatever steps are necessary to protect the security of our country, and when that is done, I will stand with the President as I have before.

U.S. SQUABBLING OVER CUBA MUST CEASE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Washington is rife with contradictions on the amount of Soviet military equipment in Cuba. Each day new charges on the specific number of Cuba-based Communist arms are hurled from the floors of the Congress. Executive agencies are then drawn into bickering over the quantities of Soviet military equipment, the design of this equipment, and whether it is in Cuba for offensive or defensive purposes.

The American people view the situation in simple terms. One Soviet soldier in Cuba is one too many. And when does the mission of that one Soviet soldier, with one pack on his back, and one rifle in his hand, become offensive or defensive? The answer is simple—when the Kremlin orders it so.

Mr. Speaker, we may be losing sight of the basic problem. The amount and type of Soviet military equipment in Cuba is not the problem. Nor does the offensive or defensive nature of such equipment change the problem. In simple and glaring terms, the problem centers on the existence of communism in Cuba, backed up by Soviet military equipment—whatever it may be.

How do we solve this problem? The first step is by isolating Cuba. Cuba should be placed in solitary confinement by the nations of this hemisphere. I would urge that isolation be accomplished by first closing U.S. ports to vessels calling at the island of Cuba. I further urge that the United States propose to the Organization of American States, which now stands ready to act, the following steps:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to vessels calling in Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of the hemisphere to airlines flying into Cuba.

Third. Ban telecommunications relays of messages to and from Cuba.

Fourth. Curb the travel of Castro agents throughout the hemisphere.

Fifth. Freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, we must not be diverted by the extent of the Soviet strength in Cuba. The United States must concentrate its full strength and power toward ridding the hemisphere of all Soviet influence now present in it. The United States must exert its leadership to rid this hemisphere of communism.

THE CUBAN CRISIS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I read from an editorial that was published in the daily paper of my home town. This is apropos of the discussion that has taken place on the floor of the House here this morning. Certainly all of us are interested in the situation that has arisen in Cuba and all of us are concerned. Yet during times of this nature it is advisable for men to gage their remarks and to use caution in their language.

Mr. Speaker, I read the last sentence of this editorial:

President Kennedy acted in a role during the Cuban crisis which will be applauded by the overwhelming majority of American people.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in this statement and I concur in the defense of former Presidents as to their loyalty to this country. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the debate on this question has aroused a great interest among the people of America and, therefore, the debate should be waged with caution and discretion.

In times of great stress such as those that have developed with regard to Cuba in the last 5 or 6 months it is particularly important that we maintain our national solidarity. The President and our military leaders are entitled to the support of all of us on issues where they of necessity must bear the burden of decision. This is not to say that any man should not hold or express such personal views as he has. But such views or such information should be transmitted to those who are responsible under our system for acquiring, evaluating, and acting upon information bearing on the security of our country. I believe the vast majority of us, without regard to partisan preference, have faith in the loyalty and integrity of those in whom we vest the lonely responsibility of ultimate decision.

Mr. Speaker, I submit this editorial for the RECORD.

The matter referred to follows:

DICTATORSHIP—UGLY WORD

"Dictatorship" is an ugly word in a democracy where we pride ourselves on freedom for all. Yet there come times even in the land of the free when we must exercise a sort of dictatorship temporarily in order to preserve freedom permanently.

When the Cuban crisis arose, someone had to take the plow handle and act decisively. The only one in America who could do the job then was the President of the United States.

Whatever criticism there might be today over the fact that President Kennedy did act decisively, did assume the role of a sort of temporary dictator, and did act even without clear-cut constitutional authority at times should not cause extremists to shout "dictator." It should point up the need here in our democracy for certain reforms giving the President temporary power to act decisively in a quick crisis.

Had the President not acted quickly and decisively in the Cuban crisis, then we hesitate to think what the results might have been. Because he assumed authority and exerted definite leadership at that time in no way causes us to feel that he is trying to be a dictator over this Nation.

Yet there are people who are openly critical at what they see as a man assuming such extreme powers at such a time.

If we admit that "dictatorship" is an ugly word, we must also admit that "chaos" or "surrender" is far uglier.

No, to our way of thinking when a man becomes dictator, it takes on a status of being permanent. President Kennedy acted in a role during the Cuban crisis which will be applauded by the overwhelming majority of American people.

UNITED STATES IMPORTATION OF LUMBER FROM CANADA

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Northwest lumber producers have found themselves caught in an ever-tightening cost-price squeeze. The demand for softwood products has dwindled with the decreases in the homebuilding industry, but this is only a fraction of a very complex problem. Production in the United States has declined faster than consumption, and the difference is importation of lumber from Canada.

In recognition of the devastating effect the loss of lumber markets has on the Idaho economy, the 37th session of the State of Idaho Legislature has passed two memorials relative to the importation of Canadian lumber and the restrictive effects of wilderness legislation.

According to the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, the memorials have been received and referred to the proper committees.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND MENTAL RETARDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 58)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

It is my intention to send shortly to the Congress a message pertaining to this Nation's most urgent needs in the area of health improvement. But two health problems—because they are of such critical size and tragic impact, and

because their susceptibility to public action is so much greater than the attention they have received—are deserving of a wholly new national approach and a separate message to the Congress. These twin problems are mental illness and mental retardation.

From the earliest days of the Public Health Service to the latest research of the National Institutes of Health, the Federal Government has recognized its responsibilities to assist, stimulate, and channel public energies in attacking health problems. Infectious epidemics are now largely under control. Most of the major diseases of the body are beginning to give ground in man's increasing struggle to find their cause and cure. But the public understanding, treatment and prevention of mental disabilities have not made comparable progress since the earliest days of modern history.

Yet mental illness and mental retardation are among our most critical health problems. They occur more frequently, affect more people, require more prolonged treatment, cause more suffering by the families of the afflicted, waste more of our human resources, and constitute more financial drain upon both the public treasury and the personal finances of the individual families than any other single condition.

There are now about 800,000 such patients in this Nation's institutions—600,000 for mental illness and over 200,000 for mental retardation. Every year nearly 1,500,000 people receive treatment in institutions for the mentally ill and mentally retarded. Most of them are confined and compressed within an antiquated, vastly overcrowded, chain of custodial State institutions. The average amount expended on their care is only \$4 a day—too little to do much good for the individual, but too much if measured in terms of efficient use of our mental health dollars. In some States the average is less than \$2 a day.

The total cost to the taxpayers is over \$2.4 billion a year in direct public outlays for services—about \$1.8 billion for mental illness and \$600 million for mental retardation. Indirect public outlays, in welfare costs and in the waste of human resources, are even higher. But the anguish suffered both by those afflicted and by their families transcends financial statistics, particularly in view of the fact that both mental illness and mental retardation strike so often in childhood, leading in most cases to a lifetime of disablement for the patient and a lifetime of hardship for his family.

This situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience, but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution. The Federal Government, despite the nationwide impact of the problem, has largely left the solutions up to the States. The States have depended on custodial hospitals and homes. Many such hospitals and homes have been shamefully understaffed, overcrowded, unpleasant institutions from which death too often provided the only firm hope of release.

The time has come for a bold new approach. New medical, scientific, and so-

cial tools and insights are now available. A series of comprehensive studies initiated by the Congress, the executive branch and interested private groups have been completed and all point in the same direction.

Governments at every level—Federal, State, and local—private foundations and individual citizens must all face up to their responsibilities in this area. Our attack must be focused on three major objectives:

First, we must seek out the causes of mental illness and of mental retardation and eradicate them. Here, more than in any other area, "an ounce of prevention is worth more than a pound of cure." For prevention is far more desirable for all concerned. It is far more economical and it is far more likely to be successful. Prevention will require both selected specific programs directed especially at known causes, and the general strengthening of our fundamental community, social welfare, and educational programs which can do much to eliminate or correct the harsh environmental conditions which often are associated with mental retardation and mental illness. The proposals contained in my earlier message to the Congress on education and those which will be contained in a later message I will send on the Nation's health will also help achieve this objective.

Second, we must strengthen the underlying resources of knowledge and, above all, of skilled manpower which are necessary to mount and sustain our attack on mental disability for many years to come. Personnel from many of the same professions serve both the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. We must increase our existing training programs and launch new ones; for our efforts cannot succeed unless we increase by severalfold in the next decade the number of professional and subprofessional personnel who work in these fields. My proposals on the health professions and aid for higher education are essential to this goal; and both the proposed youth employment program and a national service corps can be of immense help. We must also expand our research efforts, if we are to learn more about how to prevent and treat the crippling or malfunction of the mind.

Third, we must strengthen and improve the programs and facilities serving the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. The emphasis should be upon timely and intensive diagnosis, treatment, training, and rehabilitation so that the mentally afflicted can be cured or their functions restored to the extent possible. Services to both the mentally ill and to the mentally retarded must be community based and provide a range of services to meet community needs.

It is with these objectives in mind that I am proposing a new approach to mental illness and to mental retardation. This approach is designed, in large measure, to use Federal resources to stimulate State, local, and private action. When carried out, reliance on the cold mercy of custodial isolation will be supplanted by the open warmth of com-

munity concern and capability. Emphasis on prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation will be substituted for a desultory interest in confining patients in an institution to wither away.

In an effort to hold domestic expenditures down in a period of tax reduction, I have postponed new programs and reduced added expenditures in all areas when that could be done. But we cannot afford to postpone any longer a reversal in our approach to mental affliction. For too long the shabby treatment of the many millions of the mentally disabled in custodial institutions and many millions more now in communities needing help has been justified on grounds of inadequate funds, further studies, and future promises. We can procrastinate no more. The national mental health program and the national program to combat mental retardation herein proposed warrant prompt congressional attention.

I. A NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR MENTAL HEALTH

I propose a national mental health program to assist in the inauguration of a wholly new emphasis and approach to care for the mentally ill. This approach relies primarily upon the new knowledge and new drugs acquired and developed in recent years which make it possible for most of the mentally ill to be successfully and quickly treated in their own communities and returned to a useful place in society.

These breakthroughs have rendered obsolete the traditional methods of treatment which imposed upon the mentally ill a social quarantine, a prolonged or permanent confinement in huge, unhappy mental hospitals where they were out of sight and forgotten. I am not unappreciative of the efforts undertaken by many States to improve conditions in these hospitals, or the dedicated work of many hospital staff members. But their task has been staggering and the results too often dismal, as the comprehensive study by the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health pointed out in 1961. Some States have at times been forced to crowd five, ten, or even fifteen thousand people into one, large understaffed institution. Imposed largely for reasons of economy, such practices were costly in human terms, as well as in a real economic sense. The following statistics are illustrative:

Nearly one-fifth of the 279 State mental institutions are fire and health hazards; three-fourths of them were opened prior to World War I.

Nearly half of the 530,000 patients in our State mental hospitals are in institutions with over 3,000 patients, where individual care and consideration are almost impossible.

Many of these institutions have less than half the professional staff required, with less than 1 psychiatrist for every 360 patients.

Forty-five percent of their inmates have been hospitalized continuously for 10 years or more.

But there are hopeful signs. In recent years the increasing trend toward higher and higher concentrations in these institutions has been reversed, by the use of new drugs, by the increasing public

awareness of the nature of mental illness, and by a trend toward the provision of community facilities, including psychiatric beds in general hospitals, day care centers and outpatient psychiatric clinics. Community general hospitals in 1961 treated and discharged as cured more than 200,000 psychiatric patients.

I am convinced that, if we apply our medical knowledge and social insights fully, all but a small portion of the mentally ill can eventually achieve a wholesome and constructive social adjustment. It has been demonstrated that two out of three schizophrenics, our largest category of mentally ill, can be treated and released within 6 months, but under the conditions that prevail today the average stay for schizophrenia is 11 years. In 11 States, by the use of modern techniques, 7 out of every 10 schizophrenic patients admitted were discharged within 9 months. In one instance, where a State hospital deliberately sought an alternative to hospitalization in those patients about to be admitted, it was able to treat successfully in the community 50 percent of them. It is clear that a concerted national attack on mental disorders is now both possible and practical.

If we launch a broad new mental health program now, it will be possible within a decade or two to reduce the number of patients now under custodial care by 50 percent or more. Many more mentally ill can be helped to remain in their own homes without hardship to themselves or their families. Those who are hospitalized can be helped to return to their own communities. All but a small proportion can be restored to useful life. We can spare them and their families much of the misery which mental illness now entails. We can save public funds and we can conserve our manpower resources.

1. COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Central to a new mental health program is comprehensive community care. Merely pouring Federal funds into a continuation of the outmoded type of institutional care which now prevails would make little difference. We need a new type of health facility, one which will return mental health care to the main stream of American medicine, and at the same time upgrade mental health services. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress: (1) Authorize grants to the States for the construction of comprehensive community mental health centers, beginning in fiscal year 1965, with the Federal Government providing 45 to 75 percent of the project costs; (2) authorize short-term project grants for the initial staffing costs of comprehensive community mental health centers, with the Federal Government providing up to 75 percent of the cost in the early months, on a gradually declining basis, terminating such support for a project within slightly over 4 years; and (3) to facilitate the preparation of community plans for these new facilities as a necessary preliminary to any construction or staffing assistance, appropriate \$4.2 million for planning grants under the National Institute of Mental

Health. These planning funds, which would be in addition to a similar amount appropriated for fiscal year 1963, have been included in my proposed 1964 budget.

While the essential concept of the comprehensive community mental health center is new, the separate elements which would be combined in it are presently found in many communities: diagnostic and evaluation services, emergency psychiatric units, outpatient services, inpatient services, day and night care, foster home care, rehabilitation, consultative services to other community agencies, and mental health information and education.

These centers will focus community resources and provide better community facilities for all aspects of mental health care. Prevention as well as treatment will be a major activity. Located in the patient's own environment and community, the center would make possible a better understanding of his needs, a more cordial atmosphere for his recovery, and a continuum of treatment. As his needs change, the patient could move without delay or difficulty to different services, from diagnosis, to cure, to rehabilitation, without need to transfer to different institutions located in different communities.

A comprehensive community mental health center in receipt of Federal aid may be sponsored through a variety of local organizational arrangements. Construction can follow the successful Hill-Burton pattern, under which the Federal Government matches public or voluntary nonprofit funds. Ideally, the center could be located at an appropriate community general hospital, many of which already have psychiatric units. In such instances, additional services and facilities could be added, either all at once or in several stages, to fill out the comprehensive program. In some instances, an existing outpatient psychiatric clinic might form the nucleus of such a center, its work expanded and integrated with other services in the community. Centers could also function effectively under a variety of other auspices: as affiliates of State mental hospitals, under State or local governments, or under voluntary nonprofit sponsorship.

Private physicians, including general practitioners, psychiatrists, and other medical specialists, would all be able to participate directly and cooperatively in the work of the center. For the first time, a large proportion of our private practitioners will have the opportunity to treat their patients in a mental health facility served by an auxiliary professional staff that is directly and quickly available for outpatient and inpatient care.

While these centers will be primarily designed to serve the mental health needs of the community, the mentally retarded should not be excluded from these centers if emotional problems exist. They should also offer the services of special therapists and consultation services to parents, school systems, health departments, and other public and private agencies concerned with mental retardation.

The services provided by these centers should be financed in the same way as other medical and hospital costs. At one time, this was not feasible in the case of mental illness, where prognosis almost invariably called for long and often permanent courses of treatment. But tranquilizers and new therapeutic methods now permit mental illness to be treated successfully in a very high proportion of cases within relatively short periods of time—weeks or months—rather than years.

Consequently, individual fees for services, individual and group insurance, other third-party payments, voluntary and private contributions, and State and local aid can now better bear the continuing burden of these costs to the individual patient after these services are established. Long-range Federal subsidies for operating costs are neither necessary nor desirable. Nevertheless, because this is a new and expensive undertaking for most communities, temporary Federal aid to help them meet the initial burden of establishing and placing centers in operation is desirable. Such assistance would be stimulatory in purpose, granted on a declining basis and terminated in a few years.

The success of this pattern of local and private financing will depend in large part upon the development of appropriate arrangements for health insurance, particularly in the private sector of our economy. Recent studies have indicated that mental health care—particularly the cost of diagnosis and short-term therapy, which would be major components of service in the new centers—is insurable at a moderate cost.

I have directed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore steps for encouraging and stimulating the expansion of private voluntary health insurance to include mental health care. I have also initiated a review of existing Federal programs, such as the health benefits program for Federal personnel, to determine whether further measures may be necessary and desirable to increase their provisions for mental health care.

These comprehensive community mental health centers should become operational at the earliest feasible date. I recommend that we make a major demonstration effort in the early years of the program to be expanded to all major communities as the necessary manpower and facilities become available.

It is to be hoped that within a few years the combination of increased mental health insurance coverage, added State and local support, and the redirection of State resources from State mental institutions will help achieve our goal of having community-centered mental health services readily accessible to all.

2. IMPROVED CARE IN STATE MENTAL INSTITUTIONS

Until the community mental health center program develops fully, it is imperative that the quality of care in existing State mental institutions be improved. By strengthening their therapeutic services, by becoming open institutions serving their local communities,

many such institutions can perform a valuable transitional role. The Federal Government can assist materially by encouraging State mental institutions to undertake intensive demonstration and pilot projects, to improve the quality of care, and to provide inservice training for personnel manning these institutions.

This should be done through special grants for demonstration projects for inpatient care and inservice training. I recommend that \$10 million be appropriated for such purposes.

3. RESEARCH AND MANPOWER

Although we embark on a major national action program for mental health, there is still much more we need to know. We must not relax our effort to push back the frontiers of knowledge in basic and applied research into the mental processes, in therapy, and in other phases of research with a bearing upon mental illness. More needs to be done also to translate research findings into improved practices. I recommend an expansion of clinical, laboratory, and field research in mental illness and mental health.

Availability of trained manpower is a major factor in the determination of how fast we can expand our research and expand our new action program in the mental health field. At present manpower shortages exist in virtually all of the key professional and auxiliary personnel categories, psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, social workers, and psychiatric nurses. To achieve success, the current supply of professional manpower in these fields must be sharply increased, from about 45,000 in 1960 to approximately 85,000 by 1970. To help move toward this goal I recommend the appropriation of \$66 million for training of personnel, an increase of \$17 million over the current fiscal year.

I have, in addition, directed that the Manpower Development and Training Act be used to assist in the training of psychiatric aids and other auxiliary personnel for employment in mental institutions and community centers.

Success of these specialized training programs, however, requires that they be undergirded by basic training programs. It is essential to the success of our new national mental health program that Congress enact legislation authorizing aid to train more physicians and related health personnel. I will discuss this measure at greater length in the message on health which I will send to the Congress shortly.

II. A NATIONAL PROGRAM TO COMBAT MENTAL RETARDATION

Mental retardation stems from many causes. It can result from mongolism, birth injury or infection, or any of a host of conditions that cause a faulty or arrested development of intelligence to such an extent that the individual's ability to learn and to adapt to the demands of society is impaired. Once the damage is done, lifetime incapacity is likely. With early detection, suitable care and training, however, a significant improvement in social ability and in personal adjustment and achievement can be achieved.

The care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes

and cure, have, as in the case of mental illness, been too long neglected. Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social, and economic problem. It strikes our most precious asset—our children. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as muscular dystrophy, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults, an estimated 3 percent of the population. Yet, despite these grim statistics, and despite an admirable effort by private voluntary associations, until a decade ago not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families.

States and local communities spend \$300 million a year for residential treatment of the mentally retarded, and another \$250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services. The Federal Government will this year obligate \$37 million for research, training, and special services for the retarded, and about three times as much for their income maintenance. But these efforts are fragmented and inadequate.

Mental retardation strikes children without regard for class, creed, or economic level. Each year sees an estimated 126,000 new cases. But it hits more often and harder at the underprivileged and the poor; and most often of all, and most severely, in city tenements and rural slums where there are heavy concentrations of families with poor education and low income.

There are very significant variations in the impact of the incidence of mental retardation. Draft rejections for mental deficiency during World War II were 14 times as heavy in States with low incomes as in others. In some slum areas 10 to 30 percent of the school-age children are mentally retarded, while in the very same cities more prosperous neighborhoods have only 1 or 2 percent retarded.

There is every reason to believe that we stand on the threshold of major advances in this field. Medical knowledge can now identify precise causes of retardation in 15 to 25 percent of the cases. This itself is a major advance. Those identified are usually cases in which there are severe organic injuries or gross brain damage from disease. Severe cases of mental retardation of this type are naturally more evenly spread throughout the population than mild retardation, but even here poor families suffer disproportionately. In most of the mild cases, although specific physical and neurological defects are usually not diagnosable with present biomedical techniques, research is rapidly adding to our knowledge of specific causes: German measles during the first 3 months of pregnancy, Rh blood factor incompatibility in newborn infants, lead poisoning of infants, faulty body chemistry in such diseases as phenylketonuria and galactosemia, and many others.

Many of the specific causes of mental retardation are still obscure. Socio-economic and medical evidence gathered by a panel which I appointed in 1961, however, shows a major causative role for adverse social, economic, and cultural factors. Families who are deprived of the basic necessities of life, opportunity and motivation have a high proportion of the Nation's retarded children. Unfavorable health factors clearly play a major role. Lack of prenatal and postnatal health care, in particular, leads to the birth of brain-damaged children or to an inadequate physical and neurological development. Areas of high infant mortality are often the same areas with a high incidence of mental retardation. Studies have shown that women lacking prenatal care have a much higher likelihood of having mentally retarded children. Deprivation of a child's opportunities for learning slows development in slum and distressed areas. Genetic, hereditary, and other biomedical factors also play a major part in the causes of mental retardation.

The American people, acting through their Government where necessary, have an obligation to prevent mental retardation, whenever possible, and to ameliorate it when it is present. I am, therefore, recommending action on a comprehensive program to attack this affliction. The only feasible program with a hope for success must not only aim at the specific causes and the control of mental retardation but seek solutions to the broader problems of our society with which mental retardation is so intimately related.

The panel which I appointed reported that, with present knowledge, at least half and hopefully more than half, of all mental retardation cases can be prevented through this kind of "broad spectrum" attack—aimed at both the specific causes which medical science has identified, and at the broader adverse social, economic, and cultural conditions with which incidence of mental retardation is so heavily correlated. At the same time research must go ahead in all these categories, calling upon the best efforts of many types of scientists, from the geneticist to the sociologist.

The fact that mental retardation ordinarily exists from birth or early childhood, the highly specialized medical, psychological, and educational evaluations which are required, and the complex and unique social, educational, and vocational lifetime needs of the retarded individual, all require that there be developed a comprehensive approach to this specific problem.

1. PREVENTION

Prevention should be given the highest priority in this effort. Our general health, education, welfare, and urban renewal programs will make a major contribution in overcoming adverse social and economic conditions. More adequate medical care, nutrition, housing, and educational opportunities can reduce mental retardation to the low incidence which has been achieved in some other nations. The recommendations for strengthening American education which I have made to the Congress in my mes-

sage on education will contribute toward this objective as will the proposals contained in my forthcoming health message.

New programs for comprehensive maternity and infant care and for the improvement of our educational services are also needed. Particular attention should be directed toward the development of such services for slum and distressed areas. Among expectant mothers who do not receive prenatal care, more than 20 percent of all births are premature—2 or 3 times the rate of prematurity among those who do receive adequate care. Premature infants have 2 or 3 times as many physical defects and 50 percent more illnesses than full-term infants. The smallest premature babies are 10 times more likely to be mentally retarded.

All of these statistics point to the direct relationship between lack of prenatal care and mental retardation. Poverty and medical indigency are at the root of most of this problem. An estimated 35 percent of the mothers in cities over 100,000 population are medically indigent. In 138 large cities of the country an estimated 455,000 women each year lack resources to pay for adequate health care during pregnancy and following birth. Between 20 and 60 percent of the mothers receiving care in public hospitals in some large cities receive inadequate or no prenatal care—and mental retardation is more prevalent in these areas.

Our existing State and Federal child health programs, though playing a useful and necessary role, do not provide the needed comprehensive care for this high-risk group. To enable the States and localities to move ahead more rapidly in combating mental retardation and other childhood disabilities through the new therapeutic measures being developed by medical science, I am recommending:

(a) A new 5-year program of project grants to stimulate State and local health departments to plan, initiate and develop comprehensive maternity and child health care service programs, helping primarily families in this high-risk group who are otherwise unable to pay for needed medical care. These grants would be used to provide medical care, hospital care, and additional nursing services, and to expand the number of prenatal clinics. Prenatal and post partum care would be more accessible to mothers. I recommend that the initial appropriation for this purpose be \$5 million, allocated on a project basis, rising to an annual appropriation of \$30 million by the third year.

(b) doubling the existing \$25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child health, a significant portion of which will be used for the mentally retarded.

(c) doubling over a period of 7 years the present \$25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for crippled children's services.

Cultural and educational deprivation resulting in mental retardation can also be prevented. Studies have demonstrated that large numbers of children

in urban and rural slums, including preschool children, lack the stimulus necessary for proper development in their intelligence. Even when there is no organic impairment, prolonged neglect, and a lack of stimulus and opportunity for learning, can result in the failure of young minds to develop. Other studies have shown that, if proper opportunities for learning are provided early enough, many of these deprived children can and will learn and achieve as much as children from more favored neighborhoods. This self-perpetuating intellectual blight should not be allowed to continue.

In my recent message on education, I recommended that at least 10 percent of the proposed aid for elementary and secondary education be committed by the States to special project grants designed to stimulate and make possible the improvement of educational opportunities particularly in slum and distressed areas, both urban and rural. I again urge special consideration by the Congress for this proposal. It will not only help improve educational quality and provide equal opportunity in areas which need assistance; it will also serve humanity by helping prevent mental retardation among the children in such culturally deprived areas.

2. COMMUNITY SERVICES

As in the case of mental illnesses, there is also a desperate need for community facilities and services for the mentally retarded. We must move from the outmoded use of distant custodial institutions to the concept of community-centered agencies that will provide a coordinated range of timely diagnostic, health, educational, training, rehabilitation, employment, welfare, and legal protection services. For those retarded children or adults who cannot be maintained at home by their own families, a new pattern of institutional services is needed.

