

as one of the key party figures in the Caribbean area. A man like Guevara—bold, dashing and ruthless—is not one who would be expected to fight for democratic liberties. He is a promoter of dictatorship.

The handwriting is clear for all who are willing to observe—Cuba is well on the road toward Communist domination. Perhaps Castro himself is not to become Cuba's Lenin—the man who actually sets up the Communist dictatorship. We do not know; perhaps Castro will be a Kerensky, the man who was to briefly head the Russian Government after the czar's forced abdication in March 1917, only in turn to be replaced by Lenin the following November. The important thing is this: anti-American, anti-democratic, anti-liberty forces are on the rampage in Cuba at this very minute. Communism is growing there. Our fear is that the Kremlin will gain either overt or covert control, swinging this lovely tropical island into the Kremlin's control. This, I say, America can never permit.

There are some people who say give Castro time to straighten out affairs. That advice would be excellent, if only

the possibility existed that democratic processes might gain the ascendancy. But the whole flavor of the July 26 movement and Fidel Castro personally militate against this prospect.

First of all, there is the fact that Castro gained power through bloody military revolt, not democratic elections. He thinks in terms of ruthless military force—witness his handling of the "treason" trials and those who criticize his regime. "From now on the symbol of our revolution," he told a cheering throng on resuming the Premiership, "will be the machete," the razor-sharp ax used by Cubans. Seldom has history recorded that a military dictator has become a believer in democracy.

Then, in 9 months, the trends are all running contrary to free government: there have been no free elections; establishment of responsible local self-government; no operation of an independent judiciary. Attempts have been made to interfere with the free press. Property has been expropriated without due process of law. Then there is the continual atmosphere of emotion, Castro-sponsored rallies and parades de-

signed to whip the people into frenzied acclaim—the familiar trappings of the dictator.

Castro, moreover, is attempting to churn discontent and revolt among his Caribbean neighbors. He has become a firebrand threatening to inflame the peace of Latin America. He talks and acts like a bully, forgetting that nations must learn to live peacefully. If disputes arise, they should be settled amicably—not by name calling, guerrilla invasions, and subversive infiltration. Castro is running contrary to the principles of Western Hemisphere unity.

When the Cuban jig-saw puzzle is put together, piece by piece, we find a man—Fidel Castro—and a group—26th of July Movement—which are basically anti-democratic. This young man, trained to think in terms of violent revolution and dictatorship, represents a severe danger to the United States. As Communist influence grows, as the Kremlin increases in power in Cuba, we must be alert to protect our national security. Let's make no mistake: Fidel Castro is the Achilles heel of our national security. We cannot allow Moscow to gain a foothold too close to our shoreline.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1960

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

Eternal God, our merciful Father, whose faithfulness abides in spite of all our fickleness, whose forgiveness outlasts all our transgressions, take from our darkened minds, we pray, the delusions which so often color our judgments and control our verdicts.

May we know that in all the confusions and perplexities of these days, which so sorely test our powers of discernment, at best we but see as through a glass darkly. Keep us from mistaking one ray of light for the total sun.

We dare to ask for light upon only one step ahead, faith to take 1 day at a time, endurance in the darkness to wait in patience and confidence for the dawn.

May we be loyal to all the truth we know and seek, and, with scorn of all expediency, may we discharge faithfully the duties which lay their commission upon our conscience.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of TEXAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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.)

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 255)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States relating to the budget for the year 1961, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 300)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Ninth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 18, 1960.

DIRECTOR OF GALLAUDET COLLEGE

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of 68 Stat. 265, the Chair appoints the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] a Director of Gallaudet College to fill the vacancy

created by the retirement from the Senate of Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection with the presentation of memorials, the introduction of bills, and the submission of other related matters, be limited to 3 minutes.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO MEET DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

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

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

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENTS OR RECESSES OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during adjournments or recesses of the Senate during

the 2d session of the 86th Congress, the Committee on Appropriations be, and it is hereby, authorized to report appropriation bills, including joint resolutions, with accompanying notices of motions to suspend paragraph 4 of rule 16 for the purpose of offering certain amendments to such bills or joint resolutions, which proposed amendments shall be printed. This is the customary request which is made on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations early in each session of the Congress.

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

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that we plan a Democratic caucus for Wednesday, at 10:30 a.m., in the room in which we have previously held our caucuses, for the purpose of discussing the education bill which appears on the calendar, and is Order No. 1049, Senate bill 8, introduced by the Senators from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA and Mr. HART]. It is a bill to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States.

I announce that we expect to follow the unfinished business—which is Calendar No. 571, Senate bill 2436, to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes—with Calendar No. 559, Senate Joint Resolution 39, to amend the Constitution to authorize Governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives. That joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I am informed that amendments will be offered to that measure—including an amendment known as the so-called poll tax amendment, and perhaps others.

When the Senate completes its action on the unfinished business, Senate bill 2436, I expect the Senate also to take action on Calendar No. 819, Senate bill 694, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. That is a bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

Furthermore, a number of other bills have been cleared by the policy committee; and announcement about them has previously been made to the public. These bills will be called up at appropriate times. I do not mean to indicate that they will be called up in order in which I have announced them.

I should like to have all Members know that the proposed constitutional

amendment measure, the juvenile delinquency bill, and the Democratic caucus on the State aid to education bill, have been scheduled, and that we plan to follow the disposition of the unfinished business with some of those measures.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

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

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF FLIGHT-TRAINING PROGRAM

A letter from the Special Assistant for Manpower, Personnel and Reserve Forces, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Secretary of the Air Force, on the progress of the flight-training program, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ASSIGNED TO PERMANENT DUTY AT THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that, as of December 31, 1959, there was an aggregate of 2,463 officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of Government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting three drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans.

A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program; and

A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN SERVICES BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to procure the services of experts and consultants (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—PAKISTAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on review of the military assistance program, Pakistan, dated August 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Saint Lawrence

Seaway Development Corporation, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law an audit report on the Tennessee Valley Authority, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED REGIONAL OFFICE ACTIVITIES, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected regional office activities, Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated January 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO ANTHRACITE EXPERIMENT STATION, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Anthracite Experiment Station, Bureau of Mines, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1959; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PURCHASE AND EXCHANGE OF LAND AND INTERESTS ON BLUE RIDGE AND NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAYS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY MUCKLESHOOT INDIANS, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION ON TALENT DIVISION, ROGUE RIVER BASIN PROJECT, OREGON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of contract relating to proposed construction work exceeding a total cost of \$200,000, on the Talent Division of the Rogue River Basin project, Oregon (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Daytona Beach, Fla., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial report of that order, for the fiscal year, August 1, 1958 to July 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISSOLUTION OF MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART

A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Daytona Beach, Fla., confirming the final dissolution and liquidation of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc., formerly incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON POSITIONS FILLED IN CERTAIN GRADES OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, reporting, pursuant

to law, a report on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949 in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Mary Braun of Chicago, Ill., relating to the resurgence of nazism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at the annual convention of the United States Savings and Loan League, held in Dallas, Tex., last November, the league adopted a resolution on the subject of "Preserving a Sound American Dollar."

In this resolution the league recognizes that the management of the public debt is closely related to the battle for a stable dollar and expresses concern over the fact that the present 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term marketable Treasury obligations is adding an ever-increasing burden to the cost of financing our Government obligations.

The United States Savings and Loan League is entitled to much credit for its statesmanlike stand on this important issue.

Congress has a very definite responsibility in this field and I sincerely hope we can get legislative action that will permit our Government to finance its obligations on a long-term basis and eliminate the 4¼-percent limit on interest rates that may be charged on long-term bonds.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PRESERVING A SOUND AMERICAN DOLLAR

During the past year the present administration and many Members of the Congress have intensified their efforts to preserve the integrity of the American dollar. Their insistence on fiscal responsibility on the part of the Federal Government was a primary factor in making a balanced Federal budget for the fiscal year 1960 a confident expectation. The United States Savings and Loan League commends the President and these Members of Congress for their unwavering efforts to improve the status of the American dollar abroad and to preserve its buying power at home.

The league recognizes that the management of the public debt is closely related to the battle for a stable dollar; it also recognizes that such management is a particularly serious problem to the Treasury in a period of rising demand for credit from all sectors of the economy. The league urges upon its member savings and loan institutions continued active assistance to the U.S. Treasury by participation in the sale of savings bonds, through which many thousands of persons are started on the path to thrift.

It is obvious that the present 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term marketable Treasury obligations should be eliminated. This limitation has not prevented interest rates from rising, nor has it prevented the Treasury from paying more than 4¼ percent for money. On the contrary, the ceiling has the unfortunate effect at the present time of forcing the Treasury to concentrate its bond offerings in maturities under 5 years, has imposed an abnormal pressure on the short-term securities market, and has forced the Treasury into an unprecedented competition with thrift institutions which seems likely to result in a decrease in funds available for home mortgage loans next year.

The league recognizes that earlier in the decade of the 1950's—before the 4¼-percent ceiling became a barrier—the Treasury did not move frequently and decisively toward placing more of the debt on a long-term basis. Its policy of continually refunding on a short-term basis contributed to the present difficult situation the Treasury now faces. Fortunately, the Treasury now gives every indication of being wise and courageous enough to pursue a policy of long-term financing.

The U.S. Savings and Loan League urges that the 86th Congress, when it reconvenes in January, promptly enact legislation raising the present ceiling on long-term Treasury obligations.

DISASTER RELIEF BY A "GREAT WHITE FLEET"—COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the whole free world was delighted with the enthusiastic reception which the President received on his visit to other countries last month. Nothing has done more than has this visit to promote good will and friendship among the nations. The reception accorded President Eisenhower on his trip proved dramatically that a just and lasting peace is uppermost in the minds of the people everywhere.

While the results of the President's trip abroad were indeed momentous, other ways to implement our efforts for world peace can be effective, and can be carried out with comparatively little cost.

One project which would have very great value is the sending of a fleet, without guns, to carry medical supplies, food, clothing, and other emergency assistance to the victims of disaster in near and far parts of the world.

On July 21 of last year, I joined with the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in submitting Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, urging the President to provide for the establishment of a Great White Fleet to carry emergency assistance to people stricken by famine, disease, earthquakes, floods, or other disasters.

Subsequently, 31 other Members of the Senate became cosponsors of the resolution. The same resolution was offered in the House by Representative BATES, of Massachusetts, and Representative EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma.

The effect of the submission of the resolution was not only gratifying, but also rather startling. I received thousands of letters from people in every State, as well as many mailed on shipboard and from foreign countries, urging the establishment of this mercy fleet, and offering moral and material support for

this purpose. In fact, I have had to return to the writers nearly \$1,000 which they wanted to contribute to the cause.

Much of the credit for this outstanding response was due to an article and endorsement by Life magazine.

I had hoped that the administration would take the lead in pushing this project, without further urging by the Congress.

The very fact that our Nation would be prepared to cope with disaster wherever it might occur would give hope and encouragement to people everywhere.

We already have the necessary ships, lying idle; and it is my firm belief that the expenditure of \$5 million in establishing such a Great White Fleet would make a greater contribution to understanding among nations and the establishment of a lasting peace than an additional \$5 billion spent for instruments of destruction.

Since several months have gone by, and since there appears to be no move on the part of the executive branch to take any further steps toward the establishment of the Great White Fleet, I am turning over today to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee the several thousand communications which I have received in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 66; and I urge that the Senate go on record as favoring this proposal.

I submit the communications, and ask that they be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would it be possible and also very practical to take the \$5 million from perhaps the foreign-aid funds which have not already been specifically committed? I think the idea of such disaster relief is a very worthy one, as a positive contribution to worldwide understanding and good will.

Mr. AIKEN. I would be delighted to select a part of the foreign-aid funds from which the \$5 million could be deleted.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that could be done.

Mr. AIKEN. At the time when the concurrent resolution was submitted, I believe the White House was supporting the idea. However, I have heard nothing further from it lately, and I do not know what has happened.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thought I should bring it to the attention of the Senator. It is a worthy objective, and I think it is a very practical approach. Certainly, it would be wise to consider that approach once a year to see what would happen. We have certainly spent money on less worthy projects, and we have sometimes obtained rather small results.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New Hampshire knows, of course, he will have an opportunity to review these reports, because these communications are being referred to the Committee on Armed Services, of which the Senator from New Hampshire is a high ranking member.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

CONTINUANCE OF STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report an original resolution authorizing a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy, and I submit a report (No. 1027) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 250) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the conduct of United States foreign policy, with special reference to Latin America, and the problems of world disarmament.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (4) to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) to take such testimony; and (6) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups, and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$185,000 for the period ending January 31, 1961, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INTERIM REPORT ENTITLED "ORGANIZING FOR NATIONAL SECURITY" (S. REPT. NO. 1026)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 115, 86th Congress, I submit an interim report entitled "Organizing for National Security," which I ask may be printed.

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

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246) to investigate the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with its jurisdiction under Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from February 1, 1960, through January 31, 1961, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds, in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees; and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various Governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government; (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$275,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 248) providing additional funds for the Committee on Government Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the

Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from February 1, 1960 to January 31, 1961, inclusive, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government with particular reference to—

(1) the effectiveness of the present organizational structures and operational methods of agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government at all levels in the formulation, coordination, and execution of an integrated national policy for the solution of the problems of survival with which the free world is confronted in the contest with world communism;

(2) the capacity of such structures and methods to utilize with maximum effectiveness the skills, talents, and resources of the Nation in the solution of those problems; and

(3) development of whatever legislative and other proposals or means may be required whereby such structures and methods can be reorganized or otherwise improved to be more effective in formulating, coordinating, and executing an integrated national policy, and to make more effective use of the sustained, creative thinking of our ablest citizens for the solution of the full range of problems facing the free world in the contest with world communism.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized—

(1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;

(2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one such person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and shall receive compensation at an annual gross rate not less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and

(3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred to examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. GREEN:
S. 2833. A bill for the relief of Sadako Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2834. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pilar S. Auad, Beatriz Auad, and Manuel Auad; and

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Dominador B. Cunanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of Florante M. Dulay;

S. 2837. A bill for the relief of Dr. Avellino Raquizza Lazo and Dr. Segundina del Carmen Lazo; and

S. 2838. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hyun Mo Kwak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2839. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2840. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2841. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to publish on microfilm the original military and naval records of the Civil War, both Union and Confederate; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CORTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 2842. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HENNING, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 2843. A bill further modifying the lower Mississippi River flood control and improvement project, originally adopted May 15, 1928; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2844. A bill to provide for adjustments in the lands or interests therein acquired for the Kanopolis Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, by the reconveyance of certain lands or interests therein to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. MORTON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 2845. A bill to stabilize the price support of tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2846. A bill for the relief of Chyn Duog Shiah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2847. A bill to amend the Act relating to the importation of adult honeybees; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 2848. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years

1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTIONS

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF ALL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 246) to investigate the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

ADDITIONAL FUNDS AND CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CHAVEZ submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 247); which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and of the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 248) providing additional funds for the Committee on Government Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON IMPROPER ACTIVITIES IN THE LABOR OR MANAGEMENT FIELD TO FILE REPORT

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 249), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the time for filing a final report by the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, established by S. Res. 74, Eighty-fifth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1957, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended to March 31, 1960.

Sec. 2. For the purpose of enabling the Select Committee to complete its work and prepare such final report, it is hereby authorized to exercise, until such date, all of the duties, functions, and powers conferred upon it by S. Res. 74, Eighty-fifth Congress, as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$48,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

CONTINUANCE OF STUDY OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 250) authorizing a continuing study of U.S. foreign policy, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. President, the Republican committee on committees has concluded its committee assignments. The recommendations were approved by the conference held this morning.

I therefore submit a resolution which embodies the recommendations, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 251) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Indiana, Mr. CAPEHART, is excused from further service on the Committee on Government Operations; the Senator from Delaware, Mr. WILLIAMS, is excused from further service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. CORTON, is excused from further service on the Committee on Finance; the senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, is excused from further service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the junior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MORTON, is excused from further service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and on the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Be it further resolved, That the Senator from Delaware, Mr. WILLIAMS, be assigned to the Committee on Foreign Relations; the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. CORTON, be assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary; the senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. COOPER, be assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the junior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MORTON, be assigned

to the Committee on Finance; the Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, be assigned to the Committee on Government Operations; the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. FONG, be assigned to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. BRUNSDALE, be assigned to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 251) was considered and agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 252), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Unemployment Problems established and authorized pursuant to Senate Resolution 196, adopted September 22, 1959, is hereby continued through June 30, 1960.

SEC. 2. Expenses of the committee under this resolution for the period February 1, 1960, through June 30, 1960, which shall not exceed \$24,682.61, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon voucher approved by the chairman of the committee.

AUTHORIZATION TO MICROFILM BOTH UNION AND CONFEDERATE MILITARY AND NAVAL RECORDS OF CIVIL WAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the microfilming of the original official records of the Union and Confederate Armies and Navies and other records now in the National Archives and other places. This measure would enable many scholars across the country to have access to these priceless historical records, thus increasing the public knowledge of our great heritage.

A companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives last year by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, and is of importance to the Civil War Centennial Commission, and many libraries across the country, including the Texas State library. The State archivist of Texas, Mr. Dorman H. Winfrey, has called this matter to my attention, and I hope that this bill may be enacted to allow him to so render even greater services to the people of Texas, just as it would enable other librarians to render similar services to their States and thus to all the people of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter addressed to me by the State Archivist of Texas be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2841) to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to publish on microfilm the original military and naval records of the

Civil War, both Union and Confederate, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in connection with the centennial of the Civil War, the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized and directed to microfilm for publication or to procure the microfilming for publication of the original official records of the Union and Confederate Armies, Navies, War and Navy Departments and such other official Confederate records as are not now included in the War Department collection of Confederate records in the National Archives: *Provided*, That there shall be excluded from the records microfilmed such series of records as the Archivist of the United States may deem to be of insufficient historical value to warrant the cost of microfilm publication: *Provided further*, That when any of the records to be microfilmed are not now in the custody of the Administrator, the consent of the present holders thereof shall be obtained.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services shall cause a printed descriptive catalog of the microfilm publication prepared in accordance with this Act to be issued from time to time to reflect the current stage of progress in the work of publication until such time as the whole project shall be completed.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of General Services such sum, not exceeding \$50,000 per year for ten fiscal years, as may be required to cover the costs of preparing the records for microfilm publication and making a negative and security copies thereof.

The letter presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

TEXAS STATE LIBRARY,
ARCHIVES DIVISION, CAMP HUBBARD,
Austin, Tex., January 4, 1960.

The Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Thank you so much for your letter of December 28, 1959, concerning the Civil War service records of Texans now in the National Archives.

In 1955 the National Archives microfilmed its carded index file of Texas Confederate soldiers and made it available on 41 rolls of microfilm as the National Archives Index to Compiled Service Records of Confederate Soldiers from Texas. We do have this in the State archives.

I feel certain that more recent legislation has been passed concerning the microfilming of Confederate and Union records, and that I just do not know about it. In the American Archivist (January 1959), there was the following item:

An assembly of interested organizations, called by the Civil War Centennial Commission a year ago, endorsed the idea of microfilming the important Civil War records in the National Archives and elsewhere. Representative FRED SCHWENGEL, chairman of the Commission's Legislative Committee, has introduced a bill in Congress that would authorize the appropriation of \$50,000 per year for this purpose. "For the first time," commented the Commission's Executive Director, "it will be possible, if this bill is passed, to study, without coming to Washington, the day-to-day and hour-to-hour business transacted by war officials on both sides."

And in the American Archivist, July 1959, the following item appeared:

"Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, stated that bills had been introduced in Con-

gress calling for an appropriation of \$50,000 to microfilm Union and Confederate records in the National Archives."

I would be interested in any information you may have about the above legislation. I hope the charge for microfilm will not be large. It took our State archives 4 years to secure the 41 rolls of the National Archives Index to Compiled Service Records of Confederate Service Records, and then the money to purchase the microfilm had to come through private sources. Any assistance you can render in this matter will be deeply appreciated by the customers of the Texas State archives and Texans throughout the State. I am sure you agree that the next few years will see much research done on the subject of the Civil War. I want to make everything possible on the subject available here.

Respectfully yours,
DORMAN H. WINFREY,
State Archivist.

NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senators from Massachusetts [Messrs. SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY], the Senators from New Hampshire [Messrs. BRIDGES and CORTON], the Senators from Rhode Island [Messrs. GREEN and PASTORE], and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact.

Mr. President, the compact proposes a unique experiment in Federal-State relations which may set a nationwide pattern for regional conservation and development of water and related land resources. For the first time in our history, the many Federal agencies concerned with these problems would be brought into a continuing cooperative relationship with the States.

The hurricanes and floods which have taken a disastrous toll of lives and property in New England in recent years have emphasized the need for an effective, coordinated protective program. Much progress has been made since the tragic flood disasters of 1955, but much more remains to be accomplished. The proposed compact offers a method of expediting this vital work, and other related programs, such as the development of water resources for recreational, domestic and industrial use, the improvement of harbors, and the prevention of erosion of the beaches on the Atlantic coast and Long Island Sound.

The compact already has been approved by the legislative bodies of four States; Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island. By its terms, it will become effective when approved by the Congress. I trust that approval will be given promptly.

Mr. President, an excellent summary of the history of cooperative efforts to develop New England's water and related land resources, of problems encountered in Federal-State relations in this area, and of the need for the proposed compact was given in testimony by William S. Wise, director of the Connecticut Wa-

ter Resources Commission and vice chairman of the Northeastern Resources Committee, before the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources at Boston, Mass., on December 8, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Wise's statement, which was presented in behalf of the Governors of the New England States, may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks, together with the bill itself.

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

The bill (S. 2842) granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact, introduced by Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent and approval of Congress is given to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact, as hereinafter set out. Such compact reads as follows:

"NORTHEASTERN WATER AND RELATED LAND RESOURCES COMPACT

"ARTICLE I

"Findings

"The northeastern part of the United States is by virtue of geographic location and other characteristics a great natural resource area which, with more intense use of natural resources, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective resource management and orderly growth of the region. The work of the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee demonstrated that a continuation and furtherance of activities such as those undertaken by it would be of great value. To this end, it is the intent of this compact to establish and provide for the operation of a joint agency for the Northeast.

"ARTICLE II

"Purpose

"It is the purpose of this compact to provide, in the northeastern region, improved facilities and procedures for the coordination of the policies, programs, and activities of the United States, the several states, and private persons or entities, in the field of water and related land resources, and to study, investigate, and plan the development and use of the same and conservation of such water and related land resources; to provide means by which conflicts may be resolved; and to provide procedures for coordination of the interests of all public and private agencies, persons and entities in the field of water and related land resources; and to provide an organization for cooperation in such coordination on both the federal and state levels of government.

"ARTICLE III

"Creation of Commission

"There is hereby created the Northeastern Resources Commission, hereinafter called the Commission.

"ARTICLE IV

"Membership

"The Commission shall consist of one member from each party state to be appointed and to serve, in accordance with and subject to the laws of the state which he represents,

and seven members representing departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development to be appointed and to serve in such manner as may be provided by the laws of the United States.

"ARTICLE V

"Functions

"It shall be the responsibility of the Commission to recommend to the states and the United States, or any intergovernmental agency, changes in law or policy which would promote coordination, or resolution of problems, in the field of water and related land resources. The efforts of the Commission in coordination of work and resolution of conflicts may be directed towards all state and federal activities involved in water and related land resources development responsibilities and shall include coordination of the following:

"(1) Collection and interpretation of basic data.

"(2) Investigation and planning of water and related land resources projects.

"(3) Programming (including scheduling) of water and related land resources construction and development.

"(4) Encouraging of the referral of plans or proposals for resources projects to the Commission.

"The Commission shall use qualified public and private agencies to make investigations and conduct research in the field of water and related land resources, but if it is unable to secure the undertaking of such investigations or original research by a qualified public or private agency, it shall have the power to make its own investigations and conduct its own research. The Commission may make contracts with any public or private agencies or private persons or entities for the undertaking of such investigations, or original research within its purview.

"ARTICLE VI

"Voting

"No action of the Commission respecting the internal management thereof shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the members are present and vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the Commission membership. No action of the Commission respecting a matter other than its internal management shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which a majority of the state members and a majority of the members representing the United States are present and a majority of said state members together with a majority of said members representing the United States vote in favor thereof: provided that any action not binding for such a reason may be ratified within thirty days by the concurrence in writing of a majority of the state members and the concurrence in writing of a majority of the members representing the United States.

"ARTICLE VII

"Finances

"A. The Commission shall submit to the Governor or designated officer of each party state a request for funds to cover estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of that jurisdiction for presentation to the legislature thereof. Any such request shall indicate the sum or sums which the Commission has requested or intends to request be appropriated by the United States for the use or support of the Commission during the period covered thereby.

"B. With due regard for such monies and other assistance as may be made available to it, the Commission shall be provided with such funds by each of the several states

participating therein to provide the means of establishing and maintaining facilities, a staff of personnel, and such activities as may be necessary to fulfill the powers and duties imposed upon and entrusted to the Commission.

"With due allowance for monies otherwise available, each budget of the Commission shall be the responsibility of the party states, to be apportioned among them on a weighted formula based 50% on population and 50% on gross land area, such population and gross land area to be determined in accordance with the last official U.S. Census of Population, but provided that the total contributions of all of the states shall not be required to exceed \$50,000 annually and provided further that regardless of the number of states party to the compact at any time the maximum annual contribution required of any state shall not exceed its share of the \$50,000 as determined above. Any state may contribute such funds in excess of its share, as determined above, as it may desire.

"C. The Commission shall not pledge the credit of any jurisdiction. The Commission may meet any of its obligations in whole or in part with funds available to it under Article VIII (E) of this compact, provided that the Commission takes specific action setting aside such funds prior to the incurring of any obligation to be met in whole or in part in such manner.

"D. The members of the Commission shall be paid by the Commission their actual expenses incurred and incident to the performance of their duties, subject to the approval of the Commission.

"E. The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements of the Commission shall be subject to the audit and accounting procedures established under its by-laws. However, all receipts and disbursements of funds handled by the Commission shall be audited by a qualified public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the Commission.

"F. The accounts of the Commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the Commission.

"ARTICLE VIII

"Administration and management

"A. The Commission may sue and be sued, and shall have a seal.

"B. The Commission shall elect annually, from among its members, a chairman, vice chairman and treasurer. The Commission shall appoint an executive director who shall also act as secretary, and together with the treasurer, shall be bonded in such amounts as the Commission may require.

"C. The Commission shall appoint and remove or discharge such personnel as may be necessary for the performance of its functions irrespective of any civil service laws which might otherwise apply. The Commission shall establish and maintain, independently, by contract or agreement with the United States or an agency thereof, or in conjunction with any one or more of the party states, suitable retirement programs for its employees. Employees of the Commission shall be eligible for social security coverage in respect to old age and survivors insurance provided that the Commission takes such steps as may be necessary pursuant to federal law to participate in such program of insurance as a governmental agency or unit. The Commission may establish and maintain or participate in such additional programs of employee benefits as may be appropriate to afford employees of the Commission terms and conditions of employment similar to those enjoyed by employees of the party states generally.

"D. The Commission may borrow, accept or contract for the services of personnel from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, from any intergovernmental agency, or from any institution, person, firm, or corporation.

"E. The Commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions under this compact any and all appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services, conditional or otherwise, from any state or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, or any institution, person, firm or corporation, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same.

"F. The Commission may establish and maintain such facilities as may be necessary for the transacting of its business. The Commission may accept, hold, and convey real and personal property and any interest therein.

"G. The Commission may adopt, amend, and rescind by-laws, rules, and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"H. The Commission shall make and transmit annually, to the legislature and Governor of each party state, and to the President and Congress of the United States, a report covering the activities of the Commission for the preceding year, and embodying such recommendations as may have been adopted by the Commission. The Commission may issue such additional reports as it may deem desirable.

"ARTICLE IX

"Other compacts and activities

"Nothing in this compact shall be construed to impair, or otherwise affect, the jurisdiction of any interstate agency in which any party state participates nor to abridge, impair, or otherwise affect the provisions of any compact to which any one or more of the party states may be a party, nor to supersede, diminish, or otherwise affect any obligation assumed under any such compact. Nor shall anything in this compact be construed to discourage additional interstate compacts among some or all of the party states for the management of natural resources, or the coordination of activities with respect to a specific natural resource or any aspect of natural resource management, or for the establishment of intergovernmental planning agencies in subareas of the region. Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit the jurisdiction or activities of any participating government, agency, or officer thereof, or any private person or agency.

"ARTICLE X

"Enactment

"A. This compact shall become effective when entered into and enacted into law by any three of the states of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont, and when the United States has provided by law for the designation of its representation on the Commission. Thereafter it shall become effective with respect to any other aforementioned state upon its enacting this compact into law.

"B. Upon consent of the Congress of the United States of America, any other State in the northeastern area may become a party to this compact, by entering into and enacting this compact into law.

"ARTICLE XI

"Withdrawal

"This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each party state until renounced by it. Renunciation of this compact must be preceded by sending three years' notice in writing of intention to withdraw from the compact to the governor of each of the other states party hereto and to such officers or agencies of the United States as may be designated by federal law.

"ARTICLE XII

"Construction and severability

"The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be unconstitutional or the applicability thereof, to any state, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the constitutionality of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any other state, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. It is the legislative intent that the provisions of this compact be reasonably and liberally construed.

"Sec. 2. The consent of Congress is given to any of the States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont to become a party to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact in accordance with its terms.

"Sec. 3. (a) The President is authorized to appoint seven members, representing departments or agencies of the United States having principal responsibilities for water and related land resources development, to the Commission created by the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact.

"(b) Each such representative shall receive compensation and travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the manner provided for experts and consultants in sections 5 and 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, except that (1) the time limitation with respect to the length of services authorized in such section 15 shall not apply, (2) the per diem rate of compensation for such representative shall be such amount, not in excess of \$100, as is established by the President, and (3) the total compensation paid in any calendar year to such representative shall not exceed \$15,000. A retired military officer of the United States or a retired civilian employee of the United States may be appointed to serve as such representative without prejudice to his retired status, and shall receive compensation as authorized in this subsection except that his retired pay or annuity under Federal law and compensation under this subsection shall not exceed \$15,000 in any calendar year. If an employee of the United States is appointed to serve as such representative in addition to his regular duties as such employee, he shall serve without additional compensation.

"Sec. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved."

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

A statement concerning the water resources of New England presented in behalf of the Governors of the New England States to the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, U.S. Senate, by William S. Wise, director, Connecticut Water Resources Commission, Boston, Mass., December 8, 1959

The individual New England States and many of the State agencies will present more detailed information at this hearing covering varying phases of water resources conservation and development. Consequently, this presentation will cover only general statements and conclusions for the region.

The opening sentence of the findings of the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact states:

"The northeastern part of the United States is by virtue of the geographic location and other characteristics a great natural resource area which, with more intense use of natural resources, increasingly requires coordinated planning as a basic ingredient of effective resource management and orderly growth of the region."

The Governors of the New England States heartily concur in this statement and unani-

mously support any sound and equitable program which promotes the growth, prosperity, and welfare of this great region. What benefits this region also benefits the Nation.

This statement will present briefly a review of the water resources under three main headings:

1. Water resources of the area.
2. Accomplishments in water resource development.
3. Policy and program needs for the future.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE AREA

History supports the contention that New England comprises one of the great industrial and recreational regions of the country. One of the most important factors contributing to this fact is the nature and extent of its water resources—ample in quantity and generally suitable in quality. They are also unusually well distributed and reasonably accessible to the centers of demand. New England occupies an enviable position in this respect.

The water resources, in this 65,000 square mile area, are contained in thousands of lakes, ponds, and reservoirs with a total water surface area estimated at 3,500 square miles and in over 75,000 miles of rivers and streams with drainage areas ranging in size from over 10,000 square miles to only a fraction of a square mile. An undetermined, but obviously large, volume is hidden under the ground surface. New England is also fortunate in having a beautiful shoreline approximately 4,600 miles long. This constitutes a tremendously valuable recreational asset, a source for industrial supplies where saline water is useful, and also as an unlimited potential source of fresh water when salt water conversion becomes feasible and economical. Because of the large number of undeveloped potential fresh water supplies it does not seem likely that there will be a heavy demand for such water in the foreseeable future, except for special requirements.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The development of water resources in New England has reached its present stage largely through the efforts and initiative of private interests and by a people who traditionally have been doing things for themselves. Currently consideration is being given to providing storage in flood control reservoirs for future supplemental water supplies. This has great merit in those areas where the future conditions may become critical, provided the beneficiaries bear an equitable share of the costs for this service.

The people of the New England States have generally adjusted themselves to the principles of State sovereignty in those matters affecting their economy. In those problems of regional scope they have endeavored to find the solutions through interstate compacts and interstate agreements. This practice has proven to be very effective in the attack on broad scale complex problems and in uniting the people in a common interest for their common good.

In 1947 the States joined in a compact setting up the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission for the purpose of controlling pollution in interstate rivers and waterways, a fundamental step in the conservation of the region's water resources. The Connecticut River Valley Flood Control Commission was created in 1955 by the States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut to coordinate and program the construction of flood control works on the Connecticut River watershed. In 1957 the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts created the Thames River Valley Flood Control Commission to coordinate efforts in reducing the ravages of floods in that valley. Less formal associations have served this region well in the numerous interstate problems.

This region was the locale of the most outstanding experiment in Federal-State relations ever undertaken in this country. Through a Presidential directive in 1950 the New England-New York Interagency Committee was created to make a thorough study of the natural resources in this area. Representatives from each of the 7 States involved and from seven Federal agencies worked, struggled, and compromised for 4 years to complete a factual report contained in 49 volumes and at a cost of over \$5 million. This was the most comprehensive study of its type ever undertaken in the field of water and related natural resources.

Following the discharge of this committee the New England Governors, in 1956 through a charter created the Northeastern Resources Committee with a similar membership of States (except New York) and Federal agencies to implement this report and its recommendations. In 1958 after 2 years of organizational endeavors the Governors again indicated their interest in the continuation of the work of this committee in a memorandum of understanding between the States involved. The results of these efforts and the growing concern over resource problems have aroused public opinion strongly supporting a permanent and more effective status for this committee. Consequently legislation in the form of a compact, between the New England States and the Federal Government, was introduced into the States' general assemblies in 1959. Four States, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island, already have approved this document and the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact will be presented for action in the next session of Congress. If enacted this could become the most useful agency for coordinating the conservation and development of natural resources in this region.

With few exceptions the public water supplies of this region are obtained from unpolluted sources and therefore the States have always diligently followed a strong policy seeking to protect the quality of the waters for future expansion and development. New England has pioneered in stream pollution control and some of the early treatment works were constructed here. The different States, individually and collectively, are engaged in other programs involving certain phases of water resource management, such as flood control, shore and beach erosion control, stream encroachment control, dredging and construction in tidal and navigable waters, supervision of dams and drainage. Cooperative programs have long been carried out with Federal agencies—Army Engineers and Geological Survey—on flood control, beach erosion control, stream gaging, ground water investigations, quality of water studies, and geological mapping.

In the realm of law of water rights and water use the New England States have generally followed the common law of riparian rights. The general adoption of this principle by the States in the eastern and mid-western portions of the country has caused this to be referred to frequently as the eastern law in contrast to the western law followed by those States in the western part of the country. The doctrine of riparian rights has adequately served the growth and prosperity of this region and while some of the States are examining their laws in this field to determine if they are outmoded, it is questionable, if changes are found to be necessary, that they will be based extensively on the western doctrine.

POLICY AND PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

The fields of water resource investigation and management are becoming overcrowded with activities of multifarious agencies—both governmental and private—which if uncontrolled might cause a confused condition approaching chaos. Initiative and competence

should not be suppressed but proper channels should be established for directing the activities toward their maximum productivity.

A partial cause of this perplexing situation is the reluctance of Federal and State Governments in setting forth policies and indicating possible guidelines for action. Then, too, it has frequently been claimed that the only method of attack on this problem is from the top level of government down rather than from the lower levels of government and activity up. It is obvious that all levels of government and activity must participate but each in its own special sphere of influence and responsibility.

In line with this premise the most important and fundamental first step is the establishment of a sound national water policy. This policy should set forth six areas of principles and cooperative intent:

1. Recognize the differences in water problems, water rights, and water law existing between regions—especially the contrasting doctrines followed in the eastern and western sections of the country.
2. Encourage and facilitate participation by private interests or agencies to attract the wealth of competence and ability available in this sphere of action.
3. Encourage establishment of regional agencies and authorize binding agreements or compacts between the Federal Government and such agencies for positive, cooperative action.
4. Assure participation by State or local governments consistent with the impact upon the economy of the respective areas.
5. Delineate the functions and responsibilities of the various Federal agencies involved in water-resources problems to avoid duplication and confusion in administration.
6. Set forth procedures for coordinating and channeling the activities of all agencies involved.

Conflicts now exist between Federal and State Governments and with the increasing attention being given to water resource matters by both governments it is likely that the conflicts will become more acute. A clean cut national water policy could prove to be a great boon to sound resource development and should stimulate establishment of State water policies without risk of conflict with Federal piecemeal policies and procedures.

Congress has set a pattern for Federal assistance to the States and local communities in the construction of stream pollution control facilities through Public Law 660. This has greatly stimulated the construction of necessary treatment facilities to the extent that in some areas there are substantial backlogs of plans awaiting availability of Federal funds. The pollution control programs in New England would be greatly advanced if Congress provided increased funds for both construction and programming until the backlog of construction is reduced. It then should determine what policies would best maintain this program in a fluid and active state, recognizing that the State and local communities should bear their fair share of responsibility and support.

There is a great need for overall comprehensive planning to care for the many problems confronting the economy of local communities. These programs have been advanced by interest-free loans through the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency. This service should be continued until the urgency has abated.

A well developed navigation system is as important to the Nation as it is to New England. The harbors of this region have not been as intensively developed for use by modern deepwater transportation craft as has been done in other areas. The needs for deeper harbors in New England must be

recognized and positive steps taken to insure their construction in the near future.

In the fields of flood control, tidal flooding and hurricane protection, shore erosion, geologic mapping, surface and ground water studies the appropriate Federal agencies have provided invaluable assistance and support in carrying out these programs cooperatively with the respective States. From time to time the needs for temporarily accelerating these programs in certain areas becomes critical and provisions should be made for meeting these demands with the requirement of a fair share of support and participation by the States involved.

The water problems of New England are not as critical as they are in other sections of the Nation. Time is in our favor, but there is a common belief that this situation will not continue indefinitely. There is also a very real determination to prevent a lackadaisical approach to advance planning for meeting the future needs on both the State and Federal levels. Public sentiment strongly favors coordination and programming on a regional basis such as is contemplated under the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact. This would provide a sound and most effective procedure for a real Federal-State-local cooperative action. To demonstrate the productivity of this plan and to assure an abundant future New England needs the helpful assistance of a sympathetic Congress, which could partially be supplied by favorable consideration of the previously suggested policies and procedures.

MODIFICATION OF LOWER MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL AND IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Mississippi River is without a doubt one of America's greatest assets and one of the principal sources of its wealth and well-being. The long, wide, deep river drains 42 percent of the entire United States into the Gulf of Mexico. On its way to the sea it picks up much sediment and meanders at will if it is not controlled by bank protection works.

During the course of its meanderings over a long period of time, the Mississippi River has changed its course on numerous occasions. Recently the Federal Government has found it necessary to take steps to prevent the river from changing its course in any particularly critical area where the change would have been so drastic that it would have affected the economy of the entire southern part of the country.

On several occasions the Mississippi River, in its process of building and cutting, has seen fit to build a mudbank in front of some of the harbors along the river. It has done this at New Madrid, Mo., Helena, Ark., and Lake Providence, La. As a result of this action of the river, the harbors at these three places have been cut off from access to the river. As the result of this action, the Federal Government, through the Corps of Engineers, cannot legally maintain the 9-foot channel in the Mississippi River that it guarantees for navigation on a year-round basis.

On behalf of myself, the Senators ELLENDER, FULBRIGHT, HENNINGS, and SYMINGTON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will make it legal for the Corps of Engineers to maintain

navigating depths in these chutes that have resulted from the action of the Mississippi River. This bill will make it possible for the engineers to construct and maintain low-water access navigation channels from the existing channel of the Mississippi River to established harbor areas along the river between Cairo, Ill., and Baton Rouge, La. This bill will limit this work in any particular locality for any single year to \$150,000.

It is my feeling that, had we had corrective works years ago, we would never have permitted these harbors to be blocked off. It is only proper that we should now restore the harbors and make this important artery of our commerce available to those localities that have been cut off as the result of this unusual action of the river. The bill I am introducing will accomplish this purpose and will do so at a cost that is very negligible when the amount of good that it will accomplish is considered.

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

The bill (S. 2843) further modifying the lower Mississippi River flood control and improvement project, originally adopted May 15, 1928, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

STABILIZATION OF PRICE SUPPORTS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to stabilize the price supports for tobacco.

This measure, Mr. President, would accomplish the same objectives as the Jordan-Cooper bill which was passed by the Congress last year and was vetoed by the President.

The new bill differs very little in its approach from the original Jordan-Cooper bill. It would allow prices of tobacco to fluctuate in direct relation to the prices farmers pay for the things necessary to the production of tobacco, including wages, taxes, interest, and the other costs involved in production. Under the bill, the 1960 price supports would be identical with those for the 1959 crop. Beginning with the 1961 crop, tobacco price supports would be computed on the basis of the average index of prices paid by farmers for the 3 calendar years immediately preceding each crop year. In this way, tobacco prices would move up or down in relation to the average cost of production for the 3 preceding calendar years.

I should like to emphasize that this measure represents another effort on the part of growers, warehousemen, dealers,

and exporters of tobacco to stabilize prices in a manner that will help tobacco produced in the United States to regain its position in world markets.

For several years we have been losing at a dangerously rapid rate foreign markets for our tobacco. If action were not taken, we would lose still more, and farmers would be forced to take another acreage reduction, which would spell disaster for thousands of farm families. If this measure is enacted into law, it will bring hope of an increase in acreage allotments, because of the new foreign sales it will promote.

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

The bill (S. 2845) to stabilize the price support of tobacco, introduced by Mr. JORDAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], as I did last year, in introducing this bill to stabilize the support levels for tobacco. I enjoyed working last year with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, and I look forward to working with him again this year in the interest of the enactment of this legislation. He is an able advocate of the interests of tobacco farmers, and has great knowledge of our tobacco program.

This bill is very similar in its practical effect to Senate bill 1901, which Senator JORDAN and I sponsored last year and which was passed by the Senate and by the House of Representatives.

This bill has the complete support of all the tobacco-grower organizations and the tobacco-State farm groups, and in fact of the entire tobacco industry.

I am particularly glad that the bill has the support of the Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation, the Burley Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association, the Burley Auction Warehousemen's Association, the Western Dark-Fired Tobacco Growers' Association, and the Stemming District Tobacco Association, all of Kentucky.

In addition, this bill has the full support of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which opposed Senate bill 1901. And in view of the conferences which have been held with responsible officials of the Department of Agriculture in coordinating the presentation of this proposal, I trust that this bill will have the approval of the Department of Agriculture.

The purpose of the bill, which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and I are joining in introducing today, is to stabilize the price-support levels for tobacco, basing them on the 1959 support levels, which were the best in history. This would assure continuation of the present fair level of price support, which has resulted in good prices for tobacco growers, with adjustments reflecting any future changes in farmers' costs.

As an example of the improvement in farmers' prices under the tobacco pro-

gram, I give the average price per pound of burley tobacco in recent years:

	Cents
Prewar, 1934-38	22.7
1941-45	40.0
1946-50	45.7
1951-55	52.5
1956-59	62.6

In addition to protecting farmers' prices—and this is of great importance—the bill will encourage the expansion of markets for tobacco in this country and abroad. Stabilizing the price-support levels for tobacco will permit manufacturers of tobacco products in this country and other countries to make their plans for a period of years, and will stimulate larger purchases.

I am sure this proposal will have the support of all Members of Congress from the tobacco-producing areas. I can see no reason why the bill should be opposed by any group, and I do not anticipate any objection. A preliminary hearing on the proposal was held by the House Committee on Agriculture on Thursday, January 14.

I trust that the Department of Agriculture will promptly approve this bill. I hope the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will quickly report the bill; and, Mr. President, as a new member of that committee, I will urge, together with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], that the bill be passed.

I believe this measure certainly should be passed by the Congress without delay, and I see no reason why it should not be signed into law.

IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture requesting the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2847) to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The letter presented by Mr. ELLENDER is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., January 6, 1960.
The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a proposed bill to amend the act relating to the importation of adult honey bees.

The proposed legislation would amend the Honey Bee Act (42 Stat. 833; 7 U.S.C. 281) to prohibit or regulate the importation into the United States of adult honey bees of all species and subspecies. The present law is now specifically limited in its application to only one species of honey bees.

Apis mellifera, the present species' name for the honey bee designated as *Apis mellifica*

in the act, is only one of four species of honey bees, the others being *A. indica*, *A. florea*, and *A. dorsata*. These latter three species may now be imported without restriction since the present act is specifically limited in its application to *A. mellifera*. Recently an infestation of *Acarapis woodi*, a mite that causes a serious disease of *A. mellifera*, was discovered at the Beltsville Bee Culture Laboratory of the Department of Agriculture in specimens of *A. indica* imported from India. This illustrates the potential danger in importing species of *Apis* other than *A. mellifera*.

Acarine disease, caused by the mite *Acarapis woodi* Rennele, is one of the most serious diseases affecting the honey bee. This disease is considered more serious than any other disease of bees, adult or brood, by apiculturists in the countries where it exists. In areas abroad it has been so destructive that it has virtually wiped out the apiculture industry in heavily infested localities.

The acarine mite is known to be present in 22 countries which represent most of Europe plus South Africa, India, and two countries in South America—Argentina and Uruguay. It is possible the disease may also occur in other countries where its presence has not been noted. The probability of this is suggested by the recent receipt of a sample of abnormal bees by the bee culture laboratory at Beltsville from Punjab, India. The sample was *Apis indica* and was found infested with *Acarapis woodi*. This was the first record of the mite being present in India and first for the *indica* species.

At the present time, to our knowledge, we do not have the disease in the United States. We have had quarantines against importation of bees since 1922, imposed solely to exclude this disease. Should the disease be introduced into the United States, it could have a devastating effect not only upon beekeeping but upon agriculture in general through the more than 50 crops that now rely heavily on the honeybee for pollination. There are approximately 450,000 beekeepers in the United States operating a total number of colonies in excess of 5 million. The value of the honeybee in pollination is often quoted as at least 10 times that of the honey and beeswax crop of \$60 million annually.

Amendment of the act as recommended would not involve the expenditure of any additional funds for its enforcement, since its effect would be to prohibit the importation of additional species of adult honeybees, except that the Department could bring in such bees under adequate safeguards if necessary for experimental purposes.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959— AMENDMENTS

Mr. HENNINGS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXPANSION OF SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my

distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2797) to increase and extend the special school milk program, introduced by me on January 13, 1960.

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

MONUMENT TO MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of January 14, 1960, the name of Mr. YARBOROUGH was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 2827) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the 150th anniversary of the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Senators MORSE, CHAVEZ, ENGLE, GRUENING, GOLDWATER, MANSFIELD, and DIRKSEN), on January 14, 1960.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OF DR. THOMAS A. DOOLEY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION—EDITORIAL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on January 13, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148, which would authorize that a gold medal be struck for Dr. Thomas Dooley for his extraordinary services to mankind, both in the U.S. Navy and subsequently. I am glad to report this resolution is now sponsored by some 35 Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senators be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Senate Joint Resolution 148 (medal for Mr. Dooley) sponsored by Mr. BUSH and Senators HENNINGS, JAVITS, SYMINGTON, MANSFIELD, BIBLE, BEALL, PRUTTY, FONG, SCOTT, CASE of South Dakota, HUMPHREY, ROBERTSON, HRUSKA, PROXMIRE, MURRAY, DODD, SPARKMAN, SCHOEPEL, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, GRUENING, JACKSON, MCGEE, ALLOTT, BYRD of Virginia, KUCHEL, THURMOND, YOUNG of North Dakota, MOSS, NEUBERGER, CURTIS, BENNETT, COOPER, CASE of New Jersey, and SALTONSTALL.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial which was published January 16, in the Hartford Courant, entitled "A Medal for Dr. Dooley," be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

A MEDAL FOR DR. DOOLEY

There should be unanimity in Congress in supporting the resolution of Senator Prescott Bush calling for a medal honoring Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. Few contemporaries deserve it more than this young physician. Originally assigned to Laos and the surrounding area by the U.S. Navy, Dr. Dooley became so impressed by the need of these poor, gentle, and grateful people that after

his discharge he raised money and went back with several colleagues as volunteer medical workers.

What he and his companions have done to help those unfortunate people, and the good will for the United States it has engendered, will never be fully appraised. There is an epic quality to it, enhanced immeasurably by the news that Dr. Dooley himself has been suffering from a cancer and that his own useful days may be numbered.

This country is dotted from end to end with metallic men on horseback who, to be sure, served what appeared to be useful ends. But the ends of society can be said to be improving when recognition is given to men like Dr. Dooley. Hartford has a statue to the discoverer of anesthesia, but this is a rarity. A medal to Dr. Dooley, as Senator Bush suggests, would be America honoring one of her best-loved and most useful citizens.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I observe, for the benefit of the Senate, that sponsorship of this joint resolution remains open until the close of business tomorrow.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 94 BY COM- MITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued by the Committee on Foreign Relations announcing the scheduling of public hearings on Senate Resolution 94 on January 27, 1960.

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

The Committee on Foreign Relations will hold public hearings on Senate Resolution 94 on January 27, 1960, at 10 a.m., in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman, announced today. This resolution, introduced by Senator Humphrey on March 24, 1959, would serve to repeal the so-called Connally amendment to the 1946 resolution which authorized the President to deposit with the United Nations a declaration accepting on behalf of the United States the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under certain conditions. The Connally amendment has the effect of reserving to the United States the right to determine unilaterally whether the subject matter of a dispute was essentially within its own domestic jurisdiction. Senate Resolution 94, which is a resolution of advice and consent, will require a two-thirds Senate vote for approval.

On January 27, the committee expects to hear administration witnesses, as well as witnesses who have asked to testify.

In connection with the forthcoming hearings, Senator Fulbright released the attached reports on Senate Resolution 94 which the committee has received from the Departments of State and Justice:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE REPORT ON SENATE RESOLUTION 94

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 30, 1959.

The Honorable J. W. Fulbright,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 25, enclosing a copy of Senate Resolution 94, relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising, and requesting the views of the Department of State.

The Department notes that the resolution in question would amend Senate Resolution 196 of the 79th Congress, 2d session, by omitting the automatic reservation under which the United States reserved the right to determine unilaterally whether the subject matter of a dispute was essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. The Department of State favors omission of this automatic reservation from the U.S. declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The following considerations are believed to be relevant.

The reservation of a unilateral right to determine whether a particular matter lies essentially within domestic jurisdiction is regarded by some as inconsistent with the provision in the statute of the International Court of Justice (art. 36, par. 6) whereby the Court is to decide a dispute whether it has jurisdiction in a particular case. Under that view, such a reservation could be regarded as rendering the U.S. declaration illusory and as evidencing a distrust of the Court, contrary to our policy of support for referral to the Court of international legal disputes which cannot be settled otherwise.

This policy is in aid of the broad U.S. objective of fostering development of the rule of law in world affairs. With an automatic reservation in our own declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction, the United States is hindered in urging upon all states the judicial settlement of international legal disputes and greater use of the World Court. The U.S. automatic reservation has served as a model for reservations in a number of other declarations accepting compulsory jurisdiction. It would be desirable for the United States to be in a strong position for advocating the elimination of automatic reservations.

Under the statute of the International Court of Justice (art. 36, par. 2), declarations accepting the Court's jurisdiction are made on a reciprocal basis. Thus any state against which the United States might bring suit is enabled today to invoke against us reciprocally the automatic reservation, and could determine unilaterally that the subject matter of our suit was essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the defendant state. This is precisely what happened in the case of certain Norwegian loans (*France v. Norway*), decided by the International Court of Justice in 1958. There the defendant Norway successfully invoked the automatic reservation of France, and the French application was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Elimination of the U.S. automatic reservation would not result in conferring jurisdiction on the World Court with respect to disputes over matters essentially within domestic jurisdiction. Disputes of this character would still be subject to exclusion from the Court's jurisdiction under the standard reservation on domestic jurisdiction. The Court would decide in particular cases whether this reservation was applicable.

As a practical matter, retention of the automatic reservation would not afford a defense having significant value. It was the understanding of the Senate when the automatic proviso was adopted that this reservation would never be improperly invoked and that the United States would be bound in good faith to accept the Court's jurisdiction in every case involving matters not essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. Thus, the United States as a matter of policy would expect to invoke the reservation only in those cases in which the Court itself would probably uphold a plea of domestic jurisdiction if interposed by the United States on the basis of the domestic jurisdiction reservation without the automatic proviso.

The Department of State notes that Senate Resolution 94 would retain in the resolving

clause of Senate Resolution 196, 79th Congress, the words "hereafter arising" as a limitation on disputes to be submitted to the International Court of Justice. In their original context these words referred to the date of Senate Resolution 196, namely, August 2, 1946. In order to avoid any possible doubt as to the import of Senate Resolution 94, it would seem desirable to replace the words "hereafter arising" with an expression such as "arising after August 2, 1946" if it is intended to carry forward the limitation contained in Senate Resolution 196.

With warmest personal regards,

Most sincerely,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REPORT ON SENATE
RESOLUTION 94

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1959.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning Senate Resolution 94 relating to the "recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising."

The purpose of Senate Resolution 94 is to amend Senate Resolution 196 of the 79th Congress, 2d session, agreed to August 2, 1946, by which the Senate consented to the U.S. acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice with respect to international legal disputes upon the express terms provided therein. One of these terms reserved from the Court's jurisdiction "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States." This amendment would delete the words "as determined by the United States" from this reservation.

The legal effect of the proposed amendment would be to affirm unequivocally that the Court is the judge of its own jurisdiction as provided in article 36(6) of the statute of the Court to which the United States is a party. The proposed amendment would not otherwise change or alter any of the U.S. reservations including the reservation of disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

This Department recommends the adoption of this amendatory resolution by the U.S. Senate.

The proposed amendment would tend better to effectuate our settled national policy to encourage and develop the rule of law in the affairs of nations. The existing reservation of a unilateral right to determine what disputes are domestic has had the opposite tendency. First, it has served as an example for other nations to adopt similar limitations on the Court's jurisdiction. Second, it permits other nations on the basis of reciprocity to exercise the same right after a dispute has arisen. The inevitable effect, contrary to our objectives, is to frustrate the purpose of the advance acceptance by nations of the Court's jurisdiction and to weaken the Court as the principal organ of the United Nations for the judicial settlement of international legal disputes.

The proposed amendment would be fully consistent with article 36(6) of the statute of the International Court of Justice which provides "in the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

The amendment would be consistent with the comparable reservation with respect to domestic matters in article 2(7) of the Charter of the United Nations.

Experience over a period of 13 years has demonstrated that the Court has not sought in any way to enlarge its limited jurisdiction. On the contrary, the Court in its judgments has meticulously applied relevant principles of international law on a case-by-case basis after affording to the parties before its full procedural safeguards.

For the foregoing reasons, it is the Department's conclusion that the national interest would be best served by the adoption of Senate Resolution 94.

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

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE E. WALSH,
Deputy Attorney General.

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. PROXMIRE:

Address by Senator KENNEDY delivered at National Press Club, Washington, D.C., on January 14, 1960.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Opinion poll taken from small businessmen throughout the country and in New York State, submitted to him by the National Small Business Men's Association.

NEEDED: IMMEDIATE ACTION TO PROVIDE SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR THE SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last week I introduced Senate bill 2797, to provide supplemental funds for the current year for the special school milk program, as well as to extend and expand the program for the years ahead.

During the period in which this program has been in effect, it has been extremely useful in terms of providing an outlet for surplus milk, as well as improving the health of our school children.

To carry out the milk distribution program, school officials and community leaders have made a constructive effort to provide services and facilities, and have done an outstanding job.

As I stated upon the introduction of my bill, additional funds are needed immediately, if the program is not to suffer curtailment. As a matter of fact, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has already sent out directives that Federal participation is to be cut back on March 1, if the necessary money is not provided.

Fortunately, the Agriculture Committees in both the House and the Senate have recognized the need for expeditious action to avert curtailment of this program. As I understand, hearings to consider supplemental appropriations have been scheduled in the House committee for Wednesday, and in the Senate committee for Thursday of this week.

Today, I received a number of communications from school officials in Wisconsin, who point out the adverse impact which lack of funds would have on the milk program. These letters reflect the need for expeditious action; and I request unanimous consent to

have a number of these printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF OCONTO, WIS.,
January 15, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Early in November of 1958 the Secretary of Agriculture issued an amendment to his regulations governing the operation of the special milk program in which the rates of reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk beginning March 1, 1960. This reduction would mean that schools serving type A school lunches, of which our school is one, the reimbursement rate would be dropped to 3½ cents per half pint of milk.

To the casual observer this may seem like a very insignificant amount and hardly worthy of consideration. This is not the case, however, as most school lunch programs are operated on a nonprofit basis to enable all students who so desire to take part in the program and receive a well balanced meal without a prohibitive cost to their parents.

In a low income area such as we have in our school district, this lack of revenue would have a profound effect upon our lunch program. It is very possible that a higher student assessment would be necessary, and this might discourage the very student who stands to gain the most from a program of this type.

As I understand it, the only way the Secretary's action can be rescinded would be through legislation on the part of the Congress to appropriate additional funds to make possible the continuation of existing rates and to issue a mandate to the Secretary of Agriculture requiring that the amendment to the regulations be withdrawn or adjusted.

We are all looking for ways to hold down the rising costs of taxes, and perhaps our community is selfish in its motives for perpetuating the school milk program as it now exists, but we are sure that this type of aid is providing positive help to many millions of school children who might be without nourishing food each day were it not for the school lunch program. Few Federal programs benefit so many.

We hope that you see fit to support any legislation which would make it possible to continue the milk support program at its present level.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,

GERALD A. EYLER,
Superintendent.

JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1,
Glidden, Wis., January 15, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have received a communication from the Wisconsin School Food Service Association indicating that the Secretary of Agriculture has issued an amendment to his regulation governing the operation of the special milk program to the effect that the rates of the reimbursement are to be reduced by one-half cent per one-half pint of milk.

The purpose of this letter is to urge you to vote for legislation that would appropriate additional funds and also legislation requiring the amendment to the special lunch program to be rescinded. Any action you may take in this regard will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

E. B. CORRIGAN,
Supervising Principal.

WILTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Wilton, Wis., January 15, 1960.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,
U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is a protestation of the action taken by the Secretary of Agriculture reducing the Government reimbursement rate for milk provided schools in the special milk program.

This amendment to his regulation governing the operation of the special milk program will undoubtedly terminate the program, at least as far as providing free milk to the students is concerned in our school.

A reduction of Government reimbursement to 3½ cents per one-half pint will add an additional ½ cent to the 1 cent per one-half pint already expended by district funds for this program. This adds up to a 1½ cents per one-half pint cut which the school district must pay to have students enjoy the special milk program here at Wilton.

As the administrator of the Wilton Public Schools I wish to voice my objections to this Department of Agriculture action and I urge you, as one of our Congressmen, to use your influence to secure legislation in this present session to prevent the forthcoming reduction from becoming a reality.

Respectfully,

ALLEN E. SCHRAUFNAGEL,
Supervising Principal.

GALE-ETTRICK SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Galesville, Wis., January 15, 1960.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: It is urgent that you exert all effort available to support a renewal of sufficient funds for the special milk program. It is imperative, since our budget has been established for the ensuing year, that the full value is received for all school milk.

Very sincerely yours,

VERMONT JOHNSON,
District Superintendent.

ONALASKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Onalaska, Wis., January 15, 1960.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: I am disturbed by a recent directive from the Secretary of Agriculture ordering a cut in subsidy of one-half cent per half pint of milk used in the schools' special milk programs. This is a cut in this subsidy of 12½ percent and many school districts, including our own, are subsidizing lunch programs as much as they can. Our plans are made for this school year so that a cut going into effect March 1, 1960, fills us with consternation.

I appeal to you to use your resources to get this directive changed or to support legislation designed to maintain the present rate of Federal support.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT G. PETERSON,
Superintendent.

U.S. COMMUNIST PARTY CONVENTION IN NEW YORK LAST DECEMBER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday, January 17, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, issued a statement alerting America to the results of the U.S. Communist Party convention in New York last December.

In my opinion, Mr. Hoover's significant statement is "must" reading for every Senator.

Noting that the 200 Communist delegates to the convention adjourned in a state of jubilation, Mr. Hoover said:

And well they might feel in high spirits, because Communist Party, U.S.A., emerged from this convention more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic.

Mr. Hoover further stated:

Without question, the most signal achievement was the welding of the Communist Party, U.S.A., into a solidly unified, aggressive force behind the militant, devious, and ruthless leadership of Gus Hall, exconvict and avowed archenemy of the American way of life.

Mr. Hoover then asked:

Why is the party so optimistic for the future? Why were Gus Hall and other Communists almost gleeful in speaking of Communist possibilities in the days ahead?

"The answer," Mr. Hoover declared, "comes from the convention proceedings, an answer which, like a thread, runs through all the remarks, actions, and hopes of the leadership."

The answer, Mr. Hoover stated very emphatically, is:

That the recent visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States has done much to create an atmosphere favorable to communism among Americans.

Mr. President, this is exactly what I warned against last August before Mr. Khrushchev came to this country. Last summer I said I was opposed to the Khrushchev visit. I said I was very doubtful that any good would issue from it.

More than that, I said I feared it would have a softening effect on a certain element of our population and cause a lowering of our guard. Now, just a few months later, we find Mr. Hoover substantiating my fears.

Mr. Hoover reported:

In one convention discussion, for example, it was stated that as a result of the Khrushchev visit the American people have open minds toward socialism. Hence, the party must learn how to get socialism across to the people and break down misconceptions about the Soviet Union.

Mr. Hoover asserted:

To party leaders, Khrushchev's presence in this country has eased the way for party activities.

Mr. President, what is happening is exactly what I warned against last summer. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoover's statements be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that it will receive the attention and widespread distribution it deserves.

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

STATEMENT BY J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, CONCERNING THE 17TH NATIONAL CONVENTION, COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A., DECEMBER 10-13, 1959

Profaning the very meaning and spirit of the "Star-Spangled Banner" by opening its sinister conclave with our national anthem, the Communist Party, U.S.A., convened its 17th national convention on December 10, 1959, in a hotel in New York City's Harlem section. Four days later, the same 200 delegates, representing other Communists

throughout our Nation, adjourned in a state of jubilation.

And well they might feel in high spirits—because Communist Party, U.S.A., emerged from this convention more powerful, more unified, and even more of a menace to our Republic.

Without question, the most signal achievement was the welding of the Communist Party, U.S.A., into a solidly unified, aggressive force behind the militant, devious, and ruthless leadership of Gus Hall, exconvict and avowed archenemy of the American way of life.

Hall was elected general secretary of the party at the convention, and there is virtual unanimous agreement among party powers and rank and file that he is the No. 1 man in the party. As such, he now spearheads as powerful a group of dissidents and fanatic democracy haters as America has seldom seen within its shores during peacetime.

The Communist conspiracy in America today is led by a man who has openly boasted that he was willing to take up arms and fight to overthrow our form of government. Hall was convicted in Minneapolis, Minn., in 1934 in connection with a riot there when he was a member of the Young Communist League. During his trial he testified as follows:

"Question. But you would prefer the Russian—you would prefer to be in Russia?"

"Answer. I prefer American with a Soviet government.

"Question. And you are willing to fight and overthrow this Government?"

"Answer. Absolutely.

"Question. And you are willing to take up arms and overthrow the constituted authorities?"

"Answer. When the time comes, 'Yes.'"

As a hot-blooded young Communist in the late 1930's, Hall was arrested in Ohio and charged with the possession and use of explosives. He subsequently pleaded guilty to a lesser charge of malicious destruction of property and was fined \$500.

The election of the fiery Hall to lead a strongly knit Communist Party which has and always will have as its chief objective the communizing of America should certainly shake even the most apathetic American from his lethargy, especially when viewed in the light of this hardened Communist's own statements. During radio and television interviews at the convention, Hall gladly stated that the American public "definitely" has underestimated the size and influence of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He added that the Communists in this country should make even greater strides toward increasing its already growing number of members. He boasted that the party "is growing in industry and youth" due mainly to the change in political climate.

Assuredly, there is a significant lesson for every American in this display of machinations, propaganda, and opportunism which is communism itself at work within our borders. The 17th national convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., was a revealing 4-day miniature preview of what our Nation would become if those who aspire to become commissars of a Soviet America should ever fulfill their evil ambitions. It is apparent that, more than ever before, each American must maintain vigilant watchfulness toward this Trojan horse in our midst.

The 17th national convention is being hailed by the Communists themselves as a great milestone in the party's history in the United States.

These gains, recognized as formidable ones, are regarded by the party faithful as their chief accomplishments:

1. Promotion of Gus Hall, strongly pro-Russian and an energetic, aggressive leader, to the No. 1 position in the party;

2. Untying the membership solidly behind the newly elected leadership, making the

party a hard-hitting, mobile weapon against the free American Government;

3. Exploiting the current international political climate in an effort to make Russian policies more acceptable to American public opinion. This involves an attempt to exploit Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's visit to the United States as a means of furthering its own schemes for bringing about a Soviet America;

4. Implemented a number of concrete programs aimed at increasing party membership and party influence in America. Such programs include increased emphasis on party recruiting, training of leaders, collection of funds, stepping up of party propaganda, and infiltration efforts into non-Communist organizations such as labor unions, Negro groups, national minorities, etc.

The newly elected "boss" of the Communist Party, U.S.A., Gus Hall, vaulted to the top post of the party through a combination of fortuitous circumstances and artful plotting. He has long been disgruntled at what he believed to be soft, ineffectual leadership in the party; but his ambitions have been hidden by the shadow of Eugene Dennis, national chairman and previously acknowledged leader of the party. As the date of the convention approached, Dennis still was top man in the party, although there was indication that Hall had nurtured a "dump Dennis" campaign to the point where Dennis' position was indeed a tenuous one. Then came the news that Dennis would be unable to attend the convention, that he had suffered a slight stroke, and that someone else would have to give the keynote address.

The scheming, opportunistic Hall rose to the occasion and delivered the address. He saw his ambition start to crystallize. Today he is communism's champion in the United States—a powerful, deceitful, dangerous foe of Americanism.

What sort of a man is Gus Hall? We in the FBI know him as a fanatical practitioner of Karl Marx' tenet that "the end justifies the means"; a coldly calculating Communist conniver who changes tactics as easily as he changed his name many years ago. He was born Arvo Halberg in 1910 at Virginia, Minn., the son of Matt and Susanna Halberg, both of whom later became charter members of the Communist Party. As a result of his early background of having been born into communism, many of his followers regard him as literally a man of destiny who can breathe new life into the party.

Hall joined the party in 1927 and went to Russia in 1931 to attend the Lenin School where students were taught, among other things, sabotage and guerrilla warfare techniques. After returning to this country in 1933, he became active in the Young Communist League as an organizer and in 1938 entered into full-time party work as a section organizer. As a Russian-taught disciple of Leninistic communism, Hall worked hard and rose swiftly into positions of increasing power. He was elected to the party's national committee in 1945 and became a national board member in 1947. In 1950, he was appointed national secretary, a move necessitated by the imprisonment of Eugene Dennis, who was then general secretary and who was found guilty of conspiring to violate the Smith Act of 1940.

Then, faced with confinement himself after being convicted for violation of the same act, Hall jumped \$20,000 bond and became a fugitive. He dyed his blond hair, eyebrows, and eyelashes dark brown, shaved off his mustache, and shed 40 pounds in an unsuccessful effort to evade apprehension. Arrested by the FBI in 1951, Hall was sentenced to 3 years for contempt of court, making a total of 8 years when added to the 5-year sentence imposed for conspiracy to violate the Smith Act.

Conditionally released from prison in March 1957, Hall, after his probationary period ended on April 5, 1959, immediately resumed his nefarious aim of infecting America with communism.

This, then, is the man—exconvict, propagandist, unabashed emissary of evil, and rabid advocate of a Soviet United States.

Behind this Moscow-trained, utterly ruthless Communist leader, the 17th national convention formulated an organizational apparatus designed to make the Communist Party a hard-striking power against American society. A 60-member national committee was established with such veteran and hardened party leaders as Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, James Jackson, Hyman Lumer, Arnold Samuel Johnson, and Irving Potash. This national committee is theoretically the governing body of the party between conventions, but actual policy is made by the small ruling clique.

This small clique consists of the party's national officers (though a national executive committee is later to be established) who were elected after the convention by the national committee. The national officers are: William Z. Foster, chairman emeritus; Eugene Dennis, national chairman; Claude Lightfoot, vice chairman; Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, vice chairman; Benjamin J. Davis, national secretary; Gus Hall, general secretary; Hyman Lumer, national education secretary; James Jackson, national secretary for the South.

A five-man secretariat, consisting of Dennis, Hall, Davis, Lumer, and Jackson, will be the day-to-day operating authority of the party.

Although the positions of national chairman, national secretary, and general secretary theoretically are of equal importance, Hall is indisputably the new party chief. It will be remembered that Joseph Stalin once bore the title of general secretary of the Russian Communist Party—a position from which he became dictator of all communism.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from the national convention's leadership decisions:

- (1) The party will remain in the future—as it has been in the past—an obedient slave of Moscow: No new personalities were brought into the party's top leadership. Rather, leadership is today exercised by the same corps of hardened, disciplined, veteran Communists who feel that Moscow represents the final goal of all of mankind's hopes. So-called rightwing Communists are not represented. They have either voluntarily resigned in complete disillusionment or been coldbloodedly purged. These rightwingers believed that the party in America should have some choice in its tactics of operation, not be completely bound by Moscow. This slight deviation cost them dearly. Communists should know there is only one road—that defined exclusively by Moscow.

Proof of the growing monolithic unity of the party is further shown in the changes made in the party's constitution by the convention. These changes eliminated features stemming from the previous convention which allowed greater freedom to local party units. The 1959 changes eliminated these rights and centralized control in national headquarters. They are in full accord with the historic Communist principle of democratic centralism which asserts that once a decision has been made in the party it must be carried out without dissent.

- (2) The elimination of factionalism, making the party a more unified and more compact organization: Especially since the death of Stalin, the party has experienced factional disputes. These "factionalists" have now been liquidated or driven to cover. This was the theme of Gus Hall's summary remarks just before the end of the convention. Speaking with gusto, this new Communist commissar declared that "we" now

have one policy, one line, and one direction. Interpreting the convention, Hall stated it gave a mandate to the leadership to completely destroy and burn out all elements of factionalism and that the leadership must carry out the mandate. Hence, in his words, the party cannot permit factionalism.

So, in the days ahead, we can expect an ever-increasing emphasis on party discipline, with all dissidents being eliminated. This is truly in the tradition of international communism which has no place for free speech and free thought.

Every action of the convention was designed to make the party a hard-hitting, versatile, and mobile weapon of attack against our form of government.

Why is the party so optimistic for the future? Why were Gus Hall and other Communists almost gleeful in speaking of Communist possibilities in the days ahead?

The answer comes from the convention proceedings—an answer which, like a thread, runs through all the remarks, actions, and hopes of the leadership. It is: that the recent visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States has done much to create an atmosphere favorable to communism among Americans. In one convention discussion, for example, it was stated that as the result of the Khrushchev visit the American people have open minds toward socialism. Hence, the party must learn how to get socialism across to the people and break down misconceptions about the Soviet Union.

To party leaders, Khrushchev's presence in this country has eased the way for party activities. The Communists see the possibility of gaining still more influence in American society. Gus Hall, in his keynote speech on the convention's first day, was most sensitive to this point. He stated:

"The central question of this convention is: What is the role of the party in this entirely new situation? How can it now move out into the broad stream of the people's movement? How can it break the bonds of its isolation and become more and more effectively a factor in the life of our Nation?"

He then went on:

"We want to participate in, organize, and lead the broadest of united front movements—on every level—in a thousand ways, in 10,000 places, on 100,000 issues—if possible, with 180 million people."

Note the scope of Communist hopes—180 million people or the entire United States. The buoyant optimism of the party is geared to plans to take advantage of an international climate which, in their eyes, is aiding their work. Americans can look forward to a period of renewed party agitation in all fields—always hoping to increase party strength and influence. The Communists will endeavor to gain allies wherever they can be found, creating fronts, launching infiltration programs, participating in all phases of American life.

This new hope program of communism in the United States is geared to concrete programs both (1) building up the party apparatus itself, and (2) increasing party influence in the Nation as a whole.

Party leaders realize that a strong party organization is absolutely necessary to a successful agitation program. The convention adopted a number of programs to strengthen the internal operational structure of the party.

A resolution was adopted calling for the immediate launching of an intensive membership drive to run to May 1, 1960, aimed at increasing membership by 10 percent. This resolution outlined a program which calls for each party district to advise the national office by the end of January 1960, as to its specific plans for recruitment. To show the urgency of this task, the resolution asserted that each national committee member must adopt a personal quota of new recruits. In addition, each Communist Party club must adopt a quota. Moreover, each national of-

ficer will be designated to a specific district to aid in this nationwide recruitment program.

The training of party members also must be stepped up. This will mean more party schools. In the Communist Party, education (really meaning indoctrination) is of vital importance. Every member must be deeply imbued with the principles of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

The convention also adopted reports about the status of the Worker, the party's weekly publication. It was pointed out that the Worker was the lifeblood of the party and that strengthening this paper must be one of the party's chief aims. The Worker does much to guide members, giving them the latest twists of the party line. Circulation of the Worker is now approximately 14,000, and the party wants it to be increased to 25,000 in 1960. The convention also accepted a resolution to the effect that the Daily Worker, which was discontinued in 1958, be reinstated in the shortest possible time but preferably prior to the 1960 national elections in the United States. To the party, the Communist press represents one of its most effective methods of propaganda. In addition, it was recommended that the new national committee should set a date for the next fund drive, probably from January 13, 1960, to May 1, 1960. (The date of January 13 was selected as on this date in 1958 the Daily Worker was discontinued.)

Hence, the convention has given new guidance and enthusiasm to the party's recruiting, indoctrination, and propaganda campaigns. As one of the speakers stated, this was a convention to build the Communist Party, U.S.A.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A., FOLLOWS LENIN

Virtually every move taken at the 17th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., has its roots in the teachings of the early gods of communism. In 1902, Lenin wrote:

"We must go among all classes of the people as theoreticians, as propagandists, as agitators, and as organizers. The principal thing, of course, is propaganda and agitation among all strata of the people."

In 1920, Lenin was even more explicit regarding the manner in which the seed of communism was to be planted in fertile areas of unrest, dissension, and strife:

"Every sacrifice must be made, the greatest obstacles must be overcome, in order to carry on agitation and propaganda systematically, perseveringly, persistently, and patiently, precisely in those institutions, societies, and associations—even the most reactionary—to which proletarian or semi-proletarian masses belong."

Naive, indeed, is the minority, class, or dissatisfied group which lets its banner pass into the hands of the Communists, for this banner will be held aloft by the Reds only so long as it serves the purpose of expediting the Communist objective of domination over all classes.

YOUTH

If for a moment any American considers the Communists to be blind to opportunity, let him consider this vile tactic which came out of the 17th national convention:

It is obvious to the Communists that, if its party is to survive, it must attract the youth of this Nation. As newspapers and other media reveal almost daily, many of America's juveniles are in a state of upheaval—adult authority and morality have been spurned to the point where juvenile arrests in this country in 1958 increased 8 percent over the preceding year.

During the convention, an Illinois Communist took note of the juvenile delinquency situation and proposed that if we provide them with a place to go and with activities they will not be so delinquent; we can move them in a positive direction.

What can be more despicable or dangerous to our democracy than this sort of Red Pied Piper trickery?

NEGROES

Another of the major aims of the 17th national convention was to reemphasize the recruitment of Negroes into the Communist Party by reemphasizing the same old hackneyed phrases alleging that the Communist Party is the savior of the Negro. It is no secret that one of the bitterest disappointments of communistic efforts in this Nation has been their failure to lure our Negro citizens into the party. Despite every type of propaganda boomed at our Nation's Negro citizens, they have never succumbed to the party's saccharine promises of a Communist utopia. This generation and generations to come for many years owe a tremendous debt to our Negro citizens who have consistently refused to surrender their freedoms for the tyranny of communism.

Behind the Communists' scheme of recruiting Negroes is deceit as there is in every one of their designs. The Reds are not so interested in the Negro as they are in using him to further Communist goals. This is clearly shown by instructions issued by the Communist Party, U.S.A., to its members as early as 1925:

"The aim of our party in our work among the Negro masses is to create a powerful proletarian movement which will fight and lead the struggle of the Negro race against exploitation and oppression in every form and which will be a militant part of the revolutionary movement of the whole American working class, to strengthen the American revolutionary movement by bringing into it the * * * Negro workers and farmers in the United States to broaden the struggles of the American Negro workers and farmers, connect them with the struggles of the national minorities and colonial peoples of all the world and thereby further the cause of the world revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat."

The Negro resolution adopted by the convention discarded the party's historic position advocating self-determination, meaning that Negroes should be given the right to form a separate nation in the Southern States. Stalin had defined "self-determination" in these words:

"The right of the oppressed peoples of the dependent countries and colonies to complete secession, as the right of nations to independent existence as states."

The 1959 convention resolution hence represents a party admission that its position concerning Negroes is bankrupt. Time itself has shown that the party is not interested in the welfare of the Negro, but only in using him as a tool to advance party interests.

OTHER MINORITIES

During the 17th national convention, much was made of the party's responsibility of championing the causes of such groups in the United States as the Mexicans, Japanese-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and a relatively new target, the American Indian. Again, such pseudo concern by the party is readily made apparent by its history of exploiting any area of unrest.

As early as 1921, the Communist International laid down the following rule to be followed by foreign Communist Parties affiliated with the Comintern:

"In countries whose population contains national minorities, it is the duty of the party to devote the necessary attention to propaganda and agitation among the proletarian strata of these minorities."

The choice of the words "propaganda" and "agitation" belies any "noble" motive which those who are easily beguiled might ascribe to the international Communist conspiracy.

LABOR UNIONS

The 17th national convention reaffirmed the party's constant aim of attempting to

infiltrate and dominate labor unions to turn them into a tool for communism—to make them recruiting areas for additional members in the Communist movement.

The 17th national convention's 10-page draft resolution on trade union problems contains the pious statement that—"that fact that Communists have no interests apart from those of the entire working class must be brought home to the American workers again and again."

Actually, the party's burning desire to grab control of labor unions is nothing more than an attempt to carry out one of Lenin's most necessary rules to achieve communism:

"It is necessary to be able to withstand all of this, to agree to any, and every sacrifice, and even—if need be—to resort to all sorts of devices, maneuvers, and illegal methods, to evasion, and subterfuge, in order to penetrate into the trade unions, to remain in them, and to carry on Communist work in them at all costs."

Certainly, the Communists' glittering generalities of "freeing the workingman" and securing "better working conditions" for him can never take the place of the free bargaining system under our democracy. No semantic window-dressing will ever disguise the true objective of communism—to make slaves of workingmen.

The man masterminding the party's unscrupulous attempts at infiltrating labor unions is Irving Potash, national labor secretary. His sordid background indeed makes a farce of the party's claim that it has no interests apart from those of the entire working class. Born in Russia in 1902, he has an arrest record dating back to 1919 for criminal anarchy, conspiracy to influence and intimidate witnesses, conspiracy to teach and advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force and violence, and illegal re-entry into this country.

Potash has been dedicated to the Communist movement since his early youth and has been described by a party comrade as "a guy who has never betrayed the party line." In 1931, he placed his own picture on a passport issued to another person and utilized this passport to travel to Russia to attend the Lenin School. Although Potash has stated that he considers America his home, there is no indication he has made any efforts to obtain U.S. citizenship in the 46 years he has called America his homeland. He has, however, frequently and consistently invoked the constitutional privileges of an American citizen when questioned by various congressional committees regarding his Communist Party membership and activities.

FARMERS

In considering what position the Communist Party, U.S.A., will take during the 1960 political campaign, those in attendance at the 17th national convention were provided with a document containing a 10-point program, which the party would support. One of these concerning farmers is ridiculous per se when examined in the light of the ultimate aim of communism. Despite the slaves in the communes of Communist China and the state-owned collective farms and farm machinery in Soviet Russia, the Communists in America have the effrontery to intone sanctimoniously that the Communist Party, U.S.A., will support a program which will "protect the rights of the small farmers to their land and their implements."

What else could such a program be but one small, but expedient, step toward the sovietization of American farmers? Who can conceive of farmers being allowed to own their farms and machinery in the type of society advocated by Communists whose very name connotes a social order in which all goods are held in common by a single authoritarian party?

POLITICAL ELECTIONS

Communists know that apathy among American citizens is the chink in democracy's armor. One of the speakers at the 17th national convention revealed the basic Communist tactic of taking advantage of every weakness when he urged members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to move in the primaries since 90 percent of the Congressmen are elected at the primaries.

The convention heard a report of a five-man committee which had made a study of what the party could do in the 1960 elections. It advocated, among other things, influencing both major political parties. Also, it recommended that the party attempt to exploit labor and Negro groups to wield independent political influence. This report was adopted by the convention.

EDUCATION

The Communist Party remains deeply interested in the American college student. At a press conference, Gus Hall was asked if the party had made any inroads among college students. He replied that the party had made gains in this field, adding that there has been a change in the thinking of college students toward nonconformity. Hall added that he based this comment on the fact that a number of requests have been received from colleges for speakers.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

As evidence of the fact that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a part of the international Communist conspiracy, the convention received greetings from 50 Communist Parties in foreign countries. Most prominent, of course, were the messages received from the Communist Parties in Russia and China.

A motion adopted by the convention reflects another area of growing Communist concern. This motion instructed the new national committee to create a subcommittee on Latin American affairs. Another motion called for an appeal to the conscience of the American people to give support to the "revolutionary" movement developing in Latin America.

In the days ahead, the party can be expected to give increasing emphasis to Latin American matters. Joseph North, foreign affairs editor of the Worker, gave a report to the convention on Castro and the Cuban situation. He praised the progress that has been made by the Cuban Government and said that the agrarian land reform has made the farmers more prosperous than they were before the revolution.

Juan Santos Rivera, president of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico, addressed the convention. He extended his best wishes for success to the Communist Party, U.S.A. The party was most enthusiastic over Rivera's appearance.

COMMUNISM AND THE PRESS

One of the paradoxes at the convention was the fact the convention was closed to the press, this in spite of the party's old, old theme that the Communist Party fights for freedom. When queried by a reporter as to why the convention was not open to the press, Hall blithely stated that the party has received unfavorable treatment from the press in the past and also because there were delegates in attendance who might lose their jobs if their identities became known. Of course, the real reason the press was not admitted was because the party does not dare let its illegal aims against the United States become public. The exclusion of the press is a tacit admission that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is a clandestine, far from legitimate organization, and that if the free press cannot praise communism, then there is no room at Communist conventions for the press. His feelings regarding the purpose of the press are revealing, too, as to what place

the fourth estate would have in a society dominated by the Communist Party.

However, veteran newspapermen are not easily fooled, and some of Hall's answers to questions posed by the reporters quickly exposed him. For instance, Hall was asked if the Communist Party, U.S.A., advocates the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government. Hall, convicted in Federal court for conspiring to do just that—Hall, who once openly testified that he was willing to take up arms to bring about a Soviet America, blandly said without hesitation, "No, we have never advocated this."

THE SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the assistant majority leader, last week had a colloquy with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. In the course of that colloquy some very important information was elicited from the Senator from Montana. I should like to follow that up, since the Senator from Montana is now present on the floor.

I refer to a speech that was made last year, March 9, in which a colloquy took place between the Senator from Montana and myself. The Senator from Montana at one point said this:

The Senator knows that under the law there are only seven members on the policy committee. If the Senator from Wisconsin wants to have that committee expanded, I suggest he introduce a measure to that effect. I assure him it will be given the most earnest and serious consideration. At the present time the committee is stymied as to the number of its members. So far as I am concerned, I am merely a file closer. I am an ex officio member.

It is my understanding and I hope the Senator from Montana will correct me if the situation is now different.

While other members of the committee may be ex officio members, who are not among the seven referred to by the Senator from Montana, they have a vote, and they have the same powers as the regular members of the policy committee; there is no difference except that they were appointed at a later date. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is correct. Under the law there are only seven members of the policy committee, and that includes the leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. However, beginning with Senator Barkley, the secretary of the majority at the present time, the position being held by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the whip or assistant leader, the position held by me, were added as ex officio members, and that has been the situation down to the present time.

The majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], instead of looking upon us as ex officio members who merely participate, has allowed us every leeway he possibly could in discussions and voting. Last year he extended the membership still further by bringing into the policy committee the three members of the calendar commit-

tee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and he has given them the same privileges a regular member on the committee has. So what we have in effect at the present time is a 12-man committee, although under the law only 7 are supposed to be members.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the fact is that the senior Senator from Texas, the majority leader, has extended the power of voting on the policy committee to five additional members, who, according to the law as it was passed, are not designated as members of the policy committee. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true. In the case of two, he was carrying out a policy inaugurated by the former majority leader, Mr. Barkley, at the time the so-called policy committee was set up in 1947; and, on his own initiative, to give a wider representation, I suppose, he brought into the policy committee the three members of the calendar committee, who sit with us regularly, and have for over a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wanted to reinforce that impression, as to whether the members of the calendar committee had power to vote on all occasions. I think the statement of the Senator from Montana has made the situation perfectly clear. I called the Library of Congress on that question. They checked with the Democratic National Committee. I do not know why the Library should have checked with the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the advisory committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Library received word that the ex officio members of the policy committee do not vote. The Senator from Montana has clarified that aspect. I am glad that fact has been made a matter of public information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted the Senator from Wisconsin has brought this matter up, but I thought it was a matter of public information. I assure the Senator that, so far as the members of the calendar committee are concerned, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], they have a vote and they know they have a vote. Their views are asked, and they participate in matters affecting proposed legislation reported by the standing committees of the Senate.

THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times has a massive sense of history which is brilliantly condensed in a 3-minute thumbnail summary of the news every morning in the Times' daily news summary and index. Yesterday morning the first two news events summarized under the caption "National" bear an interesting relationship. I will read them without comment:

NATIONAL

His finger poised in the air for emphasis, Vice President Nixon opened his 1960 campaign against the Democrats by challenging

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY's concept of the Presidency. In Florida for his first speaking appearance since announcing his own candidacy, Mr. Nixon said the Senator, also a declared candidate, seemed to confuse prestitial table pounding with strong leadership. The Vice President defended the Eisenhower record and set forth his own list of qualities the next President should have.

President Eisenhower spent the entire day out in the fields in Georgia hunting elusive quail. Shotgun blasts and the yelping of bird dogs set up a commotion, the like of which had scarcely been known since a hurricane all but leveled the nearby town of Albany in 1940. When it was all over, the President had bagged his legal limit of 12 birds.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], discussing the Presidency, and his remarks about the President, particularly calling attention to the weekend vacation he has taken, I wish to comment briefly.

The President of the United States needs no defense from me. Criticism of or debate about the concept of the Presidency or the President's policies is a matter within the competence of this body and of the American people. But from time to time some Members rise in this body and comment on the fact that the President has taken a weekend vacation, that he may play golf, that he may shoot, or that he may hunt. I do not derogate the character or the qualities of the Senator from Wisconsin, but I must say that in my view such remarks are in bad taste and wholly uncalled for.

Even for a man who has had no sickness at any time, one serving as President of the United States, one who bears the tremendous burdens of that Office, deserves to have a rest now and then, even often, and it is good for the country.

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

Mr. COOPER. The President, who has had a heart attack and another serious illness, and who has come back from those illnesses to serve this country with devotion to duty, deserves and has the approbation of the people of this country.

Whatever may be said, it is a fact that the President is at a peak of public approval in this country and throughout the world. It is doubtful if any President of the United States ever before enjoyed the confidence of the people of this country and of the people of the world that President Eisenhower enjoys.

I hesitated to give any notice to such comments, but I must say that in the last 2 or 3 years I have heard these statements, and at times they affront me, not simply because I happen to be a member of the President's party, but it affronts my sense of taste. I believe the people of this country are affronted also.

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

Mr. COOPER. I should like to finish.

The President of the United States serves 12 months a year, every day of the month. We in the Congress have our vacations, and we take them pretty often. We have recesses, and Members travel all over the world, at Government expense. I am sure these Members work

hard, but they are traveling much of the time on vacations.

The President of the United States has no such vacation. He is working constantly. The decisions which he has to make—which we talk about but do not have to make—weigh upon him heavily and affect the Nation and the world.

I wish to say to my friend from Wisconsin and to other members on the other side of the aisle, for 3 years, some of you have talked about finance and what ought to be done, defense and foreign policy and what ought to be done, but the chief result of all their talk has been declarations employing such adjectives as "imaginative, bold, new programs." Neither from their side of the aisle in the Senate nor from their party on the outside have they yet been able to come up with any program—other than criticism and critical remarks—and you have had neither the support of your own party in the Congress or the support of the people of the United States.

Again I say, I am in favor of debate upon all public issues. We have a perfect right to debate these questions—not only the right, but the responsibility. But these little personal remarks are tiring.

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

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, since the Senator commented on an insertion I made in the RECORD, I should appreciate the opportunity of replying briefly.

The remarks of the Senator from Kentucky seem to me simply incredible. I have never engaged in any personal attack on the President. What I did was to read into the RECORD a summary from the New York Times, which is certainly a fair, dispassionate, objective, and competent newspaper.

Republicans have become so inordinately sensitive about the President that they cry out in protest against any recitation of the facts. And, Mr. President, how could any Senator be more precisely factual than I have been. I have simply taken a factual summary from a newspaper that is internationally known for its absolute fidelity to the facts, and I have asked that it be printed—that is all.

I read one item, and then I read the item immediately following, and I sat down. I made no comment on it whatsoever.

The New York Times pointed out that the Vice President of the United States said the Eisenhower record was a strong record, and printed right below the fact that the President was quail shooting. I did not draw any conclusion from that. This was in the New York Times, and was considered to be extremely newsworthy and pertinent. I simply leave it to the American people and to all Senators to draw whatever conclusions they wish to draw from it.

TENDENCY OF STAND OF CHANCELLOR ADENAUER TO ENCOURAGE MOB VIOLENCE IN GERMANY

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not my usual custom to speak about

events in other countries, but I feel I must speak out on the issue of anti-Semitism in Germany.

We all recall too vividly how Adolf Hitler rose to power using anti-Semitism as a lever and then plunged Germany and the entire world into the grim holocaust of senseless war. It is not my purpose today to detail the horrors that Hitler cast upon this planet.

I do desire to register my concern about the advice Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is reported to have given his people on the recent outbreak of anti-Semitism. He is reported by the Washington Post and Times Herald for Sunday, January 17, 1960, to have said in a nationwide TV-radio speech:

To my German fellow citizens as a whole I say: If you catch a hooligan anywhere, carry out the punishment on the spot and beat him up. That is the punishment he deserves.

I hope that, upon quiet deliberation, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer will rescind this advice. I am confident the German government has the legal means and the lawful capabilities to suppress hooligans of any sort without inviting mob action. Government should not encourage violence.

For a leader of government to urge his people to take on the role of policemen, prosecutors, juries and judges, is to invite anarchy—the complete breakdown of justice, with harm to innocent people. This is what the ruthless Nazis did in the 1930's.

How well can a mob—or a few emotional citizens—provide justice on the spot? The answer is that they cannot and they should not try to.

I express the earnest hope that the good people of Germany will show the world that they respect the rights of their fellow man. This will require that any and all violations of human decency be handled in a manner which gives the accused a fair trial, presided over by officials of the German Government and its subsidiaries.

I particularly hope that those German citizens who are of the Jewish faith will carefully abstain from taking the law into their own hands. Violators of the law should be promptly handed over to the proper authorities—not manhandled. There must be government by law.

Only by faith in lawful procedures will Germans escape a return to the pain road that Hitler led them down. His faulty creed was well set forth in "Mein Kampf," when he said:

The very first essential for success is a perpetually constant and regular employment of violence.

The bombed ruins that still exist in Germany challenge that advice.

Germans must show that law and order prevail and that violence will be met by the rule of law. But beyond this the German people must show that they will not turn their eyes away and pretend not to see what their eyes see well or pretend not to hear what their ears hear plainly. To ignore vicious and debasing evils are to condone and—yes—to support them.

The German nation must actively demonstrate a national purpose based

upon genuine respect for the rights of all people. No other route will save them from the anarchy that breeds a Hitler and the destruction that follows a Hitler. The well-being of Germany lies in showing unity to protect human rights by lawful means. The danger is discord caused by disregard for man's inherent rights. I know that the intentions of Chancellor Adenauer are of the best. His motives are high and pure; and yet I fear it is a basic mistake for a great national leader like Mr. Adenauer to condone mob violence in the slightest degree. Upon reflection, he himself—wise man that he is—may reach a similar conclusion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 17, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

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

WEST GERMANS TOLD TO BEAT "HOOLIGANS"—ADENAUER PLEDGES STATE BACKING TO JEWS IN TV TALK

BONN, JANUARY 16.—Chancellor Konrad Adenauer advised West German citizens tonight to beat up any anti-Jewish hooligans they find smearing walls with Nazi symbols.

Such punishment on the spot is what the hooligans deserve for disgracing Germany and causing a wave of hatred for Germans abroad, Adenauer said in a nationwide radio-TV address. He told German Jews they have nothing to fear, that he personally guaranteed that the power of the German state stands behind them.

Nazism has no roots in West Germany and its incorrigible followers are few, Adenauer said. He pledged that the movement never will make a comeback.

The anti-Semitic incidents have been strongly condemned by the whole German people, Adenauer said.

There was a marked lapse across Germany in the rash of vandalism that, breaking out at a Cologne synagogue Christmas eve, has spread to far corners of the world. None has been reported on German soil for 48 hours. Authorities speculated that bitterly cold weather is keeping swastika-smearers indoors.

Adenauer told the German people that most of the incidents, in Germany and elsewhere, seem due to hooliganism without any political background, but the Cologne outrage appears to be of a political nature.

"To my German fellow citizens as a whole I say: If you catch a hooligan anywhere, carry out the punishment on the spot and beat him up. That is the punishment he deserves."

In Saarbruecken, meantime, a torchlight procession of 500 people marched to the site of a former Nazi concentration camp to protest the recent neo-Nazi outbursts. Earlier, at a rally there, speakers urged that German schoolchildren be told more of Nazi crimes. A French movie on concentration camp atrocities was shown.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the President's estimate of a budget surplus in excess of \$4 billion on June 30, 1961, cannot be accepted or regarded as an accomplished fact. From experience

I know accurate budget estimates 18 months in advance are extremely rare.

A surplus was also estimated originally for last fiscal year—ended June 30; and the Government closed the year with a deficit of \$12.5 billion—the biggest peacetime deficit in history. During the 18-month period involved the Federal debt limit was raised three times.

Following the recent state of the Union message, there are already some who are planning to reduce taxes, increase spending, and do both in anticipation of surplus which is by no means certain. The Nation should be warned that this would be fiscal irresponsibility.

From the President's statement it was obvious that he was relying on increased revenue—not expenditure reduction—to produce the surplus he forecast.

Revenue totaling \$84 billion in the coming year would be an increase of \$15.7 billion over collections last year, or an increase of 23 percent in 2 years. Such an increase would be difficult without heavy inflation. Inflation of such proportions is certain to increase Government costs.

If a surplus develops, I agree with the President that it should be applied to the Federal debt, which this month reached its all time peak.

Preliminary examination of the Federal Budget for fiscal year 1961, beginning next July 1, submitted by the President to Congress today, shows the following:

1. Budget in general (In billions)

	1959	1960	1961
Receipts.....	\$68.3	\$78.6	\$94.0
Expenditures.....	80.7	78.4	79.8
Deficit (-) or surplus (+).....	-12.4	+2	+14.2
Appropriations and other new spending authority.....	81.4	79.7	79.4

These estimates contemplate \$554 million from increased postal rates (1 cent in first-class and airmail rates, etc.) and \$140 million in other charges, fees, transfers, etc., requiring legislation. If these changes are not enacted, expenditures and appropriations would be increased by \$694 million, and the surplus would be reduced by the same amount.