The key to the development of this comprehensive new approach toward services for the mentally retarded is twofold. First, there must be public understanding and community planning to meet all problems. Second, there must be made available a continuum of services covering the entire range of needs. States and communities need to appraise their needs and resources, review current programs, and undertake preliminary actions leading to comprehensive State and community approaches to these objectives. To stimulate public awareness and the development of comprehensive plans, I recommend legislation to establish a program of special project grants to the States for financing State reviews of needs and programs in the field of mental retardation.

A total of \$2 million is recommended for this purpose. Grants will be awarded on a selective basis to State agencies presenting acceptable proposals for this broad interdisciplinary planning activity. The purpose of these grants is to provide for every State an opportunity to begin to develop a comprehensive, integrated program to meet all the needs of the retarded. Additional support for planning health-related facilities and services

will be available from the expanding planning grant program for the Public Health Service which I will recommend in my forthcoming message on health.

To assist the States and local communities to construct the facilities which these surveys justify and plan, I recommend that the Congress authorize matching grants for the construction of public and other nonprofit facilities, including centers for the comprehensive treatment, training, and care of the mentally retarded. Every community should be encouraged to include provision for meeting the health requirements of retarded individuals in planning its broader health services and facilities.

Because care of the mentally retarded has traditionally been isolated from centers of medical and nursing education, it is particularly important to develop facilities which will increase the role of highly qualified universities in the improvement and provision of services and the training of specialized personnel. Among the various types of facilities for which grants would be authorized, the legislation I am proposing will permit grants of Federal funds for the construction of facilities for (1) inpatient clinical units as an integral part of university-associated hospitals in which specialists on mental retardation would serve, (2) outpatient diagnostic, evaluation, and treatment clinics associated with such hospitals, including facilities for special training, and (3) satellite clinics in outlying cities and counties for provision of services to the retarded through existing State and local community programs, including those financed by the Children's Bureau, in which universities will participate. Grants of \$5 million a year will be provided for these purposes within the total authorizations for facilities in 1965 and this will be increased to \$10 million in subsequent years.

Such clinical and teaching facilities will provide superior care for the retarded and will also augment teaching and training facilities for specialists in mental retardation, including physicians, nurses, psychologists, social workers, speech and other therapists. Funds for operation of such facilities would come from State, local, and private sources. Other existing or proposed programs of the Children's Bureau, of the Public Health Service, of the Office of Education, and of the Department of Labor can provide additional resources for demonstration purposes and for training personnel.

A full-scale attack on mental retardation also requires an expansion of special education, training, and rehabilitation services. Largely due to the lack of qualified teachers, college instructors, directors, and supervisors, only about one-fourth of the 1,250,000 retarded children of school age now have access to special education. During the past 4 years, with Federal support, there has been some improvement in the training of leadership personnel. However, teachers of handicapped children, including the mentally retarded, are still woefully insufficient in number and training. As I pointed out in the message on education, legislation

is needed to increase the output of college instructors and classroom teachers for handicapped children.

I am asking the Office of Education to place a new emphasis on research in the learning process, expedite the application of research findings to teaching methods for the mentally retarded, support studies on improvement of curriculums, develop teaching aids, and stimulate the training of special teachers.

Vocational training, youth employment, and vocational rehabilitation programs can all help release the untapped potentialities of mentally retarded individuals. This requires expansion and improvement of our vocational education programs, as already recommended; and, in a subsequent message, I will present proposals for needed youth employment programs.

Currently rehabilitation services can only be provided to disabled individuals for whom, at the outset, a vocational potential can be definitely established. This requirement frequently excludes the mentally retarded from the vocational rehabilitation program. I recommend legislation to permit rehabilitation services to be provided to a mentally retarded person for up to 18 months, to determine whether he has sufficient potential to be rehabilitated vocationally. I also recommend legislation establishing a new program to help public and private nonprofit organizations to construct, equip, and staff rehabilitation facilities and workshops, making particular provision for the mentally retarded.

State institutions for the mentally retarded are badly underfinanced, understaffed, and overcrowded. The standard of care is in most instances so grossly deficient as to shock the conscience of all who see them.

I recommend the appropriation under existing law of project grants to State institutions for the mentally retarded, with an initial appropriation of \$5 million to be increased in subsequent years to a level of at least \$10 million. Such grants would be awarded, upon presentation of a plan meeting criteria established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to State institutions undertaking to upgrade the quality of residential services through demonstration, research, and pilot projects designed to improve the quality of care in such institutions and to provide impetus to inservice training and the education of professional personnel.

3. RESEARCH

Our single greatest challenge in this area is still the discovery of the causes and treatment of mental retardation. To do this we must expand our resources for the pursuit and application of scientific knowledge related to this problem. This will require the training of medical, behavioral, and other professional specialists to staff a growing effort. The new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development which was authorized by the 87th Congress is already embarked on this task.

To provide an additional focus for research into the complex mysteries of mental retardation, I recommend legislation to authorize the establishment of

centers for research in human development, including the training of scientific personnel. Funds for three such centers are included in the 1964 budget; ultimately 10 centers for clinical, laboratory, behavioral and social science research should be established. The importance of these problems justifies the talents of our best minds. No single discipline or science holds the answer. These centers must, therefore, be established on an interdisciplinary basis.

Similarly, in order to foster the further development of new techniques for the improvement of child health, I am also recommending new research authority to the Children's Bureau for research in maternal and child health and crippled children's services.

But, once again, the shortage of professional manpower seriously compromises both research and service efforts. The insufficient numbers of medical and nursing training centers now available too often lack a clinical focus on the problems of mental retardation comparable to the psychiatric teaching services relating to care of the mentally ill.

We as a nation have long neglected the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. This neglect must end, if our Nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity and achieve the maximum use of its manpower.

This tradition of neglect must be replaced by forceful and far-reaching programs carried out at all levels of government, by private individuals, and by State and local agencies in every part of the Union.

We must act—

To bestow the full benefits of our society on those who suffer from mental disabilities;

To prevent the occurrence of mental illness and mental retardation wherever and whenever possible;

To provide for early diagnosis and continuous and comprehensive care, in the community, of those suffering from these disorders;

To stimulate improvements in the level of care given the mentally disabled in our State and private institutions, and to reorient those programs to a community-centered approach;

To reduce, over a number of years, and by hundreds of thousands, the persons confined to these institutions;

To retain in and return to the community the mentally ill and mentally retarded, and there to restore and revitalize their lives through better health programs and strengthened educational and rehabilitation services; and

To reinforce the will and capacity of our communities to meet these problems, in order that the communities, in turn, can reinforce the will and capacity of individuals and individual families.

We must promote—to the best of our ability and by all possible and appropriate means—the mental and physical health of all our citizens.

To achieve these important ends, I urge that the Congress favorably act upon the foregoing recommendations.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 5, 1963.

ROLE OF TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN OUR TOTAL MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there are so many speeches, and some good ones, made by people in the executive branch of our Government that it would be impossible to read them all. From time to time, however, speeches which get little attention in the press contain information and policy statements of importance to every American interested in the defense of his country.

Two such speeches have recently been delivered by the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force. One was on January 16 before the New York alumni of the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, where both Mr. Zuckert and Secretary of Defense McNamara once served together on the faculty, and the other was at the College of Engineering of the University of Florida on January 29.

The things which interested me in these speeches were Mr. Zuckert's definition of the role of tactical nuclear weapons in what he called "the broadened nuclear deterrent which President Kennedy asked for nearly 2 years ago."

My work on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, since the day that committee was formed, has given me an opportunity to study the possible means of employment of nuclear weapons. Much attention has been given to the very high yield weapons and their employment for the strategic deterrent, with delivery by both manned bombers and missiles.

The place of nuclear weapons of smaller yield, or what are called tactical nuclear weapons, in our total military preparedness, has not been clearly defined. There has been a tendency to assume that the use of nuclear weapons of any size or type, even in the most limited situations, would automatically mean escalation to total, all out, unrestricted nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, I have never accepted this reasoning, and I am happy to say that Mr. Zuckert has spelled out in very clear terms—and, I might say, cleared terms—the important place which nuclear weapons might play in deterring wars of any size.

In his address to the engineering students at the University of Florida, Mr. Zuckert spoke of three phases of the cold war.

First, he spoke of our motivations, that is, the sources of our strength to fight and win the cold war.

Second, he spoke of what the cold war means to men preparing to enter the en-

engineering profession, and the role of engineering in the cold war. Finally, he discussed our national military posture for cold war.

I recommend all of his speech, but I want particularly to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the section dealing with our national military posture. I urge your reading it and for this purpose I ask unanimous consent to include the full text with my remarks.

The 1963 Robert Tyrie Benton memorial lecture at the University of Florida by the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, follows:

REMARKS BY HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT,
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

It is an honor to give the Robert Tyrie Benton memorial lecture in the College of Engineering of the University of Florida.

It is also a very special privilege for the Secretary of the Air Force because it was in the air service of our country's military that Robert Tyrie Benton gave his life 18 years ago.

But, in addition, it is a very heavy responsibility because the engineering students of the university who form the core of this audience are the same strain that produced Robert Benton. You are part and parcel of the body of American students from whose ranks such men will continue to come.

Anything less than our total devotion to the cause of preserving the freedom for which he and so many others died, and of preventing the future expenditure of human lives in war, would be unworthy of their trust in us.

The gathering here tonight is a good and proper form of memorial. Its purpose is to memorialize a man by nourishing the things for which he lived. They are also the things for which he died, for his sacrifice had a purpose.

His purpose, and the purpose of the thousands of others who have served to the end—and past—in the uniform of our country, is the heart of the responsibility which rests upon each of us. It is really America's purpose. It is our primary strength for what we now call the cold war.

America's purpose covers a lot of ground. It is all the things we stand for—our political idealism, our concepts of liberty, our economic initiative, our generous but realistic role in the community of free nations, and our determination to oppose the forces of tyranny with whatever force it takes to stop them.

The cold war has many fronts. It is a war of nerves as well as words, of political and diplomatic techniques, of economic action and industrial production, of scientific and technical accomplishment, and of humanitarian motives against institutional motives.

Since a university community audience such as this one has both range and depth in terms of its interest and knowledge of the cold war, I thought that tonight I should discuss three quite separate aspects of this strange period in history. Within the span of these three, however, fall most of the other aspects which call for our understanding and attention.

First, I want to talk our motivations—the reasons why we are in the cold war and the basic plan by which it should be conducted.

Next, I want to take up briefly an aspect of the cold war which is closely related to education, particularly engineering.

Finally, I want to discuss our military posture for cold war, including our space interest.

Having in mind the traditional tough-mindedness of engineers, and since the cold war calls for tough-mindedness, it seems to me that the job of working all the talents

of resources of the Nation into a concentrated campaign to win the cold war is very much like a big engineering job.

The bridge engineer has to mobilize many branches of engineering, many crafts and skills, then direct all these resources and talents to accomplish work upon which will depend the lives of countless thousands who travel that way.

The cold war presents a similar problem. We must mobilize all our resources and energies and direct them toward the goal of the victory of freedom over tyranny. We seek not the destruction of people or nations but the building of the bridges over which free people can travel toward realization of their own ideals.

Our national goals are high. We face a challenge perhaps unparalleled in history, true, but as President Kennedy pointed out in his state of the Union message in 1961, the hour of national peril is also an hour of opportunity. It is interesting to note that the Chinese word meaning crisis is composed of two characters, one meaning danger, the other meaning opportunity. The cold war is both.

Somebody once defined the ideal as that which is practical in the long run. The definition fits American idealism. We've been practicing it for about 183 years—and growing stronger. What is more, we've been gathering company on the way. We are an idealistic people, and we know that it is a rugged and tough course we have set for ourselves.

We are convinced that there is no other way. However rugged and tough we have to be, we will. Our idealism runs deep, and widespread. You only have to sit where I do and see daily what the men in the uniformed service of our country do in her behalf all around the world in order to know the strength of that idealism. They certainly couldn't be hired to do what they are inspired to do.

What better proof of America's idealism do you want than the Peace Corps? By the end of this year, President Kennedy says there will be 9,000 Americans working overseas for hardly more than the costs of their training, their going, and their keep, in order to demonstrate America's purpose.

He also said we have nearly a million Americans overseas working at one job or another, civil and military, working with varying degrees of success and competence, agreed, but working for a purpose more than their own.

I saw a tabulation recently which showed that since World War II the American people have spent some 41 billions of dollars in military and economic aid to other countries. There is no precedent in all of man's recorded history of such generosity, such vision, such idealism.

Starting with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, then the programs in Greece and Turkey, the Marshall plan, and NATO, the people of the United States have sought to establish the foundations upon which a new community of nations could be built.

The news on any one day, or over a month, or even a winter, brings slight evidence of progress, but if we compare Europe today to the Europe of the time when the members of this year's senior class were just toddlers, you will appreciate the significance of the period of history of which you are a part.

The real unification of Western Europe—which despite apparent setbacks of recent weeks, developing before our very eyes—is a turning point in Europe's history as great as the changes marked by Charlemagne's exploits nearly a dozen centuries ago.

Our hopes have not been so well served, however, in Latin America. There are many reasons, both divisive and diverting in this discussion. But, unquestionably, to our south lies probably our greatest challenge.

The building of strong foundations for freedom and economic growth in Latin America will be one of the major tasks in the lives of the generation of men now in engineering school.

Unfortunately too, in parts of the world such as southeast Asia, the problems, which we fear can grow into serious threats to our own security, are not immediately subject to solution by peaceful means. It is necessary for us to provide both economic and military help to nations which, in addition to being pressed by critical economic and social problems, are faced with externally supported terrorism under the banner of political reform.

The reform which would be imposed upon them is the regimentation of Sino-Soviet communism. Its declared objective is to bury freedom as we know it. Its methods are subversion and terrorism, outright military aggression when dared, economic pressure, and the exploitation of human suffering and despair.

This is a worldwide program which has no timetable other than continuous expansionism through whatever means become available. It is a program which is constantly alert to opportunities to destroy the weak, weaken the strong, divide the united, and to enslave the free in increments of any size.

Behind this process of slow reduction by Communist caustic is great military power which could plunge the world into unrestrained nuclear war, with a prospect of destruction of most of the words of man on earth, if not of man himself.

Now, what do we do in the face of this broad front of aggression, blackmail, and conspiracy? It seems to me there are a few basic guidelines which can—and must—be applied to every decision we make as a free people.

First, of course, we are determined to overcome this threat to the future health of ideas which have been growing among men for a score of centuries. These ideas hold that freedom with justice in peace is attainable. They also hold that constructive order can be established and maintained in a world of self-governing nations behaving in accordance with laws agreed upon by those nations.

Second, we must look to our own strength. We must be true to our national purpose in the way we run our own country, jealously guarding the individual liberties we have defined in law, conserving and developing our human resources as well as our natural resources, and exploiting our great talents and energies for a common good.

Third, we recognize and join the essential unity of the free world nations, whose leader we are today, in President Kennedy's words, by both strength and conviction. We, therefore, seek to strengthen the whole of the free world through productive sharing and exchange of the talents and the means of all its members.

Fourth, we keep ourselves armed, and strive to assist our free world associates to do the same, to the degree necessary to deter the use of armed force against us and, if war is brought upon us, to win it.

Fifth, we work unceasingly for a peaceable solution to the issues which divide the world. We seek a reasoned reduction in both the areas and the intensity of the friction between the parts of a divided world. One of these areas is the arms race. We try for a diversion of the motivations to aggression by the strong, and we work to change the environment of vulnerability of the weak.

These five guidelines set a difficult course, and a very long one. To me, they constitute a plan as to how we fight the cold war.

It is a sign of our national maturity that we no longer look for quick solutions to the world's problems. We are prepared to follow these guidelines from now on. It is going to be a long time, but time is in our favor.

It is a sign of national confidence, in ourselves and in our institutions, that we hold such a course without being diverted from it by differences among allies or inconsistencies among neutrals. The President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense are steering just such a course through the seas of current problems in this area.

And there is a basis for confidence in us on the part of other nations that our purpose is, in the words of the Secretary of State, "for a peace within the United Nations kind of world community."

And certainly there is a basis for confidence and encouragement for every young American preparing for a life of useful service, in engineering, music, medicine, teaching, or the military. The opportunities are unlimited. But so are the obligations, and so are the needs of our country for inspired and trained people.

This brings me to a point of educational interest in preparing for the cold war. It is a subject which to me has acquired very great importance as we look at the long-term job of maintaining the Nation's position in the world.

If it is the engineer's job to apply the knowledge which the research scientist discovers, then the fields of service open to you are many and varied as the needs of the people of all the world for all the products of man's technological genius.

Engineers are particularly needed to maintain the course in world affairs which America's national purpose has set for us. The United Nations needs and uses engineers in its technical assistance programs, and deserves the best. Our direct foreign aid programs require many kinds of engineers and demand our best. The military services must have engineers, both in uniform and out. The military demands for engineering talent are particularly high.

We have been discussing in the Air Force recently the subject of military professionalism. The Nation now has a permanent Military Establishment, the professional requirements of which are higher than ever before in all man's history of employment of military power. Our national security depends not only upon the skill and proficiency of our military professionals but also upon their professional integrity, that is, adherence to their own high standards of professionalism.

The engineer and the military man have much in common as professionals. They are professionals in every sense of the word, since they share the characteristics of expertise, responsibility, and corporateness. These are the essential characteristics of a profession listed by Samuel P. Huntington in his book "The Soldier and the State."

The expertise of a profession is primarily intellectual in nature, is developed and transmitted through institutions of research and teaching, and embodies both knowledge and skill acquired through formal education, experience, and continuing study or practice.

Certainly these things apply both to engineering and military science. They also apply to the law and teaching, but the latter two professions involve a particular type of expertise not always recognized in the military and in engineering. That is skill in the art of advocacy.

We are placing great emphasis in the Air Force on developing skills in presentation. The ultimate decision on a weapon system costing hundreds of millions of dollars must be based on a full presentation of the facts by the men who know them. Way back in the depression, when I was studying law, I remember the case of a school which added a course in public speaking and writing to the senior year in electrical engineering. The professor explained that there wasn't much point to a designer's being able to come up with the best powerplant plan if he couldn't sell it to the board of directors.

The same requirement exists in the defense business. Professional military men must be able to present clearly and support logically the proposals for today's high-cost weapon systems. They have an obligation to provide and make understandable to the civilian managers of defense the rationale behind these proposals. It is necessary to make such presentations in a manner which will permit analysis and comparison with alternatives.

This is one of the reasons why the curriculum at the military academies is so strenuous. The beginning young officer today must do more than prepare himself with the substance of his profession; he must also be able to communicate his ideas. You might be surprised to know that we have continuing courses in the Pentagon, taken every year by men of 10 to 20 years of service, in what is nothing more than specially tailored and concentrated English composition, the bane of so many freshmen for so many years.

The range of expertise of the military man must cover many of the subjects of the humanities and the arts because, for example, the duty of a military attaché, or the duty of the military assistance people helping build the defenses of a new and developing country, requires a language competence as well as a knowledge of the history and culture of the host country.

American engineers building dams in the Middle East, bridges in Africa, powerplants in Brazil, and chemical plants or refineries in Europe, have need of the same kind of training.

The parallels between the engineering and the military profession can go on and on. They are especially marked in the second characteristic of a profession, responsibility.

One essential element of responsibility is simply occupational integrity. It is the business of striving for perfection for perfection's sake. It is the recognition that human lives depend upon the quality of performance.

Another element of professional responsibility—and truly characteristic of a profession—is that the practice of it is a necessary service to society. It is not just a way to make a living. The late Justice Brandeis once said a profession is an occupation pursued largely for others and not merely for one's self. He also said it is an occupation in which the amount of financial return is not the accepted measure of success.

Here, of course, the military man has an advantage which offsets his conditions of fixed and limited earnings. He necessarily finds satisfaction in another form. Since there is no way to put a price on his service, our country tries only to maintain the dignity of the military service and assure its strength and continuity. For reasons the military man understands well, his profession will never make him rich. It will even keep him behind in remuneration compared with his equals in other professions. He accepts this because he has accepted an obligation, dedicated his life, to serve his country. A part of his pay is his pride in what he is doing.

One of the characteristics which distinguishes the military profession is the existence and acknowledgment of an authority above and outside the profession, that is, the civil authority of the state over the military. Military expertise, responsibility, and corporateness must not only serve the national purpose, but serve it within a framework of final authority outside the profession.

Corporateness, of course, is a characteristic which the military profession enjoys, for obvious and necessary reasons, to a far greater degree than other professions, the law, medicine, engineering, teaching, etc. Corporateness is that sense of organic unity and consciousness of themselves which the

members of any profession share as a group distinguished from laymen.

This collective sense, and its bearing upon the standards of the profession, is naturally stronger in the military than in civilian professions. In both, however, it has its origin in the discipline and training regimen, in associated pursuit of professional competence, in the sharing of a special social responsibility, and in common motivations.

Membership in the professional organization denotes possession of the qualifications and acceptance of the obligations. For the military man, this is symbolized by the uniform. For the engineer it is symbolized in many other ways, but in each profession the respect of one's peers is part of the incentive as well as the reward.

For the military, corporateness takes many forms. It is more a means than an end. It is probably the key element in the conduct of the honor systems at the Military Academies. It is certainly a vital element in the efficiency of a submarine crew, or of a Strategic Air Command B-52 crew flying 24 hours on airborne alert—in a plane kept skyworthy by a corporately related ground crew. Corporateness is necessary to the incredible teamwork of tankers and fighter planes, which can find each other in the pitch black 5 miles above the polar wastes and transfer 1,000 gallons of jet fuel in 4 minutes while both are moving at 400 miles an hour.

This kind of teamwork and confidence, the certainty of coordinated reactions without coordination, is based on knowledge of how a comrade-in-arms is trained, how he behaves under stress, how he thinks and what his equipment can do. It is a product of corporateness, and it demonstrates part of the reason for separate military services.

Many of you, as engineers, will experience the same aspects of corporateness, whether you are part of a design team on a chemical processing plant or a construction team on a bridge, or as a member of the many kinds of teams required for nuclear powerplants, missile systems, rocket engines, or space communication networks. In some of these, you will be working with military people.

I remind you of this professional kinship with the military people for a reason. The reason lies back in the defense guideline of national policy and leads to my third aspect of cold war—military posture.

We said we were determined to keep ourselves sufficiently armed as a nation to deter the use of armed force against us, and that if war is brought upon us, we must be prepared to win it. Furthermore, we are going to help others who are less endowed to do two things: to defend themselves and to contribute where possible to the defense of all freedom-loving nations.

We are sure in our minds and our hearts that this Nation will never employ military aggression to gain a national end. We have no ends which war could serve. There is sound basis and demonstrated reason for the growing confidence on the part of the rest of the world that this is so. Our search, however, for similar evidence of Sino-Soviet intentions is unrewarding, to say the least.

Military preparedness bids to be a way of life for us for a long time. The Nation's engineering community is essential to military preparedness. The bridge between the engineering and military professions will be heavily traveled.

In the past, this Nation kept a small military establishment of professionals, a nucleus which could be expanded and beefed up with modern equipment when the threat of war appeared. That was our approach to military preparedness for the century and a half up to the end of the forties. That theory and that period of defense history have passed.

It probably started closing with the development of the airplane as an instrument

of war. The lesson was brought home to us with Korea and the advent of Soviet nuclear power.

The "get ready" period has disappeared. We have to be ready.

The time-compressing change in warfare, stemming largely from technological progress, was finally nailed down by the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. Space bids to be the medium of the next stage of military exploitation of technology. In a sense, it is already, because part of the ICBM trajectory is through space. The timespan continues to shrink.

Two oceans obviously no longer provide the time period necessary for converting a peacetime Military Establishment into a war-ready one. We once thought of our defense frontier as the ocean's rim near our shores.

World War II, as President Roosevelt pointed out, moved it to the Rhine. Aerospace vehicles and nuclear weapons remove frontiers altogether.

Our Military Establishment therefore has to be ready at all times for two widely divergent tasks of defense.

The first is to provide a strategic strike capability of sufficient power—backed by credible determination to use it if necessary—to deter a massive attack against the free world.

The second is to provide the capability of meeting and overcoming military forces at levels less than the massive thermonuclear exchange. We have to be able to meet threats to our real security all the way down the ladder of intensity to the bottom rung of guerrilla warfare. Somewhere along the way is the unfixed line between nuclear and conventional war. That is where we are now concentrating on what might be called the tactical deterrent. It offers the possibility of stopping war at a lower level of violence.

The type of warfare going on in Vietnam, which I had an opportunity to see last month, is near the bottom of the ladder. It is a very bitter kind of hit-and-run, strike-and-hide warfare. It has many of the marks of very ancient jungle wars.

If the bottom rung of the intensity ladder is spear-throwing, then the top rung is ICBM-throwing with nuclear warheads.

In between, the free nations of the world have to make sure they have the power to stop aggression and win a war at the lowest possible level of conflict. We don't want to have to jump, at the enemy's call, from the least to the worst. This is the reason for the broadened deterrent which President Kennedy asked for nearly 2 years ago.

We want to be able to stop, with victory, at any rung of the ladder. Some of the in-between rungs may involve the use of tactical nuclear weapons. They, too, can be a stopping point. Effective deterrence necessarily starts at the top of the ladder of intensity. Our posture must be one which confronts the aggressor with a higher certainty of defeat at each higher rung of intensity of war.

Each rung will be an opportunity to stop war. Each is a stage of possible limitation on war. It may be geographically limited or limited as to objective as well as to weapons used. Or it may be limited by condition or by convention. The point is, our superiority, whether nuclear or nonnuclear, at each higher level of intensity will discourage leap-frogging. It can preserve for us the power to call the stop.

We have to be able to enforce the stop—by conventional or unconventional means. We must not fall into the trap of assuming that the use of a tactical nuclear weapon—aimed from the battlefield or from the air above—to break up a concentration of armament or stop a massive ground attack means automatic escalation to ICBM delivered megatonnage on the whole nation. We must be prepared to win at the middle of the

broad range of possible conflicts as well as at the ends.

The President has made clear his determination to have many more options than a choice between humiliation or holocaust. Airpower—fast becoming aerospace power—is critical in every option. The Air Force, therefore, has a tremendous responsibility within this sensemaking defense policy. The national policy calls for a wide range of effective response to aggression and airpower is essential to that flexibility. Our job is due to become more difficult, not less, more demanding of scientific and engineering talent, and will call for an ever higher order of military expertise.

It is interesting to note that on one coast of Florida, at Eglin Air Force Base, we are training men in the most ancient techniques of warfare for responses at the bottom of the ladder of war. The Special Air Warfare Center at Eglin is turning out instructors and advisers for the employment of airpower in such places as Vietnam and other areas subject to Communist terrorism and geographic chiseling.

On the opposite coast of Florida, we are testing and developing ultramodern techniques for a response so high on the ladder of intensity that even the most desperate aggressor will hesitate to invoke it.

Also on the east coast, at Cape Canaveral, the Nation is developing the technology which literally opens the universe to man's exploration. The prospect is breathtaking for both peace and war. And so is the cost. America has no choice, however, but to acquire the capability in space for whatever opportunities may be opened to peaceful exploitation, or for whatever demands may put upon us to defend freedom in space.

The primary emphasis in the U.S. national space effort has been the constructive exploitation, to learn more about what is beyond our world, to expand and improve communications among nations, to develop the science of meteorology, and to investigate the possibilities of navigation in earthly orbits.

But increasingly, and cumulatively, we are forced to recognize that the Soviet efforts in space point toward an aggressive military posture. As a consequence, American defense programs in space are necessarily being stepped up. The Air Force, which has primary responsibility for U.S. defense development in space, must provide the systems for protection of free world peaceful activities in space and for protection of the free world itself against attack through or from space.

Between the Air Force and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the technological base is being laid for future aerospace defense forces. The billion-and-a-half dollar military space program envisions preparedness to use either earth-based defensive systems, or manned space systems, or both. We foresee reusable boosters and vehicles which operate through and beyond the far reaches of the atmosphere.

Two current projects are contributing to this capability: one is the X-15, a powered test vehicle to investigate among other things atmospheric heating problems. It has been fantastically successful. The other is the X-20, familiarly known as the Dyna-Soar, which is a boosted vehicle to investigate flight control and reentry problems.

The national program for manned space flight was given a great boost last week with the announcement of a joint planning board of NASA and Air Force representatives for the Gemini project. This is an experimental program to advance the technology of manned space flight, including rendezvous and docking, and to study the effect of weightlessness for periods up to 2 weeks.

As I say, the American people really have no choice but to pursue the space opportunity. We cannot put a barrier across the

avenue knowledge of this new realm. We believe that man must never fail to push back the frontiers of ignorance. If a new salient opens a new threat to freedom, we must be prepared to defend it. Space, too, offers new dangers as well as new opportunities.

In closing, I should pay tribute to the basic good sense of the student population of America. It seems to me, they are keeping their heads better than some oldsters. It is the students who have to contend with the future. They have grown up in years of danger, so perhaps they can see more clearly the opportunities.

But they will also have the high privilege of serving America's purpose in countless and varied undertakings extending to the ends of the earth—and beyond.

AN ARTICLE MISPLACED

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in speaking yesterday on the role of the property tax in our country, I said that I was placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which I had prepared for the Yale Political Journal's January 1963 issue. In its place, I inadvertently placed in the Record an article from U.S. News & World Report on the same subject, an article which deserves the attention of those interested in property taxation and which well found a place in the Record. It, as those who read my remarks noted, showed some of the problems which have come upon areas where imbalances have thrown property taxes out of line. As I said in my remarks yesterday, there is well-founded criticism which relates to the way in which certain communities are abusing the property tax, but we must recognize the criticism for what it is and realize it does not strike to the heart of the merits of the tax itself. Following is the article to which I referred yesterday, my article in the Yale Political Journal of January 1963.

TAXATION AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

(By THOMAS B. CURTIS)

(NOTE.—The senior Republican on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, THOMAS B. CURTIS has been the Congressman from Missouri's Second District since 1950. A graduate of Dartmouth and Washington University Law School, he has been a member of the House Ways and Means Committee since 1952.)

In 1960 total Government tax receipts were \$137.3 billion, of which \$95.4 were Federal, and \$41.9 were State and local, 69.5 percent Federal, 30.5 percent State and local. Before World War I the percentages were almost reversed, i.e., 70 percent State and local, 30 percent Federal and, in 1927, after the impact of World War I had diminished, the ratio was 27.9 percent Federal to 72.1 percent State and local. During the depression the Federal ratio rose, 52.1 to 47.9 percent State and local by 1940. In 1946, immediately after World War II, the ratio was 82.2 percent Federal to 17.8 percent State and local. This lowered to 60.3 percent Federal, 39.7 percent State and local in 1950. Since that time the ratio has climbed back to the 70

percent Federal to 30 percent State and local ratio where it is today.

Within the State and local sector the shift was rather continuous away from local to State but has stabilized in the past decade. In pre-World War II days the local percentage was well over 50 percent, while State made up only about 15 percent, to produce the aggregate of 70 percent. Today the local and State split the 30 percent portion with the local slightly greater than the State, e.g., 1954, State 14.2 percent, local 16.5 percent.

Total adjusted Government debt in 1960 was \$301 billion—\$241 billion was Federal and \$60 billion was State and local, 79.7 percent Federal and 20.3 percent State and local. Before World War II, similar to tax receipts, the ratios were almost reversed. In 1912 the total governmental debt was \$5.7 billion, of which \$1.2 billion was Federal and \$4.5 State and local, 21 percent Federal and 79 percent State and local. World War I reversed these percentages. In 1922 the Federal debt was 69 percent and State and local debt 31 percent, although the total debt had risen to \$33.2 billion. By 1932 the ratio had shifted still further back to State and local debt, i.e., Federal 50 percent, State and local 50 percent. World War II brought the ratio to a height of 94 percent Federal to only 6 percent State and local from which it has been declining to the present ratio of about 75 to 25 percent.

Again, within the State and local sector, the shift was rather continuous away from local to State. In 1912 State debt was only 7 percent of the total while local was 72 percent. From this 1-to-10 ratio it moved to 1 to 6 in 1922, and declined to 1 to 3½ in 1950, \$5.4 billion to \$18.8 billion. Since 1950, however, the ratio has moved in the other direction and today it is approximating the 1-to-6 ratio after World War I.

Some may ask, what all this has to do with Federal tax reforms and economic growth. First, let me state that in considering the impact of a tax system on economic growth we cannot concentrate our entire attention on just one part of that tax structure, however major it may be. The Federal tax structure, in the case of our society, has only predominated in relatively recent times, and most of that predominance relates to the great and needed increases in the one basic Federal function about which there seems to be little constitutional, practical, or other objection—national defense.

Second, in considering any tax structure we must relate it to the debt structure because a governmental debt, Federal, State or local, is essentially a device for spreading the tax burden over a period of years instead of concentrating it in the year in which the Government expenditures occurred. The Ways and Means Committee must consider how to market additional Federal bonds if the tax receipts do not equal the Federal expenditures.

The Federal Government relies primarily upon the graduated Federal income tax and the Federal corporation tax for its revenues. This is a shift from the 19th century tax policy in which the bulk of Federal receipts were derived from transaction taxes, the Federal tariffs and excises. The State governments today, as in the past, rely essentially on transaction taxes. The local governments still rely essentially on the property tax, which is based upon assessed valuations of property and not upon incomes or upon economic transactions.

Both incomes and economic transactions are measured with some degree of accuracy in our various series of national economic indicators. We have some idea of their aggregates and ratios. On the other hand, assessed property valuations are largely unknown either in aggregate or in components. This is a neglected area in our national and regional accounts.

We are becoming quite aware of the limitations of the income and transaction taxes to produce revenue in needed total amounts and without serious yearly fluctuations. We also are becoming aware of the impact income and transaction taxes have upon the manner in which the economy operates.

There are many people who seek tax reform, not for more efficiency in tax collection or even to produce more revenue, but rather to direct the economy and allocate our resources through the Government's tax policy. They have found tax policy to be more powerful than monetary policy and not as constitutionally inhibited as expenditure policy.

These are the people who seem unconcerned about the economic impact of utilizing debt in lieu of taxes. In fact, they argue that Government debt itself is economically advantageous and, properly used, brings about economic growth. It is true that our monetary policy does rely upon a sizable Federal debt for its operation. If we retired the Federal debt, we would have to develop an entirely new monetary policy, but, beyond this point, it is difficult to follow the economic reasoning in saying deferred tax collection promotes economic growth.

Much has been made in recent years of the fact that our national budget does not differentiate between capital and noncapital expenditures, and that we carry no capital account to which we relate the Federal debt, and that certain other countries do make such a differentiation and calculation. I would point out that our local debt and even a good bit of our State debt can be and is properly allocated to capital because the expenditures of local and State governments frequently are for capital items, or infrastructure, as it is sometimes called today. However, the bulk of our Federal expenditures, being military, are not properly capital items and can only be valued at a dollar. For example, we are generating over \$7 billion in military surplus a year, on which we realize in sales less than 5 cents per purchase dollar. Military expenditures which might be classified as capital items are single-purpose items; the single purpose, being military, is therefore not of value in the economic system. Indeed, in many respects, they diminish rather than increase real economic wealth.

Furthermore, we are not heavily engaged in private type operations. By and large, we do not have our Federal Government own and operate transportation, power, and communication facilities which would require capital accounting. I would say, to the extent that the Federal Government has entered into private type operations which would justify a capital accounting system, to that extent we should be diminishing the Federal Government's activities and returning this operation to the tax base and to the more efficient personnel system we enjoy in the private sector.

Lipservice is given to the idea of a balanced budget. It is stated that the deficits created during periods of cyclical declines in economic activity, with tax receipts based upon incomes and economic transactions, will be recouped from the economic growth that results from deferring, to a later period, the obtaining of additional governmental receipts to meet the governmental expenditures. I believe I am correct in describing this kind of logic as lipservice because, if pressed to demonstrate where this recouping has even occurred, the advocates resort to the following assortment of avoidances and arguments:

1. The debt would be even greater if we had insisted upon collecting the amount of expenditures in present taxes because economic activity would have declined further, or would not have advanced so fast.

2. The debt is a smaller percentage of gross national product than it was in the year X,

the year X being a year immediately following a war when, for many reasons, tax collections had to be deferred and spread to later years through the device of debt.

3. The size of the debt does not matter economically because we owe it to ourselves. This is factually untrue because a portion of the debt is always owned by people outside our society. It is economically untrue because the ownership of the debt is the base of a great deal of the reserves held by insurance companies, pension plans, and business institutions for future contract commitments. A reallocation of these committed reserves would amount to both a political and an economic revolution.

Students of taxation of all shades of economic and political belief are singling out the Federal tax structure, based as it is upon incomes and economic transactions, as the bete noir which is impeding economic growth. Some want the structure changed to further specific ends for Government regulating to "improve" the economy by reallocating our resources, rather than to gain more revenue to diminish the Federal debt either in the aggregate or in ratio to the GNP. Others seek the reform in order to gain more revenue, believing that the system has gone beyond the point of diminishing returns. Some seek reform to remove the governmental control already being exerted on the economy through tax policies, and some believe that the aggregate take is itself impeding economic growth. Still others believe that reform is necessary because of high rates that damage individual initiative by substituting tax considerations for what should be business and investment judgment. Some favor such reform for reasons of efficiency, others for reasons of "equity."

However, interestingly enough, very little other than general criticism has been directed against the local tax structure, which depends not upon economic activity, but rather upon accomplished economic growth—the value of property. It is the local tax which has responded most remarkably since World War II to meet the essential needs, other than defense, of government—police and fire protection, schools, sewers, and other community facilities.

A well-devised property tax promotes economic growth by placing incentives on proper property utilization. That is not to say that our local property tax structures cannot be improved. Indeed, they can; but it is to say, without much attention or reform, that they have responded nobly since World War II and it is the Federal tax structure which is creaking and groaning. And yet it is the Federal tax structure upon which many political people would place an even heavier burden.

Probably the worst blow that the property tax received was the result of the Federal tax and debt management policy adopted after World War II which caused the dollar to be devalued to about 50 cents. The property tax, based as it is upon valuations assessed at the time the improvements are made upon the land, was thrown completely out of kilter by this dollar devaluation. However, the requirement that all property on the assessors' books be reassessed in terms of the same dollar probably was a reform that had been needed badly even if this massive inflation had not forced it. Certainly the communities which faced up to the challenge—about 80 percent of them—are in much healthier fiscal shape for having had to grapple with this politically and mechanically difficult task of reassessment. Some counties have come out of this reform with tax systems which call for a continuing reassessment process, which is an excellent innovation.

Many who advocate Federal aid to public schools base their syllogism on a false premise. They say that certain States are poor and, therefore, cannot afford adequate

schools; that local and State equalizations laws need the assistance of Federal equalizations laws to correct this deficiency. In proving their case, they refer to low per capita incomes of the States disregarding the fact that public primary and secondary education is financed basically by property taxes, not income transaction taxes. An examination of the assessed valuation of property reveals that the so-called poor States are far from poor and are as capable of financing education and community facilities as any State in the Union.

The efficiency of Federal tax collections is overrated. Economically, Federal tax collection is considerably more costly than that of the local property tax, which is the simplest of all taxes to compute and collect. The costs of the Federal system are hidden because they are largely passed on to the businesses and individuals who do most of the tax computation and collection work for the Federal Government. A corporation keeping books and records for tax purposes must pass on the cost of this tax collection process to the consumer in the price charged the public for its goods or services. The tax collection cost is paid as a consumer tax and accounts, along with corporate and transaction taxes, for a big item in the increases in the Consumer Price Index. Nor is the property tax regressive, as often stated. Actually, it is quite progressive because ownership of property, like incomes, are unequal among peoples. The progressiveness comes from the actualities of ownership, not from rates. In many respects it is more progressive than the Federal income tax with all its exemptions from tax base and exceptions from high rates.

With this long preamble, I now come to the question of Federal tax reform in the 88th Congress. First, I do not believe there can be meaningful tax reform for economic growth unless we reduce Federal expenditures to equal the amount of immediate revenue loss. This is not likely to occur, so whatever is done will result in economic damage.

I posed the basic question to Dr. Heller, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, and other witnesses who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Economic Committee last summer when both these committees had under discussion the matter of the proposed quickie tax cut to stimulate the economy. I received no answer.

What will be the economic impact of marketing \$5 or \$10 billion in additional Government bonds on top of the \$90 billion annual refinancing job we already have, to take care of the \$5 or \$10 billion tax cut which might be enacted?

None of the witnesses had come prepared even to discuss the implications involved in the problems of debt management. Dr. Heller did agree that selling the bonds to the public would greatly minimize the sought-after economic impact of the tax reduction. William McC. Martin, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, on the other hand, warned that if the bonds were to be passed into the Federal Reserve System, instead of marketed, the inflationary forces resulting would create serious economic damage.

I believe we must start looking at tax systems in their entirety if we are going to understand the economic impact they have. We must look to their hidden costs and to the hidden economic impact they sometimes have.

The investment dollar is a very precarious and fragile thing; it can so easily be converted into a consumer dollar at the whim of the individual or, worse still, into a hoarded dollar which truly impedes economic growth. So precarious and fragile is the investment dollar that it is the first dollar that disappears when taxed too heavily. The next

dollar to disappear is the transaction dollar, the business dollar, and the last dollar to disappear is the consumer dollar. The test of a depleted economic society is one that has in its repertoire a tax upon salt—the basic human necessity.

The one tax which stimulates rather than deters economic transactions and the best economic usage of property on the part of the individual citizen is the property tax. It also permits and encourages the growth of local governments. It is from these grass roots that sustained economic growth comes upon which the Central Government bases its revenue for its primary need, national defense.

The essential tax reforms needed today lie in attaining a better balance between Federal, State and local tax structures and the private sector and between taxes and debt—the charges levied against future tax receipts. The easiest reform to attain is lightening the entire tax load by broadening the tax base. Return to the private sector those operations which Government is not well designed to perform. As the tax base is broadened so the rate can be reduced without reducing the total receipts.

ANCIENT HISTORY: THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the critique of the President's Economic Report which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 1156-1165—and my remarks yesterday on the same subject—pages 1643-1650—I should like to bring an interesting piece of ancient history to the attention of my colleagues in this body and in the Senate, to the undefined but surprisingly widespread reading public of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to those in the public at large who read the newspaper and periodical coverage, if there is any, of these remarks.

It comes from a time when Congress was worried about the highest peacetime budget ever sought by a President, a time when economy-minded Members of the Congress sought to shave \$2.5 billion from a budget calling for the expenditure of \$39.7 billion in a single fiscal year. This ancient history dates from the time of the 2d session of the 80th Congress, the year 1948.

The particular historical item to which I refer is a report, House Report No. 1361 of the 2d session of the 80th Congress, the only report of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget.

This joint committee was created by section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It was to study the budget requests of the President and make recommendation as to the maximum amount the Congress should appropriate for expenditure in a given year. It was, in effect, to set a legislative budget, to give the Congress an overall view of the national expenditures and not the piecemeal type of view which we now receive.

Unfortunately, the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget died with the

80th Congress. We in the Congress lost this excellent mechanism for coming to grips with the realities of Federal expenditures and the country has suffered by the loss. I urge that we return to a system such as the one we enjoyed so briefly in those times of ancient history. We need a committee to take a searching look at the budget as a whole and to keep tabs on it as a whole while its parts progress through the legislative mill. Only in this way can we get a rational grasp on Federal spending policy.

I am placing this relic of a bygone day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The report, including its minority comments, is short, only seven pages. It is well worth reading to get the idea of how we can bring some order into our thinking on matters of Federal spending.

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the direction contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, members of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget convened on January 22, 1948, and selected Senator Styles Bridges, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as its chairman. It authorized the appointment of a subcommittee consisting of five members from each of the component House and Senate committees and directed that group to make a study of the President's budget for the fiscal year 1949, together with all related matters, and to report its findings to the entire joint committee by the date provided by the Legislative Reorganization Act, which is February 15.

The members of the subcommittee to whom this task was entrusted are as follows: Senators Styles Bridges, Chas. McNary, C. Wayland Brooks, Kenneth McKellar, and Carl Hayden from the Senate Committee on Appropriations; Senators Eugene D. Millikin, Hugh Butler, Robert A. Taft, Walter F. George, and Alben W. Barkley from the Senate Finance Committee; Representatives John Taber, Richard B. Wigglesworth, Charles A. Plumley, Clarence Cannon, and George H. Mahon from the House Committee on Appropriations; Representatives Harold Knutson, Daniel A. Reed, Roy O. Woodruff, Robert L. Doughton, and Jere Cooper of the House Ways and Means Committee.

At its first meeting the subcommittee determined that in the interest of a more efficient consideration of the problems before it, the work should be divided so that members of the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on Ways and Means would devote themselves especially to the problems of revenue which were involved, while the members of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate would concern themselves principally with problems of the budget, appropriations, and expenditures.

The Legislative Reorganization Act imposes the following requirements upon the joint committee:

- (1) Due consideration of the budget recommendations of the President.
- (2) Recommendation of a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year which shall include—
 - (a) An estimate of overall Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year; and
 - (b) An estimate of expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year.
- (3) A recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures in such year, including a reserve for deficiencies.
- (4) A recommendation for a reduction in the public debt if estimated receipts exceed estimated expenditures.

(5) A recommendation to be included in a concurrent resolution which shall accompany the committee's report, expressing the sense of Congress that the public debt be increased by the amount of the excess if the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts.

The committee directs attention to the fact that appropriations for expenditure are substantially less in amount than estimated expenditures as contemplated in the President's budget. The difference between these two lies in the fact that expenditures recommended by the President for the fiscal year 1949 include not only the new appropriations which are requested of the Congress for this fiscal year but also funds which are available for expenditure from appropriations which were made in prior years or in the current fiscal year or from appropriations which are anticipated.

II. REVENUES AND RECEIPTS

The President's budget for the fiscal year 1949 estimates that there will be available for expenditure \$44.5 billion. On the basis of the committee's studies of revenue possibilities, it is evident that this estimate is too low and that it is reasonable and conservative to anticipate total revenue receipts to aggregate \$47.3 billion in the fiscal year 1949. This is the figure used by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in reporting the revenue bill of 1948 to the House (H. Rept. 1274) and adopted by the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget.

III. EXPENDITURES

The total of expenditures recommended by the President for the fiscal year 1949 aggregates \$39.7 billion. The President requests new appropriations for 1949 in the amount of \$32.9 billion. Of this latter amount, the President estimates that only \$28.4 billion of such new appropriations would actually be expended in the fiscal year 1949 and the balance would be expended in subsequent years.

The committee has made a careful appraisal of the effect of the President's spending program on the national economy for the fiscal year 1949 and concluded that it should be reduced from \$39.7 to \$37.2 billion, or a total of \$2.5 billion reduction in expenditures. Naturally, this figure was not arrived at by a detailed study of the numerous items comprising the President's budget, but is rather the judgment of the joint committee, based on consideration of overall fiscal policy and budgetary requirements.

Following are some of the more important reasons that impelled the committee in its determination:

(1) This is the highest peacetime budget that has ever been submitted for congressional consideration.

(2) The spending program, as outlined in the Budget document, contemplates little or no reduction in the number of Federal employees.

(3) This Budget recommends a total of \$5.735 billion in new expenditures for 1949 for which there exists at the moment no authorizing legislation.

(4) This Nation is admittedly in grave danger of runaway inflation which, if historical precedents are any guide might, if unchecked, result in serious economic upheavals. Under such conditions, our present revenues would decline markedly, resulting in an increased debt and increased taxation unless present spending policies are curtailed. Since Federal, State, and local expenditures constitute the single greatest inflationary force in our economy, these expenditures should be curtailed wherever possible.

(5) For the same reason, large-scale expansion and acceleration of public works projects should be limited to such projects as are deemed urgently necessary to the public interest.

(6) It is obvious that the taxpayers of this Nation should be relieved somewhat of the burden of wartime taxation. This cannot be done if Federal commitments are widely expanded and expenditures are needlessly increased.

(7) World conditions make imperative heavy expenditures for foreign aid and national defense. Under such circumstances, discretion cautions us to conserve our financial resources.

It is the conviction of the committee that the reduction herein proposed is modest in the extreme and should be easily attained.

IV. APPROPRIATIONS

The President's budget message of January 6, 1948, in addition to proposing estimates of appropriations of \$32.9 billion for 1949, also set forth anticipated supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$8.7 billion. Out of the \$32.9 billion proposed for 1949, it is expected that \$28.4 billion, or 86 percent, will be expended during the fiscal year 1949. The 1948 supplementals, \$8.7 billion, include substantial amounts that will not be expended until the fiscal year 1949, which amounts are a part of the total expenditure program for 1949 of \$39.7 billion as presented in the budget document.

In order to obtain a reduction in expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 of \$2.5 billion it will be necessary to make reductions in appropriation estimates of approximately \$2.8 billion. These reductions may be made either in the estimates for 1949, \$32.9 billion, or that portion of the 1948 supplementals, \$8.7 billion, which is actually intended for the fiscal year 1949.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The committee has determined as a result of its deliberations that for the fiscal year 1949:

(1) The estimate of receipts is \$47.3 billion.

(2) The estimate of recommended expenditures is \$37.2 billion.

(3) (a) The maximum amount recommended to be appropriated against the budget estimates for fiscal year 1949, \$32.9 billion, is \$30.9 billion.

(b) The maximum amount recommended to be appropriated against the supplemental budget estimates for 1948, \$8.7 billion, is \$7.9 billion.

(4) The reserve for deficiencies recommended is \$2.25 billion.

(5) The public debt should be reduced by a portion of the excess of Federal receipts over expenditures, but in no event less than \$2.6 billion.

Summary

	Budget	Joint committee
	Billions	Billions
Estimate of receipts.....	\$44.5	\$47.3
Estimate of expenditures.....	39.7	37.2
Excess of receipts.....	4.8	10.1
Amount of new appropriations, 1949.....	32.9	30.9
Amount of new appropriations, 1948.....	8.7	7.9
Amount of 1949 appropriations for expenditure in fiscal year 1949.....	28.4	26.6
Reserve for deficiencies.....	2.25	2.25

Draft on concurrent resolution

The accompanying concurrent resolution, presented in compliance with the law, provided as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate 47.3 billion dollars and that ex-

penses during such fiscal year shall not exceed 37.2 billion dollars, of which latter amount not more than 26.6 billion dollars would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year."

(The text of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 creating the Legislative Budget:)

"LEGISLATIVE BUDGET"

"SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated overall Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

"(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: 'That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$—.'"

MINORITY VIEWS

The undersigned members on the part of the House of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget are unable to subscribe to the above report.

The Legislative Reorganization Act requires the recommendation of a legislative budget and provides for its preparation and submission after an analysis and study of such pertinent data as shall be available to, or procurable by, the agency charged with its formulation and presentation. There has been no such analysis or study. On the contrary, the joint committee was called together after its organization meeting and without intervening hearings, discussions, inquiries, or investigation, was asked to adopt a legislative budget in definite amounts without justifications or itemization of any kind. We cannot join in such flagrant disregard of the spirit of the law.

No legislative budget, logically premised, can precede a detailed study of the estimates. And such study under established procedure cannot be undertaken and completed in time to meet the February 15 deadline designated in the Legislative Reorganization Act. This was conclusively evidenced in the abortive attempt to enact a legislative budget for the current fiscal year. Due to lack of authoritative data, arbitrary amounts were proposed and the two Houses bogged down in hopeless disagreement with the consequence that the law was ignored and the mandatory provision of the statute was disregarded and no legislative budget was recommended. With that failure to carry out the express provisions of the law still fresh in the recollection of the country, we are unwilling to be parties to the adoption of an arbitrary recommendation which due to lack of information on which to base a justifiable conclusion will be just as ineffectual and

fully as drastic a violation of the spirit of the law.