One-half cent increase in highway gas tax is proposed, but this is without effect on the general fund. The Byrd amendment (pay as we go) would control.

2. Receipts breakdown (In billions)

	1959	1960	1961
Individual income.....	\$36.7	\$40.3	\$42.7
Corporate income.....	17.3	22.2	22.5
Excise.....	8.5	9.1	9.5
Other.....	5.8	7.0	7.3
Total.....	68.3	78.6	84.0

Total collections would be up 23 percent over 1959 and 7 percent over this year. Individual income tax collections would be 19 percent over 1959 and 8 percent over this year. Corporate income tax collections would be 35 percent over 1959 and 6 percent over this year. Excise taxes would be 12 percent over 1959 and 4 percent over this year.

The revenue estimate, of course, contemplates continuation of present excise and corporate income tax rates.

3. Expenditure breakdown

[In billions]

	1959	1960	1961
National security.....	\$44.1	\$43.9	\$43.8
Foreign aid, etc.....	6.1	3.9	4.0
Domestic-civilian.....	33.3	34.8	35.7

Domestic-civilian figures include roads and FNMA; they are up more than 86 percent over the expenditures at the end of the Korean war.

4. Interest: 1959—\$7.7 billion; 1960—\$9.4 billion; 1961—\$9.6 billion. Another temporary increase in the Federal debt ceiling will be requested for seasonal excesses.

5. Unexpended balances at the start of fiscal year 1961 will total \$71.8 billion; \$38.5 billion obligated and \$33.3 billion unobligated. 1961 expenditures out of prior year authorizations are estimated at \$26.3 billion.

6. Notes: Revenue proposals include continuation of existing corporate and excise rates; equitable co-op taxes; prevention of excessive depletion allowances; revision of taxes on gains from sale of depreciable personal property; increase in aviation fuel tax and transfer to general fund; repeal of interest rate ceiling; deferral of taxes on in-

come derived from less-developed areas abroad; postponement of cuts in transportation and telephone tax rates. The item veto is proposed. Effort is made to bring foreign currencies under control. Backdoor spending is reduced and sharply criticized. Extension of Corporation Control Act is recommended. Transfer of forest and public land highways to trust fund is proposed.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, an increase of nearly \$1 billion in domestic-civilian expenditures is estimated in the Federal budget submitted to Congress today.

Including highways and FNMA, domestic-civilian expenditures in fiscal year 1961 are estimated at \$35.7 billion, as compared with the estimate of \$34.8 billion in the current year.

The 1961 estimate represents an 86-percent increase in Federal spending, outside of defense, atomic energy, and foreign-aid categories, since the end of the Korean war.

If there is to be a surplus, it will not result from expenditure reduction.

A breakdown showing the increase in domestic-civilian expenditures follows:

Federal expenditures, fiscal years 1954-61, broken categorically to show national security, foreign aid, etc., and domestic-civilian

[In millions]

	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
National security:								
Military functions.....	\$40,336	\$35,532	\$35,791	\$38,439	\$39,062	\$41,233	\$40,945	\$40,995
Stockpile and defense production.....	1,045	944	588	490	625	312	230	134
Atomic energy.....	1,895	1,857	1,651	1,990	2,268	2,541	2,675	2,689
Subtotal, national security.....	43,275	38,334	38,030	40,918	41,955	44,066	43,850	43,818
Foreign aid:								
Military assistance.....	3,629	2,292	2,611	2,352	2,187	2,340	1,800	1,750
Economic and other.....	1,511	1,960	1,613	1,683	1,910	3,403	1,714	1,824
Subtotal, foreign aid.....	5,140	4,252	4,224	4,035	4,097	5,743	3,514	3,574
International affairs.....	221	221	231	290	322	376	351	419
Total, other than domestic-civilian.....	48,636	42,807	42,494	45,243	46,373	50,206	47,716	47,810
Domestic-civilian:								
Veterans services and benefits.....	4,286	4,457	4,756	4,793	5,026	5,174	5,157	5,471
Labor and welfare.....	2,485	2,575	2,821	3,022	3,447	4,421	4,441	4,569
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	2,557	4,388	4,897	4,525	4,399	6,529	5,113	5,623
Natural resources.....	1,316	1,202	1,105	1,297	1,544	1,689	1,785	1,938
Commerce and housing ¹	817	1,420	2,142	3,392	3,818	5,264	7,125	6,393
General government.....	1,235	1,199	1,630	1,780	1,350	1,506	1,711	1,911
Interest.....	6,470	6,438	6,846	7,308	7,689	7,671	9,385	9,585
Allowance for contingencies.....							75	200
Total, domestic-civilian ¹	19,136	21,679	24,168	26,127	27,270	33,334	34,790	35,660
Grand total¹.....	67,772	64,486	66,652	71,370	73,643	83,540	82,506	83,470

¹ Since 1954 expenditures for Federal National Mortgage Association and highways have been dropped from the general budget and converted into so-called trust funds—FNMA in 1955 and highways in 1957. Commerce and housing figures and affected totals above are adjusted to include these figures throughout for complete and accurate comparison over the period. For this reason the President's budget shows total expenditures estimated at \$79.8 billion for fiscal year 1961 and the above table shows \$83.5 billion. The \$3,654 million difference is entirely in FNMA and highway expenditures—\$800 million for FNMA and \$2,854 million for highways.

ANNOUNCED RETIREMENT OF SENATOR THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the week since my beloved colleague, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, announced his decision not to be a candidate for reelection, the flood of praise for this statesman's contribution to our times has been a refreshing chapter in the usually competitive existence that is the American political scene.

To this volume may I add the editorial judgment of numerous outstanding

newspapers and ask unanimous consent that the following editorials and articles be printed in the RECORD:

The Woonsocket Call for Wednesday, January 13, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Has Had Distinguished Career."

The Providence Visitor for Friday, January 15, 1960, entitled "Moral Courage and Public Life."

New York Times for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN calls It a Day."

Louisville Courier-Journal for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Plans a Suitable Exit."

Providence Journal for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "In Praise of Senator GREEN."

Pawtucket Times for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Steps Down."

Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette for Thursday, January 14, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Calls It Quits."

Newport Daily News for Tuesday, January 12, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN To Retire."

Kansas City Star for Wednesday, January 13, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN Misses a Goal by 7 Years."

Bristol (R.I.) Phoenix for Friday, January 15, 1960, entitled "Senator GREEN."

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

[From the Woonsocket Call, Jan. 13, 1960]
SENATOR GREEN HAS HAD DISTINGUISHED CAREER

It comes to few men in the field of politics to enjoy as full a life as THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has packed into his 92 years. Now the oldest man ever to sit in the U.S. Senate has decided, for reasons of health, to forgo the political arena and leave it to others to succeed him as one of Rhode Island's two representatives to the upper Chamber. As he leaves public office he will take with him the affection and good wishes of the citizens he has represented so faithfully.

To say that Senator GREEN has been a statesman of the first rank is not to use words carelessly. He brought with him to both the governorship of Rhode Island and the Senate, where he has served since 1937, a background steeped in the best New England tradition. He is a man of erudition as well as political acumen.

His abilities were properly recognized when he finally became chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, possibly the most important Senate assignment in recent years. He served in that capacity until impaired health forced him to step down.

But as he represented the United States in broad fields he never lost touch with his constituency; the people whom he has represented in Rhode Island. It might be fair to say that Rhode Island has been his first love only after the Senate and more than likely it has not been easy for him to decide to leave that distinguished group which likes to be known as the world's most exclusive club.

While Senator GREEN has announced his intention not to seek reelection, he will, of course, continue to serve during this final session of the 86th Congress.

The healthy vote always accorded Mr. GREEN here in Woonsocket is indicative of the esteem in which he is held by this community. Our people, therefore, will wish him well and join with his colleague, Senator PASTORE, in expressing the hope that "the Lord will grant THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN many more years of happiness and health."

[From the Providence Visitor, Jan. 15, 1960]
MORAL COURAGE AND PUBLIC LIFE

Rhode Island has had many reasons to be proud of its senior Senator, a man whose long life has been marked by notable attainments in law, scholarship, business, finance, and public service. His studies at the Universities of Bonn and Berlin and his teaching of Roman law at Brown gave early evidence of the objectivity and breadth of his outlook.

His labors on behalf of the public good during his two terms as Governor, his efforts to promote the further development of the Library of Congress, and his very able handling of his duties in connection with

the Committee on Foreign Relations have all won him deserved acclaim. But his act of relinquishing his cherished hope to continue his career in the Senate stands out not only as an evidence of his understanding of the limitations that come with the years but also of his unflinching sense of civic responsibility and his desire to serve the people of Rhode Island, as he will continue to do in his capacity as a private citizen and a senior statesman.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN CALLS IT A DAY

In politics, distinction does not automatically come with age, as it seems to do in some other fields. And it has not come automatically to Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN—it has been earned. Senator GREEN'S announcement that he would not seek reelection draws to a close a tenure characterized by wisdom.

That Senator GREEN, at 92, has become the oldest Senator in our history is remarkable, but more remarkable still is the fact that his entire senatorial career, marked most outstandingly by his tour as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has been carved out after the age of 70. Senator GREEN was born in Providence in 1867. After his graduation from Brown University he taught Roman law there during the nineties. He assumed a number of diversified business interests in Rhode Island and began working in State politics in 1907.

The striking aspect of Senator GREEN'S career is its continuity. He maintains old business associations. A graduate of and teacher at Brown, he is now connected as trustee. Born in Providence, he has a home there still. Obviously this is a man who sinks roots—and not to lie dormant but to grow. His decision to retire was made, he says, "after considerable thought." It was a mental tussle, obviously for a man who hates to cut ties. The Senate—and the country—will miss his services.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN PLANS A SUITABLE EXIT

One of the hardest things about a career in politics is knowing when to quit. That fine art has been demonstrated by THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN of Rhode Island, who has let it be known that he will retire from the U.S. Senate when his term ends next January.

Senator GREEN is 92 years old. He is the oldest man who has ever served in the Senate, but he is one of those rare individuals whose mental and physical vigor remained with him into his ninth decade. The sight of his spare figure darting around a tennis court is a matter of only recent memory in Washington.

But time moves on, even when its progress has seemed almost magically delayed. The Senator has had to have an operation on his eyes, and his hearing has begun to fail. A year ago he voluntarily surrendered the chairmanship of the Foreign Relations Committee to the man next in line, the amply qualified Senator FULBRIGHT. Now he announces that his fourth full term in the Senate will be his last. Rhode Island will find it hard to replace so genial and influential a spokesman, but any State would be proud of a Senator who prepares to leave public office in the same way he occupied it—with dignity.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Jan. 14, 1960]

IN PRAISE OF SENATOR GREEN

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The old, old man is going at last from the Senate.

In the 93d year of his life, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, has announced he will not seek reelection to his fifth term because he does not feel well enough.

He is not, of course, indispensable. And a man can work only so long as strength remains. Too, his State will have no trouble in finding a replacement.

All the same, when THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN leaves, the Senate will be the poorer, in the strictly human sense anyhow, for his departure. For oddly, in this correspondent's time, it has been mainly the very old men there who have given a special quality to the place.

There, more often than not, it is the very old who will take the greatest risks, who are the least influenced by today's universal urge for personal security, who are the most ready to run forward to meet the possibly menacing tomorrow. They are, again more often than not, the best of the individual men, the free and fighting spirits who make the youngsters look rather like conscientious objectors.

To be sure, "the problems of the aged"—which is a nice-Nelly phrase admitting that society tends to throw the aged upon the ash heap—exists in the Senate, too. Even there, men can grow too old to go on any more—but happily it takes an awfully long time to grow that old in the Senate.

Senator GREEN at a mere 70 carried not simply a full load but a great load, as a personally aristocratic and privileged man who went all the way with the Roosevelt New Deal.

Senator GREEN at a ripe 80 was tough enough and strong enough to take on one of the hardest and most thankless jobs the Senate had handed out in this century.

This was to serve on the first committee that investigated Senator Joseph McCarthy's charges of communism in the State Department. Nobody could hope to win in that mare's nest—nobody but, in the short run, Senator McCarthy himself. Fear and suspicion were loose in a country that had suffered great and undeniable setbacks from imperialist communism. The Nation was ready for a devil hunt; it was all there to be exploited.

But Senator GREEN, unlike some of his committee colleagues, faced the unalterable facts with that special candor and realism of the Senate's aged men. He knew Senator McCarthy and his associates were making a bitter brew that at length would spill over on the Republicans—as well it did when the Eisenhower administration came to power. But he knew that, first of all, Senator McCarthy was reaching for the throat not simply of President Truman and Dean Acheson but of the Democratic Party which Senator GREEN loved.

So, full of the self-honesty of the old Senate types, Senator T. F. GREEN, from the first moment, made no pretense to an objectivity that could not exist there. From the first moment he hit Senator McCarthy with everything to which he could lay hand.

He was a true liberal, as distinguished from a knee-jerk liberal, and he was a loyal liberal, instead of a cut-and-run liberal.

He stayed with President Truman in the good times, and also in the bad times. In the times, indeed, when some of the knee-jerk liberals were rushing self-righteously into print (to coin a sparkling phrase) to run out on a liberal President who had represented the views which they always had said were also their own. But this was a President who also now had the bad luck to get into trouble. So though they were just terribly, terribly liberal they also managed to be terribly, terribly safe.

It was only the true liberals like Senator GREEN, plus some nonliberals who believed in most but not all of what he was doing, who

stood with President Truman when the heavy firing about corruption and cronyism broke out.

Mr. Truman never has hated, or even much disliked, all those who had fought him from conviction, the Republicans and the ultra-conservative Democrats. But he has an unforgettable contempt for those who really agreed with his policies but prudently left the firing line when it became evident that his troops were going to be overborne.

Aging Senator GREEN may have been intellectually wrong in staying in the line to the end. But he was a combat soldier, and not a talking soldier. He had guts. You knew where he stood; not just some of the time but all of the time.

[From the Pawtucket Times, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN STEPS DOWN

Now that THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN prepares to leave the political stage there are those who wonder if there will ever be another public figure just like the venerable Senator. Most unlikely, seems to be the answer to those who wonder. Senator GREEN is a unique figure, an unusual and delightful person, as many will attest.

Of Senator GREEN'S political contemporaries not one was more steadfast to the ideals of the Democratic Party in the face of political foemen who could not hold a candle to the integrity of the Senator, who made an open profession of his politics.

There was a time when the Democratic Party "was" THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. Only he and a comparative handful of followers persevered to keep intact the framework of the party. After a long series of campaign disappointments lightning struck in 1932 and THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN was swept into the State capitol as Governor while the New Deal was inundating Washington. From the vantage point of the executive offices the Governor made the Democrats dominant in Rhode Island by engineering the political coup which swept Republicans from power. Elected to the U.S. Senate the former Governor continued to exercise an influence in Rhode Island as well as in the foreign affairs of the United States for he was a member of powerful Senate committees. So great was his prestige and so acceptable his leadership there were no Rhode Island Democrats willing to challenge his right to return to the Senate, even though nature was taking its toll of the oldest man ever to sit in the U.S. Senate.

So long has Senator GREEN been a Democrat and so long has he had the last word in party affairs that comparative newcomers to the party should not discount the Senator, even in retirement. Nor should anyone question his right to dictate because he bore the heat of the battle in the days when Democrats were very much in the minority. One of the most puzzling things about THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN is that as a man born to high estate, he chose to throw his lot with those of humble birth, with those who lacked the cultural background which set Senator GREEN apart.

The man who might have been a Cabinet member, or an Ambassador, chose, for reasons best known to himself, the rough and tumble of partisan politics, perhaps in the belief that he too could make a contribution to the State to which his forebears had contributed so much.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Evening Gazette, Jan. 14, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN CALLS IT QUITS

Time catches up with all men sooner or later. It has caught up at last with Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island, who says that he will not run for the Senate next November after all.

At 92, Senator GREEN is the oldest man ever to serve in Congress. His sight and his

hearing are not as good as they used to be. But the Senator still astounds his colleagues with his vigor and perception of what is going on.

No one will begrudge Senator GREEN his retirement. He deserves to take it easy. But his leaving the Capitol scene will be something like the departure of the Washington Monument. He is a fixture, and an honorable one. He has served long and ably in the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations until just a few months ago, he consistently showed good judgment, a serene temperament, and the wisdom that comes from vast experience.

As he goes into somewhat unwelcome retirement, he has the warm regards of well-wishers all over the Nation. The Senate will not be quite the same without THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN. He has served in it with distinction and style.

[From the Newport Daily News, Jan. 12, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN TO RETIRE

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN's announcement that he will not stand for reelection, removes from Congress next January the oldest man ever to serve there and from active politics in Rhode Island one who has been a tower of strength in the Democratic Party for many years.

Senator GREEN, in his 92 years, has had a remarkable career. We generally think first of him in a political role. But it must not be forgotten that over the years he has been prominent in the State's business, civic, and social life. He is a patron of the arts and a world traveler. Professionally a lawyer, at one time he was on the faculty of Brown University, his alma mater.

When he attained the position of oldest Member ever to serve in Congress, he remarked he'd like to serve until he was 100. For several months, however, the feeling has been growing that an announcement he would not seek renomination for a fifth term was imminent. Failing eyesight and hearing led to his decision to retire.

The Senator's declaration, read to the Democratic State committee last night, ordinarily would have left the nomination open to the field. But with former Gov. Dennis J. Roberts practically nominating Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY of the Second District for the place, what might have been spirited competition was cut off, until Mr. FOGARTY speaks out.

How Congressman FOGARTY will consider this opportunity for promotion to the upper Chamber remains to be seen. In his 19 years in the House, he has attained considerable seniority in the House Appropriations Committee. He has sponsored and is developing important national programs in the fields of health, education, welfare, and labor. The Senate offers greater prestige, but Mr. FOGARTY would face difficulties in continuing programs so close to his heart.

[From the Kansas City Star, Jan. 13, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN MISSES A GOAL BY 7 YEARS

In Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN's decision to retire from the Senate at the close of his present term there is the human tragedy of frustrated ambition. GREEN long has expressed his desire to be serving in the Senate at 100. Now he will not seek reelection this fall. On his last official day as a U.S. Senator, the Rhode Island Democrat will be only 93.

But GREEN's four terms have already made him the oldest man ever to serve in the upper Chamber. Also, they have made him a living legend. In appearance the Senator resembles the late Roland Young in the role of Topper in the movies. In personal activities GREEN has been the talk of Washington, the spritely oldest addicted to 2-

mile walks to the office, a patron of the cocktail party circuit and tennis player until 2 years ago. He refused, however, to take up golf because:

"It's an old man's game."

Politically, GREEN is one of the rich men who adopted the New Deal philosophy. Forty-eight years ago Theodore Roosevelt wanted him to manage the Bull Moose campaign, but GREEN stuck to his party. The GREEN skill at political infighting was apparent by then.

Twinkling blue eyes mirrored an enthusiasm for both the naked battle of the political arena and for legislative problems.

After this session, the familiar little figure will be gone from Capitol Hill. Even those who have disagreed with GREEN on matters of policy will miss their colleague. THEODORE GREEN's zest for life made each day in the Senate—indeed, each day anywhere—a great new experience.

[From the Bristol (R.I.) Phoenix, Jan. 15, 1960]

SENATOR GREEN

U.S. Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has earned the right to retire from public life. He has been and still is an excellent example of the kind of man who should hold public office. From the standpoint of training, education, experience, and personal character, his qualifications are all that are to be desired in a man elected to represent others in government. And beyond all these he has that saving sense of wit and humor that have always made him a delight in public life.

In stating now that he will not run in the November elections, he once again displays the good judgment which has marked his career. His many friends, Democrats and Republicans alike, wish him years of good health so that he might continue to enjoy life without the cares and responsibilities that accompany public office.

AIR TRANSPORTATION OF ALL MAIL

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S. 2402, which provides air transportation for mail that has not paid the airmail postage. This bill was reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the Senate late in the session last year by a committee vote of five to four. Joining me in voting against the proposal was the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and such able members of our committee as the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

S. 2402 would, first, authorize the Postmaster General to transport all classes of mail, other than air mail and air parcel post, by air carrier if he finds it would be in the public interest, because of the nature of the terrain, or the impracticability or inadequacy of surface transportation, and when the cost thereof is reasonably compatible with the service to be provided; second, require air carriers to provide such transportation under rates and conditions prescribed by the CAB; and, third, authorize the Postmaster General and any air carrier to contract for such transportation at other than CAB prescribed rates.

The Postmaster General is now transporting some first-class mail by air on

an experimental basis, but this bill would go far beyond that, and would, in addition, authorize air transportation for second, third, and fourth classes of mail regardless of the postage paid.

Mr. President, the bill does not limit the additional expense that will be incurred over and above that now being incurred in the movement of this mail by surface means. The provision that the cost of the air transportation must be reasonably compatible with the service to be provided is no limitation, since we must assume that the CAB will fix rates which are reasonably compatible with the service to be provided. Transportation rates by air have been suggested at an average of 19 cents per ton-mile, which is at least 3 times greater than the transportation rates by surface carriers, and even this rate has been objected to by the airlines as being too low.

S. 2402 MEANS HIGHER POSTAL RATES

It is inconceivable that the service sought under S. 2402 can be effectuated without greatly increasing the cost of operation of the Post Office Department, and these costs must be recovered either through increased postage rates or appropriations from the general funds.

I understand that the Postmaster General, following release of Senate Report No. 805, has taken steps to provide air transportation for classes of mail here under consideration between major cities of the United States, and has indicated that there will be a reduction in the railway post office service between the same points. When railway post office service is reduced or eliminated it not only affects the terminal cities, but it also has the effect of greatly impairing the service to the many smaller towns and villages lying along the routes of the RPO cars between the terminals.

S. 2402 MEANS POORER MAIL SERVICE TO MOST COMMUNITIES

The shift from surface transportation to air transportation between major cities could improve the service between those cities only and even then there is no assurance of an improvement since time in transit is not the only factor affecting the delivery of mail. Enroute distribution by railway post office cars or highway post offices can offset the greater speed by air, and at the same time provide an excellent service to the smaller cities. There are only about 800 air stops in this country, whereas the railroads, which carry the greater part of the mails, serve directly some 12,000 post offices.

Mr. President, since the proposal to fly all classes of mail is based on a "voluntary space-available basis," which means that the airlines will transport the mail if they wish to and have the space to accommodate it, there is no assurance that mail taken to airports will move promptly between points where the service is expected to be provided. There have been many instances where mail has been taken to airports and then, because of the inability of the airlines to move the mail promptly, has been returned to the post office for movement by surface transportation. The result could very well be complete

chaos so far as a dependable regular service is concerned. In addition, it would be quite reasonable to assume that, with the disclosure of this service, there would be a tendency on the part of many citizens to cease using airmail postage and thus reduce the revenues of the Post Office Department. The citizens of this country are entitled to an airmail service unencumbered and unhindered by the transportation of surface mail by air. That the dual system, that is, an airmail and a first-class mail, is satisfactory is evidenced by the fact that millions of people use airmail at the higher cost when speed is of sufficient importance.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE FULLY ADEQUATE

The Postmaster General has always been able to obtain all of the transportation by surface means that he needs. The railroads have some of their finest service between the points where he has announced that he intends to fly the mail. In addition, the railroads have expressed a willingness to establish exclusive mail and express trains wherever the volume of business warrants such a service. Indeed, many such trains are now operated.

S. 2402 must be carefully reviewed and considered by the Congress since it inevitably means higher postage rates and poorer mail service to most communities in our Nation, as well as endangering the financial security of the railroad industry which is so vital to our national defense. It is my earnest hope that this legislation will not be enacted into law.

PASSENGER TRAINS IN OREGON WOULD SUFFER PARTICULARLY

Furthermore, Mr. President, I should like to point out one additional factor which has helped to persuade me to oppose this bill. Evidence submitted by the Post Office Department has indicated that the principal loss of railway post-office cars, should S. 2402 be enacted, would occur in the long-haul railroad operations. These are the long-distance rail routes, predominantly the transcontinental trains.

Such trains are the principal common-carrier surface transportation linking communities like Seattle, Portland, Tacoma, and Spokane with Middle Western and Eastern States. They also afford service for the smaller cities in my own State of Oregon like Pendleton, La Grande, Baker, Ontario and others. I am informed that the loss of railway post-office cars could jeopardize the continuance of these trains. Already, transcontinental train service between the Pacific Northwest and Chicago has suffered heavily from elimination of many once-popular passenger trains. Not very many more of these trains can be abandoned without the total loss of passenger train service between our State and the rest of the Nation.

These references may seem merely regional in character, Mr. President, but I fear that passage of S. 2402 would place in great danger the jobs of hundreds of railroad workers in my State, as well as reducing the transportation facilities available to Oregon and its neighbors. S. 2402, while containing some worthy

features, would disrupt existing transportation facilities with possibly disastrous consequences.

Only recently, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City, speaking before the Exchange Club of Chicago, cited the transportation crisis in his community due to the abandonment of many passenger trains. He noted that subsidy of these trains might cost far less than the construction of many new super highways and off street parking facilities to take care of travelers forced off the rails and onto public thoroughfares.

The current January 18, 1960, issue of Time magazine likewise features an article on this general problem. The article points out that a double-track railroad can transport five times as many people per hour as a four-lane superhighway. Adds Time:

To build enough highways for the 30,000 commuters who travel into Philadelphia on the Pennsylvania Railroad would cost \$611 million. If everyone who now rides the trains into New York decided to drive, a third of Manhattan (Island) would be needed just for parking space.

In view of all these situations, Mr. President, I regard it as unwise for the Federal Government to adopt a post office policy which will merely accelerate and hasten the abandonment of so many passenger train facilities throughout America, at present so disturbing.

THE STEEL STRIKE SETTLEMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we are all pleased that we are not once more in the throes of a steel strike. But I believe the words of the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, sum up the situation in the truest and best form.

The respected Mr. Lippmann wrote:

So, we have come to a crude and embarrassing ending to an inglorious and mismanaged policy. * * * I think it is arguable from the record that a settlement on the Nixon-Mitchell terms could have been had at any time.

The settlement was clearly an act of political expediency.

Federal negotiators did not enter the dispute until after the strike was called, even though companies everywhere were stockpiling steel for the strike they knew would come. No one looked after the welfare of the people, something which cannot be stockpiled.

By mid-June of last year I think anyone who read the papers or listened to the radio or watched TV knew a steel strike was coming. But the official policy of the administration was "hands off."

A number of us in the Senate, Mr. President, met with representatives of both sides of the dispute to see what we could do to head off the impending strike. Those of us from steel-producing States begged the President to meet with us and Governors to see what could be done toward a settlement.

There was a refusal by the administration at every turn to demonstrate leadership—to try and help find a solution. The strike dragged on. Fact finders reported. The Secretary of Labor said he

had a legislative solution, but he refused to tell us, who legislate, what it was—if anything.

The President declined to use the power and prestige of his Office in the national welfare.

Finally, the strike ended with the hand of leadership absent and the hand of politics present.

The cost of the strike to all concerned was fearful, at a time when our economy was sagging anyway with pockets of unemployment, contracting foreign markets, and increasing Soviet competition. Estimates are that the cost of the strike was \$1.16 billion in wages and \$5 billion in production.

In my State of Indiana we normally produce a fifth of the Nation's steel. We lost more than \$200 million in wages and \$1 billion in production. Our State government lost an estimated \$1 million in tax revenue alone. Dollars lost cannot compare to the unnecessary human suffering the people of Indiana were compelled to undergo.

Only time will tell if the terms of the settlement were good for the country. Only time will tell us if prices of steel will rise—and then, if the time comes when they do, will it be after the election. Only time will tell us if the companies will settle for something less than record profits.

But we do not have to wait on time to tell us that we have already paid a heavy price. The price might have been far less had the administration acted with true leadership instead of neglecting the public welfare.

HELP FOR THE HELPLESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill, S. 1403, which would authorize the extension of aid for dependent children to cover those children who are in need because of the unemployment of their parents. At present, as Members of this body know, a child is not eligible for Federal aid unless he is in need because of the death, desertion, or disability of his father. This results in the anomalous circumstance whereby fathers who cannot find work are frequently able to provide for their families only by deserting them and thus making them eligible for public assistance.

The Advisory Council on Public Assistance, which recently made its report to Secretary Flemming, has recommended that children who are in need for any reason be eligible for aid to dependent children. This goes further even than my bill.

In an editorial which appeared on January 7, 1960, the Washington Post has endorsed this recommendation of the Advisory Council. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

HELP FOR THE HELPLESS

Some of the conditions attached to public assistance for dependent children, the aged, unemployed and others in desperate need seem designed to thwart the very aims for which the assistance is provided. The

Advisory Council on Public Assistance, after a year of careful study, has recommended that these conditions be modified in important ways. Congressional action and State action alike will be required to put the desired changes into effect.

The two changes recommended by the Council which seem most significant were urged here not long ago by District Welfare Director Gerard M. Shea. Residence requirements for public assistance ought to be abandoned entirely; misery knows no geographical limitations. To bring about this change, the Council sensibly proposes that Federal grants be denied to States which impose a waiting period before granting assistance.

Similarly, there is obvious need to alter the prevailing present condition that Federal aid may be given to children only if they are deprived of support or care because of absence, death or incapacity of one parent. As the report of the Council remarks, "a hungry, ill-clothed child is as hungry or ill-clothed if he lives in an unbroken home" as an orphan or illegitimate child without a father. Besides, the present limitation pushes indigent fathers into deserting their families so they can qualify for relief.

In general, the Council proposes that the Social Security Act be amended to provide Federal aid to needy persons "regardless of the cause of need." Common sense as well as common humanity supports this view.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the best commentaries on President Eisenhower's state of the Union message that I have seen is the one which appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot of January 9, 1960.

This newspaper supported President Eisenhower in both his election campaigns, but this support does not prevent its taking a balanced and objective view of the President's policies in its editorial page—which, incidentally, is one of the best editorial pages in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and, indeed, in the Nation.

While the Patriot praises many aspects of the state of the Union message, it is critical of the President's failure to "give persuasive answers to the widening missile gap between the United States and the U.S.S.R." and of his failure to mention Federal aid to depressed areas in the United States. The newspaper is also dissatisfied with his comments on inflation and by his lack of fire on the issue of civil rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE STATE OF THE WORLD—A LOOK BACK, A LOOK AHEAD

According to some Republicans, President Eisenhower's state of the Union message is one of the greatest documents of all time.

According to some Democrats, it is a compilation of sweet nothings.

One must suspect that it is neither. It is, on the whole, an outline of our position within and beyond our borders whose worth will become clearly discernible only in the light of the future.

Of necessity, the President concentrated on assessing America's posture and purpose against a worldwide backdrop.

He restated our desire to live in peace with all nations but reiterated that it must be a

peace with freedom. In fact, he said, "In our scale of values we place freedom first."

Reassuringly, he made clear that America isn't going to be duped into lowering its guard by the Kremlin's recent pleasantries. In short, we would negotiate from strength.

The President was sanguine about our defenses as an adequate deterrent to Communist aggression. But he failed to give persuasive answers to the widening missile gap between the United States and the U.S.S.R. He promised to work toward improving our space program to the extent of doubling its funds. But there have been growing doubts whether money alone can bring us up to par in the absence of new ideas and a central, efficient setup to put them into practice. Certainly, this problem needs the closest scrutiny in the months to come.

Mr. Eisenhower had the good news that our next budget will probably show a \$4.2 billion surplus. This surplus, he said, will be used to pay off part of the huge national debt. There can be no quarrel with this, provided the saving isn't achieved at the expense of vital projects, such as defense. Certainly it makes sense to try to reduce the Nation's debt during the Nation's greatest prosperity.

The President reiterated the close relationship between the economic progress of the underdeveloped nations and the security of the free world. And he gave a timely nudge to the well-to-do countries in Europe and the Far East to assume a greater burden.

Our gold reserves have been depleted to the danger point. Our foreign payment balance shows a \$4 billion deficit. This trend can't go on without imperiling our economy and, consequently, the stability of the entire West.

Unfortunately, the President held out no hope for an assistance program much closer to home. He said nothing of Federal aid to depressed areas in which Pennsylvania in particular abounds. These are underdeveloped areas which Mr. Eisenhower apparently doesn't see. But they are there and won't go away just because they're ignored.

The President made an eloquent and urgent point when he characterized inflation as our prime domestic problem. "We must fight it," he said, "as we would fight a fire that imperils our home."

It is doubtful, however, whether the galloping prices and costs can be arrested merely by what Mr. Eisenhower termed "stern self-discipline by every citizen."

The steel strike is painful evidence that labor and management cannot be depended upon to place the Nation's interest ahead of their own because it's the patriotic thing to do. And the dilemma isn't going to be solved simply by appealing to the common sense of protagonists engaged in a fight for profits on one hand and bigger wages on the other.

Somehow, and soon, the inflation spiral must be blocked. And it well may take some laws to help patriotism along in this field.

One would wish, too, that the President had displayed more fire on the civil rights issue with its vast moral, social, economic, and international implications. We have a long way to go here before our performance begins to match our words.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE BY THE EDITORS OF WISDOM MAGAZINE TO FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM BENTON, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the current issue of Wisdom magazine pays tribute to one of the most thoughtful men ever to serve in the U.S. Senate, William Benton, of the State of Connecticut.

This honor is attributable not only to Senator Benton's distinguished career in business and in public life, but also because of his position as publisher of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which is one of the great compendiums of knowledge and facts available to mankind.

I am particularly pleased to call attention in the Senate to this tribute to ex-Senator Benton, because I regard William Benton as an American of genuine courage and valor. Ahead of his time, he warned of ominous forces of hysteria and intolerance which threatened our heritage of liberty and brotherhood. His lonely stand in this regard may have contributed to his defeat for reelection in 1952, but it may also be a factor in the almost universal respect and esteem in which William Benton is held today in our country and in the free world. Despite his retirement from public office, he is a citizen of influence and eminence. His words carry weight and profundity.

Political opportunism, alas, is a more prevalent commodity than political sacrifice and bravery. Relatively few Senators challenge majority opinions in their own States, much as they may risk unpopularity in another State where they do not run for office. As a Member of the Senate, William Benton defied what probably was prevailing sentiment in his home State of Connecticut. This may have cost him his Senate seat. Yet it also heightened his stature, and stature is a priceless ingredient in both public and private life. Thus I am happy today to cite the issue of Wisdom magazine which heralds the outstanding career of former Senator William Benton, of Connecticut. The tribute is a deserved one, as many will agree.

Mr. President, the leadership of William Benton in our Nation continues to demonstrate itself in many good works. Under his direction, the education subcommittee of the Democratic Party's advisory council has recently brought forth a most comprehensive and necessary proposed program to extend educational opportunities in this country. The keystone of the program is a plan for Federal aid to schools similar to the famed Murray-Metcalf bill, which could do much to equalize school facilities in our Nation and to make certain that our greatest resource—namely, the brains of young Americans—is not wasted and frittered away.

An excellent summary of the educational program prepared under ex-Senator William Benton's wise guidance was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 18, 1960, under the byline of Mr. Raymond Lehr, of United Press International. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the

article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

**DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COUNCIL ASKS U.S. AD-
TO-EDUCATION BILL**
(By Raymond Lehr)

The Democratic Advisory Council proposed yesterday that the Federal Government undertake a program of aid for education starting at \$1 billion a year and rising eventually to \$3 or \$4 billion.

It said many States and communities had done much in the past 10 years to expand and improve schools but that they must do more and that they are entitled to more help from the National Government.

The council said the Eisenhower administration "has been characteristically strong on words and weak on deeds" in promoting better education.

SERIES OF PAMPHLETS

The council, an arm of the Democratic National Committee, is composed of former President Truman, Adlai E. Stevenson and other party leaders, most of them from outside Congress. It gave its sizeup of "education and freedom's future" in a report, one of a series of pamphlets it is publishing on foreign and domestic problems.

"Even in a world at peace it would be priority business for our free society to help every young person develop his full potentialities through education," the council said.

"In a world threatened by the aggressive challenge of the Soviet Union, education becomes a means for national survival as well."

PROGRAM RECOMMENDED

It recommended this program:

Passage of an Education Act of 1960 to provide greater coordination of Federal education programs with machinery modeled after the 1946 Employment Act. That act created the President's Council of Economic Advisers and a joint House-Senate Economic Committee. An education council would help the President prepare a report, which would be reviewed by a joint congressional committee on education.

Congress should grant the limit on funds for the National Defense Education Act program of fellowships, loans and grants, and should review the authorized limit to see if it is high enough.

While leaving control of schools to State and local governments, the Federal Government should give financial aid to the States.

Federal grants—with States perhaps required to match Federal funds—would equal \$25 for each school-age child the first year, \$50 the second, \$75 the third, and \$100 the fourth and subsequent years. Additional help would be given the poorest States.

Set up a cooperative program with the Federal Government matching State funds to provide college scholarships, starting at \$25,000 a year and increasing the number eventually to 100,000.

Scholarships would be adjusted to individual need but would not exceed \$1,000 a year.

Expanding the college housing loan program to include all buildings and set up a new program of matching grants to improve and build facilities.

The pamphlet was originally drafted by an education subcommittee headed by former Senator William Benton of Connecticut. It was reviewed and revised by the council's economic policy committee and the council itself.

NARCOTICS USE AMONG JUVENILES

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile

Delinquency, of which I am chairman, has been studying the problem of narcotics use among juveniles for the past several months. During this investigation, we have been concerned with the source of supply for illicit narcotics and marijuana as well as the high rate of use among boys and girls.

Last fall, committee staff members made an intensive investigation of the illicit narcotics traffic along the United States-Mexican border. In November, public hearings were held in three California cities, including Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco, where we heard much valuable testimony from experts in the field of narcotics control and enforcement.

This Friday, we will resume our study of the juvenile narcotics problem with hearings here in Washington.

Mr. President, several very excellent editorials have appeared in newspapers around the country relating to this problem. I ask unanimous consent that two of these from the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times—"Shouting in the Proper Ears," November 15, 1959, and "Dust on the Mexican Desk," November 19, 1959—be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 15, 1959]

SHOUTING IN THE PROPER EARS

The grim recital of facts concerning the illicit narcotics traffic from Mexico to southern California has been heard many times before. But it has never had a more important audience than the Senate subcommittee which held hearings in Los Angeles last week.

DIPLOMACY REQUIRED

Bureaucracy and diplomacy require that such facts, no matter how flagrant and well documented, be transmitted to Washington only by proper official procedures. No matter how loud we may shout, it must be into the proper ears.

The Times started the shouting this summer by assigning Gene Sherman to investigate the border dope problem and the evil and sorrow it brings. The resulting public awareness prompted the California congressional delegation to seek official action in Washington, which in turn caused the Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile delinquency to probe further into the local narcotics smuggling situation.

Senator HENNING, the subcommittee chairman, said at the end of the week that "while much of the testimony and evidence produced at this hearing has been known to various people previously, it must be pointed out that, as Members of Congress charged with the responsibility of engendering activities of the Federal Government, we have had to take into consideration all information so that we could build a record as a sound basis for action upon our return to Washington."

SHOCKING RECORD

The record that was built in the Los Angeles hearings was as clear and unmistakable as it was shocking. Expert witness after expert witness reaffirmed the two basic facts of the local dope situation: that marijuana and heroin are in abundant supply and are easily obtainable in southern California, and that by far the biggest source is from across the border of our good neighbor, Mexico.

Subcommittee members reached the inevitable conclusion that "the only realistic method of alleviating the dope smuggling

problem is by cooperative agreement with the Mexican Government."

"Upon our return to Washington," said Senator HENNING, "we will contact the State Department and with their advice seek ways to solve this problem."

And there is little doubt that on their way to the State Department headquarters, the Senators will stop off at the Treasury Building to discuss the dangerous conflict of jurisdiction between U.S. Customs officials and Federal narcotics officers.

Testimony last week indicated that Federal narcotics officers are working to combat international dope traffic with one hand tied behind them because of the strange division of authority between the two agencies.

CUSTOMS FAILURE

George White, regional Federal narcotics agent on the west coast, testified that the practice of assigning Federal Bureau of Narcotics agents in European and Middle East countries had succeeded in controlling the flow of illicit drugs to the United States. However, by some bureaucratic quirk, Mexico and the Orient were assigned to the Customs Service, which obviously has been unable to stem the smuggling tide.

When the subcommittee asked White what control steps had been set up in Mexico, he replied:

"Nothing. And I am afraid that our Government is to blame."

The subcommittee is scheduled to hear a rebuttal from customs officials this week in San Diego but U.S. Attorney General Rogers has already been advised of the charges and the importance of working out a consolidated effort.

The pattern that emerges from the hearings is the usual one of frustration. The ineffectiveness of local control efforts was again shown to be reinforced by what amounts to level indifference toward this most vicious of all corrupting crimes.

There is a difference today, however. An end to the frustration may soon be in sight, for we have begun to shout into the proper ears.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 19, 1959]

DUST ON THE "MEXICAN DESK"

The U.S. Senate subcommittee investigating the frightening flow of illicit narcotics from Mexico traveled southward from Los Angeles this week for a closer look at the border situation.

FIXING THE BLAME

What they found was even more confirmation that the ultimate responsibility—and much of the blame—lies in Washington and Mexico City.

Testimony at the subcommittee hearings Monday and Tuesday in San Diego made previous criticism of Federal narcotics control efforts seem almost complimentary by comparison.

District Attorney Don Keller of San Diego County bitterly told the investigating Senators that complaints about border vice conditions receive a pigeonhole instead of a priority in Washington. Efforts to close the border to juveniles, for instance, were initiated by the San Diego grand jury in 1951 and then taken up by the State legislature, which each year since 1953 has formally requested action in Washington.

"I was informed," said Keller, "that the Mexican desk (of the State Department) had a handy way of pigeonholing this sort of complaint."

PROBE PROMISED

This led Senator THOMAS HENNING, Jr., subcommittee chairman, to declare his determination "to find out about these things gathering dust. . . . We want to find out why matters like these are not considered properly."

"Maybe some of those people back there need a fire built under them," he said.

More fuel for the Senators' fire was provided by O. J. Hawkins, chief of the San Diego office of the State bureau of narcotics.

"The fault lies with the attitude of the State Department, as expressed in bulletins issued from time to time," Hawkins testified.

"The Department says repeatedly that Mexico does not create a narcotics problem and that she is making tremendous strides to control dope."

Such bureaucratic blindness also resulted in the Treasury Department's decision not to assign Federal narcotics agents to work inside Mexico, the subcommittee learned last week in Los Angeles.

INSTANCES OF FAILURE

District Attorney Keller enumerated two other instances in his own county: Abolition of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics office in San Diego and elimination of customs control.

Although the city is only 17 miles from the border all appeals to Washington to reopen the San Diego offices were unavailing, Keller said.

Other witnesses familiar with the shocking border situation reiterated the basic facts disclosed by law enforcement officials at the Los Angeles hearings and by Gene Sherman in the Times narcotics series last summer: Not only does the great majority of marijuana and heroin in southern California come from Mexico but the amount of smuggling is increasing.

This terrible traffic will not be halted until the dust is swept off bureaucratic and diplomatic desks. The Times pledges that it will not rest until that dust—and with it the border dope traffic—is swept away.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE MOHAWK VALLEY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last week, I spoke briefly on the floor of the Senate to report on the Schenectady, N.Y., hearings of the Senate Select Committee on Unemployment Problems. At that time I inserted in the Record a summary of the fine work being done by the GUTS (Gear Up For Tomorrow in Schenectady) program.

Mr. President, today I call attention to two statements, made at the hearings, which relate further to economic conditions in the Mohawk Valley region of my State. The first is by Mr. William Pollock, general president of the Textile Workers of America. The second is by Mr. Fred Krokenberger, business manager of the Amsterdam Joint Board, of the same union. Both of these statements are excellent presentations of the views of the leaders of the Textile Workers Union, and they add greatly to our knowledge of employment and economic conditions in the Mohawk Valley area.

At their request, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements

of these leaders of the Textile Workers Union be printed at this point in the Record.

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

STATEMENTS BY WILLIAM POLLOCK, GENERAL PRESIDENT, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SENATE COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, JANUARY 8, 1960

The time and place of this hearing add poignancy to the subject of the committee's investigations. The problem of unemployment is one which demands serious attention whenever and wherever it may be raised. But in January 1960 it is particularly fitting that we stop and take stock of our position in the age-old struggle against the human suffering that results from unemployment. We are entering a new decade. Will it be a new era? Can we fashion the tools for achieving a state of human progress in which the hopelessness of people who cannot find work will finally be abolished? This is the challenge of the sixties.

I believe we can meet this challenge. The means are at hand. It remains for us to grasp and to use them. I am confident that the investigation of this committee will reveal the shortcomings in our present approaches and uncover the tremendous potentialities of a systematic, integrated program for utilizing our human and physical resources to rid our society of joblessness and poverty. We can no longer afford the waste involved in mass unemployment and idle capital. The economics of the Soviet and Chinese Communist empire are growing too fast to permit us to accept the unemployment of 4 million Americans with complacency. By putting them to work, we can outdistance the Iron Curtain countries, increase our ability to aid the free world, and improve our own national self-confidence.

The city of Schenectady is an especially appropriate focal point for the study of unemployment problems. Here is an old center of heavy manufacturing industry which is suffering from the effects of industry's moves to newer areas. Neighboring towns in the Mohawk Valley are experiencing similar dislocations. Amsterdam, a major center of carpet and rug production, has lost one of its two large carpet mills and employs less than half the number of carpet workers employed 10 years ago. Gloversville, once the major supplier of the Nation's leather gloves, has been depressed by a decline in demand and the influx of imports which has captured the bulk of the domestic market for fine gloves.

How do we cope with the human problems created by the changes flowing from our dynamic economy? This is a question this Nation has been asking ever since the industrial revolution transformed the United States from an agricultural economy to an industrial power. In the 19th century a start was made in providing an answer. Limits were placed on the extent to which private industrial actions were permitted to cause public injury. State laws were adopted regulating factory conditions relating to the health and safety of workers. But it was not until the 1930's that the Federal Government recognized the national character of the human problems engendered by our industrial processes.

The social security and labor legislation developed in the great depression was a creative response to the need for bolstering the efforts of the individual in coping with the vicissitudes of life in a modern industrial society. The Federal programs that resulted from the innovations of the thirties provided a measure of security against the hazards of unemployment and old age. A floor was placed under wages to prevent

extreme exploitation and the right to organize was established by law to enable workers to improve their economic and industrial position through collective bargaining.

These measures provided the underpinning for an economy that had lost its moorings. They sought to ameliorate the ill effects of a system that had gone wrong. But they did not seek to correct the operations of the system itself. It remained for the experience of the Second World War to teach us that the Federal Government has a significant positive role to play in promoting the full employment of our resources. The result was the Employment Act of 1946, which declared it the national policy for the Federal Government to "use all practical means . . . to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining . . . conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities . . . for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

THE PROMISE OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

The enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 marked a milestone in the development of a positive approach to the solution of the human and economic problems created by our industrial civilization. A new dimension was added to the function of the Federal Government in the economic sphere. A pledge was given to the American people that the National Government would do what was needed to achieve and maintain a full employment economy.

Has this pledge been kept? Have all Americans been afforded useful employment opportunities? Have maximum employment, production and purchasing power been achieved? To ask these questions is to answer them. With full-time unemployment averaging 3 1/4 million during the past 7 years, the Nation has lost \$175-\$200 billion in production owing to underemployment of our labor force. Surely the average rate of full-time unemployment during this period (4.8 percent) has been greatly in excess of what can be considered frictional. Even in the period from 1955 through 1957, when full-time unemployment averaged 4.3 percent, the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that only half of the unemployment was accounted for by short-term frictional factors (entry of new workers into the labor force; voluntary job shifting; and seasonal fluctuations). ("The Extent and Nature of Frictional Unemployment," Study Paper No. 6, prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress.)

The truth is that the Employment Act has not yet been adequately implemented. While the administration has given lip service to its principles, its actions have been directly contrary to the purposes of the act. Full employment has been subordinated to the balanced budget. An obsessive fear of inflation has displaced economic growth as our primary goal. The administration's tight money policy has cramped our recovery from the 1957-58 recession, leaving 4 million Americans out of work a year and a half after the start of the recovery. It has failed to adopt the correct policies to prevent rising prices and followed programs which have throttled the economy.

A major part of the problem of persistent unemployment—surely one of its most urgent aspects—is that of structural unemployment. The displacement of workers from their jobs as a result of changes in basic economic conditions attending economic growth is particularly serious because it is most likely to lead to long-term unemployment. The overall dimensions of this problem are indicated by the fact that in November 1959 some 823,000 of the 3.7 million

unemployed in the United States were located in 171 labor market areas which were suffering from chronic economic distress. In comparison to a national rate of unemployment of 5.3 percent, the rate in the distressed areas was 8.8 percent.

STRUCTURAL UNEMPLOYMENT IN SCHENECTADY

Structural unemployment is at the heart of the problems facing the people of Schenectady and the entire Mohawk Valley. It is the type of unemployment about which the individual workers can do least. His main alternatives are to move or to await the appearance of new enterprise which would employ his skills. The major challenge therefore is to understand the nature of the developments which have made for the chronic condition of unemployment and for the Federal Government to provide the help necessary to inaugurate a new era of economic growth in these areas. In all of these instances, the communities have tried but, with the resources at their command, have been unable to overcome the decline in economic activity.

The central community in this area is Schenectady. Not only is it important because it is the largest but also because it has been the source of employment for people living in the city proper and also for people in the surrounding areas, including Amsterdam and Fulton County. As the distress developed in the latter two communities, men sought employment in the Schenectady shops. When the latter shrank their job opportunities and laid off the newly hired people, the residents of these outlying areas were first displaced as they were likely to have the least seniority. This aggravated the already difficult employment problems of these smaller communities.

The central issue in Schenectady is the determined and conscious policy of decentralization of operations pursued by the General Electric Co. It is deliberately moving out of Schenectady many of its important units and retaining only a few basic operations. This program has left a great economic void. Alco Products, Inc., which has been the second largest source of employment, has contracted its diesel manufacturing activities in this area and closed down its tank manufacturing facilities. As a result its employment has been cut to well below one-fourth its former peak. The contraction of both of these large centers of employment has also meant the loss of many auxiliary and feeder industries. The men and women employed in these industries, both on manual and nonmanual jobs, include people with the widest range of skills used in the modern metal manufacturing industry and constitute a reservoir of unsurpassable quality, highly necessary in this era of electronics and complex machine manufacture. Despite this invaluable resource, the community has not displayed the resilience necessary for adjustment to its economic setbacks. For the greater part of the last 2 years, its rate of unemployment was in excess of 6 percent and its current improved record is attributable in part to the fact that the displaced workers living in the surrounding communities are excluded from the count of the unemployed within the Schenectady area itself.

The citizens' program for diversification in the Schenectady area is interesting but the great question is whether it is adequate to the task of modernizing this community and making it better able to attract new industries. Has its long history of adjustment to the policies and needs of the General Electric Co. and Alco Products, Inc., handicapped this community in its ability to provide a home for other industries and companies? It is paradoxical that the hometown of the General Electric Co. should be suffering from its current difficulties in view of the company's proclaimed program of

fostering a favorable industrial climate as a prerequisite for local economic growth.

With its impressive human and capital resources, this community should be the cradle for many new modern industries, but there is need to modernize the civic facilities and utilities to make it better able to absorb these enterprises. Through study these needs can be more quickly identified, corrections instituted, and the process of adjustment shortened. This is the crying need of the community of Schenectady upon which the future of much of the Mohawk Valley is dependent. It can fit into the pattern of American economic growth. What is necessary is to shorten this process deliberately so that human suffering and economic waste be reduced to a minimum.

The community cannot do this job itself. When it is left to its own resources, it will turn primarily if not exclusively upon promotional techniques which, however useful, will not be sufficient. Economic planning and modernization of the community's facilities to fit the needs of the newer industries must be pushed concurrently with the promotional work. These two developments will be inaugurated if the Federal Government helps underwrite these activities.

The two neighboring areas in the Mohawk Valley are confronted with different structural problems. Amsterdam is beset by the fact that it has depended upon the carpet industry for its basic economic foundation. Unfortunately, more than 5,000 carpet millworkers have lost their jobs in recent years as a result of a combination of factors, including the geographical relocation of the industry to the south, shifts in consumers' tastes, a rising volume of imports and technological changes. The Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., one of the two major operations in the city, has closed down all of its local activities and the Mohasco Co. has contracted considerably. These industries had for decades been the base of the economic organization of this community and its surrounding areas. They employed both men and women at comparatively high wage and benefits. This community had shaped its existence around the economies of these companies. The direct skills which they fostered were primarily useful to this industry.

The removal of these jobs has left thousands of men and women without other resources. There have been few alternative jobs available. Even though the community has made heroic efforts through Industries for Amsterdam, Inc., to find occupants for the abandoned carpet factory buildings and has itself constructed one new building, these additions have not been sufficient to correct the downward trend. Since the beginning of 1955, Amsterdam has been uninterruptedly classified as a surplus labor market.

The problems of redevelopment of this community are more difficult than those faced by Schenectady. There are obvious problems of physical rehabilitation in the community including the leveling of some of the older industrial sites along the railroads and the clearance of other outmoded facilities in order to open up sites for the construction of new buildings with better access to transportation and other utilities. Many necessary local public facilities must be advanced in order to make the community more attractive. These programs should be preceded by a careful economic analysis which will help to define precisely the way in which this community will fit into the major new American industrial and economic trends. Following such studies and projections, the human and physical resources must be updated and adapted to these trends. The crying need is to shorten the process of adjustment to our changing industrial complex. This community has done much to help itself but it is not sufficient to ameliorate the plight of the people or to provide the

base for economic rehabilitation. It needs the help of the Federal Government to address itself vigorously and determinedly to this problem.

The third area, Gloversville-Johnstown, should be more properly labeled Fulton County. The distinctive feature of this area has been the preponderance of leather, fabric, and knit glove manufacture. The region has been dependent upon these industries for its growth. More particularly these communities have specialized in the manufacture of fine gloves. They have been beset by the fact that there has been a drop in the total consumption of women's leather gloves and a growing proportion of this domestic market has been taken up by imports. While cut and sewn fabric gloves made of warp knit fabric have gained in popularity, this industry has been a marginal operation in this area, with less than 5 percent of domestic production being located here. This branch has also suffered from low-cost competition from Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and other foreign producers. Seamless knit gloves have not fared better as foreign competition has also hit this branch. Moreover, the cutbacks in employment in Schenectady and Amsterdam adversely affected workers living in Fulton County for they were among the earliest to be laid off. As a result, the chronic unemployment has been of longer standing in this community than in the other areas of the Mohawk Valley. The problems of economic redevelopment are therefore of more serious nature. The experience of this area points up the discouragement which sets in after continuing high unemployment has become truly chronic.

The continuing depression has narrowed the tax base and has also resulted in a destruction of local services, both of which have inhibited new industries from coming into the area. The long standing economic difficulties have engendered a fatalism which has robbed the community of the daring and enterprise necessary to redevelop for new growth. A conservatism has set in which has deterred new growth. The funds have not been available locally for developing the base for new industries or economic activities. Here is a community which needs stimulation from a friendly Federal agency which will help it better to understand its problems and to define long term solutions. It cannot on its own find the answers to its difficulties; it must be helped to define its future pattern and the course to follow for its redevelopment. (For a thorough analysis of the Fulton County problem, see Betti Goldwasser, "Report on the Gloversville Project, Local Impact of Foreign Trade Project," National Planning Association, Washington, D.C., May 1957, mimeographed.)

HEAVY IMPACT ON TEXTILE WORKERS

Textile workers have borne a heavy share of the burden of structural unemployment in these areas. From a total of 15,600 in 1951, textile employment has fallen to 8,600, a decrease of 45 percent. The largest portion of this decline is accounted for by the demise of the carpet and rug industry in Amsterdam, where total textile employment dropped from 8,600 to 4,200 or 51 percent. The Albany-Schenectady-Troy area contributed a loss of 2,200 jobs in this period as textile employment declined from 5,500 to 3,300, a 40-percent reduction. In Gloversville textile employment fell from 1,500 to 1,100 in the past 8 years, a reduction of 27 percent.

The figures cannot tell the full story of the personal tragedies involved: the desperation of workers who see the mill shut down after a lifetime of service, without so much as a severance payment; the search for jobs where there are no jobs; the exhaustion of unemployment benefits; the exhaustion of personal savings; the dependence on private and public charity; and above all, the sense of

hopelessness that overcomes the individual after many months of enforced idleness.

The plight of these people cries out for a solution. The promise of the Employment Act must be fulfilled. It is time to put into practice the words of the law: those who are "able, willing and seeking to work" must be afforded "useful employment opportunities." It will take imagination and the courage to innovate. But it must be done.

The Senate has taken the first step. The adoption of the Area Redevelopment Act by the Senate in the 1st session of the 86th Congress points the way to a massive attack on the problem of structural unemployment. This legislation would set in motion a coordinated program for redeveloping the distressed industrial and rural areas of this country so that they could throw off the yoke of hopelessness imposed by chronic unemployment. With technical assistance from the Federal Government, these communities could take a fresh look at themselves. They could determine what they have to offer and what it will take to put the area on its feet again. They could plan to take advantage of their resources—potential as well as actual. They could renew their public facilities. These are the essential prerequisites for an effective rehabilitation program.

Now it is up to the House of Representatives. The Committee on Banking and Currency has approved the bill. It remains for the House to act on it. Surely this should be the first order of business in the new session of Congress. The suffering of the people in economically distressed areas will brook no further delay. It is time we put the principles of the point 4 program to work at home. Can we hope to show the peoples of the underdeveloped areas in the world how to eradicate poverty if we cannot wipe out the pockets of economic distress in our own country?

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT A NEW MILESTONE

The Area Redevelopment Act will be a new milestone in the forward march of America. It will translate into concrete accomplishments the promise of full employment offered by the Employment Act of 1946. It will provide living proof for all the world to see that a free society can harness the resources of an economy for the benefit of all the people.

As we plan for the achievement of this great goal we must not neglect the immediate needs of the people in distressed areas. Emergency measures are needed to tide these people over until community rehabilitation is achieved. Government contracts should be channeled into these areas to provide immediate employment opportunities. Surplus food should be allocated. Persons in distressed communities who exhaust their unemployment benefits should receive extended benefits. The entire unemployment compensation system needs to be modernized, with Federal standards to assure adequacy of benefits and duration.

The free world looks to us for leadership in this critical time. As we enter the decade of the sixties unemployment is no longer merely a domestic problem. Our response to it may well prove crucial in determining the struggle between Communist tyranny and the free peoples of the world. Our success in solving the problem of unemployment will add strength to our purpose and set an example for all the world to emulate.

STATEMENT BY FRED KROENBERGER, BUSINESS MANAGER, AMSTERDAM JOINT BOARD, TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, AFL-CIO, ON THE NEED FOR ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT IN AMSTERDAM, N.Y., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF UNEMPLOYMENT OF THE U.S. SENATE

The city of Amsterdam, N.Y., is economically distressed. It has been suffering from

heavy unemployment continuously for the past 6 years. One of the largest plants in the area was closed in 1955 and further curtailments have since taken place. In spite of strenuous local efforts to attract new industries, employment has continued to decline. Unemployment in the latest available month (July) numbered 1,800, comprising 8.1 percent of the civilian labor force. The people of this distressed community look to the Federal Government for aid in redeveloping the area so that it can once again be placed on a healthy self-sustaining basis.

EVIDENCE OF DISTRESS

Employment in the Amsterdam area has fallen steadily in recent years. In 1951, non-agricultural industries covered by the unemployment insurance law employed 17,182 workers. Of this total, 13,167 were employed in manufacturing industries. By far the largest group (8,649) was employed in the textile industry, with the bulk of these workers accounted for by two large wool carpet and rug plants, Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., Inc., and Mohawk Carpet Co. Employment in these plants declined gradually until 1955, reflecting the drop in consumer demand for wool carpets and rugs and the substitution of tufted carpeting for woven carpets.

CARPET MILL LIQUIDATIONS

In the spring of 1955, the community suffered a severe blow when the Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co. announced the liquidation of its Amsterdam plant, except for a small axminster carpet weaving unit. More than 2,000 workers were displaced, comprising about 20 percent of the total factory employment in the area. By the end of 1955 textile employment was down to 5,847, a decline of 32 percent from the 1951 average. Total covered employment declined from 17,182 to 14,262, or 17 percent, during this period.

While there was a modest pickup in employment in 1956 and 1957, the latter year witnessed new reverses in the community's fortunes as Bigelow-Sanford closed its remaining axminster weaving unit, displacing 400 workers, and the Mohawk company also shut down its axminster weaving unit, resulting in the loss of 700 additional jobs. Mohawk had merged with Alexander Smith, Inc., at the end of 1955, becoming Mohasco Industries, Inc., and making it possible to shift its axminster production to the Greenville, Miss., plant which the city of Greenville had built for Alexander Smith. The subsidy which Greenville had supplied (amounting to \$4,750,000) thus was instrumental in wiping out 700 jobs in Amsterdam.

Further declines in textile employment brought total employment to a low of 13,458 for the year 1958, with textiles accounting for 3,825 jobs. In spite of the improvement in 1959, employment in covered industries during the latest available period (first quarter) was only 13,640, still lower than in any comparable period during the past decade, except for the recession low of 1953. Textile employment (4,181) had dropped by 4,468 since 1951. Less than one-quarter of this loss had been offset by gains in apparel (which increased from 1,548 in 1951 to 2,045 in 1959), food (which rose from 1,507 to 1,710) and durable goods plants (which increased from 218 to 807). Consequently, there was a net loss of 3,542 jobs in covered employment from 1951 to the first quarter of 1959. The area's largest employer (the Mohawk carpet mill) currently employs 2,500 compared to the previous peak of 5,400.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

The impact of the decline of the textile industry on the economy of Amsterdam is evident in the physical structure of the community and the suffering of its people. High rates of unemployment have become chronic, persisting in prosperous periods and reaching catastrophic proportions during

general recessions. Thus in 1954, when the national average rate of unemployment rose to 5.6 percent, the Amsterdam rate fluctuated between 11.6 and 17 percent. In the 1955-57 recovery, when the national average varied between 4.2 and 4.4 percent, the annual average for Amsterdam stayed up between 8.9 and 9.8 percent more than twice as high as the national rates. The 1958 recession raised the national average to 6.8 percent while the Amsterdam unemployment ratio jumped to 14.1 percent, with a high of 18 percent in July. By July of 1959, the national unemployment rate had fallen to 5.2 percent while 8.1 percent of Amsterdam's labor force was still unemployed.

As high as the Amsterdam figures are, they are still an understatement of the seriousness of the unemployment problem in this area. Thousands of workers who have sought employment unsuccessfully for long periods have either left the labor force entirely or have departed to look for work elsewhere. In July 1957, there were 26,850 persons in the Amsterdam labor force (employed and unemployed). By July 1959 this number had dwindled to 23,450, a decline of 3,400 in 2 years. This marked decrease indicates that many residents of the Amsterdam area have withdrawn from the labor force out of despair. While the Government estimates of unemployment do not include these people, they are an integral part of the problem faced by the community.

RIISING WELFARE COSTS

The high cost of meeting the immediate consequences of this problem is evident from the figures on welfare expenditures in the area. The cost of home relief has mounted steadily. In 1951, when the average number of persons receiving home relief was 197, the cost amounted to \$62,000. In 1958, the average number of recipients had jumped to 350 and the cost to \$108,000. In the first 11 months of 1959 the average number of recipients rose to 368 and the cost (\$119,000) exceeded the amount for the entire year 1958. Expenditures for home relief in the first 11 months of 1959 were 26 percent greater than in the corresponding period last year and 111 percent greater than in the corresponding period in 1951.

These steep increases in relief costs result from the inadequacy of the current unemployment insurance system in dealing with the problems of chronic unemployment. While payments under the unemployment compensation programs have cushioned the economic distress of those affected by short-term unemployment, they do not meet the needs of the people in an area suffering from persistent distress. Payments under the permanent State and Federal programs in the Amsterdam area amounted to \$1,255,000 in 1951 and rose to \$2,541,000 in 1954. After falling to \$1,591,000 in 1957, unemployment compensation benefits jumped to \$2,706,000 in 1958. In addition, payments under the Federal Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, effective June 23d, amounted to \$419,000 in 1958. Regular benefits in the first 9 months of 1959 amounted to \$1,269,000, with an additional \$168,000 paid under the Federal and State temporary programs, which expired in July.

EXHAUSTION OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The inadequacy of present unemployment insurance provisions is highlighted by the fact that 1,442 claimants exhausted their benefits in 1958; these workers comprised 66 percent of the average number of claimants during the year. As a result of the high rate of benefit exhaustions, the proportion of all unemployed workers who received compensation fell from 79 percent in January 1958 to 61 percent in November 1958 and to a low of 52 percent in June 1959.

Older workers have been hit particularly hard by the distressed condition of the Amsterdam economy. These workers have much more difficulty in finding a new job when they are laid off than do younger workers. In January 1959, when unemployment insurance claimants in Amsterdam numbered 1,859, the proportion of claimants who were 65 or over was 9.4 percent. In October, when the total number of claimants had declined to 836, the proportion 65 and over jumped to 19.6 percent. Significant increases in the proportions in the 55-64 and 45-54 age groups also took place during this period, with the former rising from 15.7 to 16.7 percent and the latter from 24 to 29.3 percent.

DECLINE IN POPULATION

The lack of adequate employment opportunities has resulted in a gradual decline in the population of Amsterdam. From 33,329 in 1940, the population fell to 32,240 in 1950, a decline of 3 percent in a decade which saw an increase of 10 percent in the population of the State. In 1959 the population of Amsterdam is estimated at 31,745, a further decline of 2 percent since 1950, compared to an increase of 13 percent for New York State.

The demise of the textile industry in Amsterdam has left the city with considerable excess factory space. Approximately half a million square feet of vacant space still exists in the old buildings vacated by Bigelow-Sanford in 1955. An additional 100,000 square feet of space is vacant in other industrial buildings, much of which is obsolete. In addition, many thousands of square feet of space is to be found in vacant stores and other commercial structures.

LOCAL EFFORTS AT REHABILITATION

The efforts of the people of Amsterdam to solve the problems resulting from the decline in the textile industry have been organized by Industries for Amsterdam, a membership corporation established in 1954. This group is designed to promote the location of new industrial enterprises in the city. It collected \$260,000 in contributions and built a factory shell which is currently occupied by the Ward Products Co., a manufacturer of antenna employing 125 workers. It has also obtained credit of \$80,000 for the acquisition and development of real estate suitable for industrial development. The only plant which has availed itself of this opportunity so far is the Southwest Manufacturing Co., a boat building firm employing 60 workers. In addition to these activities, Industries for Amsterdam has sought to attract new industries by disseminating information. Altogether, as a result of its efforts to date the development corporation claims the location of 15 new industrial plants in the area, including the two above-mentioned plants, with a total employment of between 1,000 and 1,150.

Another organization which has been active in the industrial promotion field has been L. Grossman Sons Inc., which acquired the former Bigelow-Sanford real estate in December 1955. This firm has leased or sold space in the old carpet plant to 13 firms, which currently employ a total of approximately 900 employees. Five of these firms, employing 800 workers, received assistance from "Industries for Amsterdam," and are included in the above-cited figures for the development corporation. The peak employment by Bigelow-Sanford in these buildings had been in excess of 3,200. All but 4 of the current tenants employ fewer than 40 workers apiece, and 7 of them have fewer than 20 employees. Only 1 employs more than 200. Approximately one-fourth of the 2 million square feet of floor space in these buildings is still vacant.

It is clear from the gap which still exists between the community's needs and the

achievements of local promotion groups over the past 6 years that Federal assistance is urgently needed. Local resources are inadequate to the tremendous task of revitalizing the area. It will take more than the erection of a few factory shells and the sale or leasing of existing plants to very small businesses to solve Amsterdam's basic problems. What is needed is a fundamental study of the community's economic, physical, and human resources and a plan which would take advantage of the area's actual and potential advantages. With appropriate planning and adequate financing, the Amsterdam area can be redeveloped into a highly attractive location for modern, progressive industries.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF A FEDERAL REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Only the Federal Government is in a position to provide the integrated program necessary to revitalize the Amsterdam area. We heartily endorse the Douglas area redevelopment bill (S. 722) as encompassing the flexible and comprehensive approach which is imperative for the solution of our problems.

First, it would provide technical assistance to our local development group in conducting a survey of the current and potential resources of the community. This information is indispensable to the intelligent planning of a constructive development program. It will point to the kinds of industries we should seek to attract to our community. Moreover, it will enable our development group to discuss local advantages with prospective employers on a specific and factual basis.

Second, the bill would integrate the redevelopment program with the existing Federal urban renewal program. At present, the latter is largely confined to residential renewal. Extension of the urban renewal program to areas which are not primarily residential will make available Federal grants to defray a portion of the cost of removing obsolete industrial and commercial structures as part of the economic development of the area. This would be an important contribution to the improvement of Amsterdam's layout, making it possible to build modern plants in locations which are convenient for transportation facilities.

Third, the Douglas bill would authorize the Secretary of Labor to determine the needs of our community for vocational training to meet the new skills required by new and expanding industries in the area. In order to enable unemployed persons to get the benefits of this training the bill also provides for subsistence payments to such persons while they are being trained.

Finally, the area redevelopment bill would provide financial assistance for projects which would fit in with the overall program for redevelopment, as drawn up by the local development group. Such assistance would contribute to the revitalization of the community through the improvement of public facilities and the construction of industrial and commercial facilities necessary for balanced economic growth.

NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT IN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

The experience of the people of Amsterdam is clear proof that present unemployment compensation provision are inadequate. We endorse the Karsten-Machrowicz-Kennedy-McCarthy bill, which would establish Federal standards guaranteeing each eligible worker unemployment benefits for up to 39 weeks, and increasing the benefits to the levels originally intended for unemployment compensation.

With decent Federal standards for unemployment insurance and a Federal program for area redevelopment, we are confident that the people of Amsterdam can overcome the difficulties that have made our commu-

nity a distressed area during the past 6 years. We shall rebuild our economy on a sounder base to assure a healthy future for ourselves and our children.

WASHINGTON POST SUPPORTS REMOVAL OF INTEREST-RATE CEILING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, when I spoke briefly on the floor, I stated my position in favor of the President's request for the removal of the interest-rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

As I said at that time, I intend to follow up on this matter; and it is my hope that in the near future it will be possible to bring about congressional action to carry out the President's request.

Mr. President, today I want to call attention to an excellent editorial, published in the Washington Post, supporting the removal of the interest-rate ceiling. The Post is squarely in favor of immediate congressional action to remove this unrealistic and arbitrary limit. The Post's analysis of and comment on this matter deserve careful consideration.

Mr. President, I commend the Post for its fine editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1960]

MIXED OBJECTIVES

The argument about the efficacy of the Federal Reserve Board's monetary controls and the wisdom with which they have been used in the past will no doubt continue for a long time. There is much room for improvement both in techniques and in timing. Most of all, monetary policy should be fitted to a larger framework in which the long-term requirements of growth would more fully influence day-by-day decisions. But, given the present state of affairs, the President's renewed request for elimination of the archaic ceiling on the interest rates of Government bonds is supported by the most urgent considerations. Congressional attempts to evade this present need in a search for monetary-policy reforms are an unrealistic mixing of objectives.

If Congress wishes to attempt to define a monetary policy for the avoidance of high interest rates, let it recognize that the task involves a quite sweeping reappraisal of budget, tax, and credit programs and then lift its sights to the challenge. But, in the meantime, it cannot ignore the consequences of past failure to develop institutions and policies within which severely restrictive monetary controls and high interest rates might not be necessary.

The unavoidable fact is that the short-term money market is exceedingly tight and the Government's necessary reliance on short-term borrowing has contributed to the trouble, although it is by no means the only cause. Unless the Treasury is freed to enter the long-term market at realistic interest rates, short-term rates may be driven even higher.

Let Congress acknowledge these facts in sorrow, if it wishes, but let them be faced. Then the larger task of freeing up the country's full productive potential can be undertaken. If this broader goal could be achieved, the Government's debt-management problems would be eased in more fundamental and lasting ways.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONGRESS, AS WELL AS THE PRESS, SHOULD BE GIVEN COPIES OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in behalf of all Americans, I desire to enter a strong protest against the one-sided, and thereby deliberately distorted, manner in which the Bureau of the Budget and the current administration is using Madison Avenue propaganda techniques to try to foist off the proposed budget on the American people.

Since last Saturday, gentlemen of the press have been calling my office to get me to comment on this or that item in the President's budget. Copies of the budget were handed the press last Saturday, yet they were marked for release today at noon, and copies were expected to be delivered at my office and the offices of most other Senators around 1 p.m. today.

Mr. President, I do not object to this information being given to the press, because I am a firm believer in keeping the press informed so that it in turn can contribute mightily to keeping the people informed. But I do object most strenuously to the press being informed before Members of the Congress as to proposed expenditures, for I believe that we who are elected to represent the people and vote the money and the taxes to run this Government have an even greater responsibility than any private business in letting the people know about proposed projects and expenditures. In line with this responsibility, it seems to me just as important that we of the Senate, and even key members of our staffs, should receive information on proposed budgetary actions, as it is for private individuals to have such information.

Mr. President, I think it is time for the executive branch of the Government to treat the legislative branch as equal partners in the Government, and stop treating the Congress as a bunch of schoolboys to whom information is doled out at the will of the teacher.

Mr. President, I desire to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

WILL OF MRS. W. L. CLAYTON, GREAT DEMOCRATIC WOMAN LEADER, INCLUDES LARGE BEQUEST FOR HER "BELOVED COUNTRY" THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Monday January 11, it was my painful duty to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that one of our most honored and distinguished philanthro-

pists and Democratic leaders of Texas, Mrs. W. L. Clayton, had passed away.

As the wife of Will Clayton, brilliant former Under Secretary of State, Mrs. Clayton would have naturally enjoyed wide social acceptance and prominence. Therefore, I think it particularly adds to her enduring fame and credit that on her own she did such outstanding work, made such exceptional contributions of service and money to helping thousands who could not help themselves, and that she earned widespread personal recognition.

Perhaps one of her most remarkable attributes was that although she was blessed with substantial wealth, she assiduously avoided joining with the so-frequent cry of the money class against taxes, against spending on programs of human decency. On the contrary, as an ardent supporter of President Franklin Roosevelt, she worked many hours to forward his basic programs of economic justice—his fights to "return America to the American people." She believed in liberty and equality and individual dignity, and she recognized that our Nation virtually was the only spot on earth where all men have even a chance of enjoying such priceless treasures.

This was not only true at the national level, but also at the local level, as evidenced by the fact that she fought for slum clearance in her home city of Houston.

It was, I think, entirely fitting, then, that she should not forget her country in her last will, although probably no one else thought of it until her will was made public. In a handwritten codicil dated August 3, 1957, she had made a very substantial contribution to "my beloved country, the United States of America, to be used for the retirement of the national debt." The contribution to this country was of one-half of the Susan V. Clayton Trust No. 2, the other one-half going to Johns Hopkins University for medical research.

Score of millions of Americans dearly love their country; most would die for it, but few voluntarily make gifts of money to it. Mrs. Clayton was one of those rare persons who so loved this country that in her will she divided her accumulated wealth with it, and said, "To you my beloved country, goes this part of my estate."

Higher patriotism has not been shown by any American in time of peace.

Her surviving husband, Will Clayton, her children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren, have a proud heritage that few can equal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story by Marshall Verniaud in the January 14, 1960, issue of the Houston Post, entitled, "Will of Mrs. Clayton Includes Her 'Beloved Country' for Retirement of U.S. Debt."

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

FOR RETIREMENT OF U.S. DEBT—WILL OF MRS. CLAYTON INCLUDES HER BELOVED COUNTRY

(By Marshall Verniaud)

A bequest to the United States of America "to be used for the retirement of the na-

tional debt" was made by Mrs. William L. Clayton in a will and codicil filed for probate Wednesday.

Mrs. Clayton, wife of the cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co. and former Under-Secretary of State, also directed bequests to the Texas Children's Hospital, the Clayton Fund, and Johns Hopkins University.

Specific bequests totaling \$3,686,000 to her husband, 56 other relatives and 3 servants were included in the handwritten will executed April 13, 1953.

No estimate of the estate's value was available. The petition for probate listed it as having a value "in excess of \$100,000."

In a handwritten codicil dated August 3, 1957, Mrs. Clayton directed that one-half of her interest in the Susan V. Clayton Trust No. 2 shall be given "to my beloved country, the United States of America, to be used for the retirement of the national debt."

The remaining half of her interest in this trust will go to Johns Hopkins University for the support of medical research to be designated by a son-in-law, Dr. Benjamin M. Baker, of Baltimore, Md.

The will written on both sides of a single sheet of paper, bequeathed two-thirds of her corporate stock in Anderson, Clayton & Co. to the Texas Children's Hospital, with a proviso that it will be retained by that institution and only the income used.

The remaining one-third of the stock was given to the Clayton Fund, founded by Mr. and Mrs. Clayton.

Any balance of the estate after distribution of designated bequests shall go to the Texas Children's Hospital, Mrs. Clayton directed.

In addition to a bequest of \$100,000 to her husband, Mrs. Clayton ordered payment of \$100,000 each to four daughters, their husbands, four granddaughters, and five grandsons.

Additional bequests of \$50,000 each were made to 5 nieces, 3 nephews, 5 great-nieces, 10 great-nephews, 9 great-great-nieces and 5 great-great nephews.

The will also directed bequests of \$25,000 to a sister-in-law, \$5,000 to a brother, \$2,500 each to two servants, and \$1,000 to a third servant.

Daughters named in the will were Mrs. W. St. John Garwood, of Austin; Mrs. S. M. McAshan, Jr.; Mrs. John W. Johnson, of Houston; and Mrs. Benjamin M. Baker, of Baltimore.

Granddaughters named to receive bequests were Mrs. Lucy J. Hadac, of Seattle, Wash.; Miss Burdine C. Johnson, of Houston; Mrs. Susan V. Baker and Miss Julia May Baker, of Baltimore.

The five grandsons who will share in the estate are St. John Garwood and William T. Johnson, of Houston; William L. Garwood, of Austin; Benjamin M. Baker, Jr. and William C. Baker, of Baltimore.

Mrs. Clayton died January 7 at the age of 78.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, during the 1st session of this 86th Congress two bills were introduced which proposed a U.S. Department of Science. One of these bills was S. 586, which I introduced. A second bill, S. 646, was introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Since then, it has become increasingly evident that lack of coordination, bickering, duplication, and absence of leadership among various bureaus, agencies, and branches, are major stumbling blocks in our Nation's efforts to match if not outdistance the Soviets in space and missile developments.

When I appeared before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations last April 17, I stated:

The outstanding attribute of science is its exactness. If we are to deal with science in our Government, we must also be exact.

It is my serious contention that the quickest course of exactitude in our scientific research and development programs will be found in this bill which I have offered—S. 586.

We need action and we need it fast. Duplication of effort is wasting our resources and money and retarding our country in this very fast and dangerous race. In the Pentagon alone, the maze of committees and departments is enough to confound progress itself.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues on this committee, science in our Nation today is all over the lot.

In spite of the improvements that have been made to correct this situation, we have no overall boss, no Cabinet member to make the ultimate decisions.

For our immediate needs—and they are most immediate—I feel my bill for a Department of Science holds the answer.

To have effective direction of our scientific efforts, we need somebody to call the signals.

Perhaps our ultimate goal is to be found in Senator HUMPHREY's proposal, which would transfer all the functions of science to such a department.

But for the immediate, crying needs of here and now, I feel it is better that we make a start. We can transfer the other functions later as we go along.

I urge that you report out my bill for a Department of Science as quickly as possible.

I was pleased to read in the newspapers of December 29, 1959, that Dr. Wallace R. Brode, the retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, called for creation of a Cabinet-rank Science Department when he spoke before the group meeting in convention in Chicago.

Dr. Brode expressed the opinion held by many scientists and laymen that the Nation cannot hope to get the most from its scientists unless their genius and energies are better coordinated.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two newspaper accounts of Dr. Brode's address, as well as an editorial on the subject from the Washington Post and Times Herald.

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

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 29, 1959]
CABINET-RANK SCIENCE OFFICE URGED FOR UNITED STATES

CHICAGO, December 29.—A ranking Government scientist has called for creation of a Cabinet-rank science department to take over all basic scientific work for all branches of the Federal Government.

Only by establishing such an operating agency, Dr. Wallace R. Brode said last night, will the Nation be able to meet the demands of technology with the scientific assets available.

Dr. Brode, who is serving as science adviser to the Secretary of State and who is on leave as Associate Director of the National Bureau of Standards, outlined his proposal in a speech before the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The talk, entitled "Development of a Science Policy,"

was Dr. Brode's traditional "swan song" address as retiring president of AAAS.

The scientist, a noted chemist as well as Government administrator, rejected arguments that resulted early this year in the shelving of a proposal to create such an agency. He said the matter should be reopened at once.

WANTS REAL SETUP

"We should be certain that it is in fact as well as in name an operating department," Dr. Brode said. "It should not be a superstructure imposed on existing organizations, but * * * an honest and real effort to mesh the scientific interests and objectives of our Government in the fullest utilization of resources.

"Thus a department of science, while not removing from agencies such as Defense and Agriculture applied research programs specific to their mission, should, however, include all major segments of science not specifically pertinent to an applied mission.

"It should have separate bureaus or institutes with suitable directors of distinction to deal with space, atomic energy, medicine, weather, patent information, physical science, geology, and other recognized areas of importance.

"To provide the * * * administrative head with broad and helpful advice it would seem reasonable to create an advisory council * * * [this] might be helpful in arriving at decisions on extent and character of support which the Government should provide."

SLAPS AT DEFENSE

Dr. Brode noted with alarm the domination of the national research scene by defense agencies, in which he lumped the military services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

This domination, which he said adds up to about 85 percent of the total basic research bill of the whole American economy, creates a situation of artificial priorities which often works against scientific projects.

A department of science, Dr. Brode said, should be run by scientists and career civil servants. He criticized the procedure to try to find someone to come in from the outside to run a major agency.

"Seldom does one seriously consider the appointment of a career civil servant even though there are in the Government career civil servants who may be recognized in other nations as world authorities * * *."

Speaking generally against this outside recruitment trend, Dr. Brode added:

"The Government should develop within its own establishment sufficient capability to operate its agencies; and our policy decisions, whether they be in science, taxation, or welfare, should not be made without guidance from governmentally experienced personnel."

[From the New York Times, Dec. 29, 1959]
SCIENCE BUREAU URGED FOR UNITED STATES—
BRODE, STATE DEPARTMENT'S ADVISER, OFFERS
PLAN TO END WHAT HE CALLS CHAOS

(By Walter Sullivan)

CHICAGO, December 28.—A program designed to end the alleged chaos of this country's scientific effort, stimulate basic research and loosen Government control over universities was proposed today.

Dr. Wallace E. Brode, scientific adviser to the State Department, made the proposal at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Dr. Brode, who is the association's outgoing president, emphasized that he was speaking for himself, not the association, or the Government.

The root of his plan is to create a Federal Science Department. He testified for such

a step during a congressional hearing on the plan earlier this year.

He proposed that a commission or study group be formed to examine the question of administering American science.

Among his criticisms of the organization of Government research were the following: "It is dominated by military and quasi-military agencies. Defense, Space, and Atomic Energy Agencies spend \$500 million a year, about 85 percent of the total research outlay.

"Universities, having been bailed out of financial difficulties after World War I by defense contracts, are now under excessive control. Each agency feels it should be able to select and direct both recipient and subject of research. Such contracts cover half the total basic research.

"The role of the military has made foreign scientists reluctant to take part in American-sponsored projects.

"With the explosive growth of research in recent years, there has been increasing proliferation of Government agencies concerned with research.

"A function of the National Science Foundation, in Dr. Brode's view, was to take over the Government's role in basic research except where such work was closely linked to the tasks of other Government departments. Instead, the various agencies have been contracting for research in all areas of science, with a consequent lack of coordination and planning."

SAYS PROGRAMS STAND STILL

Dr. Brode said Government agencies were farming out research to industry and universities, whereas programs in Government laboratories were standing still.

Thus, he said, there has been no substantial change since the 1930's in the number of scientists working for the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines and Forest Products.

In addition, he noted, civil service status limits their advancement and makes it hard to attract talent.

Dr. Brode also called for a National Science Council, whose membership would bridge the gap between the Government, the academic world, and industry. Centralization of planning, he said, would help free policymaking from the whims of public fancy and political expediency.

He said the Government would be less inclined to go all out for space research one year, and perhaps weather control or new energy sources a year later.

Instead, he argued, there could be long-range planning for a balanced program with enough leeway to preserve the independence of researchers.

Britain and France have taken such a step, he said. He admitted there was opposition to it, even within the association's board. The President's Science Advisory Committee also opposed it early this year, but on synthetic grounds, he added.

While there is a crisis, he warned, it is mild compared with what will exist a decade later, when expenditures for research are expected to double present levels.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1960]

A SECRETARY OF SCIENCE?

Among other proposals likely to be made again in Congress for the strengthening of the Nation's scientific efforts will be that to create a Department of Science with a Secretary of Cabinet rank. Many scientists and others in the administration are opposed to this idea, but the science adviser to the State Department and immediate past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Wallace R. Brode, said in a speech the other day that he thought such a department might be

useful. We hope that congressional sponsors of the plan will focus on the objectives. Otherwise the creation of another Federal agency could become an end in itself and could result merely in the imposition of a new layer of administrative supervision, more redtape, and more interagency committees to try to cut it away.

As Dr. Brode sees the objectives, one is to provide a better allocation of Federal funds among the competing scientific programs which the Government either conducts or supports and which, he calculates, account for some 80 percent of the Nation's basic research. This might be accomplished, we suppose, by better scientific staffing of the Budget Bureau, or by fuller use of the recently created Federal Council of Science and Technology, or even by a stronger voice for the science adviser in the White House. Or it might take a new Cabinet office to provide the sustained effort obviously required.

Another objective, Dr. Brode believes, is to upgrade Government scientists so that less scientific work will have to be farmed out and to establish more Government owned and operated laboratories. Again, a Department of Science might be the only way to bring the virtual revolution in pay scales and organization which this would entail—or there might be easier ways. The point is that there is much more at the root of the American scientific lag, already pronounced in some fields and merely imminent in others, than the mere lack of a Department of Science. The coming debate in this field ought to concern itself with the fundamentals, not just the superstructure.

DIVESTITURE OF DU PONT INTEREST IN GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, late last week I found it desirable to again call to the attention of the Senate the necessity for enacting appropriate legislation to prevent shareholders of the Du Pont Co. from the serious and unjustified tax penalties threatened as a result of the pending antitrust case brought by the Government against this corporation.

My statement was issued following an announcement by the Department of Justice that it had appealed the findings of the district court in Chicago which had ruled that divestiture by Du Pont of its General Motors stock was not necessary to effect appropriate relief which the Supreme Court by a 4-to-2 decision had earlier decided would be required.

In my remarks, I invited and urged both the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Treasury to join in supporting legislation to facilitate antitrust enforcement by lowering tax hurdles to the achievement of this goal.

This proposal is embraced in Senate bill 200 and in H.R. 8126 approved during the last session of Congress by the Ways and Means Committee.

Today, I am happy to advise the Senate that the Attorney General has written me a personal letter in which he reiterates the Department of Justice's support for enactment of tax legislation at this session of Congress which would assist the Government in pursuing appropriate enforcement under our antitrust laws.

I now trust, Mr. President, that the statement of the Attorney General will be followed by a similar expression of cooperation by the Secretary of the

Treasury to the end that we may have approval of one of these pending bills on this subject before Congress adjourns. Mr. President, I ask that the letter of the Attorney General be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

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

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1960.
Hon. J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have noted your statement in the Senate yesterday on this Department's decision to appeal to the Supreme Court the district court's decision permitting Du Pont to retain its interest of over \$3 billion in General Motors. First, in regard to the U.S. appeal, our position is that the district court's decree fails to remedy that violation the Supreme Court found. Until the Supreme Court determines this issue, the merits of our position, we feel, should be argued before the Supreme Court, and in no other context.

Beyond the question of appeal, you called upon this office and "others" to "join * * * in supporting * * * [legislation] to facilitate antitrust enforcement in eliminating the tax penalties upon forced divestiture" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 538).

This Department did just that last session of Congress. We expressed the belief that appropriate legislation lowering present tax hurdles to divestiture in antitrust cases could spur effective relief. Such legislation, in addition, would speed enforcement results by obviating the necessity for extending the period of divestiture over a number of years. It was with the goal in mind of prompt and effective antitrust enforcement that the Department recommended enactment of tax legislation to accompany the duty Congress placed on this Department to enforce the antitrust laws.

This continues to be our view. And our hope is that, this session, the Congress will see fit to act favorably on appropriate legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Attorney General.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO RETIRED OFFICERS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like at this time to say a word about some bills which I have introduced, which relate to the responsibility of retired officers of the armed services.

I have served on the Committee on Rules and Administration for 2 years, at the feet of our very distinguished colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN]. I hope, after my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has concluded his address, to which I look forward with great interest, to speak upon the pending legislation for a little while this afternoon.

In the meantime, I wish to advert to certain bills which I have introduced in cooperation with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], with respect to the responsibility of retired officers of the military services.

It is very gratifying to me that the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Armed Services Committee, before which I testified last July 8, in support of a bill which the Senator from

Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I had introduced, Senate bill 2228, the Retired Military Officers Defense Procurement Activities Act of 1959, has issued a report and proposed legislation which in many respects follows closely the recommendations of Senate bill 2228.

The 2-year "cooling off" period after retirement, during which officers may not participate in "selling" activities to the Department of Defense; the extension of the definition of "selling" to include negotiations, and the permanent exclusion of officers from selling activities directly related to their particular assignments in the services, should offer valuable guidelines to former personnel in their choice of future business connections.

It also becomes our duty to do affirmative acts which will offer a better opportunity for retired officers, as well as to do negative things which will prevent any abuse of what we consider to be a public trust.

Accordingly, I hope that, at the same time we consider the restrictive legislation which I have discussed, we shall also consider one other bill which I introduced on September 12, 1959, which would offer retired officers working for the Federal Government in positions classified as having a shortage of personnel, according to the Civil Service Commission, the opportunity to receive an increased share of their retirement pay, notwithstanding the salaries which they receive in civil service jobs. In this way we can provide retired officers with a career beneficial both to them and their country.

With reference to Senate bill 2703, which I introduced on September 12, 1959, the bill would also require the Civil Service Commission to make a report within 3 years, to help Congress with further legislation along this line.

It is important to bring to the notice of retired military officers that real efforts should be made to keep their fine and honorable status in our country, and that in the complexity inherent in the public concern over their trying to sell defense items to the Defense Department, or to negotiate with their former colleagues, we should also make every effort to utilize their services, which are often so precious, in jobs where we do have a shortage of personnel, and to encourage them to render that kind of service by minimizing the cost to them in terms of their retirement compensation. I hope very much that Congress will, therefore, consider both sides of this coin.

I end by saying what I have maintained time and time again, namely, that I hope that our retired officers will realize our gratitude to them for their services, and that all we are trying to do is to make very clear the ground rules, and that we know from their patriotic service, which they have always rendered to their country, they would be the first to desire the ground rules to be clear, and that, as we may restrict their activities, we also indicate the lines along which they can be extended, which will be beneficial both to the country and to them.

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

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 571, S. 2436, a bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2436) to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to add a new section to the pending amendment, which is the Hennings-Keating amendment lettered "C."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Hennings-Keating amendment the amendment which would make the bill applicable to primary elections?

If that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry, perhaps I could direct the question to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will answer the question in the affirmative. That will be the pending question, following action on the so-called Long amendment relating to caucuses and conventions.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On which amendment will the vote first come? Will it be on the Long amendment to the Hennings-Keating amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the first vote will occur on the Long amendment to the Hennings-Keating amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, at this time I wish to state how I expect to vote on the Hennings-Keating amendment, and to give a few reasons therefor.

I expect to vote for the Hennings-Keating amendment to include primary elections within the scope of the bill. The reason I shall do so is that I think the primary election is an essential part of being elected to the Senate; or, if the primary election is not used, then the nominating convention which may be provided by State law is an essential part of being elected.

The selection of a party candidate, the nomination of a party candidate, is one of the steps in election.

When I was considering this matter it occurred to me that the notable cases in which there have been election con-

tests before the Senate of the United States—the most outstanding examples of something going wrong, to which the Senate had addressed itself in the past—have been in regard to primary elections. I have in mind the Newberry case in Michigan, the Vare case in Pennsylvania, and the Smith case in Illinois.

In the report on these various contests, in the book compiled by Frank Hays, of the Senate Library, on "Senate Election Cases from 1913 to 1940," these several contests are all dealt with.

In review of the case of Ford against Newberry, the opinion of Chief Justice White is cited. In that citation, this review states:

The Chief Justice pointed out that the contention of the majority that elections did not include nominating primaries was illogical, for the same clause (of the Constitution: art. I, sec. 4, clause 1) which delegated to the States control over elections and, inferentially, control over primaries, also placed the power of regulation in Congress; that the argument that the powers of election and of nomination were separable and without relation was untenable; that the general powers conferred upon Congress under the necessary and proper clause were also left out of account in the majority opinion; and that the 17th amendment tended to confirm his view as after much debate it was adopted by a resolution of promulgation which reserved to the Congress its power under article I, section 4.

In the report of a committee in the Newberry case, one of the headings is "Primary Election." Under that heading I read this paragraph:

Your committee condemns the use of such a large sum of money in any primary campaign, but in the instant case there is not the slightest foundation upon which to connect Truman H. Newberry with its solicitation, its acquisition, or its use, nor to condemn him because of the amount. * * * It is but fair to state that the evidence discloses a situation in regard to this primary which perhaps has no parallel in American history.

That was the opinion of the majority. But even in that opinion it is clear that the whole matter with which the committee was charged was that which dealt with what happened in a primary election. It is my feeling that if the cases to which the Senate has addressed itself from time to time have dealt with primary elections, then consistently the bill which we pass at this time should deal with primary elections.

In the report of a committee in this same review of Senate election cases I find that there was quoted a letter which Mr. Arthur H. Vandenberg, editor of the Grand Rapids Herald, wrote to Mr. Newberry on August 8, 1918. He quoted in his letter from the Escanaba Journal of August 2, in an editorial entitled "An Offense to Political Decency."

It—

Referring to the Newberry campaign— is being made a money campaign which outclasses the "money barrel" campaigns of 20 and 30 years ago, and if the campaign is to continue unchallenged it will create a condition which must inevitably mean the debauchery of Michigan politics.

I am sure that if the late great Arthur Vandenberg were here today, he would recognize that the dollars necessary to

carry on a general campaign, or a primary campaign, back in 1918, would be quite inadequate to carry on a campaign at this time. But if he felt, as he apparently did when he wrote this letter to Mr. Newberry, that the conduct of the primary was an offense to political decency, he would feel that primaries should be embodied in the proposed legislation.

The review further quotes Mr. Vandenberg as saying:

I direct your attention to these specific charges which have appeared in responsible newspapers. They are charges, furthermore, which find kinship in the very general rumor and report. I fully realize that gossip is a deadly and a ruthless assassin, but gossip, in this instance, is too widespread to be longer ignored. It charges you and your associates with the expenditure of money running into six figures in the erection of your senatorial organization. Such a situation must be as intolerable to you, if these reports are false, as it is intolerable for the State, if the reports are true.

In the summary of the report on the Ford against Newberry case, submitted by the minority, Atlee Pomerene, William H. King, and Henry F. Ashurst, the opening sentence is:

The exorbitant expenditures in this primary campaign shocked the conscience of the country.

They were dealing not with a general election, but with a primary.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will my distinguished friend yield for an observation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am very glad to see that the Senator from South Dakota is, as always, careful, comprehensive, and scholarly in the statements he makes either here or in committee, where he and I have served together in the past.

I take it the Senator is reading from "Senate Election Cases," in part.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. By Hays. Mr. HENNINGS. From 1913 to 1940? Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am quite sure that the Senator has also read the landmark case of the United States against Classic.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have not read it recently.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is another very illuminating case which bears upon the question of the constitutionality of Federal election laws and regulations as applied to primary elections. The Senator has noticed, I am sure, that in the "Senate Election Cases" from 1913 to 1940, as we go back, the last case which was considered was the case of Willis against Van Nuys. Preceding that was the case of Hatfield against Holt. Preceding that was the case of Chavez against Cutting; and preceding that were the cases of Long against Overton and Hefflin against Bankhead.