The budget proposes expenditures of \$39.7 billion. Of that amount \$11.3 billion would be from funds heretofore appropriated, or yet to be appropriated, for the current and prior fiscal years. The balance of \$28.4 billion would flow from appropriations recommended for the fiscal year 1949, including an amount for contingencies, and including in the totals \$1.7 billion for the liquidation of prior year contract authorizations. This would leave a net amount for expenditures from the 1949 appropriations, susceptible of curtailment, of \$27.7 billion.

The report of the joint committee proposes a reduction in expenditures of \$2.5 billion. It affords no indication of the yielding sources or the specific items from which such reductions are to be made. The report notably fails to take into consideration any expenditure demands not contemplated by the Budget, the approval of which would necessitate deeper drafts upon pending appropriation requests in order to effect the \$2.5 billion goal recommended in the proposed resolution. As a matter of fact, approval already has been given to such unpredicted and unbudgeted expenditure demands.

To attain the objective of the \$2.5 billion reduction recommended by the majority report would entail reductions in the requested appropriations many times the amount of such objective because, it should be borne in mind, the proposed reduction refers to expenditures from appropriations, and appropriations almost universally exceed the expenditures therefrom during the fiscal year of their availability. To illustrate, while the Budget proposes new appropriations for 1949 of \$32.9 billion, expenditures therefrom during 1949 are estimated to be \$4.5 billion less. Obviously, therefore, to effect an expenditure reduction of \$2.5 billion, it would be necessary to reduce the appropriations to which such reduction would be applied by a much larger amount. The question is, Where would such an appropriation reduction be made without harm to the public interest? The joint committee does not know; we do not know; nor does anyone know. And no one can know definitely until opportunity has been afforded to study the estimates and conditions affecting them.

To subscribe to a fixed total reduction at this time, therefore, with every constituent factor (including total prospective appropriations and expenditures, overall Federal receipts, tax reduction and foreign aid) undetermined and undeterminable, would be obviously absurd and nothing short of an indefensible subterfuge.

In the absence of any attempt to make the Budget provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act applicable or workable, we shall continue, as we have in the past, to examine the appropriation requests in accordance with long-established procedure and advocate, or join in advocating, any economies that appear to be practicable and consistent with the public interest.

CLARENCE CANNON.
GEORGE H. MAHON.
JERE COOPER.
JOHN D. DINGELL.
HARRY R. SHEPPARD.
NOBLE J. GREGORY.
CARL HAYDEN.
ALBERT THOMAS.
AIME J. FORAND.
JOE HENDRICKS.
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN.
JAMIE L. WHITTEN.
JOE B. BATES.
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN.
ALBERT GORE.
JOHN J. ROONEY.
JOHN E. FOGARTY.
WALTER A. LYNCH.
HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.
HENRY M. JACKSON.

TO EQUALIZE TAXATION ON REDEMPTION OF PREFERRED STOCK

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced an amendment to section 302(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 dealing with the income-tax treatment of the proceeds received in redemption of preferred stock which provides that to the extent the said proceeds do not exceed the amount paid in to the corporation on the issuance of such stock, the proceeds shall be treated as a distribution in part or full payment in exchange for the stock and not as a dividend.

Preferred stock is, in reality, a cross between common stock with its characteristics of ownership and bonds. Under the law, in certain cases redemption of preferred stock is treated for tax purposes as the return of capital, in others this redemption of the same stock is treated as dividends and taxed accordingly. Those preferred stockholders who either own no common stock or whose common and preferred stock are held in widely varying proportions fall into the first category. On the other hand, those stockholders who own the common and preferred stock of a corporation in what is called "substantially" proportionate ratios fall into the second category. This denies the idea that one man may have two distinct relationships with a corporate entity. For example, this same reasoning is not applied to an individual who holds both the common stock and the bonds of a corporation and whose bonds are paid off, so long as the bonds represent true indebtedness and the equity capital is sufficient for the needs of the corporation.

My amendment to the Internal Revenue Code would end this capricious distinction between the treatment of the proceeds of the redemption of preferred stock in the differing situations cited and would permit this stock, insofar as it represents capital invested in money or goods, to be treated as a return of capital.

The present taxation of the income derived from the redemption of preferred stock as dividend income turns some corporations, especially closely held family corporations, to debt financing rather than equity financing when further investment is needed. A change in the system of taxation of the redemption proceeds of paid-for preferred stock would have the beneficial effect of making equity financing more attractive to the corporation and would, in the long run, produce greater tax revenues.

The taxation of capital return, as distinguished from interest or dividends paid on that capital, is contrary to our Constitution. This amendment would assure proper tax treatment for the redemption of all preferred stock.

TAX CREDIT FOR EDUCATION

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the important keys to the future of our country is the education and training which we provide for our young people. I have today introduced a bill which is designed to aid and encourage those seeking training, either academic or occupational, at the post-high school level. The mechanism which I have selected is a tax credit, for through such a mechanism we are able to avoid the major objections, and I believe that they have substance, to educational aid as proposed in other forms.

In brief my bill would provide a tax credit for 30 percent of the amount spent by a taxpayer for tuition, fees or services to institutions of higher education and occupational training or retraining. There is an upper limit, \$450, to the amount of this credit in any 1 year. It might be taken either by a student who is putting himself through college or vocational school or by a parent or benefactor who is supporting such a student in his education.

This bill joins the provisions and supplants two similar measures which I offered in the 87th Congress. I have joined the two because the mechanism to be used is identical and because it is important that we give a greater emphasis to vocational and occupational training as an aspect of our educational system. Education and training of an individual after his high school years are essential if we are to build the skilled labor force which America needs to keep moving in the years ahead. We must encourage those who have the ability to get further training to meet the demanding tasks which a modern civilization poses for its citizens. This tax credit will act as such an encouragement. We can also, through the use of this credit, give aid which will help the individual student meet his expenses and give impetus to his parents or others to afford this outlay.

My bills limit the application of this tax credit to education beyond the primary and secondary level. This same approach might have application in the lower educational levels, as well. In any event, this approach offers very real assistance to education while maintaining in the individual the choice of which institution will receive this indirect benefit from the Government. By channeling aid in this way, through the uncontrolled discretion of individuals, each making his choice on the basis of what he believes is the best for his situation, we can avoid the threat of Government control which normally follows upon direct Government aid while encouraging and aiding a worthwhile goal, the education and training of our people.

INCREASED INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR ALL TAXPAYERS AND TAX RELIEF FOR THOSE ATTENDING INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION ON FEBRUARY 5, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two pieces of legislation which are designed to provide much-needed tax relief to the taxpayers of this Nation. Tomorrow the Ways and Means Committee of this House will begin extensive public hearings on the administration's proposals for a tax cut. It is my hope that the committee will give this body the opportunity of acting upon a program of tax reduction which will be both meaningful to every American citizen and fiscally responsible.

It is essential that we act responsibly on any program of tax relief. The mail which I am receiving from my constituents, and I am sure most of the communications which my colleagues are getting, emphasizes the importance of "holding the line" on nondefense spending before we proceed to reduce Federal revenues.

Therefore, in proposing my program of tax relief I do so with the philosophy that the Congress must act to cut down deficit financing and reduce the threat of an inflationary trend in our Nation's economy. We cannot afford the continuing luxury of "charging" our debts to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that every individual and every business is in need of Federal tax relief. The first measure I have introduced today would provide a tax cut which every taxpayer could easily understand and appreciate. I propose that the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer be increased from \$600 to \$900.

The \$600 personal exemption has been in effect since 1948, and since that time the cost of living has cut deeply into the family pocketbook. We have seen the consumer price index rise 23.5 percent in 14 years. It continues to rise. It would appear that a \$300 increase in the personal exemption is necessary to restore individuality, strength, and purchasing power to the American family budget.

Today I also have reintroduced legislation amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education.

Only last week the President sent to the Congress a comprehensive program of Federal aid to education which, if adopted, would cost the American taxpayers over \$5 billion in a 5-year period.

There is no question that "education is the keystone in the arch of freedom

and progress" as the President pointed out. We are living in times which demand that every person must develop his or her best talents if we are to preserve the freedoms we cherish.

I believe that the Federal Government should provide tax relief for those who are seeking to develop their talents at the university level. Such assistance would help the individual help himself.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that prompt and favorable consideration be given to this tax relief program.

LIQUIDATION OF FROZEN CAPITAL AND REINVESTMENT IN MEDIUM TERM GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1963, I introduced H.R. 257, a bill to encourage liquidation of frozen capital assets and reinvestment of a substantial portion thereof in medium term Government bonds bearing a low rate of interest.

It is my opinion that this legislation will be of great benefit to the U.S. Treasury and our national economy as well as the citizen investor.

Very considerable sums of private funds for which no present similar incentive exists would be made available to the Treasury Department. The use of these funds would involve interest rates much below those currently prevailing, resulting in substantial annual savings to the Treasury—\$30 million is the initial annual potential. The probable duration of tenure of securities issued under the proposal would result in lengthening U.S. Treasury bond maturities to a significant degree.

Current inflationary forces, perniciously influencing the price level of capital assets, would be subject to strong neutralizing pressures. Trustees, conservators and other court-appointed officers could discharge their duties with greater skill, since prudence would no longer be costly. Commitments in medium term Government securities would no longer lack any apparent justification. A new and dynamic source of equity capital for investment in our expanding economy would be developed from pay-offs at maturity or from surrendered bonds. A tremendous fund of supporting venture capital in private hands would be created which would cushion the national economy in times of drastically declining prices. Bonds redeemed and funds committed at such times would have a more immediate and salutary stabilizing effect than the much slower process of Government pump-priming.

The incentive of preserving one's savings and the produce of his enterprise would be restored to the investor. He could be expected to: First, have his capital liquid for commitment to the most

attractive available use, including financing small businesses; second, have greater amounts of funds available for gifts to institutions which contribute to the social and economic development of our Nation; third, have greater income and a larger estate upon which Federal taxes would be applicable.

Appreciation or increases in the value of capital is not income. So long as capital is held by the owner, scarcely anyone would assert that appreciation in its value is income. We maintain that when the capital is sold, the sale does not produce income, since the money or other valuable consideration received in exchange is presumably of no greater value than the capital sold. In other words, the taxpayer is clearly no better off after the sale than he was immediately before. When there has been inflation, the so-called capital gain may not be even a real gain in capital. For example, if the owner of a capital asset sells it today for twice as many of today's dollars as the number of dollars he paid for it in 1940, he is not one bit better off since today's is worth in purchasing power about half as much as the 1940 dollar. When the Government takes one-fourth of such fictitious appreciation, it is clearly imposing a capital levy, not an income tax at all. Since the inflation was caused by the Government itself, the tax is particularly unfair.

This capital levy was one of the weapons by which it was proposed to "soak the rich" at a time when "redistribution of wealth" was one of the prime objectives of the administration in power.

The present tax on long-term capital gains is certainly unjust and is injurious to the interests of hundreds of thousands of investors. They are discouraged from making long-term investments because of the present long-term capital gains treatment. It would be foolhardy for the average investor to put his capital in a long-term investment and leave it there indefinitely, ignoring possible advantages that there may be in transferring his capital to another security because of changing conditions or circumstances. However, the present long-term capital gains treatment almost forces him to ignore sound investment principles. The natural effect of this is to discourage long-term investment and for those who do venture into the field threatens them with investment problems to which they should not be exposed.

It has been conservatively estimated that American investors in corporate stocks now have over \$200 billion in unrealized capital gains, a large portion of which represents paper profits which they refuse to take because of the high current rate of the tax on long-term capital gains. They can simply hold these until death and there will be no capital gains tax imposed.

The long-term capital gains tax presently yields the U.S. Treasury no revenue of consequence—less than \$1½ billion a year.

Independent surveys indicate that the Treasury tax take from the long-term capital gains tax would more than double if the rate were drastically reduced.

LAND CONSERVATION FUND BILL

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk briefly today on something which is very important to me, and I hope is important to this great body of the Congress. My subject is conservation and enjoyment of our American heritage of outdoor resources.

It was my great privilege in the first session of the 85th Congress to sponsor the outdoor recreation resources review bill. That legislation was enacted by the 85th Congress and signed into law by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. As a result, there was immediately established the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, on which I had the honor to serve.

For 3 years this bipartisan Commission studied many phases of our Nation's outdoor recreation resources. It submitted its report a year ago in January. In that report the Commission made many recommendations concerning our great outdoor heritage. I am personally concerned in seeing that certain of these recommendations are carried out. I hope that other Members of this great Chamber will also take it upon themselves to encourage the acceptance of the Commission's recommendations.

Only two of those recommendations so far have been implemented. I refer specifically to the creation of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of the Interior, and the establishment of the Recreation Advisory Council, made up of the heads of several Federal departments. This is a fine start, but it is just that—only a start. I would like to see more of the Commission's recommendations carried out.

My colleague from Colorado and I each introduced a bill on January 14 which would provide the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation with additional authorities which it needs to effectively operate as envisioned by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. I hope that prompt and favorable consideration will be given to this piece of legislation. I refer to the bills, H.R. 1762 and H.R. 1763.

The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission emphasizes that the key elements in the total effort to make outdoor recreation opportunities available to the American people are private enterprise, the States, and the local government. It recommended that the role of the Federal Government should be one of cooperation with the States through technical and financial assistance. It further recommended that such financial assistance should be in the form of grants for not only planning, but for land acquisition and development of facilities for outdoor recreation.

Mr. Speaker, I think these are very important recommendations. I think we

need to see that they are carried out and that they are carried out promptly. The longer we delay, the higher will be the price tag for lands and facilities needed to provide for the 90 percent of all Americans who engage in some form of outdoor recreation in the course of a year.

Every day, one is aware of desirable recreation lands being taken for industrial development, highways, urban expansion, and many other purposes. Some of these beauty spots and natural areas must be tagged for the use and enjoyment of the American people. Open spaces with green vistas and sprinkling waters must be set aside in areas in which people are located—within easy driving distance from our metropolitan areas. We need to preserve some of our swamps and marshes. We need to preserve some of our lakeshores and river areas. We need to preserve some of our mountain areas and beaches. True, we are going to have to pay a high price for some, but the longer we delay, the higher the price tag. What is needed is a fiscally sound program for financing these natural areas for use and enjoyment of the American people.

It is my understanding that the executive branch is considering a broadening of the legislation which was considered, but not enacted in the 87th Congress. I refer to the Land Conservation Fund bill, H.R. 11177, which I sponsored last year. It is my further understanding that conferences on the broadening of this legislation have been held with conservation groups, recreation groups, industry groups, Federal agencies, and others.

Four months have passed since the close of the 87th Congress. This seems like ample time to revise almost any kind of bill. I do not understand the delay. The importance of this legislation requires that it be considered promptly and enacted by this Congress. Naturally, the Congress cannot consider a piece of legislation which has not yet been received. It is high time the administration makes a move.

GRUMMAN SPACE FLIGHT CENTER

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Van Pelt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my own remarks the address of our colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable GEORGE P. MILLER, chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, at the dedication of the Grumman Space Flight Center, located at Bethpage, Long Island, on February 4, 1963.

Chairman MILLER's address follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. MILLER, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS COMMITTEE

I am indeed honored to be with you today and to participate in the dedication of this impressive addition to the many structures that bear the name Grumman.

It seems to me to be entirely fitting to regard this occasion as something more than the dedication of a building alone. Rather it should also be an occasion distinguished by the dedication of the people who will spend many hours of their lives working here, to achieve the ultimate success of our manned lunar landing program.

We can dedicate here something infinitely more important than stone, mortar, and steel. We can make here, though symbolically, an avowed dedication of American people.

We can make here an irrevocable commitment to the future of this Nation in space and to the community of this world. And we can willingly submit ourselves here, without pretension, to the obligations that we as Americans have placed upon ourselves.

We have undertaken what has been described as the greatest adventure conceived by men—manned flight to the moon and return. It is a task that will involve enormous national energies and resources, both material and human.

Our goal and timetable have been set by the President. We have planned a program to achieve those objectives that demands unqualified success in every aspect of it.

You of Grumman have undertaken, in assuming the responsibility for the lunar excursion module for Project Apollo, a task of monumental proportions. It is you at Grumman who must make it possible for our astronauts to leave their orbiting rocket for the lunar surface and return safely.

It is entirely consistent with the history of your company that Grumman should be assigned such a critical and vital role. The annals of aviation are filled with the epics of American pilots in Grumman-built airplanes whose heroism and sacrifices often made the difference between victory and defeat, success and failure.

It was the contribution of Grumman, of the people who worked to produce outstanding aircraft. Their sense of individual responsibility, in a significant sense, made possible much of the outstanding success in the air experienced by our Navy in World War II.

Now you have made a transition to space vehicles. It is a tribute to President Towle and his associates that Grumman is approaching with confidence and faith this new age of space flight and all the difficult technical problems that must be solved. Certainly, this new building and a willingness to invest company funds—\$5 million—to build it, is a manifestation of that faith.

I am sure that part of that belief, that faith, goes beyond the bounds of self-interest. In practicing our philosophy of personal freedom and private enterprise we accomplish two vital purposes: the preservation of our ideals and the provision of our material welfare. We are a closely knit people. Each citizen, each company, contributes in some measure directly or indirectly to the betterment of the community and of the Nation in the achievement of its chosen objectives.

I am equally sure that the decision to build this Space Flight Center was motivated by something more than the sole desire of Grumman to gain technical advantage in the competition for space business. As a nation, we have decided to go into space, to go out to the moon for reasons that include but transcend the fact that the Soviet Union is going there, too.

True, the military facts of life in space are ever-presenting. We in Congress are certainly aware that our flights into space are directly dependent upon the strength to defend our right to be there.

And we intend, in no uncertain terms, to provide the means to enhance that strength.

But, the point is this: I don't think that we of today are any different in spirit, daring, courage, and resourcefulness than were our frontier forefathers. What made the people of a 100 years ago leave the relative security of the eastern communities and farms?

What made them willing to challenge the hazards, the hardship, and often violent death in the great trek west?

A hunger for land? An escape from economic depression? A release from religious persecution?

Surely, it was all of these and probably many more. But in addition to these temporal and mundane reasons was another reason that they all had.

It was a promise of a bright tomorrow. It was a hope that over the western horizon was a new life, a new future that would give to their children a far better world than the one into which they were born.

These hardy people probably knew specifically much less about the problems, the danger, they were to face in venturing westward than we do in going out into space. But they went. So, too, for the same and more reasons, we will go, too.

But now, penetrating the unknown is a deliberate, coordinated national effort, rather than a spontaneous surge of individuals as it was then. The Government is asking Congress for \$7.6 billion to explore space, of which \$5.7 billion will be for NASA programs, \$1.6 billion will be for military space programs, and the remainder divided between the Atomic Energy Commission, the Weather Bureau, and the National Science Foundation.

But, as large as that budget request is, NASA is requesting approximately 10 percent of the \$56 billion the American people are willing to spend to maintain a strong, progressive military defense. And the acquisition of new technology that NASA is acquiring, the striking innovations of applied science that NASA is accomplishing will unquestionably contribute greatly to the capabilities of the defense forces.

What is particularly significant is that about 90 percent of the NASA fiscal year 1964 appropriation will be spent through contracts with industry. The effect of such expenditures will surely be reflected in almost every aspect of our economy. New jobs, new businesses, new materials, new techniques—if the past is any criteria—will come into being. These will be the tangible results of NASA's activities.

The intangibles may offer even greater benefits to the future. You of Grumman are no doubt faced with the continuing problem of employing scientific and technical people of greater and greater competence, to meet the challenges of space research.

The urgent demands of our national space program, in the few short years it has been underway, for well-trained scientists, technicians, and engineers, has already been reflected in educational institutions throughout the country, from the primary grades through the graduate degree level.

Great efforts by educators and academic planners are being expended to not only improve the quality of science and engineering graduates, to improve the quality of educators themselves of all grades, but also to excite the interest of youngsters of primary and secondary schools to seek a professional career in technology or research.

I can't think of any other resource more important to the future of this country than rigorous and demanding educational systems. We need people who have been well-grounded, and thoroughly trained both intellectually and professionally.

We need more superior people who have been trained how to think, how to use their minds, and how to apply their talents. These are the kind of people you need here at Grumman in the Space Flight Center if you are to achieve the success you confidently expect.

These are the people we need throughout our entire society, not only in the fields of science and technology but also in the humanities and the arts. The drive for techno-

logical superiority must not leave us as cultural paupers.

We must not fall by choice into the same intellectual traps that now restrict or limit by government decree the philosophical development of the Russian people.

Instead we must continue to encourage and foster in every way possible the breadth and depth we try to maintain in our approach to education. It is more people of higher scholastic achievement that we need. Not an increase in emphasis on science and technology at the expense of the other disciplines.

Two weeks ago, my committee, the House Science and Astronautics Committee, conducted the fifth annual meeting of its scientific advisory panel, whose membership includes 14 outstanding scientists and educators, such as Dr. James A. Van Allen of the Iowa State University, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge of California Institute of Technology, and Dr. Fred L. Whipple of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Laboratory. I would like to quote from Dr. Van Allen's remarks before the committee. He said:

"This matter of manned lunar exploration is an undertaking of truly heroic proportions. It provides a graphic test of our national technical capabilities and our national fortitude and integrity. I, for one, would be most distressed to see the United States shrink from this challenge."

I would say that Dr. Van Allen is unquestionably correct in stating that the Nation has accepted in the lunar program a challenge that will sorely test every virtue and ideal for which we stand. I would also emphasize that it is a challenge that is freely chosen without reservation.

This was demonstrated last year when the House of Representatives voted without a dissenting voice the authorization for the NASA budget of more than \$3.7 billion. This House action is, to the best of my knowledge, unprecedented in considering a budget request of that size.

The American people are convinced that we must explore space. And they expressed clearly and firmly this conviction through their elected representatives.

Thus the people look to Congress and to NASA for the assurance that our national space program, especially the manned lunar landing, will be conducted with the utmost vigor possible. And in turn, Congress and NASA look to private industry in order to achieve in practical terms all of our objectives.

Since Sputnik I took us by surprise, people at home and abroad have been and are waiting to see how the United States has met and will meet the challenges of the Soviet Union in space. We have long claimed loud and clear to be the technological leader of the world. And we were then placed in the position of having to "put up, or shut up."

Well, we have put up—more than 100 satellites in orbit since January 31, 1958. We have sent five men out into space, three in orbit. We have made scientific discoveries in space, such as the Van Allen radiation belts, that have aroused the admiration and respect of professional people everywhere.

We have given freely to all nations the benefits we have already gained—our weather satellite data, our communications satellite facilities, and the use of our navigation satellites. I think we have—again—proved our claim.

And it was possible only through the imagination, the energy, the aggressiveness, and the competence of American industry. These are achievements in which we all can be proud.

But, they are only part of primitive, early beginnings, the infant toddling steps of a new era. There never will be a time when we as a nation can afford the luxury of basking in the sun of self-congratulation. The challenges in space that we face now, as

monumental as they may be, are only a few steps forward toward a future no one can envision.

I congratulate you of Grumman for your achievements in aviation. I congratulate you for your foresightedness in building the Space Flight Center. And I expect in the not-too-distant future to congratulate you for providing the means by which the first Americans, in a Grumman module, accomplish one of the oldest dreams of mankind—to reach the moon.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, amid all of the talk about the necessity of increasing opportunities for young people to attend college, too little attention has been given to the incentives that can be provided through the Federal tax laws.

I am introducing today a bill that will allow a special income-tax deduction for the expenses of a college education.

It is a simple and certain method of easing the burden of college expenses and it can be enacted speedily.

Of all of the programs the Federal Government might adopt to encourage higher education, I believe this is the most practical and the most helpful.

My bill will permit the student, his parents, or any other individual who is paying the expenses of a college student, to deduct, up to \$1,000 each year, the actual cost of tuition, books, special fees and the difference between the cost of living at a college and the cost of living at home.

My bill would lift a tremendous burden from young people who are attempting to support themselves while studying. It would mean the difference between success and failure for parents of modest means who wish to send their children to college.

In addition, I believe it would encourage thousands of people in the higher income brackets to give assistance to deserving but needy youngsters.

It will be noted that my bill is more generous than others that have been introduced.

Some of them propose a tax credit for a percentage of the expenses of a college education. Some of them propose a deduction for tuition or books only, or a deduction so limited that it would have little value to the persons most in need of help. There are other systems, but it seems to me that all of these are only halfway measures.

If we truly wish to encourage and assist our bright youngsters in college, we should make the most liberal allowance so that most of the expenses of attending the average college will be covered.

CUBA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, as I have been for some time now, over the inability of this administration to come forth with a basic policy, an effective plan of action, to rid this hemisphere of the Castro and Communist menace.

Neither I, nor the people of America, can be satisfied with the on-again off-again approach in dealing with Castro that the administration has apparently adopted. And neither I, nor the people of America, want to wait until the 1964 presidential campaign for further dramatic action by the administration directed toward ridding this hemisphere of the Communist menace. Yesterday, I introduced House Joint Resolution 227 calling for implementation of the Monroe Doctrine.

This will be the second of many remarks I intend to make on the Cuban situation. I am doing so, because I am concerned.

Concerned, Mr. Speaker, because our record of failure in dealing with Castro is unparalleled in the history of our Nation. Concerned because this administration is apparently willing to acquiesce in the Communist exchange of the Monroe Doctrine for the Khrushchev doctrine in this hemisphere. Concerned because there is in existence, only 90 miles from our shores, a Communist nation whose military might is second only to ours in this hemisphere. Concerned, Mr. Speaker, because this great travesty continues because of the acquiescence by inaction of this administration.

In the fall of 1960, when it became abundantly clear that Castro's true colors were red and thousands of refugees had already swarmed to Florida's shores, I proposed what I considered to be two logical and initial steps necessary to rid this hemisphere of the Castro menace.

First, I proposed the recognition of a free, non-Communist refugee government-in-exile; and, secondly, a military blockade of Cuba to halt the inshipment of arms and war materiel. Although we have recently witnessed a quarantine which was too quickly lifted, we have yet to see initiated any real effort to unite and back the Cuban refugees living in the United States and elsewhere in order to win back the freedom of Cuba. This is an effort which is essential if Castro is to eventually be toppled and the Pearl of the Antilles freed.

The President, in a dramatically staged address to the Cuban refugees in Miami's Orange Bowl recently, pledged that the flag of the invading forces will once again hang in Havana. How does the President propose to do this? Mail it to Castro and hope he will change his colors by flying it?

I do not say this to be facetious, Mr. Speaker, but it is becoming disturbingly clear that Cuban refugees, should they again attempt to invade Cuba, would fail so long as they remain disunited and unsupported.

Unless the various Cuban refugee factions are united under a common banner, they will remain ineffectual. And the obvious way to unite them is by recognizing a Cuban government-in-exile. It is an exiled government, with the help of the United States, that could and properly should become the instrument behind the forces which will someday regain their freedom on Cuban soil.

In a query to the State Department in March of last year, I asked why, in view of Candidate Kennedy's support during the campaign for the recognition of a Cuban government-in-exile, no action along these lines has been taken subsequent to his election.

I received the following in reply from the State Department:

The recognition of a government of Cuba in exile at this time is not in the national interest of the United States because neither the Government of Switzerland nor any other government could then represent U.S. interests before the Castro regime. Were a government in exile formed, and should the United States recognize such a government, the United States would have to look to that government and not the Castro government for the fulfillment of Cuban obligations.

I had been laboring under the impression that we had withdrawn diplomatic recognition of Red Cuba while all this time, we, as a nation, are continuing to transact business with the Castro government, through a middleman.

I must submit the State Department's reply as a classic example of the fuzzy thinking going on in this administration.

Where, then, does this country stand today regarding Cuba? The naval quarantine was prematurely withdrawn in that reliable sources tell us that missiles may still be hidden in the caves of Cuba's mountainous provinces because of the lack of actual inspection. In future remarks, I will point out where these missiles could be hidden—that can only be disproved by adequate inspection, particularly with our poor intelligence facilities in well guarded western Cuba.

Castro, as a result of the quarantine, is more firmly entrenched than ever before and he has had suggested U.S. assurances that this country will guarantee his island against invasion.

President Kennedy has announced that we are going to withdraw our missiles from Turkey, and naturally poses the question whether this is an aftermath of the Cuban crisis. Another concession?

Cuba continues to be an armed and highly effectual Russian military installation, a disturbing, undisputed fact.

And, the most unfortunate link on this long chain of disturbing elements, we have paid through lost tax revenues and other gimmicks indemnity to a foreign power by ransoming the Bay of Pigs invaders.

Under an administration that apparently has more respect for histrionics than history, the President's brother has reopened the Bay of Pigs invasion in an attempt to rewrite the history of that abortive invasion.

"No air cover was promised," is the latest cry of our image-conscious administration. "Not true," say the vast majority of reliable witnesses and invaders.

I am at this time, under unanimous consent, inserting the following editorials on this subject in the RECORD:

[From the Tampa Tribune, Jan. 9, 1963]

NOW WHAT'S THE POLICY?

Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, and Soviet Deputy Premier Vasily V. Kuznetsov have called it quits. Their efforts to achieve a settlement of the Cuban problem have reached an impasse.

This end could have been foretold when the United States too hastily lifted its naval blockade of Cuba before Soviet Premier Khrushchev had carried out his promise to remove his nuclear missiles and bombers from the island under international inspection. With no club hanging over their heads, the Soviets felt free to waltz on their promises. The United States cannot be certain that all the offensive weapons were removed, nor are there any assurances that they won't be returned.

To be sure, some missiles and bombers were removed. But there are still some 16,000 to 17,000 Russian troops in Cuba who appear to be running Fidel Castro's military establishment, the second largest in the Western Hemisphere. The island is still in the hands of a Moscow-run Communist regime and poses a sharp threat to hemispheric security.

The question, then, is what next in Cuba? Officially the answers are mushier than the swamps at the Bay of Pigs.

President Kennedy has promised to try to halt Communist subversion of Cuba's neighbors. He told the ransomed invasion prisoners in Miami that "the Cuban people shall someday be truly free." He didn't, however, date this promissory note. Secretary of State Dean Rusk says that the immediate future of Cuba "is not easy to predict," but adds that "this hemisphere cannot accept a Marxist-Leninist penetration by forces from outside our hemisphere." He terms Cuba "unfinished business."

These pronouncements have a dreamlike quality about them which leaves the impression that if we'll ignore Cuba it will just disappear; that the passage of time alone will neutralize the Communist threat.

Indeed, there appears to be one school of thought in Washington that holds that the leadership in Cuba is so torn between pro-Moscow and pro-China forces that Castro, or perhaps a replacement, will emerge as a Tito-like Communist. Presumably such a leader would be more acceptable to the United States and Latin American nations.

One report has it that President Goulart of Brazil is attempting to wean Castro away from his Moscow ties in return for hemispheric economic aid.

It is inconceivable that the State Department would ever entertain such an approach. After the recent treachery in which Castro permitted Cuba to become a missile base from which much of the hemisphere was placed under nuclear threat, he can't be scrubbed clean again no matter how stiff the brush.

Second, the theory that Castro can be weaned away from Moscow is the wildest kind of speculation. Cuba is both an economic and military slave of Russia, costing Khrushchev a million dollars a day. Anyone who believes he is going to give up this investment without a struggle is as fuzzy-headed as those who believe that Castro may be a Tito in disguise.

It should be the announced policy of the United States to free Cuba of its Communist rulers within the shortest period possible. If it is not to be done by direct military action, then it must be achieved by all means short of war. All the economic and political resources at the command of the United States and Latin America must be brought to bear to resolve the issue as quickly as possible.

The people of Cuba indeed must be truly free. But time alone will not loosen the Communist grip. Nor will wishful thinking. Cuba will be freed only by dedicated effort. We already have wasted too much time.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Jan. 14, 1963]

THE GREATER WRONG

President Kennedy apparently has closed the books on the ransoming of the Cuban prisoners. But whether anyone approves or disapproves paying blackmail to a Communist bandit, evidence continues to mount that the Kennedy administration has been engaged in one of the most devious and slippery operations the Federal Government has ever undertaken.

Throughout the negotiations the administration contended that it was in no way involved, insisting that successful release of the prisoners would be a "private effort by private citizens." It sought to lead the public to believe that the Federal Government would contribute nothing to the ransom pot; that the Nation's food processors and pharmaceutical houses were voluntarily donating \$53 million worth of goods with no pressure from the Government.

This obviously was not the truth. The Kennedy administration was up to its neck in the operation. And still is.

Now it has come to light that the Government not only contributed to the ransom payments but broke its own trade embargo on Cuba.

When it came time to add up the supplies U.S. producers had "donated," it was found that the amount of foods was not sufficient to meet Fidel Castro's demand. So the Department of Agriculture agreed to chip in 5 million pounds of surplus dried milk and is preparing to send 15 million pounds more.

The surplus milk is owned by the U.S. taxpayers, who paid for it through the farm subsidy program. It is an express declaration of policy by Congress that no surplus food be sent to Communist-dominated countries.

Administration officials sidestep this declaration by arguing that the dried milk contribution is not a "government-to-government deal" since the milk was first turned over to the American Red Cross. Thus the specious argument goes that the Kennedy administration is not giving the milk to Castro, the Red Cross is.

Furthermore, Government officials say that the Red Cross expects the Cuban Families Committee to raise the funds to reimburse the Department of Agriculture. But anyone who thinks the Committee will raise \$3,800,000 to pay for the milk is kidding himself. It couldn't even raise the \$2,900,000 Castro demanded for the 60 prisoners released last summer. This money had to be rounded up by Attorney General Robert Kennedy and General Lucius Clay to prevent the ransom deal from falling through at the last moment.

But if the Kennedy administration has been playing fast and loose with the Government's dried milk supply it has been equally casual about breaching its embargo regulations.

The Miami Herald has revealed that included in the ransom cargo are some \$4,200,000 worth of goods which private suppliers would be forbidden to sell to Cuba. The list covered nutritional dietary foods, veterinary pharmaceuticals, pesticides, laboratory glassware, petroleum jelly, surgical rubber gloves, optical instruments, and refrigeration equipment parts. The Department of Commerce, however, was persuaded to issue export licenses for these supplies even though they were on the embargo list.

Undoubtedly the Kennedy administration feels that "humanitarianism" justified its role in the ransom deal. But its double-

talk on the whole proceedings can hardly fail to undermine public confidence. Can the people ever again accept the administration's word as fact?

It is bad enough to pay ransom. Duplicity is even worse.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Jan. 9, 1963]

CUBA: BACK TO THE BEGINNING

The last faint hope, if there ever was any, that United Nations inspection teams could insure Cuba's offensive disarmament apparently has vanished.

Where does that leave us? What is the score since last October 22, when President Kennedy ordered the blockade?

Some, perhaps most, possibly all, Soviet missiles capable of use against the United States have been removed.

Some, apparently about one-fourth, of Russia's personnel have returned to the Soviet Union.

The Cuban invasion forces captured at the Bay of Pigs have been ransomed and returned to Florida.

For the moment, at least, all members of the Organization of American States are solidly behind U.S. efforts to keep world communism out of this hemisphere.

Is this enough? Can we now relax? Will the OAS retain its solidarity behind us on the strength of these accomplishments?

We think not, on all three counts.

As matters stand, there is nothing to keep the Soviet from promptly shipping new, or the same, intermediate range missiles back to Cuba.

With the wickedly efficient-looking anti-aircraft missiles recently on display in Havana, aerial surveillance is going to be increasingly difficult and dangerous. And undoubtedly, should missile-launching sites again be built, a great deal more care would be taken to disguise them from aerial discovery.

There are unmistakable signs that Soviet submarine bases are being built in Cuba.

A number of Soviet military and technical personnel, estimated as high as 17,000, remain in Cuba to train and supervise military forces and weaponry there.

This may not add up to any immediate threat to the United States. But can the same be said for the rest of the American States?

Both as a base for ideological and subversive penetration of Latin America, and as a possible staging point for military excursions against Central and South American States, Cuba is distinctly a threat.

Neither the OAS nor the United States can be content with the situation as it is.

Now that we have full OAS support, we should make the fullest use of it. It should not be necessary for us again to move first and then have the OAS come along with a vote of confidence. What we do now should in every way be a joint operation.

If we must reimpose a blockade, or, more politely, a quarantine, and that seems likely, it should be done with full OAS sanction and as much actual participation as our neighbors are able to provide.

Every step that we take to tighten the screws to bring about an end to Soviet domination of Cuba should be a joint action.

If we act now to get the OAS moving, we believe we can sustain the sense of urgency that led to such unanimity last fall. And such urgency, we feel, is imperative.

[From the Tampa Times, Jan. 15, 1963]

THE FINAL SOLUTION IS MISSING

The joy and some resentment, over ransoming of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, their relatives and release of another 89 Cubans and Cuban-Americans should not detract from the central fact that the problem in the Caribbean is far from solved.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, has issued a warning that the Cuban situation "remains highly critical" and he further observed that the United States has "lost what was our most precious asset in the crisis—the initiative."

Despite removal of those "weapons of offense" from Castro Cuba, there remains on the island a well armed force of Communist-led Cubans and Russian troops. Cuba is guarded by rings of anti-aircraft missiles and there is good reason to believe Red forces have short-range attack missiles which could be brought to bear against Guantanamo Naval Base.

Senator KEATING's views of the Cuban problem are significant from this standpoint: It was the New York solon who first pinpointed presence of long-range rockets on the island. He was demanding counteraction long before President Kennedy responded to this threat with his blockade order.

Senator KEATING has obviously dependable sources of information and we have no doubt that the State Department and Department of Defense are similarly informed.

But there is little to suggest that a firm policy has been developed to cope with post-blockade Cuba. We have been told that some exchanges have taken place between Washington and Moscow regarding continued presence of Russian troops in this hemisphere. We have also been told that no progress has been made toward effecting their removal.

Instead, the possibility looms that Nikita Khrushchev will use his Cuban position as a bargaining point toward forcing the United States to accept some form of U.N. administration in Western Berlin. Had President Kennedy retained the initiative acquired by establishing the blockade, it would have been possible to roll back the Russians even further insofar as Cuba is concerned.

Today, we are faced with a static situation on that troubled island. There is no sign Mr. Kennedy contemplates an anti-Castro invasion or even another version of the Bay of Pigs attack. On the contrary, all signs point to a hands-off attitude in hope Castro will "fall of his own weight" or that Russia will become weary of supporting this highly expensive parasite.

There is not even a suggestion that a more intense economic war will be waged against the Castro Cubans or that any effort will be made to pull the fangs of Nikita Khrushchev's troops on the island.

Meanwhile, we have Senator KEATING's report that Communist forces in Cuba are 10 times better equipped militarily now than they were last spring. Castro, KEATING asserted, "has 144 missile launchers, 24 bases and 500 anti-aircraft missiles, some of them the most modern in existence, and 20,000 troops."

This force creates understandable concern in Latin America as well as among intelligent North Americans. It is illogical to suppose that the Communist organization will permit it to rust for lack of use.

If it has proved anything, the Castro problem demonstrates the danger of inaction inherent in a policy of "wait and see." That is the reason Senator KEATING's warnings will be regarded seriously and with hope that they spur the State and Defense Departments into more positive action calculated to defeat Castro and drive Khrushchev out of the Western Hemisphere permanently.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. PRICE, today, for 15 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHORT in two instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOEVEN.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GRABOWSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, February 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

357. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

358. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

359. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of the rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3386. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 3387. A bill to compensate range users for authorized range improvements where land is taken to be devoted to Federal nonmilitary use; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3388. A bill to repeal the tax on transfer of silver bullion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEERMANN:

H.R. 3389. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight

car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 3390. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 3391. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 3392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other expenses at institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 3393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid for tuition, fees or services to certain public and private institutions of higher education, or for occupational training or retraining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of certain redemptions of preferred stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 3395. A bill to amend the act of August 16, 1957 (71 Stat. 372), authorizing the construction of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3396. A bill to authorize the addition of lands to Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3397. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 3398. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 3399. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3400. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which may be received by an individual while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3401. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend for 2 years the provisions thereof which would otherwise expire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 3402. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that the population figures for the year 1960 shall be used for the purpose of computing annual immigrant quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3403. A bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 3404. A bill to permit an individual to obtain coverage under title II of the Social Security Act on the basis of service which was not covered employment at the time it was performed, if service of that type has since become covered employment and such individual makes payment of the applicable social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 3405. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 additional years the present provisions permitting the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 3406. A bill to transfer certain administrative responsibility for the operation of Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to a Washington Airports Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 3407. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3408. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide judicial review of agency orders concerning biological products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 3409. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30 percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3411. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that old-age assistance or aid to the aged, blind, or disabled otherwise payable to an individual thereunder shall not be reduced on account of certain increases in any insurance benefits to which such individual is entitled under title II of such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3412. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3413. A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make eligible for the retirement income credit housewives, disabled individuals, and other individuals who are ineligible for such credit by reason of the 10-year work test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3414. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct expenses paid during the taxable year for repair, maintenance, alterations, and additions to his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3415. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of the term "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional \$2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3417. A bill to provide that tips and gratuities received from customers of an individual's employer may be included as part

of such individual's wages for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 3418. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to prohibit the inclusion of draperies and carpeting as part of the mortgage security in the case of Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages covering multifamily rental housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3419. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of widow's insurance benefits at age 50 in the case of a woman who is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3420. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to fix the premium for the insurance of cooperative housing mortgages at the minimum permissible level (one-fourth of 1 percent per annum); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3421. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the granting of survivor annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 3422. A bill to amend Public Law 503, 84th Congress, so as to provide annuities for the widows of certain Foreign Service officers who retired prior to the effective date of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3423. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 3424. A bill to provide that retired Federal officers and employees shall not be required to pay any fee for admission to national parks, forests, and monuments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 3425. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to include as creditable service certain service performed by emergency relief project employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 3426. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 3427. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3428. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a more realistic definition of "disability" for purposes of the disability freeze, and to liberalize the coverage requirements for such freeze and for disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that scholarships received by a student shall not be taken into account (regardless of such student's relationship to the taxpayer) in determining whether he is the taxpayer's dependent for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his edu-

cation or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3432. A bill to provide that any individual who is enrolled to practice before the Internal Revenue Service may indicate that fact on his professional stationery and in customary professional insertions in directories, publications, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 3433. A bill to correct certain inequities with respect to the granting of survivor annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 3434. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide career status by appointment of certain qualified substitute rural carriers of record to fill vacancies on rural routes on the basis of noncompetitive examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 3435. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$900 the income tax exemption allowed each taxpayer, and for each dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 3437. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut and New York, and other affected States, to enter into a compact relating to the taking of action to bring about improvement in commuter and other passenger services of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 3438. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to limiting the priority and nondischargeability of taxes in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3439. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3440. A bill to provide that each member of the bar of the highest court of a State or of a Federal court shall be eligible to practice before all administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3441. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgments of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3442. A bill to amend section 3231, title 18, United States Code, to reaffirm the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce State statutes prohibiting subversive activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3443. A bill to amend section 64(a)(2) of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3444. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3445. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the eligibility of members of the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court to practice before all courts

of appeals and district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3446. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to allow compensation to counsel assigned by the court in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to a program for paying the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution to investigate the operations of all intelligence agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 243. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 55; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H. Res. 244. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Res. 245. Resolution amending clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE: House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (37th sess.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, House Joint Memorial No. 1 of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (37th sess.); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the Interstate Commerce Commission reject in its entirety the recommendation of its examiner in ICC Docket No. 33571 and continue its orders of September 30, 1960, and October 24, 1960; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being opposed to the dedication of additional lands as primitive- or wilderness-type areas in the State of Idaho and requesting that all primitive and wilderness areas be reviewed and studied to determine and establish their greatest use potential; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 3447. A bill for the relief of Norma T. Sadumilano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3448. A bill for the relief of Alicia A. Basco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 3449. A bill for the relief of Elena A. Basco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 3450. A bill for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 3451. A bill for the relief of Nava Barak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3452. A bill for the relief of Pablo Fiume; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 3453. A bill for the relief of Domenico Busetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 3454. A bill for the relief of Vicente Ybinarriaga-Lopategui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3455. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Sikora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3456. A bill for the relief of Maria Orphanidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 3457. A bill for the relief of Salomon Zamli-Setton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3458. A bill for the relief of Filippo LoCicero, Rosalia LoCicero, Paola LoCicero, and Guiseppa LoCicero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 3459. A bill for the relief of Peregrina Calipo Sucaldito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3460. A bill for the relief of Marija Matijevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 3461. A bill for the relief of Gino DeSantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3462. A bill for the relief of Aurora Matessich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 3463. A bill for the relief of Doris Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 3464. A bill for the relief of Jan Marchelewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 3465. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Minacapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3466. A bill for the relief of Irina Semenovna Novikova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3467. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Bonaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3468. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Klara Schlittner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ansley Wilcox House as a National Historic Site

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing the bill which would designate the Ansley Wilcox House at 641 Delaware Avenue in Buffalo, N.Y., as a national historic site. This is the place where Theodore Roosevelt was sworn in as President of the United States, and it is one of only four sites outside Washington, D.C., where the Presidential Oath has been administered. The others are the old Subtreasury Building in New York City where George Washington was inaugurated for his first term; Philadelphia's Congress Hall—the scene of Washington's second and John Adams' inauguration; and the homestead in Plymouth, Vt., where Calvin Coolidge was sworn in.

There is no question but that the Wilcox House is a national historic landmark of the utmost significance.

Last year legislation was enacted to add Sagamore Island on Long Island, N.Y., and the Theodore Roosevelt birthplace in New York, as national historic sites. This is a fitting tribute to our 26th President. I feel that the preservation of the Wilcox House in Buffalo, as a historic shrine, would be an even richer tribute to this great American. The bill follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the Ansley Wilcox House in Buffalo, New York, as a national historic site

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, not-

withstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire on behalf of the United States the real property described in section 2 of this Act, known as the Ansley Wilcox House, which real property is of national historic significance as the place in which Theodore Roosevelt took the oath of office as President of the United States on September 14, 1901, following the assassination of President William McKinley. The Secretary shall maintain and preserve such property as a national historic site for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

Sec. 2. The real property referred to in the first section of this Act is more particularly described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land, situate in the city of Buffalo, county of Erie, State of New York, and beginning at a point in the east line of Delaware Avenue distant 110 feet southerly from the southerly line of land of Catharine Marie Richmond, recorded in Erie County clerk's office in liber 247 of deeds at page 167; running thence easterly a distance of 110 feet;

Running thence southerly a distance of 60 feet to a point in the north line of land of Morris Michael, recorded in Erie County Clerk's office in liber 531 of deeds at page 335; running thence easterly and along the north line of land of the said Morris Michael 64 feet more or less, and continuing easterly on a line extended from the land of Morris Michael a further distance of 174 feet more or less to the westerly line of Franklin Street; running thence northerly along the westerly line of Franklin Street 110 feet; running thence westerly 134 feet; running thence northerly and parallel with Franklin Street 59.51 feet more or less to a point distant 40 feet more or less easterly from the southeast corner of lands of Amelia Stevenson, recorded in Erie County Clerk's office in liber 669 at page 299;

Running thence westerly 40 feet to the southeast corner of lands of the said Amelia Stevenson and continuing westerly in a line along the south line of the land of Catharine Marie Richmond a further distance of 174 feet more or less to the easterly line of Delaware Avenue; running thence southerly along the easterly line of Delaware Avenue 110 feet to the place of beginning.

And being subject to an easement as contained in a lease agreement dated January 6, 1959, between the landlord and the Liberty

Bank of Buffalo covering a driveway ramp and automobile parking privileges, together with the right of ingress and egress to Delaware Avenue and Franklin Street, as contained in said lease.

Postmaster General J. Edward Day Addresses West Virginia Legislators—Stresses Need for Resolute Action in Order To Realize National Economic Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the pressing need for rethinking and restructuring in current tax procedures has been effectively brought out by President John F. Kennedy in his state of the Union message of January 10, 1963. The Chief Executive has pointed out that we must institute a permanent program of expanded incentives and opportunities for private expenditures, promoting fuller use of industrial capacity and higher employment.

Another effective and significant expression of this challenge which faces Congress and the Nation has now come from the capable and conscientious Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable J. Edward Day.

Speaking before members of the West Virginia Legislature at a banquet given by the Charleston Chamber of Commerce in our capital city on January 29, 1963, the Cabinet member stated that:

The dynamic age in which we live requires vital adjustments to new ideas. The challenges that face us are gigantic—but the opportunities are exciting.

Mr. Day also stressed that current tax proposals are designed to bring into balance our entire economy, and that the general principle of tax reduction has the support of liberal economists and conservative business groups.

Mr. President, I request that the address by Postmaster General J. Edward Day in Charleston, W. Va., January 29, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL, AT THE CHARLESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER IN HONOR OF WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATORS, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 29, 1963

I am happy to have this early opportunity to congratulate West Virginians on the 100th anniversary of your State. We are going to issue a commemorative stamp marking the centennial, on June 20 in Wheeling.

Second, I have enjoyed coming to West Virginia, to Capon Springs, for family weekends. We were there to help my old friend, W. Willard Wirtz, and his family, celebrate his appointment as Secretary of Labor. He has been going there for 20 years.

In addition, as a New Frontiersman, I have a personal and sentimental interest in West Virginia. Two hundred years ago my great-great-grandfather, John Day, was an old frontiersman right in this area and fought the Indians.

He settled in what is now Pocahontas County and fought in the Revolution, on the frontier.

It was not until 1832 that Congress authorized pensions for Revolutionary War veterans and my ancestor filed for his at age 91.

Sometimes people say that government today is complex and bureaucratic. But, you should see the complicated, lengthy application that old gentleman had to file in 1833. He had to give his whole life history. I have a copy of it which I obtained from the National Archives. Here is a section from his application:

"The Shawnee Indians had * * * killed my brother David Day and taken my mother and two sisters, Sally Day and Martha Day, prisoners, and also took some other property and made for their towns. The first night the Indians camped on a mountain, between Cape Capen River and Cedar Creek, and at that camp killed my mother, Susan Day * * *. And Captain Fry raised 20 men, of which I was one. We followed said Indians, and when we came to the Indian camp aforesaid, there lay my mother dead, and stripped naked, her head skinned; and we lifted her and laid her between two rocks and laid some rocks over her; and we followed on after the Indians, and the second day came in sight of them at their camp. I saw one of my sisters rise up right before the muzzle of my gun between me and the Indian; and I was so alarmed at seeing my sister rise before my gun that I involuntarily hollowed, which so alarmed the Indians that they broke and run, leaving the prisoners, and what they had at the camp, and run with all their might. And we got the prisoners, and what property the Indians left at the camp, and brought all safe to the fort."

The man whom this hotel is named after—Daniel Boone—was an Indian fighter of much greater note than my grandfather. Boone blazed a trail across to Kentucky which was at that time known as the dark and bloody land. After losing his holdings in Kentucky he moved back to West Virginia. In 1791, he was elected to represent Kanawha County in the general assembly.

As more and more people joined the westward migration, the Old Dominion became

conscious of the needs of her western inhabitants.

Regular communication with the East was made possible by the creation of post offices at Morgantown and Wheeling in 1794, at Greenbrier Court House and West Liberty by 1797, at Clarksburg in 1798 and at Union at 1800.

A post office was established at Kanawha Courthouse sometime before 1801. (The name of the office was not changed to Charleston until 1879.)

Our ledgers show that Postmaster James A. Lewis, who served from 1822 to 1852, received total remuneration of \$147.85 in 1829. Total receipts of the office were about \$250 a year.