Without further interrupting the Senator, let me say that many of these cases in which the Senate took jurisdiction were primary election cases. Is not that true?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. They dealt with the nomination of a candidate.

Mr. HENNINGS. Indeed, I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the conclusion of the report submitted by the minority in the Ford against Newberry case, Senators Pomerene, King, and Ashurst gave this as their conclusion from the facts disclosed by the record:

As conclusions from the facts disclosed by the record and the findings herein set forth, we are of the opinion—

First. That the irregularities complained of do not relate to the general election but to the primary. Henry Ford did not receive a plurality of the votes cast at the general election. We, therefore, find that the petitioner, Henry Ford, was not elected and is not entitled to a seat in the Senate of the United States.

Second. We find that under the facts and circumstances of this case corrupt and illegal methods and practices were employed at the primary election and that Truman H. Newberry violated the Corrupt Practices Act and the Primary Act of the State of Michigan, and that by reason thereof he ought not to have or hold a seat in the Senate of the United States, and that he is not the duly elected Senator from the State of Michigan for the term of 6 years commencing on the 4th day of March 1919, and we recommend, therefore, that his seat be declared vacant.

So again I take note of the fact that Members of the Senate in dealing with this case, which was referred to them, and which was their responsibility as members of the committee to investigate, dealt with a primary, and goings on in the primary, rather than with the general election, and dealt with the disbursement of funds in the primary on which the case turned.

Then, similarly in this collection by Mr. Hays of "Senate Election Cases," in the report of Mr. Reed of Missouri from the Special Investigating Committee To Investigate Expenditure in Senatorial Primary and General Elections, I find a paragraph which I believe to be significant. Again there I would point out that the committee, which the able former Senator from Missouri headed, and who was the predecessor of the able Senator who now in part represents the State of Missouri, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], was entitled "Special Committee Investigating Expenditures in Senatorial Primary and General Elections." In the partial report which Chairman Reed submitted in 1927, there appears this paragraph:

For all practical purposes it may be said that no candidate for the Senate at the last election in the State of Illinois could have any reasonable hope of election unless nominated in the primary by one of the regular party organizations. The intimate relation of the primary and the general election, and the interdependency of the latter upon the former, cannot be subject to any serious dispute.

I should like to reread that paragraph from the report of Chairman Reed of the special committee back in 1927, and invite the comment of the present Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. On what page does that appear?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. At page 305.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The paragraph to which I direct attention reads as follows:

For all practical purposes it may be said that no candidate for the Senate at the last election in the State of Illinois could have any reasonable hope of election unless nominated in the primary by one of the regular party organizations. The intimate relation of the primary and general election, and the interdependency of the latter upon the former cannot be subject to any serious dispute.

Does the Senator from Missouri agree with the conclusion of his illustrious predecessor, that there is an interdependency, and that the intimate relation between the two cannot be subject to any serious dispute?

Mr. HENNINGS. Well, I would say to the learned Senator from South Dakota that it is quite obvious that we cannot have a general election without having nominees, and that a part of the election process, as I undertook to say, I believe on Wednesday or Thursday, when discussing the amendment at the outset, is the primary, which is a predicate to the nomination and subsequent election of any candidate for the office of U.S. Senator. Of course I do agree with the late Senator James A. Reed in that statement, as do the courts and the Senate precedents, and the cases relating to them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, at page 318 I read a part of the Senate report to the 69th Congress, 1st session, as follows:

On May 19, 1926, the Senate adopted a resolution creating a special committee and directed it to investigate the expenditures in the senatorial primaries and general elections for the 6-year term in the U.S. Senate beginning March 4, 1927. The Nation's press had charged the employment of corrupt practices and large expenditures in the Pennsylvania primaries of May 18, 1926.

So again, Mr. President, the Senate, as on many other occasions, and as in this case of William S. Vare, took cognizance of what happened in a primary election.

There is one other feature in connection with the Pennsylvania case which is of interest, and that is, as the report points out—

There was no law in Pennsylvania limiting primary expenditures.

Notwithstanding the fact that there was no law in Pennsylvania limiting primary expenditures, the Senate took cognizance of the reports of excessive expenditures and corrupt practices, and went into the matter.

The letter from the Governor of Pennsylvania which transmitted the certification of the returns of the election is of interest in this connection. It appears at page 351 of "Senate Election Cases." The letter was dated at the Governor's office at Harrisburg, Pa., January 8, 1927. Gov. Gifford Pinchot wrote as follows:

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith the returns of the election of U.S. Senator, held on November 2, 1926, as the law of this Commonwealth directs.

I have the honor also to inform you that I have today signed and by registered mail

delivered to Hon. William S. Vare, a certificate which is as follows:

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

"This is to certify that on the face of the returns filed in the office of the secretary of the Commonwealth of the election held on the 2d day of November 1926, William S. Vare appears to have been chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years beginning on the 4th day of March 1927."

The form of words customarily used for such certificates by the Governors of this Commonwealth and the form recommended by the Senate of the United States both include certification that the candidate in question has been "duly chosen by the qualified electors" of the Commonwealth.

I cannot so certify, because I do not believe that Mr. Vare has been duly chosen. On the contrary, I am convinced, and have repeatedly declared, that his nomination was partly bought and partly stolen, and that frauds committed in his interest have tainted both the primary and the general election. But even if there had been no fraud in the election, a man who was not honestly nominated cannot be honestly elected to a seat.

That statement by the Governor of Pennsylvania is pertinent and germane to the debate today. The Governor refused to use the ordinary certification of election. He did say that it appeared on the face of the returns that Mr. Vare had been chosen, but the Governor took pains in his letter to the President of the Senate to say that he could not so certify, because he did not believe that Mr. Vare had been duly chosen. He said that "frauds committed in his interest have tainted both the primary and the general election," and continued: "But even if there had been no fraud in the election, a man who was not honestly nominated cannot be honestly entitled to a seat."

If that is true, and if the Senate of the United States in this previous case, as in the other cases, took cognizance of the fact that a taint rested upon the selection of a party nominee, then, it seems to me, the pending bill, if it is to be a clean elections bill, should embrace primary as well as general elections.

The Pinchot letter concludes:

The stealing of votes for Mr. Vare and the amount and the sources of the money spent in his behalf make it clear to me that the election returns do not in fact correctly represent the will of the sovereign voters of Pennsylvania. Therefore I have so worded the certificate required by law that I can sign it without distorting the truth.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Very respectfully yours,

GIFFORD PINCHOT,
Governor.

I may say, in conclusion, that the vote of the junior Senator from South Dakota will have to be cast for the Hennings-Keating amendment, which would make primary elections, as well as general elections, come within the scope of this law.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Dakota upon his diligence and

scholarship, and for taking the trouble to read the cases, to analyze them, and to present them to the Senate in his customarily effective and forceful fashion.

I may say to the able Senator that it has been a source of profound doubt in my mind as to the specific reasons, aside from various oblique and offside attacks which have been made upon the primary election reporting provision, why any Senator would not want the people of his State to know who the contributors to his campaign in the primary election were, and in what amounts those contributions were made. Why should there be reluctance on the part of the Senate to take moral leadership in this matter?

In this blessed year of 1960, when we are confronted with challenges and difficulties and crises of all manner, I do not understand why we in the U.S. Senate should seriously question the desirability, forthrightness, and honesty of reporting publicly the source of contributions to candidates' nominations, as well as their elections. I cannot understand, for the life of me, the reluctance on the part of some of our colleagues to make such information a matter of public record and understanding. The people have a right to know who support candidates, and to what extent such support may be manifested by contributions of money.

If the Senator from South Dakota could enlighten me as to what he believes a substantial argument contrariwise might be, I should be very happy to try to meet it.

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] said last Thursday that the State of Illinois had no such regulations whatsoever, either as to the primary elections or the general elections.

The Senator from South Dakota is well aware that the Senate had a very unhappy circumstance resulting from that, and perhaps other known defects of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, which is now sought to be amended, in the case of Frank L. Smith, which is one of the cases which I had intended to discuss, and shall discuss later, relating to the right of the Senate to inquire about corrupt practices employed to secure nominations to the Senate. Senator James A. Reed, of Missouri, one of my illustrious predecessors, offered the motion to investigate. As the Senator well knows, the inquiry was had, and it was found that Mr. Smith had received contributions in enormous amounts from, among others, the former utilities magnate, Samuel Insull; that Mr. Smith was nominated; and, on the face of the returns, apparently elected, although he was not seated in the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was about to conclude my remarks, but I think the points and the statements which the Senator from Missouri has made are very pertinent.

As to the reasons for Senators opposing the amendment, I am not advised. In general, I had understood there was a theory that State sovereignty might be involved; that the State had the right to

establish its own method of choosing its nominees for the Senate. But that theory, of course, could be equally applicable to the election of Senators.

I think any position to the effect that the Senate does not have the right—either the moral right or the legal right—to go into the primary, overlooks the record of the fact that the Senate has, in the cases I have cited, the Vare case, the Smith case, and the Newberry case, made an examination into what happened in the primaries, and that it was on the basis of what happened in the primaries principally that the Senate created special committees, or took whatever action it did take.

Mr. HENNINGS. It is, of course, true that in some States nomination means election, so if we imposed the so-called Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, as has been done in fiction, if not in fact, upon all States of the Union, is there any reason why in certain States, which have no reporting provisions—Illinois, for example, it not being a Southern State—candidates for the U.S. Senate should not divulge information to the public, so that the contributions to their campaigns may be subject to public knowledge and scrutiny? Thus it will be possible to determine the fitness of candidates for public office, and to determine the extent and nature of the support which candidates for office are getting. Such information may then be weighed as one factor—not necessarily the determining factor, but a factor—to enable the voters to make up their minds whom they want to have represent them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I see no reason why the law should not apply to both elections. In my State of South Dakota, there is a requirement for the disclosure of contributions and disbursements in primary elections, just as there is in the case of general elections.

I conclude by reiterating what Chief Justice White pointed out, that the argument that the powers of election and of nomination were separable and without relation was untenable; and with the conclusion of Governor Pinchot that even if there had been no fraud in an election, a man who is not honestly nominated cannot be honestly entitled to a seat.

Since the Senate has recognized that doctrine in the past by instituting tests and by coming to judgment upon evidence developed in connection with primary elections, it seems to me it would be most inconsistent and untenable for the Senate now to pass a so-called clean elections bill and not encompass primaries as well as general elections.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his very cogent and comprehensive presentation, which I think is invulnerable and, indeed, unassailable.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read, for the RECORD from an editorial which was published last week—on January 15—in the New York Times:

FIRST BUSINESS

The first major legislative business of the Senate in the present session is the bill to

revise the antiquated campaign expenditures law, which in its essence has been on the books since 1925.

For years the hypocrisy of the existing statute in the light of actual conditions has been apparent. Regularly, after each presidential election, the American public is duly shocked to learn that millions upon millions of scarcely controlled dollars have been spent by and on behalf of both parties—no one knows how much—and regularly there is a great fever to do something about it, a fever that lasts a few weeks or months before subsiding again into complacent normalcy. If the national figures who talk about morality and crusades would spend a little less time moralizing and a little more in giving hard political support to specific measures for reform of concrete political evils, our democratic institutions would be on firmer ground than they are.

One of these evils is the inadequacy of the laws governing campaign expenditures, now theoretically limited to a maximum of \$25,000 for Senators, \$5,000 for Representatives, and \$3 million for interstate political committees. There is nothing inherently good in the fact that the actual amounts spent in many campaigns are much higher; but there is something inherently bad in a law that sets limitations so unrealistic that they are constantly evaded. Therefore the proposal to raise materially these limitations, and to provide for fuller publicity as to the sources of contributions, is sound.

The present bill is, however, inadequate on two main counts. One is that it does not apply to primaries, which in at least a fourth of the States are the equivalent of elections.

I may say that to remedy that condition is the purpose of the pending amendment.

I read further from the editorial:

The other is that it sets no limit on total contributions of one individual, providing for merely a \$5,000 top to any single candidate or to any single committee.

Again I may say, Mr. President, that I propose to offer an amendment to cure that inadequacy. I offered such an amendment in the Committee on Rules and Administration, where I also offered the amendment which deals with primaries. The latter amendment was rejected by the committee, by a vote of five to four; and the bill was reported to the Senate without that amendment.

I read further from the editorial:

These deficiencies are serious; but a bill that included primaries would probably fall through the usual combination of conservative Republican and southern Democratic votes.

I say if this occurred, it would be a great tragedy. The Senate of the United States is not likely to have an opportunity to pass on legislation on this kind, character, and objective for a very long time. We have been trying to do so since I first introduced an elections bill in 1955. We had an elections bill on the calendar in the years 1955, 1957, and 1959, reported out of the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, we have not had an opportunity to pass on any bills relating to Federal elections since the enactment of the so-called Corrupt Practices Act in 1925.

For that reason I think the Senate has a clear, well-defined duty that is unmistakable, and not subject to a respectable difference of opinion, to see to it that the people have a right to know who

finances campaigns, whether they be primary campaigns or in general elections.

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

Mr. HENNINGS. In just 1 minute I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

For example, in the 1926 election in the State of Illinois, the late Samuel Insull, the largest manager and owner of public utility corporations in Illinois, contributed \$125,000 to the campaign of Mr. Frank L. Smith for the U.S. Senate. Of course, those were 1926 dollars, not 1960 dollars. To say that Mr. Insull's interest was entirely that of good government in the broad sense I think would strain the imagination and credulity of any reasonable or experienced man, and of particularly the Members of this body, who have themselves been through primaries and general elections, and who know something of what is done behind the scenes, what is done under the table, what is done without benefit of light of day, who know about cash contributions which are offered by some persons who do not want their names published, for various reasons, and, indeed, some members of the underworld. It would be very embarrassing, indeed, for some candidates for office to have to list the names of some of their less respectable contributors; and it would be even more embarrassing to have to say that certain interests or certain individuals had contributed so substantially to the primary process, in order to enable the candidate to present himself in the general election for election to this body, it would be a matter of deep and grave concern, not only to that candidate, were he to accept such contributions, but it would be a matter of deep and grave concern to some of the donors who expect something in return, who are not, by and large, so public spirited in many instances—and I speak of the disproportionate contributions such as that of Mr. Insull in 1926, of the equivalent of something like \$300,000 today, to nominate one man in the State of Illinois for the U.S. Senate.

Why in heaven's name, Mr. President, this question should have to be a matter of protracted consideration and debate, as it has been for many years, is beyond my simple understanding, unless, for reasons best known to ourselves, some Senators think that primaries are none of the people's business; that what happens in the primaries should not be known to the people of this country; that a man has a right by some magic or other, by the investiture of certain talents, powers, and gifts, to appear as a nominee on the ticket.

Now, Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my friend, the very able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank my colleague from Missouri. When the Senator from Missouri was mentioning the fact that it may be a long time hence before, once again, the question of campaign financing comes before the U.S. Senate, I was moved to say to him that I think many of us realize this paramount

question would not be here today if it were not for the persistent and tireless and indefatigable efforts of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my friend from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I salute him for his great contribution.

Mr. HENNINGS. I could not, however, quite associate myself with the suggestion that I have been tireless. This has been a long and unrewarding labor, with very few persons indicating any great interest or burning desire to help us reform ourselves and face up to the honest reality of political campaigning. I thank the Senator from Oregon, who has made many contributions along these lines, and who has, indeed, himself offered a bill which has very much merit. I should like to hear a further exposition of the Senator's bill as a part of the debate upon the pending amendment and subsequent amendments which some of us shall offer.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I assure the Senator from Missouri of my support for his dual effort, first to have primary elections brought within the scope of his bill, and, second, to establish an overall limitation on what any one individual can contribute to candidates or political groups in this country. I feel that the "dark continent" of American politics is the whole question of political campaign spending.

I have noted that a well-known author, William S. White, has declared that in a relatively small State it takes \$100,000 to elect a U.S. Senator, and that in some of the great industrial States it takes a minimum of \$1 million to elect a U.S. Senator.

In my own campaign in the State of Oregon in 1954, approximately \$103,000 was spent on my campaign, and about \$176,000 was spent on the campaign of my Republican opponent. In my opinion, both sums probably were somewhat too large.

It is my hope that eventually the time will come in the United States when no candidates for office will be dependent upon any benefactions from private sources, be they from persons engaged in industry and management or be they from trade unions.

I am sponsoring a bill, to which the Senator from Missouri very kindly referred, which is based on a special message to Congress by one of our greatest Presidents, a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, in 1907, a half century ago. Even in that distant time, before the age of television and radio, Theodore Roosevelt was disturbed by the huge campaign benefactions of the type which the Senator from Missouri discussed, namely, the Insull contributions in Illinois. So Theodore Roosevelt proposed that the U.S. Government should finance political campaigns, to free all candidates from the potential servitude occasioned by being indebted to private sources.

I have introduced a bill in that respect. I shall not offer it as an amendment to the bill of the able Senator from Missouri, because I realize that an innovation of this sort, as to which no com-

mittee hearings have been held, would not receive the number of votes to which its serious purpose would entitle it, unless extensive committee hearings were able to be held.

I think the Senator from Missouri is probing at the very root of our political processes. There is a sort of double standard in American public life which I do not understand. Many people say that if the assistant to the President of the United States, for example, should receive a coat of vicuna cloth, the assistant to the President of the United States is perforce obligated to do some special interest mission for the person who gave the coat; or, if an assistant to another President of the United States should receive a Deepfreeze, let us say, that he is inescapably obligated to the giver of the Deepfreeze. However, nothing is said about the fact that a President of the United States himself may be obligated to oil companies or utility companies not for a coat or for a Deepfreeze, but for hundreds of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions. Evidently, no obligation runs from that.

I again want to compliment the Senator from Missouri. I assure the Senator of such support and influence as I can offer in his effort to tighten up the provisions of the law, to make them apply to primaries, to put an overall limit on what one person can give, and to otherwise contribute to the effectiveness of the legislation which the Senator is so ably sponsoring.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my good friend, the able and erudite Senator from Oregon, for his generous remarks.

I wonder if the Senator can tell me why there is such a reluctance on the part of the Members of the Senate to tell the people where they get the money to finance their campaigns. Is it that we hold ourselves above some of the other functions, agencies, and departments of the Federal Government? Is it because we think we are invested with some sacred immunity—some sacrosanct, above-the-law, above-the-common-experience, above-the-common-observation, cloak? Or is it simply a general idea that things have been going along pretty well as they are, that every one here has somehow been elected under the antiquated 1925 act, so why disturb things?

Why should we let a wave of apathy and indifference and opposition overwhelm any efforts whatsoever to do anything about this matter? We try to hold ourselves up to the world, and indeed as a body in the Senate we hold ourselves up to the American people, as being above the taint of corruption and influence and suggestion improperly conveyed and made, yet we are faced with an opportunity to do something about the situation and there is all this scrambling around in an effort to evade, to avoid, and to duck.

There is talk about invading the sovereignty of States and of State election officials and State commissioners. In regard to Illinois, the minority leader has told us there is no requirement whatsoever in that State, that one can do

exactly as he pleases in both the primary election and in the general election, without reporting to anybody at any time. Now there must be a report under the obsolete, antiquated, and shamefully ineffective, abused and violated, Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

There are many, indeed, who would be satisfied to go along with this hypocrisy and this nonsense, this making a pretext of filing reports under that act, knowing full well the act does not reach anybody at any time in any consequential or meaningful way.

So there has been no effort to do much about this, until rather recently.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To answer the question of the Senator from Missouri, I am afraid there is a slight tendency here to hold up higher standards for others than we have for ourselves. We often undertake to investigate various Federal officials, bureaus, and others to determine, for example, if they have accepted favors in the form of trips or entertainment or other benefactions. Yet at the same time there is a corresponding effort to conceal not the relatively small things, like some excursion, but the enormous campaign contributions which are often required to elect somebody to the U.S. Senate.

As John Selden said:

Preachers say, "Do as I say, not as I do."

Mr. HENNINGS. "Do as I say."

Mr. NEUBERGER. We have that practice in the Senate.

I feel that the bill presented by the Senator from Missouri offers all Members of the Senate an opportunity to end this hypocrisy.

Mr. HENNINGS. If we get down to it, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, it really resolves itself into an exceedingly simple ultimate question, does it not?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It certainly does.

Mr. HENNINGS. The question is, Do we want the people to know what we are doing in order to be nominated and elected, or do we not want them to know?

By voting against this proposed amendment we shall in effect be saying, "This is none of the people's business." As Commodore Vanderbilt was once quoted as saying, although he said it in a different context, "The public be damned."

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think—and I know the Senator from Missouri, as his action demonstrates, also thinks—that the American public has a right to know about funds which are invested in electing the officials who are elected to govern them. That is the key of the issue before us today.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator mentioned another thing, Mr. President, which I believe is very important; that is, the undertaking of a candidate to raise funds for his nomination and for his election should he be nominated.

I individually have always felt considerable embarrassment in that process. I have been nominated six times and have been elected six times to office, five of those times being election to the House and to the Senate. It has always seemed to me that when a man gives a

very substantial amount, unless he is a man who is of considerable means and is highly public spirited, or a man who is a great believer in his party and who wishes to augment and increase his party's representation in the Congress, his action should be carefully scrutinized. There are many contributions offered. Some are refused, I am sure, by many Senators. I refer especially to the instance regarding the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] known to all of us, when a campaign contribution was offered to him and refused by him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We all recall that episode.

Mr. HENNINGS. We recall that. We recall the Senator's embarrassment. We recall his forthright honesty in presenting the matter to the Senate at the time of consideration of some proposed legislation of vital importance to many Members, and indeed to the whole country.

The process of trying to raise money for campaigns I think does lead us to a conclusion, ultimately, that while the country at this time may not be quite ready for what the learned Senator from Oregon has suggested, sooner or later that may be the point at which we will arrive. It may be necessary to do so, so that men will enter this and other legislative bodies free from any suggestion of taint or corruption or influence, as these factors may affect their decisions on matters relating to the welfare of the country at large.

I may say to the Senator that my own thinking on the matter, as we have been trying to set the figures, has been that we should attempt to set the amount as realistically as possible, to try to keep the funds allowed somewhat in relation to the demands of modern campaigning, with modern media, involving increased costs since 1925, and such cognate things.

However, we are still confronted with the very deep—and I think distressing—moral problem of the extent to which a candidate for office, a nominee for office, or an officeholder is under obligation to some of his contributors if that obligation to his contributors or the interests of some of his contributors is in conflict with what his conscience tells him to be the public interest and the public welfare.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think it is significant, in connection with the very point raised by the Senator from Missouri, that more than half a century ago Theodore Roosevelt faced this problem. The reason I emphasize the long hiatus since then is the fact that, in 1907, a political campaign cost only a fraction of what it costs today. An entire campaign could be financed for what one major network television broadcast costs a political committee today; yet even in that bygone era, Theodore Roosevelt was highly alarmed and disturbed over the huge campaign contributions on which candidates for the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, and both Houses of Congress were then relying. In his opinion, the only ultimate solution was Federal financing of the campaigns, to free candidates from all dependence on campaign contributions. Unless we enact legislation of the sort advocated by the

Senator from Missouri, with the tightening amendments proposed by him and some of his colleagues, we shall hasten the time when Theodore Roosevelt's proposal will become effective, when no private campaign contributions will be permitted.

Again I compliment the Senator from Missouri for the great and persistent leadership he has shown in this important effort in the Senate.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank my good friend from Oregon very much for his generosity. No one ever does anything alone. I have received a great deal of help from the staff and from other Senators on various phases of this problem over the years. I hope that some of this work may be reflected when we come to vote upon some of the amendments which would tend to make elections more honest and to make it easier for office holders to be more forthright and considerate, in the objective sense, of the public interest.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to express a brief concluding thought with respect to Theodore Roosevelt's proposal, which is embodied in the proposed legislation which I have introduced.

Some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle express great alarm and abhorrence over contributions made to Democrats from the political-action funds of trade unions. Conversely, many Democrats voice anxiety over contributions made to Republican officeholders by those who are leaders in management and big business. If the proposal of Theodore Roosevelt were law, there would be no such big contributions, either from labor unions or from big business. Both such reliances would be wiped out, and all officeholders would enter upon their offices on equal footing, with no obligations either to labor or to management, which might possibly conflict with their public responsibility.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator very much for his able and illuminating contributions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENNINGS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that I have offered an amendment to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. Yes; I understand that the Senator's amendment is the pending amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was hopeful that the Senator would be able to agree to that amendment, requiring that primaries actually shall be held by both major parties.

Mr. HENNINGS. I would say that I do not know that I would have the authority to agree to any amendment. I do not run the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator could accept my amendment as a modification of his amendment. I was hopeful that the Senator would see fit to accept my amendment to his amendment, which would require that primaries shall be held in all States.

Mr. HENNINGS. May I ask this question of the Senator? If the Senator's

amendment were accepted, would the Senator vote for the amendment I have offered relating to primaries?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be strongly inclined to vote for it.

Mr. HENNING. Would the Senator from Louisiana vote for it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be constrained to vote for it.

Mr. HENNING. "Constrained" is a very fancy word. Would the Senator vote for it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would expect to vote for it; yes. It is for that reason that I inquire the Senator's attitude toward my amendment. If it is to be resisted, I may not insist on it at this time, and let the Senator's amendment come to a vote first. However, it did seem to me that if we wished to regulate primaries we should require that all States hold them. I would therefore inquire of the Senator if he would accept my amendment to his amendment.

Mr. HENNING. That presents an entirely new question, of course, because the Senator did not suggest his amendment to the committee at the time the bill was reported. I am a little surprised that the Senator from Louisiana should offer his amendment, because the Senator is well known for his position relating to so-called States' rights and primary elections. Would the Senator go a step further and say that the Federal Government should prescribe the manner and means by which the State elections should be held? As I understood the Senator's amendment—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe I have made my position clear.

Mr. HENNING. I was here when the Senator stated his position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be constrained to go along with the amendment the Senator has offered if my amendment were accepted, to require that all States hold primary elections—that is, by the major parties—as my amendment would provide. I was hopeful that the Senator from Missouri would be able to accept the amendment to the amendment which he has offered. I did not know that his amendment was a committee amendment. Is it a committee amendment?

Mr. HENNING. No; it is not a committee amendment. It reflects the thinking of four members of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would hope that the Senator could accept my amendment to his amendment. If he could not accept it, I would be reluctant to insist upon it at this time. I would rather wait to see what happens to his amendment. However, I thought it might be clear that it would be fair that some of those who would like to regulate primary elections would be willing also to submit to primary elections. That might be a fair premise, so far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned.

Mr. HENNING. The Senator from Louisiana is well aware that the amendment contains a provision relating to caucuses and conventions, as well as referring to primaries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; a person named by a caucus or convention has hardly any expense, and in many instances the expense is only negligible. In most instances there is very little expense involved to a person nominated in that fashion, particularly if he has the support of the choice of the convention for the governorship. If the nominee for Governor supports a person for the nomination for Senator in a caucus or convention, there may be no expense at all to the person nominated for the Senate.

If we are to have the Federal Government regulate primary elections, it might be well to require that there be primaries. In that way the democratic process would be followed. I would hope that the Senator would accept the amendment which I have offered to his amendment. If he cannot accept it, I may not insist upon it at this time. I would rather withdraw it to see what the result of the vote on his amendment may be.

Mr. HENNING. To borrow the Senator's phrase, I am constrained to say that I cannot accept the amendment as such, because the amendment would seem to me to limit the States with respect to their internal systems of the nominating processes. At this time I would think it unwise to say that a State which holds a convention or a caucus for the nomination of candidates must necessarily be driven to hold primaries, as well, although there are very few States that do not have primaries.

Mr. LONG. The Senator cannot agree to accept my amendment at this time. Therefore, I will ask to withdraw my amendment to the Senator's amendment, and reserve the right to offer the amendment as an amendment to the bill in the event the Senator's amendment shall be agreed to.

Mr. HENNING. The Senator has that right. I do not feel that I have a right to accept the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment to the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The amendment to the amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING].

Mr. HENNING. At this time I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the action of the Senator from Louisiana in withdrawing his proposed amendment to the amendment makes unnecessary some of the observations which I wished to make in opposition to his amendment. However, he has raised an argument which I believe should be met in part in the general outline and context of his remarks.

The argument has been raised that the amendment in chief, of which the Senator from Missouri and I are the authors, would apply unfairly to certain States, because they do have primaries, while other States do not. I apprehend that the Senator from Louisiana would still be opposed to the amendment.

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HENNING. I missed some of what the learned Senator said.

I assume the Senator has made the point, or intends to make the point further, of our learned friend, the junior Senator from Louisiana, that the essence of the bill, in its primary ingredients, is in terms of the importance of reporting moneys received, moneys used, and the source of those moneys. I am not deeply concerned whether a State has a primary election or a convention. We have tried to keep the bill within certain boundaries and limitations, so as not to make it the subject of all manner of oblique and irrelevant attacks upon it.

I think it is very important that we bear in mind that truth telling concerning sources and amounts contributed is what we are really seeking to accomplish. I would even be willing, were it not for the fact that I do not think the public mind might be quite conditioned to it at this time, to raise the ceilings even more than we have, assuming that everything is reported. That is the basis of the proposed legislation and the philosophy behind it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that sooner or later the Federal Government must and will approach adoption of the type of suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I believe if that is done, it will have to be done on the basis of reimbursing candidates for their actual expenditures in campaigns, and with some relation to the vote which a candidate receives in an election.

It is my attitude, based on what I have seen in politics over a period of years, that whether or not such reporting is required, it will not be possible to eliminate the effect resulting from campaign contributions. It is the attitude of some of us—certainly it is my attitude—that the way to get away from the influence which follows contributions to political campaigns is to work out, eventually, a system whereby the Government will pay the necessary expenditures of those who offer themselves for office.

I have not had a chance to study the Neuberger bill. I have some ideas about how the same purpose might be accomplished from a different approach. It seems to me, however, that if we begin to regulate primary elections, it will be well to require such regulation in all States; but I do not care to insist upon it at this time, in view of the fact that there is strong sentiment in the Senate that we should not undertake to regulate primaries at all.

Frankly, I find the problem to be not so much the reporting of money, but more a question of how to get it so as to run for office. It has been my experience that money has been extremely hard to get in order to enable one to run in a Democratic primary. I cannot

speak of Republican primaries, because I have had no experience with them.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Louisiana knows that his own distinguished father was involved in a contest with the late Senator Overton.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He was involved in a contest as counsel for the late Senator Overton, whose election was investigated.

Mr. HENNINGS. The only point I wished to make relating to that incident was that the Senate took recognition of the fact that it had jurisdiction over a primary election. Is not that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To investigate it, yes. Of course, as the Senator from Missouri knows, the Senate can investigate anything. We have committees which have investigated baseball, football, juvenile delinquency, and everything else under the sun.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the Reorganization Act was passed, the Senate had a standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, which was composed of some 18 members. That committee was confined to and had as its purpose the investigation of contested elections, expulsions, and matters relating to Federal elections. The Senator is well aware of the fact that among the precedents there are many, such as the case of Heflin against Bankhead, and the case of the able Senator's distinguished father versus Senator John H. Overton, relating to matters occurring in the Louisiana primary.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not believe the Senator from Missouri will find that that happened to be an election in which my father was a candidate.

Mr. HENNINGS. That is true.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The election to which the Senator from Missouri refers was one in which John Overton was a candidate. If I might be permitted to relate an incident in that connection, without trespassing unduly on the time of the Senator from New York, I should like to do so.

Mr. KEATING. Any incident which the Senator from Louisiana relates will be of interest.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to note, in connection with that election, that Senator Overton had previously been a candidate for election to the Senate, prior to the time when Huey Long was Governor of Louisiana.

There is a story told about it. Although I was not of an age at the time to know much about it, I have heard the story.

It seems that when Senator Overton ran the first time, he received a pitiful number of votes in New Orleans. That accounted for his defeat. To show his gratitude for the few voters who voted for him in New Orleans, the late Senator Overton went to New Orleans and inserted an advertisement in the newspapers inviting as his guests the relatively few persons who had voted for him. Unfortunately, there was some misunderstanding, because thousands of people showed up. The hotel simply did not have the accommodations to make it possible to handle so large a number of persons.

A subsequent election, the one to which the Senator from Missouri makes reference, was, I believe, one of the few times that the Old Regular organization in New Orleans supported the same candidate supported by my father. They did not support Huey Long for office, but they did support Senator Overton in that election. So on that occasion it was the time for the other side to complain about what happened in the city of New Orleans. I do not believe there was ever a moment's question that Senator Overton had received a very substantial majority, and that if there had been any irregularities in the election, they were more than overshadowed by the very large majority that he achieved in the particular election.

However, the junior Senator from Louisiana has always had the feeling that those who criticized events that happened in his father's time in Louisiana, should also direct attention to what the other fellow was doing at the same time. For example, when Huey Long ran for Governor for the first time, in the great city of New Orleans he received, I believe, only about 12,000 votes out of the large number cast. Fantastically, he was greeted by large and enthusiastic crowds; yet in the returns he had very few votes in New Orleans, although elsewhere he received a large majority. I have seen that type of thing happen.

I have always thought that one of the largest contributing factors to the death of my father was the elimination of the poll tax which he fought to achieve. It doubled the number of electors. This, I believe, contributed to his assassination in that a large number of people felt that he would be in office as long as he cared to run, once the number of electors in the State of Louisiana had been doubled.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has noticed, although he does not consider himself to be equal in ability to his late father, that his own majorities have exceeded the total vote which his father received in elections, whenever his father stood for office. If Huey Long had lived to run for office after the poll tax was eliminated, his majorities would have been far greater than mine.

Mr. HENNINGS. The junior Senator from Louisiana is a worthy successor to any Senator Louisiana has ever had, in my opinion. As the Senator well knows, I do not mention this except to indicate that even in the Southern States contestants have submitted themselves to the Senate in matters relating to primaries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no doubt whatever that Congress has the right to regulate primary elections. There is no doubt in my mind that Congress has the power to regulate primary elections for Senator or Congressman in the greatest detail, if Congress wishes to do so. In appropriate cases I favor it. As a matter of fact, I am a co-sponsor of a constitutional amendment to eliminate the poll tax—

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure he is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For primary elections, as well as in the general elec-

tion, for the election of Members of Congress.

Mr. HENNINGS. Being the able lawyer that he is, the Senator from Louisiana does not take the position that any requirement of the reporting of the financing of primary elections is unconstitutional, does he?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No. It is only my position that if that is to be done—

Mr. HENNINGS. If that is to be done, the Senator from Louisiana would have it established as a matter of policy, not a matter of constitutionality; is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct. It is my point of view that if we are to do that—if we are to regulate primaries—it might be well actually to require that there be primary elections. That was the basis on which I offered my amendment to the pending amendment.

In Louisiana, one who wishes to run for election to be Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives pays a \$500 qualifying fee, which assures that his name will be placed on the ballot, even though there is no assurance that he will receive any votes.

It seemed to me, and it still does, that usually the candidates of one of the major parties are almost certain to be elected, in most States. I cannot speak of all the States; but I know that in most States the candidates of the major parties are the ones who are most likely to be elected.

So it seemed to me that there should be an opportunity for the people and for the members of the parties to vote as to whom the candidates should be. I am not insisting on the adoption of that amendment; and the Senator from Missouri and I may not agree about it; however if his amendment is adopted, I would like to have my amendment to it adopted, as a part of the bill.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator from Louisiana is aware that this is a reporting amendment, and it would relate to primaries, conventions, and caucuses. So they have been contemplated and taken into consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But the point I had in mind, in connection with the reporting part of the process, is that if we take first things first, then we should first require that there be an election, if we are to require that someone report his costs in an election.

In the case of party caucuses, in many instances there is no expense whatever for the candidates. In many instances, in States where the caucus and convention system prevails, a strong candidate for election to be Governor in a position to determine who will go on the party's ticket with him.

But on the other hand, there may be other persons who, if they had an opportunity to submit themselves in a primary election, might be successful.

Mr. HENNINGS. And the Senator from Louisiana thinks, does he, that the Empire State of the Union has not quite enough democracy at this point—in other words, not enough public participation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would not quite say that. I imagine New York State probably has too much Republicanism at the present time. [Laughter.]

But, if we are going to regulate primaries, I feel that it would be desirable to require that primaries be held.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me, Mr. President.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. In connection with their colloquy, I merely wish to join in sharing the views of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] about the great merit of our friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who differs with me in regard to the desirability of adoption of the pending amendment and also his amendment to the pending amendment. However, all the Members of this body hold in the highest regard the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, who certainly is the peer of any Senator who in the past has represented the State of Louisiana.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Louisiana, in advancing his contention, overlooks the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, on behalf of himself and myself, covers not only primaries but also "a convention or a caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates."

In my case, I was not only the selection of the great Governor of the great State of New York. In addition, the only avowed candidate for election to the U.S. Senate who at that time had announced his candidacy was apparently convinced that the junior Senator from New York was a deserving young man, and was so kind as to nominate the junior Senator from New York in the convention. In other words, the Senator from Louisiana has laid great stress upon the views of the Governor of one of the States that does not have a primary for the selection of a candidate for election to membership in the U.S. Senate; but I assure him that more than that is required in order for one to be nominated to run for election to the U.S. Senate. The delegates to the convention which is held in the State of New York—and a few other States have this system—were chosen by the Republicans, in primary elections throughout the State, to represent them at that convention.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri and myself would cover the activities of that convention, just as it would cover matters connected with primaries in other States, wherever primaries are held, and where that method of choosing such candidates is used.

The important point is to assure that all methods of selecting nominees are covered; and this seems to me to be of particular importance in the case of the States in which victory in the primary or in the party caucus or in the party convention—whatever method is used—is tantamount to election.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from New York for the very fine compliment he paid me. Let me state that I have the greatest admiration for the Senator from New York and for his service in this body.

I wish to ask him whether, as a practical matter, the situation in his State is somewhat the way the situation is in the State which I have the honor to represent in part, in that when a candidate for Governor is selected, and when one person is to be chosen as a candidate for his ticket, from that point forward the candidate for Governor can fairly well determine whom he wants to go on the ticket with him.

Mr. KEATING. I must respond in that connection, because, apparently, my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, did not follow very closely the campaign in New York in the fall of 1958. What he has just referred to was one of the issues in that campaign. The candidate for reelection as Governor, who was chosen by the party of the Senator from Louisiana, selected as his choice for his running mate someone other than the man who eventually was nominated. The convention did not agree with the Democratic candidate for Governor and picked another man.

It so happened that, happily, in my case the convention agreed with the candidate for Governor; and throughout the election, a beautiful, tranquil relationship existed between the junior Senator from New York and the Governor of New York, whereas on the other side, unhappily for them, that did not occur. So it does not always take place.

So in New York the candidate for election to the U.S. Senate is separately selected by the convention.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has been the experience of the junior Senator from Louisiana, at the only convention he ever attended, where a candidate was to be picked—and it was a convention to select a candidate for election as President—that once the Democratic candidate is nominated, he can usually determine who will go on the ticket, for election as Vice President.

It seems to me that in most instances when a Governor is being selected for a party ticket, it would be the rule, rather than the exception, that the candidate for Governor could, if he wished to do so, determine who would go on the ticket with him.

Mr. KEATING. Let me put it in this way: If I were seeking the office of U.S. Senator, I would like to have the support of the Governor, and I would like to be on the ticket with him. In most instances it would be desirable to have action taken in accordance with the Governor's desires, I would think.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Under the convention system there would not be the opportunity for the public to participate that there would be under the primary system.

I concede that many people who qualify for election to office have no business qualifying to begin with.

Mr. KEATING. Yes, under any system; it is impossible to devise a system to protect against that situation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But it seems to me that it would be desirable for a candidate to offer himself for selection under the primary system.

Mr. KEATING. I think it is open to anyone in the State of New York, just as it is in the State of Louisiana, which has primaries. It is open to anyone to offer himself for office, for the Senate or any other office. Such candidates are not even required to put up any money. They can just say, "I am a candidate." If they can get a majority of the delegates to support them, they are in the clear.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Could the Senator inform me as to whether in many instances there is any great cost incident to being selected under a convention system? Do candidates spend a lot of money for the selection, or is the cost nominal?

Mr. KEATING. I would say the cost is normally less than that in a primary. If a person is an avowed candidate for the nomination of his party for the U.S. Senate, let us say—and parenthetically I should say I am not speaking of candidates for Members of the House of Representatives; I am speaking now of only candidates in New York for the Senate who are selected by convention—and if a number are seeking that nomination, they must spend substantial amounts of money in seeking support. I would say, in all fairness, that, generally speaking, the amount spent would be less than what would be spent in a primary.

I personally think that the decision as to whether nominees should be selected by primary or convention or caucus, or whatever other manner, is something which the State legislatures should decide, rather than Congress. I feel that the bill which is before the Senate, Mr. President, would be sadly deficient if each procedure for picking candidates were not covered by what we are calling here, or what has been called, a clean elections bill.

I should like to point out also that this amendment is pertinent and important for those States where nomination does not mean automatic victory on election day. Congress has just as firm an obligation to fix the guidelines and prescribe the limitations on the manner in which nominees for Federal office are picked in those States as in those jurisdictions where nomination means election.

In other words, if we are going to set forth limitations on the process of selecting candidates for President, Vice President, U.S. Senator, or Representative, we should not do a halfway job. The law must apply to the whole electoral process, and it must apply to the so-called one-party and the so-called two-party States.

Whether nomination of a Federal candidate means he is a "shoo-in" on election day or means he must then face a

campaign against the opponent of another political party—such as described by my friend from Louisiana, with, I am afraid, a certain exaggerated degree of hyperbole—we have an obligation to set up certain rules and regulations about the manner in which each is selected. Abuse of power or misuse of funds in primary, caucus, or convention of either party weakens the whole structure of the electoral process.

If we are going to call this a clean elections bill—and that is the phrase having such wide circulation—we should make it worthy of the name. A half-hearted job will not do. Only by including within its purview primaries, caucuses, and conventions can we achieve a goal of fairness and equity in choosing federally elected officers.

I would remind the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and other Senators who oppose this amendment that the concept of States rights is a many-splendored thing. However, he would seem to wish to make it a many-splintered thing, particularly in the case of the State of New York. It happens that New York is a politically spacious State, where we have ample room for differences of opinion. The primary, we feel, is not the sole and sacred way of forming or recording that difference of opinion, and I think New York, just as should Louisiana, should have the decision in the matter.

In New York, nominating conventions are the avenues of selection, and they are broad thoroughfares open to those with conflicting opinions. They are not one-way streets that lead unflinchingly to victory.

I can testify to that most persuasively, Mr. President. In New York, to be nominated for Congress means only that one gets to play in the big November game. In Louisiana, if one is nominated on the ticket of the Senator from Louisiana, it means that he has already won the game and he can already start wearing his varsity letter. So there is that difference between the two States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I know the Senator really believes that; otherwise, he would not say it. But let me tell the Senator that whenever a popular Republican candidate for President heads the ticket which carries the Senator's State, if one is running for the House or the Senate in my State, he would be unwise to take his election as a foregone conclusion. The junior Senator from Louisiana recalls that in a presidential election some years back, the Republican opponent got 25 or 26 percent of the votes.

Mr. KEATING. That is amazing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. His Democratic opponent in the following election got 29 percent, which was not a lot more than the Republican opponent had received. That being the case, it would seem that one should be cautious. In fact, I would caution against a person's believing that the citizens of Southern States are above voting for Republican candidates.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator means below, does he not?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The junior Senator from Louisiana had assured his

little daughter in the last presidential election, that although President Eisenhower would carry the Nation, he would not carry Louisiana. She could not understand, the next day, how her father could have been wrong. I had to tell her there was no doubt that was what happened. I was satisfied President Eisenhower had carried Louisiana, and by about 40,000 votes.

Mr. KEATING. But no Republican candidate for the Senate or the House was elected from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There were few running on the ballot that same day. Every now and then a good Republican candidate comes along and gets a very respectable vote.

Mr. KEATING. I do not want to embarrass my friend by asking who a good Republican candidate would be in Louisiana. I am very glad President Eisenhower carried Louisiana. I hope the next candidate from my party will be strong enough to carry Louisiana.

I think the junior Senator from Louisiana will not be a candidate in 1960. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Well, then, I would hope that some of the candidates for Congress from Louisiana will be elected from the Republican ticket. It would be a very healthy thing, in my judgment. Undoubtedly my friend will differ with me, but, in general parlance, I think Louisiana is generally considered a one-party State, and all of the Representatives in Congress now are Members of the Senator's party. We hope that may be changed in the future.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would like to recommend that there be no change in the present Louisiana delegation. I think the State is very well represented at this time. But some of the Members of Congress from that State can point out to the Senator that they have had very serious opposition from Republican candidates in recent years; I would say in the last 4 or 5 years.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the illumination from the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, but I must impress upon him, in the light of some of the statements which he made about the procedures in the State of New York, that the candidates for the Senate in that State may come from smoke-filled rooms or non-smoke-filled rooms, but that is only a point of departure. Those candidates must then be nominated actually in convention. They must after that stalk like hopeful gladiators into the area of popular selection. Their victory or defeat is at the whim—in New York, of course, the educated and informed whim—of the convention delegates. These delegates who select the candidates did not wander in accidentally, nor were they culled like flowers all of one party shade and one party aroma. They are literally the voices of the constituents.

I can assure the Senator that whether it be a Democratic or Republican convention, the unanimity of delegates, or close to unanimity, is music to the ears of the man who has to fight his way

into an election, rather than shadow box his way there.

To the argument that primaries are outside the scope of our legitimate interest, I draw attention to the genesis of the Hatch Act, a most significant and far-reaching piece of legislation which, according to its history, seems to have been born out of a primary contest between two of our former colleagues, Alben Barkley and Gov. A. B. "Happy" Chandler of Kentucky.

According to the allegations, we had the situation of a massed battle in the great heroic tradition, with Federal employees on the Barkley firing line, according to Mr. Chandler, and the Chandler minutemen of State employees, striking and sparring for their Governor, by the claim of Mr. Barkley.

I do not seek to pass upon the merits of those claims, but I am informed that this was the great confrontation which gave rise to the writing of the Hatch Act, so that we are on firm historical ground, buttressed by a sound precedent, in this attempt to create legislation which is responsive to actual conditions rather than to traditional emotions.

It seems that during June of 1938 a series of articles dealing extensively with conditions in the Kentucky primary, written by one of the staff writers for a prominent press association, was published. In these articles the writer alleged that undue political activities in the WPA in Kentucky had taken place on behalf of Senator Barkley, the candidate in that primary for the Democratic nomination to the U.S. Senate.

A press release containing a résumé of all these charges—22 of them in all—prepared in the form of individual paragraphs and a reply to each, by Mr. Harry Hopkins, was issued by the WPA in Washington, June 30, 1938.

The dates of all of these events in 1938 are significant in the light of what I shall come to in a moment. Mr. Hopkins denied all but two of these charges, admitting the correctness of these two.

In July of 1938 the committee decided to send a representative to Kentucky in connection with these charges and the replies by Mr. Hopkins. The committee's representative and the staff assisting him, after investigation, made a report sustaining the staff writer in a majority of the charges, and concurring with Mr. Hopkins in four instances. The findings of the committee's investigator in reference to these charges indicated solicitation of WPA employees and officials for contributions to the campaign funds of candidate Barkley and a systematic canvassing of WPA employees as to preference in the race for the Democratic senatorial nomination. These activities, so far as solicitations were concerned, were carried on mainly by private parties not connected with the WPA but in some instances by WPA officials.

While the committee's investigator was in Kentucky, charges came to his attention regarding the solicitation and receipt by the campaign committee of Governor Chandler, candidate for the Democratic senatorial nomination, of contributions in behalf of his campaign from State employees whose salaries were

derived partly or wholly from Federal funds. Certain other charges were presented to the committee's investigator while in Kentucky relative to the solicitation by private citizens of Federal employees in behalf of the campaign committees for candidate Barkley.

The committee sustained many of these charges. The committee sustained the charge that the campaign committee of candidate Chandler received contributions as the result of solicitations for contributions from State employees who were receiving salaries from funds derived wholly or in part from the Treasury of the United States. The findings of the committee, based on the evidence before it, showed that the amount received for Governor Chandler's campaign, from State employees whose salaries had been partly or wholly derived from funds paid by the Federal Government, was roughly \$70,000.

The findings of the committee, based on the evidence before it, also showed that subscriptions intended for candidate Barkley's campaign committees were made not only by employees of the WPA in Kentucky, but also by employees in this State of the National Bituminous Coal Commission, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Bureau of Accounts of the Treasury Department, the Home Owners Loan Corporation, and the Federal Housing Administration, amounting to about \$24,000 in all. In other words, the committee sustained in part the charges of both of these candidates.

I wish to emphasize at this point that in a later part of the report about the matter the committee did have more to say, lest there be any misunderstanding. Again I reiterate that the merits of this controversy are not so important as the precedent which it created.

In response to questionnaires of the Sheppard committee, Senator Barkley stated that he had not used any public funds or political patronage in behalf of his campaign for nomination or election to the Senate, and that no public funds or political patronage had been used to his knowledge by others in behalf of his nomination or election to the Senate. In fact, the committee found nothing to show that Senator Barkley had any knowledge of any activity by persons soliciting contributions from Federal employees in his behalf, or of political activity within the ranks of the WPA personnel in his interests. The committee found, therefore, no basis upon which to recommend any challenge to the right of Senator Barkley to take the seat to which he had been elected.

In January 1939 the Sheppard Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures and Use of Governmental Funds reported that sufficient misuse of Federal relief funds had been shown to prompt them to make certain recommendations. On the next day after the Sheppard committee had reported, Senator Hatch introduced two bills, which he later incorporated into a single bill, introduced on March 20, 1939. This bill subsequently was enacted and became known as the Hatch Act. In other words, the entire history of that transaction shows that the genesis of the Hatch Act, which bars political

activity by Federal employees, arose out of a primary contest. Certainly there is legislative precedent for the contention that the Congress is and should be as much concerned with primary elections of Federal officials as with general elections.

I served in the House of Representatives for several sessions on the committee appointed every 2 years, known as the Committee on Campaign Expenditures, which is a slight misnomer. Actually we usually did not investigate expenditures so much as various irregularities charged by one side or the other in a campaign. A number of our hearings and the evidence we took all over the country in various years as the result of allegations of irregularities had to do with primaries.

I remember very well an investigation which we made in North Carolina, with respect to which I shall not go into detail now; but there was no question that our jurisdiction over primaries was accepted by everyone, and there is a clear basis for the action.

Mr. President, power of Congress to regulate elections has been compared, in some of the precedents, to the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce. There are some incidents of interstate commerce over which, of course, the Congress has plenary control—for example, when the subject matter is one of national interest, requiring a uniform rule. This means, for example, that Congress could require that all interstate trains comply with certain safety regulations, but it does not mean that Congress could compel a trucking company to go into the railroad business. That is the basic distinction between the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to the Hennings-Keating amendment, and the Hennings-Keating amendment itself.

If the States wish to stay out of the primary field, that is their right, and no act of Congress can properly alter that situation. But if the Congress decides that candidates in a primary for election to the Senate or the House shall disclose where their campaign contributions come from, and the amount of them, and that they shall not exceed a certain amount, certainly Congress has the power to do so.

Despite the concession by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] that in his opinion Congress does have a constitutional power to legislate in this field, his feeling being that Congress should not do so, there is a body of opinion—judging from some discussions in the cloak-rooms and elsewhere—which raises the question as to whether or not Congress can constitutionally act in this field. I wish to address myself briefly to that argument.

The argument that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act cannot constitutionally be made applicable to primary elections is contrary to reason and precedent. Whatever doubt there may have once been on this issue has been laid to rest by a line of Supreme Court decisions starting in 1941 recognizing that the selection of candidates for Federal office is an integral part of the elections

process and is subject to Federal limitations. I must say that any other rule would make a mockery of regulation in the large number of States in which the primary determines the outcome of the election, and in all States in which candidates are chosen by vote would ignore a vital part of the election process. Can anyone doubt that corruption in a primary contest can impair the integrity of the election itself and undermine the free choice of the electorate?

The power of Congress to legislate on this subject derives primarily from the provisions of article 1, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

Article I, section 4, of the Constitution provides:

The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

Article I, section 8, clause 18, of the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof.

These sections have been described as an arsenal of power ample to protect congressional elections from any and all forms of pollution. If they are not broad enough to deal with integral steps in the election process, then the Constitution itself is inadequate to the task. Happily, the courts have not found such a defect in our fundamental law.

The leading case in point is *United States v. Classic* (313 U.S. 299 (1941)). In that case, the Supreme Court upheld an indictment against the commissioners of elections in the great State of Louisiana which charged that they willfully altered and falsely counted the ballots cast in a primary election to nominate a candidate of the Democratic Party for Representative in Congress. I might add that in 1941 our distinguished friend from Louisiana was virtually in knickers. I am just stating a historical precedent. It happened to be in Louisiana. We have had violations of law in the State of New York, also. The Court pointed out that in Louisiana interference with the right to vote in the Democratic primary is an interference with the effective choice of the voters at the only stage of the election procedure when their choice is of significance. Such interference, the Court held, could be constitutionally proscribed by the Congress.

The majority opinion by Mr. Justice Stone in the *Classic* case answers virtually every argument that has been raised. I highly commend it to any of my colleagues who have even the slightest doubt on the legal merits of the amendment proposed. Let me quote just

a few short passages from the opinion to demonstrate how directly and eloquently it covers the subject:

That the free choice by the people of representatives in Congress was one of the great purposes of our constitutional scheme of government cannot be doubted. We cannot regard it as any the less the constitutional purpose, or its words as any the less guaranteeing the integrity of that choice, when a State, exercising its privileges in the absence of congressional action, changes the mode of choice from a single step, a general election, to two, of which the first is the choice at a primary of those candidates from whom, as a second step, the representative in Congress is to be chosen at the election.

Or let us consider this passage:

Nor can we say that that choice which the Constitution protects is restricted to the second step because section 4 of article I, as a means of securing a free choice of representative by the people has authorized Congress to regulate the manner of elections, without making any mention of primary elections. For we think that the authority of Congress, given by section 4 includes the authority to regulate primary elections when, as in this case, they are a step in the exercise by the people of their choice of representatives in Congress.

Or finally:

It is hardly the performance of the judicial function to construe a statute, which in terms protects a right secured by the Constitution, here the right to choose a representative in Congress, as applying to an election whose only function is to ratify a choice already made at the primary, but as having no application to the primary which is the only effective means of choice.

To these decisions and to these quotations I say "amen." Let us not be so foolish as to make the mistake the judges avoided. We have got to come to grips with the facts and not be misled by fanciful theories and unreal distinctions. This bill does not deserve to be called "a clean elections bill" as long as it leaves the primaries unscrubbed.

Back in 1957 the committee of which my distinguished friend from Missouri is now chairman and was chairman then, reported a bill to the Senate which included primaries. That bill was never scheduled for action, but in the report accompanying the bill the committee pointed out that under some of the other precedents which at present to a significant degree regulate primaries, the law prohibits national banks, corporations, and labor organizations making contributions or making expenditures in connection with the election of any Federal candidate. The committee said:

The language of this statute explicitly includes primary elections and political conventions and caucuses. Again, the prohibition of individual campaign contributions in excess of \$5,000 for a candidate or political committee during 1 calendar year comprises not only elections but also nominations. Finally, the general language of these statutes which prohibits a Member of Congress from soliciting or accepting money from Federal employees carries the strong implication at least that primaries are within the purview of this prohibition, and this broad interpretation was adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States in *U.S. v. Wurzbach*, in 280 U.S.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a direct legislative precedent for regulating political

expenditures "in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus."

Certainly those who have laid down this provision in the Taft-Hartley Act for one segment of our economy cannot be heard to say that the Congress of the United States is not interested in the conduct of primary elections, or that some different rule shall apply where some other situation is presented.

The committees of Congress charged with the function have never hesitated to inquire into irregularities in primaries, as I mentioned a moment ago, as well as in the general election, in judging the qualifications of Members under challenge.

As I indicated earlier, the Classic case has been consistently followed in a host of cases involving discrimination or inequality in primary elections; cases such as *Smith v. Allwright*, 321 U.S. 649 (1944); *Chapman v. King*, 154 F. 2d 460 (5th Cir. 1946), cert. denied, 327 U.S. 800 (1946); and *Terry v. Adams*, 345 U.S. 461 (1953).

The law on this subject is well settled. It is plain to see for anyone who does not view the matter through a clouded looking glass. Law and reason combine in this situation to make an overwhelming case for approval of this amendment.

Mr. President, I believe that the pending bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation which is likely to come before us at this session. I am really dismayed at the apparent public apathy concerning the bill. We know that everyone wants clean elections. However, many people apparently are indifferent to the great opportunity which this measure represents to help achieve that goal.

Of course, there is not anything we do here in a legislative way which is going to be perfect or going to take care of every situation.

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

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad the Senator made the observation that this will not be perfect legislation, if it is adopted, even if it is amended to the ultimate extent that some of us would like to see it amended.

I would say to my distinguished colleague that it cannot be emphasized too strongly that this is probably the last time for many years that a bill will be available to this body which will attempt to do anything about the election process and the regulation and the reporting of contributions.

I am especially pleased that the Senator has made a scholarly approach to this matter in a lawyerlike fashion in referring to the Classic case, which utterly demolishes any contention that legislation relating to primary contributions in reporting is unconstitutional or that primaries are not a part of the election process.

We know that things do happen in primaries, as they happen in general elections, of which the public has the right to possess full knowledge. I think the Senator from New York will agree

that it will be a shameful thing if the U.S. Senate goes on record by telling the American people that we do not think they should know anything about contributions and their sources and amounts in primary elections.

We like to go about the world setting ourselves up and holding ourselves up before others as having a standard of government and a form of government under a free electorate; as being governed by the people in democratic elections, under a republican form of government; and still we ourselves, right here, in what so many people think of and describe as the greatest deliberative body in the world, do nothing about this matter, and let it go by default, either through indifference or through failure to face up to the facts of life.

Contributions are something to which the public has every right to know about. The courts have so held and, as the Senator from New York has pointed out, there are innumerable precedents in the Senate itself, when the Senate has taken jurisdiction of primary election contests. Those precedents would seem to demolish effectively any argument on that point, unless there are matters of policy involved, which is an entirely different thing. Certainly on the legal and constitutional basis, there is no other side.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate those remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I do not see how anyone who votes against this amendment can explain his action. Of course, it is not up to me to try to explain someone else's vote; I am answerable only to my own conscience, as is the Senator from Missouri to his. But I agree with him that the people of the United States want to have the bill apply just as much to primaries as it does to general elections. Of that I am sure. I am sure that is true of the people in every State of the Union, not only in the State which I have the honor to represent, in part. If there is to be an election law, the people want it to apply across the board; they want to have it apply to any part of the election process where funds are used.

But I am rather concerned that there has been relatively little public response. My mail has been very light on this subject. I do not speak for other Senators, but I feel that if the people of the country understood this issue, they would back this amendment. A number of newspapers have backed the general effort to modernize our outdated election laws. The Senator from Missouri referred in his remarks today to a very splendid editorial published in the New York Times, a newspaper which has spoken out vigorously in support of the bill and in support of the amendment to include primaries. Those are sound words. They come also from other great newspapers of the Nation. I know of no newspaper which has campaigned against the bill or, indeed, against the inclusion of primary elections in the bill. There may have been some, but I have not learned of them; they have not come to my attention. I hope that such support of the general principles of the bill will be heeded when this measure and the amendment come to a vote.

Some of the provisions of the bill can be improved upon; but, by and large, the bill represents a very fine attempt to make this statute more realistic and in tune with the costs and practices of modern political campaigns. It is a giant stride in the right direction and, therefore, deserves the support of all those who believe in sound and practical legislation to improve the Federal electoral processes.

The Senator from Missouri is dead right when he says that now is the time to act. The hour has struck. If this amendment is not adopted and the bill is not passed at this time, there will not be another opportunity for a good many years. The Senator from Missouri reported a bill on this subject 2 years ago. It included primaries, as he pointed out a few minutes ago. But it was never acted upon. It was never scheduled for action. If we do not act now, we will not have another chance for a long time to come.

Mr. President, the issue is so clear and, it seems to me, so fundamental, that I do not see how there can be any opposition. Usually I can see the merit of the other side of an argument. I have sometimes bent over backward to do so. Perhaps an error or a fault of mine is seeing too much merit on the other side. But in this case I cannot understand how one can be in favor of the general principle of improving the Federal electoral machinery by enacting the bill, and then say that he will vote to leave out of it one of the most fundamental steps in the process of choosing a candidate for the Senate or House. The people, I am satisfied, want to know who spends the money to elect their candidates in a primary or a general election. They are entitled to know. We should respond to them by adopting the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support the amendment. I think it goes to the very heart of the political process. It is vital that the electorate have the fullest possible knowledge of the money which is spent in campaigns, not only in general election campaigns, but in primary election campaigns, as well.

On the basis of the individual views expressed in the committee report, both the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and also by the Republican Members of the committee, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], that the constitutional issue has been made crystal clear. I have not heard it challenged. I have been looking for enlightenment from the other side, so as to meet such a challenge. But I have been looking in vain for a substantial argument.

It has been emphasized that the case of United States against Classic, in 1941, touches very directly on this point. There is no question about it. The Supreme Court has spoken out. Perhaps even more persuasive with Congress is the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, which prohibits unions, corporations, or banks from expending money in a primary election, a convention, or a caucus. If

that is not Federal regulation of primary elections, I do not know what it is. It seems to me that the precedent is clear, just as the constitutional issue is absolutely clear.

The issue is simply a matter of disclosure. I do not think anyone in the Senate has done a more consistent, a more effective, a more commendable job of championing the public's right to know than has the great chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING]. His position on this amendment is certainly in keeping with the fight he has made over the years for the right of the newspapers to print the facts and the public to know the facts.

The only argument which can be made in opposition to disclosure is that this information is not any of the public's business. How can such an argument be made? It seems to me that if there is anything which is the public's business, it is to have a full and complete knowledge of the money which is being spent in elections. Every American citizen knows that a primary contest is as much an election, in every sense, as is a general election.

There has been a great deal of talk and there have been many changes to the effect that a great deal of labor money has been used in elections. Some have charged that oil money has been used heavily in elections, or that the executives of large banks have tried to get their friends elected to office by heavy contributions.

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield briefly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HENNING. First, Mr. President, I wish to thank my friend, the able and diligent junior Senator from Wisconsin, for his very kind words of commendation of the efforts of some of us in connection with bringing this proposed legislation before the Senate, and also for his recognition of the many years of work and effort to adjust and accommodate disparate views and views lacking in harmony, in order to report to the Senate some bill on this subject.

As I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin knows, the bill was reported to the Senator after I had offered, in the committee, amendments which I have proposed to offer here in the Chamber. One of those amendments has already been offered thus far during the consideration of the bill in the Senate.

I think the observation of the Senator from Wisconsin in regard to the Taft-Hartley Act is especially important. I undertook to mention that point several days ago, and I am very glad the Senator from Wisconsin has emphasized it.

We have not heard any hue or cry about Federal intervention in States by

the Taft-Hartley Act, which relates to contributions made by labor unions and corporations. Yet we find, for some reason or other, a disposition to set ourselves up in the guise of being the judges of what the public has a right to know about what we do in order to be elected to membership in this body, to represent them.

Not only is it hypocrisy, Mr. President, but it also seems to me that it is an evasion of direct public duty and responsibility, if we say that these things are not in the public domain and do not become, by their very nature, essential parts of the public business.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for his references and for his contributions thus far.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Missouri said, in the course of his remarks, that the public has a right to know about what we Senators do, I believe he put his finger on what is the natural, human, understandable objection to this proposed legislation. It is too bad that that has to be the situation; but, after all, legislators are human, and the Senate and the House of Representatives are human institutions.

It is always difficult for any group of people to act in such ways that they circumscribe their own conduct. However, it seems to me that this is exactly what should be done. I believe that anyone who is able to stand to one side and take an objective view of this situation must be persuaded that what we now propose is the right thing to do, and that the public has every bit as much right to know about the amounts of money spent in primary elections of U.S. Senators and Members of the House of Representatives as the public has a right to know how the executive agencies function, or as the public has a right to know about any other matter of public business.

It seems to me that the only consistently defensible position which can be taken against the public's right to know is in connection with military or diplomatic action by the Government. However, I do not believe anyone can properly argue that a general election or a primary election has anything to do with the military or diplomatic activity of the Federal Government. No sound case can possibly be made for a contention that the interests of the American people, the interests of the Nation, the interests of the Government, or the interests of any person, can be seriously damaged by letting the public know the facts of these situations.

Mr. President, I should like to dwell briefly on the nature of the vote. We take pride in the fact that we leave it up to the people of the country to decide who shall be the nominees of the respective parties. But do we really leave it up to the people to decide, if they do not have sufficient information when they are voting?

When either a Senator or any other citizen goes to vote in a regular election, it seems to me that the quality of his vote is extremely important. If people vote in ignorance, if they do not have

the facts, if they are not informed, we cannot correctly say that democracy has had a chance to speak or that the people have had a real opportunity to make a proper determination.

I believe it perfectly obvious that the amount of money contributed in connection with primary elections preceding the general congressional elections is of most vital importance in connection with the determination of whether certain candidates merit support. Certainly the people have a right to know whether persons with an ax to grind or with legislation to support or oppose are contributing very heavily to the campaigns of various candidates. The people have a right to examine those facts and the record of the candidates.

For instance, I have received campaign contributions from both business groups and labor groups, and I am very proud that I have. In fact, if I had not received those contributions, undoubtedly I would not have been elected; and I believe the same is true of all other Members of the Senate.

Certainly, the people also have a right to know what my record has been, on the basis of who my financial supporters are and who they have been. If the people do not have that information, their votes will not be informed ones; and then we shall be depriving them of the right to cast informed votes. It seems to me that then the whole process of democracy is directly and seriously weakened.

That is why I believe the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], which he has submitted on behalf of himself and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], goes to the very heart of the political process.

Mr. President, basically we are dealing with a most delicate subject which is difficult to discuss, not only because it directly affects the election of U.S. Senators, who themselves have to make the decision in this instance, but also because it affects the very delicate issue of political power. I believe that all of us recognize that the expenditure of money is necessary in order to conduct a modern campaign. All of us recognize, I believe, that democracy has been greatly aided by the participation of those who can have their campaigns financed in ways which enable them to have their messages reach the people. The television, the radio, and the newspapers perform a very vital, important, necessary, and desirable political function when they carry to the people of the country political speeches and messages.

There is nothing wrong with it. But it is clear that the public has a right to know where the money is coming from, evaluate the record of candidates who run for office, consider the amount of money that is being spent, put it in some proportion, and, on the basis of information the public has, come to a conclusion and cast a vote that is informed, and informed on the realities of political life.

The Senator from Missouri and the Senator from New York have both pointed out that this bill makes a real effort to diminish the burden of report-

ing in elections. This is not a bill that provides that candidates for Congress and their committees should do more work. This is a bill which, on the contrary, provides, as I understand it, a situation in which Senators and their committees and Representatives and their committees and their staffs would do less work. The reporting work is substantially lessened. It would not be significantly increased if primary campaigns also were subject to reporting.

Mr. President, I suppose it is not always wise to discuss all aspects of these issues, but I do not see how I can make a meaningful presentation of what I think of the issues without discussing the fact that we have in a large part of the country—and it directly affects my own party—a one-party system. We have a political system in the South in which the general election is meaningless. For many, many years—for generations—only one party has determined who is going to sit in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives, and, indeed, generally, who is going to receive the electoral votes for the Presidency of the United States.

Under those circumstances it is just incredible that the Congress of the United States should permit one-fourth of our Nation, in effect, to have no requirement whatsoever for disclosure of campaign contributions, no opportunity for the public in the South to know who is contributing to an election and who is not.

It is true that some of those States have adequate reporting laws. But the States have no responsibility. One might even say they have no business determining the qualifications of the candidates for Federal office.

The Constitution is very explicit and clear on that point, and the cases are abundant on it. It is up to the Senate of the United States to judge the qualifications of its Members. We had a celebrated case in my own State, in which the supreme court of my State set forth that, although a candidate seemed to have disqualified himself on the basis of his conduct, the Supreme Court of the State of Wisconsin had no right to pass on it, because the Constitution provided that the U.S. Senate alone shall be the judge of the qualifications of its Members.

Under those circumstances, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States are going to take the position that they have no right to inquire into and regulate the primary election process and require reports to be made to the public. What we are doing it depriving the public of an opportunity to know who is making contributions in an election—the only election in which the people in one-fourth of the Nation have a real opportunity to determine who is going to represent them in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], in his very excellent speech, asked that those who were voting against this amendment attempt to explain their vote. He pointed out that there had been very little publicity on this amendment, very little public outcry,

and very little mail. I suppose that is because those who oppose the amendment have made no attempt to answer the arguments, because, from the standpoint of the public, there is only one answer, that is a vote of ringing support for the Hennings amendment.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying that I feel we indeed should have a clean elections bill. I think it is a very happy title for the bill. But it ought to be a really clean elections bill for the United States of America, for all 50 States, for all sections of our country, and for all elections. I feel we ought to have a clean primary elections bill, just as we have a clean national elections bill.

Mr. President, I think the case for this amendment is simply overwhelming. I am very proud and happy to support it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am glad to be recognized immediately following the very fine speech of my colleague from Wisconsin, because I should like to take up where he left off. I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration and helped to draft the bill, which got nowhere in the Senate. I congratulate the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Missouri, for getting this bill called up so early in the session.

I should like to state the issue, taking up from where my friend from Wisconsin left off, as I see it. The issue, as I see it, is, Shall we have a clean elections bill or shall we have a partial clean elections bill? This is what the question really comes down to. Shall we have a bill that relates to some of the States and not to other States, or shall we have a bill that relates to all the States, where the people who decide who is going to be their Senator or Representative or President or Vice President in the primary or general elections? Because, as my friend from Wisconsin has truly said, in a very large number of States the primary decides the election. Indeed, an analysis of the individual number of citizens who vote shows that in a majority of the cases a much larger number of votes is cast in primary elections than in the general elections. In those very Southern States, a minor percentage of the vote cast in the primary—in some cases a ridiculously small portion of the vote cast in the primary—is cast in the general election. Hence, it would be a mockery for the election process to pass a clean election bill without including the primaries.

We would not be reaching what is substantially the election in many of our States.

Mr. President, the interesting thing is how we sometimes debate in a vacuum, because they have just had a hot primary election for Governor in Louisiana between Mayor deLesseps Morrison of New Orleans, and a man named Jim Davis. This primary took place in one of the largest and most important States of the Union, and the primary election was decided in favor of Mr. Davis after not only the originally primary election, but after a runoff primary election. Does anyone in this Chamber or in the United States doubt that Mr. Davis will be elected Governor of Louisiana? Will

many citizens of Louisiana trouble to go to the polls and vote in the general election? Probably not, if history continues in the future as it has in the past, as it undoubtedly will. Who is going to put up money for a candidate in opposition? Everyone knows the election has already been decided. So it would be a mockery to pass this bill to control contributions to campaigns in the general elections which is absolutely meaningless to the people of the State of Louisiana and to other States of the Union. Indeed, I think if my colleague from Missouri did not proposed this amendment, he would be derelict in his duty, he would be misleading, he would be advocating a clean elections bill which was applicable to only certain sections of the country. I know him too well and love him too much to believe anything like that from him.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am most grateful to my friend from New York. He is an able lawyer. He is a former attorney general of the State of New York. He had been a diligent member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I happen to be chairman.

The Senator is one to whom we listen when matters relating to constitutional law, or indeed all law, are involved in the processes of the Senate.

May I ask my friend from New York, whose remarks I very much appreciate and whose support we indeed welcome, how he would view any suggestion that an attempt to regulate primaries is unconstitutional, or that an attempt to regulate contributions in primaries is unconstitutional, in view of the Classic case, with which the Senator is doubtless familiar, and in view of the precedents of the Senate, taking further into consideration the Taft-Hartley Act and the contributions by labor unions in primaries and general elections?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think there is any question, Mr. President, about the fact that legislation made applicable to primaries is absolutely constitutional.

I should like to go further and point out that unless we do what we should do in this regard we hardly shall be honest with ourselves, because we passed in 1957 a so-called civil rights bill to deal with elections in far greater particularity than even the primaries.

Mr. President, one of the things which also makes me feel we live in a dream world here so very often is that nobody has talked about the fact that this is really the opening round, the challenge round to the whole question of whether we will or will not effectively protect the right to vote in this country. Mr. President, if we find ourselves inhibited on legal grounds from passing legislation to determine whether there shall be public attention drawn to whoever contributes to a primary campaign, how are we going to deal with the elementary question of what to do in a State where the State officials absolutely defy the mandate of the Constitution that every citizen is entitled to vote by refusing or by failing to register the citizen or by effectively barring him from registering as a voter?

Of course, Mr. President, everybody understands that.

Mr. HENNINGS. I will say to the distinguished Senator, we are holding hearings, which commenced this morning, with regard to the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission relating to temporary Federal registrars. This morning we heard a former president of the American Bar Association, a former dean of the Southern Methodist University, now a practitioner of law in Dallas, Tex., who strongly supported and advocated the appointment of Federal registrars, even though he is a southerner born and bred. He advocated the appointment of registrars in certain States where the right to vote is denied to citizens otherwise qualified.

Because I know of the Senator's broad interest in this question—our mutual interest in it—I thought he would be glad to know of that testimony. I believe we shall hear from the Senator tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct. I shall testify tomorrow.

Mr. HENNINGS. We look forward to hearing the Senator's testimony.

Mr. JAVITS. I have just completed preparing my testimony.

The important thing, Mr. President, is that again we live in a dream world, because nobody talks about the facts that what we do in regard to this bill is directly connected with what we shall do in regard to the other and very basic proposed legislation which we are assured will come before us in the middle of February, as to which the committee headed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is now engaged in what I consider to be a great exercise of responsibility, the holding of hearings.

Mr. President, only a few days ago the Attorney General of the United States argued in the Supreme Court a case which relates to this very critical question which is before us now, for a lower court had held the Civil Rights Act of 1957 unconstitutional, stating that the act was beyond the power of the Congress. The Attorney General was in the Supreme Court arguing it was well within the power of Congress and was very constitutional, because of the very arguments which we are making here, that the Congress has the right to deal with Federal elections in order to be sure that every citizen may vote.

Mr. President, only a few days ago a judge in the Federal court in Louisiana, acting under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, ordered restored to the voting rolls 1,377 Negroes in a Louisiana parish.

Mr. President, what we are told by those who propose that we should defeat this amendment to include primaries in the bill is, in practical effect, that we have no right to know by what processes people are financed in order to get voters either on or off the voting rolls. This is a question of a primary election, not a question of a general election.

It seems to me that to implement the law which we passed by a heavy majority in 1957 it is absolutely essential to include primary elections under the coverage of the bill.

Mr. President, I emphasize the aspects of this matter which relate to the whole

struggle to give American citizens the opportunity to vote, because I think this is very much a part of that struggle. An opportunity to vote effectively may be denied by the conditions which surround primary elections, by the amounts of money poured into them, by the sources from which the money comes, or by other conditions which relate to the election.

Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk about money, and money is a very important thing, but the bill by no means confines itself only to the question of who shall contribute money. If we pass the amendment, we shall make the whole bill—not simply that part of it relating to the reporting of contributions—applicable to primary elections.

In the first place, we shall make applicable that part of the law which, for the first time, makes realistic provision in regard to what it costs to run a primary election in one of these States where the primary election winner takes all, instead of the "mumbo-jumbo" we have been going through for years and years and years because of an archaic law, with the proliferation of many committees in order to be able to run a campaign at all, as we all know.

Mr. President, it seems to me we ought to be as honest about primary elections in that regard as we are about general elections.

Even a simple provision like that contained in the bill which would prevent anybody from making a contribution except in his own proper name, so that the people may know exactly who is contributing, ought to be applied in the primary elections.

Finally, there are regulations with relation to the so-called equal-time rule as to political broadcasts. That is certainly as applicable to primary elections as it is to general elections, and the rules on that subject should be uniform.

The same is true with respect to other phases of the law.

Mr. President, it seems to me the very key to the issue posed before us is this: Shall we pass a clean elections bill which discriminates against some States of the Union in favor of the States of the Union which decide their elections, for all practical purposes, in the primaries, or shall we not?

Shall we pass a clean elections bill which, whatever may be the approach of a particular State as to deciding who shall be the highest officials, will apply exactly the same standards to all States?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the mere framing of the question dictates the answer.

Those of us who will go out to tell our constituents that we voted for a clean elections bill, to reform the elections procedures of the country, in one and the same breath will have to tell our constituents that we were honest enough to make it applicable to all elections in which the question of who will be the Representative in Congress or the Senator, in national elections, is finally decided. In a very large number of States in the United States the question is finally decided in the primary.

Mr. President, I deeply believe there is no alternative other than to adopt the

amendment recommended by our colleague from Missouri and by my own junior colleague from New York.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I should like to say a few words about the bill itself. As I have said, when I was a member of the committee I had some hand in drafting the predecessor bill, which, incidentally, when it came to the Senate, also covered the primary elections. This bill marks a departure from a situation which I hope very much we shall correct.

Lest anyone think this bill is going too far too fast, I point out that this is an extremely modest bill, doing nothing, really, but bringing up to date, in realistic terms of today, the amounts which are spent in elections, and the ways in which the present law is made to function, notwithstanding the fact that it is archaic, and legalizing, in the sense of a Federal election, those practices, and also requiring those elements of disclosure with which we are so familiar as to accept them as almost axioms of government—as for example, in the Securities and Exchange Commission Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, the new labor law which we passed only last year, and a dozen other statutes.

In short, there is now thoroughly built into our legislative philosophy the idea that people are not wards of the legislators or anyone else. They are adults. If we give them information, we have the right to assume that they will use it wisely. If they do not, no government of our character will try to drag them or lead them around by the hand. But if we keep them in the dark, which would be the result of not passing the bill, we can hardly expect them to act as mature and educated citizens.

One final word. Something has been said about the fact that people ought to know who supports whom, as though that were a point of virtue. I know it was not thought of in that way, but I think it should be noted that it has been said to be a virtue to be supported by labor unions and not by banks; or, on the other hand, that it was a vice, in that if one were supported by labor unions he must be a wild-eyed radical, whereas if he were supported by bankers he would be a sound and very conservative fellow.

That situation is attributable to the fact that we do not have an effective law. I think the people of the United States can evaluate, in their own way, what all these things mean, and give them their proper weight when it comes to voting. But if we leave them in the dark, we only encourage all the mysteries which occur in dark places. How many people have we all heard who have said:

You do not really know how much money is being poured into this campaign by the great bankers.

Then we meet with the great bankers, as we all do, and they tell us darkly:

You cannot imagine how much money is being poured into the campaign by the loaded treasuries of the labor leaders and the labor unions.

Neither of these ideas should be given any substance unless it is supported by the facts. It seems to me that by common consent those of us who suffer under either set of mysteries, which are spread abroad and expected to be taken seriously by intelligent people, should favor a measure of this kind, which will at last be realistic. The realistic aspect of it, I will say to my friend from Missouri, is that it tries to gather up the totality of the contributions, instead of committing all the circumlocutions which have been piled upon those who run for office, and upon the very distinguished people who support them, because the law is simply out of date. The law should be brought up to date. It should be made inclusive, and it should be non-discriminatory.

In order to accomplish all these things, we must pass the bill plus the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that if the public had a full, complete, and accurate understanding of the amount contributed by officials of labor unions, banks, and utilities, and if the reports were made in full by the various competing parties and candidates in primary elections, very likely the public would come to have a far clearer, better, and more approving attitude toward candidates than it has?

The Senator has referred to the dark rumor that labor is pouring hundreds of thousands of dollars into a campaign, or that banks or big oil companies are pouring enormous funds into a campaign. The Senator has said so well that it is the innuendo, rumor, or half-truth kind of situation which develops so unfortunately in a campaign which smears candidates, merely because the facts are not known. It seems to me that this kind of legislation, requiring disclosure, could eliminate that very unfortunate situation, which unfortunately colors the character of too many persons who are public officials or would be public officials, and lends a very sad aspect of evil and improper conduct, which too many people associate with political activity.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with my colleague. We ourselves often fall into the same error. Even in this discussion, for example, I have spoken of utilities, labor unions, and banks. So have others of our colleagues. As a matter of law, they are not permitted to contribute. They do not contribute. The contributions are made by individuals—directors or heavy investors in the companies. Yet the discussion becomes loaded with generalities, because we do not have an adequate accurate reporting system, and everything is left to the general observation of the people, because the specific facts are not clearly delineated and set forth, as would be required by this bill.

We are really doing something which is long overdue, and which seems so

elementary that it is a little sad that we must spend so much time on the problem.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HENNING. Does not the Senator from New York know that there were days in the Senate during the past century and early part of the present century when virtually every interest or business—manufacturing, banking, shipping, agriculture, and other interests—had its own Senators here?

Mr. JAVITS. That was popularly reputed to be the case.

Mr. HENNING. I will not mention the name of a great former Senator from the Senator's State, but a certain Senator was known as a New York Central Senator. He was a great after-dinner raconteur. He was in the Senate for a long time.

There were others, whose names it would serve no useful purpose to remember. All one has to do is to read "The Robber Barons," or "The Age of the Moguls," together with a considerable amount of the history of the Senate. During that period no doubt there were Senators who were owned, body and soul, who were bought and paid for to look after certain interests. They performed their work well.

Mr. JAVITS. To make the discussion completely bipartisan, I know that the Senator will recall that certain Senators in those days were considered to be Southern Pacific Senators.

Mr. HENNING. Yes. The supreme court of my State was formerly referred to in terms of two divisions, namely, the division which represented the Frisco, and the division which represented the Missouri Pacific. That was many years ago, happily.

But there is no use in our being completely unsophisticated and naive about the fact that many people want someone here who will do their bidding.

If all the information is disclosed and becomes a matter of public information, the public may decide:

Well, and good. We are happy to have that Senator in the Senate, because he is doing the bidding of a group of interests which are contributing to the welfare of the State. We believe he is a man who could control matters, and do such things as are best for the interests of the country.

We are not quarreling with the fact that there are contributions. We are trying to resolve the simple proposition, as the Senator has well said, that these facts should be made public. They should be a matter of public record, subject to public scrutiny, public observation, and understanding by the people who do the voting. The reason why there is no substantial debate on these points, and no substantial arguments against the provision relating to primaries, seems readily apparent.

I doubt not that if there were constitutional questions really involved, many of our Members would raise those questions; that if there were matters of Senate precedents, such as the election cases involved, those questions would be raised by our Members.

Therefore, the reluctance on the part of Senators to support the amendment regulating contributing and reporting of contributions can be fairly interpreted as meaning, as I have undertaken to say before—I believe the Senator from New York was not present—that it is none of the public's business.

Some of us believe it is, indeed, in very large part, the public's business, and that the public has a right to know, and wants to know, and has demanded for these many years to know. We believe that the proposed legislation is in the public interest and for the public benefit.

I thank the senior Senator from New York for his very able and thoughtful contribution to the discussion.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New York—because of his acute and long experience and because of his fine legal mind, as a former attorney general of the great State of New York, and a man whose brilliant legal career is well known—with respect to one argument which I have heard some of my colleagues make against the bill, namely, that it involves a matter of States rights; that while it is right for the Federal Government to regulate general elections, primary elections should be left up to the States, because the States have a peculiar interest in primary elections.

For the life of me I cannot grasp what principle is involved. A primary election for Federal office is a Federal election, not a State election. It is an election for Federal office in which, the Constitution states—in the case of the Senate—that the Senate shall be the judge of the qualifications of its Members.

Can the Senator from New York enlighten me as to what is the legal nature, at least, of the States rights argument which is being made against the proposed legislation?

Mr. JAVITS. The States rights argument is based on the premise that Senators are ambassadors of their States. That is completely contrary to the Constitution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Why would not this argument apply also to general elections?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly right. However, the concept is that although we have gotten away from the idea that a Senator is elected by the State legislature—and it took a constitutional amendment to provide for the direct election of Senators—there still persists the argument that when a Senator comes from his State he is an ambassador of his State; therefore the process of his coming to the final point of his appointment as ambassador is none of our business.

That is a completely artificial premise. The answer is overwhelmingly stated in the Classic case, to which my colleague has referred, and to which there have been so many references during the debate; namely, that there is an organic process of electing Senators and Representatives, part of which is their nomination in a primary, and the other part

of that organic process is the result, to wit, their coming to the Senate; and that, therefore, the primary, just as the general election, is properly susceptible to the action of Congress.

Therefore we are dealing with a question of option, or a question of judgment. If we do include primaries by adopting the amendment, then these particular requirements would be applied to them. We are not obliged to pass every statute that is constitutional.

So the argument is answered on two grounds: First, the bill is without question constitutional; second, it is absolutely essential that the bill, if passed, be nondiscriminatory and do what it states to the public it will do, namely, include all elections.

Not only is the primary an organic element of the process, but it is also in some States the final selection process itself. Therefore it seems crystal clear to those of us who support that argument that the amendment must be adopted if the proposed legislation is to be meaningful at all. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment reported by the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

I should like to make an observation or two about the procedures in the Senate. It has been said that legislative committees make policy in the Senate and that, accordingly, my party, at least, if not the opposite party, should press forward as the majority party in the Senate to enact legislation which is reported by a legislative committee.

Yet I would suggest that the proposed legislation now before the Senate has almost as good a case history as any could have to enable anyone to sustain the position that legislative committees cannot, will not, and do not make policy, in many instances.

A committee of nine very able Senators, after intense deliberations, have presented a bill which it reported unanimously, but which satisfies no one. It is a bill which I believe my good friend, the chairman of the committee, who has worked so hard in this matter, would be the first to admit is an inadequate bill, because he himself, the chairman of the committee, has brought to the floor three amendments, of which the pending amendment is one, intended drastically to rewrite on the floor a bill which I think he quite obviously considers inadequate in the form in which it comes from the committee.

He is joined by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island in his effort to amend the bill on the floor, against a 5-to-4 vote of the committee of which he is the chairman.

An earlier bill presented by the distinguished chairman of the committee, also sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, carried in it—and I ask if this is not the case—the three provisions which the Senator from Missouri now seeks to insert by floor amendment.

Mr. HENNINGS. In reply to the able Senator from Pennsylvania, the 1957 bill

did contain provisions relating to primaries. That bill was reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration, as I have said before in the debate. The bill before the Senate was reported after a number of amendments had been offered. It was reported in the hope that legislation would, as it has now, reach the floor for the purpose of debate and improvement by the process of amendment. Although the vote was very close on the amendment—5 to 4 in committee—the committee did reject the primary provision. I feel that the bill would be inadequate without such an amendment. I have felt that way since the beginning of my consideration of these matters back in about 1953, and during all of the time since then.

I hope that that, in some measure, at least, answers the question put to me by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Missouri for his excellent clarification of this subject.

Now we find a situation in which two Democratic members of the committee and two Republican members of the committee join in submitting an important floor amendment. Their five colleagues—four Democrats and one Republican—do not join them in this request.

We are told that legislative committees make policy and that we in the majority party should support the legislative committees. Whom are we to support—the chairman and the Republicans who join him, or those Republicans and Democrats who do not join them? So I suggest that there still is a problem as to how my party can determine what policy it should follow on specific pieces of proposed legislation.

For that purpose, we scheduled a Democratic conference the other day. Unfortunately, other matters took so much time that when this bill was called before the conference for discussion, and although the chairman of the committee made a very able and a very short statement of what the bill was about, there was no opportunity to discuss it before the conference recessed. So now we are trying to make policy on the floor.

We have been told that we have no policy committee in the Democratic Party. I agree that that is the fact. We have what has been called a traffic committee or a listing committee, or, unhappy analogy, a rules committee in the sense of that in the other body, which schedules proposed legislation for floor action. But we have no policy committee, and it is said that we do not need one. I suggest that the pending bill is about as good evidence as we can get that we need a real policy committee; that we should have an opportunity to determine what the party policy on an important piece of proposed legislation of this sort should be. But we do not. Unfortunately, we were never able to get to the matter in conference.

In the absence of any definitive party policy on this matter, I, for one, turn to a pamphlet published on December 7, 1958, by the Democratic Advisory Council.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he comes to the last point?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me, in an attempt to pursue this very interesting suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that there are several things which Senators could do. They could say that the committee as a whole—a majority of the committee—should be viewed as a policy-recommending body—at least, to the Senate—and therefore if a majority of the committee decides on a certain course of action, that is a recommendation for the Democratic Senators, inasmuch as we have a substantial majority.

Mr. CLARK. I assume the Senator by his statement meant that if a majority of the Democrats on the committee voted a certain way, that would be our party policy. He could not have meant a majority of the Democratic Party.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am wondering. This is a question which has never been answered by our friends who say we do not need a conference to arrive at a party policy; they say we do not need a policy committee to help us to arrive at party policy. We should not have to be that responsible or that unified. This is something we should not have to arrive at.

What puzzles me is that if we exclude the Republicans who are on that committee, and if we take the recommendation of the Democrats, we might conceivably arrive at some kind of recommendation. But I have never—and this is the third year in which I have served in the Senate—heard any Member of the Senate refer to the vote of a standing committee and say, "I feel that because it is the recommendation of the Democrats, because the Democrats on this committee voted 4 to 2 to follow a certain course, we should be constrained to pay attention to that action and to follow it."

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Wisconsin agree that the proposal is untenable that legislative committees, in the present Senate at least, make party policy for our party?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it is, indeed, because there is in committee deliberations no opportunity to refer to any party position which the Democratic Party may have arrived at. There is no reference to any party platform; there is no consideration of any position taken by our great national leaders, our former President, or our nominee for President in the past. There is no reference to what the position of the leadership of the Senate, powerful, and able as it is, may be. There is no reference to anything of this kind.

The result is that a policy may be set by any kind of majority which can be put together. It may be a majority of unanimous Republicans and a small minority of Democrats. It may be almost any kind of a majority which comes forth with a conclusion or recommendation, whether it be yes or no.

I enthusiastically support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I think it carries

great weight with all Senators. But I have no illusions about this. If a standing committee does not come forth with a majority recommendation, the chances of its passing in this body are enormously reduced. Whether we like it or not, it means that our policy is being made, in an effective way, by whatever majority can be put together on the bipartisan committee, which has no responsibility of any kind to party position. It has no reference, in discussions, or anything else, to actions or principles which have been arrived at by the Democratic Party.

Mr. CLARK. I find myself in complete accord with the Senator from Wisconsin. Having received no policy guidance from the committee itself, having had no opportunity to obtain policy guidance in the Democratic conference, and having received no expression of opinion from the leadership as to what it thinks the policy should be, I am constrained to turn to the only authority in the Democratic Party which has expressed, as a matter of policy, its views on this subject, namely, the Democratic Advisory Council, which, on December 7, 1958, published a pamphlet entitled "Democratic Task During the Next 2 Years."

I am constrained to give this policy statement of the advisory council a great deal of weight, indeed, because of two facts: First, that the advisory council is an official arm of the Democratic National Committee, created by it to advise on matters of policy during the 4 years between presidential elections. That, I believe, entitles the council to receive careful attention by all Democratic legislators in both bodies of Congress.

My second reason for paying careful attention to the recommendations of this group is the distinguished nature of its composition. I shall read for the RECORD only a few of the names of the members of the council who have given their approval to this statement by having their names printed on the flyleaf: W. Averell Harriman; Hubert H. Humphrey, the senior Senator from Minnesota; Estes Kefauver, the senior Senator from Tennessee; David L. Lawrence, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, whose views on this matter are particularly pertinent and important to me, as a Senator from that Commonwealth; Herbert H. Lehman, who served with great distinction for so long in this body; Adlai E. Stevenson, twice the Democratic standard bearer in the presidential contests of 1952 and 1956; the grand old man of the Democratic Party, one of the greatest Americans now alive, Harry S. Truman, former President of the United States; G. Mennen Williams, the distinguished Governor of Michigan; and as consultant, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The collective wisdom of this group and their many other colleagues on the committee does, I submit, Mr. President, carry great weight with me and, I believe, should carry great weight with my colleagues on this side of the aisle. What do they say—

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

Mr. CLARK. May I complete my sentence? What do they say about the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri?

Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me it is most significant that the Senator from Pennsylvania is doing what he is doing this afternoon. This is the first time, to my knowledge, it has been done. I think it is highly important. Many of us in the Senate have been asking for a long time for some opportunity to take part in determining policy for our party—a responsible policy.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out very well that we do not really have that opportunity. He has also pointed out that there is an eminent body of well-qualified, thoughtful, responsible, and very, very distinguished Americans who have assumed that responsibility. I welcome the way in which the Senator from Pennsylvania has called the attention of the Senate to the recommendations of these distinguished Democrats, who are an official body, and who do have a responsibility which they are willing to recognize, and who have met and have thoughtfully considered the matter, and, I may add, have tapped the best brains in the country—some of the outstanding leaders in our universities and elsewhere—in regard to issue after issue after issue, and now have come before the American people to make their recommendations in regard to the policies the Democratic Party should follow.

The fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out that there is such a well-qualified body of Democrats who have taken a strong position on this proposed legislation is most important; and I believe that January 18, 1960, will go down—at least in my book—as a most important day, because of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania has called on Democrats in this body to recognize that the only group of nationally recognized Democrats who attempt to arrive at a thoughtful and responsible Democratic Party position is the advisory committee of the Democratic National Committee. This is party responsibility day, 1960.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his comments, and I hope he has not overemphasized the importance of the comments I have made. Time alone will tell as to that.

Mr. President, I return to the question of what did the Democratic advisory committee say about the pending amendment, which has been offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]; what did the Democratic advisory committee say about it on December 7, 1958, when they published to the world the pamphlet entitled "The Democratic Task Force During the Next 2 Years?" They said:

Clean elections law: The Federal election laws should be modernized along the lines proposed by the Hennings-Green bill, in order to assure more meaningful reporting of campaign expenditures and tightening of the corrupt practices laws and an exten-

tion of Federal regulation of elections for Federal office, to include primary elections for any Federal office.

Mr. President, that is so plain that there can be no doubt that the Democratic advisory committee, composed of many distinguished members of our party, and including an ex-President of the United States and our party's candidate for that high office in two separate elections, is 100 percent behind the effort of the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections to overrule a majority of his own committee and to call up, here on the floor of the Senate, an amendment which will comply with that suggestion by the Democratic advisory committee.

Mr. President, I intend to support the chairman of the committee on privileges and elections, and I intend to go down the line with the Democratic advisory committee.

I urge every Democratic Senator to follow the lead of that committee; and I hope and believe that the Senate leadership of the Democratic Party will also follow that lead. I hope they will make their position abundantly clear before we come to vote on this matter. If they have any reasons for not following that lead, I wonder whether they will be kind enough to state those reasons on the floor of the Senate, before this matter comes to a vote, so that we who wish, when possible, to bend over backwards in endeavoring to follow our duly elected leadership may have an opportunity to consider any views they may have which may happen to be in opposition to the views of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. HENNING], who himself is a member of the Democratic leadership, since he serves as secretary of the Democratic caucus.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended. I shall not longer detain the Senate, except to say that the cogent reasons stated by the chairman of the committee [Mr. HENNING] and, indeed, also stated by the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who comes from the other side of the aisle, in support of this amendment are, to my mind, so persuasive that it is difficult to understand why the Senate does not unanimously accept the amendment as being clearly in the public interest.

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, I desire to express my thanks, and also those of the rest of us who are associated in this endeavor, for the brilliant and apposite statement made by the most able Senator from Pennsylvania. He has raised some very challenging and some very thought-provoking questions.

I am glad to have him revive the 1958 statement of support by the Democratic advisory committee.

Some of us have been "in the trenches" for a good many years, in regard to this one bill and these amendments to it; and by "a good many years" I mean 7 or 8 years.

But now, here on the floor, we find virtually no opposition expressed from any source or quarter. Sometimes I feel that we are speaking out in the woods,

and that perhaps we are hearing only the echo of our own voices.

If there are substantial reasons for opposition to this amendment, I think many of us believe we are equipped to debate the matter on the issues.