I am happy to say that the receipts of the Charleston Post Office are now a good deal larger. I am also happy to say—and I am sure Charleston's present Postmaster, Jim Lakin, shares my gratification on this—that his compensation is measurably higher than was Postmaster Lewis'.

The Post Office Department today is the largest service establishment on earth. We have a payroll of \$10 million a day—with 587,000 full-time employees in 45,000 locations.

We handle 68 billion pieces of mail a year—over half the world's total. We make use of over 90,000 vehicles. We perform services for 10 other Federal agencies, such as registering 2½ million aliens annually—since we are the only department with employees and locations in every village, town and major neighborhood.

I am proud that the Post Office Department is doing a better and more efficient job in carrying the Nation's mail than ever before. Our productivity is climbing steadily.

America has made significant strides forward in the last 2 years. The last 22 months have seen uninterrupted economic recovery.

The gross national product has risen by 12 percent and inflation has been brought under control. Employment has increased by 1.3 million. Profits, personal income, and living standards have never been higher.

Even so, we are not doing well enough. As President Kennedy said in his state of the Union speech: "We cannot be satisfied to rest here. This is the side of the hill, not the top. The mere absence of recession is not growth. We have made a beginning—but we have only begun."

Our economy is capable of producing \$30 to \$40 billion more than we are producing today. Business earnings could be \$7 to \$8 billion higher. Existing plant and equipment is not being fully utilized.

Certainly we cannot be complacent about the continuing high rate of unemployment. It was 5.6 percent in December and has remained above 5 percent for 61 out of the last 62 months.

The major attack on unemployment must be increased demand. Other measures, however, are needed as well. Many able-bodied workers have skills which have become outmoded. Others remain unemployed because they and their families are too far from the places where jobs are opening up. The Manpower Development and Training Act, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the "adjustment" provisions of the Trade Expansion Act passed by the last Congress were aimed at bringing about a better balance between job skills and job requirements. Further measures may be needed if "structural" unemployment is to be reduced to a tolerable level.

Unemployed young people are one of our most serious national problems. We are faced with the prospect of between 7 and 8 million youngsters dropping out of school and coming onto the labor market in this decade. The great success the Peace Corps—which is comprised mainly of young men and women—has achieved overseas has sug-

gested the utility of a similar corps, working in the areas of our own community needs—in slums, in hospitals, in centers for the aged, in schools for the illiterate and handicapped, etc. President Kennedy will ask Congress to enact legislation setting up such a corps this year.

To cure the chronic slackness in our economy, President Kennedy last Thursday sent specific Federal tax cut proposals to the Congress. The last decade has clearly taught us that budget deficits are not caused so much by increases in Government spending as by sluggish economic growth and periodic recessions. Our present Federal tax system, which is largely a legacy from World War II, is unduly burdensome. It siphons out of the private economy too big a share of personal and business purchasing power, and reduces the financial incentives for personal effort, investment and risktaking.

The chronic deficits of recent years have been caused not so much by too little taxes, or by too much spending, as they have been caused by a sluggish economy. It is, as President Kennedy said last month, "a paradoxical truth that tax rates are too high today and tax revenues are too low, and the soundest way to raise revenues, in the long run, is to cut rates now."

Our real aim, in the President's tax proposal, is to help balance the economy. Tax cuts in 1954 were followed by a higher total of Federal tax revenue.

The administration's proposals do not involve a quickie tax cut or a temporary shot in the arm to the economy. They represent a permanent program to expand the incentives and opportunities for greater private expenditures, for fuller use of industrial capacity, and for higher employment.

The President has made clear that this tax proposal is the top priority item on his program at the present time. The general principle of tax reduction has support from liberal economists and it has support from conservative business groups. But in between are many doubters—many men of little faith.

Some of those who oppose the tax cut say, cut Federal expenditures by an equal amount. Let us insist they tell us just where. Do they want to junk the space effort? Do they think we should spend less on defense and give up having a military position second to none? Do they want to hurry along the alarming trend toward bankruptcy for small farmers? Do they want to return to isolationism?

In 1939, 44 percent of our Federal budget went for labor, education, and welfare. Today that figure is only 7 percent. We are today using 79 percent of our Federal budget to pay for past wars and to prepare for and to attempt to prevent future wars.

Let us insist that those who oppose the President's tax proposal tell us their alternative for restoring buoyancy to our economy. Let us find out if they are among the pessimists who are believers in the so-called matured economy theory and if they think there is nothing that can be done or should be done about an unemployment rate persisting above 5 percent for 61 out of the last 62 months.

The early settlers on the Virginia frontier, in what is now West Virginia, faced challenge and struggle. Some turned back. Some were afraid. But most moved ahead and built a great State and a great nation.

Let me mention one statistic which hammers home why we have to grow and move ahead. Today there are about 3½ million students in college in the United States. It is estimated that by 1985—in just 22 years—there will be 12 million students in college. Just to provide the physical plant for this surge of new college entrants will cost nearly \$90 billion.

Some throw up their hands at such a figure as this and say: "It can't be done." "Where

will the money come from?" "We will have to be satisfied with less."

But all those same things could have been said a century ago when this great State was new. In 1870, in the entire United States, only 8,000 students graduated from college. Last year it was over 50 times that many.

We must cast off old slogans, old inertia, and old doubts. We must think brave and think big.

Speaking last year at Yale University, President Kennedy said:

"As every past generation has had to disenchant itself from an inheritance of truism and stereotype, so in our own time we must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult, but essential confrontation of reality."

For the great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie—deliberate, contrived, and dishonest—but the myth—persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic. Too often we hold fast to the clichés of our forebears.

The dynamic age in which we live requires vital adjustments to new ideas. The challenges that face us are gigantic—but the opportunities are exciting.

We are a resourceful nation and an energetic people.

We are not afraid of government. We are not afraid to use its powers—at local, State, and Federal levels—to advance the cause of the greatest good for the greatest number.

I am confident we shall boldly meet the challenges of a changing and expanding world, and fill the needs of Americans in the 1960's.

An Anniversary for a Great Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the 50th anniversary of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith was observed in a memorable way last week. On a television broadcast, President Kennedy and others joined in tribute to this great organization. Those of us who saw the program will remember it as a dramatic, moving occasion which forcefully reminded us of the common quest we have in this Nation for full equality of opportunity and full equality of treatment for all Americans.

To those of us from New Jersey, the evening was made all the more memorable by the fact that a New Jersey native, Dore Schary, was closely associated with the television production. Mr. Schary has always raised his voice in admirable causes; he has fought discrimination and injustice in many ways. His election as national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League on February 3 was a welcome, logical development.

Mr. President, we can be proud of the B'nai B'rith, and we can be grateful for the vigilance its Anti-Defamation League has maintained for the benefit of all citizens. President Kennedy commented briefly on this at the close of the television broadcast. His message was very much to the point. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the *RECORD*, together with a Washington Post story

describing the election of Mr. Schary on February 4.

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

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 50TH ANNUAL MEETING ANTIDEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH, SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Schultz, Mr. Vice President, Mr. Schary, members of the Supreme Court, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to receive this award from an organization which, on its 50th anniversary, should, itself, be receiving an honor for distinguished contribution to the enrichment of America's democratic legacy. Your tireless pursuit of equality of treatment for all Americans has made a lasting and substantial contribution to our democracy.

The men who first shaped the democratic legacy that you honor tonight were filled with a sense of commitment and of wonder at the importance of the events in which they were participating. It was not only as John Adams exulted, that they were to have the unique opportunity to write a new Constitution and form a new Government and begin a new Nation; it was also the deep conviction, as later expressed by Walt Whitman, that here we have planted the standard of freedom, and here we will test the capacities of men for self-government.

America was to be the great experiment, a testing ground for political liberty, a model for democratic government, and although the first task was to mold a nation on these principles here on this continent, we would also lead the fight against its tyranny on all continents. In short, wrote Jefferson to Adams, "The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble energies of despotism." Although Jefferson also foresaw that to attain liberty in other parts of the globe, years of desolation must pass over.

Almost two centuries have passed since a small, weak nation, a beachhead on a continent, began the great experiment of democracy in the world where government by the consent—it is almost 11 o'clock where government by consent of the governed was extinguished for 2,000 years. As Jefferson prophesied, there have been many years of desolation and destruction. It seems to me that it is our responsibility in this year of change and hope to prove that we are equal to this great inheritance, to make it possible for the four freedoms which Franklin Roosevelt so eloquently described in another time of peril and danger 20 years ago—to make sure that those four freedoms, indeed the great concept of indivisible freedom, are made available to all of our people, to all of our citizens, and to bear our part of the burden as we have for so many years in making that great concept available to all people.

This is a great inheritance. It is a proud privilege to be a citizen of the great Republic, to hear its songs sung, to realize that we are the descendants of 40 million people, who left other countries, other familiar scenes, to come here to the United States to build a new life, to make a new opportunity for themselves and their children.

I think it is not a burden, but a privilege to have the chance in 1963 to share that great concept which they felt so deeply among all of our people, to make this really, as it was for them, a new world, a new world for us, and, indeed, for all those who look to us.

That is what this organization has stood for for 50 years. That is what this country has stood for for 200 years, and that is what this country will continue to stand for.

Thank you.

PLAYWRIGHT DORE SCHARY IS ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

(By William Raspberry)

Dore Schary, 58-year-old author of "Sunrise at Campobello," was elected national chairman yesterday of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith at the closing session of the League's 5-day, 50th annual meeting at the Sheraton-Park.

Schary, producer as well as playwright, has been active in Anti-Defamation League affairs since 1937, when he helped organize a chapter in Los Angeles to combat Fascist activities.

Now living and writing in New York, Newark-born Schary was one of the first Hollywood figures to take a public political stand when he campaigned for presidential nominee Adlai Stevenson and other Democratic candidates.

While refusing to say he started a trend for taking political positions in the film capital, he acknowledges that he "helped move many Hollywood people away from their splendid comfort and brought them out of political hiding."

"Problems are creeping up all over America—sensitive problems, rightwing groups, extremists," Schary said in an interview. "We must take open and full opposition in any way we can."

He feels that Anti-Defamation League's fight in these areas has been sound and said he plans to broaden these programs.

His participation in political and inter-group problems does not hinder his work, Schary said.

"Anybody who achieves any sort of reputation in any field—business, arts or science—has an obligation to participate in the world around him," he said. "Any creative person finds himself deeply embroiled with the pain of the world we're living in."

Anti-Defamation League's new president admits to an element of enlightened self-interest in this: "What affects James Meredith in Oxford affects me as a Jew. All members of minority groups have to fight for the rights of all the others."

Despite Schary's involvement in the fight against bigotry and injustice, he does not want to see minorities absorbed.

"If we could cure anti-Semitism once and for all by evaporating our individuality," he said, "I'd be against such a cure." He said he would prefer a society in which group differences are accepted without prejudice rather than a society of standardized Americans.

Expenditures and Personnel in the Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most confusing and complex problems facing a Member of Congress every year is the spending and lending programs of the executive branch of our Government.

While our colleagues who serve on the Committee on Appropriations have both the opportunity and responsibility to grasp the details of these programs, many on legislative committees find a great deal of confusion and conflicting claims to be in existence.

This situation is particularly true in the case of expenditures on agriculture and agricultural resources. The many programs administered by the Department of Agriculture are financed in a variety of methods ranging from the conventional appropriation process and the collection of import duties to Treasury borrowing.

As a result of these different methods used and the necessity for periodic supplemental appropriations, it is often quite difficult to get an accurate picture of the Department's fiscal affairs.

In order for Members of Congress, farmers, and the general public to have a more complete understanding of the fiscal affairs of this great Federal agency, I requested Dr. Walter Wilcox, senior agricultural specialist of the Library of Congress, to compile a set of financial data concerning the Department of Agriculture which I hope will help clarify some of the confusion which exists.

At the outset, let me point out the very basic fact that a great part of the expenditures by the Department of Agriculture are not earmarked for farmers alone. Many programs and expenditures are for the benefit of all our citizens and, in some instances, for the major benefit of nonfarmers. Foreign assistance, conservation, flood control, resource development, meat inspection, research, disease and pest control, school milk and school lunch, and surplus food distribution are examples of programs for the overall benefit of our Nation. In addition, the Department administers a number of loan programs which return almost all of the original outlay.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert copies of my correspondence with Dr. Wilcox along with some explanatory comments:

JANUARY 10, 1963.

DR. WALTER WILCOX,
Senior Agricultural Specialist, Legislative
Reference Service, Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WILCOX: As we move into the 88th Congress, I feel it is important that we have at our disposal an accurate and objective picture of the expenditures by the Federal Government for American agriculture, both in the past and at present. I would therefore appreciate your assistance in compiling some accurate and comparable facts in this area.

In particular, this is what I would like to know:

1. The total expenditures of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (including the U.S. Forest Service) by fiscal years from 1933 through 1963 (estimated) along with the projected expenditures for fiscal 1964 on a basis comparable to the data set forth in the attached table which appeared in this week's issue of the American Farm Bureau Federation Newsletter.

2. The total expenditures by USDA by commodity or program for activities designed to enhance farm income from fiscal year 1933 through fiscal year 1963 (estimated) along with the projected expenditures for fiscal 1964.

3. The total value of the following crops produced in 1962: (a) corn, (b) oats, (c) rye, (d) barley, (e) sorghum, (f) wheat, (g) cotton, (h) rice, (i) peanuts, (j) tobacco, (k) soybeans, (l) dairy products.

4. The number of employees in the U.S. Department of Agriculture on June 30 each year from 1933 to 1963 (estimated).

5. The total Federal debt by fiscal years from fiscal 1933 to fiscal 1964 (estimated) along with the budgetary surplus or deficit incurred in each of those years.

If you have any other information on this general subject which you believe is pertinent, I would appreciate having it, too.

I enjoyed very much seeing you at Ames last month.

With best wishes for a happy new year, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Member of Congress,
6th District of Iowa.

TABLE 1.—USDA appropriations (fiscal year)
[Millions of dollars]

Item	1960	1961	1962	1963
Special milk program	66.7	74.7	90.0	1200.0
School lunch	110.0	155.0	170.0	170.0
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	40.5	43.6	44.0	95.4
Sugar Act program	71.5	74.5	78.0	77.7
Public Law 480, titles I and II	1,072.5	988.1	1,013.0	1,330.6
Wheat	63.9	32.6	159.5	81.2
Barter	129.0	423.0	288.2	125.0
Surplus commodities (sec. 32)	251.4	320.0	325.9	324.0
Wool	50.1	67.2	75.3	65.0
Feed grain administrative costs			18.5	(?)
Conservation reserve	335.0	330.0	312.0	300.0
ACP	241.5	242.0	238.0	212.9
CCC losses	2,043.7	1,151.8	1,017.6	2,278.5
Total (support programs)	4,475.9	3,902.4	5,820.0	5,260.3
General activities and loan authorization	958.0	823.6	1,292.1	1,436.4
Total	5,433.8	4,726.1	7,122.1	6,696.7

¹ Includes reimbursement of \$95,000,000 to CCC and appropriation of \$105,000,000 to put program on pay-as-you-go basis for current year.

² Established as a consolidated appropriation item under the head "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service," for items formerly appropriated for within the items of "Acreage Allotments and Quotas" through "Special Agricultural Conservation and Adjustment Programs" for administrative expense costs.

³ Congress appropriated funds to reimburse CCC expenditures and to put program on a pay-as-you-go basis. This budget item covers the following types of programs: (1) price support; (2) commodity export; (3) storage facilities; (4) supply and foreign purchase; (5) feed grain, special program; (6) wheat stabilization program; and (7) special activities. This amount includes \$2,066,955,000 for net realized losses, on price support activities in 1961, plus \$211,500,000 to reimburse a part of realized losses due to revaluation of inventory to reflect acquisition value. The sum of \$211,500,000 is included in the 1963 appropriation to restore to CCC's operating funds over a six-year period the \$1,069 million involved in the inventory adjustment. The procedure adjusts the book value of commodity inventories to remove costs incurred for storage, handling, and transportation of such inventories.

⁴ Special feed grain and wheat programs costs are included in CCC and export program financing.

⁵ Excludes Forest Service.

Dr. Wilcox replied to my original letter as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1963.

To: Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN.
From: Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture.
Subject: Letter of January 10 requesting statistical information on the Department of Agriculture.

The attached table includes statistical information in response to items 4 and 5 in your letter of January 10, 1963.

Budget officers in the Department of Agriculture inform me that it may take perhaps another 2 weeks to prepare the basic data requested under items 1 and 2, unless the request is put on a time urgency basis. If you need the information at an earlier date,

let me know, and I will try to meet your deadline.

TABLE 2.—U.S. public debt, budget surplus or deficit, and number of employees in the Department of Agriculture, 1933 to 1964 (estimated)

Fiscal year	Public debt at end of fiscal year ¹	Budget surplus or deficit at end of fiscal year ¹	Number of employees in the Department of Agriculture at end of fiscal year ²
	Billions	Billions	
1933	\$22.5	-\$2.6	33,233
1934	27.0	-3.6	54,208
1935	28.7	-2.8	55,114
1936	33.8	-4.4	82,302
1937	36.4	-2.8	80,125
1938	37.2	-1.2	84,031
1939	40.4	-3.9	86,250
1940	43.0	-3.9	81,886
1941	49.0	-6.2	90,169
1942	72.4	-21.5	91,141
1943	136.7	-57.4	104,510
1944	201.0	-51.4	77,720
1945	258.7	-53.9	81,984
1946	269.4	-20.7	96,590
1947	258.3	+8	87,483
1948	252.3	+8.4	82,134
1949	252.8	-1.2	86,247
1950	257.4	-3.1	84,097
1951	255.2	+3.5	81,350
1952	259.1	-4.0	78,559
1953	266.0	-9.4	78,404
1954	271.3	-3.1	76,276
1955	274.4	-4.2	85,503
1956	272.8	+1.6	89,398
1957	270.5	+1.6	95,998
1958	276.3	-2.8	101,139
1959	284.7	-12.4	97,220
1960	286.3	+1.2	98,694
1961	289.0	-3.9	102,557
1962	298.2	-6.4	110,511
1963	303.5	-8.8	116,268
1964	315.6	-11.9	121,583

¹ U.S. Bureau of the Budget. "The Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1963." Washington, January 1963, p. 63.

² U.S. Bureau of the Census. "Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1938-62."

³ Employment figures for December.

⁴ U.S. Department of Agriculture.

⁵ U.S. Budget, 1964. Washington, 1963, p. 422.

⁶ Estimated.

I then replied to Dr. Wilcox as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1963.

DR. WALTER W. WILCOX,
Senior Specialist in Agriculture, Legislative
Reference Service, Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. WILCOX: Thank you for your memorandum of January 18 in response to my request for statistical information concerning the Department of Agriculture. I very much appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Your memorandum indicates that the additional information requested will be furnished in several weeks. However, since other members of the Committee on Agriculture have asked me to obtain this data in their behalf also, and since we need it urgently at this time, I would be pleased if you could ask the Department to try to get it by the end of this week.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Member of Congress, Sixth District
of Iowa.

Dr. Wilcox then replied as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1963.

To: Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
From: Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture.

Subject: cost of farm programs.

Attached are tables showing the realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income for 12 major farm commodities, 1932 to 1961. The Department of Agriculture has not worked up similar data for fiscal 1962, and it is not possible to

make reliable estimates for the fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964.

Also attached are the values of selected crops in 1962.

On receiving your letter of January 21, I asked the Office of Budget and Finance to try and have the other data you requested available by the end of this week. They

agreed to do their best and thought it would be possible. I will forward the USDA expenditure data to you as soon as it is available.

TABLE 3.—Appropriations and REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1964

[Figures in parentheses () not included in totals. Adjusted for comparability with the appropriation structure in 1961]

[In millions]

	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943
Agricultural Research Service.....	\$33.8	\$32.0	\$28.9	\$33.0	\$57.0	\$52.7	\$56.4	\$53.7	\$50.9	\$46.1	\$48.2
Extension Service.....	10.3	10.2	9.5	17.5	17.9	18.3	18.8	19.4	19.3	19.7	19.8
Farmer Cooperative Service.....	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4
Soil Conservation Service.....	.4	.4	.3	6.0	21.3	21.2	27.1	23.0	20.1	26.8	22.6
Agricultural Marketing Service:											
School lunch program.....								(12.4)	(15.3)	(23.1)	(15.3)
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec 32).....				92.1	109.1	125.1	144.0	205.5	235.5	222.5	175.3
Other.....	6.8	6.2	5.4	5.7	6.6	6.6	7.3	7.8	8.1	8.3	9.0
Foreign Agricultural Service.....	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3
Commodity Exchange Authority.....	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.5	.6	.6	.6	.6	.5
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:											
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas.....											
Sugar Act program.....					469.0	429.1	494.8	555.4	461.4	494.7	444.6
Agricultural conservation program.....											
Parity payments.....											
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.....							25.4	5.8	25.4	8.4	8.4
Rural Electrification Administration, including loan authorizations.....			15.4		50.8	31.3	142.1	42.4	103.1	103.7	13.0
Farmers Home Administration, including loan authorizations.....	0.5	40.0		2.0	53.0	12.9	260.1	249.5	281.2	279.9	207.1
Office of the General Counsel.....	.3	.2	0.4	.5	.9	1.2	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.3	1.9
Office of Information.....	.9	.7	.6	.7	.8	.8	.8	.9	.9	1.3	1.1
National Agricultural Library.....	.2	.3	.2	.3	.3	.3	.4	.4	.4	.5	.5
General administration.....	.7	.7	.6	.7	1.1	1.1	1.4	1.5	1.7	2.0	1.9
Forest Service.....	18.2	13.5	12.5	17.7	24.1	37.0	46.5	35.6	30.6	37.5	33.6
Commodity Credit Corporation:											
Restoration of capital impairment.....						94.3		119.6		1.6	
Special activities financed from CCC funds.....						(0.5)	(0.7)	(2.0)	(2.3)	(3.5)	(4.4)
Corporate administrative expense limitation.....											
Other funds.....	100.0	428.6	791.5	470.9			1.8			47.4	45.6
Deduct amounts included in above figures transferred for Pay Act costs.....											
Total, Department of Agriculture.....	173.0	533.4	865.9	647.9	812.7	873.0	1,496.3	1,596.7	1,501.6	1,563.6	1,086.4

[In millions]

	1944	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Agricultural Research Service.....	\$45.9	\$52.0	\$52.7	\$58.7	\$60.2	\$75.6	\$80.0	\$77.0	\$88.8	\$79.2	\$80.0
Extension Service.....	19.8	19.9	24.4	28.4	28.8	32.2	33.5	33.5	33.5	33.6	35.3
Farmer Cooperative Service.....	.4	.4	.4	.5	.5	.5	.5	.6	.4	.4	.4
Soil Conservation Service.....	22.8	28.6	34.6	46.7	41.7	53.6	62.1	59.1	69.3	66.6	71.9
Agricultural Marketing Service:											
School lunch program.....	(50.0)	(57.5)	(57.5)	81.0	70.0	75.0	83.5	83.5	83.4	83.4	83.2
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec 32).....	97.1	119.3	114.3	116.2	84.0	57.9	125.6	111.2	158.9	181.0	172.4
Other.....	9.6	10.0	10.2	14.1	15.3	18.4	19.5	19.9	19.7	20.0	22.4
Foreign Agricultural Service.....	.6	.5	.6	.7	.6	.7	.8	.8	.7	.8	2.4
Commodity Exchange Authority.....	.4	.4	.3	.5	.5	.6	.6	.7	.7	.7	.7
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:											
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas.....				1.9	5.1	14.9	30.1	23.0	10.0	10.0	43.3
Sugar Act program.....	63.9	52.5	48.4	53.5	55.0	72.0	60.0	63.8	70.0	65.0	59.6
Agricultural conservation program.....	400.1	302.6	355.8	312.5	223.1	145.0	257.0	256.5	291.0	251.7	227.0
Parity payments.....	170.3										
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.....	3.5	33.4	8.3	27.3	15.0	4.5	5.1	7.1	7.9	8.5	7.5
Rural Electrification Administration, including loan authorizations.....	22.6	28.3	304.7	235.6	405.0	406.0	502.1	305.3	133.5	100.8	248.1
Farmers Home Administration, including loan authorizations.....	180.8	155.5	192.5	179.5	104.8	115.2	156.2	176.1	212.4	193.3	338.7
Office of the General Counsel.....	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.6	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.6
Office of Information.....	1.0	.8	.7	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3
National Agricultural Library.....	.5	.6	.5	.6	.7	.7	.7	.6	.6	.6	.6
General administration.....	2.2	1.8	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.3
Forest Service.....	49.8	44.3	52.5	72.4	73.9	73.5	80.9	84.3	98.7	104.3	108.0
Commodity Credit Corporation:											
Restoration of capital impairment.....		256.8		1,563.3				66.7	421.5	109.4	96.2
Special activities financed from CCC funds.....				10.8	30.5	34.0			109.5	193.4	178.8
Corporate administrative expense limitation.....	(5.4)	(7.2)	(8.9)	(8.8)	(8.5)	(10.8)	(15.4)	(19.1)	(16.5)	(16.5)	(20.0)
Other funds.....	69.2	57.3	44.2	24.4	4.4				1.5	2.0	
Deduct amounts included in above figures transferred for pay Act costs.....				-15.6		-2.2	-2				
Total, Department of Agriculture.....	1,153.4	1,166.9	1,249.2	2,839.1	1,224.5	1,183.5	1,503.8	1,375.9	1,817.8	1,510.4	1,782.3

[In millions]

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963 ¹	Budget estimates, 1964
Agricultural Research Service.....	\$70.1	\$76.5	\$112.8	\$104.7	\$141.0	\$146.6	\$171.3	\$165.3	\$179.1	\$186.7
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service.....	19.6	25.0	30.0	30.9	32.1	32.1	33.2	36.2	38.2	40.4
Extension Service.....	43.6	49.1	54.1	60.3	63.9	64.1	67.4	70.8	75.8	77.3
Farmer Cooperative Service.....	.7	.8	.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.3
Soil Conservation Service.....	75.1	84.9	97.2	124.1	134.7	133.2	155.2	178.6	193.3	210.0
Economic Research Service.....	4.7	5.9	7.3	7.8	8.2	8.1	8.7	9.1	9.5	10.3
Statistical Reporting Service.....	4.7	5.1	5.5	6.2	6.6	6.6	8.1	8.8	10.0	11.6
Agricultural Marketing Service:										
School lunch program.....	83.2	83.2	100.0	100.0	110.0	110.0	110.0	125.0	125.0	137.0
Special milk program.....									105.0	102.0
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities (sec 32).....	180.1	166.8	200.0	220.9	235.9	251.4	320.0	325.8	318.1	361.5
Other.....	16.0	16.7	18.2	22.7	29.8	33.5	35.8	41.1	43.1	46.7
Foreign Agricultural Service.....	2.2	14.3	7.2	10.6	9.1	8.7	17.5	15.9	21.1	19.0
Commodity Exchange Authority.....	.7	.8	.8	.9	.9	.9	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—Appropriations and REA and FHA loan authorizations, fiscal years 1933 through 1964—Continued

	[In millions]									
	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963 ¹	Budget estimates, 1964
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:										
Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service	\$65.0	\$63.6	\$67.1	\$118.0	\$104.2	\$88.1	\$87.6	\$105.1	\$95.4	\$114.9
Sugar Act program	58.1	58.0	65.8	65.5	73.8	69.2	72.0	75.8	77.7	80.0
Agricultural conservation program	169.2	191.5	203.2	187.3	209.8	214.7	212.9	209.0	212.9	220.0
Conservation reserve program				147.3	183.8	316.6	317.6	300.7	300.0	294.0
Acres reserved program				565.6	590.6					
Land use adjustment										27.0
Emergency conservation measures			4.0	20.0				5.0		
Other		2.2	2.0	29.7	24.5	50.1	67.2	75.2	69.2	69.0
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	6.0	6.2	19.2	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.6	6.5	6.8	7.2
FCIC fund (operating expenses payable from premium income)		(1.5)	(2.0)	(2.0)	(2.3)	(2.3)	(2.6)	(2.8)	(3.3)	(3.5)
Rural Electrification Administration, including loan authorizations	252.4	243.1	522.6	248.1	419.1	249.6	320.0	417.5	490.5	506.3
Farmers Home Administration, including loan authorizations	176.9	199.3	713.3	239.7	252.7	256.7	500.0	380.4	375.7	406.7
Office of Rural Areas Development									.1	.1
Office of the General Counsel	2.4	2.7	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.9	4.0
Office of Information	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.7
Centennial observance of agriculture								.1		
National Agricultural Library	.6	.6	.7	.7	.8	.8	1.0	1.0	1.2	2.2
General administration	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.4	4.0
Forest Service	112.8	130.4	153.0	168.2	181.6	208.4	317.9	286.8	274.7	310.3
Commodity Credit Corporation:										
Price support, supply, and related activities	550.2	1.6	906.9	1,194.2	1,703.4	2,043.7	1,151.8	936.4	2,278.5	2,799.4
Special milk program			22.4	45.6	57.0	66.7	74.7	171.2	95.0	
Special activities financed from CCC funds	2.1	117.3	13.2	605.0	19.4	1.1				
Limitation on administrative expenses	(25.3)	(30.8)	(33.0)	(35.4)	(39.6)	(42.4)	(45.7)	(47.9)	(43.2)	(43.9)
Foreign assistance programs	129.6	66.9	257.2	2,550.0	1,315.8	1,265.4	1,443.6	3,460.6	1,576.9	2,429.8
Deduct amounts included in above figures transferred for Pay Act and other costs	-2.8	-1.0	-4.0	-9.9	-28.9				-8.0	
Total, Department of Agriculture	2,026.5	1,613.3	3,587.0	6,878.5	5,894.5	5,641.2	5,510.1	7,418.5	6,975.8	8,481.7

¹ Includes anticipated supplementals and transfers for Pay Act and postal costs.