But if the reason for opposition is simply "Well, we do not want it; we do not like it; we do not want to regulate ourselves; we do not want anyone to tell us what to do, because we are the Senate; we may represent the people, but we do not want them to know about what we do to get here"—if such an attitude of cynicism is the general attitude on the part of those who are opposed to our proposals, not only would I say it is exceedingly disappointing, but I would also say that those who take that position are recreant in the performance of their duty to the people of the country.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I had the privilege of being on the floor last week when the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] engaged in a colloquy with the able minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I do not believe that ever during my service in the Senate I have heard any Member go more quickly or better to the heart of any matter than did my friend, the Senator from Missouri, when, in one sentence, he said to the able minority leader that the issue is simply whether we want the people to know who contribute to our primary campaigns, or whether we want to keep that information secret. Certainly, that is clearly the issue.

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that those of us who advocate the adoption of this amendment have not been engaging in legalistic expressions; neither have we been engaged in stating, here in this Chamber, sententious platitudes or in answering ourselves—already completely in agreement—by engaging in a process of repetition and redundancy.

No substantial argument against this proposed legislation has been offered in this Chamber. Yet, there seems to be going around word that there is a coalition between some Members on the other side of the aisle and some Members on this side of the aisle, and that that coalition will be able to defeat this amendment.

I may say that, to the best of my knowledge, no such group of Senators appeared before the committee prior to the time when it reported to the Senate a skeleton bill susceptible of amendment, and now in the course of being amended. It seems to me that here in the Senate Chamber there has not been any semblance of respectable opposition to the amendment on the basis of any claim that it lacks constitutionality.

We have had no persuasive argument on the basis of violation of States-rights, or indeed of policy, except what seems to be a very durable core of stubborn opposition to telling the people the truth about what happens in primary

elections. I do not think many would dare go so far as to say that we should not have to make any reports in general elections, although I cannot help but question whether some would not like to have all regulation of all elections relegated to limbo, because there are some people who just do not like any regulation whatsoever, be it traffic regulation, be it a criminal statute, be it a matter of public information given to the people of this country by public officers, or those seeking to be public officers, after or before their nominations at primaries or at conventions.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I had not intended to speak further on the amendment. The other day there was a smokescreen attempted by some Senators for the sole purpose of confusing and concealing the issues. I believe it necessary, in very brief fashion, to reply to it as a matter of record, not because of the stature of the arguments made or because of their persuasiveness or their cogency.

This floor today is singularly deserted by those who, I am sure, are prepared to come in when a vote is taken on this amendment and to vote in opposition to it. However, the names will be recorded, and the people of this country will know who, of the Senators representing them, wish to continue to operate in the dark and to attain nomination in a political party by means not requiring full and public disclosure.

We have heard arguments about this being selection and not an election, and about preemption and election areas not being covered by the bill or the amendment.

The argument that it is selection, not election, is, indeed, a nice distinction. However, in a good many State elections we know selection means election, as has been said many times. In many States where this situation exists, I would not like to tell the victorious nominee that he had not been through an election, but only a selection. I believe the comments of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are more than enough to prove that a nominee in his State has been elected.

The sole question before us is, Do we believe the people should be informed as to campaign financing in primary elections, caucuses, and conventions? As has been said repeatedly on this floor during the course of this discussion, primaries are an integral part of the election process, for no candidate, of course, can be elected to a congressional seat unless he is placed on the ticket by victory in the primary process, be it election, caucus, or convention.

In the general election, the people must choose between the candidates on the ballot. Therefore, it is impossible to separate the general election and the primary process. We have again the authority of the leading case in 1941, United States against Classic, from which I had intended to read further, but that has already been done by my able colleague from New York. I have read parts of it, and may again advert to it tomorrow. The Congress has taken this attitude in election contests, and

the courts have taken this attitude in cases before them—that the primary is a part of the election process.

It has also been argued that it would be a paradox if primaries had to be conducted under both State law and Federal law. If such is a paradox, that paradox exists today, because under existing law, the Corrupt Practices Act, the Hatch Act, and other Federal statutes control phases of general elections. However, each State also has laws controlling who can vote and where. Even in primary elections today we have dual control. Certainly, the Taft-Hartley Act, relating to contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations, is the law pervasive throughout all States of the Union.

I now ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD title 18 of the United States Code, section 610, being that portion of the United States Code relating to contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations under the Taft-Hartley Act.

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

TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

SEC. 610. Contributions or expenditures by national banks, corporations, or labor organizations.

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to any political office, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which presidential and vice-presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any of the foregoing offices, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

Every corporation or labor organization which makes any contribution or expenditure in violation of this section shall be fined not more than \$5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization, who consents to any contribution or expenditure by the corporation or labor organization, as the case may be, and any person who accepts or receives any contribution, in violation of this section, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if the violation was willful, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.

For the purposes of this section "labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exist for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 723; May 24, 1949, ch. 139, sec. 10, 63 Stat. 90; Oct. 31, 1951, ch. 655, sec. 20(c), 65 Stat. 718.)

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, as has been said before, the Hatch Act limits contributions to \$5,000 to any candi-

date or political committee in a calendar year. Therefore, if dual control is a paradox, it has existed, indeed, for many years.

Another one of the arguments presented, in some fashion or other, to prevent the extension of reporting and disclosure to primaries is that the bill, even with this extension, does not go far enough, in that it does not require reports from State and local committees. This is the strangest argument I have heard against extending the bill to cover primaries. In preceding days, although not today, we have had some weird or singular arguments raised in opposition to this amendment.

I would agree that failure to require reports from such committees may be a weakness, but the solution to a weakness in another section of the bill is not to oppose the amendment on primaries, but to support it and also support an amendment to include such committees.

As I said in my opening remarks on Wednesday, I advised the Senate that at the appropriate time, after consideration of the pending amendment, I proposed to offer an amendment to extend the bill to cover State and local committees. The adoption of this amendment I believe would be a solution to the weakness which some have pointed out.

Another argument raised is that where the new expenditure limitations disagree with expenditure limitations under State law, doubt may arise as to which one controls, and a State secretary of state might refuse to certify an election because the victorious candidate had expended more than the State limitation.

I am unable to determine exactly what this argument has to do with this amendment on primaries because it goes to the certification of the winner of a general election, but, nevertheless, the answer is simple, if we are going to undertake to answer it, and I think we should, because the minority leader himself raised the question the other day.

Section 210 of the bill is titled "Effect on State Laws," and in this section, the bill specifically states:

That the limitations on expenditures prescribed in section 207 shall supersede any such limitations prescribed in State laws which differ therefrom.

This provision is simple and direct. There can be no question as to the intent of Congress. In the area of expenditure limitations, the Federal law controls, and supersedes State law.

Mr. President, as I said earlier, the question of preemption has been brought up, again by the able minority leader, who said that it did not make any difference whether the committee reported the bill unanimously or not. We sometimes think in the Judiciary Committee, where we serve together, that reporting a bill unanimously is a rather important and most unusual achievement. It has been suggested that because the amendment would bring primaries within the purview of the law and would regulate expenditures and require reporting respecting primaries, the courts might hold that the Federal Government had preempted the whole field of regulation of primaries. The answer to this is manifold.

First, Congress regulated the same activities with respect to general elections by the passage of the Corrupt Practices Act in 1925 and the courts have not so ruled during the 35 years this creaking, archaic 1925 act has been in effect.

Second, as I mentioned before, the bill contains a specific provision as to preemption. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has long worked diligently for the passage of a bill which would govern preemption on a general basis. I, conversely, have long opposed passage of such a bill, because it would cut across the whole area of Federal law with one swoop without regard to the past intent of Congress.

This matter was debated in the closing days of the Congress preceding this, when it was defeated by a margin of one vote. I refer to S. 3, and the so-called McClellan-Bridges amendment.

Mr. President, I have always believed that Congress must determine specifically in every area of the law if it has the power to preempt, and, if it desires to preempt, then Congress should spell it out in clear, unmistakable, and unequivocal language, so that in interpreting the law the courts will know the legislative history and the intent of Congress.

However, we cannot today pass a bill in broad terms covering all past legislation. The result would be chaos. The bill of the Senator from Arkansas on preemption in its first provision sets out that—

No act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field in which such act operates, to the exclusion of any State laws on the same subject matter unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between such act and the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

Section 210 of the bill before the Senate provides:

This act shall not be construed to annul or to exempt any candidate from complying with the laws of any State relating to the nomination or election of candidates unless such laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That the limitations on expenditures prescribed in section 207 shall supersede any such limitations prescribed in State laws which differ therefrom.

I do not think there can be any question as to the intent of the Congress, following that language and its interpretation, with respect to the so-called doctrine of preemption.

Question has been raised because certain expenditures of a candidate, such as assessments, fees, or charges levied upon a candidate by a State; necessary personal, traveling, or subsistence expenses and cost of stationery, postage, writing, or printing—other than billboards or newspapers—distributing letters, circulars, posters, and telegraph or telephone service, are not to be included in determining whether the candidate's expenditures have exceeded the limitation. The present law—the Corrupt Practices Act, so called—also excludes these expenditures from this computation, and

the committee agreed to keep these exclusions. However, under both the present law and the bill of 1959, these expenditures must be reported by the candidate.

Again we get back to the essence, to the gravamen of the bill, which is the reporting, which is indispensable, so that the people will know the amount of such expenditures. This certainly is the heart and soul of the proposed legislation.

The question of precedents has also been raised. The Congress has already enacted legislation controlling activities in primaries. Under the Taft-Hartley Act, corporations, national banks, and labor unions cannot contribute or expend money to influence primaries or general elections. Under the Hatch Act, a person cannot contribute over \$5,000 to any candidate or committee in a calendar year to influence the nomination or election of a candidate. Therefore, the precedent is there. This amendment would extend Federal control in this area, but some of us believe it is very significant to recognize the extent of. Therefore, the control provided by this bill if the amendment is adopted. Primarily, the bill calls for disclosure. It requires that the people be informed. Therefore, the control provided by this bill will not come from the Federal Government, but from the people, when they are informed as to the amount of money spent and from where it came.

I have said before, and I believe it worth repeating, the sole question before the Senate is, Are we to inform the people respecting campaign financing or are we to operate in the dark, in secrecy, in a subterranean manner? I ask, What do Members of the Senate have to fear from informing the people as to campaign financing in primaries?

That question has been asked many times in the course of this debate, and to this time, Mr. President, the silence of this Chamber has remained unbroken by any answer to that very direct, very simple question, which relates only to common sense and, to human experience; which is not legalistic; which does not transcend, interfere with, or in any wise impinge upon State law, the decisions of the Supreme Court, or the precedents of the Senate in determining the qualifications of its own Members.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 19, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18, 1960:

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

George Harold King, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of 14 years from February 1, 1960. (Reappointment)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, vice Dudley C. Sharp.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

- *Glennon, James B.
- *Carneal Wyatt B., Jr.
- *Walsh, Walter R.
- *O'Connor, Thomas J.
- *Johnson, Richard S.
- *Welch, Claude H.
- *Spritzen, Roland J.
- *Lattimer, Hubert C.
- *Wilkinson, Andrews M.
- *Dalton, Honore G.
- *Aldridge, Frederick S.
- *Glickert, Robert W.
- *Russell, Gerald F.
- *Currin, Ralph H.
- *West, Fraser E.
- *Popper, Harry S., Jr.
- *Doyle, Edward J.
- *Helmer, Wilbur R.
- *Sawyer, Webb D.
- *Jewson, Winston E.
- *Kisgen, James T.
- *Moore, George E.
- *Oliiver, William P., Jr.
- *Williams, Maxie R.
- *Pratt, Harry D.
- *Dobson, Charles E., Jr.
- *Harris, Arnold W.
- *Reid, Leonard D.
- *Cokin, Milton G.
- *Wertman, Howard E.
- *Altman, Sidney J.
- *Buzhardt, Harry O.
- *Feeley, James A., Jr.
- *McDaniel, James T.
- *Keller, Robert P.
- *Stapp, Donald H.
- *Armstrong, Alan J.
- *Lahue, Foster C.
- *Padley, John J.
- *Porter, Frank R., Jr.
- *Campbell, Albert W.
- *Mee, Fenton J.
- *Pratt, Spencer H.
- *Arsenault, Albert
- *Farrelly, Robert B.
- *Vogel, Frank H., Jr.
- *Clark, James H.
- *West, Robley E.
- *Gorman, John E.
- *King, John H., Jr.
- *Bangert, Douglas A.
- *Bronleewe, Thomas G., Jr.
- *Ireland, Julius W.
- *Howatt, William J.
- *Burnett, John R.
- *Randall, David S.
- *Winstead, Edwin G.
- *Esterline, William C.
- *Marsh, William H.
- *Blackwell, James R.
- *Dulacki, Leo J.
- *Hammond, Bruce B.
- *Nelson, Stanley J.
- *Brickley, John H.
- *Griffin, David R.
- *Ryffel, George G.
- *Hammond, Robert C., Jr.
- *Coss, Francis K.
- *Vick, Kirby B.
- *Schlesinger, Francis R.
- *Ingle, Shelton C.
- *Sherman, Donald W.
- Olson, Merlin R.
- Smith, Robert E., Jr.
- Miller, Roy D.
- Bonner, William R.
- Clarke, Harry D.
- Elliott, Benton H.
- Norton, William R.
- Kurdziel, Edward G.
- Blackwell, John O.
- Myers, Reginald R.
- Leffers, James
- Martin, Glen E.
- Trompeter, Joseph D.
- Atkin, Ernest G., Jr.
- Miller, Norman A., Jr.
- Andre, Paul L., Jr.
- Smith, Sherman A.
- McGlothlin, Joe H., Jr.
- Baker, Robert R.
- Yunck, Michael R.
- Quilty, Joseph F., Jr.
- McElhany, Boyd C., Jr.
- Moran, Arthur M.
- Moore, Jack R.
- Morrison, Jack W.
- Flaherty, Robert F.
- Scott, Jack C.
- Shuman, Perry L.
- Abblitt, William E.
- Eisele, Harold A.
- Long, Herbert H.
- Whitten, Robert T.
- McMahon, John P.
- White, Robert O.
- Love, James W.
- Holdzkom, Lincoln N.
- Widdecke, Charles F.
- Andruska, Bruno J.
- Early, Cleland E.
- Burgoyne, William R., Jr.
- Wilson, Louis H., Jr.
- Flake, William L.
- Gottschalk, Vincent J.
- Gilliland, George A.
- Mitchell, Bryan B.
- Wojcik, Thaddeus P.
- McLaughlin, John N.
- Holmes, Fenwicke W.
- Haltom, Winfield S., Jr.
- Treleaven, Lewis F.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the

grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

- *Brandenburg, Paul F.
- *Anderson, Eugene
- *Kruszewski, Matthew J.
- *Burrill, Ray M.
- *Seaton, James B.
- *Landis, Walter P.
- *Tomlinson, John H.
- *Leslie, Lornie
- Tant, St. Clair
- Utz, Joseph W.

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:

- *Moriarty, Paul M.
- *Pickerell, Walter D.
- *O'Neal, William T.
- *Humphrey, Howard M.
- *Jordan, James D.
- *Cox, David M.
- *Reed, Edwin O.
- *Sloan, Jack R.
- *Boortz, Neal A.
- *Strandtman, Lesley V.
- *Miller, Thomas H., Jr.
- *Mickelson, Laurel M.
- *Dair, William G., Jr.
- *McClane, George E.
- *Martin, Benjamin G.
- *Lehnert, Robert C.
- *Barbour, Robert J.
- *Finlayson, Edwin H.
- *Hopkins, Warren G.
- *Peebles, Vernon J.
- *Wilson, Rex.
- *Jennings, Francis C.
- *Idler, Basil T.
- *Kelly, George E.
- *Dominick, Robert L.
- *Brandon, William E.
- *Lomac, John M.
- *Cowper, William H.
- *Patton, Harvey M.
- *Hansen, John E.
- *Allen, Victor E.
- *Cleeland, David
- *Pietz, Reuel H.
- *Carver, Nathaniel H.
- *Danowitz, Edward F.
- *MacAskill, Ross M., Sr.
- *Hubka, Frank J.
- *Wagner, John H.
- *Anderson, Elmer A., Jr.
- *Lupton, Edward L.
- *Porter, Mervin B.
- *Bardon, Thomas J.
- *Buford, Ernest A., Jr.
- *Reed, Roy L.
- *McGough, James D.
- *Blatt, Wallace D.
- *Schmidt, Carl E.
- *Lodge, Orlan R.
- *Schultz, Leonard L.
- *Ebel, Ardell
- *Butcher, Warren A.
- *Howe, Odia E., Jr.
- *Lewis, Woodrow B.
- *Thorne, Nicholas G. W.
- *Woods, Ray.
- *Finn, John, Jr.
- *Mitchell, Joseph A.
- *Bohannon, Thomas J. L.
- *Wilson, James E., Jr.
- Carter, David V.
- *Terry, Wilson C.
- *Shoden, John C.
- *Smith, Richard B.
- *Lawrence, George E.
- *Barrow, Robert H.
- *Lobell, William R.
- *Donnell, James W.
- *Duncan, William R.
- *Beckington, Herbert L.
- *Sullivan, John B.
- *Casey, Thomas P.
- *Gibson, Baylor P., Jr.
- *Fribourg, Leonard E.
- *Hollenbeck, Marvin K.
- *Rainforth, Richard H.
- Wales, Eugene A.
- *Krumm, George A.
- *Graves, James B.
- *Wray, Robert P.
- *Morrison, Robert J.
- *Pope, Eugene J.
- *Boldman, James D.
- *Knapp, George C.
- *Henley, Paul B.
- *Warren, Stephen G.
- *Wilson, Frank E.
- *Jones, States R., Jr.
- *Truesdale, Marlon G.
- *Atkins, Wade W.
- *Sollom, Almond H.
- *Frankovic, Boris J.
- *Dressin, Sam A.
- *Rushlow, Bruce A.
- *Stanford, Norman R.
- *Beckett, John W., Jr.
- *Challacombe, Arthur D., Jr.
- *Wilkinson, John H.
- *Anderson, Roy L.
- *Johnson, Wayne
- *Tulipane, Thomas T.
- *Driftmier, John F.
- *Corman, Otis W.
- *Brown, Charles S.
- *Simmons, Robert L.
- *Farish, George B.
- Gray, Roy C., Jr.
- *Daniels, Elmer R., Jr.
- *Miller, Edward J.
- *Bruce, Henry K.
- *Dyer, Phillip G.
- *Deweese, Raymond, Jr.
- *Hamm, Norman L.
- *Magill, James H.
- *Merchant, Clark E.
- *House, Charles A.
- *Mein, Ernest I.
- *Greenfield, Gaylord C.
- *McDaniel, James
- *Harmon, Lester G.
- *Morrison, Gene W.
- *Clapp, Archie J.
- *Rushlow, Ray D.
- *McBarron, Alden
- *Witt, William T., Jr.
- *McManus, John
- *Wilker, Dean
- *Mawyer, Ralph P.
- *Johnston, John C.
- *Vance, Johnnie C., Jr.
- *MacQuarrie, Warren L.
- Dellamano, Albert F.
- Hepler, Frank M.
- Guss, William F.
- Johnson, James K.
- Ross, John D.
- Felton, James A.
- Barber, William E.
- Hemstad, Robert S.
- Barnhill, Claude O., Jr.
- Austen, Philip N.
- Sevier, Charles B.
- Leogue, John J.
- Keller, Karl T.
- Millenbine, Otis E.
- Reed, Herbert C.
- Sigler, William M., Jr.

Cass, Bevan G.
 McGraw, Thomas F., Jr.
 St. John, Roscoe R.
 Swinford, David G.
 Ewers, Norman G.
 Kern, Richard H.
 McGraw, William C., Jr.
 Ewell, Dee E.
 Rutledge, Rockwell M.
 Flinn, Norman W., Jr.
 LeFaitre, Edward N.
 Adams, Harold W.
 Pond, Darwin B., Jr.
 McCaleb, Alfred F., Jr.
 Payne, Ernest W.
 Gould, William R.
 Schmagel, Arthur O.
 Ward, Richard A.
 Quillian, Stone W.
 Ray, Grady W.
 Francke, Donald E.
 Conroy, Donald
 Jackson, Owen G., Jr.
 Andres, Russell A.
 Gribbin, Thomas A.
 Collins, George J.
 Panska, Donald A.
 Matthews, Merlin T.
 Warren, Robert F.
 Painter, Harry F.
 McLaurin, John M., Jr.
 Lees, Urban A.
 Bolts, Lewis E.
 Mileson, Donald F.
 Robinson, Robert B.
 McRay, Harold G.
 Newport, Richard B.
 Graham, Robert J.
 McMahan, John F., Jr.
 Heilman, Roland B.
 Atwater, William L., Jr.
 Simlik, Wilbur F.
 Derryberry, Don G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Olszewski, George M.
 *Carter, Johnny L.
 *Martin, Gene C.
 *Rapp, John A.
 *Zielinski, Edward L.
 *Pyles, Howard E.
 *Livingston Charles R.
 *Blass, Lytton F.
 *Roberts, Henry G.
 *Bradshaw, Frank L.
 *Varley, William J.
 *Bailey, Jack F.
 *Grow, Hubert C.
 *Anderson, Eugene D.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Rall, Raymond R., Jr.
 Grimes, George H.
 Clark, C. P., Jr.
 Haden, Frederick M.
 Ferguson, Gilbert W.
 Markus, Howard M.
 Alexander, Richard D.
 Talbott, Richard B.
 Gaugh, Orvis O., Jr.
 Phillips, George R.
 Webster, Charles A.
 Levert, Harris J., Jr.
 Lamb, George R.
 Burger, Donald J.
 Ohanesian, Victor
 Keith, William C., Jr.
 Alop, William F., Jr.
 Cunningham, Ralph L., Jr.
 Grubaugh, William R.
 Foley, Kenneth S.
 Beyerle, Garland T.
 Stevens, Marvin H.
 Mathis, Jerry F.
 Deering, Claude E., Jr.
 Cross, William E., Jr.
 Hart, Elwin B.
 Stine, Harold E.
 Mehargue, David G.
 Bronars, Edward J.
 Marsh, James W.
 Cowing, Harry O., Jr.
 Tubley, George F.
 Bendell, Lee R.
 Rosenfeld, Charles A.
 Petersen, Arthur R.
 Pross, Vincent J., Jr.
 Greenwood, John E.
 Vest, Wendell N.
 Hare, Andrew E.
 Twomey, David M.
 Dinabo, James J., Jr.
 Walker, Paul D., Jr.
 McNair, Audrey P.
 Palmer, Thomas A.
 Brennan, Robert B.
 Morgan, Ira L., Jr.
 McMillan, Alexander P.
 Svenson, Otto L., Jr.
 Green, Fredric A.
 Sargent, George T., Jr.
 Gary, Harry L.
 Gruenier, Robert E.
 Walsh, Walter V.
 Herman, Stanley A.
 Randall, Harry B., III
 Ryan, Raymond M.

Hall, Lawrence A.
 Megarr, Edward J.
 McClintock, Bain
 Good, Robert N.
 Miller, Donald O.
 Buchanan, Richard K.
 Ridderhof, David M.
 Talbert, Aubrey W., Jr.
 DeWitt, Birchard B.
 Wightman, David J.
 Chapman, Winston D.
 Swigart, Oral E., Jr.
 Woeller, Frederick M.
 Jones, Richard E.
 Savage, Cornelius F., Jr.
 Trevino, Rodolfo L.
 Zlogar, Albert J.
 Nastasi, Joseph
 Buss, Kenneth M.
 Wadzita, Cyril
 Dorsey, Joshua W., III
 Lesser, William
 McMahon, Paul G.
 Brown, Robert G.
 Wold, Henry E.
 Keller, Don L.
 Hytrek, David J.
 Corson, William R.
 Robinson, Kenneth L., Jr.
 Oliver, Robert W.
 Paraskos, Peter G.
 Burckell, Thomas J.

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:

Maas, Patricia A.
 *Caley, Virginia
 *Mock, Mary S.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*McAlexander, Donald E.
 *Carlisle, Robert L.
 *Gerber, Donald R.
 *Bischoff, Joseph J.
 *Grey, Clarence B.
 *Cates, Leroy R.
 *Candea, George A.
 *Bicknell, William V.
 *Newell, James F.
 *Marushok, Andrew G.
 *Fifield, John G.
 Whitley, Billy L.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Nichols, Bobby J.
 *Portner, Jack
 *Hartmeier, William J.
 *Bittner, Barry N.
 *Moore, Jacob W.
 *Ingraham, John D.
 *Peacock, Marvin E.
 *Carr, John R., Jr.
 *Melcher, Paul F.
 *Boschonis, Stephen
 *Lamb, Allan W.
 *Grayum, Walter E.
 *Batt, Karlton L.
 Baker, Terrance P.
 *Czubal, Stanley J.
 *Kramer, Russell I.
 Ward, Charles
 *McCoury, Melvin W., Jr.
 *Maxwell, Jack L.
 *Folks, Tommy I.
 Borlan, Albert G.
 *Christensen, Keith L.
 *Loughry, Arthur S.
 *Morgan, William I., Jr.
 Brown, Walter R.
 *Kussmann, John E., Jr.
 *Hamber, John W.
 *Greer, Jesse E.
 *Hanneman, Richard W.
 *Hurley, John E., Jr.
 Foxworth, Eugene D., Jr.
 Rigby, Edward J.
 Wood, James W.
 Stanton, Donald C.
 Smith, Erin D.
 Bowman, James L.
 Aichele, James E.
 Dorsa, Lawrence R.
 Fleming, William B.
 Johnson, Warren R.
 McLernan, Joseph V.
 Harter, Robert H.
 Clizek, Gregory J.
 Horn, William K.
 Abbott, Charles W.
 Gambardella, Joseph J. N.
 Bulger, Thomas E.
 McCurdy, William B.
 Watson, Edward R.
 Smith, Richard J.
 Roth, Earl F., Jr.
 Frels, Reagan L.
 Wyatt, Richard B.
 Staley, Newell D., Jr.
 Herrin, William M., Jr.
 Gibney, Jesse L., Jr.
 Bacauskas, Withhold J.
 Monti, Anthony A.
 Wehrle, Robert E.
 Corvi, Joseph A.

*Hedges, Manuel H. L.
 Preston, Leonard T., Jr.
 *Larsen, Erik
 Moody, James D.
 *Dotson, Thomas E.
 *Griggs, Charles E.
 *Popok, Charles S.
 *Jacobs, Phillip M.
 *Worden, Peter R.
 *Barry, Lloyd W.
 *Smith, William R.
 *Miller, James E.
 *Cooney, Thomas D.
 *Janz, Edward P.
 *Spreier, Richard P.
 *Conway, Richard C.
 *Skinner, Wilbur E.
 *Derickson, Neal L.
 *Webb, Donald E.
 *Robinson, Charles D.
 *Pratt, George E.
 *Robertson, Thomas E.
 Nelson, Herbert E.
 Pafford, Billy E.
 Plant, Robert
 *Daniels, Charles E., Jr.
 *Yanochik, Walter N.
 Hull, Robert R.
 *Schofield, Harold
 Evans, George G., Jr.
 *Manziona, John A., Jr.
 *Habgood, Charles R.
 *Coogan, Richard J.
 Hadden, Don H.
 *Welss, Robert J.
 *Stauch, Victor D., Jr.
 *Bainbridge, Robert L.
 *Plantadosi, Louis J.
 *Sessler, Donald T.
 *Wilson, Paul A., Jr.
 *Holmes, Lyell H.
 Miller, Henry G., Jr.
 *Gash, William J.
 *Nalle, Thomas A., Jr.
 *French, Russell W.
 *Spratt, David N.
 *Spred, Thomas S.
 Sells, Jimmy D., Jr.
 *Nelbach, Arthur A., Jr.
 *Nieland, Paul F.
 *Graham, Frank E.
 *Curry, Kenneth D., Jr.
 *Cassidy, Gerald W.
 *Sanders, Albert L.
 *Koch, John R.
 *Holstead, George N.
 *Emery, Gordon P.
 Baughman, Robert C.
 Elliott, Philip L.
 *Boddy, Howard E.
 *Klinglesmith, Ronald W.
 *Simerly, Calvin F.
 Hutchinson, Franklin G., Jr.
 Sardo, Americo A.
 *Williams, Charles P.
 *Courson, Eugene S.
 *Kettering, Alvah J.
 Emberton, Bruce W.
 Henson, Edwin B., Jr.
 *Zimmerman, Karl A., II
 *McNeilis, James F.
 Woeckener, Robert J.
 *Pentecost, Thomas J.
 *Oliver, John P.
 *Dale, Denver T., III
 *Gregorcyk, Joe L.
 McDonald, Charles J., Jr.
 *Parker, Charles E.
 *Shubert, James D.
 *Shoemaker, Franklin R.
 *Reid, Robert J.
 *Lafser, Raymond C.
 Bair, Harry H.
 *Jamison, Russell E.
 *Wood, Richard F.
 *Nulty, William H.
 *Cady, Michael P.
 *Overcash, Bobbie G.
 *Helster, Theodore A.
 *Boone, William
 Johnson, Richard J.
 *Bustamante, Miguel E., Jr.
 *Dodds, William E.
 Waters, Robert T.
 *Anderson, Donald C.
 *Black, Carl E. R.
 *MacFarlan, Cornelius W.
 *Leighty, Merle R., Jr.
 Petroff, Richard
 *Leavitt, James E. C., Jr.
 *Cardwell, Ronald E.
 *Andrew, Thomas C., Jr.
 *Bailey, George N., Jr.
 Jones, Homer P.
 *Ondrako, Stephen Jr.
 *Robson, Jon R.
 Scarborough, Kenneth L.
 *Moore, Robert H.
 *Berry, Fred H., Jr.
 *Brubaker, Ralph E.
 *Gahagan, James S.
 Throgmorton, James R.
 Samaras, Peter N.
 Schilhab, Eugene E.
 *Monteau, Hubert A.
 *Jupp, Walter A.
 *Birzer, Edward A.
 Tye, Charles
 *Mills, Harry L.
 *Symm, Bernice M.
 Crittenden, Jerry J. S.
 *Nichols, John T.
 *Brandenhorst, John D.
 *Isbell, Will D.
 *McMahon, George F., Jr.
 Holcomb, Charles E.
 *Guttmerson, Harold L.
 *Anderson, James E.
 *Bieger, Donald C.
 Chapman, Ralph L.
 *Cole, Jack L.
 *Cassidy, Brendan J.
 Brown, Earl E.
 *Page, James E.
 *Ramsey, Lonnie E.
 *Johnston, Carl B.
 *Harrell, James T., III
 *Roberts, John W.
 *Pitman, Charles H.
 Boemerman, George F.
 *Hintz, Gary W.
 Bergman, Arthur A.
 Henry, Charles A.
 *Phifer, David W.
 Beers, Thomas G.
 *Green, James R.
 Webb, Bruce D.
 *Frandsen, Jerald L.
 *Nelson, Jack P.
 *Stewart, Arthur L., Jr.
 *Horn, Denis R.
 *Barry, John A.
 Yeckel, Donald G.
 *Krazberger, Billy D.
 Coleman, George F.
 *Sheehan, James F.
 *Gaboury, Laurence E.
 *Bouzalez, John C.
 *Bloomer, William A.

*Foreman, Clarence D.
 *Cox, James M.
 Cranford, James O.
 *Eggers, Robert F.
 Steffey, Richard G.
 *Leach, George H.
 *Ivy, Henry C., Jr.
 *King, Robert D.
 Foley, William M.
 *Abel, Gerald G.
 *Shunkey, William P., Jr.
 *Mack, Jack A.
 *Crampton, Ervin J.
 *Browne, Desmond F.
 Young, David L.
 *Cooper, James L.
 Wieler, Eric H.
 *Macha, Benjamin E.
 Vanous, Fredric J.
 Blalock, Ira, Jr.
 Kandra, Michael D.
 *Whitman, Fred T.
 *Arman, Phillip T.
 *Weir, Robert K.
 Valentini, Mario S.
 *Lockie, John E.
 *Crawford, John D.
 *Stevenson, Craig H.
 Widener, William W.
 Lewis, Ernest P., Jr.
 Scoloro, Leo J., Jr.
 *Edwards, Myrddyn E.
 *VanHemert, Willem
 *Solazzo, Vito M.
 *Liedel, Arthur J.
 *Bollard, George J.
 *LeBrun, Robert A.
 *Fahrl, Leonard W.
 Scott, Roger F. Jr.
 *Rust, Barry P.
 *Oaks, Charles W.
 *White, Francis V., Jr.
 *Roberts, Stanton H., Jr.
 *Bailey, Richard A.
 *Greene, Wallace M., III
 Newton, Haril W.
 *Lee, Arthur E.
 *Carr, Richard W.
 *Way, John D.
 Townsend, David C.
 *Doran, Edwin J.
 *Noble, Joe B.
 *Clauretje, David M.
 Hawthorne, Richard W.
 *McElroy, Howard M.
 Buxton, John S. W.
 Slack, Paul D.
 Kerr, Hugh T.
 Franklin, Donald H.
 Stewart, James T., Jr.
 Smith, Rodgers T.
 Bradley, Robert L.
 Jacks, Glenn G.
 Lapham, Thomas J.
 Knuebel, Kenneth P.
 Robertson, Richard S.
 Christy, Howard A.
 Masters, James E.
 Pauley, Donald C.
 Carl, Randall C.
 Biel, Richard K.
 Odom, David L.
 Frucci, Allen L.
 Jones, George E.
 Murty, James B.
 Mason, Robert B.
 Clark, Arthur B.
 Hyatt, Richard C.
 Peterson, George E.
 Clarkson, Edward J.
 Swift, James N.
 Morris, McLendon G.
 Martino, Frank W.
 Murray, John D.
 Caldwell, Robert C.
 Avera, B. Lewis, Jr.
 Caputo, Joseph J.
 Mason, Donald G.
 Miller, Donald R.
 Perryman, James M., Jr.
 Sparks, Donald R.
 Burton, John J.
 Marks, Roy M.
 Ridgely, Reginald H., III
 Clute, Morrel G.
 Onslow, Robert C.
 Brown, Allen W., Jr.
 Votaw, Edward F.
 Trehy, Jerome P.
 Read, William T.
 Eller, Franklin P., Jr.
 Obuhanych, David E.
 Edson, Herbert R.
 Rogers, Marcus B.
 Ross, Richard D.
 Kelly, Francis J.
 Berwald, Herbert T., Jr.
 Cuthbert, Edward W.
 Knotts, Joseph B.
 Bennett, David R.
 Grissom, Esta D.
 VonHarten, William R.
 Perron, Edward R.
 Ball, William R.
 Weaver, Calvin G.
 Armstrong, Joseph E.
 Tolleson, Frederic L.
 Curnutt, John R.
 McGarvey, James M.
 DeWitt, John W.
 Eldred, Loran C.
 Fischer, Robert L.
 Gary, John H., III
 Owlett, Fred
 MacNulty, William K., Jr.
 Terhorst, Bernard R.
 McAfee, Carlos K.
 Pifel, Bruce A.
 Cassin, Brendan J.
 Trueblood, Cecil R., Jr.
 Chmelik, James J.
 Clowski, Richard J.
 Milone, Donald E.
 Maitland, Peter R.
 Gannon, Dominick R.
 Camper, Richard M.
 Edwards, Cecil A., Jr.
 Bickel, Donald C.
 Shea, William S.
 Hallden, Richard C.
 Albert, Karl V.
 Schulken, James E.
 Arney, Harold E., Jr.
 Hayes, Charles H.
 Blanchard, Ronald E.
 Esterline, Charles S.
 Forehand, Lorraine L., Jr.
 Hoag, John A.
 Wiedemann, Robert J.
 Poland, James A.
 Coffin, John C.
 McFarland, Thomas G., Jr.
 Sasko, George M., Jr.
 Acey, John B.
 Beery, Richard L.
 Morra, John A.
 Colassard, Barry S.
 Sudduth, Donald E.
 Arnold, William P.
 Gray, John T.
 Stuckey, Robert D.
 Stoy, Charles H.
 Goins, Robert F.
 Valentine, Harry C., Jr.
 Slattery, William P.
 Cowart, James G., Jr.
 Locke, Frederick A.
 Sime, Colben K., Jr.
 Tyler, John T.
 Vail, Alfred L.

Adkins, Mars M.
 Freeman, Bobby H.
 McManaway, James L.
 Janis, Robert V.
 Bowers, Donald V.
 Fisher, Wilfred S.
 Geraghty, Gerald W., Jr.
 Celli, John G.
 Fisher, Albert T.
 Monahan, John P.

Shelton, Jerry L.
 Holdridge, George L.
 Marks, James W.
 Taylor, Charles H., Jr.
 Seeley, Devon C.
 Helms, Samuel H.
 Adams, John A.
 Lowrey, Bill G.
 Sheridan, John J.
 Miller, Robert C.

Flynn, John F.
 Ford, Hadley C., Jr.
 Fowler, John W.
 Frank, George R., Jr.
 Fredricksen, Ronald A.
 Fuller, Irving L., Jr.
 Futrell, John W., Jr.
 Gale, George A.
 Garcia, Robert E.
 Gardner, George L.
 Gast, Harry H., Jr.
 Gatliff, James I.
 Gentry, William R.
 Gerber, Frederic H.
 German, Richard T.
 Gillette, Robert W.
 Gilson, Ronald H.
 Goddard, Charles D.
 Gullett, Victor H.
 Goodwin, William L.
 Gore, Gordon D.
 Gore, Orrin R.
 Gorham, Bradford
 Gould, Walter D.
 Graham, Otis L., Jr.
 Graves, Dean W.
 Grosch, Glenn R.
 Gullett, Charles H.
 Gurtner, James F.
 Gustafson, Richard A.
 Hahn, Paul A.
 Haldi, Donald A.
 Hall, Donald D.
 Hamel, William S.
 Hammack, Tommy R.
 Hammond, George L.
 Hanklin, Ronald M.
 Hanly, Alfred S.
 Harrison, Kenneth P.
 Hart, John G., III
 Hart, Richard T.
 Hart, Robert W., Jr.
 Hatcher, William J., Jr.

Kelly, Michael J.
 Kennedy, Thomas J., Jr.
 Kerce, Herbert M.
 Kiene, Christian F.
 Kindig, Jerry L.
 Kirchner, John A.
 Kitchens, Kenneth E.
 Kline, Franklin J.
 Knapp, James V.
 Knight, Howard E. Jr.
 Kohnen, Hubert
 Koziscek, Donald A.
 Kreppeln, Donald U.
 Kristoff, Basil L.
 Kruthers, James M.
 Landis, John P.
 Lawrence, Robert L.
 Lawson, Charles S.
 Leyer, Robert W.
 Lecky, Timothy B.
 Lee, Barbara J.
 Lee, Peter B.
 Lefevre, Pierre L.
 Leighton, David J.
 Lessard, Paul F.
 Liati, John J.
 Lilla, John M.
 Linford, Claude M.
 Linnemann, John A.
 Lipper, A. Michael
 Lively, Charles M.
 Lloyd, Charles F.
 Loe, Gerald E.
 Long, Basil M.
 Lopresti, Phillip A.
 Lougheed, Thomas P.
 Lovejoy, Hugh M.
 Lowe, Thomas F.
 Lucas, Robert G.
 Lutes, William R.
 Mabry, David R.
 Machenberg, Donald E.
 Mackie, Carter G.
 Maguire, James F., Jr.
 Manwarring, Charles L.
 Manzo, Joseph V.
 Marada, Joseph P.
 Mardick, Max L.
 Marsden, Richard W.
 Marsh, John O.
 Martin, David R.
 Martin, Donald D.
 Mason, Benjamin J.
 Maxwell, John A.
 May, Jacob T.
 McCAlexander, Donald E.

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:

Cox, Martha A.
 Land, Florence E.
 Wallis, Jane L.
 Pruett, Margaret R.
 Olds, Dorothy A.

Colmer, Patricia A.
 Gifford, Shirley A.
 Pinney, Claire A.
 Twilley, Patsy 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:

Adams, Richard J.
 Ades, Robert E., III
 Airola, John B.
 Allen, Earl R.
 Allworth, Norman D.
 Altman, James L.
 Amidon, Alton L.
 Andrews, Burk
 Andrews, Robert H.
 Angus, Thomas P.
 Arnold, Roy F.
 Augustine, Charles A.
 Babbitt, Robert R.
 Baer, John H.
 Bailey, David B.
 Baker, Daryl E.
 Baker, Owen C.
 Bancroft, Robert E.
 Barney, Kline P., Jr.
 Barutio, William H.
 Bateman, Kent C.
 Bates, William S.
 Batson, Herman D.
 Baulch, Ernest F.
 Beans, James D.
 Beaty, William D.
 Beck, Jerome L.
 Bell, Francis W.
 Benjamin, William D.
 Benton, Bert D., Jr.
 Berry, Eugene A.
 Binns, Donald R.
 Black, Frank R.
 Black, Robert M.
 Blaul, Daniel J.
 Bloodworth, John M.
 Bond, William H., Jr.
 Borland, Joseph P.
 Boutton, Jerry D.
 Brennan, Gene E.
 Bridges, Larry W.
 Brooks, Robert P.
 Brown, Donald G.
 Brown, Gordon R.
 Browne, Randolph M., III

Cassity, James E.
 Cate, Bradley F.
 Cockeril, Robert C.
 Cerasoli, James R.
 Cerreta, Michael D., Jr.
 Champlin, Jimmy C.
 Chandler, James R. F.
 Chelius, Carl R.
 Chenault, Richard F.
 Chwatek, Walter T.
 Cisewski, Fred L.
 Clapp, Wiley M., Jr.
 Clark, Gordon M.
 Clark, John W.
 Clark, Richard W.
 Coakley, Paul F.
 Cobb, Jere B.
 Cole, Paul M.
 Conaty, Donald B.
 Condon, Edward A., Jr.
 Cooper, John C., Jr.
 Corr, Edwin G.
 Corr, Ethelbert L., Jr.
 Corrigan, Francis M.
 Crabtree, Robert A.
 Craig, Eric W. S.
 Crouch, Logan A.
 Croy, Stanley R.
 Dahlquist, Martin J.
 Dasch, Robert D.
 Davidson, James U.
 Davis, Robert D.
 Davison, Hollis E.
 Day, Marilyn F.
 Dayton, Valerie M.
 Dearth, Wayne R.
 Dobrowski, William D.

Brownlee, Gordon D.
 Bruce, Robert C.
 Buckley, Edward A.
 Buckley, John C., Jr.
 Bugbee, James F.
 Bullard, Donald E.
 Burch, Gene P.
 Burchard, Jerome C.
 Burnes, Alan J.
 Burns, Mervyn J.
 Busby, Marlon G.
 Butler, John W.
 Byrnes, Joseph B.
 Caccivio, James C.
 Canova, James H.
 Carboni, Joseph L.
 Carew, Frederick R., Jr.
 Carpenter, Charles L., Jr.

Dodd, Edward L.
 Doman, Tom R.
 Doyle, Cyril W.
 Drake, Clancy G.
 Drost, Ronald S.
 Duggan, Donovan F.
 Dunn, John L.
 Duval, Robert C.
 Easley, Jon T.
 Eastin, Ray F.
 Eddins, James C.
 Edwards, Charles S.
 Ellis, Gerald L.
 Ellison, George V.
 English, John P.
 Ernst, Edward H.
 Esau, Richard H., Jr.
 Evans, Emory S.
 Fairbanks, Edward J.
 Farber, James F.
 Fassler, Gerald D.
 Faust, Frank B., Jr.
 Firststahl, Vernon E.
 Fitts, William D., III
 Fitzgerald, Dennis C.
 Fitzgerald, Stanley G.
 Flattery, Paul C.

Haupt, Hans S.
 Haven, Thomas W.
 Haverkamp, Robert E.
 Hayden, Louis H., Jr.
 Heiden, Charles H.
 Henry, Norman E.
 Hicks, Donald L.
 Hines, David R.
 Hoar, Joseph P.
 Hoff, Robert M.
 Hoffman, Marvin E.
 Hollabaugh, Jon D.
 Hooper, Robert C., Jr.
 Hornback, Bert G.
 Houchin, Gerald R.
 House, David W.
 Howard, Medford W., Jr.

McCoy, James J., Jr.
 McCracker, James N.
 McCrindle, Ronald B.
 McCordman, Leroy D., Jr.
 McGee, David O.
 McGinn, James A.
 McIlhenny, John E.
 McIntyre, David S.
 McLennan, Charles C.
 McMahan, Bernard
 McManus, John F.
 McMillan, Colin R.
 McSweeney, Harold R.
 McTighe, Michael J.
 McWilliams, James P., Jr.
 Meador, James G.
 Merritt, Richard O.
 Mikulecky, Donald C.
 Miller, John G.
 Miller, Justus K.
 Miller, Ralph D.
 Mixson, Joseph G.
 Monteth, Joseph W., Jr.
 Moore, Brian D.
 Moore, Wilbur N., Jr.
 Morgan, Louis L.
 Morris, Donald L.
 Mount, Fred H.
 Mullally, Daniel E., Jr.
 Mundy, Carl E., Jr.

Huff, Emmett S., Jr.
 Hunt, Richard V.
 Ingels, Larry T.
 Inglis, Angelo M.
 Irwin, William R.
 James, Gerald D.
 James, Robert L.
 Jensen, Redmond R.
 Jensen, Robert G.
 Jessup, William B.
 Johansen, Peter J.
 Johnson, Edward T., Jr.
 Johnson, Mary Ann
 Johnson, Richard R.
 Johnson, Theodore C., Jr.
 Johnston, Gordon R.
 Jones, Allan E.
 Jones, Duncan H.
 Jones, Richard O.
 Jones, Stanley E.
 Joy, Jim R.
 Junger, Frank
 Jurecka, James R.
 Kahn, Paul F.
 Kauffman, Francis M.
 Keeney, Robert
 Kellett, Morris C.

- Murphy, Gerald P.
Murphy, Irene M.
Murray, Ronald L.
Murray, William B.
Napheys, Benjamin F.
- III
Neal, Robert G., Jr.
Nelson, Harold M.
Neumann, Peter F.
Newton, John S.
Norton, James C.
Nowak, Andrew N.
Oates, Richard H.
O'Brien, Paul M., Jr.
O'Donnell, John W.
Ohman, James H.
Olf, Nelson M.
O'Rourke, John F.
Orr, James W.
Orth, Allan J.
Ossenfort, Richard C.
Osterman, Joseph V., Jr.
Pare, David F.
Parrish, Lionel J.
Patterson, Roy A., Jr.
Peavey, John T.
Peterson, Jerry D.
Peterson, William P.
Phillips, John E.
Philon, Robert H.
Pikel, John J., Jr.
Piper, Earl S., Jr.
Pitt, Albert
Pollock, John C.
Prescott, George S.
Price, Allen I., Jr.
Putnam, Samuel G., Jr.
Pyne, Richard S.
Raiselis, Donald R.
Ram, Cornelius H.
Ramzel, David R.
Reams, Radford M., III
Redding, William F., Jr.
Revell, Joseph E.
Ridge, Paul E.
Rilling, David S.
Ritchie, Robert D.
Robertson, Olin J.
Robertson, James Y.
Robillard, George N., Jr.
Robinson, Frederick J.
Robinson, Lucien C.
Rodenbach, William J.
Rodriguez, Evelyn J.
Rogers, Jack J.
Rogers, Robert P.
Roush, Paul E.
Royer, James E., Jr.
Ruck, Thomas L.
Rule, Julius M., III
Rushin, Robert K.
Rutherford, Robert E.
Samsonoff, Ivan K. T.
Samuelson, Conrad J.
Sanderford, James H.
Sargent, Richard H.
Sattolo, Arthur J.
Saye, Dicky A.
Shroeder, Clifford
Schultz, Joseph P.
Schuppe, Robert H.
Schwaninger, Marvin E.
Searby, Frederick W.
Sellers, Wiley J.
Senik, John P.
Seymour, Kenneth F.
Shaw, Philip G.
Shaw, Robert W.
Shearer, William L.
Shepard, Robert B., Jr.
Sheppard, Thomas F.
Sheridan, Michael K.
Silhanek, David K.
Simmons, Roger E.
Sindelar, Robert L.
Sistrunk, Francis
Smalley, David P.
- Smart, Robert H.
Smeltzer, Gareth W.
Smiley, James B.
Smith, Staley L.
Smith, Vea J.
Smith, William W.
Snyder, Brock R.
Soomre, Raoul
Sorenson, Dwight T.
Spaulding, Dorsey L.
Spivey, Lloyd G., Jr.
Squillace, Gaetano F.
Stevens, Carl M.
Stevens, Robert C.
Stonum, Burl V.
Stowe, Edward L.
Strausser, Warren J.
Streitman, Henry W.
- III
Strickland, William C.
Stringer, Anthony E.
Stubbs, Charles S.
Stuhre, Walter A., Jr.
Sullivan, William L.
Sullivan, John C.
Swartwood, Robert E., Jr.
Sweeney, James R.
Swift, Richard F.
Teague, Marjorie L.
Tebbe, Carl G., Jr.
Thelen, John F.
Thomas, Carl E.
Thompson, Wayne D.
Thorp, Joseph C.
Tiernan, William H. J.
Tirschfeld, William J.
Tivnan, John M.
Townsend, Bruce E.
Toxie, Paul G.
Treadwell, Russell P.
Tricca, Chester J.
Tricpa, Samuel M.
Trower, William P.
Trowsdale, Annie M.
Turchinsky, Andrew
Vazquez, Pedro R.
Vogt, John S.
Waggener, Ronald W.
Waibel, Leonard C.
Walker, James E.
Wall, Caleb N.
Warren, George F.
Waterbury, Mark H.
- III
Webb, Richard J.
Wehrle, William K., Jr.
Wells, Harry E.
Wells, Richard C.
Wells, Samuel F., Jr.
Wescott, William J.
Westmoreland, James H.
White, Edward A.
White, Francis V., Jr.
Wilde, Hugh L.
Williams, Larry R.
Williams, Benjamin D.
- III
Williams, Morris M.
Williamson, Charles P.
Wilson, Douglas N.
Winglass, Robert J.
Witzmann, Phillip A., Jr.
Wright, David H.
Wuerch, George P.
Wulff, Fred A. III
Wuthrich, John R.
Young, William D., Jr.
Anderson, Hugh E.
Andreas, Ronald C.
Back, Vladimir H.
Black, Harry P.
Brown, Charles W.
Brutcher, Samuel P.
Cantrell, Robert L.
Carrigan, David H.
Clayes, Alfred I., Jr.
Connolly, Richard P.
- Cooper, John G.
Cronkite, Charles L.
Davis, Gary A.
Dawson, James P.
Deitrick, Roger E.
Dolan, John J.
Ekholm, Wallace H. Jr.
Gilgoria, Thomas J.
Goodman, Robert B.
Griffay, Donnie M.
Grimshaw, James E.
Harnden, Milton D.
Haych, Everard E.
Hinkel, John B.
Hoffman, Richard C.
Howe, Edward L., Jr.
Keathley, Jesse N.
Kemp, Gerald G.
Krueger, Stanley P.
Layman, Phillip B.
Lewis, Dale E.
Mason, John L. H., Jr.
Millhouse, Timothy J.
Whipple, Lawrence A.
Morgan, John E.
- 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:
- Abington, Richard C.
Adams, Joe C.
Allen, John S., Jr.
Ammon, Ray D.
Amsler, John H.
*Anthis, Bobby G.
Archambault, Arthur E., Jr.
Armstrong, Reginald E.
Babbs, Kenneth J.
Baggett, Charles A.
Baker, Donald S.
Banks, Charles G., Jr.
Bean, Gary W.
Bearce, Larned V.
Behymer, Lynn A.
Bernotas, Alphonse A.
Bickley, Leroy A.
Bienvenu, Charles T., Jr.
Bienvenu, Wayne J.
Bizzano, Joseph D., Jr.
Black, Samuel E.
Bledsoe, Leard B., Jr.
Bock, Philip H.
Boltz, Harry W.
*Booth, Francis D.
Bottom, Earle D., Jr.
*Bown, Rodney L.
Boyce, Edward H., Jr.
Braman, George H., Jr.
Branner, William H., Jr.
Breth, Frank J.
Brinkley, Edward C., Jr.
Brown, Bruce G.
Brown, Dwight E.
Brown, James H.
Brown, Jimmy L.
*Bucknam, Howard V.
Burnett, Leslie D.
Burns, Edmund B. R.
Burt, Robert N.
Bush, Charles A.
Calhoun, David H.
Calteaux, John A.
Capin, Frank L.
Carnes, Robert A.
Carr, Donald R.
Carroll, Herman G., Jr.
Carter, Robert S.
Cashwell, Richard G.
Cassidy, Lawrence M.
Chambers, Francis X., Jr.
Chapla, Daniel B.
Christensen, Gary E.
Clarence, Donald L.
- O'Mahoney, Terrence P.
Oren, Ralph B.
Psaros, George C.
Pulcheon, Jack H.
Raditch, John T.
Ridings, William H.
Root, Roland W.
Downing, Glenn H.
Rinehart, Benny D.
Sahaydak, Edwin
Simon, Clyde C.
Skinner, Barry F.
Skinner, James L.
Sparks, Kenneth R.
Spauldings, Jerry L.
Stofer, John M.
Stroman, Herbert F.
Uhlenhake, Dale J.
Watson, John L.
Wehrle, William K., Jr.
Jr.
Jennings, James W.
Johnson, Charles M.
Johnson, David C.
Johnson, Richard A.
Johnson, Robert E.
Johnston, Clyde J.
Kappelman, Charles W.
*Keating, Daniel J., Jr.
Keiser, Gordon W.
Kemper, David L.
Kempf, Donald G., Jr.
Kiely, Denis J., Jr.
Kilday, John J.
Knief, John H.
Koester, Alfred K.
Koury, Victor A.
Kruger, Alfred L.
Kurtz, Patrick T.
Lain, Bobby D.
Lamar, Lewis W.
Lannes, William J., III
Larowe, William C.
Laumbach, Dallas D.
Lavan, Ray E., Jr.
Lee, Thomas A., Jr.
Legro, Stanley W.
Lemmel, Kenneth G.
Lennartz, Francis J., IV
Lewandowski, James H.
Lewis, John W.
Liitschwager, Robert C.
Ling, Harry A., II
Losee, Ronald M.
Lovett, William D.
Lowe, Robert E.
Lyons, Perry D., Jr.
MacEachin, Douglas J.
Madden, Richard J.
*Magee, James T., Jr.
Maney, David A.
Marks, Anthony M.
Marr, David G.
Maxwell, John A.
McCarthy, John M.
McFarlane, Robert C.
*McGuire, James S.
McLelland, Donald R.
McMinn, Wilbur C., Jr.
McRoberts, James C.
Meehan, John L.
Mecharg, Ben A.
Menning, Frederick H., Jr.
Messerschmidt, Donald B.
Metry, Robert A.
Mikkelson, Philip C.
Miskow, Kenneth P.
Mollineaux, Joseph F., Jr.
Monaghan, Thomas C.
Monroe, Jerry W.
Moore, William S., Jr.
- Halbert, Robert O.
Hanle, Ray L., Jr.
Hawkins, Ronald H.
Heffley, Henry S., Jr.
Heginbotham, Stanley J.
Henderson, David H.
Hicks, Harold D.
Hokom, Robert A.
Horsfall, Richard S.
*House, Edward L., Jr.
Hoynes, Edward J.
Huber, Thomas P.
Huddy, Norman W., Jr.
*Huffcut, William H., II
Hunnicut, John E.
Hyatt, Wayne R.
Iversen, Kenneth M.
Jenkins, Hulen F.
Jenkins, Raymond S., Jr.
Jennings, James W.
Johnson, Charles M.
Johnson, David C.
Johnson, Richard A.
Johnson, Robert E.
Johnston, Clyde J.
Kappelman, Charles W.
*Keating, Daniel J., Jr.
Keiser, Gordon W.
Kemper, David L.
Kempf, Donald G., Jr.
Kiely, Denis J., Jr.
Kilday, John J.
Knief, John H.
Koester, Alfred K.
Koury, Victor A.
Kruger, Alfred L.
Kurtz, Patrick T.
Lain, Bobby D.
Lamar, Lewis W.
Lannes, William J., III
Larowe, William C.
Laumbach, Dallas D.
Lavan, Ray E., Jr.
Lee, Thomas A., Jr.
Legro, Stanley W.
Lemmel, Kenneth G.
Lennartz, Francis J., IV
Lewandowski, James H.
Lewis, John W.
Liitschwager, Robert C.
Ling, Harry A., II
Losee, Ronald M.
Lovett, William D.
Lowe, Robert E.
Lyons, Perry D., Jr.
MacEachin, Douglas J.
Madden, Richard J.
*Magee, James T., Jr.
Maney, David A.
Marks, Anthony M.
Marr, David G.
Maxwell, John A.
McCarthy, John M.
McFarlane, Robert C.
*McGuire, James S.
McLelland, Donald R.
McMinn, Wilbur C., Jr.
McRoberts, James C.
Meehan, John L.
Mecharg, Ben A.
Menning, Frederick H., Jr.
Messerschmidt, Donald B.
Metry, Robert A.
Mikkelson, Philip C.
Miskow, Kenneth P.
Mollineaux, Joseph F., Jr.
Monaghan, Thomas C.
Monroe, Jerry W.
Moore, William S., Jr.
- Moran, John B.
Morgan, Harcourt A., III
Morris, Maynard R.
Morris, Robert S., Jr.
Murphy, John T.
Nash, William A.
Navioux, Jacques C.
Neville, William H.
Nevins, Gary R.
Norton, Gary D.
Notboom, Kenneth W.
*Oravits, Joseph J.
Osgood, Jonathan K.
Ostermann, George A.
Parker, Larry E.
*Patrick, Jimmy L.
Paulson, Raymond C.
Phelan, Leo H., III
Phillips, Jack W.
Pitman, Ralford L.
Platt, John C., III
*Powell, Donald A.
Proctor, James M., III
*Prewitt, Robert C.
*Ramsay, Charles J.
Rector, Edwin B.
Reed, Amos R.
Reed, Gerald D.
Richards, Tommy J.
Rider, James W.
Rietman, Jan D.
Rindfleisch, Jon A.
Roberts, Albert J., III
Roitstad, Lawrence A.
Roof, Douglas P.
Rucksdahl, Rex N.
Saenz, Ramiro
Sallstrom, Duane M.
Sapp, John W., IV
Sarvi, Alfred E.
Schon, Peter C.
Schrader, Daniel W.
Searle, Robert E.
Selutto, William H.
Selby, Mack D.
Severs, Hugh E., II
Shimota, John E.
Shirreffs, John J., Jr.
Shropshire, Jack C.
Shutter, David V. A.
Simmons, Gary
Sisson, Winfield W.
Skellenger, James R.
Smith, Lynn A.
Southard, Frank L.
*Spence, Jack R.
*Sperry, Charles B.
Stamand, Norman
Stanford, George R.
Stanton, James E.
*Steffen, Allan J.
*Stevenson, Samuel H.
Sockwell, John E.
St. Pierre, Glen S.
Swingen, Ronald E.
Taggart, Thomas M.
Tammaro, Richard J.
Taylor, Zelma L., Jr.
Thomas, Dudley E., Jr.
Thomas, Henry E., IV
Thompson, Thomas W.
Thompson, William S., III
Tibbetts, Otis P.
Tinsley, James H.
Topham, James T.
Torinus, John B., Jr.
Towers, Thomas B.
Town, Kenneth R.
Tupper, Jan C.
Turner, Robert A.
Udpye, James M.
Vann, Fredric M.
Vecchio, Ralph J.
Vogt, Robert L.
*Vorreger, Richard W.
Walker, Robert F.
*Wall, Melvin N.

Ward, Michael J.
Warman, Kenneth E., Jr.
Warren, David D.
Weber, Edward M.
Weida, George A. F.
Whelan, James E.
*Whipple, Oliver M.
Wilke, Martin E. P.
Williams, John R., Jr.
Williams, Wayne S.
Winmore, Winfield S., II

Windolf, John A.
*Wogan, Christopher M.
Wolk, Charles J., Jr.
Wollard, David A.
Wolpert, Richard J.
Wood, Mack E., Jr.
Woods, Richard M.
Wright, Grant D.
Wright, Wilton

Parretti, Lawrence
Clay, Robert L.
Wells, Marcus D.
Hill, William J. D.
Magrath, Eric
Parker, George R., Jr.
Durham, George D., Jr.
Swearngen, Thomas F.
Fleming, Raymond R.
Noonkester, Henry E.
Jones, Samuel J.

Angll, Thomas
Parsons, Franklin R.
Johnson, Stephen J., Jr.
Powell, Richard T., Jr.
Ponstingel, August J.
Gleim, Earl C.
Smith, Arnold H.
Johnson, Harold E., Jr.
Zimmerman, Norbert
A.
McIntyre, Alice

Grabowsky, Leon
Griber, Peter A. M.
Griffing, Charles W.
*Gruber, Richard D.
Guillory, Troy T.
Gundlach, William
Gustafiero, Joseph F.
Guy, Robert S.
Hackett, James E., Jr.
Hadden, Mayo A., Jr.
Hailey, Robert
Haller, Morris E.
Harding, William T.
Hardy, Lewis R., Jr.
Harrell, Robert B.
Harrison, Edward W.
Harrold, Clay
Hatch, William N.
*Hawes, George M.
Hickman, Howard H., Jr.

*MacGregor, Stephen H., Jr.
Macklin, Robert D.
Marquardt, Richard C.
Marshall, James M.
Mason, Frank V.
Mayer, Lucas B.
Mayher, John R.
McCormick, Thomas E., Jr.
McDonald, Maxwell
"D"
*McEntire, Paul W.
McIntosh, David M.
McKee, John R.
McLaughlin, Bernard
McNulty, Willard J.
McQuown, Wymard B., Jr.

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:

Bormann, William P.
Floyd, Wayne E.
Glovingo, Salvador
Thyring, Arthur J.
Oliver, William M.
Aldridge, Jack B.
Cole, Phillip J.
Horstmann, Theodore
Kuchler, Lester W.
Christensen, Jack R.
Chapin, Charles H., Jr.
Edmunds, Merritt S.
Farris, William D.
Gryder, Kenneth W.
Hajtun, Paul
Baxter, Monta G.
Lemolue, Levy P.
Blalack, Robert L.
Vickery, Wallace E.
Mervish, Nathan
Light, Paul L.
Davis, Harold R.
Calcagno, Martin J.
Frey, Eugene C.
Allen, John H., Jr.
Amend, Robert G.
Head, Samuel
Jensen, Donald L.
Sedinger, James P.
Lockaby, Prince L.
Ryan, James E.
Degener, Walter E.
Young, Henry H.
Madore, Norman C.

Cumiskey, Francis P.
Millar, Stanley G.
Cole, James E.
Slagle, John W.
Wilkinson, Henry E.
Burt, Floyd R.
Dryden, Weldon J.
Fergash, Edward M.
Gustafson, Oscar D.
Kunkle, Frank P., Jr.
Candler, Orville G., Jr.
Miller, George H.
Montgomery, Benton R., Jr.
Moog, Carl W.
Oidenburg, Forrest A.
Bourbeau, Richard T.
Berling, Raymond R.
Sleger, Joseph, Jr.
Locke, Orville C.
Gerard, Louis E., Jr.
Pullen, George D., Jr.
Armstrong, Leonard O.
Post, Robert L.
Jablonski, Raymond C.
Edmondson, Phillip A.
Niekowal, Michael J.
Pike, Earl A.
Kouba, Joseph
Garvey, James M.
Johnson, Roy M.
Stewart, Robert F.
Green, Harold A.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Adams, John P.
*Allen, Hartsel D.
Alley, Charles J.
Anderson, Elmer D.
Anderson, Roy G.
Anderson, William R.
Andrews, Clyde C.
Andrews, Thomas L., Jr.
Auman, Forrester C.
Bacon, Schuyler W.
Baker, Carl S.
Balaban, Stephen F.
Ball, Thomas J.
Bangs, Louis L.
Barackman, Bruce M.
Barnhart, Robert E.
Bassett, Henry B.
Bauser, Edward J.
Baxter, Robert J.
Beauchamp, Ernest M.
Bellis, Charles A.
Benton, Burgin "L"
Bikle, Burton L.
Bjornson, Gordon B.
Blandin, Victor A.
Borden, Paul F.
Bowell, John H.
Bowen, John S.
Boyle, John E., Jr.
Bradway, William S., Jr.
Brandt, George E., Jr.
Brines, George R.
Brinn, Rufus T.
Brittin, Burdick H.
Brooks, Sidney
Brown, Gordon J.
*Bryan, William C.
Byrant, James S.
Bunn, Giles F., Jr.
Burley, Thomas G., Jr.
Byrnside, Benjamin C., Jr.
Calland, Robert W.
Calvert, James F.
Campbell, Donald C.
Cappello, Henry J.
Carmichael, Carl
Carney, Gerald F.
*Carpenter, William M.
Carr, Charles H.
Carter, William D.
Chalmers, Norman E.
Chandler, Ralph S.
Christiansen, Arnold R.
*Clark, Robert B.
Clinton, Jack W.
Coats, Robert C.
Cocowitch, Harry M.
Collingwood, John F.
Combs, Paul C.
Compton, Oliver D.
Compton, Raymond F.
*Cone, Davis
Connolly, John M., Jr.
Cook, Ralph E.
Corcoran, William J.
Cornellussen, Steve T.
Costagliola, Francesco

LINE

Cowart, Andrew H.
Cox, Harry C.
*Coyle, James J.
Cramp, Kenneth W.
Crawford, Joseph W., Jr.
Crockett, David S.
Cross, William H.
Crowe, John W.
Cunnare, Francis H.
Daly, George W.
Damon, Arthur H., Jr.
Daniels, Lowell P.
Darby, Lowell E.
Darrah, Charles A.
Davidson, James J.
Davis, Bernard W.
Davis, Maxey B.
Davoil, Charles D., Jr.
Denegre, Thomas B., Jr.
Dertien, Donald A.
Deventer, Willard W.
Dinneen, John H.
Dolan, John H.
Donahue, John C., II
Donahue, Phillip M.
Douglass, George M.
Drain, Dan T.
Drake, James P.
Dresser, Kenneth R.
Drum, Henry W.
Dzupzyk, Robert R.
Earnest, Albert K.
Eason, Van V., Jr.
Easterling, Henry M.
Edelstein, Sam E., Jr.
*Eder, Willard E.
Edwards, Frederick L., Jr.
Eggen, Arnold W.
Elliott, James B., Jr.
Englander, Felix L.
Engle, Aubrey D.
*Erickson, Henry J., Jr.
Evers, Adelbert R.
Fairchild, Dale E.
Field, Henry C., Jr.
Fleet, John P.
Floyd, Joe H.
*Flynn, David R.
Foltz, Gayle C.
Ford, James A.
Foster, Edward L.
Foster, William M.
Erdmann, Robert F.
Freitag, Robert F.
French, Dana P.
Gallagher, Thomas J., Jr.
Garrett, Ned
Garvey, Richard S.
Gee, Roy P.
Gerry, Duane J.
Gibbs, Harry B.
Glassman, David E.
Gooch, Floyd W., Jr.
Gooding, Robert C.
Gordon, Archer R.
Gorman, Frederick E.

Hildreth James E.
*Hill, Raymond E.
Hirst, William B., Jr.
Hitchcock, John H.
Hodson, Norman D.
Hoffberg, Howard J.
Holm, Stanley R.
Holmes, John L., Jr.
Holmes, Paul L.
Holmes, Wilbur T.
Holmquist, Carl O.
Hopkins, Lewis A.
Horner, Thomas L.
Houser, William D.
Howard, Seth T.
Hunt, Edward R.
Iarrobino, John H.
Ireland, James M.
Issitt, Donald K.
Iverson, Sterling H., Jr.
Jackson, Clifton E.
Jackson, Harry A.
Jackson, Wymen N.
James, Daniel V.
*Jeffrey, Robert E.
Johns, Ruben L.
Johnson, Edward B., Jr.
Jones, Joseph M.
Kalin, Morris I.
Keegan, John P.
*Keehn, Robert H.
Kelly, Charles B.
Kennedy, John E.
Kern, Donald H.
Kiefer, Edwin H.
Kilner, John S., Jr.
King, Jerome H., Jr.
*Kittler, Fred W.
Kittrell, James R.
Knoche, Ernest J.
Knowlton, Negus W.
Kobay, Albert L., Jr.
Koenigsberger, Charles, Jr.
Kooy, Herman P.
Koschuko, Henry M.
Kotsch, William J.
Kroger, Bruce G.
Laforest, Thomas J.
Lane, Stanley H.
Lange, Robert V.
Lanterman, William S., Jr.
LaRocque, Gene R.
LaRoe, Edward T.
Laufl, Bernard J.
Leldel, John S.
*Lee, Norman I., Jr.
Lewis, Allen L.
Lewiston, William A.
Lienhard, Bernard A.
Lloyd, Frederic M., III
Lockett, Lawrence S.
Long, Andrew W., Jr.
Lowe, Grady H.
Luce, William T.
Luehman, Earl A.
Lundgren, Arthur E.
Lyon, Hugh P.

Medley, Russell C.
Melson, Lewis B.
Menge, Robert F.
Merrill, David A.
Michael, Vernon L.
Mildahn, Elwood C.
Miller, Jack A.
*Miller, Robert N.
Milota, Robert F.
Minor, Gerald E.
Minton, Robert B.
Mishan, John E.
Mohr, Edgar V.
Moriarty, Thomas J.
Morrissey, Jack L.
Morton, Albert O.
Muckenthaler, Charles P., Jr.
Myers, Fredrick R.
*Neesse, William G.
Nelms, Kenneth S.
*Nelson, John B.
Neman, Sol
Nichols, Keith G.
Norrington, William E., Jr.
*Norton, Marvin D., Jr.
Norvell, Forrest H., Jr.
Oliver, Ray E.
Oliver, William B.
Olson, Donald K.
O'Neill, Harold J.
Orme, Samuel T.
*Osborne, Manley C.
Osterhoudt, Raymond S.
Ousey, Walter M.
Parisian, Richard W.
Parris, Arthur
*Paulin, William B.
Pease, Forrest A.
Peet, Raymond E.
Pendergrass, James T.
Penfold, Jack R.
Pennoyer, Frederick W., III
Pittman, William R.
Plate, Douglas C.
Plemmons, Arnold G.
Pollard, Eric W.
Porter, Ebenezer F.
*Potter, James A., III
Poulsen, Harold N.
Fugh, Harry M.
Quinn, Charles S., Jr.
Rahill, Gerald W.
Raht, Adolphus G.
Rau, Robert E.
Rawlings, Grover L.
Rayburn, Joseph H., Jr.
Redmayne, Richard B.
Reidy, John J., Jr.
Reitz, Spencer
Rex, Daniel F.
Ricks, Robert B.
Rifenburgh, Edward G.
Riley, George B.
Ring, Eli D.
Roberts, Francis R.
Rodin, Harry C.

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:

Johnson, Brooks, Jr.
Glenka, John M.
Clydesdale, Robert, Jr.
Morrison, George E.
Rasmussen, John H.
Sudduth, Joseph F.
Hall, John C.
Reese, Charles L.
Park, Herbert E.
Jenkins, Clarence E.
Vickerman, Joseph R.
Zimmerman, Edward
L.
Owens, Norman S.
Davis, Kenneth L.
Shelton, Deward E.
Zarkos, Tom A., Jr.
Seaman, George W.
Kelly, Edwin F.
Good, Hubert M.
Flock, Robert E.
Walton, Theodore C.
Joyce, Danna
Jordan, Thomas E.
Strickland, George E.
Yeam, Arden W.
Emerson, Sheldon M.
Nutter, Edward L., Jr.
Doyel, Grant R.
McLeod, Sandy L.
Antoine, George E.
Larkin, Harold E.
Waugh, Clinton C.
Peters, Benjamin F.
Beattie, Clarence R.

Mihalak, Stephen J.
Huffaker, Lionel
Taylor, James R.
Hamlet, Dean L.
Donavan, Samuel H.
McLaughlin, Patrick H.
Costlow, Walter E.
Shultz, James S.
Smith, Albert J.
*Nickell, Chester T.
Halsley, Robert E.
Johnson, Robert W.
Black, Robert M.
Perry, George A.
Foster, George E.
Healey, Philip N., Jr.
Boyd, Ossie A.
Owens, William C.
Fields, John, Jr.
Watson, James O.
Sturgis, Richard O.
Duer, Arthur M., Jr.
Nestor, George R.
Adams, John A.
Exley, Harley H.
Eryks, Leon J.
Clark, Talmadge
Hull, Donald L.
Duerr, Edward J.
Covert, Newton C.
Wood, Edward N.
Myorski, Stephen M.
Harris, Roy K.
Winship, Larry E.

Rood, George H.
Ruefle, William J.
Russell, Allard G.
Sallenger, Asbury H.
Salzer, Herbert L., Jr.
Salzer, Robert S.
Sanborn, Francis R.
Sandor, Edward A.
Santry, Jere J., Jr.
Satterfield, Loys M.
Savker, David R.
Scapa, Jacob
Schalbie, Theodore C.
Scherrer, Carl L.
Schley, John B.
Schmidt, Henry E.
Schwee, William W.
Seith, William
Sessums, Walter M.
Shallenberg, Lowell W.
Shawcorthorn, George
Shear, Harold E.
Shelton, Samuel M.
Shockey, William H.
Showers, Donald M.
Shropshire, Paul H., Jr.
Shults, Roy G.
*Siefert, Jerry R.
Sillberstein, Howard J.
*Simmons, Kenneth G.
Sims, John H.
*Smalzel, Charles W.
Smith, Carl M.
Smith, Coleman H.
Smits, Cornelius J., Jr.
Sorensen, Robert E.
Sotos, George P.
Southard, Pemberton
*Spencer, John C.
Stanziano, Arthur J.
Staring, Merlin H.
Steen, Kenneth
Stetson, Thomas H.
*Steuckert, Julius F.

Stevens, Paul F., Jr.
Stevens, Wynne A., Jr.
Stone, Frank B.
Stonecipher, Elmer T.
Strum, Charles G.
*Swacker, Stewart W.
Swain, Dean H.
Swayne, Charles B.
Sweatt, Robert A.
Sweeney, James B., Jr.
*Swenson, Winford A.
Talbot, Wallace L., Jr.
Tappan, Benjamin
Tenantry, Joseph R.
Terrill, Ralph B.
Terry, John H.
Thomas, Willis L.
Thompson, Joseph E., Jr.
*Todd, Forrest A.
Towle, Barnaby L.
*Trauger, Robert J.
Traynor, Laurence G.
Tripp, Jack H.
Turner, Thomas A.
Tvedt, Joseph A.
Vanderburg, Elden R.
Venne, Antoine W., Jr.
Wallace, John G.
Warns, James T.
Wayne, John B.
Weary, Neil S.
*Weatherwax, John C.
Welch, David F.
Westervelt, John D.
Whatton, James E.
Whitman, William A.
*Wier, John P.
Williams, Clyde A.
Williams, Robert E.
Witten, Charles H.
Wittmann, Narvin O.
Wolfe, Malcolm E.
Wood, Albert H.
Worcester, Benjamin F., II.

Jones, Richard M.
Kahao, Martin J. B.
Knight, Charles L.
Labarre, Carl A.
Lindsay, Peter M.
Linscott, Henry D., Jr.
Lyles, Arromanus C., Jr.
Lynch, James J.
Lyness, Douglas H.
Lyon, Frederick A.
Malloy, John M.
Mann, Arthur W., Jr.
McCarten, George C., Jr.
McCreery, Bernard L.
Peterson, George W., Jr.

Purvis, Theodore B., Jr.
Quinn, Joseph P.
Rainey, Benajah L.
*Rieseberg, Robert W.
Roberts, Leo W.
Sharp, Evert R.
Shea, Leonard E.
Smith, Bert
Smith, Stuart H.
*Spore, James S.
Stern, Theodore S.
Tobias, Robert H.
Vandermaaten, Robert R.
Voegeli, George L.
Williams, Ralph E., Jr.
Williams, Richard A.

Brandenburg, John H.
Bratten, Toria J., Jr.
Brauer, Walter J.
Braun, James F.
Brekke, Trond G.
Brent, Sherman E.
*Brimmer, Frank L.
Britt, Harvey R.
Brocato, Samuel J.
Brogioitti, Bobby C.
Brooks, Laurence G.
Brown, Fred W., Jr.
Brown, John E., Jr.
Brown, LaVerne W., Jr.
Brown, Willis I.
Bryan, Clarence R.
Bryan, Leonard G.
Bryant, Olney J.
Buchanan, Charles S.
Buck, Clarence C., Jr.
Bucknell, Howard, III
Burger, Robert P.
Bush, Thomas A., Jr.
Bussey, Samuel T.
Butler, William S.
*Butz, Frederick S.
Cadenas, Ernest M. M.
Callahan, Robert J.
Callaway, Steven W., Jr.
Callaway, William F.
*Campbell, Donald L.
Caple, Edward S., Jr.
Carlenzoli, Henry
Carpenter, Donald B.
Carpenter, Charles R.
Carrier, Francis A.
Carrier, William, Jr.
Carson, James D.
*Carter, Lester D.
*Catanzarito, Joseph
Chaires, William F.
Chambers, Kenneth W.
Chambliss, Joe "E"
Chapman, Arthur S.
Chapman, John W.
Chappell, John R.
Chesler, Daniel E., III
*Chester, Raymond M.
Chester, William R.
Childress, Howard W.
Christofferson, Edward
A., Jr.
*Churchill, Jack G.
Clancey, Robert J.
*Clark, Eugene F.
Clarke, Robert L.
Clary, Warren "L"
Clements, Daniel C.
Cleveland, Hugh A.
*Cleveland, Jesse S.
Clifford, Frank F., Jr.
Close, Robert A.
Cobb, Jesse B.
Cochrane, Edward L., Jr.
Cockrill, James T.
Coffey, Claude C., Jr.
Cogswell, George W.
Cole, George
Colegrove, Warren R.
Coleman, Edward P.
Collins, John D.
*Collins, Ralph W.
Colton, Joseph
Colvin, Ted H.
Condor, Bernard
Converse, Paul V.
Cook, Charles D.
Cookie, Richard J.
Cooley, Samuel M., Jr.
Cooper, Lloyd F.
Corner, Sheldon L.
*Cornwell, Roy S.
Correia, Frank E.
Coset, Albert W.
Cosgrove, Thomas A.
Coulthard, Robert O.

Cox, John W.
Cox, Lyle A.
Cranney, "W" Loron, Jr.
Crayton, Louis B., Jr.
*Crosby, Edward O.
Cross, Richard E.
Cullen, John P.
Cummins, David E., III
Cunningham, Patrick F.
Curran, Donald C.
Custer, Robert E.
Dalland, Carl A.
Dame, Allen M.
Daniel, Royal T., Jr.
Daubin, Scott C.
Dauer, Frank H.
Davidson, Hubbell Y.
Davis, Charles R.
Davis, Jack E.
Dean, Benjamin H.
Deasy, Charles J.
Dedrick, Walter
DeGroot, Douglas F.
DeLaney, Charles E.
Delany, Walter S., Jr.
Delaware, Joseph L.
Delgado, Robert
*Delly, Daniel B.
Demmler, Charles F.
Derr, Phaon B., Jr.
Dietzen, Walter N., Jr.
Dinwiddle, John M.
Doak, Joseph J., Jr.
Dobbs, Charles E. W.
Donaghy, Charles F.
Donavan, Robert D.
Doolin, Edward H., Jr.
*Drag, Theodore F.
Driscoll, John R.
*Duckett, Edmund D., Jr.
Dunning, Bruce B.
Dunton, Donald D.
*Dutton, John P.
Dzikowski, Richard J.
Eaton, John D.
Eaton, William G., Jr.
Edge, Donald B.
Edmonds, Leroy S.
Edmunds, Francis E.
Ellis, George F., Jr.
Christofferson, Edward
Eppes, George P.
Eriksen, George A.
Ernesti, John H.
Esmiol, Morris A., Jr.
Evans, Kenneth J.
*Evans, Simpson, Jr.
Ewald, Frank W.
Ewing, Robert H.
Faddis, James M.
Fahey, John A.
Fannin, William E.
Farnsworth, William D.
Farrell, Charles S.
Farrell, Crumpton
Farrell, Rollo L., Jr.
Fay, Richard C.
Felchner, William E. H.
Ferrin, Robert W.
Fick, Theodore E.
Fielding, Teddy R.
Findly, Lee B.
Fisher, Dale W.
Fisher, Lowell E.
Fisher, Robert D.
Fisher, Willis M.
Fitch, Lowell F.
Flynn, William J.
*Fogg, Reginald S.
Forbes, Bernard B., Jr.
Ford, John E.
Fortson, Robert M., Jr.
Fowler, William E.
Franck, Herbert A.
Freeman, DeWitt L.
Froyd, George R.
Furtek, Adolph J.

Chaplain Corps

Albrecht, Herber C. W.
McComas, Robert F.
Michaels, Emmett T.
Moorman, Julian P., Jr.
Reaves, James E.

Ricker, Richard W.
Salzer, Oswald B.
Schnurr, Herman J.
Stephenson, Marion O.
*Weise, John W.
Wright, George A.

Civil Engineer Corps

Allegro, Charles
Clampet, William T.
Cooke, Thomas P.
Culp, Dennis K.
Gill, Samuel C., Jr.
Johnson, Henry J.
Maley, William T., Jr.
McFarland, Wilburn J.

Neumann, Arthur C.
*Norcross, William E.
Pinkerton, Richard D.
Raymond, John M., Jr.
Reilly, Charles A., Jr.
Smith, Spencer R.
Sparks, Robert E.
Stevens, Harry, Jr.

Dental Corps

Bernhausen, Elwood R.
Chudzinski, Joseph G.
Enke, Loren F.
Gabrels, Wilton R.
Hillis, Walter G.
Lyon, Harvey W.

Rhobotham, Frank B.
Shepard, John R.
Steinauer, Jerome J.
Stowell, Ralph H.

Medical Service Corps

Holway, Richard T.
Timberlake, Claude V., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Erickson, Ruth A.

The following-named officers of the 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

Adams, Paul A.
Adams, Robert E.
Adams, Will M., Jr.
Adrianse, Homer R.
Aglas, James H.
Alexander, Richard G.
Allen, Charles C.
Allison, John K.
Ambler, Joseph B.
Anania, Vincent J.
Anderson, Charles O.
Anderson, Paul A.
Anderson, Vernon F.
Anson, Henry O., Jr.
Armour, Robert H.
Armstrong, Sam "T", Jr.
Arthur, Russel L.
Atkins, Waldo A.
Atkinson, Aubrey E.
Atkinson, Wilton L.
Aulich, Julian
Austin, Kenneth B.
Bagby, Henry L.
Bain, Edwin C., Jr.
Baker, John T.
*Ball, James L.
Barkley, Paul H.
Barnes, John W.
Barnett, Gordon R.
Barnhart, Robert C., Jr.
Barrett, Ernest R.
Barry, Searle J.
Bascom, Wade R.

Bean, George F.
Beardsley, William J.
Becker, Merlin D.
Behm, Edward W.
Beiler, Peter G.
Bell, Lloyd F.
Bennett, Edgar T.
*Berg, Royal D.
Berry, Robert M.
Berude, John B.
Bess, James O.
Bessac, Norman B.
Birdt, George
Blair, Carvel H.
Blair, Marvin S.
Blakely, Robert G.
Blaylock, Mabry, Jr.
Blum, Howard E.
*Bodnaruk, Andrew
Boldt, Charles H., Jr.
Bolger, Joseph F., Jr.
Bollenbacher, Robert M.
Bonds, Joseph E.
Boney, Bobby E.
Bordelon, Guy P., Jr.
Borlotti, Joseph G.
Boston, Leadore G.
Bowcock, Charles S., Jr.
Bowes, William A.
Bowler, Roland T. E., Jr.
Boyd, Edward A.
Bradley, James F., Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

Anthony, Lynn E.
*Ash, Henry T.
Balsch, Bruce F.
Baker, Howard A.
Benson, Victor G.
Brown, Carleton J.
Brown, Robert H.
Burdle, Joseph S.
Connor, Richard B.
Deas, Thomas C.
Dimmette, Robert M.
Dineen, James R.
Dobbins, Richard F.
Draper, Arthur J.
Dunn, Adolphus W.
Egan, John T., Jr.
Esswein, John G.
Fischella, Rosario A.
*Fleck, Robert L.
Fraser, William E.
Geib, Philip O.
Helgerson, Arthur A.
Hering, Alexander C.
Holmes, Alden V.
Honsik, Cyril J.
Hoopingarner, Newman A.

Howard, John W.
Jones, Jack T., Jr.
Kelley, Kenneth J.
King, Robert L., Jr.
Lemmon, Robert H.
Lewis, Charles W., Jr.
Lewis, Garner L.
Lineberry, William T., Jr.
Loeffler, Robert A.
Mackie, Robert W.
Martin, Richard J.
Matthews, Walter S., Jr.
Meyer, Fredrick W., Jr.
Nauman, Richard D.
Nordstrom, Harry C.
Ricketson, George M.
Robinson, Donald W.
Rogers, Charles E.
Rush, Anthony P.
Schlang, Henry A.
Semmens, James P.
Spicher, Robert W.
Stevenson, Roger
Valusek, Fred A.
VanPetten, George T.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, John P.
Arrighi, Norman L.
Arst, Norton J.
Balch, Richard S.
Beyer, Kenneth M.
Bonnell, Graham C.
Bradley, Rex A.
Brogan, James M.
Campbell, Robert R.
Cartee, James W.
Campbell, Robert R.
Cartee, James W.
Christensen, Don C.
Cooley, Hollis W.
Custer, John D.
Clark, Grover V.
Daray, Jack L., Jr.

Edwards, Robert B.
Evans, Philip W.
Everett, Robert J.
Poster, George S., Jr.
Gay, William W., Jr.
Graham, John W.
Gregg, William B.
Harrison, Frederick D.
Harvey, James E., Jr.
Helsel, Roland A.
Henry, George, Jr.
Hobgood, William W.
Howard, Joseph L.
Hughes, William V.
Jepson, Francis E.

- Gale, Philroy C., Jr.
 Callemore, James G.
 Gambrell, Nelson J.
 Garofalo, Paul C.
 *Gary, Vaughn H.
 Gates, James L.
 *Gatlin, William A.
 Geiger, Anson D.
 Gensert, John R.
 Gilbert, John R.
 Gilchrist, John A.
 Gillooly, John F.
 Gilmore, Allen J.
 Godfrey, Earl F.
 Godshall, Walter H.
 Gohr, Robert B.
 Gore, Frederick S.
 Goulet, Lionel J.
 Graham, Frank W.
 Graham, Ralph E.
 *Greenwood, Thomas E.
 Grey, Valentine
 Griffin, Thomas H.
 Grill, Robert W.
 Gronemann, Carl W., Jr.
 Gumb, Irving T., Jr.
 Hadaway, Donald L.
 Hale, Robert R.
 Halwachs, Alois W.
 Hamilton, Billie C.
 Hamilton, George T.
 Hannifin, Patrick "J"
 Hansen, Jens B.
 *Hanson, Donald M.
 Harper, Wyatt E., Jr.
 Harris, Jack
 Harris, Willie W.
 Harrison, Leo W.
 Hartzel, Harvey C.
 Harvey, James H., Jr.
 Harward, Phillip S.
 Hastings, Edward E., II
 Haugh, Edward M.
 Hayes, Robert S.
 Hayes, Robert V.
 Haylor, William B.
 Heagerty, Harold R.
 Heath, Leroy A.
 Hecker, George M.
 Hefferman, William J. J.
 Held, Robert S.
 Heinze, Arthur D.
 Henley, Nathaniel T.
 Henson, Josiah
 Herman, John S.
 Hermann, Edward P.
 Herrick, Robert W.
 Hertzog, Richard D.
 Hicks, Richard J.
 Hill, John F.
 Hill, Robert D.
 Hilsen, Ralph A.
 Hinkelman, John W., Jr.
 Hinman, Charles R.
 Hobltzell, Charles M.
 Hogsed, Robert A.
 Holmes, Francis M.
 Holmes, Robert A., III
 *Holmgard, Ewald
 Holschuh, Howard W.
 Hooper, James A., Jr.
 Hoover, William H.
 Hopwood, Gordon R.
 Hosler, Ray S., Jr.
 Houck, Richard
 Houghton, Alexander J.
 *Houston, Trumond E.
 Hubbeling, Johan D. W., Jr.
 Hubert, William E.
 Huddleston, Woodrow
 Hudson, William H., Jr.
 Huff, Ralph E.
 Hunter, Clifford E.
 *Hurd, Ernest L., Jr.
- Jobe, James K.
 Johnson, Clayton F.
 Johnson, Gerald M.
 Johnson, John R.
 Johnson, Theodore L.
 Johnston, Harry D.
 Johnston, Phillip D., Jr.
 Jones, Edward D.
 Jones, Roy K., II
 Jortberg, Richard E.
 *Juarez, Robert
 Julian, Alexander, Jr.
 Kallina, John F.
 Karnes, Austin G.
 Kasten, Robert I.
 Kauth, John L., Jr.
 Kays, Robert L.
 Kearns, William E.
 Keating, James H.
 Keeler, William E.
 Keevil, Arthur K.
 Ke'ih, Omar F.
 Kelley, Frederick J.
 Kelly, Merrill E., Jr.
 Kempf, Lawrence A.
 Kennedy, Donald W.
 Kerr, Alex A.
 Kerstein, George E.
 Kidd, John D.
 King, Ernest J., Jr.
 King, Evans P. K.
 King, Nathan H.
 King, Patrick J.
 Kirk, Robert
 Kirkemo, Leland E.
 Kistler, William C.
 Klaessy, Dale S.
 Klaus, Edward L.
 Kleber, Francis T.
 Klein, Harry J.
 Klemawesch, James
 Klindworth, Carl H.
 Klockenkemper, Joseph B. G.
 Knudsen, John T.
 Knudson, Irving H., Jr.
 Koch, Robert A.
 Kole, Carl B.
 Konzen, Joseph J.
 Koppes, Richard L.
 Kribbs, David A., Jr.
 Krolczyk, Stanley P.
 *Kube, George F.
 *Kulig, Raymond A.
 Kurfess, John F.
 *Kushman, Howard B.
 Lake, Kenneth "B"
 LaMar, Burris D.
 Lamartin, Frederick H., Jr.
 Lamb, Harold M.
 Lang, Ralph R.
 Laubach, Luther W. S.
 Loughton, Robert J.
 *Lawrence, Edward J.
 Lea, Malcomb A.
 Leavitt, Eben, Jr.
 Lee, Richard H.
 LeFevre, Adolphe C.
 Legare, Rupert W., Jr.
 Leib, Frederick L.
 Leland, Harley G.
 Lemert, Russell C.
 Leonard, Warren E.
 Leslie, Jene L.
 LeTourneau, Joseph R. E.
 Lewis, David D.
 Lewis, William C.
 Licko, Richard J.
 *Lindler, Charles R., Jr.
 Lipfert, Ralph G.
 Loftin, Edward H., Jr.
 Longfield, John N.
 Longton, David M.
 Longwill, Albert E.
 Lorenz, Samuel, Jr.
 Loveday, John C.
 Lowery, Hugh H.
- Luka, Earl
 Lulu, Michael T.
 Lyons, Thomas W.
 Mackay, Douglas S.
 *Maddock, Edmund J.
 Madson, Rae P.
 Mallon, Richard J.
 Manger, Arthur J.
 Manger, Martin M., Jr.
 Manhart, Raymond J.
 Manherz, Jack M.
 Mansfield, Samuel K.
 Marr, Robert I.
 Marshall, Daniel V., Jr.
 Masica, Eugene M.
 Mason, Hugh C.
 Massey, Joseph P.
 Masters, James C., Jr.
 Matheson, James C.
 Mathwich, Leon E. L.
 Matthes, Harold K.
 May, Robert E.
 McAdams, John K.
 McCaskill, James M.
 McCool, Richard M., Jr.
 McCord, Stanley R.
 McCullough, William F.
 *McDade, Nolan H.
 McDaniel, Hector S.
 McGarry, William J., Jr.
 *McHugh, Richard P.
 McKee, John C.
 McLaughlin, William H., Jr.
 McLean, William O.
 Mercer, Ellsworth O.
 Meredith, Carl E.
 Merrick, John L.
 Merrick, Robert H., Jr.
 Merrill, Clayton W.
 Middleton, Charles H.
 Midgett, Joe L.
 Milhan, Harry L.
 *Miller, David L.
 Miller, John W.
 Miller, Orville H.
 Miller, Robertson L.
 Miller, William W. K., Jr.
 Mills, Terry
 Mitchell, Cleo N., Jr.
 Montgomery, James W.
 Moore, Albert L.
 Moore, Charles K.
 Moore, Jack L.
 Moore, Joseph E., III
 Moore, Robert L.
 Moorer, Joe P.
 Moul, Cornelius F.
 Mulligan, Champ C.
 *Mundt, Clinton H.
 Murphey, Samuel B.
 Murphy, Hugh D.
 Nance, James W.
 Nearman, Leonard M.
 Neilson, Thomas L.
 Nelson, Robert R.
 Nelson, Wayne S.
 Nicholls, Benjamin F.
 *Nichols, John E.
 Nichols, Ramon B., Jr.
 Nickerson, Norval E.
 North, John R.
 Norton, Hassell L.
 Novak, Jerome C.
 Nugent, Floyd C.
 Nuschke, Paul L.
 O'Day, Henry J.
 Oder, Lyle D.
 Olsen, Alfred R., Jr.
 Olson, Fredrick G.
 O'Neil, Warren H.
 O'Neill, John L.
 O'Rourke, Gerald G.
 O'Shea, George A., Jr.
- *Osterholm, Robert E.
 Overman, Dana C., Jr.
 *Padburg, Harry R.
 Padgett, John B., Jr.
 Page, William P.
 Parks, Everett A.
 Pate, Jack A.
 Peed, George P.
 Perkins, Peter R.
 Peters, John V.
 Petersen, Forrest S.
 Peyton, Henry A. R.
 Phillips, Donald M.
 Pitts, Charles R.
 *Plante, Richard J.
 *Powden, James E., Jr.
 Poe, Donald T.
 Poenicke, Charles F., Jr.
 Polk, Mavis X.
 Polk, Thomas H.
 Poorman, Herbert "R"
 Potter, John R.
 Priest, Charles, Jr.
 Prothro, Randell H.
 Prouhet, Clement R.
 Purinton, David F.
 Purkrabek, Paul V.
 Quanstrom, Carl R., Jr.
 *Quitel, Norwald R.
 Quinn, George D., Jr.
 Quinn, Harry T., Jr.
 Racette, Henry J., Jr.
 Radcliffe, Robert J.
 Ragon, George T.
 Rankowski, Charles A.
 Raposa, William C.
 *Rasmussen, Ralph R.
 Rawlings, Frank T., Jr.
 Ray, Glenn E.
 Rayburn, Lawrence M.
 Reeve, Robert W.
 Reid, James A.
 Renaldi, Richard R.
 Rentschler, Alexander K.
 Richards, Donald R.
 Richards, Harold O.
 *Richardson, Kenneth
 Richardson, Guy D.
 Ricinck, Michael D.
 *Rider, Russell D.
 Riley, Horace, Jr.
 Riley, John F.
 Riley, Ralph R.
 Risch, Harry, Jr.
 *Robb, Earl J.
 Roberts, Gerald M.
 Robinson, Rembrandt C.
 Rockoff, Herbert R.
 Rogers, Benjamin C., Jr.
 Roll, Walter D.
 Rooney, George M.
 Rorex, Sam, Jr.
 Roth, Edward F.
 Rumble, Richard E.
 Rush, Max R.
 Rymal, George R.
 Saroch, Emil, Jr.
 Saunders, David M.
 Scambos, Thomas T.
 Scherrer, Robert A.
 Schulz, Quinley R.
 Schwager, Joseph E.
 Schwartz, Matthew J.
 Schwartz, Walter W., Jr.
 Scirlis, Louis G.
 Scott, Julian F.
 Scott, Kenneth W.
 Searles, Philip N.
 Seay, Samuel D.
 Selfridge, Samuel W., Jr.
 Sepper, Frank
 Sette, Lyle H.
- Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
 Trautman, Wilbur O.
 Shelton, Doniphan B. Jr.
 Shepard, Alan B., Jr.
 Traynor, William J.
 Sheppard, Cedric W.
 Tremaine, Mark G.
 Sheppard, William L.
 Trueblood, Harold J.
 Sherman, Robert O.
 Uncles, John F.
 *Sherwood, Charles
 Ursettle, Howard J.
 Shuman, William P., Jr.
 Utengaard, Thomas F.
 VanOrden, Merton D.
 VanOss, Willis B.
 *Vaughan, Elwood
 *Vaughan, Vie J.
 Simpson, William H., Jr.
 Vierregger, William T.
 Vining, Pierre H.
 Vint, Vinton, C.
 Viscardi, Peter W.
 Vissering, Victor M., Jr.
 Squire, Wade R.
 Stalmaker, Will L.
 Stansell, Herman J., Jr.
 Stanton, Robert F.
 Stauffer, Howard C.
 Steele, George P., II
 Steele, Robert D.
 Steers, Lucius E., III
 Stell, Ralph W., Jr.
 Stepanian, George
 Stephens, William E., Jr.
 Stewart, Clifford L.
 Stewart, Hal B.
 Stewart, William S., III
 Stirnweiss, Andrew P., Jr.
 Stout, Graydon T.
 Strong, William W.
 *Stull, John O.
 Sullick, Tom E.
 Sullivan, Robert C.
 *Sutton, Ralph N.
 Swallow, Chandler E., Jr.
 Swank, John A.
 Swensen, Robert A.
 Tarbox, William
 Tartre, Robert J.
 Tate, James D.
 Taylor, Arnett B.
 Taylor, Harold A.
 Taylor, Thaddous M.
 Taylor, Warren
 *Teevan, Charles L.
 Temple, Walter N.
 Thomas, Homer B., Jr.
 Thomas, Warren J.
 Thompson, Arthur E.
 Tierney, Glenn A.
 Tollefson, Leif
- Downey, John J.
 Dykhuizen, Robert F.
 Ebersole, John H.
 Fox, Lay M.
 Guida, Anthony J.
 Hastedt, Robert C.
 Hines, Larry J.
 Humes, James J.
 Ireland, Roger G.
 Jones, Kenneth P., III
 Klein, Chester L., Jr.
 Klein, Martin H.
 Kramer, Scott G.
 Laning, Robert C.
- Medical Corps
 Adams, William C., Jr.
 Austin, Frank H., Jr.
 Bernard, Donald P.
 Blakey, Ernest A.
 Bowers, Jesse A.
 *Browne, Howard S., Jr.
 Cales, Robert J.
 Chandler, Deck E.
 Christiansen, David V.
 Cummings, Ronald A.
 Delaney, Thomas J.
 Dempsey, John J.
 Dinsmore, Harry H.

Lehman, Ross M., Jr.
Linehan, Francis J., Jr.
Lonergan, Walter M.
Pascoe, Delmer J.
Paul, Jed
Sigel, Carter B.
Snyder, William A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, Clayton L.
Aull, Herbert H.
Austin, Charles B.
Balcon, Vaughn O.
*Barton, Alton W.
Bates, Raymond H.
Batterson, Robert E.
Baumann, Wesley O.
Bennett, Keith
Benson, David W.
Bland, Herbert L.
Blandin, Sherman W., Jr.
Blank, Arthur E.
Boylan, Walter J.
Bryson, William L.
Burns, Hugh F. J.
Caldwell, William F.
Cohn, Murry
Creel, Clarence A.
Crosby, Philip
Curtis, James R.
Dale, Oscar N.
Duncan, Henry C.
Dunn, George G.
Ericson, James B.
Gardner, Charles A., Jr.
Geneste, Elmon A., Jr.
Greene, Eugene G.
*Griffin, Cecil L., Jr.
Grinstead, Eugene A., Jr.
Hackenson, Bernard J.
Haddock, William N.
Hart, Samuel S.
Henn, Carl L., Jr.
Herb, James W.
Hightower, James I., Jr.
Hoffman, George P.
Howell, Jesse E.
Jones, Russell A.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Capers, Keen H.
*Metzger, Ernest W.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bannister, John M., Jr.
Graff, Charles W.
Grah, Ralph B., Jr.
Jones, Richard O.
Krikenberger, Custer F., Jr.
Lalor, Foster M., Jr.
Marschall, Albert E.

DENTAL CORPS

*Black, Edwin "R"
Chap, Bernard
DeLautentis, Carlo A.
Didton, Robert W.
*Evans, Joseph R.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Abernathy, Odell S.
Baker, David H.
Ball, Gilbert R.
Bennett, Paul B.
Bing, John H.
*Bodenlos, Leonard J.
Bonnell, Theodore V.
Curtis, Ned B.
Donovan, Harold G.
Edge, Cary O.
Goldenrath, Walter L.

NURSE CORPS

Carlson, Eloise M.
Daughtry, Edna M.
Duwe, Elizabeth M.
Flanagan, Rose A.

Sparks, Henry A.
Speaker, Richard B.
Sweeney, Francis J.
Trummer, Max J.
Watten, Raymond H.
Webb, Martin G., Jr.
White, Neil V.

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abdon, Albert L.
Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackerman, Warren J.
Ackley, Richard T.
Ahles, Raymond W.
Albright, Donald S.
Allen, Richard P.
Allison, Paul
Allman, Richard R.
Ambrose, John E.
Anderson, Lee C.
Anderson, Robert G.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrews, Jack B.
Angleman, Cornell C.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
Armstrong, Robert P.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, Julian M.
Arnold, William S. M.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.
Aumack, Robert F.
Austin, Fuller A.
Axe, John R.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
Baarstad, David E.
Babb, James R.
Babcock, Robert E.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, William C.
Banke, Elmer A.
Barck, Dale E.
Bardecki, Frank J.
Bare, Keith R.
Barker, Franklin H.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnes, Dale E.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barnhart, Robert W.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Basso, Robert J.
Bates, George M.
Baty, Edward M.
Baty, Norman R., Jr.
Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
Beavers, Robert A.
Beck, Frederic E., Jr.
Beckman, Kenneth L.
Bell, James R.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Belter, Robert H.
Bender, Albert F., Jr.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Robert E.
Bennett, Robert W.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Benson, Harry L.
Bergeron, Roy L.
Berglund, Rex R.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Biles, Joel T.
Billings, John H.
Billings, Randall K.
Bircher, William
Brown
Blaha, Albert J.
Blalock, David H., Jr.
Blaney, William C., Jr.
Block, Peter F.
Bloomfield, Rollin W.
Boeing, Charles E.
Bogart, Tudor M.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Bond, John R.

Bonekamp, Fred H.
Borst, Francis W., Jr.
Bortner, James A.
Boston, Leo
Bourne, William D.
Bowersox, Earl C., Jr.
Boyd, David S.
Bradberry, Richard F.
Braddy, Don L., Jr.
Bradfield, James
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Brand, Alvin
Brandenburg, Delbert E.
Brandenburg, Robert
C.
Brandorff, Paul A.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brecka, Joseph, Jr.
Brewer, Thomas J.
Brick, John H.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brown, Charles O.
Brown, Charles "D"
Brown, James W.
Brown, Robert S.
Brubaker, Walter Y.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Bryan, Thomas S.
Brzenski, Benjamin J., Jr.
Buck, Roger L.
Burden, James D.
Burks, Ernest, Jr.
Burnett, James C.
Burson, Roger T.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Byron, Herbert I.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Cameron, Clifford R.
Campbell, Donald H.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, Norman R.
Campbell, Richard B.
Campbell, William D.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Capers, Ellison
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Cariton, George A.
Carmichael, Robert C.
Carpenter, Malcolm S.
Carr, Robert L.
Carr, William K.
Carter, Earl L.
Carter, Frank R.
Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Catterlin, Samuel F.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
Chambers, John J.
Chanau, Henry L.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Chappell, Lawrence A.
Childs, William J.
Choyce, Charles V.
Christiansen, Charles C.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clark, Willard H., Jr.
Clarke, Michael
Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.

Cleveland, Arthur W.
Clifford, John G.
Cochran, James A.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Coleman, Eddie T. Jr.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerard G.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Colvin, Robert D.
Concannon, Leslie E.
Conkey, Carlton G.
Connolly, Robert D.
Conroy, Thomas P.
Coogan, Joseph E.
Cook, Richard M.
Coontz, Robert J.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Jack E.
Corbin, Rex G.
Cordray, Richard P.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowell, William J.
Cowperthwaite, John K.
Cramblett, Frank
Crosby, Howard S.
Cross, Daniel F.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cullivan, Daniel W.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Czernicki, Leonard
Dagg, Robert M.
Dahlman, Donald A.
Daley, Bradley L.
Dalla Beta, Aldo
Daly, Norman F.
Darfus, George H.
Darnell, Donald P.
Davi, Jerome A.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Frederick P.
Davis, Jack W.
Day, Lawrence C.
Deibler, Daniel T.
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
Delozier, Richard G.
Demers, William H., II
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
Dennis, James M.
Dickins, Richard A.
Diehl, William F.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Dollinger, Richard E.
Doyle, Richard B.
Draddy, John M.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Driscoll, William T., Jr.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Dukes, Warren C.
Duncan, Richard D.
Dunn, Delma D.
Dunn, Neville D.
Dunning, Frederic S., Jr.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
East, George W.
Eaton, Nelson W.
Eckerdt, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.

Ellena, Eugene D.
Elliott, James D.
Ellison, Leroy S.
Ellsworth, William A.
Emerson, David F.
Enlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
English, Ernest C., Jr.
Enright, George E.
Erikson, Warren W.
Esau, Robert L.
Estes, Windom L.
Everett, Elmer C.
Everson, Carl
Eylar, Emil M.
Fahland, Frank R.
Falkenstein, Rudolph
Farrell, John B.
Fassula, Richard F.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald G.
Featherston, Frank H.
*Feeney, Harold
Fendorf, James E.
Fenno, Eric N.
Ferguson, George D., III
Ferrucci, David E.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Fitzpatrick, John R.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fleming, Joseph P.
Fletcher, James L.
Flynn, Donald J.
Flynn, Richard E.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Forster, William G.
Forsythe, Forrest
Foscatto, Sydney E., Jr.
Foster, James R.
Foster, John B.
Foster, Raymond H.
Fouch, Richard A.
Fowler, Arthur D., Jr.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, George A., Jr.
Fox, Richard T.
Fraasa, Donald G.
Frazee, Joyce M.
French, Robert D.
Freytag, David R.
Friesen, Edwin "J"
Frosio, Robert C.
Frudden, Mark P.
Fry, Gayle "A"
Gaddis, George E.
Gaddy, James K.
Garland, John C.
Gates, David E.
Gates, Herbert K., Jr.
Geist, Richard A.
Geltz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Giles, Claude F.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Gilyard, John G.
Gire, Larold W.
Gobble, George F., Jr.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodspeed, Richard E.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Greene, Leonard E.
Gregory, George T.
Griffith, Thomas J.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Groff, Bruce F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grote, Joseph C.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Guggenbiller, James A.
Gully, Robert L.

- Gureck, William A.
Hage, Leland P.
Hahn, William S.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Hall, Donald P.
Hallsay, Norman L.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hamilton, Donald C.
Hamilton, Robert C.
Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
Hanson, Carl T.
Hanson, Richard W.
Hardgrave, James B.
Hardin, David L.
Hardy, Martin E., Jr.
Harlan, Edgar W.
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Harrison, James R.
Hartshorn, David L.
Harty, Thomas G.
Hartzell, Robert H.
Harvey, John W.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hatcher, Hugh P.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hayes, Stanley M.
Hays, Ronald J.
Hecker, Stanley
Heerwagen, David D.
Hegrat, Donald M.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Henderson, Burton
Henning, John C., III
Henning, Robert F.
Henry, Martin H.
Hlat, Henry G., Jr.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hill, Allen E.
Hill, Jackson D.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hirstein, Robert V.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hoffman, Samuel D.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hohn, Henry E.
Hollack, Michael
Holloman, George H.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Holt, Donald P.
Hoover, Matthew V.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Horn, John E., Jr.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hoseman, Leland J.
Howard, Joseph B.
Hubbard, Donald
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Hunsley, Lindell A., II
Hunt, Donald B., Jr.
Hunter, Paul I.
Huntsman, Gary S.
Hussmann, Harry "L", III
Huth, Ralph L.
Iredale, John P.
Jackson, John G. "W"
Jacobson, Jacob H., Jr.
Jacobson, Robert C.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jefferson, Robert R.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenista, John E.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Donald L.
Jensen, Edwin F.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jessen, George E.
Jewell, Downing L.
Johns, Ronald L.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Richard L.
Johnson, Richard "D"
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Kenneth W.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, Huby A., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kallgren, Bruce M.
Kampe, John H.
Kangas, Robert T.
Karns, Dane L.
Kaufman, Norman L.
Kaufman, Richard F.
Kaune, James E.
Kays, Jack C.
Kearney, John R.
Keays, Keatinge
Keeler, Donald J.
Keller, Robert G.
Kelley, Bruce E.
Kellogg, Edward P., Jr.
Kelly, Roger W.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William, Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kernan, William H.
Kersch, Roger N.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiernan, Warren R.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
Kimball, Edwin D.
King, Robert A.
King, Thomas E.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Knecht, Harry B.
Knighten, Charles E.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Krag, Robert L.
Kramer, George
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Krause, Stephen R.
Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kremer, John L.
Kretzman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Kropf, John F.
Kunkle, Floyd S., Jr.
Lally, William K., Jr.
Lamb, Arthur D., Jr.
Lane, Henry
Laque, Harold A.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassen, William V.
Lassiter, Will E.
Lawler, William G., Jr.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V., Jr.
Leach, Donald B.
Leary, Ramon W.
LeDew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lefler, Luther
Lehman, Donald A.
Leibowitz, Martin M.
Lemon, Robert T.
Leser, John R.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, Daniel A.
Lewis, William W., Jr.
Lindbeck, Edwin E.
Lintner, Richard W.
Lisanby, James W.
Littell, Raymond W.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
Lombard, Richard L.
Long, Charles R.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lord, Warren W.
Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
Losely, Willis M.
Loux, Raymond E.
Lovelace, Robert H.
Lund, John D.
Luzader, Robert B.
Lyman, Jack N.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lynch, Robert M.
Lyne, George C.
Lyon, Howard E.
Lytle, James H.
MacDowell, Charles R.
Mackell, Richard A.
MacKenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Magnuson, Roy W.
Mahon, Richard E.
Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maier, William J., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
Mangus, Thomas B.
Mann, Charles L., Jr.
Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Markham, Walter G.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Marona, "G" "L"
Marriner, Richard E.
Martin, Gene A.
Martin, Richard W.
Mason, Robert C.
Massa, Emiddo
Mathews, Ross A., Jr.
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A.
Mauney, Thomas C.
Mauro, John
May, Donald S.
May, Harry Lee
Mayer, Joseph C.
Mayo, William H.
McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McCarthy, Richard L.
McAvenia, James F., Jr.
McBride, Jeremiah R.
McCarthy, James P., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James E.
McConnell, Joseph E.
McCraw, Frank M., Jr.
McDaniel, Willard H.
McFall, Albert D.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
McGinnis, Ted R.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McIntyre, Andrew
McJunkin, Russell E., Jr.
McKay, Robert B.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLoughlin, Howard T.
McNally, John J., Jr.
Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
Meetze, James C.
Melville, Charles W., Jr.
Merkley, Carlyle "C", Jr.
Michaud, Robert A.
Miesner, John A., Jr.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Milani, Albert V.
Miles, Frank A.
Miller, Alfred E.
Miller, Byron K.
Miller, Gerious G., Jr.
Miller, Marvin J.
Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, William A.
Millpointer, Edward D.
Mills Joseph E.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Misakian, Harry H.
Moberly, Arthur L.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Modeen, Donald O.
Mohr, Charles H.
Molnar, Joseph J.
Molzan, Edward W.
Monroe, Robert E.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Moore, Howard B.
Moore, John F., Jr.
Moore, Lund A.
Moore, Thomas L.
Moore William F.
Moors, Donald E.
Morgan, Robert E.
Morin, Gene D.
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrisset, John N.
Moss, Lewis M.
Moss, Robert
Moy, Frank "E"
Muck, Floyd R.
Mudrock, John
Mull, Charles L., II
Mulligan, James A., Jr.
Mumford, Homer E.
Murphy, Frank "M", Jr.
Murphy Garrison E.
Myatt, Bert, Jr.
Myer, George W.
Myers, Charles B.
Myers, Raymond W.
Nail, Delbert L.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, William R.
Netro, Robert J.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newman, Fred S.
Newman, James F.
Nichol, Monte B.
Nicholson, Jerome E.
Nix, Henry J.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nulton, Frank I.
Nussbaumer, John J.
Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
Oakes, Raymond H.
Oberholtzer, James P.
Oberle, Ronald R.
O'Brien, John W.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donel, James H.
O'Donnell George J., Jr.
O'Drain, John E.
Odrobina, Stephen R.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
O'Reilly, James P., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Osborne, Dwight G.
Otten, Henry E.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Owen, Charles K.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parent, Gerald "J"
Parker, James W.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Paschal, Joseph B., Jr.
Patterson, Donald W.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pelton, Robert L.
*Pennington, Otis G.
Perry, Frank M., Jr.
Perryman, Donald B.
Pester, Benjamin H.
Pester, Fred J.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Petersen, Donald E.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pezzel, Engelbert G.
Pfeffer, King W.
Phillips, Charles T.
Pickering, Richard C.
Pierce, Robert E.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platte, William A.
Platzek, Eugene H.
Pleasants, John B.
Pond, Richard E.
Porter, Thomas
Portnoy, Howard R.
Pouliot, Jean R.
Powell, Samuel F., III
Powell, James R., Jr.
Prange, Eugene H.
Prehn, Frederick A., Jr.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Price, Allen B.
Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Proflet, Leo T.
Proper, Worthy "F"
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Purvis, Elvis E.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Racy, Louis P.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Rakes, Calvin E.
Ramella, Albert J.
Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
Ratliff, William M.
Rau, William F.
Raymond, Marshall P.
Reddick, James P., Jr.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Sherman C.
*Reichel, Alfred J., Jr.
Reichl, Charles J.
Reid, Eugene L.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reyn, William P.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Ricci, William J.
Rice, Minor T.
Richards, William L., Jr.
Risser, James B.
Robertson, John W.
Robinson, Thomas W., Jr.
Robisch, Herbert E.
Rochester, Carl W.
Rockwell, Frank A.
Rodgers, James F.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Rosenberg, Donald D.
Rosendahl, Edmund I.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Roulstone, Lawrence M.
Rowe, John D.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Russell, George G.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Phillip J.
Sabalos, Nicholas
Scarob, Merwin
Paschal, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sands, James W.
Sandsberry Jack C.
Satre, Robert S.
Sattler, Donald C.
Schader, James A.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Schettino, Joseph N.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
Schroeder, Robert A.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schwab, Robert W.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scribner, Henry L., Jr.
Sebuly, Donald G.
Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
Seipp, Russell M.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Sharpe, William K.
Shartel, Howard A.
Shea, Paul W.
Sheehan, Charles A.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherin, Joseph E.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shick, George B., Jr.
Shields, William B.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
Singer, Arnold N.
Sirrine, Jack D.
Skalla, Derald Z.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skirm, George L., Jr.
Skorheim, Robert D.
Slankard, Max L.
Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Sliwinski, Daniel J.
Smith, Allan R.
Smith, Chandler G.
Smith, Edgar M., Jr.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Leon W.
Smith, Maurice E.
Smith, Melbourne L.
Smith, Robert F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Smoot, William N.
Snodgrass, Cornelius S.
Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
Stalzer, Charles E.
Stanley, Donald E.
Stapp, Aron L.
Steentofte, Eric H.
Stein, Earl M.
Sterrett, Bailey D., Jr.
Stimler, Richard P.
St. John, Alvin P.
St. Louis, Norman E.

Stollenwerck, William M.
 Stone, Bruce G.
 Storey, Joseph D.
 Strand, John A., Jr.
 Streich, Paul R.
 Stroupe, Keith K.
 Stull, Donald
 St. Ville, Edward L.
 Sudhoff, Herbert A.
 Sullivan, Don M.
 Summers, Gilbert L.
 Summitt, Clyde W.
 Sutherland, Donald G.
 Swadener, John R.
 Swanson, Carl W., Jr.
 Switzer, James R.
 Swope, Homer J., Jr.
 Tarbox, Ronald L., Jr.
 Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
 Tebo, Ballard W.
 Temple, Charles H.
 Templeton, Stuart N.
 Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
 Thom, Norman R.
 Thomas, Bernard K., Jr.
 Thomas, Robert L.
 Thomas, Walter R.
 Thompson, James J.
 Thompson, Robert C.
 Thompson, William B., Jr.
 Thorndike, Robert F.
 Thorp, John H.
 Thurston, Dick W.
 Thyberg, Robert C.
 Tobias, David L.
 Todd, Troy E.
 Todd, William E.
 Tollgaard, Elmer M.
 Touch, Ralph J.
 Toy, Frank E.
 Traynor, Lawrence E.
 Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
 Trimble, Dan M.
 Trommlitz, James R.
 Tuomela, Clyde H.
 Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
 Twite, Martin J., Jr.
 Tyson, James J., Jr.
 Underwood, Leland J.
 Upton, William O., Jr.
 Valentine, Robert F.
 Vanderbeck, Eugene A.
 Van Kirk, Robert W., Jr.
 Van Kleck, Justin L.
 Varner, Byron D.
 Vaughn, Robert E.
 Veasie, Robert H.
 Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
 Vines, Thomas E.
 Vining, Adrian D.
 Vinsel, John E.
 Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
 Vollmer, Robert J.
 Vosseier, Warren P.
 Wagner, Eugene R.
 Wagner, Robert H.
 Walchko, Daniel P.
 Walker, George D.

Wallace, David T.
 Wallace, Donald E.
 Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
 Wallace, Kenneth R.
 Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
 Wamsley, John A.
 Ward, Donald S.
 Warner, Marvin H.
 Warwick, William B.
 Wasniewski, Emil F.
 Watson, Richard K.
 Weatherly, Robert T.
 Webb, William H.
 Weeks, Grady A.
 Werner, Robert V.
 Weymouth, Burton R.
 Whaley, William S.
 White, Arthur C.
 White, Grover C., Jr.
 White, John E.
 White, Wendell A.
 Whitehead, Richard T.
 Whitley, Walter J.
 Whitlock, Richard T.
 Whitman, Donald L.
 Whittlesley, Eugene H.
 Wikeen, Donald B.
 Wilbur, Harley D.
 Wilder, Fred W.
 Wilgus, Carlton L.
 Wilhite, Alan S.
 Wilkins, James R., Jr.
 Willard, Daniel D. M.
 Wille, James E.
 Wilt, Thomas A.
 Williams, Leland S.
 Williams, William A., III
 Willingham, William E., Jr.
 Wilson, Alexander B.
 Wilson, Carl B.
 Wilson, Joseph W.
 Winton, John R., Jr.
 Wiram, Gordan H.
 Wise, Gerald W.
 Wiseman, Richard F.
 Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
 Wood, John W.
 Wood, Peter W.
 Woodruff, Richard F.
 Woolcock, Thomas E.
 Woodridge, Edmund T., Jr.
 Wooley, Robert T.
 Worchesk, Robert R.
 Wright, William B.
 Wuethrich, Don L.
 Wunderlich, Robert
 Wylie, Henry K.
 Young, Casanave H., Jr.
 Young, Robert M.
 Ziarnik, Walter P.
 Ziegler, Frank G.
 Zilch, Charles H.
 Zimm, Alfonz
 Zimmerly, Arthur, III
 Zink, Stewart T.
 Zoske, Frank H.
 Zwolinski, Frank J.

Almand, Willie G.
 Althouse, Arnold S.
 Alton, Homer W.
 Ambrosini, Leo A.
 Ames, David E.
 Ames, Laverne W.
 Amon, Ronald L.
 Amos, Robert H.
 Anderson, Charles R.
 Anderson, Charles L.
 Anderson, George B.
 Anderson, Howard R.
 Anderson, Joseph J.
 Anderson, Jerry P.
 Anderson, James B.
 Anderson, John A.
 Andrade, Allan L.
 Androski, Frank N.
 Angeil, Richard C.
 Anthony, Joseph D., Jr.
 Anthony, Phillip D.
 Anton, Leonard G.
 Apple, John D., Jr.
 Aquilino, Salvatore P.
 Armstrong, Leo F.
 Arnold, James G.
 Arnold, Thomas F.
 Arrighi, George J., Jr.
 Arvay, John F.
 Ashbacher, Raymond W.
 Ashworth, Thomas, III
 Atkins, Allan L.
 Audilet, Garland O.
 Avery, Paul R.
 Ayers, Harry P., Jr.
 Baals, John R.
 Bachman, Robert A.
 Bailey, George M.
 Bailey, Robert B.
 Bair, Lavon H.
 Baker, Earl R.
 Baker, Evan S.
 Baker, Floyd O.
 Baker, Robert E.
 Baldwin, Max M.
 Ball, George B., Jr.
 Ball, Glenn F.
 Ball, John W.
 Ballou, James E.
 Balsley, Francis W.
 Bandy, Clifford W.
 Banks, Peter A.
 Barbour, William J., Jr.
 Baril, Robert F.
 Barnes, Harold E.
 Barnett, Charles E.
 Barnett, Stephen B.
 Barney, Charles R.
 Barnhart, Harold D.
 Barr, John F.
 Barret, Lee E., Jr.
 Barrigar, Donald B.
 Barrish, Paul D.
 Bartley, Robert H.
 Barton, Harold C.
 Bassett, Charles G.
 Bassett, James S.
 Baszak, Joseph F.
 Bate, Ronald D.
 Battersby, John J.
 Baudouin, Morris R.
 Bauer, Donald R.
 Bauman, John M.
 Baumann, Gerard R.
 Baumgartner, James A.
 Beach, Milton D.
 Beach, Robert R.
 Beall, Thomas J.
 Bean, Lynn B.
 Beaton, John M.
 Beck, Richard J.
 Beck, Richard E.
 Beecher, Ronald R.
 Begle, Earl A.
 Bellsie, Philip M.
 Bell, Brewer

Bellinger, John R.
 Benediktsson, Philip W.
 Benjamin, Charles L.
 Bennett, Edward I. H., Jr.
 Bennett, John E., Jr.
 Bennett, Peter C.
 Bennington, Thomas P.
 Benoit, Richard S.
 Benser, Earl H.
 Benson, Thomas C.
 Bentley, Arthur L.
 Berg, Milfred C.
 Berger, Raymond E.
 Bergman, Walter R.
 Bergstrom, Kenneth I.
 Berry, Roy A.
 Bess, George D.
 Best, Albert H., III
 Bethel, Robert G.
 Betts, Roger S.
 Beverly, Louis M.
 Beversdorf, Donald W.
 Beving, Duane U.
 Biehl, George F.
 Bigler, William W.
 Biles, George E.
 Billings, Alfred J.
 Bird, Ralph G.
 Bitner, Gregory J.
 Black, James L.
 Blake, Gordon N.
 Blackwood, David E.
 Blanchard, James W., Jr.
 Blanchard, Ralph W., Jr.
 Blankenship, James M., II
 Blaser, John W.
 Bledsoe, Paul I.
 Blevins, Deward C.
 Bloom, Donald D.
 Blumie, John A.
 Boebert, Frank L., Jr.
 Boensch, Arthur C.
 Bolte, William S.
 Bonadies, Louis
 Booth, Peter B.
 Borcik, Andrew J., Jr.
 Borden, Clifford A.
 Borden, Robert C., Jr.
 Borgardt, Elmer G.
 Bossert, John L.
 Bovey, Paul E.
 Box, Roger E.
 Boyd, Jack W.
 Boyd, Richard M.
 Boyer, Jesse V., Jr.
 Boyle, James T.
 Brannigan, James W., Jr.
 Brasseur, Edmond L.
 Breeding, Leslie E.
 Breland, Edgar A.
 Brennan, Richard J.
 Brenneman, Harold R.
 Brennen, William L.
 Briegel, Charles V.
 Briggs, Braden R.
 Bright, Richard A.
 Bright, Thomas B.
 Brink, Robert E.
 Brisbois, Marshall B.
 Brockway, Charles J., Jr.
 Brogan, Thomas E.
 Brooks, Bernard A.
 Brooks, James W.
 Broton, Chester F.
 Brown, Bruce F.
 Brown, Claude C.
 Brown, Daniell M.
 Brown, Donald L.
 Brown, Harold W.
 Brown, James E.
 Brown, James J.
 Brown, Nicholas
 Brown, Ora D., III

Brown, Robert H., III
 Brown, William M.
 Browning, Elmer L.
 Brunner, James W.
 Brusio, James W.
 Bruyere, Thomas E.
 Bryan, John E., Jr.
 Bryant, Leroy
 Buchanan, Charles A., Jr.
 Buchsieb, Louis D.
 Buckwalter, Gary L.
 Buehler, William S.
 Buggy, Joseph S., Jr.
 Builder, Gustav F.
 Bullock, Robert F.
 Burdick, Howard F., Jr.
 Burdsall, Milton E.
 Burghardt, Louis, Jr.
 Burke, Edmund, III
 Burke, Francis J.
 Burke, Joseph S.
 Burkel, John F.
 Burris, William L., Jr.
 Burt, Mattison A., Jr.
 Burt, Russell H.
 Bush, Ronald J.
 Bush, Vernon R.
 Button, Ralph L.
 Butts, Richard F.
 Bylund, Howard E.
 Byng, Weston H.
 Cahill, Walter A.
 Calamaras, Nicholas
 Caldwell, John M.
 Callahan, David F., Jr.
 Callaway, Jack M.
 Camacho, Richard G.
 Camp, Robert W.
 Campbell, Carl E.
 Campbell, Donald G.
 Campbell, George E.
 Campbell, John E.
 Campbell, Ronald K.
 Canada, Donald E.
 Cannon, James R.
 Carlson, Walter G.
 Carpenter, Lemmon F.
 Carpenter, Jack R.
 Carr, David M., Jr.
 Carrigan, Richard C.
 Carroll, John T.
 Carroll, Robert J.
 Carswell, Michael S.
 Casey, Ronald C.
 Cates, Gus V.
 Catoe, Ralph D.
 Catola, Stanley G.
 Cecelski, Arthur R.
 Cedercrans, Phillip N.
 Ceilar, Charles J., Jr.
 Cernan, Eugene A.
 Champlin, Donald G.
 Chancellor, Dean H.
 Chaney, Marvin L.
 Chang, Ming E.
 Charneco, Carlos M., Jr.
 Chase, Henri B., III
 Chase, Warren T., Jr.
 Chatham, Walter L.
 Chemacki, Stanley
 Chester, Scott A.
 Chisholm, Charles G., III
 Chrans, Ronald L.
 Christensen, Charles C.
 Christensen, Cyrus R.
 Christopher, Richard V.
 Christopher, Allyn C.
 Chumley, Sylvester G.
 Cicchetto, Mario J.
 Cichowitz, Edward J., Jr.
 Clark, Arthur R., Jr.
 Clark, Bruce A.
 Clark, Elmer S., Jr.
 Clark, George G.

Clark, George E.
 Clark, James M.
 Clark, Joseph E.
 Clark, William E., Jr.
 Clausen, Bernard F.
 Clay, Jack D.
 Clayton, George H., Jr.
 Clement, Leroy A.
 Click, Duane L.
 Clock, Richard V.
 Cloud, Bruce L.
 Clower, Claude D.
 Clynes, Charles E.
 Cobb, Roy L.
 Coffee, Ernest E.
 Cohen, Milton N.
 Coleman, Cornelius E., Jr.
 Coll, William A.
 Collier, Merrill F.
 Collins, Charles R.
 Collins, Erwin A.
 Collins, Jay R.
 Collins, Leroy, Jr.
 Collom, Frederick W., Jr.
 Colville, Robert E.
 Condon, Thomas E.
 Conklin, Peter A.
 Conley, James H.
 Connell, Earl W.
 Connell, Laurence M.
 Connell, Phillip J.
 Connolly, James H., Jr.
 Connolly, Leo J.
 Conroy, John W.
 Conti, Francis A.
 Cook, Richard D.
 Cook, Ross E.
 Cook, Wilmer P.
 Coolidge, Julian L., II
 Coons, Henry A.
 Cooper, James L.
 Cooper, Ross E.
 Cooper, Scott E.
 Corica, Kenneth J.
 Corkins, Charles W., Jr.
 Corkrum, Richard C.
 Cosgrove, Robert R.
 Costello, Donald H.
 Costlow, Kenneth L.
 Cotthran, George E.
 Cotsonas, John P.
 Cotton, Francis X.
 Counsell, Duane J.
 Coupe, Walter E.
 Courtney, Hugh J.
 Covey, Edward J.
 Cox, George E.
 Cox, Henry
 Coyle, Charles A.
 Cozine, Kenneth J.
 Craddock, Gerald G.
 Craig, John E., Jr.
 Craig, Stephnos D.
 Crain, Carroll O., Jr.
 Cramer, Dean E.
 Cramer, Edward A., Jr.
 Crandall, Douglas R.
 Craven, Robert P.
 Crawford, Paul G.
 Credland, Earl D.
 Cremo, John, Jr.
 Cress, Robert B.
 Crickey, James E., Jr.
 Crim, Billy R.
 Crissman, Daniel M.
 Crosby, Elwood A.
 Crowder, Billy
 Crowe, George W.
 Crowe, Guy T.
 Cruise, Reese E.
 Crutchfield, Claud C.
 Cumming, Richard S., III
 Cunningham, Donald E.
 Curry, Keith Royal W.
 Curtis, Joe C., Jr.
 Cust, Harlan E.

The following named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE	
Abele, Andre	Alexander, Sherman G.
Adams, Ben L.	Allard, Frank A.
Adams, Billy J.	Allemang, John D.
Adams, Frederick G.	Allen, Corbett U., Jr.
Adams, Jerome B.	Allen, Curtis R.
Adams, Thomas C.	Allen, Edward P.
Ahrens, Michael C.	Allen, George M., Jr.
Akers, John F.	Allen, John E.
Albin, Harold C., Jr.	Allen, Richard O., Jr.
Albright, William E., Jr.	Allen, Robert L., Jr.

- Cutler, Alan "B"
 Cyr, Byron A.
 Czar, Raymond J.
 Dage, Jerry D.
 Daley, Joseph M., Jr.
 Daniels, Hal B.
 Daniels, Nelson M.
 Danlin, Victor
 Dankel, Kenneth M.
 Daulton, James T.
 Daws, Rudolph H.
 David, Thomas P.
 Davidson, Jack R.
 Davidson, Paul J.
 Davies, Eugene L.
 Davis, George E.
 Davis, Howard C.
 Davis, Milton W.
 Davis, Norman E.
 Davis, Robert G.
 Davis, Sidney F., III
 Dawe, Robert V.
 Day, John T., Jr.
 Dean, Robert V.
 Dean, Ronald I.
 Dement, Ira B.
 Denison, William F.
 Dennis, Don J.
 Dennis, Paul L.
 Denunzio, Nicholas J.
 Deutermaun, David W.
 DeVane, Richard W., Jr.
 DeWeese, Everett D.
 DiBona, Charles J.
 Dickerson, Kenneth A.
 Diederich, Robert E.
 Dioreto, Lucio
 Dockery, Olan L.
 Doebler, Harold J., II
 Doerr, Peter J.
 Doherty, Richard S.
 Dolan, Edward H., Jr.
 Dolan, John H.
 Domville, Compton N., Jr.
 Donahue, John F.
 Donlan, William J.
 Donley, James M.
 Donohue, Douglas J.
 Donovan, Neil
 Doolittle, Wallace F., Jr.
 Doran, Samuel W.
 Dorow, William R.
 Dorsey, James F., Jr.
 Dougherty, Charles E.
 Dove, William F.
 Dowd, Gregory P.
 Drake, Donald L.
 Drake, Leon L.
 Drayton, Frank J., Jr.
 Drennan, Donald C.
 Dresser, Roderick A.
 Driskill, Robert E.
 Drucequer, Cedric W.
 Dudrow, Donald L.
 Duffield, Frederick H., Jr.
 Dugan, William D., Jr.
 Dunbar, Fredric A.
 Dunn, Robert R.
 Durkel, Ronald E.
 Durham, Jack D.
 Duval, Thomas J.
 Dwyer, James L.
 Dyer, Nathaniel B., Jr.
 Dyro, Stanislaus G.
 Eagye, Vernon A.
 Earman, Harry L.
 Earnest, Charles "M"
 Eason, Thomas E.
 Eason, William G.
 Easton, Robert H.
 Edmunds, Donald C.
 Edwards, James C.
 Edwards, Joshua V.
 Edwards, Joe D.
 Edwards, Leslie E.
 Edwards, William F.
 Egerton, James W.
 Eifsten, Robert N.
 Elinski, Michael, Jr.
 Ellingwood, Arthur R., Jr.
 Elliott, Bernard C.
 Elliott, John H.
 Ellis, Frank K.
 Ellis, Hal R., III
 Elpers, William W.
 Emmerson, Milo E.
 Emsley, Albert P., Jr.
 England, Robert N.
 Englund, David L.
 Erie, Carl R.
 Erner, Eugene J.
 Errickson, John J.
 Ervin, Charles F.
 Eskew, Perry R., Jr.
 Estes, Edward D.
 Evans, Alton R.
 Evans, Frederic H.
 Evans, Gene O.
 Evans, James A.
 Evans, Ronald E.
 Everett, William A.
 *Eversole, Frederick L.
 Eyster, Frederick P.
 Eyster, Armand T., Jr.
 Fairbanks, Wayne K.
 Faircloth, Gerald F.
 Fallin, Jerry W.
 Fallon, Thomas F., Jr.
 Farris, William E.
 Farnsworth, John F.
 Farr, Sterling J.
 Farrar, Charles E.
 Farrell, Edward J.
 Farren, Thomas J.
 Fauth, Donald P.
 Featherstone, Rex W.
 Feeney, Edward J.
 Fehrle, Fred R.
 Fehrs, Walter H.
 Felkins, Charles G.
 Fellows, John H.
 Fenton, Clayton J., Jr.
 Ferrarini, Richard L.
 Ferry, James M.
 Fesler, Robert J.
 Festag, Albert P.
 Findley, Anderson H., Jr.
 Finley, Dean M.
 Fischer, Theodore A., Jr.
 Fisher, Walter L., Jr.
 Fitch, Edward S.
 Fitzgerald, Maurice D.
 Fitzsimmons, Eugene W.
 Fitzwilliam, Peter G.
 Flannery, Thomas N., II
 Flannery, Gerald J., Jr.
 Flather, Charles R.
 Flatley, James H., III
 Fleming, William J.
 Flight, John W., Jr.
 Floyd, Edward R.
 Folds, Arthur T.
 Foote, Everett W.
 Ford, Homer L., Jr.
 Ford, John W.
 Forgy, James P.
 Forster, Robert M.
 Fortenberry, Thomas N.
 Foster, Charles R.
 Foster, John A.
 Fournier, Paul E.
 Fowler, Neville D.
 Foxworth, David H.
 Franchini, Wallace L.
 Francis, Paul R.
 Frank, Thomas P.
 Frederick, Russell E.
 Freely, John J.
 Freeman, Thomas L.
 Frey, Charles W.
 Friedrich, Thomas E.
 Fries, Charles L.
 Frichtenicht, Richard D.
 Frokjer, Elmer H.
 Fromm, George R.
 Fuld, Charles L.
 Fuik, Gerald A.
 Fuller, Fred R.
 Furlong, George M., Jr.
 Gable, Edwin P.
 Gaffrey, Leo J.
 Gaines, Milton J.
 Galnes, Richard S.
 Galinsky, Jerome J.
 *Gallagher, Vincent E.
 Gambarani, Paul R., Jr.
 Garber, Cecil E.
 Garzoza, Henry
 Garretson, Arthur S.
 Garrison, Charles H., Jr.
 Garsoe, Norman D.
 Garvin, John K.
 Gates, Richard L.
 Gay, Donald M.
 Gaylor, Elvin L.
 Geer, Gilbert H.
 George, Irl J.
 Gero, Richard L.
 Gerald, Benjamin W.
 Gesling, Marion L.
 Ghering, Walter L.
 Gibson, Clifford W.
 Gibson, Donald
 Giffin, John L.
 Gifford, Robert M.
 Gilbert, Donald E.
 Gilbert James C.
 Gilbert, Robert L.
 Gilchrist, Edwin B., Jr.
 Gile, Robert H.
 Gillette, Nelson M.
 Gillman, James W.
 Gilpin, George W.
 Gilreath, James E.
 Giuliani, Leonard E.
 Glaeser, Frederick W.
 Glenn, Eugene R.
 Gluse, Michael R.
 Goetz, Charles R.
 Goeway, Lee E.
 Golden, Edward E.
 Gomez, Louis G.
 Good, Glenn E.
 Goodale, Charles N.
 Goodman, Robert B.
 Gore, Lawrence C.
 Gormley, Kenneth L.
 Goss, Richard M.
 Gougar, Jack M.
 Graham, Frank M.
 Gralew, Richard T.
 Grandjean, Charles A.
 Grant, Claude A.
 Grant, Freeman A., Jr.
 Grant, John C.
 Grant, Richard L.
 Gray, Anthony W., Jr.
 Gray, Lewis S.
 Green, Gerald E.
 Green, William E.
 Green, William H.
 Greene, Richard O.
 Greer, Albert E.
 Gregory, Kenneth A.
 Grewe, Webster
 Grier, Thomas C., Jr.
 Griffin, John R.
 Griffin, William H.
 Grimes, Donald L.
 Grimes, William H.
 Grimmell, Robert L.
 Grisham, Albert M.
 Groepeler, Neil F.
 Groff, Peter J.
 Gussioehme, Clyde
 Gullio, Carmano J.
 Guthrie, Wesley E.
 Cyder, Charles E.
 Haberman, Robert
 Hahne, Dayton R.
 Hale, Frederick W.
 Haley, George K.
 Hall, Don L.
 Hall, Robert A.
 Hall, Thomas J.
 Halloran, Richard J.
 Hamilton, Donald E.
 Hamilton, Verlie M.
 Hammon, Colin P.
 Haning, James L.
 Hannaford, William H.
 Hansen, Lawrence W.
 Hanson, David F.
 Hanson, Dero L.
 Hanson, Donald C.
 Hanson, Edwin E.
 Hanson, Morton H.
 Harmon, Jack E.
 Harmon, Oliver E.
 Harney, George S.
 Harriott, Robert K.
 Harris, Homer D.
 Harris, Robert H.
 Harris, William R.
 Harrison, Joseph W.
 Harscheid, David G.
 Hartley, Donald H.
 Hartshorn, Owen P.
 Hasch, Ralph H.
 Haskell, Hugh B.
 Hastad, Cleighton W.
 Hastings, Irvin J., Jr.
 Haswell, Fremont G., Jr.
 Hatch, Ross R.
 Hatfield, Willis G.
 Havran, Phillip S.
 Hayes, Newton G.
 Hayman, Douglas S. F., Jr.
 Hefferon, Thomas W.
 Hegar, Edwin J.
 Heggood, Frank E.
 Helland, Charles E.
 Heinz, Paul R.
 Heisinger, Duane L.
 Heitman, Milton H.
 Hejhail, Roy C.
 Helm, Ralph M.
 Helmick, John P., Jr.
 Henry, Albert L., Jr.
 Henry, John A., Jr.
 Henry, William F.
 Hepburn, Richard F.
 Herring, Hubert B.
 Herring, John J., Jr.
 Herring, Paul E.
 Hess, Ronald K.
 Hickerson, James M.
 Hickey, John F., III
 Hickman, Jimmie E.
 Hicks, Harry E.
 Hicks, John R.
 Hierholzer, Joseph A.
 Higgins, Lloyd A.
 Hill, Kenneth E.
 Hill, Raymond W.
 Hill, Richard L.
 Hill, Rollin L.
 Hindorff, Donald M.
 Hines, Walter P.
 Hipp, William J.
 Hoak, James F.
 Hobbs, Fermer W., III
 Hodgate, Charles, Jr.
 Hodge, William R.
 Hoerner, Fredrick C.
 Hoffman, Chauncey F.
 Hoffman, Herbert F., Jr.
 Hogeboom, Edward L., Jr.
 Hogg, James E.
 Hogue, Robert L.
 Hohenstein, Clyde G.
 Holland, Clyde W.
 Holland, John O.
 Holliday, James E.
 Holm, John P.
 Holmes, Harry M.
 Honea, Milton D.
 Honsinger, Vernon C.
 Hootman, John J.
 Horne, Roger B., Jr.
 Horvath, Donald L.
 Hovater, Arthur K.
 Howard, Charles B.
 Howard, Edgbert F.
 Howard, Richard P.
 Howell, Richard F.
 Howell, William J.
 Hubbard, John H.
 Hubbell, Milford M.
 Huckaby, James H.
 Hueber, Fred P.
 Huff, Walter C., Jr.
 Hughes, Howard W.
 Hughes, William D.
 Huhn, Samuel F.
 Hull, William S.
 HULLander, Robert A.
 Hunter, Wallace R.
 Huntington, Donald E., Jr.
 Hurd, Devon "H"
 Hurst, Wilmer W.
 Hussey, Harold W.
 Husted, Muri E., Jr.
 Husted, Richard C.
 Hutchinson, Aiden M.
 Hutto, Charles H.
 Hyatt, Robert G.
 Ingalls, Frederick G.
 Ingram, Frank L.
 Ingram, William A.
 Ion, Dalton L.
 Irons, Robert P., Jr.
 Isaac, Philip D.
 Isaacs, Charles R.
 Isenberg, Albert D.
 Ishol, Lyle M.
 Ivy, Travis R.
 Jackson, Carle L.
 Jacobs, Arthur G.
 Jaeger, Robert H.
 James, Edgar L.
 James, Ernest W.
 Janetatos, Jack P.
 Jarratt, Guy C., III
 Jarwin, Raymond J.
 Jebb, Robert D.
 Jellison, Harry E.
 Jenkins, Jerry V.
 Jennings, Mark J.
 Jennings, Walter E.
 Jensen, Richard S.
 Jensen, Gunnar S.
 Jernee, Andre L.
 Johe, Richard E.
 Johns, Alan D.
 Johnson, Bobbie D.
 Johnson, Charles E.
 Johnson, David E.
 Johnson, Harrison A.
 Johnson, James E.
 Johnson, Jerome L.
 Johnson, Myron S.
 Johnson, Norman C.
 Johnston, Donald H., Jr.
 Johnston, Donald W.
 Jones, Jerry E.
 Jones, Wilbur D., Jr.
 Jordan, Henry W.
 Jordan, Henry M.
 Judge, Michael J.
 Jumper, Vernon L.
 Karas, Robert E.
 Karn, Alvin R., Jr.
 Kasnicki, Edward J.
 Kavanaugh, Michael W.
 Kawalkowski, Leonard P.
 Keari, Grant W.
 Keegan, Arthur E.
 Keeley, Edward C.
 Keene, Charles R.
 Keith, William J.
 Keller, Robert M.
 Keller, William E., Jr.
 Kelly, Francis P.
 Kelso, Frank B., II
 Kemper, Robert D.
 Kenaston, George W.
 Kennedy, Dennis E.
 Kennedy, William F.
 Kenney, Richard A.
 Keough, Robert J.
 Kersting, William H.
 Kilgore, William H.
 Kilpatrick, Paul G., Jr.
 Kilpatrick, Louis A.
 Kincade, Clarence R.
 Klnert, John H.
 King, Charles C.
 King, Ural W.
 King, William W.
 Kinney, Ben J.
 Kinney, Charles H.
 Kinzel, Herman L.
 Kirkpatrick, John H.
 Kirkwood, Robert L.
 Kitzelman, Glenn E.
 Klein, Melvin A.
 Kloman, John H.
 Knef, Andrew L.
 Knight, Burton L.
 Knight, John R., Jr.
 Knott, Howard E., Jr.
 Knowlton, Ronald S.
 Koll, William P.
 Komsarcik, Adam
 Kordok, Walter A.
 Kouns, Archie R.
 Kraemer, Kenton K.
 Kralik, Simon C.
 Kramer, James B., Jr.
 Kramer, Rex W., Jr.
 Kreutzberger, Donald J.
 Krieger, John W.
 Krieger, Thomas R.
 Kristof, John J.
 Krogh, David E.
 Kronnagel, Julius
 Kruger, Allen L.
 Kurz, Walter C.
 Kuykendall, Herbert B.
 Kvederis, James P.
 LaBarge, William A.
 Lacey, Trammell C., Jr.
 Lacy, William A.
 Lackey, Earl L.
 Ladas, Nick J.
 LaFave, Maurice G.
 Laird, John V.
 Lakey, Jimmie D.
 Lakin, Bill
 Lambert, Billy C.
 Lamm, George E.
 LaMoite, Francis J.
 Landroche, William J., Jr.
 Langenheim, John P.
 Langley, Thomas R., Jr.
 Lanham, Gene
 Lanning, Richard J.
 Larson, John D., Jr.
 Larsen, James L.
 Larsen, Victor D.
 Larson, Lawrence H.
 Lassetter, Keith M.
 Laub, Burton R., Jr.
 Laux, Arno H.
 Lavelle, Thomas J.
 Law, Mervin H.
 Lawrence, Donald W.
 Lawson, Henry T.
 Lawson, Ramsay
 Leach, Richard L.
 Leahy, Philip G.
 Leblanc, James E.
 Lee, Dennis B.
 Lees, Forrest A., Jr.
 Lefevre, Robert J.
 Leird, William A.
 Lenhardt, Harry F., Jr.
 Levendoski, Richard J.
 Levy, Norman S.
 Lewey, Ira D.
 Lewin, Theodore E.
 Lewinski, Roman R.
 Lewis, Harold S.

- Lewis, John L.
Lewis, Norman H.
Linch, Donald T.
Lind, Frederick J.
Lindquist, Donald B.
Linehan, Timothy J., Jr.
Lippert, Frederick G., III
Lloyd, David B.
Locke, Jerry L.
Loechelt, Cecil P.
Logan, David E.
Lohr, Harold C.
Logley, William N.
Loos, Donald G.
Loscavio, John M.
Loudermilk, Henry E.
Loudal, Rodney H.
Lowden, Lawrence A.
Lown, Paul C.
Lowry, Donald G.
Loynes, Louis A.
Lumbert, Albert W.
Lundquist, Donald R.
Lyle, Calvin H.
Lynch, Robert B., Jr.
Lyons, James E.
Macan, John J.
MacAskill, Everett, Jr.
MacDiarmid, Allen B.
MacDiarmid, Ronald B.
MacIntyre, Daniel G.
MacLaren, John H.
MacQuarrie, Gary L.
Mademann, Paul F.
Magarity, Roy L.
Maines, Henry L.
Mainland, Edward A.
Majors, William T.
Mailczowski, William
Malloy, Malcolm A.
Malone, Donald W.
Maloney, John J.
Manes, William C.
Mansell, Richard T.
Marcoux, Eugene A.
Marks, Everett D.
Marrison, Reginald T.
Martensen, Vincent F.
Martin, Charles G.
Martin, Frank P.
Masterson, Leo S.
Maston, Joseph H., III
Mateer, Edward R., Jr.
Matson, Bruce W.
Matt, George E., Jr.
Matthews, John B.
May, Harding W.
Mayer, Robert V.
Mayer, Robert R.
Mayfield, Albert L.
Mayfield, Douglas S.
Mays, Samuel E., Jr.
Maytham, Peter
McAllister, Rex F., Jr.
McAllister, Richard C.
McBride, Francis E.
McBride, Michael A.
McBurnett, Kenneth S.
McCaffery, Robert A.
McCain, James R.
McCarter, Kenneth W.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McCarthy, John D.
McCauley, George A.
McClenahan, Tom P.
McCleskey, Jerry
McClure, Dale R.
McConkey, Edward C.
McConnell, Edward W., II
McCoy, Harry E.
McCoy, James C., Jr.
McCoy, Thomas H.
McCrary, John R., Jr.
McCullough, "J" "P"
McCune, Terrance O.
McDaniel, Eugene B.
McDonald, Ray M.
McDonell, Walter L., Jr.
McDonough, William J.
McEachen, Angus D., III
McFadden, John H., Jr.
McGarry, John G.
McGee, Claude A.
McGhinnis, Richard O.
McGlavery, James L.
McGrath, James J.
McGuire, Marvin "E"
McHugh, Philip R.
McIlwaine, John C.
McIntire, Stanley H.
McIntire, William G., Jr.
McIntire, Wilton H.
McKee, Frank R.
McKenna, Charles E.
McKinney, Charles P.
McKinney, Gaie A.
McKinney, Mercer L., Jr.
McKinnon, John D.
McKinstry, Thomas W.
McKinzie, William E.
McKissock, Donald J.
McLaughlin, John R.
McLean, Charles R.
McLellan, Charles A.
McMillan, Edward W.
McMillan, Lee Q.
McNeil, Charles H.
McNeill, Dale A.
McNeill, Richard J.
McPherson, Edward W.
McPherson, Albert A.
McQueen, George B.
Medwedeff, Channing W.
Meier, Leonard M.
Meintzer, William C., Jr.
Mellette, William W.
Melvin, Edmund W.
Melvin, Virgil B.
Merrill, Grant C.
Metzler, Charles D.
Michaels, Danny J.
Mikitalian, Samson
Miller, David K.
Miller, Donald R.
Miller, Gordon J.
Miller, Herbert A.
Miller, Hoyle H.
Miller, James R.
Miller, John A.
Miller, John M., Jr.
Miller, Kenneth L.
Miller, Merle E.
Miller, Robert L., Jr.
Miller, Wayne W.
Miller, Wendell E.
Miller, William H.
Minton, David C., III
Mirise, Kerry W.
Misar, Kenneth H.
Milligan, Wayne L.
Millon, Donald H.
Milne, James L.
Minkler, Eugene D.
Mitchell, Kenneth
Mizerak, John
Moffitt, Vernon D.
Molloy, Arthur E.
Molloy, Ronald J.
Monahan, Edward P.
Moore, Harold A., Jr.
Moore, Nelson E.
Moore, Paul M.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, Robert W.
Moran, Thomas J.
Morgan, William N.
Morris, Charles S.
Morris, Jesse B., Jr.
Morris, John D.
Morrison, Jon K.
Mortimer, Edmund C.
Morton, Richard E.
Mossop, Wallace L., Jr.
Motika, Ralph
Mount, Eugene A.
Moyers, Gilbert E.
Mozler, Richard A.
Mulholland, Howard E.
Mullen, John T.
Mulloy, Charles S.
Mulvihill, James H.
Munn, Robert J., Jr.
Munsey, William D.
Murphy, James J., Jr.
Murphy, Robert E.
Murray, Darrell
Murray, Frank S.
Murrell, Charles J.
Musgrove, William M.
Musick, Wayne O.
Myers, Ashley A.
Naddy, Llewellyn L.
Nagel, "L" "D"
Neale, George L.
Nelson, Carl A.
Nelson, Paul J., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, Sven D.
Neuhard, Henry H.
Newbury, Alfred C.
Newcomb, James W., Jr.
Newsom, Joe E.
Nicholas, David W.
Nicholson, Murray M. J., Jr.
Nicholson, Odie A.
Nielsen, Irving C.
Nielsen, Robert P.
Niles, Wilmer J.
Normand, Paul R.
Norris, Richard J.
Northam, Thomas A., Jr.
Noss, Charles H.
Notargiacomo, Joseph M.
Novarra, Francis J.
Novratil, Robert V.
Nowak, Arthur A.
Nowak, Edward M.
Nuanes, Charles
Oberle, Ronald J.
Ochs, Dorance L.
O'Connell, Jerome A.
O'Connor, Edwin A.
O'Connor, Harold B.
O'Connor, William J. M.
O'Donnell, Daniel T.
O'Donnell, Robert G.
O'Dwyer, Kyran M.
Ogden, John H.
O'Halloran, William J.
Ohnen, Douglass J.
O'Keefe, William J.
O'Kelly, James E.
Oliverio, Theodore E.
Olson, Albert W.
Olson, Carroll A.
Olson, Darryl D.
Omundson, Jerrold W.
Onstott, Donald D.
Orchard, Wayne J.
Ord, Donald C.
O'Rear, Gilbert A.
Orton, Cloyd G.
Orzech, Bernard P.
Osgood, Wayne R.
Overstreet, George H.
Owen, James L.
Owings, Dwight C.
Oyler, Jimmie D.
Paine, Francis S., Jr.
Palmer, Howard L.
Palmer, Jerry J.
Pardue, James I., Jr.
Parrick, Carl R.
Parsons, Charles E.
Pasquinnelli, Francis C.
Pate, Homer W.
Patterson, James W., Jr.
Patterson, Ray A.
Patterson, Robert G.
Pattin, Stephen M.
Patton, James M.
Pearson, John E.
Pedersen, Odd B.
Peek, Robert F.
Peeples, John M., Jr.
Peetz, Robert E.
Penders, Joseph W.
Pennock, Murray F.
Perez, Edward A.
Perry, Albert J.
Perry, Henry B.
Person, Herbert F.
Peters, Vernon W.
Petersen, Richard D.
Peterson, Bob L.
Peterson, James F.
Peterson, John R.
Peterson, Karl L.
Peterson, Peter C., Jr.
Petree, Noel H., Jr.
Petrich, Horst A.
Pfeister, William J.
Phillipp, Frederick C.
Phillips, Charles R., Jr.
*Phillips, George L., Jr.
Phillips, Ronald M.
Phillips, Richard W.
Picciuolo, Stephen A. D.
Pickel, Theodore C., Jr.
Pinton, David E.
Poe, Benjamin L., Jr.
Polfer, Clarence R.
Poole, Thomas E.
Poore, Thomas W.
Porter, Robert W.
Potter, Clare E.
Poulsen, Wells P., Jr.
Powell, Falvey C., Jr.
Powell, Francis L.
Powell, Leonard F.
Powell, Stewart G.
Powell, Wendell W.
Powell, William C.
Poyet, Elmer F.
Presley, Jack C.
Previ, Wallace M.
Price, William H., II
Proctor, Robert C.
Proper, Vance D.
Propper, Ronald M.
Pugh, Robert W.
Putnam, John C.
Pyle, Roger G.
Quinn, James E., Jr.
Quisenberry, Jesse W.
Raab, Charles F.
Raab, George E.
Rabuck, Leo V.
Randall, Harold N., Jr.
Randrup, Peter N.
Ranieri, Richard A. J.
Ransom, James P., II
Rashley, George E.
Rathbun, Philip W.
Rayome, Francis L.
Read, Benton M.
Redhage, James L.
Redington, Jerome J.
Reed, Allen E., Jr.
Reed, Dale H.
Reese, Russell R.
Reid, Ralph G., Jr.
Reifschneider, Jack L.
Reinhardt, Ellwood B., Jr.
Reis, Joseph J., Jr.
Rennaker, Charles L.
Renner, Lorraine E.
Repta, Robert S.
Rettig, Godfrey A.
Revak, Paul A.
Reynolds, Rodney R.
Rice, Robert P.
Rich, Willis S.
Richardson, Fred D., Jr.
Richardson, Ronald W.
Richmond, Bruce R.
Richter, John H.
Riefler, George B.
Rigler, Douglas V.
Riley, Edward E., Jr.
Rinkel, Richard A.
Rinn, John R.
Roach, John C.
Roberts, Charles R.
Roberts, Ned C.
Roberts, Richard D.
Roberts, Tommie W.
Robertson, Hollis E.
Robertson, Robert J.
Robinson, David W.
Robinson, Eugene I.
Robinson, Robert E.
Rodgers, Robert D.
Rodrigue, Gerard J.
Roegge, Charles E.
Roehren, Robert R.
Roemer, Charles P.
Rogers, Joseph A.
Roper, Vincent W.
Roscoe, Simon A., Jr.
Rosendale, George W., Jr.
Ross, Scott K.
Rothe, Jack F.
Rowell, George W.
Rowsey, James M., Jr.
Ruhle, Robert C.
Rush, Claude E.
Russ, William M., Jr.
Russell, Kay
Rutherford, Harry M.
Ruthrauff, Clifford B.
Ryan, Thomas M.
Rypel, Ronald J.
Saavedra, Robert
Sabin, James F.
Sabine, Frederick R.
Sackett, Dean R., Jr.
Salatine, Richard
Saleh, Richard E.
Salo, Elmer E.
Sampson, Robert J.
Sams, Hugh P.
Sandler, Charles A.
Sandman, Richard S.
Sandoval, Albert, Jr.
Sargent, Stephen E.
Saunders, Richard E.
Savage, Jimmy E.
Saville, Terry D.
Sayers, Samuel L.
Scarborough, John R. L.
Scarlett, Frank B.
Schade, Eric H., Jr.
Schaffert, Richard W.
Schaible, David L.
Schatz, Robert G.
Scherer, Francis H.
Scheyder, Ernst J.
Schick, Herbert A.
Schilling, George F.
Schleicher, Carl
Schmidt, Peter R.
Schmidt, Robert H.
Schmidt, Robert P.
Schmitt, Robert W.
Schneider, Frederick F., Jr.
Schneider, Walter L., III
Schoen, Victor A.
Schoessel, William M., Jr.
Schreadley, Richard L.
Schreck, Milton W.
Schreiner, Raymond J.
Schulze, John M., Jr.
Schuster, Eugene J.
Schutte, John J.
Schwartz, Ralph C.
Schwatka, August O., Jr.
Schweiger, Melvin B.
Scott, Phillip J.
Scott, Thomas P.
Scott, William W.
Scovel, Frank D.
Scranton, Herbert "H"
Seaward, Hobart E.
Sechrest, Edward A.
Seesholtz, John R.
Sailer, Melvin E.
Seip, Asher P., Jr.
Sesma, Ramon A.
Sexton, Delbert A.
Shafer, Richard W.
Shanley, Robert J.
Shannon, Philip M.
Shannon, Richard A.
Sheehan, John P.
Shelso, David A.
Shelton, Donald D.
Shelton, Woodrow W.
Sheppy, Clayton L.
Shinn, Robert A.
Shibley, Carl N.
Short, Benjamin F.
Short, Leroy A., Jr.
Shultz, Theodore B.
Shumaker, Robert H.
Sibley, David N.
Sigmond, Arie C. A.
Sikes, James H.
Siletto, Ronald J.
Simonik, Robert J.
Simpson, George T. K.
Simpson, William H.
Sirch, Richard W. F.
Skelly, Arthur R.
Slack, Stephen E.
Slaughter, William T.
Slawson, Bryce D.
Slawson, Bruce L.
Sleeman, Charles F.
Slingeland, Raymond D.
Sloan, John H.
Sloan, William D.
Slough, John H.
Smetheram, Herbert E.
Smiley, Robert R., III
Smith, Augustine J., Jr.
Smith, Bobby E.
Smith, Donald W.
Smith, Frederick H., Jr.
Smith, Gene A.
Smith, George O.
Smith, Harold L., Jr.
Smith, James W.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Joseph C.
*Smith, Richard E.
Smith, Norman M.
Smith, Phillip J.
Smith, Ronald E.
Smith, Thomas F.
Smith, Vernon C.
Smith, Warren R.
Smith, Wayne H.
Snively, Arthur W.
Snyder, Richard C.
Sones, William C.
Sorenson, Fred, Jr.
Spann, Homer R.
Spees, Adrian D.
Spellman, Fred G.
Spencer, Barry W.
Spencer, Charles H.
Spindler, Raymond S.
Spink, Peter J.
Spivey, Franklin L.
Spotts, James L.
Squires, Howard J.
Staats, Michael C.
Stalcup, Jimmie M.
Stallings, Arthur G., Jr.
Stammer, Walter H., Jr.
Stanford, Robert M.
Stanley, John N.

Stanwick, Stanley W. Vanderwagen, Edward
 Starbuck, Virgil K. A.
 Stark, Walter W. VanHorne, Alfred L.
 Statham, Raymond B. VanMetre, James M.
 Steece, Robert B. VanNice, James R.
 Stefanou, Christopher Vanoy, William E.
 M. VanPool, Logan E.
 Stephens, William J. Varney, Gale N.
 Stephenson, Paul D. Ventimiglia, Edward
 Sterling, John C. M.
 Stevenson, Connelly D. Vickers, Wrenclie
 Stevenson, Barr S. Villalobos, Julian
 Stewart, Charles C. Villenave, Robert A.
 Stewart, Edwin M., Jr. Vincent, Robert F.
 Stocking, Sigurd I. Vispo, Peter P.
 Stone, Elmer M. Vohden, Arthur F., Jr.
 Stone, Lowell P. VonGlahn, Ralph H.,
 *Strahan, Wendell L. Jr.
 Stratford, Robert H. Voorhees, Walter M.
 Stratton, Richard A. Vowel, Joe L.
 Straughan, William N. Waddell, Jack W.
 Streull, Joseph W. Wagner, John A.
 Strong, Henry H., Jr. Walder, Edward F., Jr.
 Stroup, Wayne E. Waldron, Charles H.
 Stuart, Charles J., Jr. Waldron, Michael J.
 Stutz, James D. Waldrop, Glynn A.
 Sullivan, Gene F. Wales, George E.
 Sullivan, Thomas J., Walker, Brian F.
 Jr. Walker, William E.
 Sumner, Donald M. Wallace, Richard J.
 Sumrall, William H. Wallace, Turner P.,
 Swagart, Allan M. Jr.
 Swan, William R. Walleen, Maurice L.
 Swanson, Harlan D., Wallis, Wayne H.
 Jr. Walter, Dale J.
 Sweeney, Leo H. Walters, James E.
 Taff, Clarence O., Jr. Waltzer, Jacob
 Tager, Bruce A. Ward, Compton E.
 Talbert, Joseph T., Jr. Wardell, William L.,
 Talbot, Merrill L. Jr.
 Tapp, John B. Warren, James W.
 Tarbuck, Richard R. Watkins, Robert L.
 Tatom, Frank B. Watson, Lloyd C.
 Taylor, Dan L. Watts, Henry A.
 Taylor, Hugh R. Watts, James W.
 Taylor, James M. Way, Edward R.
 Taylor, John D. Weak, William G.
 Taylor, Larry J. Weatherby, Theodore
 Taylor, Robert C., Jr. R.
 Teachout, David S. Weber, Gustave A., Jr.
 Thearle, William J. Webster, John A., Jr.
 Theodoros, Pete "J" Wehner, George D.
 Thoma, John C. Weidknecht, Frank A.
 Thomas, James G. Weldman, Russell H.
 Thomas, Richard L. Weinfield, Richard M.
 Thompson, Benton G. Welch, Ralph W.
 Thompson, James M. Welch, Richard D.
 Thompson, Jack D. Wells, Walton E.
 Thompson, Tommy L. Welsh, George T.
 Thomte, William J. Werner, Marshall D.
 Thorin, Duane W. West, Arch T.
 Thurber, John D. West, Charles T.
 Thurneysen, Jon S. West, Norman P.
 Tibbitts, Barrick F. Westall, Kenneth W.
 Tibbs, John C. Westendorf, Donald R.,
 Tierney, James S. Jr.
 Tietgen, Charles A., Jr. Westphal, Harold S.,
 Toohy, Edward L., Jr. Jr.
 Townsend, James B. Wharton, Edwin K.
 Tralla, Wade A. Wheeler, James R.
 Trent, Richard W. Whitbeck, Charles J.
 Truax, Hugh G. White, Clarence A.
 Trupp, Adam R. White, Laurence A., Jr.
 Tubbs, Kenneth A. White, Richard F.
 Tucker, Edwin B. Whitehorn, Floyd H.
 Tucker, James E. Whiteside, James D.
 Tucker, Roy E. Whitten, Jimmie
 Tugwell, Richard L. Whittington, James W.
 Tullis, James V. Whittle, Henry W.
 Turner, Robert C. Wichmann, William
 Turner, Vernon K. H.
 Turner, Wilson C. Wicke, James O.
 Tuttle, Jerry O. Widen, Max W.
 Tyers, Robert D. Widen, Richard D.
 Tyler, Eugene M. Wier, Ronald L.
 Tyler, Maurice F., Jr. Wiggins, Larry C.
 Ulrich, Thomas R. Wilbern, Jack M.
 Underhill, Edward B. Wilde, John H., Jr.
 Usher, John P. Wilke, William L.
 Vall, William C. Wilkins, George H.
 Vallera, Rocco D. Wilkinson, Thomas A.
 Vance, Walter N., III R.

Will, Robert A. Woodside, Harold R.
 Williams, Forrest R. Wootten, Carl B.
 Williams, Frank E. Wood, Millard L.
 Willis, Clayton B. Worrock, Bryce K.
 Wilson, Charles R. Wright, Frederick E.
 Wilson, Charles N. Wright, Harry W.
 Wilson, Donald C. Wright, Joseph M. P.,
 Wilson, Eric J. Jr.
 Wilson, Jackson A., Jr. Wright, Marsh E.
 Wilson, John S. Wright, Orville, Jr.
 Wilson, William E. Wuthrich, Richard E.
 Windsor, Nelson E. Wyly, James R., Jr.
 Winslow, Myron S., Jr. Yarber, James
 Winter, Richard A. Yarbrough, William P.,
 Wise, Stephen A. Jr.
 Witherspoon, Beverly Yarnell, James L.
 W. Young, Kenneth G.
 Witherspoon, Charles Zagortz, Leonard "A,"
 R. Jr.
 Witt, Robert F. Zaner, Aubrey B.
 Wolfe, Robert E. Zarcaro, John G.
 Wolfe, William F. Zdolsek, Martin F.
 Wollam, John E. Zechin, Frank F.
 Womack, David R., Jr. Zerwas, Richard L.
 Wood, Clarence W. Ziemer, Howard
 Wood, Forrest H. Zimmerman, John C.
 Wood, Joseph V. Zimmerman, Robert
 Wood, Rex S. W.
 Wood, Walter S. Zinn, Chester A., Jr.
 Woodbury, Orpheus L., Zipse, Robert L.
 III Zirbel, William D.
 Woodruff, Gene L. Ziskovsky, Joseph W.
 Woods, Herbert P.

Bisek, Dennis G. McCauley, George A.
 Burton, James L., Jr. Moran, Charles K., Jr.
 Campbell, Carl E. Mozley, Edwin A.
 Coffman, William R., Newsom, Joe R.
 Jr. Perkins, Richard L.
 Cust, Harlan R. Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
 Daum, Richard A. Persons, George R.
 Davis, Donald V. Pollard, Ronald T.
 Dean, Robert V. Proper, Vance D.
 Dyro, Stanislaus G. Rayome, Francis L.
 Forbes, Shirley J. Ream, Ronald L.
 Gardeila, John K. Reich, Merrill D.
 Gilbert, Robert L. Rhoads, John D.
 Goodwin, James E. Salatine, Richard
 Graham, Neil H. Schmidt, John A.
 Gray, Anthony W., Jr. Schumacher, Duane
 Gray, Lewis S. O.
 Greer, Robert E. Scott, William W.
 Hanson, Derooy L. Seif, Norman T.
 Herd, Robert V. Smith, Lee O.
 Higginson, John J. Swartz, Theodore R.
 Jines, Milton L. Thomas, James W.
 Kascote, George Thorpe, Gordon L.
 Kloman, John H. Titus, Edward D., Jr.
 Lange, Christian A., Wages, Clarence J.
 Jr. Wales, George E.
 Lomheim, Louis G. Walter, Harold B.
 MacAskill, Everett, Jr. Weichman, Denis R.
 MacKenzie, Bruce E. Wood, Walter S.
 Maloney, John J. Word, Millard L.
 Mann, John P. Yelle, A. Courtney

SUPPLY CORPS

Corblitt, James R. Hopkins, Richard B.
 Cunningham, John H. Kalafut, George W.
 Daddona, John M. Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
 Dewey, Edward P. Petras, George A.
 Greenfield, Milton Pliska, Robert F.
 Gumpert, Leroy C. Sechler, John L.
 Hawkey, William C.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Chin, William Klein, Dale M.
 Crisp, Hugh A. Lonegan, Thomas L.
 Godsey, Jack L.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Abbot, James L., Jr. Bonvillian, William D.
 Abercromble, Theo J. Bowdley, George W.
 Ady, Howard P., Jr. Bower, Carl R.
 Akers, Charles O'N. Brandenburg, Howard
 Alford, Lodwick H. H.
 Allen, Charles "L" "D" Brassfield, Arthur J.
 Alley, Murlin W. Breen, Roy E., Jr.
 Alm, Carlton F. Brehm, William W.
 Almgren, Neal Brent, Robert
 Anderson, Fernald P. Brough, James A.
 Arbes, James D. Brown, Frederick W.,
 Arrington, John L., II Jr.
 Aymond, John P. Brown, Gaylord B.
 Bacon, Noel R. Brown, Ira W., Jr.
 Bagby, Oliver W. Brownlie, Robert M.
 Balch, John B. Broyles, Ned L.
 Baldwin, Charles A. Bruning, Robert
 Ballantyne, Robert D., MacK., Jr.
 Jr. Bryce, David G.
 Bampton, Frank W. Buchan, Robert B.
 Banvard, Theodore J. Burgess, Andrew L.
 Bardshar, Frederic A. Burke, Edmund, Jr.
 Barnes, Jess W. Butler, Glen "B"
 Barnes, Robert C. Byrnes, Robert B.
 Barr, Capers G., Jr. Caldwell, Sam J., Jr.
 Barry, Richard F., Jr. Callhoun, Charles R.
 Bell, Clarence E., Jr. Calthan, Cornelius P.,
 Bemis, Wendell W. Jr.
 Berg, Alvin C. Cameron, Gerald L.
 Berg, Winfred E. Campbell, Duncan A.
 Bergstrom, Edward W. Caracciolo, Felix
 Bernard, William B. Carmichael, David C.
 Berns, Max A., Jr. Carrison, Daniel J.
 Bettinger, Joe L., Jr. Cassel, Charles M., Jr.
 Beveridge, Richard A. Cassidy, Herbert A., Jr.
 Bill, David S., Jr. Cattermole, George B.
 Blackburn, John R. Center, Richard L.
 Blonts, Edward C., Jr. Chalmers, George E.
 Bobczynski, Sigmund Chandler, Charles E.
 A. Childers, Kenan C., Jr.
 Bogart, Frank L. Christie, William F.
 Bonner, Emmett P. Clark, Alto B.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bosco, Clement, Jr. Sorenson, Jackie R.
 Shaughnessy, John M.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Vernon, Clarence A.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Smith, Ralph A., III

William W. Scott, United States Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and Supply Corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Baker, Mary T. Ziegler, Kathleen
 Ducey, Anne L.

SUPPLY CORPS

Brown, Betty J.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Casanova, Jean O. Floyd, Sara J.
 Cronin, Catherine V. Zook, Joan E.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Carol Y. Goodwin, Anne V.
 Andersen, Jeanette L. Hollis, Zid V.
 Bashe, Kathleen A. Larsen, Dorothy A.
 Bingham, Rosina E. Pierce, Velma A.
 Burnside, Mary D. Staub, Shirley A.
 Denby, Sara P. Steenburgen, Anna L.
 Dilorenzo, Julia J. Thomas, Wylene S.
 Forbes, Shirley J. Young, Johanna L. H.
 Frost, Beverly W. Zierdt, Lucy E.

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Angell, Richard O. Baumstark, Richard
 Aucoin, James B. B.
 Bailes, Ralph T. Beagle, Clyde A., Jr.
 Bailey, William W. Bingham, Rosina E.

- Clark, Charles R., Jr.
Clark, Robert W.
Clarke, Fredric "B"
Clarke, Samuel R.
Clarke, Walter E.
Clausner, Marlin D.
Coleman, James P.
Collins, Thomas W., Jr.
Compton, Emmett M.
Conatser, Charles N.
Conrad, Homer E.
Conroy, Thomas L.
Cooper, Francis T., Jr.
Corcoran, Daniel J.
Cox, Robert D., Jr.
Crabill, Charles H., Jr.
Crenshaw, Russell S., Jr.
Crews, Howard W.
Crouch, Partee W., Jr.
Crowley, Roger J., Jr.
Cunha, George D. M.
Curran, James H.
Dancy, Charles A., Jr.
Daniels, James G., III
Daniels, Jerry F., Jr.
Dare, James A.
Dashiehl, Edward L., Jr.
Davey, Harry E., Jr.
Davis, Lewis F.
Davis, Richard J.
Davis, Will "J", Jr.
Davison, William H.
Dawson, George E.
Dawson, William S.
Deacon, Edward T.
DeLaureal, Henry H.
DeLoach, William R., Jr.
Denton, William, Jr.
De Vico, Anthony J.
Dewey, Irving D.
Diekhoff, Aroid H.
Dimpfel, Emerson H.
Dinsmore, John R.
Doble, Ernest W., Jr.
Doughty, Morris R.
Downing, Arthur L.
Duchin, Morris G.
Dudley, John B.
Duffy, Gerald H.
Duncan, George C.
Duncan, Richard L.
Duplap, Ernest H., Jr.
Eddy, Thomas R.
Egbert, Gordon R.
Eisenhart, George N.
Eider, Robert M.
Ellison, Thomas B.
Elsom, James H.
Evans, Frank W., Jr.
Fagan, Robert H.
Fairfax, Eugene G.
Fargo, William B.
Farmer, Claude S.
Farwell, Arthur F., Jr.
Ferriter, John B.
Fidel, John A.
Finn, William S.
Fischer, Arthur F., Jr.
Fisher, Ellis J.
Fisher, Guin M.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J.
Forrest, Blake S.
Foster, Thomas M.
Frazee, Murray B., Jr.
Fryer, Norman E., Jr.
Funk, Harold N.
Furlong, Donald
Gantz, Saxe P.
Gavitt, Severance W.
Gehman, Harold W.
Gels, Lawrence R.
Gentry, William W.
Gerdon, Harold P.
Ghesquiers, George D.
Gibson, Edward I.
Gill, Paul W.
Gillette, Robert C.
Goalsby, Lee D.
- Gould, Richard K.
Green, Robert R.
Greene, Howard J.
Grell, Theodore A.
Griffin, Donald
Guerry, John B., Jr.
Gugliotta, Guy F.
Guinan, Timothy J.
Guinn, Dick H.
Gulick, Robert A., Jr.
Haines, John L.
Hance, Kenneth P.
Harbert, Charles W.
Hardaker, William T.
Harding, Edwin T.
Hardy, Leonard R.
Hare, Robert H.
Hargreaves, James C.
Harkleroad, Neil E.
Harper, Robert M.
Harrington, Daniel J., III
Harris, David L.
Harris, Leroy E.
Harris, Thomas D.
Hart, Charles S.
Hart, Joseph E.
Hartigan, Charles C., Jr.
Harty, Harry L., Jr.
Hayes, Richard M.
Healy, Charles E.
Heifrich, Harry D., Jr.
Hendrix, Charles N. G.
Henry, Eugene B., Jr.
Hermanson, Joseph M.
Heyer, Frank D.
Higgins, Elmore F., Jr.
Higgs, Alfred H.
Hilgedick, Winfred C.
Hingson, James M.
Hizer, DeVon McC.
Hogan, Richard J., Jr.
Holmberg, Paul A.
Holt, Alexander C., Jr.
Holzapfel, Valentine G.
Honan, John B.
Hoolhorst, Robert A.
Hooper, Frederic A.
Hooper, Posey A.
Hough, Jack W.
Howell, Willard Y.
Howland, John B.
Hubbell, Lester E.
Hughes, Jack J.
Hughes, John G.
Hunsicker, Charles, Jr.
Hushing, William C.
Huston, Charles D.
Hutchins, Robert B.
Iarrobino, Charles A.
Isaman, Roy M.
Jackson, Andrew D., Jr.
Jarvis, Benjamin C.
Jennings, Verne A.
Johnson, Cecil V.
Johnson, Charles H., Jr.
Johnson, Stephen L.
Johnston, James F. B.
Johnston, Means, Jr.
Kaye, John B.
Keegan, Thomas D.
Keim, William J.
Kelllogg, Frederic D.
Kenny, Edward T.
Klem, Edwin L.
Kinney, Sheldon H.
Kinsella, Charles W.
Kline, Raymond P.
Knapp, Elton L.
Knapp, Paul J.
Kroeger, Edwin J.
Kuntz, William E.
Laferty, Kenneth F.
Lambing, Charles Lr.
Lancaster, Norman G.
Laning, Richard B.
Lawler, Joseph T.
Lawrence, John C.
Lefever, Robert C.
- Leon, Strauss S.
Lindon, Elbert C.
Lindsey, Robin M.
Linehan, Joseph D.
Lloyd, Henry F.
Locke, Ralph F.
Lockwood, Ralph H.
Loustanaun, Paul E.
Lowe, Marcus L., Jr.
Lyngby, Alfred R.
Mackroth, John R.
MacNair, Martin P.
Magennis, Edward G.
Mandel, Herbert I.
Manning, William J.
Manser, Burton R.
Marinke, Charles A.
Mather, Lee W.
McAllister, James A.
McCall, Charles D.
McCarthy, John C.
McConnaughay, James W.
McCrocklin, James W.
McCurtain, James H.
McCuskey, Elbert S.
McDaniel, George T., Jr.
McDowell, Joseph M.
McElroy, Richard S., Jr.
McElwain, Harry W.
McGuinness, Walter A.
McManus, John W.
McQuiston, Lionel T.
Merritt, Robert G.
Meyer, Otto F., Jr.
Michael, Willard deL.
Miller, Robert C.
Miller, Charles K.
Miller, Harold C.
Miller, Hugh B., Jr.
Miller, Jim D.
Miller, Walter B.
Minner, Delbert M.
Moffett, Charles S.
Moore, Frederick T., Jr.
Moore, Waller C.
Mott, Charles D.
Munson, John J.
Munson, William H.
Murphy, Thomas W.
Nace, Charles D.
Norton, Gerald S.
Oldfield, James C.
Olson, Clarence E.
O'Malley, George F.
O'Meara, Donald J.
Ost, Herbert E.
Parker, James F.
Parker, Oscar B.
Parks, John E.
Parmelee, Clyde H.
Pawka, Edward J.
Pear, John F.
Pennell, Jesse L.
Peters, Maurice A.
Peterson, Dale K.
Pew, Leslie A.
Pfeifer, Carl F.
Phillips, Douglas G.
Pond, Charles E.
Powell, Lucien C., Jr.
Powell, Ward F.
Powell, William O., Jr.
Pressler, Louis P.
Price, Frank H., Jr.
Prickett, Samuel L., Jr.
Pugsley, Edmond B.
Radel, Frederick M.
Ramage, James D.
Ratliff, William "K"
Rawle, Wilmer E.
Read, Samuel H. P., Jr.
Reaves, Henry G.
Refo, Miles F., III
Register, Allen B.
Reigart, John M.
- Reilly, James D.
Renfro, John N.
Rhodemyre, John L.
Rice, Richard H.
Rigg, James F.
Ringness, William M.
Ritch, John B., Jr.
Roberts, Richard S.
Robertson, Charles M.
Robertson, James McI.
Robinson, Leslie S.
Robinson, Thomas
Roemer, Charles E.
Rogers, Leon W.
Rogozlenski, Frank E.
Romberger, William M.
Rommel, Herbert F., Jr.
Rooney, Paul C.
Roth, Eli B.
Rudden, Thomas J., Jr.
Ruhe, William J.
Rumsey, Dexter C., II
Russell, Frederick N.
Rynd, Robert W.
Salvia, Onofrio F.
Satterford, Robert B.
Saunders, Thomas F., Jr.
Savage, Arthur M.
Savidge, William L.
Sawyer, William T.
Schlegel, Rowland F.
Schmidt, Herbert T.
Schratz, Paul R.
Schreiter, Ernest F.
Schroeder, Fred J.
Schumann, Roland W., Jr.
Schuyler, Irving J.
Schwab, Ernest L., Jr.
Schwab, Erwin G.
Schwartz, John R.
Scott, Albert P.
Scott, George W., Jr.
Scurria, Norman V.
Semmes, Raphael, Jr.
Seymour, Harry A.
Shamer, Preston N.
Sharp, George F.
Sheridan, John G.
Shifflette, William M.
Shirley, Gene T.
Short, Norman S.
Siegmund, Theodore C.
Silk, Francis W.
Simmons, George S., III
Simpson, Eugene H.
Sinnott, Robert E.
Skuzinski, Charles F.
Slagle, Robert J.
Sloatman, John K., Jr.
Smith, Ellsworth N.
Smith, Emory C.
Smith, Eugene C.
Smith, George W.
Smith, Gordon W.
Smith, James H., Jr.
Smith, Joseph G.
Smith, Leonard "B"
Smith, Robert H.
Snipes, Beecher
Spear, Louis P.
Standish, Edwin O.
Stanley, Onia B., Jr.
Stay, Charles A.
Steigelman, Edward T.
Stow, Walter K., Jr.
Stultz, Ronald F.
Suddath, Thomas H.
Sullivan, Eugene T. B.
Superfine, Irving J.
Sutherland, William T.
Swanson, Chandler W.
Swanson, Leroy V.
Syverson, Douglas N.
Tausch, Frederick L.
- Taylor, Edward J.
Teich, Richard J.
Thompson, Howard A.
Toulon, Alfred J., Jr.
Tucker, Frederick B.
Tunnell, Richard McC.
Utgoff, Vadym V.
Vandergrift, Jacob J., Jr.
Vannoy, Frank W.
Van Wolkenten, Raymond V.
Vasey, Lloyd R.
Verbrycke, "J"
Russell, III
Vinock, Eli
Waldron, Alton L. C.
Wallace, James E.
Wallace, William E.
Walley, Marion C.
Waring, Elmar S., Jr.
Warner, Rex W.
Washington, Thomas, Jr.
Watson, Joseph T., Jr.
Wedell, Edward V.
Wehmeyer, Wilbur J.
Weinel, John P.
Weisner, Maurice F.
- Weitzenfeld, Daniel K.
Welden, Frederick
Wells, Harold A.
Wells, Wade C.
West, John N.
West, Joseph M.
Wheat, Dick M.
Whitty, Frank R., Jr.
White, Thomas S.
Whiteman, Armand D.
Whitney, Laurens A.
Whittier, Mark T.
Williams, Gordon B.
Williams, John B., Jr.
Williams, Thomas C.
Wood, Robert H.
Wood, Robert B.
Woolen, William S.
Wootton, James C.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Spencer D.
Wright, Whitney
Young, Jack C.
Young, Lloyd V.
Zimanski, Frank A.
Zimny, Stanley M.
Zoeller, Raphael A.
Zullinger, John R.
- CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS
Adams, Jesse F.
Banks, Lawrence E.
Beckman, Edward L.
Black, Paul E.
Bond, Sidney D., Jr.
Brooks, Ralph K.
Callagan, Dwight "A"
Canfield, Earle G.
Cheffey, John H.
Childs, Donald R.
Clare, Frank B.
Clark, Gale G.
Courtney, Marvin D.
Cronmiller, Philip D.
D.
Cunningham, James K.
deWilton, Edward L.
Dominey, Joseph B., Jr.
Doolittle, Robert C.
Faaland, Halvdan G K.
Faucett, Ralph E.
Goebel, John E.
Goodman, Edward G.
Hall, Clifford R.
Hill, Howard W.
Holloway, Charles K., Jr.
Holmes, Francis H.
- CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS
Adams, Henry P.
Allis, Frederick A.
Atkinson, Wallace L., Jr.
Bell, Thomas H.
Brandow, Henry W.
Brighton, Edward E.
Carson, John D.
Cherry, Jerome
Christensen, Charles M.
Claypoole, Jess S., Jr.
Cobb, Richard
Cope, Raymond W.
Corle, Frederic W.
Cosgrove, Paul F., Jr.
Coutu, Louis A.
Davis, James J., Jr.
Dexter, Robert C., Jr.
Dobbyn, Edward T., Jr.
Durant, William B., Jr.
Durham, Henry O., Jr.
Fisher, Allan J.
Frampton, Woodley E.
Glocheski, Virgil R.
Gore, John M.
- Grahn, Karl A., Jr.
Grassino, Ceasar M.
Greenhalgh, William T.
Grubb, Francis B.
Haggard, James W.
Heck, Charles B.
Hoard, Douglas H.
Hunt, Harold H.
Jackson, Alfred C.
James, Nathaniel W., III
Jeffrey, Richard P.
Joshua, Edward R., Jr.
Lally, Paul R.
Lee, Curtis J.
Letterman, Lincoln L.
Logan, Daniel F.
Lovig, Lawrence, Jr.
Madden, John E.
Major, Samuel J.
Milson, Wallace F.
Moore, George E., II
Moore, Glen C.
Muller, William F.
Norton, David C.

- Osborne, Charles S., Tonner, William G., Jr.
 Peckham, Charles W., Twitchell, William A.
 Rice, Gilbert McK., Van Donge, Charles J.
 Robertson, John B., Waite, George T.
 Stafford, Otis W., Walsh, James G.
 Standish, Eben M., Watson, Robert L.
 Stewart, Fred B., Webster, James K.
 Stokes, Maynard G., Wheeler, Kenneth R.
 Tolbert, Harmon S., Willis, Enos H.
 Yockey, Roy O.
- CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS**
 Barnes, Ernest R., McGann, Francis L.
 Coe, Robert W., Jr., Shilling, John H.
 Kleckner, John M.
- CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS**
 Boyer, William R., Pratt, Richard T.
 Burke, Jasper R., Reynolds, Luther S.
 Byrnes, William J., Seuffer, Paul E.
 Chilton, Arthur B., Jr., Simmons, Paul J.
 Morris, Albert C., Wilson, John W.
- CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS**
 Aldridge, William A., Oesterle, Albert R.
 Cathcart, John H., Pennington, James F.
 Cernak, George L., Pruitt, Charles C., Jr.
 Conant, Julian R., Relly, John V.
 Cooper, Richard G., Richardson, Glenn D.
 Edwards, Irwin G., Rudolph, Charles E., Jr.
 Eubank, Dillard P., Jr., Rupp, Nelson W.
 Gray, Gus W., Salandi, Robert T.
 Hamilton, Martin R., Spann, Sylvester E.
 Hamilton, Traver R., W., Jr.
 Hass, Albert P., Stanford, Walter O.
 Hedman, Warren J., Jr., Susewind, Simon W.
 Joseph, Robert L., Swearingen, John C.
 Kalres, Anthony K., Tande, Syrus E.
 Larson, Gilbert H., II, Van Damm, Vincent W.
 Manke, Wilbert C., W.
 Marking, William M., White, Dan B.
 Mosson, Lester H., Williams, Robert M.
- CAPTAIN, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS**
 Knight, Kenneth L.
- CAPTAIN, NURSE CORPS**
 Houghton, Ruth A.
- COMMANDER, LINE**
 Abbott, Thomas H., Banks, William R.
 Adams, Alton P., Barbor, Robert T.
 Adams, Loraine S., Barco, Leslie T., Jr.
 Adams, Robert S., Barker, Laughlin
 Adams, William L., Barrett, Alcus E.
 Adrian, Robert N., Barrett, Boynton
 Ady, Joseph W., Barrett, John M.
 Alrheart, James H., Barron, Carl F.
 Alber, La Vier C., Bartol, John W.
 Alexander, John S., Bass, Thomas E., III
 Alexatos, Michael S., Bath, Edwin J.
 Allen, Joseph W., Jr., Bauman, John F.
 Allison, Donald, Baumeister, Charles, Jr.
 Alt, Earl J., Bayne, Marmaduke G.
 Amme, Robert G., Andersen, Wayne G.
 Andersen, Charles R., Anderson, Donald A.
 Anderson, Donald A., Anderson, George D., Jr.
 Anderson, Paul H., Behner, Herbert C., Jr.
 Anderson, Robert W., Belling, John K.
 Anderson, William R., Belk, George H.
 Andrews, Milner L., Belt, Richard W., Jr.
 Aroner, Richard, Bemis, Lawrence R.
 Arthur, Robert L., Bennett, Milton D.
 Aubrey, Norbert E., Benoit, Horace G.
 Jr., Bentall, Howard G.
 Ault, Frank W., Berg, Frank M.
 Babcock, Courtland T., Berger, Eugene B.
 Bacak, Joseph J., Berkeley, Kenneth H.
 Bailey, Bernard J., Berquist, Carl R.
 Bailey, William F., Bertoglio, Lloyd W.
 Baird, Lawrence I., Bertoglio, Floyd J.
 Baker, Howard J., Beyer, Clarence R.
 Baker, Robert W., Bisbee, Roger A.
 Baker, Robert H., Bishop, Ralph F.
 Baker, William P., Blackburn, Emmitt W.
 Baldrige, Jewett A., Blakeney, Hulon R.
 Ball, Robert, Blattmann, Walter O.
 Ballou, Justin G., Bloom, Paul J.
 Bloomer, Francis W.
- Bolt, William H., Jr.
 Bookhamer, Robert H.
 Borysiewicz, Anthony F.
 Botten, Ralph D.
 Boyle, John A.
 Braddock, Robert L.
 Brady, Francis X.
 Brady, Francis L., Jr.
 Brady, Gordon G.
 Brady, James G.
 Braley, Gerald N.
 Branscome, James R.
 Bratten, John L.
 Braun, John E.
 Brchan, Edwin D.
 Brega, Richard E.
 Bress, Henry
 Brissette, Kenneth F.
 Britt, Edgar R.
 Brock, John R.
 Brookes, Charles S.
 Brown, Billy F.
 Brown, Clifford L.
 Brown, Donald N.
 Bryan, George R., Jr.
 Bryant, Franklin D.
 Buchanan, Donald J.
 Bucklew, Oscar T.
 Buckowski, George A.
 Buckwalter, Earl E.
 Buergey, Herman P.
 Burgess, Emery L.
 Burgo, Daniel F.
 Burley, Albert C.
 Burnett, Robert C.
 Burnette, Oliver S.
 Burns, Warren "H"
 Bursik, Viada D.
 Burton, John H.
 Burum, Roger L.
 Busik, William S.
 Butcher, Harold K.
 Eutler, Francis A.
 Byrd, Newton P., Jr.
 Cable, Jesse F.
 Cafferata, William F.
 Callahan, James E.
 Callan, Allie W., Jr.
 Campbell, James M.
 Campbell, William A., Jr.
 Caney, Lawrence D.
 Cantwell, Richard A., Jr.
 Carlson, Paul G. A.
 Carlson, Robert C.
 Carmichael, William P.
 Carpenter, Melvin J.
 Carter, Arthur McD., Jr.
 Carter, Harold A.
 Carton, Wilbur A.
 Casey, Thomas H., Jr.
 Cates, Clifton B., Jr.
 Center, George
 Chalkley, John W., Jr.
 Charles, John F.
 Cheal, Wayne R.
 Cheney, Harlan L.
 Cherbak, Alfred A.
 Choate, Robert B.
 Clark, Harry L., Jr.
 Clark, Jackson W.
 Cleveland, Blair
 Clingan, Forest M.
 Coad, Richard J.
 Coates, Joseph K.
 Cobb, William W.
 Cochran, Elvin P., Jr.
 Cockroft, Irving G.
 Coll, John A., Jr.
 Coleman, Thaddeus T., Jr.
 Collins, Cecil B., Jr.
 Collins, Samuel L.
 Conn, Alton H.
 Connolly, Bartholomew J., III
 Cook, Marshall M.
 Cooke, Henry J. H.
- Cooper, Walter
 Coppola, Eduguardo M.
 Cormack, John G.
 Cornelius, George
 Cornell, Leland B.
 Coulter, William G.
 Cowles, Jack R.
 Cox, Channing H.
 Cox, James L.
 Crow, Nelson W.
 Crusier, Handford T., III
 Culley, William F.
 Cummings, Edward J., Jr.
 Cure, Harold R.
 Curley, Clyde W.
 Dalzell, Samuel, Jr.
 Dampier, Robert M.
 Daniel, Charles L.
 Daniels, John
 Dankert, Herbert W. H.
 Dankworth, Edwin G., Jr.
 Danner, Howard E., Jr.
 Danz, Lawrence F.
 Darchuck, Matthew E.
 Darnold, Marshall P.
 Dauphin, Oyd L.
 Davidson, William A., Jr.
 Davis, Edwin T.
 Davis, George S., Jr.
 Davis, George J.
 Davis, George W. V.
 Davis, James H.
 Davis, John K., Jr.
 Davis, Judson C., Jr.
 Davis, Raymond E.
 Davison, Jaquelin C.
 Deatherage, Benjamin C.
 De Bord, Robert K.
 Decker, Daniel D., Jr.
 Demoss, Charles W.
 Dennehy, Roderick C.
 Detweller, Austin L.
 Dewey, William H.
 Dibble, Edgar J.
 Dick, John
 Dick, John H.
 Dimmitt, Robert E.
 Dingle, John A.
 Ditch, William E.
 Dodson, Boykin R.
 Donald, Herbert L., Jr.
 Donnelly, John A.
 Dootson, William W.
 Doran, Homer M., Jr.
 Dorsey, Patrick C.
 Dougall, Alan
 Dougherty, Robert M.
 Douglas, Benjamin T.
 Douglas, Daniel E.
 Douthit, James H.
 Dower, William D.
 Downs, Arnold E.
 Doyel, Wilbur T.
 Doyle, William T.
 Drachnik, Joseph B.
 Dress, George K.
 Dudley, John A.
 Duncan, Charles L.
 Dunkum, Hugh H., Jr.
 Dunn, Stanley M.
 Durham, Ardis H., Jr.
 Durham, Harold D.
 Durio, Jack N.
 Durna, Gordon A.
 Durocher, Charles O.
 Durup, Paul C.
 Earl, Raymond L.
 Easton, William E.
 Eaton, Max A.
 Ebel, August A.
 Edgerton, Stuart T., Jr.
 Edlun, William O.
 Edmisten, William H.
 Edwards, Arthur T. McB.
- Edwards, Eldon L.
 Edwards, Emory H., Jr.
 Efrid, Terril A.
 Elder, Arthur G.
 Elfefer, Theodore
 Elens, James N.
 Ellerbe, Gail J.
 Ellis, James W., Jr.
 Ellis, Walter J.
 Ellison, Harold H.
 Ellzey, Jack E.
 Emerson, Arthur T., Jr.
 Emerson, William D., Jr.
 Engdahl, William A.
 Engelman, Ralph
 Eslinger, Robert "H"
 Jr.
 Essling, Mark T.
 Etheridge, Melvin R.
 Everett, William J.
 Fallon, James V.
 Fatkin, Thomas J.
 Favreau, Floyd F.
 Fearnow, Fredrick R.
 Fechtelkotter, Harlo E.
 D.
 Fehr, Harrison R., III
 Ferris, James
 Feuerbach, Theodore
 Field, Leonard E.
 Finley, Miles R., Jr.
 Fitzgerald, Paul D.
 Fitzhugh, Mayo McG., Jr.
 Fleming, William W.
 Flessner, Conrad J.
 Flynn, Edward P., Jr.
 Foley, Peter J.
 Foltz, Frank E.
 Forcier, Alfred A.
 Forde, Lambert V.
 Fortner, Herschell
 Fosha, Charles E.
 Foster, John I.
 Fox, Elmer L.
 Fox, John C.
 Francis, Frederick E.
 Franz, Leonard A.
 Frawley, Larry W.
 Freeman, Daniel H.
 Freeman, Leon H.
 Freeman, Rowland G., III
 Frellsen, Max E.
 Frese, Bernard W., Jr.
 Frohne, Charles T., Jr.
 Gadberry, William F.
 Gage, Rex A.
 Gallimore, Roy H.
 Gano, John H.
 Garbow, Bernard L.
 Gardemal, Robert C.
 Garrett, William L., Jr.
 Garrison, Lloyd W.
 Garvey, Hugh M.
 Gastrock, Martin D.
 Gendron, Edward W.
 Gerdes, Henry A.
 Gersuk, Iper J.
 Getschell, Douglass D., Jr.
 Hill, Charles A., Jr.
 Hill, Fred C.
 Gibson, Aubrey L.
 Hill, Paul E.
 Gibson, James C.
 Hill, William O.
 Gibson, Moses McA., III
 Gieszl, Carl E.
 Gillespie, Donald R.
 Gillin, James McK., Jr.
 Gillock, Robert H.
 Gills, James W.
 Girard, George W.
 Gleason, Richard G.
 Godek, Mieczyslaw
 Gonzalez, Rene E.
 Good, Dale S.
 Goode, William M.
 Goodwin, Glendon
 Gordon, Grant B.
 Gordon, Harold L.
- Gorman, John P.
 Gould, Joseph E.
 Graham, Mac A.
 Gray, "O" "B"
 Gray, Rollin E., Jr.
 Gray, William J.
 Grazda, Melvin G.
 Greenwell, Martin D.
 Greenwood, Robert B.
 Gregory, Hayden A.
 Grieve, John R.
 Griggs, John B., III
 Grkovic, George
 Grosbeck, James D.
 Grossetta, Warren A., Jr.
 Guidry, Joseph W.
 Hadley, Stephen V.
 Hagood, Douglas R.
 Hathcock, June D., Jr.
 Hall, Alvin W., Jr.
 Hall, Jack S.
 Hall, Perry
 Halsey, Edward K.
 Hamblin, Robert L.
 Hamby, Edward P.
 Hammerstone, James
 Hamrick, Laurence L.
 Hanks, Eugene R.
 Hannon, Edward J., Jr.
 Hansen, Frederic T., Jr.
 Hansen, John B.
 Hansen, John L.
 Hansen, Robert L.
 Hansen, George W.
 Hanson, Ralph M.
 Hanson, Sammy H.
 Harcastle, William H., Jr.
 Harrelson, George D.
 Harrington, Charles B.
 Harris, Daniel R.
 Harrison, Curg W., Jr.
 Hart, Gordon McA.
 Hart, "J" Vincent
 Hart, John R.
 Hartman, Raymond G.
 Hartzell, James W.
 Hassell, Victor G.
 Hathaway, George C., Jr.
 Hatheway, Valentine J., Jr.
 Hattaway, Cleland S.
 Hawkins, Arthur R.
 Hawley, Edward R.
 Hawthorne, Robert E.
 Haynie, John C., Jr.
 Hazapis, Thomas
 Healey, Thomas L.
 Heflin, Edward A.
 Hein, Ralph, Jr.
 Heller, Samuel R., Jr.
 Hellickson, Aaron J.
 Hendler, Pennard
 Henry, Alfred J., Jr.
 Hersey, Kirk
 Heyworth, Lawrence, Jr.
 Hickman, Berton H.
 Hill, Charles A., Jr.
 Hill, Fred C.
 Hill, Paul E.
 Hill, William O.
 Hines, William M.
 Hitchcock, Edwin N., Jr.
 Hitchins, William S.
 Hitz, Frederick W., Jr.
 Hoffman, Robert J.
 Hoggard, Preston
 Hogue, "J" "C"
 Hogue, Robert F.
 Holder, Billy D.
 Holloway, James L. III
 Hollowell, Frank W., Jr.
 Holly, David O.
 Holmes, David O.
 Holt, Harry S.