Source: Office of Budget and Finance, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

NOTE.—Figures may not add to totals shown due to rounding.

TABLE 4.—Realized cost of programs primarily for stabilization of farm prices and income, major commodities, fiscal years 1932-61

["Realized cost" means the net cost incurred to date; it does not include anticipated gains or losses from stocks in inventory. Costs reflect the realized losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, value of commodities shipped to foreign countries under Public Law 480 less proceeds from sales of foreign currencies, and sec. 32 programs.]

	[In millions of dollars]											
Fiscal year	Total feed grains	Cotton and cottonseed	Wheat	Rice	Tobacco	Peanuts	Dairy products	Potatoes	Rye	Flax, flaxseed, and linseed oil	Dry edible beans	Wool
1932-39	292.0	790.3	346.5	19.9	33.2	6.0	45.6	11.2		2.1	4.8	12.3
1940	160.7	264.1	171.7	6.4	7.2	1.3	17.8	5.8			1.6	
1941	148.9	264.1	121.8	3.3	14.4	8.3	14.8	16.4		.1	6.9	
1942	144.2	121.8	124.9	3.3	16.5	1.1	29.4	15.0			7.8	
1943	195.7	60.1	124.4	.5	10.2	1.7	10.4	34.5		.1	3.3	
1944	129.1	47.2	163.6	.6	4.2	1.2	3.7	8.5	1.3		.2	.6
1945	8.2	119.7	16.1		1.2	1.4		13.2		.1	.7	1.1
1946	17.7	129.0	3.0		1.4			16.9			.1	14.2
1947	1.4	6.9	1.9		6.2			88.8		22.5		33.4
1948		2.8	1.2			1.7		67.5			.1	19.6
1949	4.4	4.7	8.4			36.2	1.7	214.5		.2	.1	13.6
1950	35.8	6.6	114.4	1.6	1.4	47.4	27.0	77.6		3.1	.1	10.8
1951	35.1	127.5	201.6	.1	1.2	17.6	46.0	58.7	.2	58.6	11.7	1.1
1952	1.7	13.2	174.6	1.1	2.3	10.6	5.3	.1		4.7	15.4	.1
1953	22.0	16.7	148.7	.3	2.2	4.8	25.7	.1		1.4	6.8	
1954	102.3	48.3	193.3	1.6	.5	25.1	172.0	2.1	.1	51.3	8.3	.5
1955	125.8	92.7	400.6	10.4	5.1	3.5	133.1	.5	2.8	22.8	13.6	.7
1956	246.1	158.3	499.4	38.5	5.0	10.5	166.6	5.0	7.6	7.7	10.6	7.3
1957	455.2	648.7	768.9	117.5	13.8	18.7	109.6	4.1	5.4	2.5	9.9	66.7
1958	511.6	574.2	693.1	60.0	34.5	12.8	172.4	2.6	3.2	15.5	.8	58.0
1959	620.4	396.7	511.4	43.8	32.4	19.5	134.7	7.3	7.4	1.4	1.7	16.1
1960	267.3	507.6	537.5	50.8	7.8	17.4	78.2	.1	2.5	1.2	.3	85.2
1961	1,481.6	463.8	1,350.6	50.1	4.7	33.7	180.9	1.0	5.0	.2	1.9	53.9
Total	4,980.0	4,372.8	6,671.4	385.6	201.4	279.1	1,374.5	651.5	34.2	199.7	107.6	302.9

¹ Represents income or minus expenditures.

Source: USDA Office of Budget and Finance Appendix Tables, December 1959 and later unpublished data.

TABLE 5.—Value of production of selected farm commodities, 1962¹

	[In millions]
Corn for grain	\$3,923
Oats	640
Barley	395
Sorghum grain	506
Rye	40
Wheat	2,205
Rice	323
Cotton	2,383
Tobacco	1,352
Peanuts	200
Soybeans	1,563
Dairy products	4,870

¹ Preliminary.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 1963.

In regard to the table showing total USDA spending, you will note that the Office of Budget and Finance of the Department has compiled a detailed statement of USDA spending and lending for 30 years.

In regard to the table on realized costs by commodities, a word of explanation is in order. As reflected in the table, the realized cost does not include anticipated gains or losses from stocks in inventory. It also reflects the value of Public Law 480 shipments which in many instances are grants on loans of foreign currency. It should also be noted

that this chart goes only through fiscal year 1961.

Later, my office contacted Dr. Wilcox in regard to obtaining the 1962, 1963, and estimated 1964 figures, and he replied as follows:

From: Legislative Reference Service.

To: Hon. CHARLES HOEVEN.

The attached costs for price supports for fiscal years 1961 and 1962 are based upon unpublished USDA data as indicated in the headings, which are not completely comparable with the realized cost data for earlier years furnished you under date of January 25.

WALTER W. WILCOX.

TABLE 6.—Farm price support costs and value of marketings, specified commodities, fiscal years 1961-62

Commodity	Value of marketings, 1961-62 average	CCC realized losses (excluding Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961-62 average		CCC realized losses (including Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961-62 average		Commodity	Value of marketings, 1961-62 average	CCC realized losses (excluding Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961-62 average		CCC realized losses (including Public Law 480 costs) and sec. 32 removals, 1961-62 average	
		Million dollars	Percent of value of marketings	Million dollars	Percent of value of marketings			Million dollars	Percent of value of marketings	Million dollars	Percent of value of marketings
Feed grains.....	15,439	1,175.0	21.6	1,277.0	23.5	Dairy products.....	4,824	238.0	8.0	240.0	8.3
Cotton.....	2,509	260.0	10.4	438.0	17.5	Wool.....	110	58.0	52.9	58.0	52.9
Peanuts.....	180	25.0	13.8	25.0	13.8	Rye.....	22	2.0	8.8	2.0	8.8
Rice.....	255	47.0	18.5	106.0	41.5	Tung oil.....	6	.5	7.8	.5	7.8
Tobacco.....	1,234	6.0	.5	20.0	1.7	Dry edible beans.....	135	11.0	8.5	13.0	9.3
Wheat.....	2,185	343.0	15.7	1,058.0	48.4	Soybeans and vegetable oil.....	1,339	27.0	2.0	92.0	6.9

¹ Value of feed grain crops produced.

² Includes costs of special school milk program.

Source: Computed from U.S. Department of Agriculture data.

As Dr. Wilcox pointed out, these figures in table 6 are not completely comparable with the realized cost data for earlier years appearing in table 4.

Since the Department states it is not possible at the present time to make reliable estimates for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, I trust that the Committee on Appropriations will be able to determine these costs in their hearings on the appropriations bill for agriculture this session.

Part 6: Let's Keep the Record Straight— A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro—October 22-29, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, this sixth portion of my continued chronology on Cuba and Castro begins with the action by President Kennedy in imposing a sea and air "quarantine" on the shipment of military equipment to Cuba—of which the public was informed on the evening of October 21, 1962, during a nationwide TV broadcast.

It had been apparent for several days to most people in political and government circles, as well as the press, that something unusual was afoot. The return of President Kennedy from his very active speaking tour on behalf of Democrat candidates for House and Senate seats was more or less a tipoff to many that something out of the ordinary was happening.

I believe it is safe to say that the American public, although understandably on edge, gave an almost collective sigh of relief after the broadcast was over. Although many felt the action taken should have been stronger, most were glad at least that it was not weaker. The public, almost to a man, expressed their complete support of the action taken by President Kennedy in finally drawing a definite line of demarcation on what the U.S. Government would tolerate as far as Cuba and the Soviets were concerned. The public had for a long long while been frustrated and uneasy about efforts which had been made for almost a generation to keep a steady

footing and clear head in dealing with the Soviets. The harassment and humiliating thrusts from Castro in Cuba had been almost more than they could take—therefore the action taken by the President amounted at least to an assertion of our national pride—and a natural concern over the safety and welfare of our citizens and the security of our way of life. All seemed relieved that the President had, at long last, "dropped the other shoe." It appeared that this had the effect of welding together formerly warring factions, and we seemed to be joined in a common purpose—to protect our Nation.

This same electric impulse somehow touched many foreign nations who shared our love of freedom, but who had obviously doubted for some time our will to fight for it. One by one, many who previously had engaged in sniping at the United States—accusing us of being too soft—too hard—too vacillating—or too concerned about the whole subject of communism—Latin American countries and NATO allies alike—all lined up behind the United States and expressed approval and support. Although some had to be convinced by photographic proof that a threat really existed in Cuba—such as Great Britain—it did not take too long for the British as well as Mexico and several of the Latin and Central American countries to realize that this threat indeed existed and could swing in many directions—and that whether they liked it or not, their national fortunes were also involved to one degree or another.

The Soviets were, of course, shocked and unbelieving. They accused us of hysteria. Somehow they had formed the opinion that we would not, as a nation, "fight when the chips were down." They seemed to have forgotten or overlooked the fact that many times in the past we had successfully held the line against Soviet advances or threats—such as during the Berlin blockade-airlift, our resumption of nuclear testing after the U.S.S.R. had broken their moratorium, Korea, the Chinese Nationalist Government in Formosa, and so forth. The significance of these stands taken by the United States had somehow been overlooked by the Soviets and they had formed an unflattering opinion of what they termed our "softness" as a nation.

The following chronology of events will refresh our minds on the variety of charges, countercharges, threats and counterthreats, which took place but

through it all, I do not believe the spirit of unity of the American public ever really wavered. They had wanted firm action by the President and others concerned with our national and foreign policy—and were overjoyed that this had taken place. The comment was often heard that if President Kennedy had been running for reelection in the fall campaign, he would win "hands down" against any candidate—and I am fairly sure this was true.

I would like to point out here, however, that if the American public showed their pride in President Kennedy because of his action, the President had even more reason to be proud of the American public. For he had, whether intentionally or not, created an atmosphere not only in foreign countries but in his own as well which can best be described by a paragraph taken from the *Globe and Mail*, Canada's leading conservative newspaper, in an editorial entitled "Mr. Kennedy's Arrogance," and printed on December 31, 1962:

Mr. Kennedy's high-handed attitudes and ruthless methods attracted a great deal of unfavorable comment in the United States and abroad during his campaign for the Presidency. His record in the White House has not been reassuring; often he seems to confuse willfulness with toughness, and bullying with strength.

The chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO—PART 6

October 22, 1962: In a speech of extraordinary gravity, President Kennedy imposed a sea and air "quarantine" last night on the shipment of military equipment to Cuba. Broadcasting to the American people and listeners abroad, he said the Soviet Union was building offensive missile and bomber bases in Cuba. He said the bases could fire medium-range nuclear missiles 2,000 miles. Calling on Premier Khrushchev to withdraw the missiles, he said any launching against a Western Hemisphere nation would be met by retaliation against the Soviet Union. He made clear that Washington would not stop short of military action to end the provocative threat.

American warships and planes quickly put the quarantine into effect and a worldwide alert went out to U.S. forces. Destroyers, submarines, and other units put to sea all along the eastern seaboard to join a large Caribbean fleet, which included 40 ships and 6,000 marines diverted from maneuvers.

After nearly a generation of trying to avoid a direct United States-Soviet confrontation, the United States drew the line—not with Cuba but with the Russians. Mr. Kennedy's order bore out his decision to oust Soviet missiles from his hemisphere at the risk of

war. American ships have orders to attack blockade runners that resist.

Havana radio said Cuba's armed forces were alerted after Mr. Kennedy's speech.

London sources said Britain would approve the quarantine. Canada closed some of its airbases to Soviet planes bound for Cuba.

Moscow radio charges hysteria in Washington. (Foreign Affairs Division, Oct. 22, 1962.)

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE.

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA, OCTOBER
23-25, 1962

October 23, 1962: Soviet Government statement (handed to the U.S. Ambassador in Moscow) warns the United States that its quarantine raises the threat of thermonuclear world war. It says that the Soviet Union has "repeatedly declared that not a single Soviet nuclear bomb would fall either on the United States or on any other country unless an aggression is committed. . . . But if the aggressors touch off a war, the Soviet Union would strike a most powerful retaliatory blow." The statement insists that the weapons provided to Cuba by the Soviet Union were "aimed solely at enhancing Cuba's defense potential." It adds: "The United States demands that military equipment Cuba needs for self-defense should be removed from Cuban territory, a demand which, naturally, no state which values its independence can meet."

The U.S. blockade against ships delivering offensive weapons to Cuba goes into effect. U.S. Secretary of Defense McNamara announces that 25 Soviet merchant ships have been spotted on the way to Cuba, and that the first U.S. Navy contact with these ships will be in 24 hours.

Premier Fidel Castro (in a televised speech) describes the U.S. blockade of Cuba as an act of piracy. He says that Cuba will "never" accept the U.S. plan for a U.N. investigating committee to check on Soviet missile bases in Cuba.

The United States introduces a resolution in the U.N. Security Council calling for the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba.

The Council of the Organization of American States (after granting itself emergency powers as a ministerial-level organ of consultation under provisions of the 1947 Rio Treaty) formally authorizes (by a vote of 19 to 0, with 1 abstention) "the use of armed forces" to carry out the quarantine of Cuba. (Uruguay—which abstains on a technicality due to a delay in instructions from the Montevideo Government adds its affirmative vote.) "[In] the greatest display of Western Hemisphere solidarity since the days of World War II—Latin America acted swiftly to join the United States in recommending all necessary measures to halt the flow of offensive weapons to Cuba from the Soviet bloc."

The British Government expresses "deep concern at the provocative action of the Soviet Union in placing offensive nuclear weapons in Cuba," and declares its support of the U.S. position. "NATO lined up solidly behind the United States. The 14 other members of the NATO Permanent Council at Paris took under urgent consideration the question of a military alert for their forces."

October 24, 1962: U.S. Defense Department announces that some Soviet-bloc ships headed for Cuba appear to have changed their course, while others are still proceeding.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant sends urgent appeals to President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev asking them to suspend, respectively, the blockade and the shipment of arms to Cuba, for a period of 2 or 3 weeks which would allow for negotiations.

In answer to a telegram from the British philosopher and pacifist, Bertrand Russell,

who had appealed to Soviet Premier Khrushchev "not to be provoked by the unjustifiable action of the United States in Cuba," Khrushchev (in his reply) calls on the United States to "display reserve and stay the threat of execution of its piratical threats which are fraught with most serious consequences," and he suggests a summit meeting "in order to discuss all the problems which have arisen, to do everything to remove the danger of unleashing a thermonuclear war."

October 25, 1962:

U.S. Navy intercepts the first Soviet ship (an oil tanker) to penetrate the blockade, and allows it to continue on its way to Cuba after it is determined that it carries no offensive arms.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev accepts U.N. Secretary General U Thant's proposal of October 24 for a suspension of the U.S. blockade and Soviet shipments of arms, and for talks leading to a negotiated solution of the Cuban crisis. President Kennedy (in his reply to U Thant) says that "the existing threat was created by the secret introduction of offensive weapons into Cuba, and the answer lies in the removal of these weapons." He says that the United States is willing to engage in "preliminary talks" with the U.N. to see whether a satisfactory basis can be found for negotiations on the Cuban crisis.

In the U.N. Security Council, U.S. Delegate Adlai Stevenson displays photographic evidence of Soviet missile bases in Cuba, after Soviet delegate Valerian A. Zorin insists that the U.S. assertion is based on false evidence.

Stevenson-Zorin exchange in the U.N. Security Council, October 25, 1962:

Stevenson: "Let me ask you one simple question: Do you deny that the U.S.S.R. has placed and is placing medium- and intermediate-range missiles in Cuba? Yes or no? Do not wait for the translation. Yes or no?"

Zorin: "I am not in an American courtroom, and, therefore, I do not wish to answer a question that is put to me in the fashion of a prosecutor. In due course you will have your reply."

Stevenson: "You are in the courtroom of world opinion right now, and you can answer 'Yes' or 'No.' You have denied that they exist, and I want to know whether I have understood you correctly."

Zorin: "Will you please continue your statement? You will have your answer in due course."

Stevenson: "I am prepared to wait for my answer until hell freezes over, if that is your decision. I am also prepared to present the evidence in this room."

Canadian Government endorses the U.S. position in the Cuban crisis. Prime Minister Diefenbaker says (in the Canadian House of Commons) that the Soviet offensive weapons in Cuba are a direct and immediate menace to Canada and a serious menace to the deterrent and strategic strength of the whole Western alliance on which our security is founded.

British Prime Minister Macmillan (in a speech to the House of Commons on the Cuban crisis) does not specifically endorse the U.S. blockade, but says that the measures taken by President Kennedy are not extreme, since they are designed to meet a situation without precedent. He expresses the hope that a peaceful solution to the crisis will soon be found which will make it possible to move to a wider field of negotiation. However, he adds: "I think what has happened in the last few weeks must confirm our view that in these grave matters we cannot rest upon mere words and promises. These need, if they are to restore confidence, to be independently verified and confirmed."

October 26, 1962: In answer to a new appeal from United Nations Secretary General U Thant, Soviet Premier Khrushchev agrees to keep Soviet ships away from the U.S. blockade area for the time being, and Presi-

dent Kennedy says that he will try to avoid any direct confrontation at sea "in the next few days." Kennedy points out, however, that certain Soviet ships are still proceeding toward Cuba, and that work on Soviet missile bases in Cuba is still continuing.

The White House issues a statement which says: "The development of ballistic missile sites in Cuba continues at a rapid pace. . . . The activity at these sites apparently is directed at achieving a full operational capability as soon as possible . . . there is no evidence to date indicating that there is any intention to dismantle or discontinue work on these missile sites. On the contrary, the Soviets are rapidly continuing the construction of missile support and launch facilities and serious attempts are underway to camouflage their efforts."

The U.S. Navy stops and searches a Soviet-chartered freighter of Lebanese registry. The ship is allowed to proceed to Cuba after no offensive weapons are found on board.

A message from Premier Khrushchev (which is not made public) reaches President Kennedy: "Never explicitly stated, but embedded in the letter was an offer to withdraw the offensive weapons under United Nations supervision in return for a guarantee that the United States would not invade Cuba."

October 27, 1962: President Kennedy receives a second message from Premier Khrushchev (made public in a Moscow broadcast), which proposes that the Soviet Union will dismantle its missile bases in Cuba and withdraw its jet bombers from the island, if the United States will do likewise in Turkey. In his reply to Khrushchev, Kennedy ignores the proposal to link Turkey with Cuba, and bases his answers on Khrushchev's private letter of October 26 which—Kennedy says—contains proposals "which seem generally acceptable," i.e., the Soviet Union would dismantle its bases and remove its offensive weapons from Cuba under U.N. supervision, and would halt further shipment of such weapons to Cuba, and in exchange the United States would end the quarantine and give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. Kennedy adds: "I am confident that other nations of the Western Hemisphere would be prepared to do likewise." Kennedy emphasizes that "the first ingredient . . . is the cessation of work on missile sites in Cuba and measures to render such weapons inoperable, under effective international guarantees. The continuation of this threat, or a prolonging of this discussion concerning Cuba by linking these problems to the broader questions of European and world security, would surely lead to an intensification of the Cuban crisis and a grave risk to the peace of the world."

The White House issues a statement which implicitly rejects Khrushchev's proposed Cuba-Turkey deal: "Several inconsistent and conflicting proposals have been made by the U.S.S.R. within the last 24 hours, including the one just made public in Moscow. The proposal broadcast this morning involved the security of nations outside the Western Hemisphere, but it is the Western Hemisphere countries and they alone that are subject to the threat that has produced the present crisis—the action of the Soviet Government in secretly introducing offensive weapons into Cuba. . . . The first imperative must be to deal with this immediate threat, under which no sensible negotiation can proceed. . . . As to the proposals concerning the security of nations outside this hemisphere, the United States and its allies have long taken the lead in seeking properly inspected arms limitation on both sides. These efforts can continue as soon as the present Soviet-created threat is ended." Well-informed sources [at NATO headquarters in Paris] indicated that they regarded the kind of horse trading proposed by Mr.

Khrushchev as dangerous to Western security and the morale of the Atlantic alliance. It was pointed out that the missile bases in Turkey were put there on the openly proclaimed decision of the heads of government of the NATO states in December, 1957 * * * [and] this was in direct response to repeated threats of employment of Soviet missiles against the West. It would be intolerable, in the opinion of some Western diplomats, to equate this action with the clandestine installation of Soviet missiles in Cuba at a time when the highest Soviet officials were proclaiming that none but defensive arms were being supplied to Cuba.

The U.S. Defense Department announces that a U-2 reconnaissance plane is missing and presumed lost over Cuba, and that other unarmed U.S. planes on surveillance missions over Cuba have been fired on. The Defense Department warns that measures will be taken to "insure that such missions are effective and protected." At the same time, the Defense Department announces that 24 troop-carrier squadrons of the Air Force Reserve are being recalled to active duty. In this connection, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara says: "We must be prepared for any eventuality." Premier Fidel Castro (in answer to an appeal from U.N. Secretary General U Thant) says that Cuba will suspend work on missile bases while negotiations are in progress if the United States "desists from threats and aggressive actions against Cuba, including the naval blockade of our country." He invites U Thant to come to Cuba "with a view to direct discussions on the present crisis."

Communist saboteurs in Venezuela blow up four electric power stations of the U.S.-controlled Creole Petroleum Co.'s installations at Lake Maracaibo, thereby cutting Venezuela's oil production by 500,000 barrels a day and reducing by \$1.2 million a day Venezuela's Federal oil revenues which make up 70 percent of its budget. It is estimated that it will take 1 to 3 months to repair the power stations.

October 28, 1962, Premier Khrushchev (in a message to President Kennedy) announces that he has ordered the dismantling of Soviet missile bases in Cuba and the return of Soviet offensive weapons to the Soviet Union, to be carried out under U.N. supervision.

President Kennedy issues a statement, welcoming Khrushchev's statesmanlike decision, and says (in a message to Khrushchev) that the Cuban blockade will be removed as soon as the U.N. has taken the necessary measures, and he pledges that the United States will not invade Cuba. Kennedy says that he attaches great importance to a rapid settlement of the Cuban crisis, because "developments were approaching a point where events could have become unmanageable."

Premier Fidel Castro issues a statement which declares that the United States must fulfill five conditions if the present crisis is to be resolved. These are: (1) End of economic blockade and all measures of commercial and economic pressure exercised against Cuba by the United States. (2) End of all subversive activities, dropping and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, organization of mercenary invasions, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, "all of which actions are organized in the territory of the United States and certain accomplice countries." (3) End of pirate attacks carried out from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico. (4) End of all violations of air and naval space by U.S. planes and ships. (5) U.S. withdrawal from the naval base of Guantanamo and return of this territory to Cuba.

October 29, 1962: United States announces it will lift the blockade of Cuba for 2 days, at the request of the U.N. Secretary General U Thant during the latter's mission to Cuba which begins on October 30. (On the next day, the United States also suspends its air

surveillance of Cuba during U Thant's 2-day mission.)

President Kennedy appoints a three-man coordinating committee (headed by John J. McCloy, former disarmament adviser, Under Secretary of State George Ball and Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric) to carry on negotiations for a conclusion of the Cuban crisis with U.N. Secretary General U Thant and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily Kuznetsov (Premier Khrushchev's special envoy, sent to the U.N. to negotiate about the dismantling of the Soviet bases in Cuba).

Part 7: Let's Keep the Record Straight— A Selected Chronology of Cuba and Castro (October 30-November 20, 1962)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 7 of my continued chronology of Cuba and Castro deals with the period when negotiations were underway between Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations and Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, concerning United Nations supervision of the dismantling and removal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba.

We should keep in mind that in an interchange of messages between Soviet Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy the United Nations was suggested as the proper agency to verify that the missiles were being removed and shipped back to the U.S.S.R. On October 28, 1962—detailed in part 6 of my chronology—Khrushchev announced in a message to the President that this was to be done under U.N. supervision, and was congratulated for his "statesmanlike decision" in a return message from the President, in which he pledged that the United States would not invade Cuba. This was followed by a five-point statement by Fidel Castro setting forth his conditions on whether the present crisis would or would not be resolved.

About this time the public began to be a little uneasy because of a growing feeling that we perhaps were making too many concessions to Cuba and the U.S.S.R.

It seemed reasonable and right that inspection and verification be made of the missiles removed from Cuba, since our country was making our willingness to negotiate the issue clear to the U.S.S.R., Cuba, and the world. But U Thant, although assuring us that his talks with Castro had been "fruitful," and assuring us that proper arrangements had been made for dismantling the missiles and shipping them back to the Soviet Union, could not assure us that their talks had borne the fruit we expected.

One bright spot in the picture appeared to be signs of a quarrel shaping up between the Soviet Union and the

Red Chinese over the yielding of Khrushchev to what they term "U.S. imperialists attempt to browbeat the people of the world into retreat at the expense of Cuba." Even this had its drawbacks, however, because we knew if Red China's support of Cuba was substituted for the Soviets, our dealings with Red China would call for much more strength of purpose on our part since they were not members of the United Nations and we had no diplomatic relations with them. And while the American people's strength of purpose could not be doubted—the memory was still strong of the frustrations experienced in the Korean war in which we fought an enemy backed by the Red Chinese, in a war which it appeared could not actually be won by anyone.

We were offered the alternative of the International Red Cross assuming the task of inspecting Cuba-bound ships to determine whether or not they carried offensive weapons, in lieu of our continuation of the task which we assumed by our quarantine. However, they failed to accept the task in the end and the problem was laid back in our laps.

The "fishing port" construction plan of the Soviet and Cuban Governments, which had created such consternation and anger in the Congress previous to the quarantine, appeared to be moving ahead, although our State Department tried to reassure us that "appropriate measures" would be taken if such facilities represented a "military threat" to the United States or to the hemisphere. But these words had a familiar ring and we could not be sure what "appropriate measures" would mean.

When President Kennedy formally lifted the quarantine on November 20, 1962, after extracting a promise from the Soviets that the IL-28 bombers—also a bone of contention—would be removed from Cuba in 30 days, an uneasy peace seemed at last to shroud the entire Cuba-United States-Soviet Union issue.

And although the public seemed to need and want a little reassurance from time to time, the general feeling appeared to be that they felt they must, and could, trust their leadership. But those who felt differently were forced to merely try and preserve a calm attitude because, after all, they really had no place to go.

Part 7 follows:

PART 7: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT— A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO

October 30-31, 1962: Secretary General U Thant (accompanied by 18 U.N. officials) in Havana for talks with Premier Fidel Castro with regard to U.N. supervision and verification of the dismantling and removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. On his return to New York on October 31, U Thant says that he has been "reliably informed" that Soviet missiles in Cuba are being dismantled and that this operation will be completed by November 2. He also says that he has been informed that arrangements for shipping the missiles back to the Soviet Union are "in hand." He describes his talks with Castro as "fruitful."

October 31, 1962: White House announces that the arms blockade and air surveillance of Cuba (suspended during U Thant's visit) will be resumed on November 1, because of "the absence of effective United Nations

arrangements." It is announced in Moscow that Premier Khrushchev is sending First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan on an urgent mission to Cuba.

Communist Chinese newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao (People's Daily) publishes an editorial which indirectly accuses Soviet Premier Khrushchev of yielding to the "U.S. imperialist attempt to browbeat the people of the world into retreat at the expense of Cuba." "There is no doubt that * * * this latest struggle of the Cuban people against U.S. imperialist aggression will have the firm support of the entire Socialist camp. China's 650 million people have stood consistently and firmly at the side of the Cuban people. We are fully convinced that the Cuban people, under their great leader Premier Castro, will * * * smash all U.S. imperialist acts of aggression and intervention."

November 1, 1962: Communist Chinese note to Cuba (made public in Peking) gives "unreserved support" to Cuba's "just demands" which include U.S. evacuation of Guantanamo. The note assures the Cuban people that China will stand by them and "fight against our common enemy, U.S. imperialism, to the very end."

Premier Fidel Castro (in a radio-television broadcast to the Cuban people) categorically rejects any international inspection of the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba. He also turns down a Soviet proposal (transmitted to him by U.N. Secretary General U Thant) that the International Red Cross Committee be entrusted with the task of inspection. Before Mr. Thant made his trip to Havana the Soviet Union had suggested that the Red Cross organization be used for the inspection. Castro says that "we respect the Soviet decision to withdraw their strategic weapons," and that Cuba is not trying to hinder their withdrawal. He declares: "If we have any misunderstanding with the Soviets they must be discussed only among the principals and not before the world. We trust the principles of the Soviet Union. Between the Soviet Union and Cuba there will never be a breach."

November 2, 1962: President Kennedy (in a broadcast report to the Nation on the Cuban crisis) says that aerial reconnaissance shows that "the Soviet missile bases in Cuba are being dismantled, their missiles and related equipment are being crated and the fixed installations at these sites are being destroyed." He declares that the United States will "follow closely the completion of this work through a variety of means, including aerial surveillance, until such time as an equally satisfactory international means of verification is affected." He says that the quarantine will remain in effect until "adequate procedures can be developed for international inspection of Cuba-bound cargoes," and adds that the International Committee of the Red Cross would be an "appropriate agent" for this task. He asserts that "progress is now being made toward the restoration of peace in the Caribbean."

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan arrives in Havana for talks with Premier Castro.

November 4, 1962: Meeting in New York between John J. McCloy, chairman of the U.S. coordinating committee on Cuba, and Vasily V. Kuznetsov, special Soviet representative for the U.S.-Soviet-U.N. talks on Cuba. "The United States was reported * * * to have protested that the Soviet Union had failed to remove jet bombers from Cuba. Reliable sources said that John J. McCloy * * * made the protest to Vasily V. Kuznetsov on November 4 * * *. These sources said that recent U.S. reconnaissance photographs showed no reduction in the number of bombers—most of them still in packing cases—at an airbase near Havana. The planes are IL-28's, which are capable of carrying nuclear bombs.

"Soviet Il'yushin-28 medium bombers * * * are still being unpacked and assembled in Cuba [the U.S.] Government has learned. By instruction of * * * President [Kennedy], Mr. Kuznetsov was warned [by McCloy], it was learned, that the Cuban crisis could revert to its most acute stage if the Russians turn over the bombers to Premier Fidel Castro.

November 5, 1962: Official Communist Chinese newspaper Jenmin Jih Pao publishes an editorial rejecting any "appeasement" toward the United States in the Cuban crisis and offering "full support" for Cuba's rejection of U.N. supervision over withdrawal of Soviet missile bases from Cuba.

The International Red Cross Committee declares [in Geneva] that it has been informed through the U.N. of Premier Castro's agreement to its representatives inspecting Cuba-bound ships to determine whether they carry offensive weapons.

November 6, 1962: U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson confers (in New York) with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vasily V. Kuznetsov. After the meeting, Stevenson says: "The missiles are moving out and the talks are moving on."

November 7, 1962: Soviet Premier Khrushchev announces (at a reception in the Kremlin on the 45th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution) that the Soviet Union has taken its rockets out of Cuba and that they are "probably" on their way back to the Soviet Union. He asserts that there was a total of 40 Soviet rockets in Cuba.

Subsequently the U.S. Defense Department announces: "The Soviet Union has reported ships are leaving Cuba with missiles aboard. Arrangements are being made with Soviet representatives for contact with these ships by U.S. naval vessels and for counting the missiles being shipped out." (The United States and the Soviet Union also reach agreement that inbound Soviet vessels headed toward Cuba will be inspected by the International Red Cross Committee.)

November 8, 1962: U.S. Defense Department announces that aerial reconnaissance shows that "all known" offensive missile bases in Cuba have been dismantled; "significant items of equipment" have been moved from the missile sites to port areas; "a substantial number of missile transporters have been loaded on to the main decks of certain Soviet cargo vessels * * * and several of these vessels have already departed Cuban ports." The statement also says: "Within the next 24 hours" the United States expects to obtain additional confirmation through the close alongside observation of Soviet vessels by U.S. naval vessels. It is understood Soviet vessels will cooperate in this. "The Cuban Government has informed other members of the United Nations that the bombers sent to Cuba by the Soviet Union are Cuban property and will not be returned."

November 9, 1962: U.S. Defense Department reports that U.S. Navy vessels have intercepted five Soviet cargo ships outward bound from Cuba. Three of the ships were carrying missiles back to Russia. No Americans boarded the Soviet ships which were inspected by U.S. destroyers which pulled alongside and helicopters which flew overhead.

Venezuela (at a special session of the OAS Council in Washington) presents documentary evidence (which is not made public) linking the Castro regime with recent sabotage and subversion by Venezuelan Communists.

November 10, 1962: Havana Communist daily Hoy reports that Soviet economic aid to Cuba has amounted to \$912 million since the first Soviet-Cuban trade agreement was signed in February 1960. Soviet aid is reported by Hoy to have been distributed as follows: New industrial plants, machinery and equipment, \$192 million; food, \$130 mil-

lion; raw materials, \$416 million; trucks and transportation, \$131 million. In addition, some 3,000 Cubans (according to Hoy) have been or are being trained in the Soviet Union. "Informed sources (in Washington) said that in addition to the economic aid, Russia and her satellites have delivered at least \$1 billion in military hardware to the Caribbean island, excluding the strategic missiles that are now being shipped back to the Soviet Union."

November 11, 1962: U.S. Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric, announces that the United States has counted 42 medium-range missiles being removed from Cuba on Soviet ships. He declares that the United States cannot be certain that 42 was the maximum number that the Soviets brought to Cuba. With regard to the IL-28 bombers which the Soviet Union sent to Cuba, Gilpatric says: "We hold the Soviet responsible for the types of military equipment which it has furnished to Castro and as of the present time, we regard the removal of those bombers as within the capacity of the Soviets to bring about." He also says: "We regard aerial surveillance as a part of our inherent self-defense, a means of protecting our country as we would through any form of intelligence collection. The extent to which we will need to rely on continued air surveillance over Cuba will depend again on what the nature of the threat is that remains in Cuba after the Soviets have completed, if they do complete, the undertakings made by Premier Khrushchev to President Kennedy."

November 12, 1962: International Chamber of Shipping (consisting of independent shipping associations in 18 maritime nations outside the Communist bloc) rejects, at a meeting in London, a U.S.-sponsored proposal recommending that member shipping associations should withdraw voluntarily from trade with Cuba.

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan (in a speech at Havana University) declares that the Soviet Government supports Premier Castro's five demands which he describes as "a program for peace in the Caribbean." He adds: "The Soviet Government will always be behind Premier Castro and the Cuban people."

November 13, 1962: Soviet Union and Cuba submit to U.N. Secretary General U Thant a joint proposal to settle the Cuban crisis. Although the nature of the proposal was not disclosed, usually reliable sources said that it would give neutralist ambassadors stationed in Havana a vaguely defined observer function.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (an all-Swiss body) issues a statement (in Geneva) specifying that only in a case that it considered a major threat to world peace and to the survival of humanity would it consider providing inspectors for ships bound for Cuba. For the moment there is no question of the Red Cross moving into action and appointing inspectors.

November 14, 1962: U.S. State Department announces that air reconnaissance photographs show that the Soviet Union is constructing naval facilities at the fishing port of Banos, in northeastern Cuba. The State Department warns that appropriate measures will be taken if such facilities might represent a military threat to the United States or to the hemisphere.

November 15, 1962: West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer (after talks with President Kennedy) declares to newsmen in Washington: "If you hear only of peaceful coexistence over and over again, then you gradually get used to believing that such a state exists with the other side. But in the future, when I hear peaceful coexistence mentioned again, I will think of Cuba."

Premier Fidel Castro (in a letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant) warns that

Cuba will shoot down any U.S. planes flying reconnaissance missions over Cuba.

November 16, 1962: United States declares it will continue its reconnaissance flights over Cuba and will take "appropriate measures" to protect its planes.

November 17, 1962: Three pro-Castro Cubans are arrested in New York on charges of planning sabotage. Two members of the Cuban delegation to the U.N. are also implicated in the conspiracy, and their recall is demanded by the U.S. Government.

November 18, 1962: Soviet Communist Party newspaper Pravda publishes an article defending Premier Khrushchev's policy in the Cuban crisis against the unlimited slander of critics within the Communist bloc (mainly the Communist Chinese). The article says: "They have undertaken an especially shameful and generally provocative campaign in connection with the crisis in the Caribbean. Once they talked hypocritically about peaceful coexistence, giving it an anti-Leninist content. Now they openly pursue a course of undermining peaceful coexistence and pushing mankind toward thermonuclear war."

The official Communist Chinese paper, People's Daily of Peking, attacks as pure nonsense the claim that the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba has saved the peace.

November 19, 1962: Premier Fidel Castro sends a message to U.N. Secretary General U Thant declaring that Cuba will not object if the Soviet Union removes the IL-28 jet bombers from Cuba (which Castro had previously claimed as Cuban property). Castro describes the bombers as "antiquated equipment in relation to modern means of anti-aircraft defense."

November 20, 1962: President Kennedy announces (in a televised press conference) that he has ordered the lifting of the naval blockade of Cuba after being informed (earlier the same day) by Soviet Premier Khrushchev that all of the IL-28 bombers now in Cuba will be withdrawn in 30 days. Kennedy reports that progress has been made in fulfillment of his agreement with Premier Khrushchev on the withdrawal of Soviet missiles and other offensive weapons from Cuba. "Nevertheless," he says, "important parts of the understanding of October 27 and 28 remain to be carried out. The Cuban Government has not yet permitted the United Nations to verify whether all offensive weapons have been removed and no lasting safeguards have yet been established against the future introduction of offensive weapons back into Cuba. Consequently . . . the United States has no choice but to pursue its own means of checking on military activities in Cuba."

"The importance of our continued vigilance is underlined by our identification in recent days of a number of Soviet ground combat units in Cuba. Although we are informed that these and other Soviet units were associated with the protection of offensive weapons systems and will also be withdrawn in due course, I repeat we would like nothing better than adequate international arrangement for the task of inspection and verification in Cuba."

Kennedy says that if these measures are carried out "and if Cuba is not used for the export of aggressive Communist purposes, there will be peace in the Caribbean." He adds: "We will not, of course, abandon the political, economic and other efforts of this hemisphere to halt subversion from Cuba, nor our purpose and hope that the Cuban people shall some day be truly free. But these policies are very different from any intent to launch a military invasion of the island." He expresses the hope that "the achievement of a peaceful solution of the Cuban crisis might well open the door to the solution of other outstanding problems."

Federal Charters for Savings Banks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, January 24, 1963, I delivered the following address before the Banking Law Section of the New York State Bar Association.

Under unanimous consent I insert the speech in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL CHARTERS FOR SAVINGS BANKS?

(An address by the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, U.S. Congressman, Brooklyn, N.Y., before the Banking Law Section of the New York State Bar Association, Thursday, January 24, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow members of the bar, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to you today on the question of Federal charters for mutual savings banks. On January 9, I introduced in the Congress H.R. 258, the Federal mutual savings bank bill. That bill represented the fifth time that I have introduced such legislation. The first time, in 1957, I was alone in my sponsorship. For several years this proposed legislation has received strong bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. I am happy to report that my exclusive rights to this legislation seem to have run out and are, I believe, permanently ended. The idea of Federal mutual savings banks is one which is getting more and more support—both inside and outside Congress.

Many of you are aware of the main provisions of Federal mutual savings banks legislation. For those who are not, let me summarize: A Federal system of mutual savings banks would be authorized to exist concurrently with our present State system. These banks would be chartered and supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. They could be formed either de novo or through the voluntary conversion of savings and loan associations and State savings banks. Insurance of accounts would be under the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation, which would be organized through redesignation of the present Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. Federal mutual savings banks would enjoy, as they do today in the 18 States where they exist, diversified investment powers. Branch rights would be tied to thrift institution standards.

I need hardly point out that this is a major piece of banking legislation. It is not one to be lightly proposed or lightly enacted. That is why the sponsors of the bill have been deliberate in the extreme, we have been content to introduce and reintroduce this bill over the past few sessions so that its merits could be carefully appraised by all interested and by expert Federal agencies and outside groups.

The comments of these groups are now largely in hand. The great majority are favorable. Based on these responses, it would seem that the time has arrived to move from contemplation and study to action.

I spoke of the growing support for this bill. Many of you are aware of rumors that the President's Interagency Committee on Financial Institutions, composed of representatives from 10 Government agencies, will approve Federal charters for mutual savings banks. This would carry out the earlier recommendation of the Commission on Money and Credit. In addition, the national homebuilders organization believes the bill

could greatly increase the availability of home mortgage funds. It has also become clear that many influential savings and loan association leaders welcome this opportunity to acquire diversified investment powers by converting to Federal mutual savings banks.

I am informed by the mutual savings banks national trade association that over 1,600 requests for information, from 50 States, have been received in response to their rather modest advertisements mentioning this legislation. It seems clear to me that the public's response to this bill indicates a real national interest.

I need hardly tell this group that 1963 is the 100th anniversary of the dual banking system in America. I have nothing but praise and, indeed, I have heard nothing but praise, for this uniquely American institution. There are some complaints about its operation, but none against the principle.

Dual banking is apparently on the side of the angels—it has been hailed by such dissimilar groups as the Comptroller of the Currency, the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, and the American Bankers Association. Dual banking, of course, reflects in microcosm the concept of our Federal Government, the ideal of separate and independent operations on a State and Federal level, of independent problems and responsibilities for the State and the Nation, of the necessity for independent solutions to these problems and responsibilities. In sponsoring this bill to extend dual banking to its logical limits, my colleagues and I are suggesting Federal response to Federal responsibilities in the banking area.

Dual banking has long been the order of the day for the commercial banking industry, for credit unions, for the savings and loan industry. My fellow sponsors and I propose to end the illogic of excluding mutual savings banking from the dual system, and in doing so to make available a time-tested financial institution to the entire Nation to serve in marshaling and protecting personal savings and providing additional capital for national growth.

This year of the anniversary of dual banking is clearly a year of unusual activity in the entire financial industry—a year of reawakening and of clamor for change. The Comptroller of the Currency has indicated his belief that our entire branch banking structure should be changed. In this belief he is confronted by our State supervisors. Legislation is now being prepared for introduction in the Congress calling for a Federal banking commission to unify the Comptroller's Office, the FDIC, and the banking supervisory powers of the Federal Reserve under one agency. The banking community can also expect consideration of the so-called truth-in-lending bill and legislation providing for the exclusion of the Comptroller as a member of the Board of FDIC. In this atmosphere of reformation and change, the Federal mutual savings bank bill will, I would hope, be sympathetically received.

I have called the Federal mutual savings bank bill "major" legislation and so it is. And no "major" legislation will ever, or should ever, succeed without being tested in the cauldron of controversy. Important questions must be answered by my fellow Members of Congress. "Is Federal mutual savings banking, in fact, the logical extension of the dual banking system?" "Will Federal mutual savings banks aid national growth?" "Will Federal mutual savings banks help provide additional and less expensive home financing for the people of America?" "Why not include stock banks and associations?"

I have already answered some of these questions in the affirmative. At the moment I am certain there will be hearings on the Federal mutual savings bank bill. I need hardly tell you that the House Banking and Currency Committee solicits your views.

I would like to suggest some of the benefits I perceive in Federal mutual savings banking.

First, I think the public will benefit through more personal savings in local mutual institutions; secondly, more mortgage funds will be made available to them through local mutual institutions; and, third, lower and more uniform borrowing costs can be expected to develop throughout the Nation. These benefits will very definitely aid in the broad objective of economic growth.

It may well be that commercial bankers and State supervisory authorities perceive little benefit for themselves in this legislation. I wonder if this is true? For commercial banks, I submit, the conversion of savings and loan associations to banks will result in more uniform bank standards between commercial banks and their competitors.

State supervisory authorities will see a strengthening of the dual banking system, but many argue that it also dilutes their powers by giving State institutions another place to go when dissatisfied with State supervisors. I discount this as a valid objection because the identical situation has prevailed in each of the other three instances to which I have alluded, all without any bad effects or results. If the principle of a dual banking system is good in one instance, it should prevail in all. If bad in one, it should be eliminated. I have heard no one urge elimination. The cries for improvement continue—in fact, become louder.

Federal mutual savings banks with modern operating powers may very well stimulate State legislatures into modernizing State banking, thus aiding the supervisors in their efforts to provide their banking systems maximum opportunity for safety and performance.

We have all seen the benefits of mutual savings banking in New York. We are aware of its unparalleled record in protecting the

savings of our people. We know the homes it has financed. We know the high standards of fiduciary conduct that has characterized its trustees. Because of this knowledge, I am of the opinion that people in other areas of the country should have an opportunity to decide for themselves whether a mutual savings bank in their community might not be to their advantage. Only through providing the opportunity can we be assured that the people's freedom of choice in their financial institutions has been preserved.

It has come to my attention that an opponent of this legislation has commented that there is no interest in organizing these institutions, and, besides, the presence of these institutions will introduce a destructively competitive element in banking. I ask you to ponder those pleadings for a moment. Even alternative defenses should have some consistency. I submit that if there is no interest in these banks, then, quite simply, none will be organized. If there is no interest and, therefore, none are organized, there will be no competitive threat.

I believe that many Federal mutual savings banks will be organized as a result of this legislation. I believe that in time we will see an entirely new nationwide thrift system, supplementing the commercial banks and savings and loan associations.

This legislation does not contemplate competitive anarchy, nor even an entire new system of banks that will suddenly spring full-blown from the collective congressional brow.

Under H.R. 258, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is merely authorized to charter these banks if the organizers can demonstrate: First, community need; second, probability of financial success; and, third, no destructive competitive effect on existing financial institutions. Therefore, each time a charter is sought for one of these banks, opponents will have an opportunity to argue

the merits of the proposed Federal mutual savings bank in a specific factual situation in a given community.

The need in many areas of this country for additional thrift facilities is dramatized by the recently organized Alaska Mutual Savings Bank. After 1 year in operation in Anchorage, it has \$4,500,000 in assets and has made available millions in loans to finance homes.

There are other States in this country, nonmutual savings bank States, where the number of local financial institutions has proven so inadequate in meeting capital demands that mutual savings banks, through their out-of-State lending programs, have loaned to residents of those States \$9.1 billion in home loans. New capital can be generated in many, if not all of these States through their own local thrift institutions. I urge that local mutual savings banks should be given a chance, along with local commercial banks and savings and loan associations, to prove they can do the job.

As I have stated, in the months ahead the Congress is going to be turning its attention to our Nation's banking problems with a scrutiny and purpose not seen since the early 1930's. Representatives of the entire financial spectrum, the Comptroller, the State supervisors, FDIC, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, will come forward with new legislative recommendations. It would be a mistake for anyone to misinterpret the temper of the Congress. It may well respond to many of these widespread demands for change.

In this legislative climate my fellow sponsors and I are determined that the Federal Mutual Savings Bank bill will be given its day in court.

I will not take your time to relate the details of the bill at this time. A summary of the bill and a section-by-section analysis appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My office will make copies available to you upon your request therefor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 15, 1963)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

Most merciful God, who art the fountain of all grace, the source of all true wisdom and goodness, Thou hast called us whose mortal lives so swiftly ebb away, to labor with Thee in the unfolding purpose of the ages, in causes whose coronation date is far beyond the dimensions of our calendars. Yet we may throw the stubborn ounces of our weight on the side of the invincible power which swings the stars in their courses and which in all the universe works for righteousness.

Ever near this forum of national debate with its differing points of view and the din and clash of personal interests, may there be kept an altar of communion with the unseen reality where even as we toil in these fields of time a constant sense of the eternal may save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from betrayal of the highest public good.

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 the proceedings of Tuesday, February 5, 1963, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour for the introduction of bills and the transaction of routine business.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF NORTHWEST AUSTRALIA TRACKING STATION, CARNARVON, AUSTRALIA

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration,

Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of the Northwest Australia Tracking Station, Carnarvon, Australia; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of aviation war risk insurance, as of December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

ARMING OF EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

APPLICATION OF REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1949 TO REORGANIZATION PLANS TRANSMITTED TO THE CONGRESS AT ANY TIME BEFORE JUNE 1, 1965

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ARTHUR C. BERRY

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others