- Holzrichter, Max A.
Homer, William N. P.
Hook, John C.
Hooper, Kenneth C.
Hoppe, William E.
Horrell, Ernest R.
Horswell, Vance E.
Houck, Dean W.
Hough, John B.
Hrabosky, Joseph
Hubbard, Raymond A.
Huber, Harvard C.
Hudson, Jack G.
Hudspeth, William L.
Huestis, Gerald S.
Huff, Alvin D.
Hughes, John E., Jr.
Humphrey, William S., Jr.
- Hunt, Daniel, Jr.
Hunt, Robert F.
Hurley, William G.
Hurst, Thomas C. III
Hutchison, Earle G., Jr.
- Hyde, Harold G.
Idle, Charles T., Jr.
Iiams, Meryl A.
Ingham, John W.
Irons, Robert E.
Irwin, Kay S.
Ischinger, Eric, Jr.
Jackson, Erwin S.
Jackson, James R., Jr.
Jahn, Waldemar P.
James, Richard C.
Jansen, John F.
Jennings, Douglas H.
Jennings, "E" "F" Kahle
- Jerbert, Arthur H.
Jester, Walter H.
Jogan, George J.
Johnson, Earl B.
Johnson, Harold T.
Johnson, James B., Jr.
Johnson, Melvin O.
Johnson, Silas R.
Johnson, Waldo P.
Jones, Donald R.
Jones, Jack B.
Joy, Bernard F., Jr.
Kane, John P.
Kanze, Robert F.
Karcher, Daniel M.
Karl, Paul J., Jr.
Karl, Robert D.
Karr, Delbert G.
Karter, Wilbur K.
Kauffman, Hal A.
Kelfert, Robert N.
Kell, Robert A.
Keller, Edgar T.
Keller, Harry B.
Kellerman, Lewis F.
Kelley, George A., Jr.
Kelley, Vincent F.
Kelsey, John W., Jr.
Kemp, Joseph C., Jr.
Kennedy, Edward F.
Kent, Donald G.
Kenton, Howard B.
Kenyon, Jack S.
Kerr, Edward E.
Kest, Harold W.
Kevan, Samuel McK., Jr.
- Keyes, Thomas E.
Kier, Kenneth J.
Kimener, Robert A.
King, David A., Jr.
Kirk, Leone E., Jr.
Kirkendall, Melvin S.
- Koellig, Fillmore G., Jr.
Kostrzewsky, Alexander J.
Kouns, Maynard W., Jr.
Krapf, Harry J., Jr.
Kruzick, George F.
Kruencer, William O.
Kuhl, Charles A.
Kuhn, Melvin M., Jr.
Kunhardt, Robert M.
Kunkle, Robert D.
Kuntz, Robert E.
Kurtz, Lawrence A.
Kuzell, Charles E.
Labrum, Willard D.
Laessle, Frank W.
Laird, Dean S.
Laird, Don E.
Laird, Ian M.
Landreth, William L.
Langfur, Joshua A.
LaPierre, Douglas B.
Largess, Clifton R., Jr.
Larkin, Edward J.
Larkins, Bowen S.
Larson, Rueben D.
Lasater, Allen N.
Lassell, Donald L.
Laurinat, Henry S., Jr.
Lavrakas, Letteris Law, Richard R.
Lawson, Dunbar
Lazenby, Richard D.
Leach, Alvin D.
Lee, Clyde J.
Lee, Howard "C"
Leggett, Ernest H.
Lemly, Frederick H., Jr.
- Lennon, Bernard C.
Leonard, Edward F.
LeValley, James B.
Lewis, Lawrence E., II
Lindstrom, Kenith V.
Linville, Cloyd A.
Linwick, Robert, Jr.
Livingston, William H.
- Lloyd, Marshall O.
Logan, John W.
Logan, Thomas B.
Longino, Walter B.
Loomis, William R.
Lovegrove, Howard C., Jr.
- Luberda, William S.
Lynn, Robert T.
Mabey, Alfred
MacFarlane, Arthur S.
Mackie, John R.
MacMurray, James W.
Maher, David B.
Mann, David O.
Mann, William G., Jr.
Manson, Frank A.
Marrow, Jack S.
Martin, Neal, Jr.
Martin, Richard H.
Marx, Theodore F.
Mason, James M.
Mason, Robert C.
Masle, Malcolm R.
Matthews, Joseph A.
May, Allan E.
Mayes, Damon C.
Mayo, James O.
McCain, Audley H.
McCants, Thomas R.
McCaughey, William H.
- McCauley, Brian
McConnell, Robert McC., Jr.
McCord, Walter D., Jr.
McCue, Hartsel F.
McCulley, William M., Jr.
- McCurdy, John D.
McDaniel, Jerry F.
McElwee, Robert E.
- McEnery, Edwin B.
McGaha, Curtis "D"
McGann, Patrick H.
McGinty, William G.
McGowan, Edward C.
McGrath, William F.
McGuire, Clair A.
McInnis, Norman K.
McIntyre, William R.
McKee, Robert W.
McKee, Robert L. J.
McKinley, Charles E.
McLinden, Hugh F., Jr.
- McManus, Philip S.
McMullen, Cornelius E.
McNair, William D.
McQuary, John E.
McQuilkin, William R.
McTighe, John A.
Medick, Glenn A.
Meldrum, George B.
Mercer, James W.
Merryman, Charles A., Jr.
- Merwin, Jesse A.
Metze, George M.
Metzger, Lewis W.
Meyer, Francis A.
Meyer, George R.
Michael, Bernard E.
Michie, Donald
Miller, Anthony J.
Miller, Clark W.
Miller, Harry Z.
Miller, Jesse E.
Milner, Frank D.
Mink, Robert O.
Minnear, Clyde W.
Minnick, Harvey E.
Mitchell, William C.
Monahan, John J.
Montgomery, John A.
Montunnas, Stanley
Mooney, James D.
Moore, James H., Jr.
Moore, James S., Jr.
Moore, Michael U.
Moore, Robert H., Jr.
Moore, Thomas H.
Morey, William R.
Morrison, Hubert
Morse, Lloyd C.
Morton, Henry S., Jr.
Moss, Richard N.
Mott, Howard
Muir, James S.
Mukhallan, Zaven
Mulligan, Charles E.
Munroe, William R., Jr.
- Murphy, James E., Jr.
Murtha, Vincent L.
Naegely, Laurence R.
Naylor, Jesse A.
Nelson, Arthur A.
Nelson, Leo W.
Nelson, Robert J.
Nelson, William M.
Newell, Arthur F., Jr.
Newland, John W., Jr.
Newman, Raymond C.
Nolan, John J.
Noon, Henry S., Jr.
Norton, Leroy G.
Now, John G.
Oakley, Robert D., Jr.
O'Brien, Clement E.
O'Brien, James M.
O'Brien, William B.
Ogden, Myron L.
Oliver, Joseph J.
Oller, John S., Jr.
Olson, Lester D.
Omohundro, Frank P.
O'Neil, Raymond C.
Orndorff, Winfield S., Jr.
- Padget, Paul E.
- Pahl, Herschel A.
Palm, Edgar F.
Palmer, Charles A., Jr.
Papas, Louis J.
Payne, Alton W.
Payne, Lloyd A.
Peale, William T.
Pearson, James W.
Peck, Edward M.
Pendleton, Charles A., Jr.
- Perez, Romeo
Perkins, James W.
Perkins, Tom A.
Peterson, Robert M.
Phillips, John J.
Phillips, Rockford L.
Phipps, Richard W.
Pickler, David A.
Pimentel, Antonio T., Jr.
- Pond, Robert McH.
Porter, Austin McC.
Porter, Charles S.
Porter, Phillip W., Jr.
Powers, George P.
Prada, Gerald W.
Prichard, Melvin M.
Provost, William B., Jr.
- Pryor, Samuel W.
Quillen, Vincent G.
Quillin, James C., Jr.
Quinn, Frank N.
Quinn, William J.
Racette, William A.
Raddatz, Robert W.
Randle, Jack
Randolph, John B.
Rapp, William T.
Rasmussen, Albert L.
Reed, George P.
Reeve, Delos E.
Regester, Richard P.
Reilly, Thomas E.
Rice, Russell C.
Ridgway, Richard H.
Ries, Herbert H.
Ries, Robert E., Jr.
Riley, William P., Jr.
Ringenberg, George W.
Ritchie, James
Roark, Lonnie H.
Robbins, Spencer E.
Roberts, Carlton B.
Roberts, Charles C., Jr.
Robertson, William P., Jr.
- Robertson, Chester L.
Robertson, Gordon H.
Robie, Edgar A.
Robinson, Roy H., Jr.
Robinson, Samuel J., Jr.
- Robison, Charles D., Jr.
- Rock, James C.
Rogers, Robert A., III
Rosengrant, Warren M.
Rossell, Robert H.
Rothamel, William P.
Rowell, Kenneth F.
Ruiz, Charles K.
Rusk, Alfred D.
Russell, Patrick E.
Rust, Charles C.
Ryan, Robert R.
Ryles, John W., Jr.
Ryner, Evan H.
Sammons, Robert J.
Sams, William R.
Sands, Jack H.
Sattler, James A.
Savacool, James McA.
Sawyer, Clifford R.
Sayre, Frank A., Jr.
Scaletbury, Edwin W.
Schall, Rodney F.
Schatz, Delmer A.
Schermerhorn, Dale V.
Schirmer, Adolf C.
- Schoulda, George C.
Schroeder, William A., Jr.
Schwartz, George McN.
Schwass, Earl R.
Scott, William J.
Seaman, Laurence F.
Seaver, Clifford N.
Sebring, Clair W., Jr.
Sedaker, Thomas S.
Sedell, Thomas R.
Sedwick, John W.
Selmer, Robert J.
Serrill, Julian "D," Jr.
Sevilla, Bernard
Shaver, Robert G.
Shea, John "D," Jr.
Shear, Dale M.
Sheehan, Joseph E.
Shelton, William T.
Shepard, Tazewell T., Jr.
- Sherwin, Robert W.
Shinneman, John R.
Shoner, David A.
Short, James W.
Sigurdson, Orville S.
Sillers, Colin B.
Silvani, George F.
Silverthorne, Frederick W.
Simmons, Andrew K.
Simmons, Charles T., Jr.
- Simon, William H., Jr.
Singletary, William C.
Singletory, Royce A.
Sipe, Harry C., Jr.
Sisk, Francis J.
Skidmore, Howard H.
Sloan, Stanley E.
Siocum, Winfield S., III
Smiley, Walter P.
Smith, Alwyn, Jr.
Smith, Burton E.
Smith, Clayton W.
Smith, Fenton P., Jr.
Smith, Floyd E.
Smith, Hovey D.
Smith, John W.
Smith, Leonard G., Jr.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Rodney N.
Smith, Thomas B.
Smyers, Charles W., Jr.
- Smyle, Ralph S.
Snodgrass, Joseph C., Jr.
Snyder, Charles E.
Snyder, Gordon A.
Sollenberger, Harold D.
Soule, Robert M.
Sparks, Ben, Jr.
Sparks, Robert M.
Spears, Paul H. A.
Spenser, Ray A.
Spreen, Roger E.
Spuhler, Ralph W.
Stacy, James M.
Staffel, Clayton F.
Stanley, David S.
Stanley, Donald C.
Stastny, Charles E.
Stear, David S.
Stearns, Theodore H.
Stearns, William G., Jr.
- Stegg, Robert J.
Stegner, DeWayne H.
Stephens, Russel T.
Stephens, Sidney B., Jr.
Stewart, Jack H.
Stinson, John F. J.
Stockebrand, Archie P.
Stowe, Jack L.
- Straub, Robert L.
Streeper, Harold P.
Streig, Frederick J.
Strelow, Reuben E.
Strohl, Mitchell P.
Strong, Hope, Jr.
Stronski, Edmund J.
Stroud, George W.
Struthers, Frederick E.
Stuart, Robert M.
Sullivan, Joseph B.
Sullivan, John R., Jr.
Sullivan, Philip H.
Sundquist, Gustave "A," Jr.
- Sutton, Sheldon L.
Swanson, Ray J.
Switzer, George D.
Taddeo, Alfred S.
Tallafiero, Philip B.
Tate, Benjamin C.
Taylor, Charles A., Jr.
Taylor, Halton H.
Taylor, Theron J.
Tazewell, John P.
Telfair, Robert M.
Temme, Robert L.
Teufer, William E.
Thelen, Robert H.
Thielges, Bernard A.
Thomas, Fred L.
Thomas, Gardner "J," Jr.
- Thomas, Lloyd H.
Thompson, Bert A.
Thompson, John R.
Thompson, John L.
Thorpe, Milton W.
Tichenor, William B.
Timm, Henry C., Jr.
Todd, James F.
Tolerton, Raymond C., Jr.
- Toine, Francis E.
Toulon, Ygnacio T., III
Tower, Robert G.
Tracy, Weimer B., Jr.
Traylor, James T., Jr.
Treadwell, Thurman K., Jr.
Tuft, Robert McR.
Turner, William H., Jr.
Umbarger, Bernard S.
Underwood, William E.
Vaatsvelt, Allan E.
Vallandigham, William W.
Vanderford, Gordon J.
van Lier Ribbink, Edward F.
Vann, Isalah McP., Jr.
Van Ness, Harper E., Jr.
- Vansant, Victor W.
Vaughen, William L.
Vicars, Earl C.
Vineyard, Merriwell W.
Vitucci, Vito L.
Vopatek, Matthias J., Jr.
- Vraclu, Alexander
Waddell, Stanton W.
Wagner, Arnold A.
Waldman, Albert C., Jr.
Walker, Gordon D.
Walker, Lewis W., Jr.
Wall, Charles G.
Wall, Maurice E.
Wallace, Duncan P.
Wallace, Kenneth C.
Wannamaker, John J.
Ward, Charles W.
Ward, Felix E., Jr.
Ward, Herbert H., III
Ward, James R.
Wardall, William E.
Warner, John D.
Watson, Raymond S.

Watson, Samuel E.
Watters, Harry J.
Webster, John A.
Weeks, John M.
Weible, Robert C.
Welmer, James O.
Wells, La Verne L.
Welch, Glenn E.
Welles, William T.
Wessel, Robert L.
West, Frank R.
West, Ira "B"
West, Robert G.
Westby, Donald E. S.
Westfield, Billy G.
Westray, William H.
Whisler, George H., Jr.
Whitcomb, Roy S.
White, James T.
White, John F.
White, Norman E.
Whitehurst, Robert E., Jr.
Whitmore, Quentin R.
Wildeberg, Samuel R.
Williams, Charles M.
Williams, William G.
Williamson, Cecil O.
Wills, Richard W.
Wills, Warrington R.
Wilson, Carter L., Jr.
Wilson, Robert G., Jr.
Wilson, Walter K.

Wimpey, George A.
Winner, Hal "M"
Wolff, Leonard C.
Wolff, Paul M.
Woodall, Reuben F.
Woodside, Robert C.
Woodward, Horace J.
Woodward, Lynn F.
Woodward, Nelson C.
Woodward, William B.
Wooley, Millard J.
Worthing, Lewis K.
Wright, Graydon D.
Wroblewski, Sigmund V.
Wyatt, James R.
Wyman, Herbert B.
Wynkoop, David P.
Wyrick, James W.
Yerger, Maury F., Jr.
Yonkers, George P.
Young, Richard O.
Young, William C.
Zane, Curtis J.
Ziegler, Joseph S.
Ziegler, William F.
Ziemba, Anthony M.
Zimmermann, Richard G.
Zimmerman, Chester A.
Zinn, Charles S.

Meyer, John P.
Miller, John D.
Mills, Hubert P.
Minor, George E.
Morrissey, John E.
Murphy, Robert W.
Nalley, Thomas L.
Neely, Carroll E.
Neely, Joe B.
Neilsson, Birger N.
Norcott, William C.
O'Connell, Arthur W., Jr.
Oldfield, Edward C., Jr.
O'Neill, Joseph S.
O'Rourke, Edward P.
Owen, Charles S.
Parrish, Donald E.
Perkins, Charles F.
Race, William W.
Rand, Arthur G., Jr.
Reardon, David N.
Reid, Donald P.
Reilly, Louis J.
Reiner, Raymond C. J.
Robison, Dale M.
Rosapepe, James V.
Russell, Albert J.
Sanders, Allen B.
Scheela, Jerome J.
Schmeder, Charles E.

Schmitt, Earl J.
Scott, John A.
Scott, Walter E., Jr.
Sharp, Melvin E.
Sheehan, William J.
Simpson, Harold W.
Slettvet, Richard M.
Smley, Creath B.
Smith, Lewis R.
Stonum, Robert H.
Suslick, Alphonse D.
Swan, Alfred W.
Thomson, Harvey W.
Turner, Ray M.
Van Teslaar, Everett A.
Vauzant, Joseph C.
Vaughan, James M.
VonChristlerson, Robert
Walker, Woodrow T.
Walton, Clarence H.
Weart, Elliott M.
Weiss, Arnold
White, Ernest C.
Wiedman, Charles, Jr.
Williams, Sidney W., Jr.
Windham, Albert C.
York, Edward S.
Young, Gilbert S.

Abbott, Edwin W., III
Abel, Samuel J.
Absher, George W., Jr.
Adams, Emil J.
Adams, Lynn W.
Addy, Alfred M.
Ahearn, Joseph F.
Ahlstrom, Orin J.
Albright, John J., Jr.
Alexander, Aaron G.
Alleman, Lee E.
Allen, Charles D., Jr.
Allen, Harry, III
Allen, Philip H.
Allison, Cecil G.
Allred, Jimmie "B"
Alotis, John
Alsover, James E.
Aithoff, William B.
Amos, James W.
Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
Anderson, James R.
Anderson, Leo J.
Anderson, Paul E.
Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
Andreason, Raymond R.
Archer, Martin D.
Arthur, Malcolm B., II

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE
Biltz, Sylvain F., Jr.
Bird, George W.
Bischof, William W.
Bivins, William "F"
Blackwelder, Buren L.
Biades, Jehu L.
Blair, Donald D.
Blair, John A.
Blake, Gordon
Blake, John S.
Blanks, Alva L.
Blawusch, Dirck E.
Blondin, John L.
Bly, Theodore S.
Boland, Joseph P.
Boland, Paul
Boland, Robert I., Jr.
Bolner, Jack W.
Bolles, Robert R.
Bolstad, Daryl B.
Bolton, Jordan T.
Bonewits, Donald G.
Boniface, John G.
Booker, Thomas F.
Borgerding, Howard A.
Boule, Arthur E., Jr.
Bouveron, Ernest A.
Bowen, Alva M., Jr.
Bowen, Llewellyn D.
Bowling, Roland A.
Boyd, Carl J.
Boyd, Paul C.
Boyle, Paul A.
Bradberry, Gordon D.
Brady, Robert L., Jr.
Branton, Richard C.
Branum, Rudolph
Breen, Charles E., Jr.
Brett, Robert P.
Brite, Murrel C.
Brooks, Richard S.
Brouillette, Robert R.
Broun, Leroy R.
Brown, Francis T.
Brown, Ian F.
Brown, Irwin M., Jr.
Brown, Jack, Jr.
Brown, Keith F.
Brown, Lewis C.
Brown, Robert L.
Brown, Russell D.
Browne, Herschel McK.
Brozo, John G.
Brubaker, Donald E.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Brumsted, Robert B.
Bryan, George S., Jr.
Bryant, Bobby D.
Bryce, Thomas A.
Buchanan, Fillmore B.
Bucknum, Jack E.
Bucolo, Mariano J.
Burgesser, Charles B.
Burgin, Wilbur J.
Burhans, John H.
Burki, Arde A.
Burrell, Robert E.
Burrill, James T.
Burton, Lester H.
Butler, Frank J., Jr.
Byron, Herbert I.
Cahill, John W., Jr.
Caldwell, George A., Jr.
Camp, Herbert E.
Campbell, Joseph W.
Cannon, Herbert "B"
Cantwell, William P., Jr.
Carl, John G.
Carlin, Walter P.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Carlson, Robert L.
Carneghi, Albert J.
Carper, John E.
Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
Carrroll, Thomas F.
Carter, Jack L.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Country, John C.
Cunningham, Lowell K.
Dobbie, Robert F., Jr.
Holmes, James H.

Jenkins, Judson H.
McGinley, Joseph M.
Ulshaker, Thomas R.
Waite, Charles L.
Whiteside, James E.

COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Andrews, Joseph P.
Arthur, Harry B.
Baker, Emile W., Jr.
Baldwin, Frank A.
Banks, Richard A.
Barham, John T.
Beckmeyer, Harold E.
Beumer, Alvin F.
Bevil, Lester F.
Blankinship, Grover F., Jr.
Blanton, Oscar R.
Bofenkamp, James E.
Brademan, Royce A.
Braham, Frederic C.
Brooks, Marvin L.
Brosseau, Oswald J.
Burkhead, Franklin
Burnett, Howard W., Jr.
Busby, John C., Jr.
Caporaso, John J.
Carr, Daniel M., Jr.
Cassidy, John V.
Clifford, George M., Jr.
Connelly, Max "R"
Cook, Glover H.
Cornell, Alexander H.
Coulter, Preston H.
Cummings, William J.
Dalbey, Earl G.
Daley, Clement E.
D'Amico, Joseph
Davis, Roger L.
Dawson, Thomas H., III

Gelsman, Gunter
Gibbons, Frank J.
Goodwin, Eric C.
Gould, Gene F.
Gray, William J.
Hackett, John J.
Hamblen, Eunice A.
Hammond, Richard C.
Hayden, Ralph H., Jr.
Hazen, Ralph E.
Hempson, Donald A.
Henkel, Harold L.
Herrick, Daniel K.
Herron, John C.
Hopwood, Alonzo L.
Hough, Homer H.
Huebner, Dale C.
Humphreys, Harvey F.
Huntington, John S.
Hurley, Robert E.
Iber, George H.
Jeffrey, Paul W.
Jeppson, Robert B., Jr.
Jones, Cecil P.
Kerr, Algernon H., Jr.
Kesselring, Waverly D.
Kirk, Charles A.
Klofkorn, Kenneth R.
Kriz, Frank J.
Kriz, Joseph A.
Lascara, Vincent A.
Law, Kenneth S.
Leedy, Ralph G.
Leighton, Richard W.
Lenox, Wilbert W.
Lewis, Wellington H.
Lightner, Thomas A. L.
Lohse, William M.
Lotterhos, Augustus, Jr.
MacQuarrie, Harry A.
Maggard, Talmadge P.
Maiman, Elmer J.
May, William R.
McDairmant, Robert J.
McKay, Frank W.
McKnight, Maurice P.
McLanahan, Clarence E.

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Anderson, Arthur R.
Austin, Henry E.
Bradley, Paul F.
Brink, Frederick W.
Brosius, George R.
Burns, John J.
Cahill, Richard A.
Caughey, Donald R.
Elliott, Robert E.
Ernstmeyer, Milton S.
Felder, George, Jr.
Ferris, James S.
Gallagher, Joseph P.
Garrett, Francis L.
Hemphill, Edward J., Jr.
Jones, Oliver W.
Jones, Robert "Q"
Kapalczynski, Eugene J.

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Nelson R.
Barlett, James V.
Beck, Tom W.
Busbee, Greer A., Jr.
Callahan, John F.
Cornwell, George G., Jr.
Cunney, Edward G.
Dillon, John "G"
Dougherty, John A.
Engram, Robert C.

Lloyd, Paul A.
Lyonergan, Vincent J.
Lyons, Earle V., Jr.
McGrath, James R.
Meier, Kermit I.
Menges, Harold F.
Morton, Frank R.
Oliver, Algernon M.
Peterson, Karl G.
Pipho, Edmund W.
Richter, Thomas J.
Ruleman, Robert N.
Sargent, Gerald H.
Schneck, Robert J.
Sneary, Earl D.
Sullivan, James A.
Swinson, Jesse L.
Thomas, George E.
Tuxbury, Vernon W.
Wilson, Robert K.

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Armstrong, Lloyd M.
Brauer, Frank J.
Colby, Gage
D'Vincent, Richard "C"
Ellis, Frank N.
Firestone, Dale L.
Gunther, Lewis L.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Flaherty, Paul V.
Hansche, Frank C., Jr.
Hardin, Fred M.
Herbert, Edgar, Jr.
Johnson, Edwin E.
Kwasny, Harry P.
Nelson, Martin R.
Ralston, William S.
Richey, John
Terry, Alfred G.
Turner, Charles W.

Barfield, Norwood R.
Barksdale, David A.
Barlow, John D.
Barnes, Jerald F.
Barnes, Robert J.
Barnum, Ralph L.
Bartholomew, Barton W.
Barton, Charles A.
Baskin, Donald
Bates, George M.
Baughman, Robert F.
Bauman, Kenneth E.
Baylis, John R.
Bayly, Donald C.
Beals, Granville A., Jr.
Beck, Charles E.
Becker, Arvade L.
Becker, Karl E.
Beeland, Cecil H.
Behre, Herbert A., Jr.
Bellah, James C.
Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
Bennett, Jack W.
Bennett, William O.
Benson, William D.
Bent, Jack
Bentley, Reuel H.
Bergeron, Roy L.
Bergner, Robert B.
Bergs, Robert A.
Bettis, Alfred McC.
Beumer, Everett H.
Beutler, Albert G.
Beyer, Stuart E.
Bigham, Harry

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Bogdon, "D" Dorothy
Moesser, Maxine M.
Monahan, Dorothy P.
O'Neill, Rita V.

Haymes, Benjamin F.
Hutton, Edward G.
Mazzarella, Maurice A.
Nystul, Oliver G.
Peterson, William A.
Rinke, Theodore J. H.
Rives, Robert G.
Troxell, Richard R.
Leopold, Robert S.
Sennott, Ralph A.
Swanson, Robert W.
Weise, George W.
Richards, Margaret
Thompson, Ida K.
Williams, Nell R.
Wilson, Judy N.

- Cartmell, James P.
Cartwright, Harold J.
Casey, Robert M.
Casseday, Jack N.
Casson, Robert M.
Castillo, Edmund L.
Cerstvik, Milan S.
Chamberlain, Charles H.
Chambers, Lloyd S., Jr.
Chaney, Robert S.
Chappell, Lawrence A.
Chaudoin, Harry D.
Chokas, Nicholls P.
Christensen, Morris A.
Chute, Charles L.
Clancy, George M.
Clare, James H.
Clark, Angus-Kerr
Clark, Edmund T.
Clark, Robert O.
Clarke, John L., Jr.
Clausen, Paul K.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Clayton, Edgar J.
Clegg, George B., III
Cleland, William H.
Clemmons, Robert H.
Clifton, Autry W.
Cody, Harold R.
Cohan, George M.
Coleman, Yale
Colley, Edward L.
Collins, John T.
Collins, Wayne D.
Comet, Robert E.
Concannon, Leslie E.
Cone, Warren M.
Constantine, James R.
Cooke, Edward W.
Coope, Peter MacD.
Corbett, Kenneth G., Jr.
Cordell, Curtis C.
Cottingham, Donald R.
Coulter, Fred W.
Coursin, Jack T.
Cowan, Paul G.
Cox, Harry W.
Crandall, Jack C.
Crangle, Eugene V.
Cravener, Leahmon A.
Crawford, Francis G.
Crawford, Joseph E., Jr.
Crawford, Robert E.
Critchley, John P.
Cronander, James H.
Cronmiller, Carl F., Jr.
Crooks, Thomas L.
Crosby, William H.
Cross, Thomas J.
Crowe, Thomas H.
Crozier, Francis J.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cuccias, Robert F.
Culwell, Jackson P.
Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
Curless, James P.
Curry, James G.
Cushman, Charles H., Jr.
Cutchall, Lee G.
Daly, Richard H.
Davis, Harry O.
Davis, Hector W., Jr.
Davis, John A., Jr.
Davis, William R.
Davis, William R.
Davison, Morgan L.
Davison, Richard R.
Deacon, William, III
DeBold, Joseph F.
DeCamp, Edgar A.
Decker, Edward A.
Decker, Walter C.
Dehart, Turner
- Dehn, Emerson C.
Deibler, Robert R.
Deltz, Charles J.
De Lorenzi, Robert M.
Demas, George K.
DeMayo, John J., Jr.
Demmler, Charles F.
Deney, Leonard J., Jr.
Dente, Eugene
Dickey, George L., Jr.
Dickson, George A., Jr.
Dickson, John E.
Dietrichson, Warren D.
Di Matteo, Dominic J.
Dise, Robert L.
Doell, Robert E.
Doels, Thomas K.
Don, John D.
Dorman, Alvin E.
Doss, Robert F.
Doty, William K.
Dougherty, John J.
Douthett, Richard B.
Dowling, Patrick S.
Downey, Denis J. J.
Doyle, Luther W.
Dozier, James H.
Drinkwater, Eugene E.
Duberg, Carl N.
Dudley, Harrison G.
Dudley, Sherman F.
Dugger, John A.
Duncan, Marvin H.
Duncan, Robert C.
Dunning, Richard A.
Durbin, Stephen F.
Dutra, John E.
Duval, Robert E.
Eagan, Bryan R.
Eckert, George J.
Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
Edwards, John A., Jr.
Eells, John P.
Eger, Frank A., Jr.
Egert, Marlin V.
Elgee, James F.
Elliott, Homan O.
Elliott, Luther H., Jr.
Elliott, Thomas J.
Ellis, Edmund H.
Ellis, George W.
Ellis, William H.
Emerson, Allan L.
Endacott, Jack A.
Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
Engelmann, Henry A.
Enquist, Edwin R.
Enyart, John W.
Erickson, John W.
Erwin, Willard L.
Ettner, Edward R.
Evans, Jack R.
Evans, James G.
Evans, Thomas G., Jr.
Everett, Elmer C.
Ekum, John D.
Fader, Kenneth B.
Fagan, John F., Jr.
Fagan, Philip J.
Fahney, Robert H.
Farmer, Harry C.
Farrall, John E.
Farrington, Richard S.
Faucett, William "A"
Faughaman, Franklin P.
Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
Faulx, Joe D.
Fay, Robert J.
Felsman, Jack L.
Ferguson, James C.
Ferrante, John M.
Ferree, Richard J.
Field, Francis E.
Finkel, Herman C., Jr.
Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
Finley, Robert N.
Finnigan, Robert J.
Fischer, Richard H.
Fisher, James R. M., II
Fisher, Lee W.
- Fiske, Samuel L.
Fitzgerald, Carl S.
Fitzgerald, Thomas R.
Fitzgerel, John H.
Fitzpatrick, John R.
Fleeger, Eugene G.
Fluhart, James H.
Folop, Albert A.
Ford, Frank W.
Forrester, John J.
Forson, Roy E., Jr.
Forsyth, William D.
Foust, James W.
Fox, Francis M., Jr.
Franch, Ardwin G.
Francis, Samuel
Fridge, Herbert E.
Fries, William D.
Fromknecht, George W.
Fuller, Robert C.
Furland, Frederick W.
Gaeher, Alfred H.
Gainer, Richard D.
Gallup, Frederick S., Jr.
Galt, Robert W.
Gammill, James L.
Gard, John G.
Garland, Earl E.
Garodz, Leo J.
Garrison, Robert G.
Gately, Donald E.
Gatewood, Walter P.
Gaul, Raymond A., Jr.
Gautier, Robert H.
Gavitt, Kenneth W.
Geary, Mervin O.
Gee, Harry C.
Gee, Robert D.
Gerhard, Harry "E", Jr.
Gernert, Harold F.
Geroy, Francis O.
Gibbons, James G.
Gibbs, Howard B.
Gibbs, Thomas E.
Giedt, John G.
Gilles, Donald A.
Gilliam, Gail H.
Gilyard, John G.
Ginn, Benjamin F.
Ginn, John O.
Glaser, William R.
Glaser, Clarence J.
Glennon, Allan N.
Gless, Richard D.
Glandeman, Henry P., Jr.
Glover, George W.
Glowacki, Theodore, Jr.
Gobble, George F.
Gordon, Jack G.
Gorman, John V.
Gorski, Joseph J.
Gortney, William M.
Gorton, Robert J.
Graham, Martin C., Jr.
Grantham, Robert D.
Graves, Luther J., Jr.
Gray, Julian F.
Greene, Joseph M.
Griest, Hadley C.
Griffiths, Charles H.
Griswold, Richard A.
Grkovic, Nicholas
Grojean, Charles D.
Guentz, Jack E.
Gulick, Richard I.
Gullette, John G.
Gunter, Monchie M., Jr.
Gunther, Ernest H.
Guthrie, Charles A.
Haak, Frank S., Jr.
Hagler, Billy E.
Hahs, Orrie A.
Hall, Ray E.
Hall, Richard P.
Hall, Walter D.
Hamaker, William R.
Hamberg, Harold A.
- Hamblin, Robert N.
Hankins, Wallace W., Jr.
Hanks, Robert J.
Hannah, Glyde B.
Hansen, John E.
Harlanbergh, Terry
Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
Harmer, Frank D., Jr.
Harp, Orland C.
Harper, George A.
Harris, Eli P., Jr.
Harris, William C.
Harrison, Glenn C.
Harshman, Glenn W.
Hart, John E.
Hart, Robert R.
Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
Haseilton, Frederick R., Jr.
Haseilton, Waring B., Jr.
Hauser, William F.
Hayek, Paul A.
Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
Hayes, Kent W.
Hayward, John L.
Hazen, Alan M.
Heberling, Donald A.
Hebert, Ernest P.
Heesacker, Bernard A.
Heffernan, James M.
Heldorn, Lawrence H.
Henderson, Jerome E.
Henningsen, William J.
Henriques, David N., Jr.
Herbert, Edward D.
Herweg, John B.
Herzog, John J.
Hess, Charles M.
Heuer, Edward H.
Higgins, Robert T.
Highsmith, William N.
Higley, Warren A.
Hihn, Don E.
Hill, Charles C.
Hinchcliff, Lester G., Jr.
Hoffman, Raymond L.
Hogg, Frank W.
Hoke, Charles H.
Holden, John J.
Hoover, Ralph A., Jr.
Hopkins, Francis D.
Hopp, Frederick H.
Horn, Francis R.
Horn, Maurice A.
Horner, Walter R.
Hoskins, Thomas H.
Howard, Carl L.
Howard, George D.
Howard, Walter F.
Howard, William D.
Howe, Raymond E.
Houser, Howard M.
Hoy, Hugh A.
Hubbard, Edward R.
Huddleston, William E.
Huff, Andrew F.
Hughes, Arthur J.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hugus, James E.
Hume, David M.
Hurst, Howard B.
Hutches, Robert S.
Hutchinson, Thomas H., Jr.
Hutchinson, Harold R.
Huval, Willard R.
Hyland, Kenneth G.
Iacobelli, Rocco F.
Ideker, Donald E.
Ingraham, Mark W., Jr.
Irvine, James F., Jr.
Irwin, Charles M., Jr.
Iverson, Robert G.
Jablonski, Felix J.
Jack, Earl
- Jackson, Joseph A.
Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
Jacobsen, John H.
Jarina, Michael
Jeffes, Edward W. B., Jr.
Jenkins, Glen E.
Jensen, Duane L., Jr.
Johnson, Allen R.
Johnson, Charles McC., Jr.
Johnson, Dean R.
Johnson, Donald W.
Johnson, Frank E., Jr.
Johnson, Harold E.
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Keith V.
Johnson, Mortimer C.
Johnson, Walter P.
Johnston, Frank S.
Jones, Donald P.
Jones, Francis F., Jr.
Jones, John M.
Jones, Theodore R.
Jones, William F.
Jordan, Edward V.
Jordan, James, Jr.
Jorgensen, George D.
Joy, Harmon R.
Junod, Louis L.
Kahre, Edward L.
Kallies, Richard H.
Karr, Walter G., Jr.
Kasner, Edmund B.
Kaufman, John
Kaufman, Robert Y.
Kaye, Alan J.
Kearns, John S.
Keene, Warren E.
Keiser, George R.
Keller, Thomas D.
Kelley, Albert J.
Kelly, George R.
Kelly, James J.
Kelly, Leslie D., Jr.
Keneffick, James P.
Kennedy, Alfred F.
Kennedy, James R.
Kent, John "L"
Kent, Robert B.
Kenworthy, Arthur R.
Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
Kerfoot, Dale L.
Kern, Francis X., III
Kessing, Oliver O., Jr.
Kibler, Robert L.
Kiley, Donald W.
Killefer, William, Jr.
Kilpatrick, David D.
Kimmons, George W.
Kimzey, Ord, Jr.
King, Franklin T.
King, Herbert T.
King, John E.
King, William D.
Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
Kingsbury, Chester E.
Kinney, Grayson C.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirklighter, James F., Jr.
Klein, George R.
Klibbe, Orville O.
Kline, Edward C.
Klug, George J.
Knapton, Richard P.
Knox, Gordon L.
Koch, Ferdinand B.
Koepecke, William W.
Komorowski, Raymond A.
Koons, Jack L.
Kranz, Arthur C.
Kulik, Adam P.
Lademan, Dixon
Lambert, Carl R.
Lampe, James S.
Landtroop, Joe M.
Lane, Dwight A., Jr.
Langille, Justin E., III
- Languedoc, Arthur J.
Larson, Ray I.
Lassiter, "A" "C", Jr.
Lavelle, Francis M.
Layton, Donald M.
Ledbetter, Robert L., Jr.
Lee, John W.
Lefler, Luther
Legare, Armand F. F.
Leib, James M.
Leighton, David T.
Leist, Frederick, Jr.
Lemeshevsky, Andrew A.
Lessmann, Walter G.
Leuschner, Robert J.
Levine, Saul
Lewis, George H.
Lichtenberg, Robert S.
Light, Robert G.
Lilly, Creighton D.
Lindbeck, Edwin E.
Lindberg, Charles H.
Lindsay, John R.
Linville, James C.
Little, John B.
Lococo, Salvatore
Long, David A.
Longton, William F.
Lonquest, Theodore C., Jr.
Loritsch, Richard H.
Lowell, John E.
Loven, Ernest E.
Lumsden, David, Jr.
Lund, Howard R.
Lynch, James
Lynch, Richard J.
Lyon, Harvey E.
Lyon, Howard E.
Lyon, James O.
Lyons, Kenneth H.
Lyons, Richard T.
MacKay, Robert T.
Macon, Glen G.
Madill, William G., Jr.
Maginnis, Hayden R.
Mahinske, Edmund B.
Maier, Frederick L., III
Malone, Walter J.
Mangus, Thomas B.
Manning, Alvin B.
Maple, Charles J.
Marsh, John C.
Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
Marshall, Robert C., Jr.
Martin, Joseph R.
Martin, Lealyn E.
Martz, David J.
Mason, George E.
Matejcek, John F.
Matthews, Walter L., III
Matthews, William R.
Maupin, Elwin C.
May, Robert C.
Mayer, Joseph C.
Mayer, William S.
Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
McAdams, Lee T.
McCall, Robert E.
McCallum, John F., Jr.
McCandless, Arlin R.
McCaulley, Henry B.
McClelland, Robert A., III
McClintock, William W., Jr.
McDonnell, James L.
McDonnell, John C.
McElroy, Robert L., Jr.
McGaw, Donald A.
McGee, Dan, Jr.
McGovern, William
McGrane, Clarence V., Jr.
McGrath, Charles T.
McGraw, Donald L.

- McKee, David A.
McKeever, Elmer V.
McKenzie, Robert P.
McMahon, Joseph D.
McManaman, Raymond J., Jr.
McMillan, Leo D., Jr.
McNeil, Richard S.
McNeil, Robert K.
McNeill, Howard G.
McRostie, Richard J.
Mealy, John K., Jr.
Meek, Orville M., Jr.
Meenen, Henry R.
Mellick, Roger E.
Merrell, Chadler V.
Metschel, John J.
Metzger, Daniel T.
Metzger, Robert L.
Meyer, John J., Jr.
Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
Miles, Kenneth N.
Miller, Donald G.
Miller, John "X", Jr.
Miller, John W.
Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
Mills, Jack O.
Mills, Ralph B., Jr.
Mills, William P.
Millsaps, Lewis M.
Minton, Don E.
Miskill, Donald K.
Moll, Kenneth E.
Monthan, George R.
Mooney, Francis E., Jr.
Moore, Harry R.
Moore, James A.
Moore, James I.
Moore, Oswald M.
Moore, Ralph L., Jr.
Moore, Robert E.
Moore, William V.
Moorhead, Kenneth W.
Moran, Thomas L.
Morey, William C., Jr.
Morgan, Horace H.
Morgan, Robert L.
Morgan, Walter N.
Morgan, William H.
Moro, Albert J.
Morris, James W.
Morrison, Joseph B.
Morrison, John "L", Jr.
Morrison, James W.
Morse, Kenneth L.
Morton, William W.
Mouton, Edison E.
Mulholland, William P.
Mullen, Theodore W.
Muncie, Wendell B.
Munns, David L.
Murphy, Francis J.
Murphy, Thomas J., Jr.
Myers, Robert W.
Naffah, Ned
Nagler, Gordon R.
Naspak, Valentin
Nelson, Albert N., Jr.
Nelson, Gerard L.
Nemoff, Alfred J.
Nesbitt, James O.
Nevitt, Fred M., Jr.
Newbern, Robert O.
Newman, Dale E.
Newsome, William R.
Newton, Daniel D.
Ney, Kenneth C.
Nichols, Robert L.
Nickerson, Jerome W.
Nicklas, William C., Jr.
Niehaus, Herbert H.
Nilsson, Clifford E.
Noble, Guy E.
Noble, Lee V.
Nolta, Cornelius Jr.
- Norman, James H.
Norris, Cracker J.
Norton, James C.
Norville, Robert W.
Nott, Hugh G.
Nugent, Corliss R.
Odell, John D., Jr.
Offertmatt, Wilbur F.
Ogle, Robert J.
Onsiek, Robert R.
Oliver, Daniel A., Jr.
Oliver, Stephen
Olson, Edward C.
Olson, Edwin G.
O'Neal, Alfred C.
O'Neill, Thomas H. R.
Ortland, Henry, III
Orton, Robert D.
Otten, Vincent B.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Overn, John A.
Owens, Haydn, Jr.
Oyer, John L.
Packer, Samuel H., II
Page, Robert A.
Paige, Robert W.
Palkovic, Richard M.
Palmer, John G.
Parish, John J.
Parker, Edwin J.
Parks, Larry G.
Parr, Charles W.
Parrish, Harvey S., Jr.
Parry, Loren C.
Parsons, Robert C.
Patterson, Donald P.
Patterson, William C., Jr.
Pavis, George P.
Paxson, Roy H., Jr.
Pearson, Douglas C.
Pearson, Francis E., III
Pefley, John W.
Pennington, Otis G.
Pennington, Philip B.
Penny, Harmon C.
Perez, Raul B.
Perkins, Jack B.
Perry, Joseph S., Jr.
Peters, Bernard
Petersen, Richard L.
Peterson, Frank
Petre, Gabriel L.
Petricka, Robert P.
Pfefferkorn, William R.
Phares, John V.
Phepfs, Henry E.
Phillips, Chester G.
Phillips, Harvey R.
Phillips, Robert G.
Piatek, John A.
Pickrell, Robert M.
Picton, Richard E.
Pierce, Robert E.
Pietrowski, Edward L. F.
Pilmer, Edwin H., Jr.
Pittman, Shelly B.
Pitz, Marcellus T.
Plaut, Arthur, Jr.
Plummer, Philip F.
Podhradsky, Henry B.
Pohrman, David C.
Pole, Thomas M.
Polgar, Paul S.
Pond, Robert B.
Porter, Edward M., Jr.
Potter, Horace S.
Powell, Edwin H.
Powers, Horace S.
Pringle, Robert C.
Probyn, Robert W.
Prutman, Orlin N.
Putnam, Earl B.
Quisenberry, William R.
Rabe, Richard D.
Radloff, Fred H.
- Ragland, Roy J.
Ralston, John, Jr.
Rambur, William M.
Randle, David D.
Rasmussen, Merwin E.
Ratte, Paul W.
Ray, Charles E.
Ray, Troy G.
Rayner, Donald E.
Reaves, George A., III
Redden, Lawrence E.
Redgrave, DeWitt C., III
Reese, John W., Jr.
Reich, Charles A.
Reiff, Glenn A.
Renn, John E.
Reynolds, Allan J.
Reynolds, George R.
Rice, Minor T.
Richelieu, Charles F.
Rickman, Wilford M.
Rieke, Norbert A.
Riggs, Wallace M.
Riley, Jack
Rives, James D., Jr.
Roberts, John
Robertson, Chaytor L., Jr.
Robertson, Horace B., Jr.
Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
Robinson, Gordon E.
Robinson, William H., Jr.
Robinson, Winthrop P.
Rock, Clifford "T"
Rockett, Charles W.
Rodier, Richard L.
Roe, Philip A.
Rogers, David A.
Rogers, Frank W.
Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
Rogers, Harry M.
Rogerson, Reuben G.
Rose, Albert E., Jr.
Rothwell, James G.
Roulstone, Don J.
Roux, Vernon K.
Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
Rushin, Thomas E.
Rusling, John A., III
Russel, Joseph W.
Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
Sabota, Leo M.
Samota, Frank
Sandeford, William H.
Sanders, Rodney D.
Sanderson, James R.
Sands, James W.
Saunders, Walter E., Jr.
Savage, John E.
Savage, Richard A.
Savage, Stuart, Jr.
Saylor, Beverly
Schabacker, Robert B.
Schaefer, John E., Jr.
Schaffer, Donald R.
Schetky, Malcolm O.
Scheuing, Robert E.
Schindler, Clyde H.
Schirra, Walter M., Jr.
Schmidt, Wesley H.
Schmieler, Arthur H.
Schneider, Frank J.
Schultz, Robert F.
Schulenberg, Duane E.
Schultz, Henry
Schwemley, Paul A.
Schwitters, Merlin J.
Scott, Clyde L.
Scott, Norvell O., Jr.
Scott, Richard Y.
Scott, Wiley A.
Scripp, John L., III
- Seabaugh, Raymond R.
Seargeant, John A.
Searl, Floyd C.
Searle, Willard F., Jr.
Seay, George W.
Sellers, Harry S.
Sells, Warren H.
Shane, Elbert B.
Sharer, Keith W.
Shea, Stephen J.
Sheehy, Edward J.
Sheil, James E.
Shepard, Everett G., Jr.
Sheppard, Walter P., Jr.
Sherfy, John B., Jr.
Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
Shipman, James L.
Shonk, William H., Jr.
Short, Merton D.
Shrake, Francis B.
Shreve, Andrew K.
Sickel, John A.
Sidenberg, George M., III
Sigafos, John J.
Sigler, Edward E., Jr.
Simmons, Robert L.
Simon, Harold W.
Simons, Minton, II
Simpson, William E.
Sims, Clifford L., Jr.
Sindell, Leroy J. E.
Singer, Arnold N.
Sipe, Richard G.
Skidmore, Edward O.
Skooq, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Bruce K., Jr.
Smith, Donald L.
Smith, Edwin P., Jr.
Smith, Emory P.
Smith, Floyd L.
Smith, Frederic N.
Smith, Henry L.
Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.
Smith, Lowell H.
Smith, Raymond D.
Smith, Rush S.
Smith, Wallace E.
Snopkowski, Edward L.
Snowden, John W.
Snowden, Macon S.
Sperandio, Joseph L.
Sprague, Albert T., III
Sproul, William C.
Stadter, George B.
Stahl, Lawrence E.
Stanley, Donald E.
Stanley, Earl W.
Starr, Mark R.
Staveley, Ernest
Steedle, George D., Jr.
Stell, Albert L., Jr.
Stephens, Alvis H.
Stephenson, Marion G.
Stevens, Mortimer, Jr.
Stiegelmar, Loren R.
Still, Raymond G.
Stilwell, Louis "C"
St. John, Alvin P.
Stokes, Robert E. L., Jr.
Stose, John F.
Stout, Cecil C.
Stoutenburgh, Joseph S.
Stroux, Peter M.
Stufflebeem, John D.
Sturdevant, Harvey W.
Sullivan, Joseph J.
Sullivan, Russell H., Jr.
Sullivan, Robert M.
Sullivan, William P.
Sunney, Frank F.
Sutton, Thomas L.
Swanson, Karl T.
- Sweeney, James R.
Swope, John R.
Taft, Jesse W.
Taylor, James D.
Taylor, John L.
Taylor, Perry R., Jr.
Taylor, Waymon
Teneyck, Hubert A., Jr.
Tesh, Charles P.
Thomas, Albert H., Jr.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Robert H.
Thomas, Robert E.
Thompson, Bruce R.
Thompson, Harold T.
Thompson, Lewayne
Thompson, Robert D.
Thompson, Thomas N.
Thompson, William
Thorndyke, John R.
Thurman, Russell, Jr.
Tice, John J., III
Tidd, Emmett H.
Tideman, Otto D.
Tierney, John M.
Tiffany, Emory G.
Tilghman, Walter W., Jr.
Tippie, Bruce E.
Tipping, William L.
Tisdale, Robert S.
Tolson, George F., Jr.
Trahan, Paul K.
Trapp, Bill C.
Travers, Edward P.
Treacy, Edmund J.
Treadwell, Archie B.
Tribble, Gordon B.
Tribble, Robert J.
Trip, Rudolph E.
Trott, Robert J.
Tucker, William W.
Tull, John "L" D.
Tully, Claude I.
Turk, Carl F.
Turley, Miles D. J.
Turner, William R.
Uhwat, Robert A. D.
Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
Urquhart, Alexander W., Jr.
Vail, Ronald A.
Valentine, Andrew J.
Valley, James R.
Van Train, William A., Jr.
Vardy, Richard S.
Vaughn, Donald E.
Vaught, Thomas B.
Veling, George M.
Vereen, Jackson E.
Vestal, Edwin C., Jr.
Viele, John W.
Voorheese, Jack R.
Waddell, Henry M., Jr.
Wade, Felix W.
Wagner, Paul R.
Wahl, Clyde F.
Walker, Charles W., Jr.
Wallace, Donald E.
Walsh, Francis R., Jr.
Walsh, John A.
Warmath, Martin C.
Warren, Burtis "W"
Wasdin, James R.
Wash, John L.
Watt, Jesse R.
Wattie, Thomas F.
Weatherford, Jack E.
Weaver, Roy B.
Weaver, Walter C.
Webb, Babe W.
Weber, William J., Jr.
Webster, Daniel A.
Wedding, Edwin G.
- WEIDNER, ROBERT E.
Weigel, John J.
Weirich, James F.
Welander, Robert O.
Welch, Harry E.
Weity, Wayne J.
Wencker, Donald P.
Werner, Robert V.
Wertheim, Robert H.
Wesper, Willis H.
Wessinger, William D.
West, Earle L.
West, Jack
West, Richard E.
Westfall, Elmer T.
Wetlaufer, Warren H.
Whalen, William F., Jr.
Wheat, Elwood C.
Wheatley, Chester H.
Wheeler, William L.
White, Allan E.
White, Arthur C.
White, Arthur T.
White, Ira R.
White, Ray E.
White, Rue W.
Whitehead, Andrew D.
Whitlock, Eldred L.
Whitney, Loren C.
Whitney, William J.
Whittle, Alfred J., Jr.
Wible, Lester C.
Wieland, Daniel T.
Wilcox, Burr C.
Wilder, James H.
Wilkinson, Roland F.
Wilkinson, Donald W.
Willett, Elbert H.
Williams, Charles S., Jr.
Williams, Dwight L.
Williams, Elmer R.
Williams, Joseph N., Jr.
Williams, James E.
Williams, John H. D.
Williams, William H.
Williamson, Robert II
Willis, Charles H.
Willis, Thomas J.
Wilson, George B., Jr.
Wilson, Henry R.
Wilson, Phillip A.
Wilson, Richard H.
Wineman, Glenn W.
Wingfield, Elmer A.
Winter, Henry E., Jr.
Wise, Maurice E., Jr.
Witham, Burton B., Jr.
Wolf, Edward F.
Wolfe, George M.
Wolfe, John M.
Wollam, Raymond L.
Wood, Robert D.
Woods, Charles E.
Woolston, John
Woolums, Charles R.
Worsley, Earl A.
Wyand, Donald McK.
Wyman, Charles L.
Yerbury, Robert H.
Yerly, Harold J.
York, George H.
Young, William B.
Youngblood, Donald K.
Zartman, Walter F.
Zavoy, Andrew J.
Zeni, Levio E.
Zimm, Alfonz
Zimmerman, George G.
Zimmerman, Wayne L.
Zook, Lester E.
Zowarska, James G.
Zwolinski, Frank J.
Zyvoloski, Richard A.
- LEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS
Baker, Robert L. Drips, Robert C.
Boswell, "J" Thornton Dunn, Seldon C.
Buechel, Donald E. Durden, Charles S., Jr.
Conner, Robert A. Egan, John F.
Craighead, John T.

Garrett, Robert I.
Gaylor, Donald H.
Gill, John E.
Herlihy, Charles E.
Hodges, Thomas L., Jr.
Kaufman, Paul
Lagerquist, Howard W.
Long, James A.
Maher, Robert W.
Martin, Stuart H.
McDonald, John J.
McGreery, John J.
Meekings, Walter J., Jr.
Neptune, Edgar McC., Jr.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS

Adrian, Rodger J.
Ainlay, Henry L., Jr.
Albea, John P.
Allen, Paul M.
Applegate, Richard C.
Avellone, Francis P.
Bailey, Edward F.
Bain, Louis E.
Baird, Richard S.
Baker, William R.
Barron, Willard D.
Benson, John A.
Bond, Calvin C.
Bower, Edward E.
Britt, Ernest E.
Buchanan, Richard W.
Buck, Walter J.
Challain, Leonard J.
Chance, Carl
Chapman, Edgar C., Jr.
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Clifton, Emory V.
Collins, James H.
Comeau, Reginald B.
Conard, Melvin L.
Conover, Donald T.
Corley, James O.
Crain, Harold
Creekman, Charles T.
Criner, Eugene F.
Crook, Lewis J.
Crowder, Norman M.
Dellasega, Joseph L.
Dester, John M.
Doucette, Forrest H.
Duncan, Bryan L.
Dura, Leon J.
Effner, James E.
Elkins, Robert H.
Ewing, Paul C.
Fay, John F., Jr.
Fischer, Carl R., Jr.
Forrest, James E.
Gallup, Mearl
Gillis, Charles L.
Gobel, Carl F.
Gralla, Eugene
Haberlin, William E.
Hair, Maurice E.
Haley, Robert S.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Harris, Robert B.
Hart, Carten M.
Harvey, Hobart D.
Haslett, Robert H.
Hay, Patrick M.
Henker, Donald E.
Hill, Roger E.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Hughes, Thomas W., Jr.
Jankovsky, Norlin A.
Jones, Joe L.
Jones, Joseph B.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Abucewicz, John A.
Cloonan, Joseph F.
Dennis, Arthur W.
Fay, John P.
Fitzpatrick, Francis J.
N.
Forney, Fredric J.
Hayes, Henry H.

Olson, Marshall W.
Palmer, Robert H., Jr.
Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
Risi, George F.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
Sanderlin, Joseph M.
Smitley, Roger P.
Valdivieso Del Toro, Jorge R.
Welch, Elbert S.
Wiebenga, Ned H.
Wilber, Martin C.

Lavin, Henry T.
Maguire, Connell J.
Mahoney, Vincent J.
Mershon, Carroll McB.
Morgan, Raymond
Nerthling, Edwin J.
Nunn, Jack E.
Power, Joseph G.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, Max H.
Ashley, Donn L.
Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.
Boyd, Earl I.
Brantner, William B.
Burton, George W.
Daub, Leland A.
Dearth, Keith H.
Devlin, John G.
Diehl, Charles E.
Doyle, Paul J., Jr.
Draves, Albert W., Jr.
Farley, Robert J.
Forquer, Charles J.
Francy, William J.
Gregory, George W., Jr.
Hediger, Fritz H.
Heglund, Robert Q.
Heuston, Robert H.
Iselin, Donald G.
Jasper, Paul R.
Jonas, Whitney B.
Kaloupek, William E.
Kirk, Randolph
Klingemeier, Russell J., Jr.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Bartlett, Stephen O.
Beall, Frank P., Jr.
Counsel, Lee A.
Dunn, John J.
Echols, Archie P., Jr.
Gregory, Worth B., Jr.
Hawkins, Kenner F.
Holmes, Corey H.
Jasper, William J.
Lehmann, William G.
Mahoney, Jack D.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Allen, Cleo R.
Allen, Robert V.
Anderson, William S.
Armitage, Horace G.
Baldrige, Henry D., Jr.
Bohannon, Ray
Broulik, Frank
Burr, Leonard W.
Caldwell, Charlie C.
Carter, Charles H.
Cartier, William L. G., Jr.
Chapman, William H.
Civiello, Harold J.
Clauss, Edward L.
Coburn, Kenneth R.
Colman, Frederick R.
Combs, Harrison T.
Cox, Walter R.
Deriso, Dominic J.
Dyches, Kenelm "O"
Ervin, Francis A.
Ethridge, John W.
Garrett, John L.
Henry, Girtton H.
Hunter, Russell E.
Joslin, Leslie H.
Kelly, Joseph A.
Klostermann, Wolfgang E.

LEUTENANT, LINE

Abele, Henry F.
Abercrombie, Jerry T.
Abrahams, Thomas P.
Abrahamson, Dean A.
Addams, John F.

Rademacher, Glen A.
Rossbach, George F.
Sullivan, Mark
Szczeny, Charles A.
Vincer, John D.
Webb, Charles E.
Widman, John A., Jr.
Zoller, John E.

Albertson, William H.
Albright, Richard K.
Aldern, Donald D.
Alexander, William H.
Alexander, Marvin W.
Aldredge, Donald L.
Allen, John B.
Allen, William D.
Allen, Winfred P.
Allison, Arnold W.
Altee, Thomas M.
Altmeyer, John M.
Amick, Benjamin C., Jr.
Anastion, Tommy K., Jr.
Anderle, Charles K.
Anderson, Charles A.
Anderson, Curtis O.
Anderson, Duane E.
Anderson, David W.
Anderson, Forrest P.
Anderson, Robert P.
Anderson, Robert C.
Anderson, Robert N.
Apted, George L.
Archambault, Jackson L.

Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Arison, Rae E.
Armel, Lyle O., II
Armstrong, Philip McC., Jr.
Arnheiter, Marcus A.
Arnold, John E.
Arrott, Reed T.
Asbacher, Martin A., Jr.

Ashley, Bruce H.
Atkinson, Robert J.
Auccin, Leonard L.
Avary, James C., Jr.
Avrit, Richard C.
Ayers, David W.
Babcock, Donald E.
Baciocco, Albert J., Jr.
Backes, Ronald J.
Bacon, John L.
Bademan, Harold W.
Bagby, Hallam O.
Bailey, George T.
Balderston, Buele G.
Baldwin, Charles C.
Ball, Courtland D., III

Bandemer, Otto H.
Banghart, Leslie L.
Banks, Bruce R.
Banks, William E., IV
Banta, Robert
Barke, Arthur R.
Barnes, Donald K.
Barnes, Harry G., Jr.
Barnes, John B.
Baron, Charles E.
Barringer, Malcolm L.
Barry, Thomas M.
Barthelenghi, George H., Jr.
Bassett, Jerry S.
Bassett, Melvin S.
Bates, David H., Jr.
Bates, John A., Jr.
Bath, Alan H.
Bathurst, Robert B.
Bauchspies, Rollin L., Jr.

Baum, Joseph H.
Bayer, David A.
Beard, Donald W.
Beat, Robert O.
Beaulieu, Reo A.
Beaumont, Eugene A. G.

Becker, Glynn R.
Beers, Robert C.
Beeton, Harvey J.
Bekkedahl, Clifford L.
Bell, Clyde R.
Bell, Gershom R.
Bell, William R.

Benero, Manuel A., Jr.
Benner, Leslie W., Jr.
Bennett, Richard W.
Bennie, Donald B.
Bentley, William C.
Benton, Jerry S.
Bergbauer, Harry W., Jr.
Berge, Norman K.
Berglund, Lester W., Jr.
Berkley, Lawrence N.
Berry, Joel H., Jr.
Berry, William H.
Best, Eddie F.
Bird, Charles F.
Bird, Joseph W., Jr.
Bishop, Richard D.
Bivens, Arthur C.
Blackington, Richard N.

Blackmore, Thomas A.
Blackwood, Jack D.
Blanchard, Robert C.
Blaindine, Robert E.
Block, Stanley H.
Blum, Frederick J., III

Blundell, Peveril
Boggs, Steve V.
Bohannon, William L.
Bolst, Albert L.
Boister, Harry E.
Boncer, Lawrence
Booth, Roger G.
Booth, Theodore W.
Borthwick, Robert B.
Botula, Bernard C.

Bowen, John H., Jr.
Bowen, William S.
Bowers, Henry H.
Bowling, David H.
Bowman, Lawrence F.
Boyd, John H., Jr.
Boyer, Walton T., Jr.
Boyett, Stephen G.
Boyle, Darrell D.
Bozeman, Henry G.
Bradbury, John I.
Braden, Melvin E., Jr.
Brady, Francis T.
Brady, John H., Jr.
Breaux, Fred J., Jr.
Bridg, James A., Jr.

Bridges, Kenneth K.
Bristol, Robert B.
Britton, William L.
Brooks, Edwin H., Jr.
Brouillard, Donald C.
Brown, Clyde I.
Brown, Donald N.
Brown, Harold
Brown, Jacob C.
Brown, James R.
Brown, Kenneth R.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Robert M.
Brown, Walter H., Jr.
Browning, Siras D.
Brownley, John H.
Bruce, Robert E.
Brummage, Richard L.
Bruning, Richard A.
Brunson, Wright "A", Jr.

Bucher, Lloyd M.
Bucy, John T., Jr.
Bull, Joseph L., III
Bullard, John R.
Bunnell, William P.
Burdon, Eugene R.
Burgess, James A.
Burke, William C.
Burlley, John R.
Burriss, John R.
Burt, Thomas E.
Bush, James T.
Bushong, Brent
Butcher, Nathan T.
Butcher, Paul D.
Butler, Archie P., Jr.

- Butler, Charles T.
Butrym, Stanley B., Jr.
Buys, Jay R.
Byrd, Sam R.
Byrnes, Robert E.
Cahill, Charles A.
Callcott, Jack D.
Cameron, Kenneth R.
Cameron, Norman A.
Campanella, Anton M.
Campbell, Edward L.
Campbell, George R.
Campbell, John A.
Campbell, James B.
Campbell, Jack
Campbell, William N.
Canfield, Gerald L.
Cann, Tedford J.
Cannell, Donald T.
Cannon, David E.
Cannon, Leo J.
Canon, George A., III
Cantacuzene, Rodion
Carelli, Francis L.
Carey, William R.
Carl, William T.
Carlin, Robert J.
Carlson, Olof M., Jr.
Carlson, Ronald F.
Carnevale, Angelo M.
Caron, Robert R.
Carola, Joseph J.
Carr, John H.
Carr, Nevin P.
Carrington, James H., Jr.
Carroll, William E.
Carson, Ernest H.
Carson, Ralph
Carter, James D.
Carter, Robert D.
Carterette, Robert T.
Cash, Eugene J.
Cashman, Michael, II
Cassel, Dean G.
Cassen, John S., Jr.
Cassidy, Thomas J., Jr.
Causey, Donald F.
Cave, Thomas H.
Chadwick, John K.
Champlin, Gerald B.
Chapman, Frederick L.
Charest, Philip G.
Chase, Edgar M.
Chase, Warren A.
Chesley, James F.
Chewning, Robert W.
Christensen, Eugene J.
Christensen, Raymond J.
Christon, Paul W.
Clark, Charles E.
Clark, David P.
Clark, Donald E.
Clark, Richard G.
Clark, Stanley D.
Clarkin, James J.
Clements, Billy R.
Clew, William M.
Clingenpeel, William A.
Cloughley, William D.
Coe, David C., Jr.
Cole, Edgar E.
Cole, William S., Jr.
Coleman, James O.
Collier, Larry D.
Colligan, Thomas R.
Collins, Philip K.
Combs, Martin F.
Coney, Robert W.
Conn, Lannie, Jr.
Conolly, Robert D.
Conrad, Charles, Jr.
Conrad, Peter C.
Converse, Douglas
Coogan, Richard D.
Cook, Charles L.
Cook, William H.
Cooke, Donald L.
Cooley, Arthur W.
Cooper, Robert G.
Cooper, Tommy G.
Corbett, Eugene A.
Corbin, Malcolm R., Jr.
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.
Crader, Clifford L.
Craig, Earl C.
Crain, James D.
Crater, Ray F.
Craven, Robert C. E.
Crawford, Nace B., Jr.
Crepeau, George A.
Cricchi, John V.
Crinklaw, Douglas L.
Cronin, Francis W.
Crosby, Charles A.
Cross, Charles H.
Cruden, David S.
Cuccias, Leo P.
Cunningham, Edward F.
Curl, Kent W.
Curran, Robert W.
Curry, Thomas E.
Dally, David F.
Dalton, Charles W.
Dalton, Richard V.
Daly, Harry P., Jr.
Daly, Richard G.
Damian, John L.
Daniels, James M.
Daniels, Verlyne W.
D'Arville, Edmond J.
Davidson, Charles H.
Davidson, Christie H.
Davidson, David D.
Davis, Bill N.
Davis, Frank E.
Davis, Henry J., Jr.
Davis, John B.
Davis, Michael C.
Davis, Noble J., Jr.
Davison, John W., Jr.
Day, Arthur R.
De Hart, William
DeLaney, William E.
DeMaris, Darryl A.
De Martini, Edward J.
Denman, Charles C., Jr.
Denton, David N.
Derr, John P.
DeTonnancourt, Arthur E.
Devereaux, John R., Jr.
Dick, Joseph L.
Dickman, Jerry A.
Diesel, Charles N.
Dietz, Richard J.
Di Giacomo, Joseph G.
Dillingham, Paul W., Jr.
Dillon, Harlan K.
Dimon, Charles G., Jr.
Di Nola, Michael J.
Divebiss, Dallas R.
Dixon, Edward R.
Dobyns, John E.
Dodds, Robert M.
Doelling, Robert D.
Dolan, William R.
Donaldson, Robert S.
Donaldson, Robert J.
Donnelly, Raymond D., Jr.
Donnelly, Robert G.
Donovan, James F.
Dorosuk, John, Jr.
Dotson, Gene E.
Douglas, Jack R.
Douglas, James G., Jr.
Dowe, Robert M., Jr.
Dowe, William J., Jr.
Dowse, Herbert B., Jr.
Doyle, William J.
Drago, Anthony J., Jr.
Drain, John F.
Drew, Russell C.
Drummond, Scott E., Jr.
Dubino, Andrew D.
Dubois, Roland H.
Duckering, Donald W.
Duckett, Philip VanH. L.
Dudley, Paul L., Jr.
Duffy, Joseph A., Jr.
Duhkoph, Don J.
Duke, Marshal B., Jr.
Dunaway, John A., Jr.
Dunbar, Vance O.
Duncan, Dale W.
Dunkin, Ray L.
Dunlop, Thomas E.
Durbin, Peter
Eberhart, Robert S.
Eckhouse, Morton A.
Eddleman, Gilbert H.
Eddy, Denver D.
Eddy, William P., III
Edwards, Forrest L.
Edwards, Jerry J.
Edwards, William R., Jr.
Eibert, Don C.
Ellis, David E.
Ellis, George D., Jr.
Ellison, John C.
Elster, James M.
Emerson, Jesse R., III
Engel, Francis J., III
Engelbrecht, Richard H.
English, Francis W., Jr.
Erwin, Donald E.
Evans, David W.
Evans, George J.
Evans, Thomas B.
Everist, Philip W.
Ezzell, Leon J.
Falconer, Alastair S.
Fall, David R., Jr.
Farber, Karl H.
Farnham, Charles G.
Fawcett, Craig R.
Fead, Louis MCP.
Feeke, Edmond M.
Fehl, Frederick C., Jr.
Feller, Donald L.
Fellingham, Robert W.
Fellowes, Frederick G., Jr.
Fellows, Charles D.
Felt, Donald L.
Felt, Joseph A.
Feltham, John C., Jr.
Fenn, Dan E.
Ferguson, Andrew C.
Ferguson, William W.
Ferguson, Ernest W.
Fernandes, James E.
Ferrell, Dewitt T., Jr.
Fette, Estal J.
Field, Harford, Jr.
Filkins, William C.
Finneran, William J.
Finney, Jack L.
Fischbein, Ernest
Fischer, David H.
Fischer, Edward J.
Fisher, John C.
Fisher, Russell H.
Fisher, William G., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Thomas W., Jr.
Fleeson, Richard J.
Fleischmann, William H., Jr.
Fleming, Raymond T., Jr.
Fletcher, Richard M.
Florance, John E., Jr.
Fong, Chong S.
Font, Carlos G.
Fonville, Henry P.
Fossum, Paul G.
Fox, Charles W., Jr.
Fox, Richard V.
Frank, Benjamin L.
Fraser, George K., Jr.
Fraser, Robert "E"
Frederick, Donald R.
Freeman, Linus W., Jr.
Freeman, Robert W.
French, Fred H.
French, William L.
Frick, Joseph F.
Friedel, Gordon W.
Frier, John M., Jr.
Friele, George A.
Friesen, Floyd A.
Frost, John F., III
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.
Gantt, Richard G.
Garcia, William V.
Gardner, Kenneth R.
Gardner, Louis J.
Garner, Pat M.
Garnett, Walter W.
Garrett, Bernard D.
Garrett, John E.
Gatewood, Tommy L.
Gavazzi, Robert R.
Gennette, Robert L.
George, Charles A., Jr.
Gibbs, Charles E., Jr.
Gildea, Joseph A.
Giles, Thomas N.
Gillette, Halbert G.
Gilmore, Arthur H.
Giovanetti, William C.
Glaves, Robert H.
Glazier, Alvin S.
Gleim, Ernest H.
Godek, John
Golde, Morton
Goldner, Robert R.
Goldsmith, Watson W.
Goldstein, Jonas L.
Good, Ronald P.
Gooden, Richard O.
Goodfellow, John
Goodman, Kelsey B.
Goodrich, John R.
Goodwin, Frank O., Jr.
Goodwin, William D.
Gordon, Richard F., Jr.
Gowing, Richard M.
Gradel, Robert
Graf, Frederic A., Jr.
Graffam, Earl H.
Gravason, George L., Jr.
Greeley, Michael T.
Green, Harry J.
Green, Thomas B.
Greer, Wayne C.
Gregory, George B.
Gress, Donald H.
Grier, Robert W., Jr.
Griffith, Philip G.
Griffith, Webster
Griggs, Norman E.
Groder, Robert E.
Groff, Peter F.
Grogan, Lee R.
Gross, Arthur J.
Gross, Ralph, Jr.
Gunn, William J.
Gunning, Patrick J.
Gurnsey, Ronald A.
Hackney, Benjamin F., III
Haggquist, Grant F., Jr.
Hahn, Frederick, Jr.
Haig, Robert B.
Hall, Donald F.
Hall, John P.
Hall, William C.
Halsey, Charles H., Jr.
Halverson, Richard K.
Hamel, James K.
Hamilton, Glenn D.
Hamilton, LeRoy A.
Hamm, Clement D., Jr.
Hammock, John W.
Hamrick, Thomas D.
Handford, Richard C.
Hangartner, Lyle G.
Hannegan, Frank N.
Hannula, Brian K.
Hansard, Stonewall
Hansell, Emerson L., Jr.
Hansen, Norman T.
Hansen, Robert F.
Hansen, Rodney V.
Hanson, Albertlea
Hare, Charles W.
Harney, Russell F.
Harns, John H.
Harper, William W.
Harris, James W.
Harris, James W.
Harris, Richard A.
Harrop, Robert D.
Hart, John R.
Harter, Raymond B.
Hartley, John D.
Harwood, John B.
Harwood, Lewis D.
Hatch, Harold G.
Hatcher, Robert E., Jr.
Hatcher, William K.
Havens, Stanley L.
Haverty, Alvin D.
Havird, Lloyd B.
Hawk, Arthur L.
Hawkins, Richard McK.
Hayes, Albert M., Jr.
Hayes, Jerome B.
Hays, Estel W.
Head, William N.
Headland, Carl B.
Headley, Allen B.
Headrick, Billy J.
Heasley, Waldo L.
Heath, Frederick T.
Hebbard, LeRoy B., Jr.
Hedberg, Arthur J., Jr.
Heise, Paul R.
Helgemoe, Raymond A. E., Jr.
Helgeson, Harry E., Jr.
Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
Henderson, Charles G.
Henderson, Nathan S., Jr.
Hendrick, David E.
Hennessey, Aloysius G., Jr.
Henry, Lee L.
Henson, John M.
Herker, Richard T.
Hertwig, William G.
Hetu, Herbert E.
Hickman, William J.
Higginbotham, Allen B.
Higgins, Hugh W.
Higgins, Raymond F.
Higgins, Thomas G.
Hill, Charles D.
Hill, Frank W.
Hill, Lucio W.
Hill, Marshall E.
Hilz, Harold J.
Hiniker, Peter J., Jr.
Hinman, Albert H.
Hipp, Ronald N., Jr.
Hornsey, Ronald A.
Hobgood, Ray A.
Hoch, John E., Jr.
Hodges, George P., Jr.
Hodson, Theodore L., Jr.
Hofman, Robert B.
Hogan, Walter V.
Hoge, James H.
Hobert, William H., Jr.
Holcomb, Gordon B.
Holcomb, "M" Staser
Holland, James N.
Hollenbach, William T.
Holt, Ivey B., Jr.
Holt, John J.
Holway, Nathan C.
Hope, Edgar G., Jr.
Hannegan, Frank N.
Hortan, Edward R.
Hostettler, Stephen J.
House, Edward C.
Houser, Richard M.
Houston, Albert W.
Howard, Albert W., Jr.
Howey, Robert E.
Hoye, James M., II
Hozey, Ira D., Jr.
Hubal, Augustine E., Jr.
Hubbard, Samuel W., Jr.
Hubbell, Walter B.
Huffman, Malcolm L.
Hughes, Kenneth P.
Hukill, Henry D., Jr.
Hull-Byde, Donald
Humber, Marcel B.
Humphreys, Felton "M", Jr.
Hunter, Herbert P.
Hurd, John B.
Hurley, Robert J.
Hyde, Robert A.
Ingram, Talcott L., Jr.
Inman, Wayne D.
Isaacks, Marion H.
Jacobs, Edward J., Jr.
James, Joe M.
Jaycox, Randall E., Jr.
Jaynes, Jack K.
Jefferies, Allen S.
Jenkins, Folsom
Jenkins, James R., Jr.
Jeter, Norman L., Jr.
John, Robert P.
Johns, Arthur J.
Johnson, Arne C.
Johnson, Clifford D.
Johnson, Clarence A. E., Jr.
Johnson, Eldon D.
Johnson, Emil L.
Johnson, George M.
Johnson, Oren D.
Johnson, Theodore F.
Johnson, William R.
Johnston, George T.
Johnston, John M.
Johnston, James I.
Jones, Alfred L., Jr.
Jones, Arthur L., Jr.
Jones, Donald W.
Jones, Donald S.
Jones, Henry R.
Jones, Thomas W., Jr.
Jordan, James S.
Joy, Bernard I.
Kaall, Samuel W.
Kaalaus, Richard L.

- Kane, Paul E.
Karcher, Robert K.
Karpatis, Anthony J.
Kassel, Robert H.
Kattmann, Roger H.
Kauderer, Bernard M.
Keefe, Thomas J., Jr.
Keenan, Richard L.
Kehoe, Thomas R.
Keimig, Allen D., Jr.
Kelley, Alfred G., Jr.
Kelley, Roy A.
Kelly, James F.
Kelly, John S.
Kelt, William N.
Kendrick, William O.
Kennedy, William B.
Kennedy, William E.
Ketzner, Harry T.
Kidd, Vernon G.
Kiewel, Frank W., Jr.
Kilduff, Paul E.
Killian, Donald J.
Kinzey, Walter F.
King, Everett D.
King, John E., Jr.
King, Wilbert A.
Kinsley, Harry W., Jr.
Kirksey, Robert E.
Klee, Robert E.
Kleeman, Leonard
Kling, William T.
Knight, Charles H.
Knight, Robert H.
Knipp, Walter J.
Kniss, Donovan E.
Knoerr, Don H.
Koch, Donald F.
Koenig, Edgar F.
Kohler, Walter, Jr.
Kratz, Marshall L.
Kretschmann,
Curt H.
Krochmal, Alfred F.
Kruse, Charles T., Jr.
Krusl, Peter H.
Kucyk, Peter M.
Kuffel, Robert W.
Kugler, Kenneth D.
Kunstmann,
Clarence M.
Kutzele, Robert E.
Labeau, Thomas J.
Lafferty, Jerry D.
Lage, Robert L.
Laib, Ernest E., Jr.
Lake, Walter W.
Lamb, Marion G.
Lamm, William A.
Landersman, Stuart D.
Lane, Archie G.
Lane, Terry L.
Lang, James M.
Langford, John McC.
Langston, John L.
Lardis, Christopher
S.
Larson, Howard J.
Lashbrook, Durwood
E.
Latham, William B.
Latta, Robert L.
Laube, Clarence E.
Lauber, Ronald M.
Laughlin, Gerald F.,
Jr.
Laux, William J., Jr.
Lavender, Robert E.
Lavin, Charles V.
Lawler, William A.
Lawrence, Donald S.
Leavitt, Horace M.,
Jr.
LeBlanc, Georges E.,
Jr.
Lenahan, Robert P.
Lent, Willis A., Jr.
Leonard, Robert W.
Levenson, Lee E.
Levey, Sanford N.
- Lewis, Harold M. J.,
Jr.
Lewis, Robert
Limerick, Christo-
pher J., Jr.
Lindsay, Robert B.
Lipford, Charles E.
Litwin, William S.
Lloyd, Theodore L.,
Jr.
Locke, Barrie B.
Lodge, Billups E.
Loftus, Robert McN.
Logan, Joseph B.
Lohr, Chester H.
Longman, Richard D.
Lorden, Lawrence R.
Lorge, Eugene P.
Low, Frederick M.
Ludwig, George E.
Luthin, Richard B.
Lykes, William F. G.
Lyman, John S., Jr.
Lynch, William A.
Lynn, Robert E.
Lyon, Peter W.
Lyons, James A., Jr.
Lyons, Thomas W.,
Jr.
MacGregor, John
Mack, Chester M.
MacKenzie, William
W., Jr.
MacKinnon, James
C., III
Mahony, Wilbur J.
Maloney, Robert E.
Malone, John S.
Malone, Thomas L.,
Jr.
Maloney, Peter M.
Mandel, Cornelius E.,
Jr.
Manduca, Theodore
W.
Mangin, Joseph N.,
III
Mann, Horace D., Jr.
Mann, James D.
Markham, Lewis M.,
III
Marsh, William C.
Marshall, John C.
Martin, Alan F.
Martin, Charles W.,
Jr.
Martin, Donald E.
Martin, James K.
Martin, Robert C.
Mason, Wesley R.
Masse, Donald M.
Matais, George R.
Matheson, Eugene C.
Mathews, Bobby D.
Mathews, Donald W.
Mathews, Thomas H.
Mathews, William
B., Jr.
Mattson, Donald J.
Mauldin, Richard A.
Maxim, Rodney E.
Maxwell, Philip H.
Mayberry, Thomas A.,
Jr.
Mays, Clayton P.
McAlevy, John H.
McBrayer, John E., Jr.
McCafferty, William E.
McCall, John M.
McCanna, Marvin G.,
Jr.
McCardell, James E.,
Jr.
McCarthy, Eugene W.
McCarthy, Charles M.
McCarthy, Richard W.
McCausland, Robert G.
McClain, Joseph E.
McComb, Robert B.
McConnell, Donald L.
- McConnell, Giley R.,
Jr.
McCormack, William
E.
McCormick, Daniel G.
III
McCoy, Roy E.
McDaniel, Johnny B.
McDonald, Raymond T.
McDowell, Russell N.
McGathy, Charles L.,
Jr.
McGovern, Joseph J.
McGrath, William D.
McGreevy, Walter J.,
Jr.
McHugh, James J.
McKay, John H.
McKee, Jack V.
McKenna, Patrick
McKeown, William G.,
Jr.
McLaird, Preston, Jr.
McLaughlin, Bernard
R.
McLuckie, James D.
McMurtray, Robert A.,
Jr.
McNaughton, James
M.
McNett, William T.
McPadden, Donald F.
X.
McQueen, John T.,
Jr.
McVay, Donald H., Jr.
McWaters, William A.,
Jr.
McWilliam, John E.
Mead, George R.
Melchers, Arthur C.
Melton, Edward C., Jr.
Meredith, Stuart T.
Merget, Andrew G.
Merwin, Paul L.
Metzler, Donald M.
Meyer, William C., Jr.
Mhoon, John E.
Miale, Robert E.
Middleton, Charles O.
III
Milano, Vito R.
Miller, Blount R., Jr.
Miller, Clarence W.
Miller, Curtis W., Jr.
Miller, Evan K.
Miller, Floyd H., Jr.
Miller, James H., Jr.
Miller, John R.
Miller, Joseph J., Jr.
Miller, Richard J.
Miller, Robert L.
Mills, James R.
Miner, Jack B.
Mircheff, Robert A.
Mitchell, Allan R.
Mitchell, Edgar D.
Mitchell, Grant L.
Mitchell, Howard C.
Mitchell, Robert C.
Mock, Roy L.
Moncure, Edwin C., Jr.
Monroe, Edward H.,
Jr.
Monroe, William D.
III
Moonan, Raymond L.
Mooney, John B., Jr.
Moore, Carlton H., Jr.
Moore, Charles E.
Moore, Clarence E.
Moore, Joseph O.
Moore, Raphael B.
Moore, Rufus J.
Moran, Clifford D.
Moreau, Arthur S., Jr.
Morford, Dean R.
Morgan, Houston M.
Morgan, Joseph R.
Morgan, Leroy W., Jr.
- Morin, Ronald D.
Morris, Robert E.
Morse, Edward A.
Morton, Charles B.,
III
Moss, Daniel J.
Moury, Roger F.
Muench, Gerald W.
Muka, Joseph A., Jr.
Mulcahy, William J.,
Jr.
Mulloy, Paul J.
Munford, Charles E.
Murdoch, Alan G.
Murnane, Frederick C.
Murphy, Elbridge F.,
Jr.
Murray, Joseph E., Jr.
Musorrafti, Francesco
A.
Myers, Coleman E.
Mylander, Stig J.
Naschek, Marvin J.
Nason, Charles F., Jr.
Neill, Louis D., Jr.
Nelson, George E., Jr.
Nelson, Herbert F.
Nelson, James McC.
Nelson, Keith
Nelson, Leroy C.
Nelson, Teddy N.
Nesbitt, Harry J.
Nevarez, Antonio
Newcomb, James A.
Newman, Robert L.
Nichols, John F.
Nichols, Richard L.
Nicholson, John L.,
Jr.
Nielsen, Donald E.
Nielsen, Richard
Nokes, Neil M.
Nomady, Verne G.
Norby, Merlin R.
Nordmeyer, Philip J.
Nordvedt, Ernest R.
North, Dean B.
Numbers, Earl W.
Nunnally, Edward H.,
Jr.
Nystrom, Frederic L.
O'Brien, Terrence P.
O'Bryan, Michael E.
O'Connell, John D.
O'Connor, Joseph E.
O'Der, John T.
Ogle, William J.
O'Hara, John T.
O'Keefe, James L., Jr.
Olson, Conrad B.
Olson, John R.
Olson, Richard S.
O'Neill, Louis C.
O'Reilly, Charles W.
Orell, Quinlan R.
O'Rourke, Bernard J.
Ortega, Joseph J.
Osborne, Arthur M.
Oster, John S.
Owens, Robert M.
Padgett, Harry E.
Painter, George V.
Pajak, Michael M.
Palmieri, John J.
Paolucci, Donald C.
Paris, Thomas A.
Parker, Thomas C., Jr.
Parks, Joe
Parr, Donald R.
Passantino, Sebastian
P.
Pattee, Arthur W.
Patridge, Roger H.
Paul, David L.
Paul, John E.
Paulk, John E.
Pearlman, Samuel S.
Peckworth, Dana
Pedersen, Alton A.
- Perkins, Joseph "A",
Jr.
Perkins, Richard L.
Ferrault, Mark E.
Perrey, Philip L.
Perry, Lowell E.
Perry, Robert P.
Person, Ross H.
Personette, Alan J.
Pertel, Joseph A.
Peters, William J.
Peterson, Edwin J., Jr.
Petersen, Fred D.
Peterson, George E.,
Jr.
Peterson, John W.
Peterson, Richard N.
Petry, William A.
Piromer, Robert A.
Phillips, Charles A.
Phillips, John T.
Phillips, Lawrence, Jr.
Phillips, Walter M., Jr.
Pickett, Gordon D.
Pitkin, Ronald E.
Pitts, Paul D.
Place, Allan J.
Platt, Grafton S.
Platt, Ralph E.
Ploss, John H.
Podaras, Nicholas C.
Pohli, Richard R.
Poland, James B.
Poling, William E.
Pollum, Edgar W.
Poor, Robert A.
Pope, Daniel K., IV
Pope, James F.
Porter, David N.
Porter, Robert D.
Porterfield, Robert E.
Potter, Arthur M., Jr.
Powell, George W.
Prentiss, Dickinson
Preston, Edgar H.
Price, Oliver L.
Price, Walter P.
Prickett, Bruce L.
Priddy, Clarence L.,
Jr.
Pritscher, Robert L.
Proflet, Clarence J.
Pugh, Jack M.
Purdum, William H.
Purvis, Ronald S.
Quartararo, Michael A.
Quick, Jaye E.
Quirk, William J.
Radeff, Lewis J.
Raffaele, Robert J.
Ralph, Steve, Jr.
Ramsey, William E.
Randall, Howard W.
Randall, Howard F.,
Jr.
Rasmussen, Robert L.
Ratcliff, Stephen D.
Ray, Glen P.
Rayder, Daniel F.
Read, Carlisle D., Jr.
Reddick, Robert E., Jr.
Reed, Charles A.
Reed, Robert G.
Reeg, Frederick J.
Reffitt, Raymond E.
Reger, William L.
Reilly, William F.
Reischauer, Robert E.
Reith, George, Jr.
Renz, Donald J.
Reynolds, James H.
Reynolds, Robert F.,
Jr.
Rhodes, John P.
Rhodes, Randolph L.
Rice, Daniel W.
Rice, Stanley G.
Rich, Richard
Richards, Lloyd W.
Richardson, Harold M.
Riley, Raymond T.
- Ritz, Merlin C.
Roach, Francis L.
Robbins, Noel
Roberson, George D.
Robertson, Coll E.
Robinson, Kirby L.
Robinson, Percy E.,
Jr.
Robinson, William A.
Rodgers, Dean T.
Rodgers, Harvey P.
Rodgers, James B.
Rodgers, James R.
Rodgers, Thomas A.
Roepke, John R.
Rogers, Charles E., Jr.
Rogers, Ralph E.
Rorie, "C" "J"
Rose, Hardy N.
Ross, Orrin B.
Rosson, James W.
Rowan, Thomas C.
Rubb, Milton R.
Ruch, Martin, Jr.
Rudolph, Francis A.,
Jr.
Ruhsenberger, Roger
H.
Rumpik, Rudolph H.
Rusch, John M.
Russ, William A.
Russell, John J., Jr.
Ryan, James A., Jr.
Ryan, William A.
Sacks, Harold H.
Sanden, Oscar E., Jr.
Sanders, Ben T.
Sanford, Stephen J.
Sanks, David R., III
Sapp, John, Jr.
Sargent, Richard E.
Saucier, Gerald
Saunders, Thomas J.
Sawyer, George A., Jr.
Sayer, William D.
Schaaf, Thomas W.
Schaefer, Gene R.
Schaub, John R., Jr.
Schermerhorn, James
R.
Schimansky, John A.
Schroeder, Robert E.
Schulte, Jean H.
Schuster, Dale G.
Schutz, Albert C., Jr.
Schwartz, Wallace J.
Schweitzer, Robert J.
Scott, Edward T.
Scott, Frank P.
Scott, Kenneth M.
Scully, John J.
Sebring, Leland H.
Seeba, Herman A.
Seitz, Richard L.
Self, David L.
Semple, William C.,
III
Sesow, Anthony D.
Seymour, Conrad L.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shaffer, William J. E.
Shakespeare, Frank-
lin B.
Shappell, John R.
Sharrah, Ronald L.
Shaw, John H.
Shaw, Warren L.
Shay, Fred L.
Sheehy, Eugene E.
Sheeley, Elmer E., Jr.
Sheets, Jean P.
Sheets, Roger E.
Shelley, Leon R.
Shepherd, David C.
Sherman, John W.
Shilling, John D.
Shine, Maurice J.
Shirley, William B.
Shrewsbury, Lawrence
H., II
Shuler, Ashley C., Jr.

- Shuler, Olin J.
Signor, Philip W., Jr.
Sillars, Donald G.
Sima, Frederick F., Jr.
Simmons, Arlis J.
Simmons, Clayton M.
Simms, James T.
Simon, Douglas M.
Simpkins, George C.
Simpson, Bryan L., Jr.
Siska, Edward
Skerrett, Robert J.
Skolnick, Alfred
Skomsky, Louis J.
Skubinna, Myron A.
Slater, Donald L.
Slyfield, Frederick J.
Small, Joseph F.
Smevog, Herbert W.
Smith, Alfred A.
Smith, Delvin W., Jr.
Smith, Frederick D., Jr.
Smith, James H.
Smith, Jason J.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Morgan H.
Smith, Paul J., Jr.
Smith, Robert M.
Smith, Thomas J.
Smith, William L.
Smith, William L.
Snively, Abram B., III
Snouse, William H.
Snuffin, Jerry A.
Snyder, Aaron W. S.
Snyder, Fred D.
Snyder, Ned "C"
Solan, Thomas V.
Sothan, Norman L.
Sutherland, Thomas C., Jr.
Spanagel, Herman A., Jr.
Spar, Edwin F.
Spaulding, Robert E.
Spear, Willard W., Jr.
Spencer, Harry A., Jr.
Spradley, Van E.
Squier, Lucius R., Jr.
Stafford, Kenneth B.
Stallings, Clyde, Jr.
Stanard, John D., Jr.
Stanley, Edward E.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Stanley, Thomas A.
Stark, Arthur R., Jr.
Stark, Gerry L.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Stevens, Jack D.
Stewart, Douglas A.
Stockings, William B.
Stolle, Edward St. C., Jr.
Stone, James M.
Storm, Richard E.
Story, Warren L.
Strasheim, Don N.
Strawn, James H.
Stromme, Donald J.
Strong, Dean L.
Struven, Robert L.
Studebaker, Clayton A.
Sturgeon, William J., III
Sudduth, Roger M.
Sullivan, Joseph E., Jr.
Sullivan, Patrick G.
Sullivan, Thomas J.
Sullivan, Walter F.
Sullivan, William W.
Sutherland, Doyle L.
Swarztrauber, Sayre A.
Sweeney, John F.
Sweet, William J.
Sykes, Lewis B.
Talbot, Frank R., Jr.
- Talbot, James R., Jr.
Tally, Billy F.
Tappan, Jeremy R.
Tariton, Joe E.
Tarpley, William A.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, Reeves R.
Taylor, Richard F.
Taylor, Thomas H.
Tennyson, Richard B.
Terry, Daniel G. W.
Thole, Charles P.
Thomas, Donald P.
Thomas, Don W.
Thomas, Douglas N.
Thomas, Earl G.
Thomas, Frederic J.
Thompson, Arthur R., Jr.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thompson, George I.
Thompson, Jack C., Jr.
Thomneson, Earling R.
Throop, James R.
Todd, Alexander M.
Toland, Hugh J. C., Jr.
Tortora, Anthony M.
Trammell, Webb D.
Traweck, Billy B.
Treber, Gerald R.
Trebore-MacConnell, Barrie K.
Troost, Carlisle A. H.
Trowbridge, Vern H.
Truax, Evan C.
Trueblood, William E.
Turk, Herman L.
Tuttle, John R.
Umberger, Robert C.
Upshaw, Donald E.
Usilton, William B.
Vaden, Donald E.
Vahlkamp, Eugene W.
Van Hoof, Eugene R.
Van Horssen, David A.
Van Houton, Laurence P.
Van Valkenburg, George B.
Van Westendorp, Steven
Varner, Duane L.
Varney, Jack E.
Vaughan, Edgar, III
Velazquez-Suarez, Francisco A.
Vernon, Everett L.
Volatile, Thomas M.
Vosseller, John H.
Voyer, Irving L., Jr.
Wachtel, Joseph J.
Wade, Thomas R.
Wagner, David F.
Waite, Charles E.
Wakeman, Curtiss O.
Walker, Harold E., Jr.
Walker, Henry McD.
Walker, Peter R.
Wall, Joseph E.
Wallace, Thomas McC.
Walling, Eugene K.
Wallner, Michael P.
Walls, Richard B.
Walters, James B.
Wanamaker, John F.
Ward, Conley R.
Ward, Gene P.
Ward, Robert B.
Warren, Thomas C.
Warthen, Donald
Wasson, John E.
Watson, Max H.
Watson, Wyatt P.
Weaver, James J.
Weaver, John H.
Webb, James I.
Webster, James McA.
Weddington, George L., Jr.
Weedon, Robert E.
- Weeks, Alan L.
Weeks, George H.
Weeks, Wayne F.
Wehrman, Philip W.
Weissman, Marvin M.
Wellings, John F.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wells, Don V.
Wells, Eugene R., Jr.
Wells, Walter H., Jr.
Wenker, William A.
West, Gordon R.
Westmoreland, Ralph M.
Wetz, James E.
Wev, Bosquet N., Jr.
Wheeler, James B.
Wheeler, John R.
Whiddon, Elmer C., Jr.
Whitcomb, Richard A.
White, Charles E.
White, Donald C.
White, John E.
White, Richard E.
Whittaker, Don J.
Whittier, James F.
Wildner, William E.
Will, Otto W.
Willenbrink, James F.
Willever, Edward L.
Willhauck, Marion
Willhauck, Aaron
Williams, Clyde V., Jr.
Williams, David W.
Williams, James G., III
Williams, Kenneth A.
Williams, Louis A., Jr.
Williams, Randall L.
Williams, Ralph T.
Williams, Ralph E., Jr.
Williams, Wallace E.
Williamson, Paul W.
Williamson, Robert L.
Willis, Jack R.
Wills, Doyne R., Jr.
Wilner, Jack D.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Wilson, Robert W., Jr.
- Wilson, Samuel B.
Wilson, Vaughn E., Jr.
Winfield, Gordon T., Jr.
Winfree, Herman D.
Winkler, Thomas Q., Jr.
Wise, Peyton R., II
Witcher, John R.
Withrow, John E., Jr.
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.
Woods, Paul G.
Woods, Robert C.
Woodyard, Jon C.
Worth, Edward E.
Wright, Charles H., Jr.
Wright, James D.
Wright, Kenneth L., Jr.
Wright, Richard T.
Wright, William W.
Wunsch, John R.
Wyatt, Charles M.
Wynn, Carl E., Jr.
Yanaros, John O.
Yeager, Donald R.
Yoder, Dwane F.
Young, Alfred A., III
Young, David B., Jr.
Young, Joseph A.
Youngjohns, Richard P.
Youse, James A.
Zastrow, Robert R.
Zebrowski, Joseph P.
Zeithaml, Donald P.
Zemaitis, Robert J.
Wilson, Richard V., Jr.
Zirkle, Forrest E.
Zirps, Christos
- LEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS
- Alleman, Howard
Anctil, Arthur O., Jr.
Anderson, Robert F.
Anderson, Daniel G.
Applegate, William V.
Arness, John A.
Baird, Robert M.
Baker, John H.
Baker, Robert F.
Baker, William J.
Balas, George I.
Balster, Vernon H.
Barker, Deli J.
Bason, William M.
Beach, Thomas B.
Beaumur, John H.
Beddo, Byron L.
Beeby, James L.
Benoit, Fred L., III
Bergee, Harold E.
Betts, Gordon D.
Biemer, James J.
Biser, Christopher H.
Borin, Robert S.
Boucher, Wesley W.
Bouterie, Ronald L.
Boylan, Charles E.
Brighton, Carl T.
Brooks, Herbert E.
Bryan, Frank S.
Burr, John B.
Cagle, Donald R.
Cameron, Ronald R.
Cassidy, Walter J., Jr.
Chappeka, Alfred R., Jr.
Christian, Maynard S.
Coil, Edmonston F.
Colgrove, Robert C.
Collettine, Marvin E.
- Collier, Terry M.
Corbett, John R.
Cosgrove, Theodore J.
Cremona, Frederick J.
Cureton, Richard K.
Daum, Jere J.
Davis, John W.
DeCaprio, Vincent H.
Defebre, Bruce K., Jr.
DeFries, Hugh O.
Dewey, Albert W., Jr.
Doland, Kenneth D.
Dolan, Michael F.
Douglass, William C.
Elliott, Robert C.
Evans, Eldon L.
Evans, Fred S.
Ferre, George A.
Finch, John R.
Finney, Louis A.
Fisher, Elbert L., Jr.
Fithian, William W., Jr.
Folkner, Albert L.
Fortenberry, Ralph M.
Gallant, James H.
Garcia, Nicolas A. III
Giard, Henry L.
Gilbert, Allyn E.
Gillespie, James T., Sr.
Glover, James B.
Gramlich, Edwin P.
Greaves, Edward D.
Greene, Donald H.
Hamilton, Thomas P.
Hansen, James E.
Hargrave, Robert L.
Harmon, Stanley D.
Harper, Charles R.
Hayes, Jude R.
- Hebert, James E.
Hillis, Jon K.
Huseby, Helmer W. S.
Irons, Howard S.
Jacobs, Edmund P.
James, Stephen H.
Kendra, Stephen J.
Kent, Tommy S.
Kinkel, Donald M.
Kingle, Francis L.
Knapp, Robert W.
Knox, Henry D.
Kohi, David H.
Koller, Elmer C., Jr.
Krepps, Arthur C., II
Krepps, John L.
Langevin, Jack A.
Lansinger, Donald T.
Larocque, Normand P.
Larson, Willard A. E.
Lee, Joseph D.
Livingston, William O.
Loew, Albert G., Jr.
Lukash, William M.
MacCarthy, Denton E.
Madison, Gilbert I., Jr.
McHale, James J., Jr.
McMahon, George J.
Meehan, William L.
Menzel, Richard E.
Meredith, Robert C.
Merrill, Raymond E.
Metz, George E.
Miles, Donald R.
Millington, Richard A.
Milner, Johnny E.
Mitts, Murray G.
Modell, Jerome H.
Moquin, Ross B.
Morgan, Jacob R.
Mortensen, Norval
Mukomelz, Arthur E.
Nelson, George A., Jr.
Nickel, Alvin L.
Norton, Robert K.
Norwood, Otar T.
Oldershaw, John B.
Olesnjuk, Andrew
O'Neal, David M.
- LEUTENANT, SUPPLY CORPS
- Adair, Joseph P.
Alderman, Charles B.
Allinder, Joe A., Jr.
Almen, Richard E.
Ashton, Merton E., Jr.
Ayling, Charles W.
Baker, Ernest L.
Bates, Robert L.
Bell, John L., Jr.
Blue, Frank H., Jr.
Bogorowski, Robert J.
Bolander, Jack "C"
Boyer, Charles L.
Brainard, John W.
Briggs, Irving G.
Brown, Boyd F., Jr.
Brown, Russell M.
Brunson, Robert L.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bryant, Robert K.
Bunker, Donald J.
Burlingham, Nathan N.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Carberry, Raymond G., Jr.
Carpenter, Charles F.
Carpenter, Arthur J.
Causey, Bruce M., Jr.
Christensen, Harvey J.
Christopher, Robert N.
Clancy, John F.
Clark, Roger S.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Connelly, Charles T.
Conner, Walter E.
Corn, James E.
Curtin, Pat
Curtis, Richard E.
Davis, William W.
- Dempster, Darrell D.
Derby, Francis A.
Donzell, Richard J.
Drabek, Stephen J.
Earl, Bobby J.
Eastwood, William O., Jr.
Ebert, Scott W.
Ethridge, James D.
Felthousen, Charles E.
Fishback, Burney L., Jr.
Fiske, Leon S., Jr.
Flolid, Robert E.
Flores, Joseph L.
Freese, Ralph F.
French, Robert T.
French, Robert C.
Frost, Shirley D.
Garabedian, Edward J.
Giagni, Vincent J.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gilpen, Franklin M.
Gilrod, Roy O.
Gray, Jack E.
Greenwood, Joseph L., Jr.
Greer, Merwyn C.
Gunther, Roy W.
Haggard, Howard F.
Hamilton, Thomas, Jr.
Hemmert, George V.
Hendrickson, Richard
Hennessey, William J.
Henry, Gerald R.
Hill, Jesse R., Jr.
Hill, Robert E.
Hodges, William J.
Hohenstein, Charles R.

Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John E. Barber Arthur D. Bert
Forrest R. England William P. Hickey
Dan W. Sargent

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald R. Bradford John C. Kiefer
William H. Dittman Richard Albert
George H. Ginn Schaeffer
Stephen Staley
Groves, II

Robert R. Gillespy, Jr., Naval Reserve officer to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Charles H. Miller (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Herbert L. Pope, Naval Reserve officer to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Warren C. Boop, Jr. *Louis E. Potvin
*Walter J. Cassidy, Jr. *William C. Prescott
*James J. Ryskamp, Jr.
*Jerry Cassuto
*Nicholas A. D'Amato
*Charles H. Dockhorn
*Vernon L. Goller
*Francis M. Highly, Jr.
*Elmer C. Koller, Jr.

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Claude A. Barnhill *Francis T. Kostohryz
*Arthur A. Beaudry *Robert H. Saxton
*James K. Cooke, Jr. *John T. Vincent
*Tommy E. Hall

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Tor Richter
*Frank G. Steen
*Robert M. Jennings (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to 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 qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Phillip R. Falcone *Robert E. Thomason
*Joseph J. Lawrence, Jr. *James McC. Wilson

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Joseph A. Bodner, Jr. *James H. McLeran
*Joseph H. Burke *Leonard E. Mark
*Richard L. Carrothers *Robert J. Pinkerton
*Sam Castronovo *George W. Rice, Jr.
*Bruno F. Dattilo *Ronald M. Romaniello
*John S. Eppolito
*Robert E. Howe *Harry E. Semler, Jr.
*Robert P. Kuentzel *Kenji Seo
*Robert P. Landes

The following-named Naval Reserve officers to be permanent lieutenants and temporary

lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*William R. Brown
*Thomas J. Charles, Jr.
*Robert V. Peterson

The following-named graduates from naval enlisted scientific educational program to be ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Lexie B. Boswell
*Richard F. Dehler
Robert F. Noland

*John P. Dobson, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Henry T. Koonce, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent captain in the line of the Navy for engineering duty, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Richard F. Johnston, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant in the line of the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

*Clyde L. Ido, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy for temporary service, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 1211.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, limited duty only, for temporary service, in the classification indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Chester A. Adams *Gordon E. Lindstrom
*William R. Andrews *Richard J. Logue
*Dale E. Alexander *Robin C. MacFadden
*Leon Austin *James R. McCall
*Samuel S. Bable *George C. Meters, Jr.
*James E. Bagley *Raymond R. Mulhearn
*Willie H. Ball, Jr. *Stanley E. Mumford
*George J. Bauer, Jr. *Ernest E. Olds
*Willis D. Bender *Walter H. Otte
*Frederick C. Bowley *Stanley D. Peckham
*Anthony Clotti *Charles R. Pilcher
*William J. Clemente *William F. Polzin
*Willis D. Conner *Fred H. Qualls
*Anthony C. Coulapides *Arthur O. Richartz
*Charles E. Craig *Lloyd T. Ritchie
*Richard W. Culbertson *Laurentino Rodrigues
*Edward M. Deloury *Henry F. Rooney
*Merrill L. Dennis *Earl W. H. Schultz
*Victor C. Evans, Jr. *Robert E. Shuford
*Cornelius W. Fisher *Gordon H. Simms
*William F. Flannery *Robert W. Smiley
*John E. Flinn *Billie J. Smith
*Wayne E. Fryman *Falcon J. Smith
*Norman H. Gellinas *Henry B. Stenson
*James E. Goforth, Jr. *Thomas N. Thompson
*Cecil M. Greene *Video V. Tonelli
*Raymond E. Haney *Morris E. Upham
*Edward M. Hart *Downey M. Ware
*William C. Hatton *Robert R. Warren
*Clifton W. Jenkins *Donald C. Wheeler
*William T. Jennings *Loran A. Wilcox
*Robert H. Keepin *Raymond M. Will
*Alexander H. Kerns *Dallas K. Williams
*John N. Kull *Arthur D. Wombold
*George E. Labor *Jere W. Woodall
*"J" "D" Lane *Gene Yarber
*Robert C. Lee

ORDNANCE, SURFACE

*James W. Ahern *Bernard S. Gath
*Theodore L. Baron *Clyde W. Hartsell
*Francis X. Beaudin *Joe P. Harrison
*Felix Benoit *Robert J. Hawkey
*Kenneth E. Benson *Donald G. Jerrell
*James C. Buchans *Stanley D. Jones
*John F. Carr *James F. Kearns
*Alon E. Cawthon *"J" "E" Lowry
*Lloyd C. Davis *Glynn Martin
*John F. Dodge *William H. Maulin
*Richard R. Dovalgo *James T. McConnell
*Alan R. Dvorak *Robert M. McFarling, Jr.
*William T. Farrell *Charles A. McLoon
*Ernest G. Felcuth *John N. Milliken, Jr.
*Leo Garcia

*Michael L. Murphy
*Liberio W. Nobile
*Patrick H. Pearce
*Thomas M. Perkins
*John A. Petrilla
*Laroyce F. Rivers

*Kenneth L. Smith
*Lyal M. Stryker
*Richard D. Tuchscherer
*Alfred H. Wagner, Jr.
*Calvin R. Warner

ADMINISTRATION

*Berton E. Bresch *Robert H. Morrison
*Richard C. Cullen *Estelito N. Potente
*Leonard G. Davis *William D. Riggs
*Lawrence D. Duncan *Lyle D. Rochholz
*Allan L. Eaton *Albert V. Schenfisher
*Thomas Hamby, Jr. *Charles F. Simons, Jr.
*Leslie R. Kelsay

ENGINEERING

*Dewey E. Babb *James G. McMichael
*Willard D. Baker *Herbert D. Morrisset
*Robert D. Bell *Arthur P. Murray
*Dale St. John Betz *Joseph P. Neary
*Robert L. Borkert *John P. O'Malley
*Francis L. Carroll *John C. Recktenwald
*Walter E. Copeland *Robert E. Rowe
*Ralph E. Devine *Daniel M. Shovlin
*Gilliam S. Dunn *Wayne E. Staley
*Oliver K. Evans *Raphael T. Superano
*William E. Evans *Phillip S. Thompson
*Charles J. Fritz *John M. Watt, Jr.
*Richard E. Gehrlich *Charles A. Whitworth
*Harry W. Harbin *Richard A. Wiggen
*Cecil E. Jones, Jr. *Robert A. Wilson
*Robert B. Klaussegger *Avery G. Wood, Jr.
*George S. Law *Raymond A. Hunter
*Harry R. Long

ELECTRONICS

*Douglas W. Belshelm *William A. Mitchell
*Clyde E. Brown *James R. Morrissey, Jr.
*Halbert G. Clark
*Richard R. Cornett *William S. Neill
*Dick A. Danals *James E. Olsen
*Thomas A. Dzurko *William A. Ottino
*James H. Ecoff *Charles A. Pellegrini
*Raymond B. Ferris *Harold E. Polacki, Jr.
*David L. Garner *William M. Putnam
*Donald E. Graham *Philip J. Rager, Jr.
*Robert B. Gross, Jr. *William C. Ryan, Jr.
*Donald E. Haney *Robert M. Sajdera
*Charles R. Hendon *Billy K. Schisler
*Leroy L. Hill *Arthur J. Smith, Jr.
*Walter J. Hyde *"J" "E" Smith
*Allan F. Jamsgard *Robert L. Smith
*Stephen Johnson *John H. Straub
*Richard E. Lambert *James R. Taylor
*Donald W. Lampert *Fred E. Thompson
*Robert A. Litten *Paul E. Wall
*Fred H. Lowery, Jr. *Patrick A. Walsh
*John F. Lusby *James K. Wolfgram
*James B. Mason

HULL

*James P. Cowell *Clarence H. Regner, Jr.
*Charles R. Cornett
*Ronald Edwards *Jack M. Riden
*William J. Flynn *John A. Russick
*George W. Gould *Omar M. Seiland
*James M. Hagins *Ralph D. Sisk
*Ronald D. Hanson *John N. Smith
*John L. Heath *Alton B. Spann
*Garth W. Johnson *Clarence E. Taylor
*Calvin L. Jones *Garland W. Toomer
*Raymond A. Kraft *James M. Vincent
*Leon Mansi *James Watkins
*Walter E. O'Shell *Gerald F. Williams
*Harry Ray, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Robert E. Austin *Albert J. Kennedy
*Martin L. Beck *Raymond P. Lasher
*Carleton W. Boutwell, Jr. *Fred O. McWhorter
*Howard L. Fry *Matthew A. Stofanek
*William R. Kenly *Raymond J. Wynne
*Robert S. Yelle

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

*Arthur L. Newman

AVIATION ORDNANCE

*Charles W. Bollinger

AVIATION ELECTRONICS

*Varro D. Anderson *Charles E. Cater
*David G. Carruthers *Paul W. Elkins

*Donald C. Johnsen *Albert H. Robbins
*Thomas D. Martin *James A. Sheler
*Samuel A. Miles II *Richard H. Short

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Royce L. Cutler *Gerald E. MacDonald
*George P. Edgell *Dan G. Miller
*Robert G. Flynn *Michael I. Opean
*Mark T. Fulmer *Milton C. Otto
*Donald W. Johnson *Olen D. Presley
*Gregory W. Jordan *James D. Scrivner
*Robert W. LaFon

The following named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the rank of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Kenneth A. Sadler

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:

*Edward L. Abner *Bobby N. Jackson
*John M. Barberi *Charles T. Knight
*Earl C. Cleim *John Koyiades
*Frank J. Cox, Jr. *Richard White
*Daniel C. Georgia *Lauritz W. Young
*Robert W. Greene

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:

William D. Bethea	Delmar D. Long
James S. Bowers	James W. Lowe, Jr.
Donald N. Broadwell	Robert D. Marshall
Michael C. Canaday	Miles C. Mays
Thomas J. Carroll	Bruce F. McMillan
Edward L. Chambless	Harry E. Metzler
Michael T. Crawford	Robert O. Meyer
David (n) Connell	Frank H. Miner, Jr.
Lynn A. Daubenspeck	Maurice C. O'Connell
MacGregor Flanders, Jr.	Scott C. Puckett
Charles G. A. Harmon, Jr.	James T. Schulster
Thomas C. Hendrix	Craig E. Shuler
Richard C. Hippner	Jerry I. Simpson
Walter F. Hudson, Jr.	Alexander R. Spellman
Frank A. Huey	David R. Stefansson
Alvin W. Jennings	Kenneth J. Steiner
Burrell H. Landes, Jr.	Allan (n) Thompson
Garland M. Lasater, Jr.	Michael E. Tipton
David A. Lefeve	Gary E. Todd
	James H. Tumlinson
	III
	Arthur L. Wallace, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 5: 9: *Wherefore we labor that we may be accepted of Him.*

O Thou who art great in might and in mercy, in this moment of prayer, we are praising Thee for Thy goodness and seeking those needed blessings which Thou alone canst give.

We penitently confess that so frequently we betray and break faith with our better self and lapse from loyalty to Thee and allow the baser impulses to have their way with us.

* Indicates ad interim appointment.

Wilt Thou quicken and gird us with Thy spirit that in all the various circumstances of life we may do Thy will with humility and sincerity.

Inspire us to carry on with faith and hope when the burdens of life become heavy and fears threaten to enslave us.

Show us how we may meet the hardships and weather the storms which we encounter in our journey toward the desired haven.

Hear us as we cry out, "Jesus Saviour, pilot me." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 14, 1960, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5421) entitled "An act to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. SCOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 15, 1960.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Administration Committee, effective immediately.

Sincerely,

WILLARD S. CURTIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 18, 1960.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives. It has been a privilege and

pleasure to work with the members of this committee, and I regret I must discontinue this association.

Respectfully,

JOHN A. LAFORE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 15, 1960.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: It is with regret that I submit herewith my resignation as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It has been a privilege and honor to work with the many fine members of this committee during the 85th and 86th Congresses, during which time it formulated historic statehood legislation.

My association with this committee will remain a pleasant and enlightening experience.

Respectfully,

HAROLD R. COLLIER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

MR. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 420) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and Labor: CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York.

Committee on House Administration: JOHN KYL, Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: JOHN KYL, Iowa.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: WILLARD S. CURTIN, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Ways and Means: JOHN A. LAFORE, Jr., Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH CONSENT CALENDAR, PRIVATE CALENDAR, AND CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

MR. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar today, the Private Calendar tomorrow, and the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LET US GET RID OF THE PEEPHOLES IN THE POST OFFICES

MR. HECHLER. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, you remember that terrifying book by George Orwell entitled "Nineteen Eighty-Four."

Last week I was shocked to discover that in the post offices of this country, 1984 is already here. When I went through our new post office building at Ravenswood, W. Va., I saw that at great expense there has been constructed a corridor along one side and through the middle of the mailing room. Along this corridor are peepholes, hidden in panels and equipped with one-way glass, through which snooping postal inspectors enter secretly to spy on postal workers to try to find them loafing or see that they do not steal anything.

Mr. Speaker, this is going on in post offices all over the country. Inspectors can sneak into town and set up their gestapo watch through private doors and special keys, unknown to the postal employees. I say this is an insult to thousands of hard-working postal clerks.

These peephole facilities actually cost millions of dollars in special construction, and they do not accomplish anything that tight supervision could not cure. But worst of all, this peephole polky is like a gestapo, and it has been misused to spy on union meetings, and embarrass postal employees in matters which should remain personal.

The peepholes cover nearly all of the post offices. They have peepholes to cover where the employees have their lunch. They have peepholes so they can look and listen in on union meetings if held in the post office. The peepholes even look into the men's room. Apparently the only place the Post Office Department has drawn the line is at the women's restroom.

The editor of the Ravenswood News, Phil Fourney, in denouncing this practice, reported that a postal inspector at Ravenswood boasted "they often spend 18 hours or more in their peephole area observing activities of postal employees."

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that Postmaster General Summerfield may want to place signs so all post office employees can see them, and the signs might read: "Big Brother Arthur is watching you."

I intend to find out how much of the taxpayers' money goes into constructing these vicious, un-American, and insulting peephole spy systems.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of freedom and Americanism, let us treat our postal employees as human beings and get rid of the peepholes in the post offices.

U.S. MARINES MARCH FROM MOUNTAINS TO SEA IN FIGHT AGAINST DISEASE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise

and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Marines represent the American military at its best. Every child in America has heard the expression "The Marines have landed—the situation is well in hand." The Marines ask for the hard jobs, the difficult jobs, the unusual jobs. The Marines accomplish the impossible.

Some time ago a young marine, a gunnery sergeant by the name of Willie Fleming, of Pacolet, S.C., along with Cpl. Philip Lassiter, of Corinth, Miss., and S. Sgt. Dave Corbitt, of Axson, Ga., obtained permission from their commanding officer at the Beaufort Air Station, Beaufort, S.C., to participate in the March of Dimes. As everyone knows, the March of Dimes is that magnificent program begun many years ago, whereby the whole Nation contributes to the conquest of poliomyelitis. These marines asked permission to march the length of South Carolina with full battle dress, including helmet. They also proposed, and got permission, to take the time from their annual leave to complete the 17-day ordeal. For each step during this 375-mile march, they would ask a dime be given in every city, town, and hamlet through which they passed.

On Wednesday, January 20, the march will terminate back at their home base in Beaufort, S.C. at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. Representatives of the Marine Corps and of the U.S. Marine Reserves in South Carolina will be there to greet them along with dignitaries from all walks of life. I plan to be among the group to welcome these fine young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this march will not be an easy one; it has not been easy. Through wind, sleet, and snow they have made their journey in an effort to eradicate some of the most insidious diseases ever to attack the human body. Mr. Speaker, I know of no undertaking so unique or so worth while. I know of no undertaking that has so captivated the imagination of all people in my part of the United States. All marines, regular and reserve, have backed this project. Col. Ted Watson—a distinguished Marine Reserve colonel from Greenville, S.C.—has actively encouraged these young men. He has constantly brought their march to the attention of every area through which they have passed. All people have contributed as they have trod from the mountains to the sea.

Mr. Speaker, I want the whole Nation to know of this great and unique march by these distinguished young Americans. They have the appreciation of all of us and they have the admiration, respect, and affection of Americans strong and weak. They have performed a great service in the common fight against disease.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include

therewith some newspaper clippings on the march:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 5, 1960]

MARINES START LONG MARCH FOR DIMES

SPARTANBURG.—Three tough young leather-necks stepped off Monday on a heel-blistering 375-mile march to the coast for the March of Dimes.

They hope to collect donations of 10 cents for every step of the way from Pacolet to Beaufort. Based on the 792,000 steps they figure it will take, that will be \$79,200 to fight polio.

Sgt. Willie Fleming, 34, of Pacolet; Sgt. Dave Corbitt, 30, of Axson, Ga.; and Cpl. Philip Lassiter, 19, of Corinth, Miss., form the trio. They are based at the Marine Beaufort Air Station.

Each carries a 28-pound pack, mostly clothing. In case of bad weather, they will use shelter halves. Otherwise they will sleep under the stars.

They collected \$56 on the 10-mile trek into Spartanburg from Pacolet, where they started. An additional \$144 was sent by donors into the March of Dimes headquarters here.

They were to camp out on the dual lane highway between Spartanburg and Greenville Monday night and head for Greenville Tuesday morning.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Jan. 16, 1960]

MARCHING MARINES REACH SUMMERVILLE IN POLIO FUND DRIVE

Three Marines, marching from the mountains to the sea in a drive to raise funds for the National Foundation's New March of Dimes received a warm welcome yesterday at Summerville. The tired trio reached the Flower Town in the Pines about 5 p.m. after an all day trek from St. George, 27 miles further inland. They were welcomed by a group of Summerville citizens including Mayor L. Hayden Doty, Mrs. Frank Rehak, Jr., Capt. John M. Moore, South Carolina National Guard, A. M. Barshay, representing the town's merchants, DaCosta Muckenfuss, and others. The three Parris Island Marines are Gunnery Sgt. Willie Fleming, of Pacolet; Cpl. Philip Lassiter, of Corinth, Miss.; and S. Sgt. Dave Corbitt, of Axson, Ga. After witnessing fund collecting in the Summerville Town Square, the trio were fed. They bedded down for the night on the grounds of the Summerville Presbyterian Church. The Marines will break camp early today and head for Charleston. They are scheduled to enter the city sometime this afternoon and will camp at White Point Gardens on the Battery tonight. The 53d Rifle Company, U.S. Marine Reserves, of Charleston is cooperating with the local March of Dimes program and will act as hosts to the three Marines here. The trio is on special furlough. Their aim is to raise 10 cents for each step they take in their march from Pacolet to Beaufort. They will leave Charleston at 6 p.m. tomorrow and head southward toward their goal. They have visited Spartanburg, Greenville, Columbia, Orangeburg, St. George, and Summerville in addition to other towns along their route.

NONVOTING DELEGATE FROM GUAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the 2d session of the 86th Congress convened on January 6, 1960, the Congress of the United States, for the first time in 163 years, was without territorial representation. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, of course, is not a territory.

When the 1st session of the 86th Congress convened Hawaii was a territory, and its nonvoting territorial delegate was our former beloved colleague, the Honorable John A. Burns. It was not until late in the first session, that Hawaii having attained statehood, the Honorable DANIEL KEN INOUYE, the popular, able, and dedicated Representative from the State of Hawaii, came to replace Delegate Burns, of the Territory of Hawaii.

The present 86th Congress is the first Congress since 1797 that includes in its composition no delegate from any territory. I have seen no newspaper comment on this phase, at least none stressing its historic significance. In fact in our entire history only four Congresses have had no territorial representation—the 1st Congress, the 2d Congress, the 5th Congress, and the 86th Congress.

In the First Congress—1789-91—only the Thirteen Original States were represented. In the Second Congress—1791-93—there were 15 States, Vermont and Kentucky having been added without serving territorial apprenticeship in the Congress.

After that each Congress—with the exception of the 5th—until the 86th Congress had in addition to its State delegations delegates from territories later destined for statehood. The reason there was no territorial representation in the Fifth Congress was by that time what had been in the Third and Fourth Congresses the territory south of the River Ohio had become the State of Tennessee and it was not until the Sixth Congress—1799-1801—that the territory northwest of the River Ohio entered the Halls of Congress.

The territory northwest of the River Ohio served out its apprenticeship in the Sixth and Seventh Congresses, entered the Eighth Congress as the State of Ohio. Meanwhile Mississippi Territory had come to Congress, later joined by Indiana Territory, the Territory of Orleans, and in the 12th Congress—1811-13—Illinois Territory.

So it went on and on in the long period of our cementing of a sisterhood of 50 States, with territorial apprenticeship in the Congress awaiting new territories as old territories became new States. On and on for 163 years until this January 1960.

Representation in the Congress by a nonvoting Delegate has given to our fellow Americans, residing in territorial domains, a recognition and a dignity that for 163 years has brought rich results in the development of our representative democratic government. I hope that in the 87th Congress we will return to the old pattern.

Guam is our most farflung territory. Under the organic act it has made marvelous progress. Its legislative body, presided over by the distinguished and able Speaker Won Pat, well known to us in Washington, is modeled on the Con-

gress of the United States, as are our State legislatures, and its influence in that faraway area in the Pacific is large and important.

I am not a member of the great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which has jurisdiction in this field and the members of which are of course much better informed, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I do not hesitate to say that the seating in the Congress of a nonvoting Delegate from Guam would have most wholesome repercussions.

I shall support a bill giving nonvoting representation to Guam if one is introduced by a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and favorably reported by that committee. Its passage would mean a return to the old and honored pattern.

EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS BY CONTRACTORS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. HÉBERT. 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. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last June in the debate on the Defense Appropriation Act of 1960, the House was promised that an inquiry on the employment of retired military officers by defense contractors would be made by the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services of which I have the honor to be chairman.

On June 23, 1959, promptly after Mr. VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, directed the inquiry, I addressed a letter to all Members of the House and to the Senate, requesting any information they might have bearing upon this subject.

There has been put in every Member's office today, the printed text of our hearings together with the report of my subcommittee, unanimously adopted and approved by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

I have dropped in the hopper, today, a bill containing the subcommittee's recommendations. This, the subcommittee, by unanimous vote, directed me to do. It is their bill as well as my own even though under House Rules it bears my name alone.

To summarize:

We would extend the coverage of the criminal statutes contained in title 18, United States Code, relating to the activities of retired commissioned officers and separated civilian personnel, within 2 years next after their separation.

To accomplish this: Section 1 of our bill introduces a new section 292. We have broadened section 283 and extended the coverage of section 284 of title 18, United States Code.

The purpose of these amendments is to stop selling. We propose to bar sell-

ing information acquired while in Federal commissioned service or otherwise, for a period of 2 years. These sections contain criminal penalties.

It is our hope that they clearly express the intent of the Congress; and that they are enforceable, and will be enforced.

Next, we have struck out what we feel is an unnecessary and discriminatory penalty upon naval and marine regular officers selling of war material and supplies to that department, while Army and Air Force officers were not under the same limitations. This Navy statute is partial and punitive, beyond the point of usefulness.

We propose a law which across the boards at all times for 2 years after retirement forbids retired pay to any commissioned officer engaged in selling, directly or indirectly, to the Department of Defense.

After 2 years, we feel that the hold of old associations will have been diluted by time. This is the cooling period of 2 years as to which there has been no noticeable dissent.

Finally, we have equalized certain opportunities. We have amended the dual compensation statute to provide, that without interrupting the career of civil service system, if the Secretary of Defense shall find the indispensable man to give the unique service which none other can supply, then he may without the restrictions of that act appoint a retired military officer and certify the action he has taken to the Congress.

The requirement that the Secretary must be personally responsible for such an appointment will, we feel, keep the exception from being abused. Likewise, we amend the dual office statute to lift the ban on officers retired for age or length of service, who, alone of all commissioned officers are now restricted by this act.

There are ethical considerations, applicable as well to all persons, as to those in retired military status. These should be made clear in a code of conduct. It should be unnecessary for the Congress to set up by legislation the details of moral and personal obligations which men of honor ought to observe. There are bounds of propriety which can be spelled out in the military profession just as in other professions. The judgment of ostracism which follows upon the violation of these codes, the scorn of upright and self-respecting professional men, should be sufficient punishment throughout the years for those who abuse the confidences obtained while in the armed services.

Now, to sum up: The subcommittee proposes to stop selling of any kind under any pretext for 2 years after departure from the Pentagon, and we think selling has a well understood meaning; and we think it embraces every form of engagement which results in the extraction of money from the public purse by reason of knowledge and associations obtained through Government service.

The subcommittee did not engage in a punitive expedition. But many instances disclosed in the testimony and the cold statistical record leave some important questions unanswered.

First. Salaries when measured against the statement of duties performed left me at least not quite satisfied that all of the salaries were associated with pious hard work.

Second. The coincidence of increased company business and the employment of retired officers may have been accidental but it left me skeptical.

Therefore, we have determined to outlaw the "salesmen" for 2 years. I have no pride of language but, as clearly as it can be expressed, I hope this bill gives effect to that objective.

We want to prevent the exploitation of Government knowledge. We want to obtain for the hundreds and hundreds of officers in all grades, especially the lower grades, the opportunity to usefully employ their skills after they are no longer needed in the military service. All anyone must do now is stay away from selling.

The salaries encountered most frequently were about \$700 per month. This is far below the grade of corresponding technical civilian competence.

It is a rather sad commentary upon the distinction made by many defense department contractors who have eyes only for the stars in technical liaison. A \$40 billion budget bears watching.

THE SITUATION IN THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Canal Zone is an area where the United States, through treaties with Panama, exercises in perpetuity all those rights which we would possess and exercise if we were the actual sovereign of the territory.

The Department of State is currently giving consideration to a request by the Republic of Panama that the Panamanian flag be flown in the Canal Zone. On the surface, this may appear to be a small request. There are implications involved, however, which might have extremely serious and far-reaching effects.

There seems to be some sharp division of opinion within the executive branch concerning the advisability of granting such permission, and many Members of Congress have also voiced their deep sense of personal concern and misgiving.

The Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs is currently holding hearings on this matter. These hearings have not yet been finished and we will continue to receive views and recommendations from official and private sources.

As our subcommittee hearings have progressed it has become increasingly apparent that flying the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone would be a major deviation from our previously established policy. We have come to no decision concerning its advisability, but I am convinced that it would be an action which should not be undertaken by the executive branch alone.

I have, therefore, today introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress "that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters involving the provisions of such treaties concerning territorial sovereignty, shall only be made pursuant to treaty."

This resolution simply expresses the sense of the Congress that a matter of such potential and far-reaching importance be undertaken only after full consideration by both the Executive and that body of the Congress which is charged under the Constitution with the exercise of such responsibility.

We wish to maintain the best and most friendly relations with the people of Panama and we wish also to fulfill the great responsibility which we undertook with the construction of the canal. I am firmly convinced that the procedure called for in my resolution will eventually do more to help avoid misunderstandings with Panama than unilateral acts of grace by the executive branch alone.

CLARENCE S. WIBEL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. 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 gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, tonight in Boston a testimonial dinner is being given for a very able and distinguished employee of the U.S. Government. On January 31, 1960, Mr. Clarence S. Wibel will retire from the Inspection Service of the U.S. Post Office by virtue of having reached the mandatory age limit of 70.

In his long and noteworthy career of over 50 years, Mr. Wibel has made many friends. These friends are honoring him tonight on his 70th birthday with this testimonial banquet. I wish so much that I could be in Boston tonight and join in the honoring of Mr. Wibel. However, due to a previous engagement here in the Capital which I have had for some time, I shall be unable to fly to Boston for this occasion. I would want to pay tribute to Mr. Wibel's lovely wife, who has been an inspiration.

During his career as chief inspector of the U.S. postal service in the Boston regional area, Mr. Wibel always has been extremely courteous and cooperative, not only with me but with everyone requiring his services. He has made a great contribution to the efficient operation of the U.S. post office in the Boston area.

Mr. Wibel's career in the postal service extends over a period of 51 years. He entered the service at the age of 18 as a substitute clerk in the Denver, Colo., post office at 30 cents an hour. Progressing through the ranks, Mr. Wibel attained the position of foreman in this office and in July of 1923 was appointed to the Inspection Service. He served as an inspector in St. Louis, Denver, and

Washington, D.C., before coming to Boston in June 1937. On October 1, 1953, he became postal inspector in charge at the Boston office, which position he is now leaving by reason of reaching the mandatory age of 70 for retirement. His service in the Inspection Service has covered all fields encompassed by that branch of the Department.

It is interesting to note that following his first 6 months' assignment at Pine Bluff, Ark., his inspector in charge elatedly reported that Inspector Wibel had expressed no discontent with his territory, which had theretofore been a problem to man because of the high incidence of malaria. Subsequently Inspector Wibel was commended for his extraordinary industry in general and specifically for his tenaciousness in obtaining a confession from a postmaster who had faked a \$1,000 holdup and claimed its proceeds.

In keeping with the pattern of industry and conduct he had demonstrated in the post office, Mr. Wibel progressed through the ranks of the service willingly accepting assignments regarded as undesirable by many and tackling the most difficult problems with vigor.

During his career he served in the St. Louis, Denver, Washington, and Boston divisions. In the mid-1930's his persistence and attention to detail brought about the recovery of \$10,000 taken in a mailtruck holdup in Charlotte, N.C., and permitted the successful prosecution of a New Jersey doctor who had received the stolen money.

During the war years his initiative and insight into operating problems was of particular value in the Boston area in assisting in the establishment of facilities for mail for the Armed Forces in the face of trying manpower and equipment shortages.

It was in 1953 in recognition of his experience, leadership abilities, tact, and diplomacy he was appointed inspector in charge of the Boston Division, where he has continued to display untiring and loyal devotion to the principles of the service and deicated competence in the direction of its affairs in his area.

On January 31, 1960, Mr. Wibel will have completed 51 years in the employment of the U.S. Post Office. Over a half of a century is a long time. As an anecdote of interest, when he was first sworn into the postal service in 1908 by the assistant postmaster at Denver, the then young Wibel was told, "Young man, don't think this is a permanent appointment." After a half century, Mr. Wibel states this appointment was not permanent, it lasted only 51 years.

I believe the Congress would like to send congratulations to a great public servant, a great American—Inspector Clarence S. Wibel—and to his real helpmate and splendid son.

THE LATE A. B. GRAHAM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I announce to the House the death the day before yesterday, in Columbus, Ohio, of A. B. Graham, the father and the founder of the 4-H Clubs of America. He was 92 years old. He founded the first 4-H Club in a country school in Champaign County, of which he was a native in my district 58 years ago.

Just a few years ago the Government of the United States honored the 4-H Clubs and Mr. Graham by the issuance of a special postage stamp. He also headed up the first agricultural extension department of any university in this country, at Ohio State University.

Mr. Graham lived a long and honorable life, and was revered by all who knew him. Of course, his living monument will be the 4-H Clubs, which have done so much for the rural youngsters of this Nation.

The following article concerning Mr. Graham appeared in the Washington Post of January 16, 1960:

ORGANIZER OF 4-H CLUBS

COLUMBUS, OHIO, January 15.—A. B. Graham, 92, died in a suburban rest home last night, 58 years after he organized what became the world's first 4-H Club.

The movement, which began in Springfield, Ohio, on January 15, 1902, has since spread over the world.

Born on a farm near St. Paris, Champaign County, in 1868, Mr. Graham rose from the post of teacher of a one-room country school to become the first director of the agriculture extension at Ohio State University in 1905. He was the first full-time extension director in the Nation.

His club, organized in Springfield as a boys' and girls' agriculture club, was grouped under the name 4-H in 1930 with similar clubs.

Mr. Graham retired in 1938 after 23 years of developing methods of extension teaching for the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Mr. SANTANGELO. 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. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has called upon Congress to reduce expenditures and balance the budget. I call upon the administration to collect the millions of dollars which aircraft companies owe to the people of the United States which the Federal Renegotiation Board has determined they have made as excess profits. On August 26, 1959, I brought to the attention of the House that certain aircraft companies were resisting the refund to our Government of the amount of excessive profits from payments made by the Federal Government. The law requires that these excessive profits be returned to the United States after the Federal Renegotiation Board has determined that the companies have overcharged the Federal Government.

Since Congress adjourned in September, determinations have been made by the Federal Renegotiation Board, and once again, we find aircraft companies which are the recipients of defense contracts by negotiation without competitive bidding, refusing to refund to the Government the taxes on excessive profits which they have earned.

I want to bring to the attention of this House the failure to cooperate on the part of the Boeing Airplane Co., the Martin Co., and Lockheed Aircraft Co. I also wish to bring to the attention of the House the fine cooperation of the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., which apparently has listened to the demands of the people and the Congressmen, and since my last speech made payment to the Government on taxes of \$8,500,000 excessive profits which it owed for the years 1951 and 1953.

I wish to report that the Boeing Airplane Co., which received defense contracts from our Government in fiscal year 1958 to the extent of \$2,131 million and for the fiscal year 1959, received in contracts \$1,166,511,000, however, once again resisted payment to the Government of the taxes on \$6,784,165 which it made in excessive profits in the year 1955. As I reported to you before, the Boeing Airplane Co. in the year 1954 made in excessive profits \$10 million and refuses to make payment thereon.

The Martin Co., in fiscal year 1958, received \$400,200,000 of defense contracts and in fiscal year 1959 received in defense contracts by negotiation and without competitive bidding \$524,063,000. It was determined by the Federal Renegotiation Board that the Martin Co. earned in excess profits the sum of \$3,500,000 in 1955. The Martin Co. has refused to pay to the people of the United States the taxes on the excessive profits of \$6,250,000 earned in 1954, and now once again \$3,500,000 on the excessive profits for the year 1955.

This is the same company which entertained many of the Pentagon officials and retired officers in the Bahamas, and saw nothing improper or untoward in the fact that a defense contractor entertained important Pentagon officials with whom it discussed the weapons procurement and contracts relative thereto.

In 1955 it was determined by the Federal Renegotiation Board that for the year 1955 Lockheed Aircraft Corp. earned \$3,500,000 as excessive profits and owed the Government the taxes thereon. Lockheed Aircraft owes taxes on its \$6 million excessive profits which it made in 1953 and the taxes on its \$6 million excessive profits which it made in 1954. The total amount that it refuses to pay taxes on is \$15,500,000.

Lockheed Aircraft Corp. is another one of the favorite companies of the defense contractors. For fiscal year 1958 it received \$755,100,000 and for fiscal year 1959 it received \$886,462,000 of defense contracts not given on a competitive basis.

The President should call upon these companies which are making tremendous profits from defense contracts to make refunds so that we need not borrow funds to pay them on their defense contracts

to the extent of their indebtedness. Perhaps the retired military officers employed by these companies will use their influence to have them pay.

I commend the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., which I criticized in my speech of August 26, 1959, because they have withdrawn their suits against the Government and have permitted the Government to collect on the bonds which guarantees the payment of taxes on the \$8,500,000 of excessive profits which it made during 1951 and 1953.

I urge that the Attorney General act diligently in the collection of these claims for refunds against companies like Boeing Airplane Co., Lockheed Aircraft, and the Martin Co., and I once again urge the Defense Department not to favor those defense contractors who refuse to refund their excessive profits and cause this Government to borrow more money than necessary.

FREE ACCESS TO FEDERAL INFORMATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of every Member of Congress an excellent article by Dr. Clark Mollenhoff, who has long been in the forefront of the fight for free access to Federal information.

The article was published in the January 1960 issue of Nieman Reports and is based on the eighth annual Lovejoy lecture given at Colby College by Dr. Mollenhoff when the college awarded him an honorary doctorate of laws. It is one more in the series of magazine articles, newspaper stories, speeches, and other public pronouncements by Dr. Mollenhoff which are part of his aggressive attempts as a working reporter to find out the facts of Federal Government.

Last year, in the July 1959 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, an article by Dr. Mollenhoff outlined the dangers to a democratic society posed by the growing restrictions on information from the executive branch of the Federal Government. The effect of the Atlantic Monthly article has been noticeable. It contributed, I believe, to some of the developments in Congress which helped reassert the people's right to know about their Government. I hope Dr. Mollenhoff's most recent article will have a comparable effect.

The article follows:

SHIELD OF SECRECY—THE CLAIM OF EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE TO WITHHOLD INFORMATION

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

On the surface it would appear there are few threats to the free press today. Those who are critical of governmental officials or of the great institutions of our Nation do not have their presses smashed, nor are they likely to be subjected to the continuous personal harassment that resulted in the death of Elijah Parish Lovejoy.

Today there is the tendency in America to take our freedoms for granted. We assume that freedom of the press is so well established that it will always be with us. Our daily newspapers are filled with columns of print exposing wrongdoing, and criticizing the mistakes of judgment by our public officials, our labor leaders, our television performers and television executives. Many newspapers pride themselves on finding room for all points of view, and have demonstrated it by carrying columnists who are as far apart as the conservative David Lawrence and such a liberal as Marquis Childs.

Members of the public and many newspapermen are inclined to accept the idea that the American people are so steeped in the traditions of a free press and its part in a democracy that no public official would dare to attack our idealistic concept of an uncensored and independent press. There is the view that Americans, born and reared in this tradition, would rise in fury to strike down the Government officials who would seek to control or suppress the Nation's newspapers. We often hear it said that Americans, reared in an atmosphere of freedom, would not put up with the encroachments on liberty that have been forced on people behind the Iron Curtain. We are told that they would not put up with the kind of conditions that have stifled many freedoms in our own hemisphere.

It seems to me that this philosophy of the indomitable American presupposes that Americans are somehow braver, stronger, wiser, and more valiant than people living in other parts of the world. I would think that the present stage in the space race would teach us that Americans have no monopoly on wisdom, enterprise, strength, or know-how. For years we kidded ourselves into thinking, simply because we are Americans, with many advantages over the Russians, that we were guaranteed a long lead in the fields of nuclear weapons, aircraft, and space exploration. In recent years we have seen our lead dwindle and vanish while many of our leading scientists have complained that nonsensical security on many matters interfered with our scientific progress.

Now, many realists are willing to admit that we Americans have no guaranteed superiority in scientific areas. We have been forced to learn the hard way that the rate of accomplishment in scientific areas is tied pretty closely to our willingness to work, to study and make sacrifices.

There is little in our lazy, well-fed, luxury-loving attitudes of the present to make me believe that any great number of Americans have awakened to the recognition that we are not a super race. There is little to indicate that any large segment of the American people recognize that we must work and study to recognize when there are encroachments on our freedoms, or risk seeing these freedoms go down the drain as has our lead in the scientific field.

My concern today is over the apathy that exists toward serious encroachments on the right of access to information. It is an apathy that covers not only the general public but a good many representatives of the press. This lack of concern is either the result of a lack of knowledge of what a free press means to a democracy, lack of enough interest to dig in and learn where some arbitrary governmental secrecy policies can take us, or lack of guts to speak out.

It is time that more Americans recognize that we are no brighter, stronger, or more courageous than many people who have been crushed by totalitarian governments. We are only luckier—luckier because we are fortunate enough to be living in a free nation.

We are fortunate that the slogans of a free press are deeply enough rooted in our history that few American political figures would take the risk of any direct attack on the

institution of the free press. I have no doubt that a direct attack on the free press would result in a loud outcry from the press itself, and from a few citizens. There is a recognition of the possibility of political repercussions from a direct assault on the press, and public officials are almost unanimous in giving at least lipservice to the concept of an uncensored press. But, many of these same public officials find indirect ways to control the information available to the press.

They also find subtle ways to influence or coerce reporters or columnists who are too aggressive and too critical.

What are the subtle methods used to influence the press?

There are the smooth public relations operators who are helpful to the point where some newsmen lean on them too much, and forget how to do their own digging and thinking.

There is the misuse of security classifications—top secret, secret, and confidential—to withhold information that should not be classified. This is a particularly effective means for officials in the Pentagon to cover up mistakes as well as improprieties. This overclassification is expensive from a standpoint of the extra cost to the Government where there is misuse of Government property or the rigging of Government contracts.

There are efforts to give the impression that material is being withheld for security reasons, when it is actually being withheld for political purposes.

There is the practice of officials being unavailable or slow in responding to calls from reporters who are regarded as critical of the administration in power.

There is the practice of granting special interviews or other privileges (such as invitations to the White House dinners) to reporters who are regarded as basically friendly.

Most important, there are the efforts to hide arbitrarily the records of executive agencies on grounds that some vague national interest unconnected with security is involved in refusing to divulge confidential executive communications.

We of the press must accept the fact that an aggressive press will always be faced with some obstructions or harassment. Regardless of which political party is in power, there will always be some men in the administration who will adopt the attitude that public business is not the public's business.

I would like to emphasize at this point that I do not believe the press is entitled to any special access to information. We should be entitled to the same access that every citizen should have in a democracy if the citizen is to inform himself on how officials are handling his Government.

I would also like to warn that the freedom of the press and the rights of citizens in a democracy are not an issue when a woman columnist refuses to tell a court the source of her hearsay information on the temperament or excessive weight of a movie and television actress. Gossip columns, comics, and a good many other features in our newspapers are mainly froth to attract readers, and have little connection with the real purpose of a free press—the informing of the public on the conduct of Government and on other matters that are vital to the general welfare.

Labor organizations operate under the privileges of special laws. The steel industry is a basic industry, tied to our national defense and to the public welfare. Television channels operate on Government licenses, and represent a powerful force in molding public opinion. These are areas in which the press and the public have an interest second only to the conduct of public affairs by Government officials.

Government secrecy represents our major reason for concern today.

A few of these secrecy-minded officials are malicious and tyrannical despots with no real concept of the responsibility to the public that is inherent in the operation of a true democracy. Such figures can grow even in a democracy.

But, I would say that a majority of those who erect secrecy barriers are well-meaning, but misguided and shortsighted.

These secrecy fanatics include men who believe a near totalitarian type of censorship is needed to protect U.S. secrets from the Kremlin. Read the testimony before the congressional committees and you will see who they are.

There are other secrecy fiends who rationalize the hiding of matters that have no connection with military secrecy on grounds that information released by the Government will be slanted or twisted by political enemies. They rationalize their own slanting of Government press releases on grounds it is really in the national interest.

There is also the secrecy group that argues that secret discussions of governmental problems result in greater efficiency, and more frank discussions of different viewpoints.

Each of these groups overlooks the long documented record of how secrecy has been used to cover up corruption in Government. They disregard the basic right of the public to know the arguments involved in a decision to award contracts or dispense other rights, unless some real military security problem is involved.

There are some reporters and editors who will tell you that there is no real problem in obtaining information in Washington.

It may be true that some reporters and editors have run into no secrecy barriers. There is no problem of obtaining information that is favorable to an administration that is in power. There is usually no problem of obtaining access even to the busiest individuals if they are reasonably sure they are to be the subject of articles puffing their importance.

The problem of access to information arises when officials know (or suspect) that the inquiring reporter may unearth facts that are not wholly complimentary to the administration, or when the reporter is known to have been critical of the administration.

Point out the newsmen who says he has no trouble obtaining information, and it is likely the subject will fit one of these patterns:

1. A reporter or editor who has been largely a patsy for the administration.
2. A reporter or editor who lacks either the imagination or the energy to go behind the self-serving declarations of agency press releases.

Reporters who are considered friends of the administration in power may have a few exclusive stories dropped in their laps in return for understanding and uncritical treatment.

By contrast, there are often efforts at retaliation against those who are critical of the administration in power. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt went so far as to summon Lyle Wilson, United Press Bureau chief, to the White House in a direct effort to kill a story. Roosevelt also threatened reprisal against the United Press if Wilson did not give in to his demands, but Wilson refused. Occasionally, Presidents since then have been equally blunt.

But, it is seldom that a President will take such direct action as to summon a reporter or editor to the White House. More common are the subtle efforts of lesser officials to interfere with the reporter, to ridicule or undermine his work, to erect barriers that interfere with him on even routine assignments.

The New York Times occupies a unique position that makes its reporters less susceptible to the pressures of Federal officials than other newspapers. It is a paper read

in Washington and in the embassies all over the world. It has a voice that is loud as well as respected and feared by official Washington.

Yet, some reporters for this mighty newspaper find themselves subjected to subtle pressures when they are critical of the administration. Bureau Chief James Reston has been highly critical of the Eisenhower administration's foreign policy, and its conduct of other matters. Although Reston was highly critical of the foreign policy of the late John Foster Dulles, the New York Times Bureau chief praises Dulles for "never taking any step to cut off my sources of information."

However, there were others in the administration who were not so understanding of the role of a critical press in a democracy. Reston's critical comments were met with hostility in some quarters, and with subtle harassment by officials who were unavailable for interviews and dilatory or unavailable on telephone calls.

Columnist Walter Lippmann, speaking from the experience of his 70 years, commented before the National Press Club this fall on the tendency of Government "insiders" to ridicule criticism from outside Government as coming from ignoramuses—persons who don't have access to the conferences and secret files of the Government.

Lippmann declares that formidable as this criticism is, he has no trouble getting the better of it:

"I tell the critic, you be careful. You will be denouncing the principle of democracy itself, which asserts that the outsiders shall be sovereign over the insiders. For you will be showing that the people themselves, since they are ignoramuses because they are outsiders, are therefore incapable of governing themselves."

Furthermore, Lippmann declared that as far as the affairs of the world are concerned, those who regard themselves as insiders are actually outsiders since none of them read all of the U.S. papers and they have no access to the records of foreign governments that are equally important if one is to have the total wisdom the insiders indicate they have.

Columnists Drew Pearson and Joseph Alsop report that when they were critical of Government policies and personalities, they found themselves subjected to investigations by agents of the FBI and other Government bureaus. They contended that no breach of security was involved but that they were subjected to probes to dry up their sources of information.

On the local level, the Arkansas Gazette found itself the target of the barbs of Gov. Orval Faubus for aggressive opposition to Faubus on the explosive issue of the Little Rock schools. Despite the fact that the paper found its circulation cut and its advertising revenue off sharply, the publisher and editor stuck with their position to win an expensive victory.

Executive editor Harry Ashmore left the Gazette this fall. He had won his battle, but he was aware that the bitterness of the integration fight had left scars that would remain as long as he directed the editorial policy of the newspaper.

Wallace Turner and William Lambert, reporters for the Portland Oregonian, tackled the corruption in local politics and the mighty Teamsters Union. They found themselves and their newspaper subject to immediate attacks and a series of libel actions that might have terrorized a less courageous editorial department.

Vance Trimble, reporter for the Scripps-Howard syndicate, had no more than started his series on the nepotism on congressional payrolls when he was subjected to vicious attacks from Congress. Fortunately, many newspaper groups rallied behind Trimble's

effort, and an atmosphere was created that forced many Members of Congress to drop relatives from the payroll or to cut their salaries. The impact of public opinion also forced the Senate to adopt new rules opening Senate office payrolls for public inspection.

As head of Sigma Delta Chi Freedom of Information Committee, V. M. (Red) Newton, managing editor of the Tampa Tribune, lashed out at the secrecy that covered spending of counterpart funds. He was immediately subjected to a personal attack by members of the House Administration Committee. That crusade to open these spending records has been unsuccessful so far, but Newton and others are still pushing for open records on this congressional spending.

The term "managing the news" was used by James B. Reston in explaining to the Moss subcommittee his complaint about Government information practices. Reston, whose work has been largely in the foreign affairs field, was objecting to the practice of releasing selective facts to present the favorable picture the administration wanted to get across to the public. He complained that barriers were erected to block those who sought further facts that were inconsistent with the picture presented in the "managed news."

In the foreign affairs field and in some other areas, the "managing of the news" can be accomplished by misusing security classifications to cover part of the facts.

In fields where national security cannot be used to hide the facts, a new device has come into wide use for managing the news. It is the claim by the executive branch of Government that it has some inherent right to refuse arbitrarily to produce any records or give any testimony that includes advice or recommendations in the executive agencies.

The Eisenhower administration has pressed this broad secrecy doctrine with the argument that all communications containing advice or recommendations are confidential executive business. The administration claims some inherent extensive privilege to hide such communications from the press, the public, committees of Congress and even from auditors of the General Accounting Office.

Leonard J. Saccio, acting International Cooperation Administration Director, testified before the Hennings Subcommittee that he believed this so-called executive privilege gave the ICA the authority to withhold practically every document in the agency from the Government Accounting Office auditors.

"If ICA wanted to apply the executive privilege, GAO would not see one thing because practically every document in our agency has an opinion or a piece of advice," Saccio testified.

No agency in the executive branch has carried this arbitrary executive secrecy to the extreme point Saccio says it could be carried. However, the testimony by Saccio was an admission from within the executive department of the danger inherent in a doctrine that any executive department official can withhold any document that includes advice or recommendations.

It may be that some have such faith in the present administration that they feel quite content to have that administration exercise an arbitrary power to refuse to produce records for the Congress, the GAO, the press and the public. However, it would be well to question whether they want such unchecked power to conceal records lodged in the hands of some other administration.

If you are a Republican, ask yourself if you would feel comfortable in letting the administration of a Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Jack Kennedy, or Hubert Humphrey put up such a barrier to congressional investigators or the GAO.

If you are a Democrat, ask yourself if you want the administration of a RICHARD NIXON to have such a total arbitrary power to withhold records of Government actions.

It is only by viewing the power of arbitrary executive secrecy in the hands of the other political party that many can test their true reaction to such a broad claim of a right to refuse to produce records.

Apply the doctrine of arbitrary executive secrecy to the Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration. Then you will see how the claim of arbitrary executive secrecy could have been used to conceal these notorious scandals.

The oil scandals of the Harding administration involved communications between Secretary of Navy Denby and Secretary of Interior Fall. Had a claim of arbitrary secrecy been invoked, it would have been impossible for Senator Thomas Walsh, the Montana Democrat, to establish the fact that eventually sent Secretary of Interior Fall to prison.

Assume that the Truman administration officials had claimed a precedent of executive privilege and refused to give testimony or produce records on the tax scandals. The communications between top officials in the White House, Justice Department and Treasury would have remained buried, along with the crimes involving some of the highest officials of the huge tax-collecting agency.

In 1948 there were some restricted efforts by the Truman administration to bar congressional investigations from some executive department records. The personnel records of William Remington were withheld under a general executive order placing loyalty files outside of the reach of congressional committees. William P. Rogers, now the Attorney General, was then the chief counsel for the Senate committee investigating Remington. Rogers presided over the preparation of a report that was highly critical of this executive secrecy.

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, then a young Congressman from California, had some sharp comments to make about this limited withholding of records by the Truman administration. NIXON said:

"The point has been made that the President of the United States has issued an order that none of this information (on Remington) can be released and therefore the Congress has no right to question the judgment of the President.

I say that that proposition cannot stand from a constitutional standpoint or on the basis of the merit for this very good reason. That would mean that the President could have arbitrarily issued an executive order in the Meyers case, the Teapot Dome case, or in any other case denying the Congress information it needed to conduct an investigation of the executive department and the Congress would have no right to question his decision.

NIXON was only one of many prominent Republicans who attacked this executive secrecy at the time. By contrast, a good many high ranking Democrats—including House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, of Texas—were defending the secrecy of the Truman administration. Many Democrats who were inclined to defend the secrecy in the Truman administration are now highly critical of the Eisenhower administration for merely extending the same basic principle. It demonstrates that political expediency has a tendency to encroach on the views of our elected representatives and to color their thinking. The press and the public cannot depend on either political party to be the beacon of right where their freedoms are involved.

After the Truman administration was so severely criticized by Republicans for imposing unjustified secrecy, it was amazing to see a Republican administration lay down a claim to a right of arbitrary executive sec-

recy that is broader than any similar claim in our history.

The new secrecy doctrine was made public in connection with the Army-McCarthy hearings on May 17, 1954—the same day the U.S. Supreme Court pronounced its historic ruling against racial segregation in public schools. The fact that the Supreme Court ruled on segregation on that day did not bury the colorful Army-McCarthy hearings or the fact that officials of the executive branch were refusing to give testimony before a committee of Congress.

President Eisenhower, in a letter to Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, authorized Army Counsel John Adams to refuse to relate conversations with Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams and William P. Rogers, then the Deputy Attorney General. The President wrote that in his view members of the executive branch should not be required to testify on conversations and communications with other members of the executive branch where recommendations and advice were involved.

Many large newspapers—still hysterical with the fear of the McCarthy era—saw this letter only as a blow at Senator Joseph McCarthy. If McCarthy wanted the testimony, then these newspapers were opposed to it. Unthinking editorial writers praised the Eisenhower letter as some new and brilliant statement of the separation of powers doctrine. Only a few looked behind the minor inconvenience it presented to McCarthy in his television battle with the Army and saw the full claim of arbitrary executive secrecy it embodied. Since then, many have changed their views.

The full threat inherent in Eisenhower's May 17, 1954, letter did not become apparent immediately. It took months and even years before it became clear that the administration would use that letter as a precedent for refusing a wide variety of information to the press, to a dozen congressional committees, and to the General Accounting Office.

Sherman Adams refused to testify in a congressional hearing on the Dixon-Yates case on grounds that his activities were all confidential executive business. His action was to set the pattern for officials of more than a dozen agencies of Government to inform Congress and the GAO that important records and testimony would not be produced. A half dozen committees of Congress prepared reports castigating this arbitrary withholding of testimony and documents.

The refusal of the executive branch to make certain evaluation reports and inspectors general reports available to the GAO and committees of Congress has become a major barrier to investigations of the Defense Department and foreign aid spending.

Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, an appointee of the Eisenhower administration, has declared that the withholding of documents was hindering the GAO in the performance of its statutory duties and could be almost fatal to the GAO's effectiveness.

The Moss Government Operations Subcommittee on Government Information has lashed out at the withholding from GAO as being a violation of the law since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 provides that all agencies must turn over all records requested by the GAO auditors.

In recent months, liberals as well as conservatives in Congress have become concerned over evidence indicating that the executive secrecy has covered up fraud and mismanagement in the foreign aid program. Even a rider tied to the foreign aid appropriations bill has not changed the administration's position.

The President has continued to provide a blanket secrecy shield to evaluation reports and inspectors general reports with a vague comment that the withholding is "in the national interest."

Some Members of Congress are so concerned that they are proposing to tighten the law and withhold all funds from those agencies that do not make full reports to the GAO on their spending and activities. This is a serious step, but many Members of Congress feel that this matter has reached a serious stage.

The concern of Congress is not so much over what has been withheld as it is worry over where this broad claim of a right to withhold records may lead at some future time. Members of Congress recognize that in the wrong hands the precedent could become a major tool in forming an executive dictatorship.

They know that it has been necessary to keep a constant surveillance over military spending—now 60 percent of our budget—to expose corruption and force action against officials involved in the corruption.

As we have greater expenditures and more complex operations of our Government, we need more congressional investigations to burrow constantly into the activities of our public officials. The press needs the skill and the power of congressional committees to spotlight the big problem areas in our society.

Congress and the GAO need the power to obtain records and testimony from those public officials in the executive departments who are responsible for administration and enforcement of laws.

This is a great issue of freedom in our time. It goes to the question of the right of Congress to serve as a check on the executive department's activities. It goes to the question of whether a free people are entitled to information on the activities of Government when no question of national security is involved.

This year, in this administration, it may represent only an inconvenience to the press, an irritant to congressional investigators and an impediment to efficient work by the GAO auditors.

But, what could such a precedent of arbitrary executive secrecy do under some later administration that may be less kindly in its basic outlook?

FLOOD CONTROL PROBLEMS AT CANTON, OHIO, AND NEIGHBORING AREAS

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include related matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted to the Committee on Public Works a suggested resolution to authorize a study by the Corps of Engineers of the very serious flood problems at Canton, Ohio, and neighboring areas.

It was just a year ago that a rainfall of 3.23 inches during a 24-hour period, at a time when the ground was frozen and unable to absorb additional moisture, caused the most damaging flood in over 40 years. More than 800 people were evacuated from their homes in Canton, Louisville, Waynesburg, Minerva, and Malvern, and property damage was estimated in the millions of dollars.

I immediately requested the advice of the Corps of Engineers, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, and the Muskingum Conservancy District to investigate possibilities of flood control in Stark County, and have been in corre-

spondence with these officials from time to time since.

Some months ago I called upon local officials to take action in the matter, and I am glad to report that a general meeting was called by Mayor Charles Babcock at which representatives of all interested groups, State and Federal agencies, and the mayor's flood committee discussed the problem. Considerable credit is due Carl F. Schoenbaum, chairman of the committee, and his associates for their carefully prepared report.

We hope that the Public Works Committee will act quickly to authorize the review report, and that the Corps of Engineers will be able to recommend a sound and feasible project to control flooding in Stark County.

Meanwhile, I have urged the mayor and other officials to continue to explore all other possibilities, including a watershed project in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. Marion DeHoff, chairman of the Stark County Soil Conservation District, has stated his willingness to cooperate with officials of the urban areas in this work.

Many other areas of Ohio have demonstrated that floods can be controlled and that many benefits accrue from proper soil and water management. I am confident we can be equally successful in meeting and solving this serious problem in Canton.

JANUARY 16, 1960.

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am submitting herewith a suggested resolution to authorize a study by the Corps of Engineers of the very serious flood problems in the city of Canton, Ohio, and nearby areas including the towns of Louisville, Minerva, Waynesburg, and Malvern.

Just a year ago, January 17, 1959, after a rainfall of 3.23 inches in a 24-hour period, severe flooding in this area forced the evacuation of about 800 people in the communities concerned and property damage of several million dollars. The situation was repeated in February, and certain areas are flooded whenever there is a heavy rainfall.

Following my suggestion, the mayor of Canton called a meeting of all local officials concerned, representatives of industry, and of the State of Ohio, the Soil Conservation Service and the U.S. Corps of Engineers. There was full discussion of all possible methods of providing flood control and it was determined that we should seek the assistance of the Corps of Engineers. Mayor Charles Babcock of Canton called on me last week and assured me the city stands ready to provide rights of way and any other local contributions that might be required should a regular flood control project be developed.

Accordingly, I am most hopeful that your committee can approve a resolution authorizing a review report at an early date. I will be glad to furnish any factual information the committee may desire.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK T. BOW,
Member of Congress.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, United States, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors be, and is hereby,

requested to review the reports on the Ohio River, submitted in House Document No. 306, 74th Congress, 1st session, with a view to determining the advisability at this time of improvements for flood control and allied purposes on Nimishillen Creek and its tributaries at and in the vicinity of Canton, Ohio.

SPECIAL ORDER FOR OBSERVANCE OF RESTORATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on February 16, on the occasion of the 42d observance of the independence of Lithuania, that after the reading and approval of the Journal, and prior to any legislative business for that day, I may have permission to address the House for 1 hour and to yield time to other Members.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL

Mr. MADDEN. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill called the quality stabilization bill. The quality stabilization bill should not be confused with fair trade legislation in any of its forms.

Surely it can be seen clearly by all that everybody, including business, labor, and the public, is certain to benefit by the proposed establishment of a simple, direct, and inexpensive method of protecting against the destructive results of predatory discounter pricing.

It is vastly different from fair trade legislation previously considered by Congress. The quality stabilization bill is not price fixing in any sense of the word. Under the proposed legislation the consumer will have complete freedom of choice. This bill will enable the consumer to choose between products varying widely as to price and as to quality, while giving the manufacturer the means, if he so chooses, to stabilize the quality of his product by stabilizing its price.

Discounter raids upon public respect for manufacturers' trademarks harm not only big manufacturers. They destroy, sometimes almost overnight, the business of smaller manufacturers who are unable to adopt the costly substitutes for price stabilizing available always to wealthy manufacturers. Discounters also are destroying the business and livelihood of those hundreds of thousands of smaller wholesalers and retailers who constitute the very backbone of the American system of distribution.

The quality stabilization bill, provides only for an honest, specific retail price, to be established by the manufacturer and to be available uniformly to all citizens, whether rich or poor.

The quality stabilization bill provides that a manufacturer may protect his

property rights in his trademark simply by revoking—by mail, if desired—the right of an offending reseller to make any further use of, or reference to, the trademark. However, the manufacturer may take such action only if the reseller sells either up or down from the specific price made known by the manufacturer as representing an honest value he desires to maintain competitively through the stabilization of the quality of his product, or if the reseller resorts to certain misrepresentations expressly condemned in the bill.

Extensive surveys have proved that when discounters select a widely known and respected product for price bait they force the manufacturer to strive constantly to reduce the cost and quality of that product, as a means of reducing its price to meet competitive prices forced constantly lower by the discounter.

This quality squeeze forced by discounter pricing inevitably injures factory labor employed in the industry affected. Surveys show frightened manufacturers laying off employees to make 15 men do the work of 20. Naturally, a manufacturer under the vicious squeeze of discounter prices has constantly less and less opportunity to improve wages or working conditions. Labor finds the dollar harder to get, and finds it gets less in real value per dollar in the products labor must buy.

To avoid further misleading confusion of quality stabilization with so-called fair trade a separate hearing will be requested for the quality stabilization bill. I am advised by the best of counsel that, with the quality stabilization bill enacted, neither manufacturer, reseller, nor the public would have any reason to rely upon any State fair trade act or upon any proposed Federal fair trade law.

And let me repeat that the bill permits the manufacturer to revoke the right of any reseller to make any further reference to, or use of, the manufacturer's distinguishing brand, name, or trademark, if the reseller sells either above or below the manufacturer's specified price, or commits other abuses, of public confidence or of the manufacturer's trademark rights, condemned in the bill.

Growing appreciation of the true meaning of the above facts is bringing increased support for quality stabilization, by manufacturers, and by reseller organizations, as well as by Members of Congress being urged to act for the protection of the public.

For the protection of all those rightfully concerned, and of the integrity of the traditional American business system, the bill should be enacted with a minimum of delay.

STABILIZING SUPPORT LEVELS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which, in my opinion, will be of great help and advantage to the entire tobacco industry. The purpose of the bill is to stabilize the support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and the upward spiral in recent years due to the operation of modernized parity formula. The bill provides for adjustments for changes in farm costs so that the level of support will rise or fall in direct proportion to changes in prices paid by farmers for commodities purchased, using the previous 3-year moving average as a base.

Briefly, the bill provides that the tobacco support level in 1960 be the same as in 1959 and that in subsequent years the support price be adjusted from the 1959 level. This bill if enacted into law should be a great factor in the retention of the foreign markets for our tobacco. It will let the exporters, the dealers, and the foreign manufacturers know that for the foreseeable future they will be able to obtain ample quantities of choice Virginia-type tobacco at a fair price and a price that will compete with foreign-grown tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that I have introduced carries out fully the recommendations of the Tobacco Industry Committee which appeared before the Tobacco Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee last Thursday, January 14. It is my understanding that the entire tobacco industry favors this legislation. I hope very much that we can get an early report from the Department of Agriculture as to its position on this legislation so that the Tobacco Subcommittee will be in a position to act on this legislation in the next week or two.

PROVIDING FOR EXCLUSION OR DEPORTATION OF ALIENS FOR VIOLATION OF LAWS RELATING TO ILLICIT POSSESSION OF MARIHUANA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9385) to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 212(a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 184; 70 Stat. 575; 8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(23)), is further amended by changing the language "narcotic drugs," to read "narcotic drugs or marihuana."

Sec. 2. Section 241(a)(11) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat. 206, 70 Stat. 575; 8 U.S.C. 1251(a)(11)), is further amended by changing the language "narcotic drugs," to read "narcotic drugs or marihuana."

Sec. 3. Section 245(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended (66 Stat.

217, 72 Stat. 699, 8 U.S.C. 1255(a)), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The status of an alien, other than an alien crewman, who was inspected and admitted or paroled into the United States may be adjusted by the Attorney General, in his discretion and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if (1) the alien makes an application for such adjustment, (2) the alien is eligible to receive an immigrant visa and is admissible to the United States for permanent residence, and (3) an immigrant visa is immediately available to him at the time his application is approved."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 16, insert:

Sec. 4. Section 203(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(1) The first 50 per centum of the quota of each quota area for such year, plus any portion of such quota not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (2) and (3), shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to qualified quota immigrants whose services are determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of the high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability of such immigrants and to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States. Immigrants who are the spouse or children of any immigrant described in this paragraph shall be held to be nonquota immigrants if accompanying or following to join him."

Sec. 5. The Immigration and Nationality Act is amended by adding thereto sections 208, 209, and 210, to read as follows:

"Sec. 208. The alien fiance or fiancée of a citizen of the United States may be issued a visa and admitted into the United States as a temporary visitor under section 101(a)(15)(B) for a period of three months (unless in exceptional circumstances this period is extended by the Attorney General): *Provided*, That (a) the alien is not otherwise ineligible to receive a visa or excludable from admission into the United States;

"(b) the Attorney General finds that the alien is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to a citizen of the United States; and

"(c) the Attorney General finds that the parties to the proposed marriage are able and intend to contract a valid marriage within the period for which the alien is admitted.

"Sec. 209. In the event the marriage does not occur within the period for which the alien is admitted, the alien shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported at any time after entry in accordance with the provisions of this act.

"Sec. 210. (a) In prescribing regulations for the administration of the provisions of section 208 of this act the Secretary of State shall include a requirement that the parties to a proposed marriage shall furnish satisfactory evidence to the American consular officer concerned, including sworn statements corroborated by other appropriate evidence showing that the parties have entered into a valid agreement to marry and are legally able and actually willing to conclude a valid marriage in the United States within a period of three months after the alien's arrival, or within such period as may be extended by the Attorney General.

"(b) In prescribing regulations for the administration of sections 208 and 209 of this act in connection with the arrival of the aliens concerned, at ports of entry in the

United States the Attorney General shall include a requirement that the prospective American citizen spouse of an alien covered by the provisions of section 208 shall furnish to the Attorney General a suitable bond, which shall be in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of the deportation of the alien concerned, and which shall be forfeited to the United States if and when the alien becomes deportable, or shall be canceled by the Attorney General upon receipt of satisfactory evidence that a valid marriage has been concluded, or that the alien has left the United States without expense to the said United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 300)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 507, 81st Congress, I transmit herewith the Ninth Annual Report of the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 18, 1960.

BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 255)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

With this message, transmitting the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1961, I invite the Congress to join with me in a determined effort to achieve a substantial surplus. This will make possible a reduction in the national debt. The proposals in this budget demonstrate that this objective can be attained while at the same time maintaining required military strength and enhancing the national welfare.

This budget attests to the strength of America's economy. At the same time, the budget is a test of our resolve, as a nation, to allocate our resources prudently, to maintain the Nation's security, and to extend economic growth into the future without inflation.

In highlight, this budget proposes:

1. Revenues of \$84 billion and expenditures of \$79.8 billion, leaving a surplus

of \$4.2 billion. This surplus should be applied to debt reduction, which I believe to be a prime element in sound fiscal policy for the Nation at this time.

2. New appropriations for the military functions of the Department of Defense amounting to \$40.6 billion, and expenditures of \$41 billion. These expenditures, which will be slightly higher than the 1960 level, will provide the strong and versatile defense which we require under prevailing world conditions.

3. Increased appropriations (including substantial restoration of congressional reductions in the 1960 budget), and a virtual doubling of expenditures, for nonmilitary space projects under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This furthers our plans to keep moving ahead vigorously and systematically with our intensive program of scientific exploration and with the development of the large boosters essential to the conquest of outer space.

4. Nearly \$4.2 billion in new appropriations for mutual security programs, an increase of about \$950 million above appropriations for the current year, with an increase of \$100 million in expenditures. This increase in program is needed to accelerate economic and technical assistance, chiefly through the Development Loan Fund, and to strengthen free world forces, in particular the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with advanced weapons and equipment.

5. A record total of expenditures \$1.2 billion, for water resources projects under the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. In addition to funds for going work, this amount provides for the initiation of 42 new high-priority projects, which will require \$38 million in new appropriations for 1961, and will cost a total of \$496 million over a period of years.

6. Substantially higher expenditures in a number of categories which under present laws are relatively uncontrollable, particularly \$9.6 billion for interest; \$3.9 billion to help support farm prices and income; \$3.8 billion for veterans compensation and pensions; and \$2.4 billion in aid to State and local governments for public assistance and employment security activities. The aggregate increase in these relatively uncontrollable expenditures is more than \$1 billion over 1960.

7. Research and development expenditures of \$8.4 billion—well over one-half of the entire Nation's expenditures, public and private, for these purposes—in order to assure a continuing strong and modern defense and to stimulate basic research and technological progress.

8. Recommendations for prompt legislative action to increase taxes on highway and aviation fuels, and to raise postal rates. These measures are needed to place on the users a proper share of the rising costs of the Federal airways and postal service, and to support the highway program at an increased level.

9. Recommendations to extend for another year present corporation income and excise tax rates.

10. A constructive legislative program to achieve improvements in existing laws

relating to governmental activities and to initiate needed actions to improve and safeguard the interests of our people.

In short, this budget and the proposals it makes for legislative action provide for significant advances in many aspects of national security and welfare. The budget presents a balanced program which recognizes the priorities appropriate within an aggregate of Federal expenditures that we can soundly support.

I believe that the American people have made their wishes clear: The Federal Government should conduct its financial affairs with a high sense of responsibility, vigorously meeting the Nation's needs and opportunities within its proper sphere while at the same time exercising a prudent discipline in matters of borrowing and spending, and in incurring liabilities for the future.

BUDGET TOTALS

During the present fiscal year we have made encouraging progress in achieving sound fiscal policy objectives. The deficit of \$12.4 billion in fiscal 1959, which was largely caused by the recession, is expected to be followed by a surplus of \$217 million in the current year. To safeguard this small surplus, I am directing all Government departments and agencies to exercise strict controls over the expenditure of Federal funds. Even so, the slender margin of surplus can be attained only if economic growth is not interrupted.

For the fiscal year 1961, I am proposing a budget surplus of \$4.2 billion to be applied to debt retirement. In my judgment this is the only sound course. Unless some amounts are applied to the reduction of debt in prosperous periods, we can expect an ever larger public debt if future emergencies or recessions again produce deficits.

In times of prosperity, such as we anticipate in the coming year, sound fiscal and economic policy requires a budget surplus to help counteract inflationary pressures, to ease conditions in capital and credit markets, and to increase the supply of savings available for the productive investment so essential to continued economic growth.

The budget recommendations for 1961 lay the groundwork for a sound and flexible fiscal policy in the years ahead. A continuance of economic prosperity in 1962 and later years can be expected to bring with it further increases in Federal revenues. If expenditures are held to the levels I am proposing for 1961 and reasonable restraint is exercised in the future, higher revenues in later years will give the next administration and the next Congress the choice they should rightly have in deciding between reductions in the public debt and lightening of the tax burden, or both. Soundly conceived tax revision can then be approached on a comprehensive and orderly basis, rather than by haphazard piecemeal changes, and can be accomplished within a setting of economic and fiscal stability.

Budget expenditures in 1961 are estimated at \$79.8 billion, which is \$1.4 bil-

lion more than the 1960 level. The total increase is attributable to (1) an increase of more than \$1 billion in relatively uncontrollable expenditures for farm price supports fixed by law, interest on the public debt, veterans compensation and pensions and public assistance grants, and (2) an increase of about \$500 million in expenditures because of commitments made in prior years for Federal housing programs, for civil public works projects and other construction, for loans under the mutual security program, and for other programs.

New activities and expansion of certain other programs have been included on a selective basis of need. These increases are offset by reductions in other existing programs, including the proposed elimination of the postal deficit.

New obligational authority recommended for the fiscal year 1961 totals \$79.4 billion. This is \$306 million less than the amounts already enacted and recommended for 1960, and \$401 million less than estimated expenditures in 1961.

Budget receipts under existing and proposed legislation are expected to rise substantially to \$84 billion in 1961. This compares with the revised estimate of \$78.6 billion for 1960 and actual receipts of \$59.3 billion in 1959.

MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Achievement of the proposed budget surplus will provide an opportunity to offset part of the deficits incurred in the fiscal years 1958 and 1959 largely because of the recession. The corresponding reduction of the public debt will reduce Government competition with private industry, individuals, and State and local governments for investment funds and will help ease the pressure on interest rates. Along with the recommended removal of the interest rate ceiling on long-term Federal debt, this will help hold down budget expenditures for interest, which now amount to almost one-eighth of the whole budget.

Statutory debt limit: It is estimated that the public debt, which stood at \$284.7 billion on June 30, 1959, will be \$284.5 billion on June 30, 1960, and will decline to \$280 billion at the end of fiscal 1961. Thus, the budget surplus estimated for fiscal 1961 will permit the Government to end the year with desirable operating leeway within the permanent debt limit of \$285 billion. However, the fluctuating seasonal pattern in receipts will again require a temporary increase in the debt limit during the fiscal year 1961, since the present temporary limit of \$295 billion expires on June 30, 1960. It is expected that the request for a new temporary limit will be for less than the present \$295 billion if the Congress accepts my budgetary proposals.

Interest ceiling: Effective management of a debt of this size requires a reasonable distribution among securities maturing at different times. Three-fourths of all marketable Treasury securities outstanding today come due in less than five years, of which \$80 billion will mature in less than a year. As long as the rate that would have to be paid on newly issued bonds exceeds the present statutory ceiling of 4½%, it is impossible

to issue and sell any marketable securities of over five years' maturity.

Exclusive reliance on borrowing in a limited sector of the market is an expensive and inefficient way to manage the debt. Inflationary pressures increase as the volume of short-term and, hence, highly liquid securities mounts, especially if these securities are acquired by commercial banks. Further, effective monetary policy becomes more difficult when the Treasury has to refinance often. To make possible prudent and flexible management of the public debt, to permit sale of a modest amount of intermediate and longer term bonds when market conditions warrant such action, and to keep the average maturity of the debt from constantly shortening, it is imperative that the Congress immediately act to remove the 42-year-old 4¼-percent limitation on interest rates on Government securities maturing after 5 years.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Estimated budget receipts of \$84 billion in the fiscal year 1961 assume a high and rising level of economic activity in calendar year 1960. Specifically, this revenue estimate is consistent with an increase in the gross national product from about \$480 billion for calendar 1959 to about \$510 billion for calendar 1960. Personal incomes and corporate profits are expected to rise considerably beyond last year's levels, which were depressed somewhat by the long duration of the steel strike. The accompanying table shows the sources of Government receipts for the fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961.

Budget receipts

(See special analysis B in pt. IV of this document)
[Fiscal years. In billions]

Source	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Individual income taxes.....	\$36.7	\$40.3	\$45.7
Corporation income taxes.....	17.0	22.2	23.5
Excise taxes.....	8.5	9.1	9.5
All other receipts.....	5.8	7.0	7.3
Total.....	68.3	78.6	86.0

The estimates for 1961 assume (1) extension of present tax rates and (2) the adoption of modifications recommended last year for certain tax laws. These are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Extension of present tax rates: In order to maintain Federal revenues, it is necessary that the present tax rates on corporation profits and certain excises be extended for another year beyond their scheduled expiration date of June 30, 1960. The scheduled reductions in the excise tax rates on transportation of persons and the scheduled repeal of the tax on local telephone service, which were enacted in the last session of the Congress, should be similarly postponed.

Improvement of the tax system: The recent tax revision hearings of the Ways and Means Committee have provided valuable information bearing on changes in the tax laws. The Treasury will continue to work in cooperation with the committees of the Congress in developing sound and attainable proposals for long-range improvement of the tax laws.

As the development of a comprehensive tax revision program will take time, the Congress should consider this year certain changes in the tax laws to correct inequities. These include amendments of the laws on taxation of co-operatives, now before the Congress, and a number of technical changes on which the Treasury Department has been working with committees of Congress. There is also before the Congress an amendment to prevent unintended and excessive depletion deductions resulting from the computation of percentage depletion allowances on the selling price of finished clay, cement products, and mineral products generally; unless the problem is satisfactorily resolved in a case now pending before the Supreme Court, the need for corrective legislation in this area will continue.

Under existing law, administration of the depreciation provisions is being hampered by the attempts of some taxpayers to claim excessive depreciation before disposing of their property. If gain from the sale of depreciable personal property were treated as ordinary income, the advantage gained in claiming excessive depreciation deductions would be materially reduced and the taxpayer's judgment as to the useful life of his property could more readily be accepted. Accordingly, I recommend that consideration be given to a change in the law which would treat such gain as ordinary income to the extent of the depreciation deduction previously taken on the property.

Aviation fuel taxes: To help defray the cost of the Federal airways system, the effective excise tax rate on aviation gasoline should be promptly increased from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon and an equivalent excise tax should be imposed on jet fuels, which now are untaxed. The conversion from piston engines to jets is resulting in serious revenue losses to the Government. These losses will increase unless the tax on jet fuels is promptly enacted. The revenues from all taxes on aviation fuels should be credited to general budget receipts, as a partial offset to the budgetary costs of the airways system, and clearly should not be deposited in the highway trust fund.

Changes in fees and charges: The cost of other Federal programs which provide measurable special benefits to identifiable groups or individuals should be recovered through charges paid by beneficiaries rather than by taxes on the general public. Whenever feasible, fees or charges should be established so that the beneficiaries will pay the full cost of the special services they receive. To help accomplish this purpose, I have directed that further work be done by the departments and agencies on a carefully defined inventory of Federal services which convey such special benefits. In the meantime, the Congress is requested to act favorably on the postal rate proposals described in this message and on a number of other specific proposals now pending before it or planned to be submitted this year for increased fees or charges for special services.

Estimated savings to the general taxpayers from more adequate fees and charges

(In millions)

Proposal	Fiscal year 1961	Full annual effect
Increase postal rates.....	\$654.0	\$654.0
Support highway expenditures by highway-user taxes.....		
Replace future diversion of general excise taxes to trust fund with increased motor fuel tax or other user charges.....		850.1
Transfer financing of forest and public land highways to trust fund.....	39.0	36.0
Charge users for share of cost of Federal airways:		
Increase taxes on aviation fuels.....	72.0	88.0
Transfer aviation fuel taxes from highway trust fund to general fund.....	17.0	20.0
Revise fees for noncompetitive oil and gas leases.....		14.0
Recover administrative costs of Federal crop insurance.....		6.4
Increase patent fees.....	3.7	3.7
Increase miscellaneous fees now below costs.....	8.0	8.9
Total savings.....	693.7	1,581.0

RECEIPTS FROM AND PAYMENTS TO THE PUBLIC

The program of responsible fiscal policy represented by a balanced budget with a substantial surplus is reinforced by an even greater surplus of total cash receipts from the public over cash payments to the public. In this more comprehensive measure of Federal financial activity, obtained by consolidating budget, trust fund, and certain other Federal transactions, receipts from the public are estimated at \$102.2 billion in 1961 and payments to the public at \$96.3 billion, resulting in an excess of \$5.9 billion of receipts.

This excess of receipts will be used to repay cash the Government has previously borrowed from the public. Repayment of such debt owed to the public will be greater than the amount of public debt retired, because the Government trust funds are expected to add to their holdings of public debt securities to the extent that trust fund receipts exceed trust fund expenditures. This will reduce the debt held by the public in like amount by shifting ownership to the trust funds.

For the fiscal year 1960, on the other hand, an excess of payments to the public of \$542 million is estimated, despite the anticipated budget surplus of \$217 million. This situation reflects the fact that total disbursements of trust funds will exceed their receipts in 1960, notably in the old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment, and highway trust funds.

Federal Government receipts from and payments to the public

(See special analysis A in pt. IV of this document)

(Fiscal years. In billions)

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Receipts from the public.....	\$81.7	\$94.8	\$102.2
Payments to the public.....	94.8	95.3	96.3
Excess of payments over receipts.....	-13.1	-0.5	-----
Excess of receipts over payments.....	-----	-----	+5.9

REVIEW OF MAJOR FUNCTIONS

The following sections of this message discuss the legislative and budget recommendations for 1961 in terms of the major purposes which they fulfill. The following table compares the estimated expenditures for each of the nine major functional categories with the actual figures for 1959 and the latest estimate for 1960.

The expenditure totals for 1960 and 1961 include expenditures under both existing and proposed legislation. The allowance for contingencies is intended to provide for unforeseen increases in existing programs, and for proposed new programs not separately itemized.

Budget expenditures
(Fiscal years. In millions)

Function	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961	
			Estimate	Percent of total
Major national security.....	\$40,426	\$45,050	\$45,568	57.1
International affairs and finance.....	3,780	2,066	2,242	2.8
Commerce and housing.....	3,421	3,002	2,709	3.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	6,529	5,113	5,623	7.0
Natural resources.....	1,069	1,785	1,938	2.4
Labor and welfare.....	4,421	4,441	4,569	5.7
Veterans services and benefits.....	5,174	5,157	5,471	6.9
Interest.....	7,671	9,385	9,585	12.0
General government.....	1,606	1,711	1,911	2.4
Allowance for contingencies.....	-----	75	200	.3
Total.....	80,697	78,353	79,816	100.0

The figures for 1961 allocate to the separate programs for the first time the dollar equivalent of expenditures for U.S. Government programs of foreign currencies received from the sale abroad of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities under Public Law 480.

MAJOR NATIONAL SECURITY

Our national objective remains as before—peace with justice for all peoples. Our hope is that the heavy burden of armaments on the world may be lightened.

But we should not delude ourselves. In this era of nuclear weapons and intercontinental missiles, disarmament must be safeguarded and verifiable. The problems involved in achieving reductions of armaments with safety and justice to all nations are tremendous. Yet we must face up to these problems, for the only alternative is a world living on the edge of disaster.

While seeking the true road to peace and disarmament we must remain strong. Our aim at this time is a level of military strength which, together with that of our allies, is sufficient to deter wars, large or small, while we strive to find a way to reduce the threat of war. This budget, in my judgment, does that.

Expenditures of the Department of Defense in 1961 will continue to emphasize the modernization of our Armed Forces. Military assistance for our allies under the mutual security program will also reflect the growing importance of modern weapons and missiles in the continued strengthening of the free world

defense forces. The Atomic Energy Commission is continuing its weapons programs on a high level and will move forward with research and development on the peaceful applications of atomic energy. Expenditures for stockpiling and for expansion of defense production will decline further, since most of the stockpile objectives have been met.

Major national security
[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Department of Defense—Military:				
Military functions:				
Military personnel:				
Present programs	\$11,801	\$11,959	\$12,124	\$11,813
Proposed legislation, retirement pay			22	24
Operation and maintenance	10,384	10,137	10,321	10,527
Procurement	14,410	13,943	13,602	13,085
Research, development, test, and evaluation	2,859	3,680	3,917	3,910
Construction	1,948	1,670	1,359	1,188
Revolving funds	-169	-444	-350	30
Subtotal	41,233	40,945	40,995	40,577
Military assistance	2,340	1,800	1,750	2,000
Atomic energy	2,541	2,675	2,689	2,666
Stockpiling and expansion of defense production	312	230	134	39
Total	46,426	45,650	45,568	45,282

¹ Additional obligational authority available by transfer: \$350 million.

² Compares with new obligational authority of \$45,517 million enacted for 1959 and \$44,749 million (including \$25 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

Department of Defense—Military: New appropriations of \$40,577 million are recommended for the military functions of the Department of Defense for 1961. Expenditures in 1961 are estimated at \$40,995 million. These amounts exclude funds for the development of the Saturn space project which I have proposed be transferred to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Strategy and tactics of the U.S. military forces are now undergoing one of the greatest transitions in history. The change of emphasis from conventional-type to missile-type warfare must be made with care, mindful that the one type of warfare cannot be safely neglected in favor of the other. Our military forces must be capable of contending successfully with any contingency which may be forced upon us, from limited emergencies to all-out nuclear general war.

Forces and military personnel strength: This budget will provide in the fiscal year 1961 for the continued support of our forces at approximately the present level—a year-end strength of 2,489,000 men and women in the active forces. The forces to be supported include an Army of 14 divisions and 870,000 men; a Navy of 817 active ships and 619,000 men; a Marine Corps of 3 divisions and 3 air wings with 175,000 men; and an Air Force of 91 combat wings and 825,000 men.

If the reserve components are to serve effectively in time of war, their basic organization and objectives must conform to the changing character and missions of the active forces. Quality and combat readiness must take precedence over mere numbers. Under modern conditions, this is especially true of the ready reserve. I have requested the Secretary of Defense to reexamine the roles and missions of the reserve components in relation to those of the active forces and in the light of the changing requirements of modern warfare.

Last year the Congress discontinued its previously imposed minimum personnel strength limitations on the Army Reserve. Similar restrictions on the strength of the Army National Guard contained in the 1960 Department of Defense Appropriation Act should likewise be dropped. I strongly recommend to the Congress the avoidance of mandatory floors on the size of the reserve components so that we may have the flexibility to make adjustments in keeping with military necessity.

I again propose a reduction in the Army National Guard and Army Reserve—from their present strengths of 400,000 and 300,000, respectively, to 360,000 and 270,000 by the end of the fiscal year 1961. These strengths are considered adequate to meet the essential roles and missions of the reserves in support of our national security objectives.

Military personnel costs.—About 30 percent of the expenditures for the Department of Defense in 1961 are for military personnel costs, including pay for active, reserve, and retired military personnel. These expenditures are estimated to be \$12.1 billion, an increase of \$187 million over 1960, reflecting additional longevity pay of career personnel, more dependents, an increased number of men drawing proficiency pay, and social security tax increases (effective for the full year in 1961 compared with only 6 months in 1960). Retired pay costs are increased by \$94 million in 1961 over 1960, partly because of a substantial increase in the number of retired personnel. These increased costs are partially offset by a decrease of \$56 million in expenditures for the reserve forces, largely because of the planned reduction in strength of the Army Reserve components during 1961.

Traditionally, rates of pay for retired military personnel have been proportionate to current rates of pay for active personnel. The 1958 military pay act departed from this established formula by providing for a 6 percent increase rather than a proportionate increase for everyone retired prior to its effective date of June 1, 1958. I endorse pending legislation that will restore the traditional relationship between retired and active duty pay rates.

Operation and maintenance: Expenditures for operating and maintaining the stations and equipment of the Armed Forces are estimated to be \$10.3 billion in 1961, which is \$184 million more than in 1960. The increase stems largely from the growing complexity of and higher degree of maintenance required for newer weapons and equip-

A substantial increase is estimated in the cost of operating additional communications systems in the air defense program, as well as in all programs where speed and security of communications are essential. Also, the program for fleet modernization will be stepped up in 1961 causing an increase in expenditures. Further increases arise from the civilian employee health program enacted by the Congress last year.

Other factors increasing operating costs include the higher unit cost of each flying hour, up 11 percent in 2 years, and of each steaming hour, up 15 percent. In total, these increases in operating costs outweigh the savings that result from declining programs and from economy measures, such as reduced numbers of units and installations, smaller inventories of major equipment, and improvements in the supply and distribution systems of the Armed Forces.

In the budget message for 1959, and again for 1960, I recommended immediate repeal of section 601 of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365). This section prevents the military departments and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization from carrying out certain transactions involving real property unless they come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. As I have stated previously, the Attorney General has advised me that this section violates fundamental constitutional principles. Accordingly, if it is not repealed by the Congress at its present session, I shall have no alternative thereafter but to direct the Secretary of Defense to disregard the section unless a court of competent jurisdiction determines otherwise.

Basic long-line communications in Alaska are now provided through Federal facilities operated by the Army, Air Force, and Federal Aviation Agency. The growing communications needs of this new State can best be met, as they have in other States, through the operation and development of such facilities by private enterprise. Legislation has already been proposed to authorize the sale of these Government-owned systems in Alaska, and its early enactment is desirable.

Procurement, research, and construction: Approximately 45 percent of the expenditures for the Department of Defense are for procurement, research, development and construction programs. In 1961, these expenditures are estimated at \$18.9 billion, compared to \$19.3 billion in 1960. The decreases, which are largely in construction and in aircraft procurement, are offset in part by increases for research and development and for procurement of other military equipment such as tanks, vehicles, guns, and electronic devices. Expenditures for shipbuilding are estimated at about the same level as in 1960.

New obligational authority for 1961 recommended in this budget for aircraft procurement (excluding amounts for related research and construction) totals \$4,753 million, which is \$1,390 million below that enacted for 1960. On the other hand, the new authority of \$3,825 mil-

Non proposed for missile procurement (excluding research and construction) in 1961 is \$581 million higher than for 1960. These contrasting trends in procurement reflect the anticipated changes in the composition and missions of our Armed Forces in the years ahead.

The Department of Defense appropriation acts for the past several years have contained a rider which limits competitive bidding by firms in other countries on certain military supply items. As I have repeatedly stated, this provision is much more restrictive than the general law, popularly known as the Buy American Act. I urge once again that the Congress not reenact this rider.

The task of providing a reasonable level of military strength, without endangering other vital aspects of our security, is greatly complicated by the swift pace of scientific progress. The last few years have witnessed what have been perhaps the most rapid advances in military technology in history. Some weapons systems have become obsolescent while still in production, and some while still under development.

Furthermore, unexpectedly rapid progress or a technological breakthrough on any one weapon system, in itself, often diminishes the relative importance of other competitive systems. This has necessitated a continuous review and reevaluation of the defense program in order to redirect resources to the newer and more important weapons systems and to eliminate or reduce effort on weapons systems which have been overtaken by events. Thus, in the last few years, a number of programs which looked very promising at the time their development was commenced have since been completely eliminated. For example, the importance of the Regulus II, a very promising aerodynamic ship-to-surface missile designed to be launched by surfaced submarines, was greatly diminished by the successful acceleration of the much more advanced Polaris ballistic missile launched by submerged submarines.

Another example is the recent cancellation of the F-108, a long-range interceptor with a speed three times as great as the speed of sound, which was designed for use against manned bombers in the period of the mid-1960's. The substantial progress being made in ballistic missile technology is rapidly shifting the main threat from manned bombers to missiles. Considering the high cost of the F-108 system—over \$4 billion for the force that had been planned—and the time period in which it would become operational, it was decided to stop further work on the project. Meanwhile, other air defense forces are being made effective, as described later in this message.

The size and scope of other important programs have been reduced from earlier plans. Notable in this category are the Jupiter and Thor intermediate range ballistic missiles, which have been successfully developed, produced, and deployed, but the relative importance of which has diminished with the increasing availability of the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile.

The impact of technological factors is also illustrated by the history of the high-

energy fuel program. This project was started at a time when there was a critical need for a high-energy fuel to provide an extra margin of range for high performance aircraft, particularly our heavy bombers. Continuing technical problems involved in the use of this fuel, coupled with significant improvements in aircraft range through other means, have now raised serious questions about the value of the high-energy fuel program. As a result, the scope of this project has been sharply curtailed.

These examples underscore the importance of even more searching evaluations of new major development programs and even more penetrating and far-ranging analyses of the potentialities of future technology. The cost of developing a major weapon system is now so enormous that the greatest care must be exercised in selecting new systems for development, in determining the most satisfactory rate of development, and in deciding the proper time at which either to place a system into production or to abandon it.

Strategic forces: The deterrent power of our Armed Forces comes from both their nuclear retaliatory capability and their capability to conduct other essential operations in any form of war. The first capability is represented by a combination of manned bombers, carrier-based aircraft, and intercontinental and intermediate range missiles. The second capability is represented by our deployed ground, naval, and air forces in essential forward areas, together with ready reserves capable of effecting early emergency reinforcement.

The Strategic Air Command is the principal element of our long-range nuclear capability. One of the important and difficult decisions which had to be made in this budget concerned the role of the B-70, a long-range supersonic bomber. This aircraft, which was planned for initial operational use about 1965, would be complementary to but likewise competitive with the four strategic ballistic missile systems, all of which are scheduled to become available earlier. The first Atlas ICBM's are now operational, the first two Polaris submarines are expected to be operational this calendar year, and the first Titan ICBM's next year. The Minuteman solid-fueled ICBM is planned to be operational about mid-1963. By 1965, several or all of these systems will have been fully tested and their reliability established.

Thus, the need for the B-70 as a strategic weapon system is doubtful. However, I am recommending that development work on the B-70 airframe and engines be continued. It is expected that in 1963 two prototype aircraft will be available for flight testing. By that time we should be in a much better position to determine the value of that aircraft as a weapon system.

I am recommending additional acquisitions of the improved version of the B-52 (the B-52H with the new turbofan engine) and procurement of the B-58 supersonic medium bomber, together with the supporting refueling tankers in each case. These additional modern bombers will replace some of the older

B-47 medium bombers; one B-52 can do the work of several B-47's which it will replace. Funds are also included in this budget to continue the equipping of the B-52 wings with the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile.

In the coming fiscal year additional quantities of Atlas, Titan, and Polaris missiles also will be procured. I am recommending funds for 3 additional Polaris submarines to be started in the coming fiscal year and for the advance procurement of long leadtime components on 3 more—making a total of 15 Polaris submarines and the appropriate number of missiles. Funds to continue the development and to initiate production of the first operational quantities of the Minuteman are also included in this budget.

Thus, four strategic ballistic missile systems will be in development and production during the coming fiscal year. These, together with the manned bomber force, the carrier-based aircraft, the intermediate range ballistic missiles, and the tactical aircraft deployed abroad, ensure our continued capability to retaliate effectively in the event of an attack upon ourselves or our allies.

In order to ensure, insofar as practicable, the safety and readiness of these forces, we have substantially completed the dispersal of Strategic Air Command aircraft and the construction of alert facilities. These measures will permit a large portion of all our manned bombers and supporting tankers to get off the ground within 15 minutes after receiving warning of an attack.

I have also authorized the Department of Defense to begin to acquire a standby airborne alert capability for the heavy bombers. This will entail the procurement of extra engines and spare parts, and the training of the heavy bomber wings with the ability to conduct an airborne alert. It is neither necessary nor practical to fly a continuous airborne alert at this time. Such a procedure would, over a relatively short period of time, seriously degrade our overall capability to respond to attack. What I am recommending is a capability to fly such an alert if the need should arise and to maintain that alert for a reasonable period of time until the situation which necessitated it becomes clarified.

Attention is also being given to the safety and readiness of our land-based strategic missile forces. Except for the first several squadrons, strategic missiles will be dispersed in hardened underground sites. Measures are also being taken to shorten the reaction time of liquid-fueled missiles. The Minuteman, because it will be solid fueled, will have a quick reaction time and will lend itself to mobile use. The solid-fueled Polaris to be carried in submarines at sea is by its very nature highly invulnerable.

Air defense forces: Much progress has been made in increasing the effectiveness of the North American Air Defense Command organized in 1957 as an integrated command of the U.S. and Canadian forces. The U.S. military elements—consisting of parts of all of our armed services—are integrated with Canada's Air Defence Command for maintaining an air defense capability for the entire North American Continent.

While we pay increasing attention to the growing threat of a potential enemy's ballistic missiles we should not lose sight of the fact that for the time being the manned bomber is the major threat. Although some \$17 billion has already been invested in defense systems against manned bombers, excluding the cost of personnel and operation and maintenance, certain segments have yet to be completed. These were described in the Department of Defense air defense plan presented to the Congress last year. The funds recommended in this budget will substantially complete the programs outlined in that plan. Specifically, the last major elements of the Nike-Hercules surface-to-air missile program will be financed in 1961 and the Bomarc interceptor missile program will approach completion. The related radar warning, electronic control, and communication systems will also be further equipped and modernized.

In response to the increasing missile threat, we are pressing to completion a new system for the detection of ballistic missile attack—the ballistic missile early warning system. Construction has been under way for the last 2 years and the first segment is expected to be in operation in about a year.

To provide for an active defense against ballistic missile attack, I am recommending the continued development of the Nike-Zeus system, but it will not be placed in production during the coming fiscal year during which further testing will be carried out.

The Nike-Zeus system is one of the most difficult undertakings ever attempted by this country. The technical problems involved in detecting, tracking, and computing the course of the incoming ballistic missile and in guiding the intercepting Zeus missile to its target—all within a few minutes—are indeed enormous.

Much thought and study have been given to all of these factors and it is the consensus of my technical and military advisers that the system should be carefully tested before production is begun and facilities are constructed for its deployment. Accordingly, I am recommending sufficient funds in this budget to provide for the essential phases of such testing. Pending the results of such testing, the \$137 million appropriated last year by the Congress for initial production steps for the Nike-Zeus system will not be used.

Sea control forces: Control of sea and ocean areas and sea lanes of communication is an integral element in the maintenance of our national security. The naval forces which carry the primary responsibility for this mission will consist of 817 combatant and support ships, 16 attack carrier air groups, 11 antisubmarine air groups, and 41 patrol and warning air squadrons.

From new construction and conversion programs started in prior years, the Navy will receive during fiscal year 1961 an unusually large number of modern ships. These will include the fifth and sixth *Forrestal*-class attack carriers, the first nuclear-powered cruiser, nine guided missile destroyers, seven guided missile

frigates, and six nuclear-powered submarines. Three more Polaris ballistic missile submarines and a converted guided missile cruiser will also be commissioned.

For the coming fiscal year I am recommending the construction of 20 new ships and conversions or modernizations of 15 others. Included among the new ships is an attack carrier. It is planned to construct this carrier with a conventional rather than a nuclear powerplant.

While it is generally agreed that a nuclear-powered attack carrier has certain military advantages, such as extended range and endurance at high sustained speeds, these advantages are not overriding as in the case of a submarine. In a submarine, nuclear power provides the critical advantage of almost unlimited operation, submerged at high speeds. This enables nuclear-powered submarines to carry out missions which no conventionally powered submarine, no matter how modern, could accomplish.

The advantages of nuclear power with respect to the carrier, however, are not comparable. The primary requirement in a carrier is up-to-date facilities to operate, safely and effectively, the most modern naval aircraft. Use of a conventional powerplant will in no way prevent a carrier from functioning as a completely modern and mobile base for fleet aircraft for its foreseeable life. The additional \$130 million which a nuclear-powered carrier would cost can be used to much greater advantage for other purposes. I, therefore, strongly urge the Congress to support this request for a conventionally powered aircraft carrier.

Tactical forces: Elements of the ground, naval, and air forces comprise the tactical forces which are available to deal with cold-war emergencies and limited-war situations, in addition to performing essential tasks in the event of general war. Recommendations made in this budget provide funds for modernization and improvement in the effectiveness of our tactical forces.

Increased emphasis has been given in this budget to improving the mobility and firepower of the 14 Army divisions and other active combat elements of the Army and the 3 Marine Corps divisions. Additional quantities of new rifles and machineguns employing the standard NATO ammunition will be procured, as will combat and tactical vehicles of all kinds, including the new M60 tank, the M113 armored personnel carrier, self-propelled howitzers, trucks and jeeps. In recognition of the value of artillery in both nuclear and nonnuclear warfare, an entire new family of self-propelled artillery is introduced with this budget. This new artillery is lighter, more mobile, and, utilizing new ammunition, will have greater range than that of types currently available.

The Army and Marine Corps will also buy a wide variety of guided missiles and rockets, such as Sergeant, Honest John, Little John, and Lacrosse for medium- and close-range ground-fire support; Davy Crockett for an integral infantry-unit close-range atomic support weapon; and Hawk and Redeye for defense of field forces against air attack. Army aircraft procurement proposed for 1961

is more than 35 percent higher than for the current year and includes funds for surveillance aircraft and for utility and medium cargo helicopters.

The tactical forces of the Army are supported by the tactical air wings of the Air Force which will also be provided with an increased capability under these budget recommendations. Funds are provided for increased procurement of F-105 supersonic all-weather fighter bombers. These aircraft, with their low-altitude handling characteristics and large carrying capacities for both nuclear and nonnuclear weapons, will strengthen significantly the air support available to the Army ground units.

The three Marine divisions are tactically supported by three Marine aircraft wings, which will also receive quantities of new aircraft.

Military assistance: The ability of the free world to deter aggression depends on the combined strength and determination of many countries. The total forces of the countries receiving aid under the military assistance program include about 5 million Army troops, 2,200 combatant ships, and over 25,000 aircraft, about half of which are jet. These forces make a vital contribution to the security of the free world, including the United States.

A committee of distinguished private citizens, the President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program, conducted an extensive and comprehensive analysis of the mutual security program during the last year. I have previously transmitted the reports of the Committee to the Congress. Many of the significant findings and recommendations of this group have been put into effect by the executive agencies; others are in the process of implementation. The military assistance program has been budgeted in 1961 with other activities and programs of the Department of Defense, and major changes are being made in the management, organization, and programing of military assistance.

Last spring I mentioned the possibility of requesting a supplemental appropriation as suggested by the Committee largely to expedite modernization of NATO forces. However, in view of the time factor involved in securing a separate authorization and appropriation for 1960, a supplemental request this year is not practical.

The new obligational authority of \$2 billion recommended for fiscal year 1961 for the military assistance program will provide the training and quantities of materiel required to support the forces in the countries receiving aid. Because of the long leadtime required for many items, procurement must be started in 1961 in order to provide the necessary deliveries in future years. During recent years, deliveries have been maintained only by drawing down the backlog of undelivered items by an amount ranging from \$500 to \$800 million per year. The backlog has now been reduced to the point where adequate deliveries in the future must depend on new appropriations.

The defense of Western Europe in this era of modern weapons is costly and

must be accomplished through the combined efforts of all NATO countries. Many of these countries have now assumed the financial responsibility for producing or purchasing conventional arms and equipment which the United States previously supplied. At the same time, the 1961 military assistance program squarely faces the pressing need for new and costly weapons for which the free world still looks for help from the United States. In addition, it provides for an intensified training effort to assure effective use and maintenance of the new equipment by allied forces.

This budget also provides for military assistance to countries which are building defenses against aggression and subversion in other parts of the world. These countries border on aggressive regimes, or are confronted with strong internal subversive elements. Many of them have joined in mutual defense organizations such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), or with the United States in bilateral defense agreements. Assistance to these countries, most of which are in the Near East and the Far East, emphasizes primarily the strengthening of conventional forces in keeping with the nature of the threat in each area.

Atomic energy activities: In 1961 the expenditures for the Atomic Energy Commission are expected to remain at the 1960 level of about \$2.7 billion. Substantial increases for research and development activities will be offset by reductions in procurement of uranium ore concentrates from United States and Canadian producers. These reductions will bring ore supplies into better balance with production requirements.

Development and production of nuclear weapons in 1961 will remain at the high levels of previous years. The vigorous development of military reactors for a variety of propulsion and power uses will continue. When the land-based prototype reactor for a destroyer is placed into operation in 1961 along with four other naval prototype reactors now operating, nuclear powerplants will be available for major types of naval combatant ships. Emphasis in naval reactor development in 1961 will be placed primarily on development of improved and longer lived reactor fuel. The development of nuclear ramjet engines for missiles, of nuclear aircraft engines, and of nuclear electric powerplants for use at remote military bases will be carried forward.

Peaceful uses of atomic energy: Expenditures in 1961 for development of civilian electric power from atomic energy are estimated at \$250 million. Of this amount, \$185 million is for research and development and \$65 million is for construction of civilian power reactors and related development facilities. The estimated expenditures include amounts from proposed new appropriations of \$40 million for assistance to private and public power groups in developing and building demonstration nuclear powerplants, and alternatively for such direct Government construction as may be considered necessary. The number,

type, and size of reactors built and the nature of the assistance provided will be determined by the Commission after considering the state of technology and the cooperation proposed by industry.

Expenditures by the Commission for research in the physical and life sciences in 1961 will again increase substantially to over \$210 million. This level of research will help the United States to continue its leadership in the study of the behavior of the basic matter of the universe and the effects of radiation on man and his environment. The largest part of the increase will be used to place in operation in the next 18 months three new particle accelerators in the multi-billion electron-volt energy range, including the alternating gradient synchrotron at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

In support of the civilian space program, the Atomic Energy Commission will continue development of nuclear-powered rockets and small, long-lived nuclear power sources for space vehicles. Development work on thermonuclear power and on applications of nuclear explosives to a variety of civilian uses will continue in 1961.

Stockpiling and defense production expansion: Most of the objectives for the stockpile of strategic and critical materials have been met. Receipts of materials under contracts to promote expansion of defense production are continuing at a reduced rate, as the number of such contracts still in effect declines. Hence, expenditures for stockpiling and expansion of defense production are estimated to decline from \$230 million in 1960 to \$134 million in 1961.

Amendments to outstanding contracts are now being negotiated where practicable, so as to minimize the delivery of materials no longer required for stockpiling. Arrangements are also under way to dispose of materials excess to stockpile objectives whenever disposal will not seriously disrupt markets or adversely affect our international relations.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

The United States is continuing to support programs to maintain world peace and to improve economic conditions throughout the free world. In helping to improve economic conditions, we are being joined in larger measure by our friends in the free world who have now reached a high level of prosperity after recovering from the ravages of war. Accordingly, multilateral programs are being expanded. At the same time, the pressing need for economic development requires the continuation of substantial economic assistance under the mutual security program.

Expenditures for international affairs and finance are estimated to be \$2.2 billion in the fiscal year 1961. This amount is \$177 million higher than estimated expenditures for 1960, mainly because of larger disbursements by the Development Loan Fund under prior commitments.

Mutual security program: Through the mutual security program as a whole the United States helps promote stability and economic growth in less-developed

countries and helps strengthen the defenses of the free world. For these purposes new obligational authority of \$4,175 million is recommended in fiscal year 1961, an increase of \$949 million over the amount enacted for 1960 (of which \$700 million is for military assistance). Expenditures are estimated to be \$3,450 million, an increase of \$100 million over 1960.

The military assistance portion of this program is carried in the Department of Defense chapter and has been discussed in the major national security section of this message. Economic assistance is discussed in the following paragraphs in this section.

Development Loan Fund: The Development Loan Fund was established in 1957 in order to provide capital to less-developed countries, when capital is not available from other sources. The capital is provided on favorable terms, often including the option to repay in the borrower's own currency. By the end of the fiscal year 1960, the Fund will have made commitments for an estimated 148 loans totaling some \$1,400 million. More than three-fourths of the projects it is financing are for roads, railroads, electric power generation, and industry, including industrial development banks. Because many of these projects require several years for construction, expenditures have thus far been relatively small. However, in the fiscal year 1961 they are estimated to be \$300 million, an increase of \$125 million over 1960. New obligational authority of \$700 million is requested for 1961, an increase of \$150 million over the amount enacted for 1960. This will provide the loan funds essential to our foreign policy objective of assisting in the economic growth of the less-developed countries of the free world.

Technical cooperation: Technical and administrative skills are no less important for the newly developing countries than capital. Through the technical cooperation program, American experts are sent abroad to transmit the skills required in a modern economy and foreign technicians are brought to the United States for training.

International affairs and finance
[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Economic and technical development:				
Mutual security—economic:				
Development Loan Fund.....	\$66	\$175	\$300	\$700
Technical cooperation.....	169	170	175	206
Defense support.....	881	740	730	724
Special assistance.....	257	250	255	268
Other.....	120	105	110	101
Contingencies.....	30	110	130	175
Subtotal, mutual security—economic.....	1,524	1,550	1,700	2,175
International Monetary Fund subscription.....	1,375	-----	-----	-----
Inter-American Development Bank.....	-----	80	-----	-----
Export-Import Bank.....	390	-56	-7	-----
Emergency relief abroad and other.....	113	140	131	116

International affairs and finance—Continued
(Fiscal years. In millions)

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Conduct of foreign affairs:				
Administration of foreign affairs.....	\$211	\$205	\$197	\$285
Philippine claims:				
Present program.....	24			
Proposed legislation.....			49	49
Other.....	2	5	3	2
Foreign information and exchange activities:				
United States Information Agency.....	109	110	124	124
Department of State, exchange of persons.....	22	24	36	36
President's special international program.....	8	7	8	9
Total.....	3,780	2,066	2,242	1,275

¹ Compares with new obligational authority of \$6,982 million enacted for 1959 and \$2,697 million (including \$49 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960. The 1959 authorization included \$3,175 million for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and \$1,375 million for the International Monetary Fund.

For the fiscal year 1961, new obligational authority of \$206 million is requested, which is \$25 million over the amount enacted for 1960, in order to permit an increase in the bilateral programs. It will also permit a higher contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program and the related special fund; as other governments increase their contributions for the United Nations programs, the U.S. contribution, which is two-fifths of the total, also increases.

Defense support: Many of the less-developed countries participating in the common defense maintain large military forces whose cost imposes a severe strain upon their limited economic resources. In order to help maintain political and economic stability and to prevent the cost of necessary defensive forces from unduly hindering economic development, the United States provides economic aid principally by supplying commodities for consumption and raw materials and machinery for industrial production. For the fiscal year 1961, new obligational authority of \$724 million is requested, an increase of \$29 million over the amount enacted for 1960.

Special assistance: New obligational authority of \$268 million is requested for economic assistance to promote economic and political stability in various countries of the free world where the United States is not supporting military forces, and for certain other special programs. In several instances, this assistance indirectly relates to military bases maintained by the United States.

The appropriation recommended for special assistance in 1961 is \$23 million above the amount enacted for 1960. Additional programs are proposed to help improve conditions in Africa, largely for education, public health, and administration.

Increased funds will also be devoted to certain worldwide health programs in conjunction with the World Health Organization of the United Nations. The largest of these is the malaria eradica-

tion program, now in its fourth year. In addition numerous public health projects are supported through technical cooperation.

Mutual security program
(Fiscal years. In millions)

Program	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Military assistance.....	\$2,340	\$1,800	\$1,750	\$2,000
Economic (including technical) assistance.....	1,524	1,550	1,700	2,175
Total, mutual security.....	3,864	3,350	3,450	4,175

¹ Compares with new obligational authority of \$3,448 million enacted for 1959 (\$1,515 million military, \$1,933 million economic) and \$3,226 million enacted for 1960 (\$1,300 million military, \$1,926 million economic).

Other mutual security programs: Other programs include assistance to refugees and escapees; grants of atomic research equipment, including reactors, to the less-developed countries for training and research in nuclear physics; support of the NATO science program; and the United States contribution to the United Nations Children's Fund. For the fiscal year 1961, new obligational authority of \$101 million is requested, an increase of \$1 million above the amounts enacted for 1960.

Contingencies: Experience has shown that economic and military assistance is also required in some international situations which cannot be foreseen or for which it is not possible to estimate in advance the specific amount needed. To cover situations of this type, new obligational authority of \$175 million is requested.

Other economic and technical development: More resources from countries of the free world are being channeled into economic development by increasing the capital funds of international organizations. In the past year the capital of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development was doubled and that of the International Monetary Fund increased by half.

The Inter-American Development Bank, with planned total resources of \$1 billion, including \$450 million from the United States, is expected to begin operations before the close of this fiscal year. Expenditures of \$80 million are estimated in the fiscal year 1960 as the first installment of the U.S. cash investment in the Bank. In addition, guarantee authority of \$200 million will be made available, on the basis of which the Bank can sell its bonds to private investors.

Last October the Governors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development unanimously approved in principle a U.S. proposal for an International Development Association, which will be closely affiliated with the Bank. Under this proposal, the Association will make loans on more flexible terms than the Bank is able to offer under its charter, such as loans repayable in the currency of the borrowing country. In addition, it is expected that the charter of the Association will contain provisions under which a member could provide to

the Association, for use in lending operations, other member country currencies which it holds. The draft charter of the Association is being prepared and will probably be submitted to the member governments early this year. Legislation authorizing U.S. participation and making financial provision for membership will be transmitted to the Congress at the appropriate time.

Private investment: The United States is trying to encourage more reliance on private enterprise in foreign economic development. During the past year, the Department of State and the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce have both completed special studies on ways to increase the role of private investment and management abroad. Tax treaties, with investment incentive clauses, are now being negotiated with many countries. More trade missions are being sent abroad. Several of the less-developed countries are opening business information offices in this country. As a result of these various activities, more private investment in the less-developed areas should be forthcoming. To provide an additional incentive, U.S. taxation of income earned in the less-developed areas only should be deferred until repatriated.

Export-Import Bank: The oldest Federal agency specializing in foreign lending and the largest in terms of foreign loan volume is the Export-Import Bank. In the fiscal year 1961 the Bank plans to devote an increasing share of its program to transactions which support economic development abroad. At the same time the Bank plans to finance its operations without requiring net budgetary expenditures by encouraging more participation by private lenders in its loan program and by using funds obtained from repayments on its large outstanding portfolio.

Eligibility for assistance: Amendments to the Battle Act to revise the eligibility requirements for assistance to certain countries are pending before the Congress. It is highly desirable that they be enacted.

Conduct of foreign affairs: The Department of State is making plans to strengthen further the administration of foreign affairs in the fiscal year 1961. The disarmament staff is being expanded in preparation for discussions on disarmament soon to begin in Geneva and for the continuation of the negotiations on the suspension of nuclear tests. Language training programs will also be expanded. New diplomatic and consular posts will be opened in Africa, Latin America, south Asia, and Eastern Europe. For these and other activities, new obligational authority of \$205 million is requested for the fiscal year 1961.

Legislation is recommended to remove certain reservations on acceptance by the United States of jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (the World Court).

Legislation will be requested for payment in the fiscal year 1961 of certain war damage claims of the Philippine Government against the United States in the amount of \$73 million. These claims

will be partially offset by an amount, now estimated at approximately \$24 million, owed to the United States by the Philippine Government. Pending legislation should be enacted in fiscal year 1960 to authorize compensation of \$6 million to displaced residents of the Bonin Islands.

Foreign information and exchange activities: New obligational authority totaling \$168 million is requested for foreign information and exchange activities in the fiscal year 1961. The United States Information Agency plans to expand its programs in Africa and Latin America, including construction of a new Voice of America transmitter in Africa. The Agency will make greater use of the growing number of television facilities overseas. The expansion of domestic radio transmitting facilities, begun last year in order to improve oversea reception, will continue. Exchanges of key persons with about 80 other countries will be increased, with special emphasis on leaders and teachers.

COMMERCE AND HOUSING

The improvements made in recent years in Federal programs for outer space exploration, aviation, highways, in postal service, housing, urban renewal, and small business will be further extended by this budget.

Expenditures for all commerce and housing programs in the fiscal year 1961 are estimated at \$2.7 billion, which is \$293 million less than the estimated expenditures for 1960. Proposed legislation to provide adequate postal rates will reduce sharply the net budget expenditures of the Post Office Department. Expenditures for other programs, however, especially space exploration and the promotion of aviation, will increase substantially.

Space exploration and flight technology: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is carrying forward the nonmilitary space projects started by the Department of Defense and has initiated additional programs that will lay the foundations for future exploration and use of outer space. Estimated expenditures of \$600 million during the fiscal year 1961, nearly double the expenditures in 1960, will carry forward the programs now under way and those becoming the agency's responsibility in 1961. Appropriations of \$802 million for 1961, together with anticipated supplemental appropriations for 1960 of \$23 million to restore substantially the congressional reduction in the space program last year, are recommended to finance these programs. Legislation is being submitted to authorize the appropriations required for 1961 and to provide permanent authorization for later years.

I am assigning to this new agency sole responsibility for the development of space booster vehicles of very high thrust, including Project Saturn. This assignment includes the transfer of certain facilities and personnel of the Army Ballistic Missiles Agency. With the imminent completion of the Jupiter missile project this outstanding group can concentrate on developing the large space vehicle systems essential to the exploration of space.

Certain amendments to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 will be proposed to clarify the organization and streamline the management of the space programs.

At the present time Soviet scientists have the advantage in the weight of the payloads that they can hurl into space. This weight advantage stems from the earlier start of the Soviet development of very large rocket boosters that they considered necessary for their intercontinental ballistic missile program. Because of the relatively advanced state of our nuclear warheads, however, we were able, after a much later start, to develop an effective ICBM using a smaller rocket booster.

Commerce and housing

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Space exploration and flight technology.....	\$145	\$325	\$600	\$802
Promotion of aviation:				
Federal Aviation Agency.....	441	567	681	717
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	53	60	69	72
Promotion of water transportation:				
Department of Commerce.....	200	257	263	299
Coast Guard.....	229	276	281	285
Panama Canal Company.....	7	4	14	-----
Provision of highways.....	30	45	13	(1)
Postal service:				
Public service costs.....	-----	37	49	49
Postal deficit.....	774	567	554	554
Proposed rate revisions.....	-----	-----	-554	-554
Community development and facilities:				
Urban Renewal Administration.....	77	197	172	305
Other.....	31	39	31	27
Public housing programs.....	97	130	148	159
Other aids to housing:				
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Under present legislation.....	-41	-50	-57	-----
Proposed premium increase.....	-----	-----	-28	-----
Federal Housing Administration.....	-51	-76	-120	-----
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	842	56	111	150
College housing loans.....	180	186	148	-----
Veterans housing loans.....	113	230	-12	-----
Farm housing loans and other.....	43	-122	36	11
Other aids to business:				
Small Business Administration.....	107	102	120	66
Proposed area assistance legislation.....	32	48	10	57
Other.....	-----	-----	48	04
Regulation of commerce and finance.....	58	58	64	66
Civil and defense mobilization.....	46	56	68	76
Disaster loans and relief.....	8	8	8	-----
Total.....	3,421	3,002	2,709	\$3,204

¹ Reflects proposed financing of Federal-aid highways in national forests and public lands from highway trust fund.

² Compares with new obligational authority of \$2,929 million enacted for 1959 and \$3,789 million (including \$71 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

Our space programs are based on a systematic and technically sound approach to the complicated scientific and engineering problems involved. This approach will assure continued demonstrable achievements. Project Mercury has a high priority and we should be ready to attempt actual manned space flights within the next 2 years. Progress on the development of very high

thrust engines and the vehicles to use them will make it possible, in the not too distant future, to launch much larger space vehicles and thus extend the conquest of space.

For the near future satellites and space probes will continue to depend primarily on Thor and Atlas missiles as boosters, with the Delta and Agena upper stages providing improved performance and reliability. These vehicles will make possible a wide variety of highly useful scientific experiments which will provide essential information for future exploration of outer space by manned and unmanned vehicles. Somewhat later the Centaur project will provide an Atlas-boosted space vehicle with further improved capabilities and establish the technology of very high energy propulsion for space vehicles. In all of these projects, the success of the space vehicle launchings depends on a strong continuing program of supporting research and ground testing.

Transportation and communication: The detailed review of transportation problems and policies which I requested last year is now nearing completion in the Department of Commerce. This study should provide a sound basis for administrative actions and for legislation that may be needed to assure adequate and balanced growth of all branches of the Nation's transportation system.

Aviation: Primarily because of the airways modernization program now under way, expenditures of the Federal Aviation Agency will increase by \$114 million to an estimated \$681 million in fiscal year 1961. New obligational authority of \$717 million is requested mainly for procurement and operation of radar equipment, airport landing aids, communications, and other facilities needed to handle the rapidly growing volume of air traffic safely and efficiently and for establishment and enforcement of air safety standards. Research and development activities are being accelerated to insure the future improvements in equipment and techniques required to meet future aviation needs.

The Federal Aviation Agency is already making increasing use of military facilities, and steps are under way to achieve a closer integration of air defense and civil air traffic control networks. Over the next few years the Agency will also assume traffic control functions now performed by military personnel at airbases throughout the world, with significant savings in cost.

Expenditures for subsidy payments to the airlines by the Civil Aeronautics Board are estimated at \$69 million in 1961, an increase of \$31 million, or 80 percent, over the \$38 million actually spent in 1958. Almost all of the subsidy will go to local service airlines, including helicopter operations in three major metropolitan areas and intra-Alaska service. This rise and the prospect of even higher subsidies in the future make necessary the consideration of proposals to reduce the dependence of these airlines on the Government.

Airway user charges: Consistent with the principle that special beneficiaries of Government programs should pay the

cost of those benefits, the users of the Federal airways should ultimately be expected to pay their full share of rising capital and operating costs. Accordingly, the effective tax on aviation gasoline should be raised from 2 to 4½ cents per gallon and the same tax should also be levied on jet fuels, which are now tax-free. Receipts from all aviation fuel taxes should be retained in the general fund rather than transferred to the highway trust fund as at present. These actions will increase revenues to the general fund by an estimated \$89 million in fiscal year 1961.

Promotion of water transportation: Expenditures of the Department of Commerce to aid water transportation will be sharply higher in both 1960 and 1961 than in 1959, primarily because of higher levels of payments required under past commitments for ship operating and construction subsidies. A supplemental appropriation of \$32 million will be requested for the current year to meet increased operating subsidy obligations caused by lower earnings of the shipping industry and to permit prompt payment of subsidies accrued.

Efforts to maintain a U.S. merchant fleet adequate, along with the ships of our allies, to meet national defense requirements are seriously hampered by high operating costs. To preserve the capability of our merchant fleet without placing an undue burden on the taxpayer will require willingness by ship operators, maritime labor, and the Government to explore and adopt new solutions.

This budget provides for expanded work on advanced ship designs that could bring sharply reduced operating costs. By extending the operation of war-built vessels, which comprise more than 70 percent of the subsidized fleet, over a somewhat longer period, the results of this research can be more fully exploited in replacement plans. The Secretary of Commerce is also undertaking a special study of sailing requirements and competitive conditions of maritime trade routes and services, in the hope of discovering opportunities to increase the benefits flowing from the public investment in this area.

I repeat the request made last year that the 3½-percent interest rate ceiling on ship mortgage loans made by the Maritime Administration be replaced by authority to charge the Government's full cost for such loans.

Work will continue on widening sections of the Panama Canal from 300 to 500 feet to facilitate the movement of increased ship traffic. Largely as a result of this program and the increased disbursements for the \$20 million Balboa Bridge, which is being built to fulfill a treaty commitment with the Republic of Panama, expenditures of the Panama Canal Company in 1961 will be \$10 million higher than in 1960.

Highways: Federal payments of \$2,728 million from the highway trust fund in 1961 will enable the States to proceed with construction of the Interstate System at a level consistent with the pay-as-you-build principle established by the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 and reaffirmed by the Congress in 1959. Last year I recommended that

highway fuel taxes be increased by 1½ cents per gallon for a period of 5 years to meet estimated expenditure requirements. The Congress after months of delay enacted an increase of only 1 cent for less than 2 years.

As a result of both the delay and the failure to provide the full amount of revenue requested, the roadbuilding program has been slowed below a desirable rate of progress. The apportionments to the States for future construction had to be reduced and a plan had to be established to time reimbursements to the States so that the trust fund could be kept in balance. By timely action and planning, however, potential failures to reimburse States promptly for want of funds in the trust fund have been avoided, and equitable and proportionate programs in every State have been established.

I urge the Congress again to increase the highway fuel tax by another one-half cent per gallon and to continue the tax at 4½ cents until June 30, 1964. This will permit the construction program for the Interstate System to proceed at a higher and more desirable level. I request repeal of the diversion of excise taxes enacted last year for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1964. New reports giving estimates of the cost of completing the Interstate System and recommendations on the allocation of costs among future highway beneficiaries will become available in 1961. At the appropriate time, further recommendations will be made to the Congress for the ensuing conduct and financing of the program.

A temporary advance of \$359 million from the Treasury to the trust fund was necessary in fiscal 1960 to balance out the monthly flow of revenues and expenditures within the fiscal year, but this will be repaid by June 30, 1960. A similar temporary advance of \$200 million will be required in the fiscal year 1961, repayable before the end of that year.

During this session of the Congress, funds should be authorized for 1962 and 1963 for regular Federal-aid highway programs and for forest and public lands highways. In view of the limited resources available to the trust fund and the priority requirements of the Interstate System, it is recommended that authorizations for the regular programs for each of these years be reduced to \$900 million from \$925 million provided for 1961. Annual authorizations of \$33 million for forest highways and \$3 million for public lands highways are also recommended.

Finally, I again request that the financing of forest and public lands highways be transferred from the general fund to the highway trust fund. Most of these highways are integral parts of the Federal-aid systems, and they should be financed in the same way.

Postal service: The Post Office Department is intensifying its efforts to improve service and to hold down the persistent postal deficit while handling a growing volume of mail. Initial steps have been taken to mechanize mail processing and to reduce serious congestion at major distribution centers. Ultimate-

ly, modern mail processing plants will be established in all principal urban areas to assure prompt and efficient deliveries.

The Postal Policy Act of 1958 established the policy that postal rates should be adjusted whenever necessary to recover postal expenses, excluding the costs of certain public services as fixed by appropriation acts. Over the past 13 fiscal years, 1947-59, the Federal budget has had to finance postal deficits totaling \$6.8 billion, which is almost half of the increase in the national debt during that time. At the average rate of interest on the outstanding debt the taxpayers are paying well over \$200 million annually in interest for the unwillingness of the Congress to take timely action to increase postal rates.

For fiscal 1961, a postal service deficit of \$554 million is estimated with postage rates now in effect or scheduled, after designating \$49 million as attributable to public services. Rate increases enacted in 1958 were substantially less than needed to meet the deficit at that time and made no allowance for the pay increase for postal employees then enacted. Since then, increased railroad rates (up \$55 million), costs of modernization (up \$80 million), and the new employee health insurance program (\$39 million) have widened the gap between revenues and expenditures.

Accordingly, legislation is again proposed to increase first-class and airmail rates by 1 cent and to raise other rates and fees by enough to cover the postal deficit. I urge the Congress to act promptly on these proposals, which will be submitted in the near future.

Housing and community development: I have presented to each of the past two sessions of the Congress a comprehensive program of legislation for the Government's housing and community development programs. Some of these recommendations were enacted in the Housing Act of 1959. This year, legislation will be requested only for the authority necessary to continue important existing programs and provide necessary flexibility in interest rates. The authorization of additional funds for these programs should be subject to appropriation action.

Urban renewal: In the decade since Federal grants were first authorized, urban redevelopment has become recognized as essential to the future vitality of our cities, and planning has been initiated on 647 projects in 385 communities. However, only 26 projects have been completed. An additional 355 projects for which Federal funds have been obligated are now under way, but progress on many of these has been slow.

The budget, accordingly, places major emphasis on accelerating program progress. Sixty-five projects are scheduled for completion in 1960 and 1961. At the same time, the number of projects under way is expected to increase from 355 at the end of 1959 to 510 at the end of 1961. The acquisition of land for these projects in 1961 is estimated at more than double, and the sale of land to redevelopers at nearly triple, the 1959 amounts. As a result of the increased rate of activity, a supplemental appropriation of \$50 million will be necessary in the current year

to pay capital grants for projects nearing completion under prior contracts. Since the Housing Act of 1959 provided new contract authority for capital grants of \$950 million for 1960 and \$300 million for 1961, no additional obligational authority will be necessary for this program for 1961.

Public facility loans: The authority of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to borrow \$100 million from the Treasury for loans to small communities for needed public facilities will be exhausted early in 1961. An additional \$20 million will be required to meet loan applications through the end of the fiscal year 1961. Legislation is recommended to authorize the provision in annual appropriation acts of this amount and such future increases as may be necessary.

Public housing programs: By the end of fiscal year 1961, about 500,000 federally aided public housing units will be occupied and an additional 125,000 units will be under contract for Federal contributions. In the allocation of new contracts authorized in the Housing Act of 1959 emphasis is being given to projects which will be constructed in the near future. The 1959 act authorized 37,000 added units of public housing, to be available until allocated. Accordingly, no additional authorization is requested. Increases of \$18 million in 1961 expenditures result primarily from rising Federal contributions to local authorities under past contracts.

Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: The share accounts of savings and loan associations insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation have increased fivefold over the past 10 years. With a continuation of this rate of growth, the insurance reserve of the Corporation cannot reach levels commensurate with the mounting insurance liability without an increase in the present premium rate. I am, accordingly, recommending legislation to restore the higher premium rate in effect prior to 1949, to remain in force until the reserve exceeds 1 percent of the share accounts and borrowings of insured institutions. At the same time, the statutory goal of a reserve equal to 5 percent of such accounts and borrowings exceeds potential needs and should be reduced to 2 percent. In addition, the Corporation should be given authority to borrow from private sources, both to increase the available sources of funds to levels adequate to meet any temporary borrowing needs and to reduce its potential dependence upon the Federal Government.

Insurance of private mortgages: The mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration will continue in 1961 to underwrite a substantial share of the mortgages on residential housing. While it is difficult to forecast mortgage insurance requirements, the general mortgage insurance authorization of the Federal Housing Administration now appears to be adequate to meet demands for mortgage insurance until the next Congress is in session.

Sharp fluctuations in the demand for mortgage insurance during recent years have caused the funds available for per-

sonnel under appropriation act limitations to be inadequate in periods of heavy demand to provide the staff required by the Federal Housing Administration for prompt service on applications. Supplemental funds are usually not made available in time to meet this problem. To correct this situation, appropriation language is being requested to permit use of additional income for such expenses when actual demand exceeds the budget estimate.

Legislation should also be enacted to extend the authority for insurance of loans on home improvements. This program, which makes a major contribution to modernization of existing homes, would otherwise expire on October 1, 1960.

Last year legislation was recommended to provide some flexibility in maximum interest rates on mortgages originated under the housing loan and guarantee programs of the Veterans' Administration and under certain mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration. The action taken by the Congress was inadequate and some of these programs are now seriously hampered by their inability at present maximum interest rates to attract adequate private capital. The Veterans' Administration should be given the same flexibility to adjust its interest rates to market conditions which is now possessed by the Federal Housing Administration in its basic mortgage insurance programs. In addition, the maximum interest rate of 4½ percent on insured mortgages on armed services family housing should be removed.

Veterans housing loans: The direct housing loan program of the Veterans' Administration, which has been extended several times, terminates July 25, 1960, and I am asking for no further authorization. At that time, over \$1 billion of loans will be outstanding, and the program will have provided over 150,000 loans to veterans. There is no longer justification for continuing this readjustment program.

Mortgage purchases: The authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow from the Treasury to purchase mortgages under its special assistance program will be exhausted during 1961. I am recommending legislation which would permit future increases in authorization to be subject to appropriation review. An additional \$150 million is requested for 1961 for this program. The additional funds will be used chiefly to buy mortgages on housing in urban renewal areas, on housing for the relocation of displaced families, and on housing for the elderly.

Special assistance for these mortgages is intended to be transitional, and an increasing proportion of total financing should in the future be obtained from private sources. With annual financing requirements in excess of \$1 billion already in sight for these programs, the need can be met only with the full and active support of local communities and private financial institutions.

At the same time, mortgage purchases by the Association's secondary market operations trust fund will continue at high levels. Expenditures for such pur-

chases are estimated at \$1,047 million in 1960 and \$975 million in 1961. These purchases will be almost wholly financed through the sale of debentures to the public and the purchase of common stock by mortgage sellers. Budget expenditures of \$50 million, however, will be necessary for the additional Treasury purchases of the preferred stock of the Association required to support the mortgage purchase program.

College housing: No additional authorizations are proposed for the existing college housing direct loan program. The housing needs of our colleges and universities represent only a part of the need for new university facilities of all types. These needs should be considered as a whole and within the framework of the general problems of education. I have, accordingly, recommended the termination of the college housing program and the enactment of legislation authorizing a new program of grants and loan guarantees for college facilities, to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (discussed under labor and welfare programs).

Small business: The increase in financial assistance to small businesses under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 will continue in 1961. I recommend the enactment of legislation previously proposed to the Congress to encourage the formation of additional investment companies by liberalizing the authority of these companies, thus expanding the supply of private capital available to small businesses. Other loans by the Small Business Administration will continue at a high level, but less new obligational authority is recommended because repayments on outstanding loans will increase. Efforts to assist small businesses in obtaining a fair share of Federal Government procurement and surplus property will also continue. In order to facilitate small business financing, the Securities Act of 1933 should be amended to extend the privilege of simplified filings to a wider range of security issues.

Area assistance: Despite the rapid economic recovery in the Nation as a whole, unemployment remains high in a relatively small number of local areas. The chronic problems in these communities reflect primarily basic changes in consumer buying habits, production methods, and industry location patterns. Some localities and States have properly taken the initiative in measures designed to meet these problems. In addition, the Department of Commerce, with the cooperation of 13 other Federal agencies, is intensifying existing Federal programs to encourage and support this local initiative. More help is required. Therefore, for the past 4 years I have requested expanded legislative authority, primarily for loans and grants, to supplement existing Federal, State, and local programs. Prompt enactment of this legislation is important. The budget includes an estimated \$57 million in appropriations as the initial amount necessary to provide the proposed additional Federal aid.

Regulation of commerce and finance: The general growth of the economy,

newly legislated responsibilities, and the increased complexity of the problems which confront the regulatory agencies require increases in funds for most of them. The largest single increase in this category will permit the Federal Communications Commission to make a thorough study of ultra-high-frequency television to determine whether channels in this range can be used to meet the needs of the expanding television industry.

I again recommend legislation to strengthen the antitrust laws, including extending Federal regulation to bank mergers accomplished through the acquisition of assets, requiring businesses of significant size to notify the antitrust agencies of proposed mergers, empowering the Attorney General to issue civil investigative demands in antitrust cases when civil procedures are contemplated, and authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to seek preliminary injunctions in merger cases where a violation of law is likely.

Civil and defense mobilization: Preparations for nonmilitary defense have been seriously hindered by the unwillingness of Congress to provide appropriations to carry out programs authorized by the 1958 amendments to the Federal Civil Defense Act. Funds are again being requested for 1961, as well as in a supplemental appropriation for 1960, to help States and localities strengthen their full-time civil defense organizations. Increased funds are also required to finance greater purchases of radiological instruments for donation to the States; for expansion of the emergency preparedness activities of other Federal agencies; and to carry on the national fallout shelter policy.

In accordance with the national fallout shelter policy, the Federal departments and agencies have been directed to include fallout shelters when appropriate in the design of new buildings for civilian use, and funds for such shelters are included in the budget requests of the various agencies. In addition, the budget of the General Services Administration includes \$6 million for a new fallout shelter program at certain Federal relocation sites and in some existing Federal buildings.

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

In the fiscal year 1961, Federal programs for agriculture will again have a heavy impact on the budget, primarily because of continued high agricultural production and the past unwillingness of the Congress to make appropriate modifications in the long-established price support laws. The longer unrealistic price supports are retained, the more difficult it will be to make the adjustments in production needed to permit relaxation of Government controls over farm operations.

Last year I proposed to the Congress urgently needed legislation relating to price supports. Very little of that program was enacted. I recommend that the Congress give this important matter early consideration.

Particularly urgent now is legislation to put wheat price supports on a more

realistic basis. Stocks of wheat are continuing to rise in spite of our efforts to move wheat abroad through the International Wheat Agreement, sales for foreign currencies, and grants to disaster victims and needy people. The carry-over of wheat stocks is expected to rise to almost 1.4 billion bushels by July 1, 1960, an amount that would provide for more than 2 years of domestic consumption without any additional production.

Agriculture and agricultural resources

(Fiscal years. In millions)

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Stabilization of farm prices and farm income:				
Commodity Credit Corporation—price support, supply, and purchase programs.....	\$2,775	\$1,828	\$2,279	\$1,250
Commodity Credit Corporation—special activities (other than acreage reserve of the soil bank):				
Public Law 480.....	1,022	1,055	1,172	881
International Wheat Agreement.....	48	49	68	49
National Wool Act.....	20	94	70	51
Other.....	347	243	124	423
Soil bank—acreage reserve:				
Program total.....	673	6	-----	-----
Under CCC special activities.....	(64)	(5)	-----	-----
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities.....	141	110	110	271
Sugar Act.....	67	74	78	74
Other.....	34	41	48	47
Subtotal.....	5,126	3,499	3,950	3,046
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones.....	315	334	355	200
Financing farm ownership and operation:				
Farm Credit Administration.....	5	6	8	2
Farmers Home Administration.....	246	236	221	216
Conservation of agricultural land and water resources:				
Conservation reserve:				
Existing program total.....	175	365	362	362
Under CCC special activities.....	(4)	(30)	-----	-----
Proposed legislation.....	-----	-----	32	32
Agricultural Conservation Program Service:				
Program total.....	246	244	233	243
Under CCC special activities.....	(7)	(1)	(-12)	-----
Soil Conservation Service (including watershed protection and Great Plains program).....	125	130	137	136
Research and other agricultural services.....	291	288	325	333
Total, agriculture and agricultural resources.....	6,529	5,113	5,623	14,570

¹ Compares with new obligational authority of \$5,421 million enacted for 1959 and \$5,069 million (including \$704 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

The wheat surplus problem has been a long time in the making and cannot be solved overnight. In fact, wheat legislation enacted in this session cannot be made applicable before the 1961 crop. The fact that any significant effect on the budget would be delayed until the fiscal year 1962 underlines the need for prompt action at this session of the Congress.

Authority to bring additional land into the conservation reserve expires after the 1960 crop year. Legislation is proposed to extend this authority

through the 1963 crop year and to expand the program by increasing the basic limitation on the amount of payments that may be made in any calendar year from \$450 million to \$600 million. Specific authority will be requested for the Secretary of Agriculture to give special consideration, in allocating conservation reserve funds, to those States and regions where curtailment of production of wheat or other surplus commodities is consistent with long-range conservation and production-adjustment goals. The rental rates needed to induce farmers to withdraw cropland from production under the conservation reserve depend on the income prospects from farming, which in turn are a reflection of the levels of price supports. Therefore, the future authorization for the conservation reserve program should not be increased above the 1960 level unless needed price support legislation is enacted for wheat.

Estimated expenditures for agricultural programs in fiscal 1961 are \$5.6 billion, which is \$510 million more than the estimate for the current year but \$907 million less than was spent in 1959. Total new authority to incur obligations requested for agriculture and agricultural resources in 1961 is \$4.6 billion. This amount includes \$1.3 billion to restore, to the extent necessary, the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from previous price support losses and \$1.4 billion to reimburse the Corporation for estimated costs and losses through the fiscal year 1960 of other programs financed through that agency.

Stabilization of farm prices and farm income: Most of the recent year-to-year variations in expenditures for agriculture and agricultural resources reflect changes in expenditures for price supports and other programs to stabilize farm prices and farm income. During the five fiscal years, 1955-59, Federal spending for these programs has accounted for 70 percent to 80 percent of the total for all agricultural programs. In the fiscal year 1961, these programs are estimated to cost \$3.9 billion, an increase of \$450 million over 1960, but a decrease of \$1.2 billion from 1959.

Under present laws, price support expenditures for agricultural commodities cannot be controlled through regular budgetary processes. They are the result, mainly, of the loans and commodity purchases that the Commodity Credit Corporation is required to make, and the other price- and income-supporting programs that the Corporation is required to finance, under existing laws. These expenditures reflect the volume of production, consumption, and exports of price-supported commodities, which, in turn, are influenced by such uncertain factors as the weather and domestic and foreign economic conditions.

The budget estimate for 1961 reflects the residual effect of the large 1958 and 1959 crops and assumes that yields on price-supported crops for the 1960 crop year will be in line with recent averages; also exports of farm commodities in the fiscal year 1961 may be down somewhat from the high level expected in 1960.

The Sugar Act expires on December 31, 1960. To give sugar producers maximum time for production planning, action should be taken early in the present session of the Congress to continue this program.

We are continuing to use our surplus agricultural production in many ways for constructive purposes overseas through the "food for peace" program. Under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), surplus wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and other commodities are being sold abroad for foreign currencies. These currencies are used principally as loans or grants for the economic development and common defense in foreign countries, and to a lesser extent to finance various U.S. programs abroad. Surplus commodities are also being given to foreign governments for emergency relief needs and to private relief organizations in support of their programs abroad; over 60 million needy people benefited this past year from these donation programs. Last year the executive branch proposed certain amendments which, if enacted, would have made this surplus disposal program more effective. It is recommended that the Congress again consider these amendments.

Rural electrification and telephones: About 96 percent of our farms now have central station electric service, as compared with 11 percent in 1935. The expanding use of power in the areas served by electric cooperatives financed by the Rural Electrification Administration continues to require substantial amounts of new capital every year to provide additional generating capacity and heavier transmission and distribution facilities. More than one-half of the total power sales by the REA system are made to rural industrial, recreational, and other nonfarm customers. The nonfarm users now comprise over 80 percent of the new customers being added.

The Rural Electrification Administration currently finances the capital needs of the cooperatives by borrowing from the Treasury at the statutory interest rate of 2 percent and re-lending at the same rate. Legislation is proposed under which REA would (a) borrow from the Treasury at not to exceed the average rate of interest payable by the Treasury on recently issued long-term marketable obligations, and (b) make future electric and telephone loans at the same rate plus one-fifth of 1 percent to cover administrative expenses and estimated losses. Legislation now before the Congress to place the operations of this agency on a revolving fund basis should also be enacted.

It is vital, looking ahead, that legislation be developed to enable telephone as well as electric borrowers to obtain funds from a mutually owned financing institution to meet the needs for the future growth of these borrowers. Under this longer range plan, loans would also be available from the Rural Electrification Administration to meet special circumstances. The Secretary of Agriculture will work with REA cooperatives and other interested parties in developing such a proposal.

Farm ownership and operation: In 1961, new direct loans and administrative expenses of the Farmers Home Administration are proposed in an amount equal to estimated collections on outstanding loans. Loans are made to borrowers who are unable to obtain credit from other sources at interest rates currently prevailing in their communities in order to finance farm ownership and enlargement, farm operations, and soil and water conservation. Direct loans for farm ownership and soil and water conservation are supplemented with private loans insured by the Federal Government.

The present authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and ranchers is the cumulative result of the enactment of many separate laws over a long period of years. The legislation now before the Congress to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make these types of loans should be enacted. Also, the pending legislation to require the States to share a greater part of the costs of farm disaster relief assistance should be enacted.

Conservation of agricultural resources: Expenditures under the conservation reserve program are expected to be \$394 million in the fiscal year 1961. Of this amount \$362 million will be needed to fulfill commitments incurred in the crop years 1956 through 1960 under existing authority, and \$32 million will be used for conservation practice payments and additional operating expenses under proposed legislation to extend this program for 3 years. Under the proposed legislation it is planned to add about 9 million additional acres to the program during the 1961 crop year, bringing the total at the end of that crop year to about 37 million acres. Increases in expenditures required for the 1961 crop year program will occur mainly in 1962 and later fiscal years.

In both the 1959 and 1960 appropriation acts, the Congress maintained the agricultural conservation program at levels which far exceeded my recommendations. As a result, expenditures of the Agricultural Conservation Program Service are estimated to be \$244 million in 1960 and \$233 million in 1961. The advance authorization for the 1961 agricultural conservation program, which will affect primarily fiscal year 1962 expenditures, should be limited to \$100 million. The lower program recommended, together with other public aids for soil and water conservation, will meet the Nation's high-priority conservation needs.

Federal policy on cost-sharing assistance in the future should be concentrated on conservation measures which will foster needed shifts to less intensive uses of cropland, and assistance should be eliminated for practices which increase capacity to produce agricultural commodities already in surplus supply. Continuation of cost sharing for output-increasing practices would directly conflict with the recommended expansion of the conservation reserve program under which cropland is removed from production.

New obligational authority of \$43 million is recommended for the upstream watershed programs, including \$28 million for projects under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Of this amount, \$5 million is provided to initiate construction on projects involving an estimated total Federal cost of \$29 million.

New obligational authority of \$10 million is requested for the Great Plains conservation program, the same as for 1960. Under this program conducted in designated counties of the 10 Great Plains States, the Federal Government provides cost-sharing and technical assistance to farmers who enter into long-term contracts to make needed adjustments of land use on their farms.

Research and other agricultural services: Expenditures for research, education, and other agricultural services, exclusive of programs financed with foreign currencies, will be about \$8 million higher in the fiscal year 1961 than in 1960. This amount will provide increased support for the research programs on pesticide residues and on industrial uses of farm commodities. It will also provide increased support for the rural development program which is making an important contribution to the solution of the economic problems of rural areas arising out of technological changes in agriculture and inadequate employment opportunities.

In addition, it is estimated that \$19 million will be spent in 1961 for the purchase of foreign currencies, obtained from the sale of surplus farm commodities, to be used for research and market development work abroad. This compares with approximately \$12 million in foreign currencies to be used for this purpose in 1960.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The recommendations in this budget for Federal natural resource programs take into account their great importance to the Nation's economic growth and security.

The estimated total of \$1.9 billion to be spent in the fiscal year 1961 for natural resources is more than has been spent for this purpose in any previous year. The increase of \$152 million over 1960 is predominantly for water resources programs.

Water resources: The Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation will spend an estimated \$1.2 billion in the fiscal year 1961 to construct, maintain, and operate flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, and related projects. This record total includes, in addition to operating costs, \$965 million to continue construction on projects started in 1960 or prior years, \$12 million for advance planning, and \$18 million for the first-year expenditures on 42 proposed new starts. These new projects, as well as three new construction starts by the Tennessee Valley Authority and one by the International Boundary and Water Commission, are recommended in this budget in the interest of balanced development of water resources.

For the Corps of Engineers, appropriations (as distinct from the expenditures previously discussed) of \$21 million are

required for starting 31 new projects and for an additional number of smaller projects costing less than \$400,000 each. The estimated commitments for these new projects total \$301 million. Appropriations of \$6 million for 1961 are recommended for the Bureau of Reclamation to begin construction on six projects with total estimated commitments of \$184 million, and \$11 million for loans which will be used by local groups to start work on five small reclamation projects.

I again recommend that the Congress authorize the Fryingspan-Arkansas project in Colorado.

Natural resources

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Land and water resources:				
Corps of Engineers.....	\$779	\$860	\$910	\$936
Department of the Interior:				
Bureau of Reclamation.....	246	234	300	314
Power marketing agencies.....	33	40	40	40
Indian lands resources.....	57	62	57	41
Public domain and other.....	33	36	40	35
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	15	7	4	-----
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	7	35	73	21
Federal Power Commission.....	7	7	8	8
Department of State and other.....	5	6	9	9
Mineral resources.....	71	66	64	63
Forest resources.....	201	223	222	191
Recreational resources.....	86	87	87	54
Fish and wildlife resources.....	68	70	71	68
General resource surveys and other.....	60	53	53	53
Total.....	1,669	1,785	1,938	1,836

¹ Compares with new obligational authority of \$1,742 million enacted for 1959 and \$2,538 million (including \$32 million of anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

To carry forward the joint development of the waters of the Rio Grande, construction should be started on the Amistad (Diablo) Dam, in accordance with the treaty of February 3, 1944, between the United States and Mexico. I urge the Congress to enact promptly the legislation now needed to authorize negotiation of an agreement for this construction. Funds will be requested for the U.S. share of the first-year cost of this project following enactment of the legislation. Provision is made in this budget to begin modification of the lower Rio Grande levee system.

Under legislation enacted during the past session, the Tennessee Valley Authority plans to issue an estimated \$115 million of revenue bonds in 1961. These funds will be used to help finance construction of a second unit in the Paradise steam powerplant and of other units under way, including new generating capacity in the eastern part of the TVA area. The Authority will start construction of the Melton Hill project for navigation and power. In accordance with this administration's policy, and as authorized under the Tennessee Valley Authority Act as amended by the recently enacted revenue bond legislation,

the power facilities portion of this project will be financed from net power proceeds and revenue bonds, and the remaining portion will be financed from appropriations. With the completion of the Wilson lock, the present lock at Wheeler Dam will be a bottleneck for shipping on the Tennessee River. Appropriations are therefore recommended for 1961 to begin construction of a new lock at Wheeler Dam.

Research for converting sea water and brackish water into fresh water, carried on cooperatively by the Department of the Interior and non-Federal groups has progressed to the point where some processes are in the development stage. Construction will begin in 1960 at Freeport, Tex., on a demonstration plant for conversion of sea water, and \$1.5 million is recommended in the 1961 budget for the Federal cost of building the first brackish water plant as well as a second sea water plant. Advance planning will be completed in 1961 on two additional demonstration plants.

Cost sharing on flood protection projects: It is essential that legislation be promptly enacted to establish a consistent basis for cost sharing on projects which provide flood protection benefits. At the present time, the various Federal agencies responsible for flood protection operate under different and confusing cost-sharing standards. The non-Federal contributions vary from zero to over 60 percent. This intolerable situation should be corrected. Legislation now before the Congress would require generally that identifiable non-Federal interests receiving flood protection benefits bear at least 30 percent of the costs of flood protection. The value of lands, easements, and rights-of-way contributed locally would be included as part of this non-Federal share. The cost of operation and maintenance would also be a State or local responsibility.

Mineral resources: Amendments to the Helium Act were recommended last year to carry out a long-range plan for conserving helium. This lightweight nonflammable gas is important to the Nation's atomic energy and missile programs, and known deposits of it are extremely limited. Under the legislation proposed, private industry would be encouraged to finance, build, and operate plants which would make helium available for conservation by the Department of the Interior. Prompt enactment is needed to check the waste of this essential gas.

The Bureau of Mines will continue its research on improved methods of production and utilization of coal and other minerals. Legislation is again recommended to grant authority to the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research, thus allowing the Secretary to use outside scientific resources to assist the coal industry.

Other resource programs: In the fiscal year 1961, programs for conserving and developing the resources of the public domain and Indian lands will be carried on at about the 1960 levels. Although total expenditures for forest resources are estimated at about the same level in 1961 as in 1960, some increases are provided in 1961 to carry forward the

long-range program of the Forest Service for conservation and development, including added facilities and services to accommodate campers and picnickers. It is expected that these increased expenditures will be offset by a decrease in the unusually large 1960 outlays for fighting forest fires.

Receipts from the timber, grazing, and mineral resources on these public lands are estimated to increase to a total of over \$400 million in 1961, including revenues from mineral leases on the Outer Continental Shelf. To obtain a more adequate return for use of federally owned resources, legislation is again recommended to revise the fee schedule for noncompetitive oil and gas leases on public domain lands.

In the interest of improving efficiency and providing convenience for the non-Federal parties concerned, certain functions with respect to land and timber exchanges should be transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture by legislation embodying the basic provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, which was disapproved by the Congress. In these exchanges, the Government obtains non-Federal lands in exchange for national forest lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture or for timber on such lands. This legislation is needed to simplify the work relating to these land exchanges.

Each year more of our citizens use and enjoy the national parks. Expenditures of \$86 million estimated for the National Park Service in 1961 for recreational resources will provide for additional urgently needed facilities and services for visitors, for maintenance and operation of the present facilities, and for selective acquisition of lands to add to existing park areas.

Before it is too late we should take steps to preserve, for public benefit, part of the remaining undeveloped shore areas. I hope, therefore, that the Congress will enact during this session the legislation proposed in the last session to permit the Secretary of the Interior to select and acquire for the national park system three areas which would be of national significance because of their outstanding natural and scenic features, recreational advantages, and other public values.

Contract authority is available to finance planned construction of parkways, roads, and trails in the national parks and forests and on Indian lands during 1961. Beginning in 1962, this construction should be financed by direct appropriations, and the budget so contemplates.

Recent legislation increased the fee charged to hunters of migratory birds and earmarked these revenues for acquisition of lands for refuges and nesting areas. In 1961 land acquisitions from these revenues will be four times those of the current year. Other proposed increases in expenditures for fish and wildlife resources are mainly for fishery research.

LABOR AND WELFARE

Budget expenditures for labor and welfare programs in the fiscal year 1961

are estimated to reach an all-time high of \$4.6 billion, of which three-fourths will take the form of grants to States and localities. The total expenditures are estimated to be \$128 million more than for the current year. The largest increase is for promotion of public health, mainly for research and hospital construction, as a result of much larger appropriations by the Congress in previous years. Significant increases are also estimated for the support of basic research provided by the National Science Foundation and for the defense education and public assistance programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Budget expenditures for labor and welfare programs will be more than double the amount a decade ago. During the same period, trust funds expenditures for these programs, including social security and unemployment compensation, will have quintupled to an estimated \$16.2 billion in 1961.

Labor and welfare
(Fiscal years. In millions)

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Promotion of education: National Science Foundation, science education.....	\$51	\$54	\$59	\$70
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Defense education program.....	78	134	170	171
Assistance to schools in federally affected areas.....	216	234	207	171
Vocational education and other.....	63	67	67	69
Other, primarily Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	60	60	62	65
Promotion of science, research, libraries and museums: National Science Foundation, basic research.....	55	71	101	122
Department of Commerce: Bureau of the Census.....	23	91	36	29
National Bureau of Standards and other.....	12	22	33	50
Other.....	27	37	50	45
Labor and manpower: Temporary extended unemployment compensation.....	447	-7	-	-
Grants for administration of employment service and unemployment compensation.....	306	323	311	326
Other.....	91	99	124	126
Promotion of public health: National Institutes of Health, research grants and activities.....	265	364	390	400
Grants for construction of health research facilities.....	23	26	29	25
Hospital construction grants.....	136	144	161	126
Grants for construction of waste treatment facilities.....	36	45	45	20
Other.....	243	271	279	276
Public assistance.....	1,969	2,056	2,087	2,087
Correctional and penal institutions.....	39	46	48	57
Other welfare services: School lunch and special milk programs.....	218	234	234	225
Other.....	61	71	76	79
Total.....	4,421	4,441	4,569	14,538

¹ Compares with new obligational authority of \$4,182 million enacted for 1959 and \$4,643 million (including \$23 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

New obligational authority recommended for 1961 totals \$4.5 billion, about the same as for 1960 but \$356 million more than for 1959. Reductions from 1960 are recommended in the grant-in-aid programs for assistance to schools in federally affected areas for hospital construction, and for waste treatment works construction. Larger appropriations are proposed for other presently authorized activities in the fields of science, vocational rehabilitation, education, welfare, and health. In addition, a number of new programs are recommended to meet important national needs, particularly in the education and labor fields.

In the last several years great strides forward have been made in the social security, welfare, and health fields. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is continually reviewing the various programs in these fields for the purpose of determining where improvement should be made. As needs for improvement are found, appropriate recommendations will be made.

Education and research: Our Nation seeks to foster a climate of freedom and creativity in which education, the arts, and fundamental science can flourish. The Federal Government helps in the attainment of these objectives through programs for support of basic research, aid to educational institutions, and training assistance to individuals in various fields important to the national interest. In this budget, I recommend increased appropriations for high-priority education and research programs and enactment of new legislation to authorize additional aids to education.

I am recommending repeal of the provision of the National Defense Education Act that prohibits payments or loans from being made to any individual unless he executes an affidavit that he does not believe in or belong to any organization that teaches the illegal overthrow of the Government. This affidavit requirement is unwarranted and justifiably resented by a large part of our educational community which feels that it is being singled out for this requirement.

Education: Expenditures for the education-aid programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 will increase sharply in 1961. During the current school year more than 100,000 students from 1,368 colleges, about four times the number of students last year, are expected to borrow from college loan funds to which the Government makes repayable advances. A supplemental appropriation of nearly \$10 million is proposed to enlarge this loan program for 1960. A small increase in appropriations is recommended for 1961 pending further experience on the rate at which loans will be made to students. Increases are also proposed for fellowships for prospective college teachers; for grants to States for science, mathematics, and foreign language teaching equipment; for research in the educational use of television and other media; for contracts with universities for training of counselors and for foreign language training; and for grants to States for vocational training in occupations requiring scientific skills.

Appropriations of \$70 million are requested for aids to science education programs administered by the National Science Foundation, an increase of \$3 million over the amount provided in 1960.

The budget includes the same aggregate amount for vocational education programs as was appropriated this year, but with shift in emphasis. The need for Federal assistance in the vocational education programs begun in 1917 for the purpose of stimulating training in agriculture, home economics, industrial trades, and distributive occupations is not as great as for promotion of training in new science-age skills. Thus as increased funds for training needs in new skills are provided under the National Defense Education Act, Federal assistance for the older programs is being reduced by a corresponding amount.

Appropriations recommended for 1961 to assist school districts whose enrollment comes partially from children whose parents work or reside on Federal property are \$54 million below those enacted for 1960 and are in line with requirements under legislation proposed by the administration last year. The appropriation recommended for these programs is the maximum which I believe should be provided. The substantial increase in Federal employment during World War II, which led to the enactment of this legislation in 1950, has been superseded by a relatively stable Federal Establishment. In many cases, the presence of Federal installations in the communities adds to rather than detracts from the revenue base for the support of schools. This is particularly true where parents employed by the Government live on private property which is subject to State and local taxation even though they earn their income on non-taxable Federal property. The proposed legislation would discharge more equitably the Federal responsibility in these districts, and its prompt enactment by the Congress is recommended.

The pressing need now is not for aid to federally affected districts on the basis initiated in 1950 but for general aid to help localities with limited resources to build public schools. Despite encouraging progress in the rate of school construction, many school districts are still finding it difficult to avoid overcrowding and double sessions as enrollments continue to mount. Moreover, increasing secondary school enrollments require facilities which are much more costly than elementary school classrooms. Last year the administration recommended legislation authorizing annual Federal advances to local school districts to pay up to half the debt service (principal and interest) on \$3 billion of bonds to be issued in the next 5 years for school construction. This legislation is designed to stimulate, not supplant, additional State and local effort. Affirmative action should be taken this year on that proposal.

Congressional approval of the administration's proposals for aid to higher educational institutions is also essential. The enrollment growth facing colleges and universities from 1960 to 1975 brings

a need for additional academic, housing, and related educational facilities. To help colleges finance the construction required, the administration's proposal would authorize Federal guarantees of \$1 billion in bonds with interest subject to Federal taxation, and would provide Federal grants, payable over 20 years, equal to 25 percent of the principal of \$2 billion of bonds. This program would provide aid on a much broader basis, and result in the construction of much larger total amounts of college facilities per dollar of Federal expenditures, than the present more limited college housing loan program which should be allowed to expire.

Basic research: To provide a strong foundation of fundamental scientific knowledge for the Nation's future advancement, this budget provides, in various functional categories including major national security, expenditures totaling more than \$600 million for support of basic research in 1961.

Appropriations of \$122 million are recommended for support of basic research by the National Science Foundation, an increase of \$34 million over 1960. The total includes \$79 million for basic research projects and \$15 million for grants to universities for modernization of graduate level laboratories under a program initiated in 1960. Increased support is also provided for scientific work of the Bureau of Standards, including funds for two new laboratories, as a first step in the construction of completely new facilities for the agency.

Oceanography: Federal support of oceanography and related marine sciences is being substantially augmented by several agencies under a long-range program developed by the Federal Council on Science and Technology to strengthen the Nation's effort in this field. This program stems from a study undertaken by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of several agencies. The expansion of oceanographic research will be undertaken by the Navy, the Departments of Commerce and the Interior, and the National Science Foundation. Funds are provided for the construction of new vessels and the replacement of obsolete vessels, and for increased support for research by private institutions.

Government statistical services: Adequate and timely national statistical information is essential for recording and appraising the performance of the Nation's economy, and for formulating public and private policies. Activities planned in various agencies for the fiscal year 1961 will help close significant gaps in our statistical information and make improvements in current data. Obligations for these purposes in the various functional categories of the budget are estimated at \$62 million, including \$20 million for the decennial census and other periodic statistical programs.

This budget includes funds for tabulating and processing basic economic and demographic data collected through the Eighteenth Decennial Census, and for the final publication of the results of the 1958 censuses of business, manufactures, and mineral industries. Other

recommendations include the initiation of a new series on the service trades and the improvement of data on retail trade, on consumer prices, on health, on crop and livestock production, and on State and local government finances.

Labor and manpower: Last year the administration recommended and the Congress enacted much-needed legislation designed to protect workers and the public from racketeering, corruption, and abuse of democratic processes which had been disclosed in the affairs of a few labor unions. To assure effective and efficient administration of this new law, the budget recommends supplemental appropriations in 1960 for the National Labor Relations Board and the newly established Bureau of Labor-Management Reports in the Department of Labor. Increased appropriations are proposed for both agencies for 1961. Additional funds needed by the Department of Justice will be requested later when requirements can be better determined.

Appropriations of \$326 million are requested in the fiscal year 1961 for grants to the States to administer the Federal-State employment security system with its network of 1,800 offices throughout the country. These grants are now financed from an earmarked Federal tax and the transactions involved increase both budget receipts and expenditures, even though these funds cannot be used for general Government purposes. Legislation proposed by the administration last year for financing this program through the unemployment trust fund should be enacted. Amounts equal to the proceeds from this tax could then be placed directly in the trust fund from which the necessary grants could be appropriated and an adequate balance could be maintained as a reserve for employment security purposes. The administration of the program would then be financed in essentially the same way as other major social insurance programs.

The job placement services and unemployment compensation payments provided through the State employment security offices are important for a smoothly operating free labor market in a growing economy. These services and payments provide also for security against economic hardship for the work force covered by the system. I again urge the enactment of legislation to extend unemployment compensation to some 3 million workers, primarily those employed in small enterprises. Some States have recently made encouraging progress in increasing the duration and level of benefits, but more needs to be done and additional States should take these steps.

Action is needed to strengthen the financial position of the unemployment compensation system. Although the reserves of most States proved adequate in the past recession, a few were and still are in a precarious condition. Moreover, reserve funds in most States have fallen behind the growth in payrolls during the last decade, and in certain States could be inadequate in the event of future economic distress. I have

asked the Secretary of Labor to make a study of this problem and to report to me his conclusions.

Previously proposed amendments to strengthen the basic authority in the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act should be enacted, and the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act should be extended to several million additional workers in accordance with previous recommendations. Legislation is likewise again proposed to assure equal pay for equal work, and to strengthen and improve laws governing hours of work and overtime pay on direct Federal and certain federally aided construction projects.

Public health: Advances in medical technology and the spread of private health insurance have played important roles in raising the level of health services for our rapidly growing population. At the same time, the growing demand for better health care has contributed to shortages of facilities, medical and scientific manpower, and supporting health workers, as well as to the rising cost of medical and hospital services.

In order to deal effectively with these developments, the Federal Government has expanded its public health programs and is actively seeking solutions to the Nation's health problems. Expenditures in the fiscal year 1961 are estimated to total \$904 million, which is \$53 million more than in 1960 and nearly three times the level 5 years earlier. The largest part of the increase is for medical research and training of research workers through programs of the National Institutes of Health, for which the estimated expenditures of \$320 million in 1961 will be four times as great as 5 years ago. Expenditures for hospital construction grants are estimated at \$161 million in 1961, a threefold increase during the same period.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will insist on maintaining high standards in determining the acceptability of medical research projects for Federal support. As I indicated last August in approving the 1960 appropriations for the Department, it is essential that Federal grants for these projects be so administered that medical manpower is not unduly diverted from other pressing needs and that Federal funds are not substituted for funds from private sources. The 1960 appropriation of \$400 million for the National Institutes of Health will not be entirely committed this year even with advanced funding of certain training programs. I am recommending that 1961 appropriations to the National Institutes of Health continue at the high level of 1960.

The recommended appropriation for the Hill-Burton hospital construction program for 1961 is consistent with the levels achieved by this program before the 1958 recession. It will assure that sufficient new general hospitals can be financed to keep pace with population growth, cover current obsolescence rates, and provide for 6,000 new beds to reduce the backlog of needs. The remainder of this program, covering diagnostic and other special facilities, would approximate the 1959 and 1960 levels.

The 1961 appropriation proposed for construction of waste treatment facilities is the same as that requested for 1960. It represents the maximum amount which I believe is warranted for a construction program which is and should remain primarily a State and local responsibility.

Larger appropriations are proposed for other health programs where present or impending needs create urgent priorities. Emerging health problems of increasing seriousness to our population arise from the complexities of the environment in which we live. To cope with the far-reaching problems of environmental health on a more systematic and intensive basis, this budget provides substantial increases to the Public Health Service for air pollution, water pollution, and radiological health control activities. These increases for radiological health, together with the stepped-up activity by the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies, will permit a greatly intensified effort by the Federal Government in this field. In order to provide for more effective Federal air and water pollution control activities, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will make legislative recommendations to strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act and to authorize greater Federal leadership in combating air pollution.

Rapid technological developments in the production, processing, and marketing of foods, drugs, and other products likewise underline the necessity for more research and action for the protection of the consumer. To meet this need, the budget continues to emphasize an orderly expansion of the Food and Drug Administration, expenditures for which will be more than double those 5 years ago.

Social insurance and other welfare: The social security insurance system now provides basic protection against loss of income from death, disability, and retirement to about 85 percent of our labor force. Another 8 percent are covered under the railroad retirement system and other public retirement systems.

Social security and public assistance: At the present time 10 million of the 16 million people aged 65 and over are receiving monthly old-age or survivors insurance benefits. This vast insurance system, which will pay \$11.7 billion in old-age, survivors, and disability benefits to 14.6 million people of all ages in 1961, is administered at a cost of about 2 percent of the social security taxes.

Our social insurance and public retirement systems provide basic protection to the worker and his family. For those who have no such protection and whose incomes are insufficient to meet basic needs, the Federal Government shares, through grants to the States, in providing four categories of public assistance payments. These are (1) old-age assistance, (2) aid to the blind, (3) aid to dependent children, and (4) aid to the permanently and totally disabled. In 1961, the Federal share for payments, made to an estimated monthly average of 5.9 million beneficiaries, will total an

estimated \$2.1 billion, or about 58 percent of the total Federal-State-local public assistance expenditures. This contrasts with Federal expenditures of \$1.1 billion, representing a Federal share of 52 percent, for payments to 4.9 million individuals in 1950.

Public assistance has long been recognized as primarily a responsibility of the State and local governments, because need for these payments in individual cases can best be determined at the local level. I am particularly concerned about the growing Federal share, especially because it tends to weaken this sense of State and local responsibility.

While we are spending hundreds of millions for aid to the needy, there are large gaps in our knowledge of the causes of dependency and of the best ways to alleviate or prevent it. I believe that appropriations to initiate a program of research and demonstration projects designed to identify and alleviate these causes are highly necessary and I have so recommended in this budget.

Military service credits: It has long been recognized that military service should be counted toward the rights of employees under the various public retirement programs. Likewise, where employees are not required to make payroll contributions during military service, the trust funds from which benefits based on such service are paid should be reimbursed by the Government. However, the Federal Government should not, as required under the Railroad Retirement Act, pay more than the true cost of such benefits or pay to both the railroad retirement account and to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds for the same military service benefits.

Accordingly, I repeat my earlier recommendation that the Federal Government should reimburse the railroad retirement account only for the actual added cost of benefits resulting from military service. Pending action on legislation dealing with substantial overpayments found by the Comptroller General, no provision is made in this budget for further Federal military service payments to either the railroad retirement account or the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance trust funds.

Other welfare services: This budget includes recommended appropriations for vocational rehabilitation totaling \$72 million for the fiscal year 1961, primarily for grants to help the State agencies rehabilitate an estimated 93,000 individuals, about 6 percent more than in 1960.

Grants to all school systems in the States through the school lunch and special milk programs of the Department of Agriculture are estimated at \$234 million in 1961, approximately the same as in 1960. These programs will provide improved diets for 11.8 million children, on the average, in 1961. The 1961 amount is in addition to the commodities which are distributed to the schools through the disposal programs classified in this budget under agriculture and agricultural resources.

The health, employment, income, and other needs of the increasing number of

elderly people in our population can be met only through the combined efforts and cooperation of private, local, State, and Federal organizations and agencies. The White House Conference on Aging, to be held in January 1961, and the State conferences which precede it should help point the way toward more productive and satisfying living for our aged citizens.

The realization of our aspirations for a better society in the years to come will in large measure depend upon the way in which our children and youth are prepared to realize their maximum potential. This will be the vital concern of the White House Conference on Children and Youth, which will be held in March 1960 and through which private and public organizations will endeavor to bring their wisest and most expert counsel together on this vitally important matter.

VETERANS SERVICES AND BENEFITS

Expenditures for veterans programs are estimated to rise by \$314 million to \$5.5 billion in 1961, chiefly because of additional pension cases and higher pension rates, both authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959. The increase for pensions, amounting to \$438 million, will be partly offset by a decrease of \$128 million in readjustment benefit expenditures.

Programs of the Veterans' Administration, providing compensation and pension, medical, and readjustment benefits for the Nation's veterans, rank fourth in size among all Government functions in this budget. Total expenditures for these programs, as presently authorized, will continue to increase in future years as our veterans advance in age. The 23 million living veterans, together with the dependents and survivors of veterans, comprise a total of 81 million people, a considerable proportion of whom are potential recipients of one or more types of benefits.

This country has provided a wide range of benefits and services for war veterans and their families to meet needs resulting from military service. Disability and death compensation benefits have been provided for veterans who were injured in the service or for their survivors. The Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act of 1956 improved the death benefit structure both for wartime and peacetime servicemen. In 1957, general disability compensation rates were increased by 10 percent, and a still larger increase was enacted in the basic rate for the totally disabled.

A first-rate hospital and medical care program is also being provided. During the past year a long-range policy for stabilizing the Veterans' Administration's hospital program at 125,000 beds has been established, and beginning with the 1961 budget a 12-year hospital modernization program is being initiated that will ultimately cost \$900 million.

The 21 million veterans who served during World War II or the Korean conflict were eligible for benefits from the highly successful readjustment programs. For the 16 million World War II veterans the GI bill provided unemployment and self-employment compensation

payments to 9.7 million veterans; education and training benefits to 8.4 million veterans; and loan assistance to 5 million veterans for the acquisition or improvement of homes, farms, and businesses. Except for the loan guarantee and direct loan programs, which will terminate on July 25, 1960, the World War II readjustment benefits have essentially expired. Similar readjustment programs, which will continue into 1965 for veterans of the Korean conflict, have already provided 2.3 million veterans with education and training benefits and 700,000 with loans. The special unemployment compensation program for Korean conflict veterans which ends in 1961 has aided 1.3 million veterans. No further extension or liberalization of these benefits is needed.

The longstanding veterans pension program also provides special assistance to war veterans for needs not arising from military service. The Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 was an important step in the modernization of the program. It eliminated the disparity in eligibility for pensions between the widows of World War I veterans and those of later wars, and provided higher benefits for all persons who could demonstrate need under a new sliding scale income test. No further liberalization of the laws concerning pensions for nonservice-connected disability is proposed.

In addition to the special veterans programs, a great majority of veterans participate in the general social security, health, and welfare programs which are financed wholly or in part by the Federal Government. In the future these general programs will provide with increasing adequacy for the economic security needs of our elderly population, of which veterans and their widows will constitute a large and increasing proportion for several decades.

Veterans services and benefits

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Readjustment benefits:				
Education and training.....	\$574	\$445	\$316	\$286
Loan guarantee and other benefits.....	133	115	124	124
Unemployment compensation.....	44	8		
Compensation and pensions:				
Service-connected compensation.....	2,070	2,071	2,066	2,066
Non-service-connected pensions.....	1,153	1,278	1,716	1,716
Burial and other allowances.....	52	58	58	58
Hospitals and medical care.....	375	906	928	933
Hospital construction.....	45	60	63	75
Insurance and servicemen's indemnities.....	35	36	31	40
Other services and administration.....	193	180	169	163
Total.....	5,174	5,157	5,471	5,476

¹ Compares with new obligational authority of \$5,125 million enacted for 1959 and \$5,176 million (including \$114 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

Readjustment benefits: Readjustment assistance is expected to decline significantly from 1960 to 1961, primarily because of the reduction in the number of

veterans of the Korean conflict participating in educational or vocational training programs. An average of 225,000 veterans will receive training in 1961, compared to 325,000 in 1960 and 425,000 in 1959. Educational benefits for war orphans, which were enacted in 1956, are expected to total over \$17 million in 1961.

Peacetime ex-servicemen are recognized as being in a different category from wartime veterans because of the different conditions under which they serve. Those who serve in peacetime undergo fewer rigors and hazards than their combat comrades. The disruption of their educational plans and careers is minimized under peacetime selective service procedures. While on active service they now receive substantial pay and benefits, and they return to civilian life under more favorable conditions after receiving valuable training while in service.

To discharge its responsibility to peacetime ex-servicemen, the Federal Government has provided unemployment compensation, employment service and reemployment rights, and service-connected disability or death compensation. One additional benefit should be added to these in accord with my earlier recommendations: a program of vocational rehabilitation for those with substantial service-connected disabilities. On the other hand, I oppose the establishment of special educational and loan guarantee programs for peacetime ex-servicemen. Such benefits are not justified because they are not supported by the conditions of military service. Moreover, they would be directly contrary to the incentives which have been provided to encourage capable individuals to make military service a career.

Compensation and pensions: Expenditures for compensation for service-connected disabilities and deaths will show only a minor change in 1961. A reduction in the number of World War I and II veterans on the rolls will be offset somewhat by the addition of veterans of the Korean conflict and peacetime ex-servicemen. Compensation will be paid for an estimated 2.4 million cases during 1961.

The net impact of the 1959 law governing non-service-connected pensions is to add several hundred thousand new cases to the rolls at an estimated additional cost of \$284 million in 1961 and an estimated cumulative cost of \$9 billion during the next 40 years. Expenditures are also increasing because of the growing number of World War I veterans reaching age 65. Approximately 40 percent of all World War I veterans over 65 are now receiving pensions. An average of 1.9 million veterans and families of deceased veterans are expected to receive pensions in 1961; this is 26 percent more than in 1960 and 33 percent more than in 1959.

Hospital and medical services: The budget includes \$928 million of expenditures in 1961 for hospital and medical care for veterans. The increase of \$22 million from 1960 is to continue improvements in the staffing and quality of service in the hospitals and to meet the

higher costs of hospital and medical care generally. Hospital and domiciliary care will be provided during the year for an average of 141,250 beneficiaries per day, and a total of 2,300,000 veterans will receive medical or dental care for service-connected disabilities in outpatient clinics.

Hospital construction: As a first step toward an orderly 12-year program for modernization of existing veterans' hospital facilities, an appropriation of \$75 million is proposed for 1961. Of this total, \$53 million is for construction of replacement hospitals at Cleveland, Ohio (800 beds); Washington, D.C. (700 beds); and Martinez, Calif. (500 beds). The remainder is for a large number of modernization projects.

Administration: The general operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration are expected to decline approximately 7 percent in 1961, reflecting decreased workloads in loan and educational programs, improved administrative procedures particularly in insurance operations, and the application of modern electronic equipment to recording and paying veterans' benefits.

INTEREST

Interest payments are estimated to rise \$200 million to \$9.6 billion in the fiscal year 1961. These payments, almost entirely for interest on the public debt, represent 12 percent of budget expenditures.

Interest

[Fiscal years. In millions]

Item	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligational authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Interest on public debt.....	\$7,593	\$9,300	\$9,500	\$9,500
Interest on refunds of receipts.....	70	75	75	75
Interest on uninvested funds.....	9	9	10	10
Total.....	7,671	9,385	9,585	9,585

For a year and a half now, market rates of interest have been increasing, reflecting inflationary pressures, the high level of investment demands in our economy and heavy Federal borrowing required by the 1958 and 1959 budget deficits. The rise in market rates requires the Treasury to pay higher interest on securities issued to refinance the heavy volume of maturing obligations, which were issued when interest rates were lower.

It is imperative that the Congress lift the present legal ceiling of 4½ percent on interest rates on all Government obligations having maturities of more than 5 years. Otherwise, interest payments could rise even more sharply. The current interest rate on shorter term securities is now higher than on long-term bonds, and the continued need to limit financing to the short-term market tends to raise interest rates more than if the financing could be spread over both the short- and long-term markets.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Expenditures for General Government activities are estimated to rise by \$200

million to \$1.9 billion in the fiscal year 1961, primarily because of increased construction of Government buildings and a new appropriation to the civil service retirement fund required by law.

Federal financial management: There is growing evidence that a considerable amount of revenue is lost annually to the Government because of the failure of some individuals and businesses to report fully the income which they have received. The existence of such a condition seriously weakens the integrity of our tax system, and places an unfair share of the total tax burden upon the vast majority of citizens who conscientiously report all of their taxable income. This budget includes an increase of \$29 million for the Internal Revenue Service, primarily to strengthen its enforcement programs, including initiation of an electronic computer system. I urge its approval as the first step in a long-range plan to prevent this revenue loss. The additional costs should be recovered many times through increased tax collections in later years.

General Government
(Fiscal years. In millions)

Program or agency	Budget expenditures			Recommended new obligatory authority for 1961
	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate	
Legislative functions.....	\$102	\$121	\$146	\$95
Judicial functions.....	47	50	63	53
Executive direction and management.....	12	13	14	14
Federal financial management.....	566	560	591	595
General property and records management.....	201	384	432	460
Central personnel management and employment costs.....	205	198	251	251
Civilian weather services.....	46	52	58	63
Protective services and alien control.....	216	218	229	230
Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.....	89	96	126	124
Other general government.....	30	20	12	15
Total.....	1,606	1,711	1,911	1,910

¹ Compares with new obligatory authority of \$1,795 million enacted for 1959 and \$1,645 million (including \$7 million in anticipated supplemental appropriations) estimated for 1960.

General property and records management: The efficient and economical operation of many Federal agencies is hindered by inadequate office space, much of which is rented. Accordingly, new obligatory authority of \$185 million is recommended for fiscal year 1961 for the planning and construction of additional general office space. Although no funds for such construction were appropriated for 1960, expenditures will rise in 1961 as outlays for new construction are added to those for construction initiated in prior years. In addition, the estimate for the legislative functions includes increased expenditures for a new office building for the House of Representatives.

The General Services Administration, in collaboration with other agencies, has developed a new program for improved use of excess personal property by Federal agencies, and faster, more efficient disposal of surplus property. This involves more effective screening of such

property and simplifying the procedures under which agencies are advised of its availability for other uses.

Central personnel management: The Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget have recently recommended a long-range policy on financing the civil service retirement system. I hope the Congress will speedily enact these recommendations, which would assure continued availability in the fund of the full amount of the net accumulations from employee contributions and establish a definite basis for meeting the Government's share of the costs consistent with the principle that its full faith and credit support the authorized benefits.

A new appropriation of \$46 million for payments to the civil service retirement fund is requested for 1961 to finance the costs of new or increased benefits enacted in 1958 for certain widows or widowers of former Federal employees and for certain retired employees. The law provides that these particular benefits cannot be continued after July 1, 1960, unless such an appropriation is made. Recipients of these benefits should enjoy the same assurance of uninterrupted payment as do other annuitants of the civil service retirement system, and the Federal liability in their case is not different from that for other benefits under this program. Accordingly, I recommend that the Congress consider, in connection with the legislation referred to in the preceding paragraph, authorizing the civil service retirement and disability fund to bear the future cost of these particular benefits without a specific appropriation.

The budget provides approximately \$120 million to pay the Government's share of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, which becomes effective in the fiscal year 1961, and which will provide opportunity for approximately 2 million employees and 2.4 million dependents to have reasonable protection against the cost of both basic and major health care. This program will add substantially to employee fringe benefits, which in the aggregate now compare very favorably with those provided to employees in private industry.

In 1958 immediately following enactment of a 10 percent general salary increase for Federal civilian employees, I propose to the Congress a review of all compensation systems in the three branches of the Federal Government, directed toward adoption of an equitable employee compensation policy. This recommendation was renewed in my budget message for the 1960 fiscal year.

It has been more than 30 years since a thoroughgoing review has been made of the manner in which the Federal Government compensates its employees. There are now dozens of pay plans in the executive branch alone. Review and coordination of the excessive number of pay plans now in existence are the most effective means of removing inequities which adversely affect the Government's ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel in some fields. Continued patching of individual Federal salary systems is not satisfactory as a substitute

for a comprehensive Federal pay policy, which should be developed either by authorizing a Joint Commission such as I proposed or by some other equally effective means. Pending development and adoption of such a comprehensive policy, a general pay raise would be unwarranted, unfair to the taxpayers of the United States, and inequitable as among employees compensated under different and unrelated pay systems.

The budget estimates for the Post Office Department assume legislative action to continue that part of the 1958 salary increase for postal field service employees which expires on January 20, 1961.

Civilian weather services: Appropriations totaling \$63 million are recommended for the fiscal year 1961 for the Weather Bureau. The \$12 million increase over the amounts enacted for 1960 will permit expanded research, weather observation, and forecasting services. These improvements are necessary primarily to keep pace with advances in air traffic controls. Research projects include intensive investigation of hurricanes and tornadoes, and the development of a semiautomatic system for the collection and analysis of weather data.

Hawaii: Our Union was greatly strengthened in 1959 by the admission of the States of Alaska and Hawaii. As in the case of Alaska, comprehensive legislation will be necessary to enable Hawaii to take its place as the equal of the other 49 States. Recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress concerning those changes needed in Federal laws in order to bring Hawaii under the same general laws, rules, and policies as are applicable to the other States.

Territories, possessions, and District of Columbia: Completion of action on statehood for Alaska and Hawaii makes it all the more urgent that legislation to provide home rule for the District of Columbia be enacted without delay. Both equity and efficiency require that the people of the Nation's Capital be given a voice in their own local government and that the role of the Federal Government be limited to matters of Federal concern.

Legislation will shortly be proposed to the Congress to establish a Government corporation to develop an improved mass transportation system in the National Capital metropolitan area, pending creation of an interstate agency to assume this responsibility.

To foster further development of democratic institutions and in keeping with the growth of local self-government, action should be taken to authorize the Virgin Islands and Guam to be represented in the Congress through nonvoting resident commissioners.

Intergovernmental relations: There are many problems requiring attention of the recently established Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Foremost among these are the problems of allocation of tax sources among various levels of government and rapid growth of metropolitan areas.

An aspect of intergovernmental relations requiring attention in both the legislative and executive branches involves

a series of court decisions permitting local taxation of federally owned property in the hands of contractors and leaseholders. This matter should be resolved in the context of the broader subject of Federal payments in lieu of taxes.

Other recommendations: Legislation enacted in the last session of Congress to amend the immigration and nationality laws failed to cover several significant proposals, including modification of the quota system. Prompt action is needed on these remaining items.

To strengthen the Government's hand in restraining inflationary forces, I urge that the Employment Act of 1946 be amended to make reasonable price stability an explicit goal of Federal economic policy, coordinate with the goals of maximum production, employment, and purchasing power now specified in that act.

I urge the Congress to enact the remaining six points of the civil rights program that I recommended last year. The Civil Rights Commission, extended for an additional 2 years by the last session of Congress, continues its important work and has developed additional constructive recommendations, particularly for protecting the right of every citizen to vote. I hope these recommendations will also be earnestly considered by the Congress.

I also recommend that the Congress create additional Federal judgeships, as proposed by the Judicial Conference, and strengthen Federal laws against organized crime.

Legislation will be submitted to increase the authorization for appropriations for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure in order that it may complete its work successfully.

It is important that legislation now before the Congress be enacted to provide reimbursement to Americans for certain property damage in Europe and the Far East during World War II for which compensation has not previously been authorized.

I again recommend that a system be devised for suitable recognition in the United States for distinguished achievement in various fields of endeavor.

IMPROVEMENTS IN BUDGETING, ORGANIZATION, AND MANAGEMENT

The decisions made by government are vital to so many aspects of our national life that improvements of the procedures through which these decisions are made should be a continuing major goal. A substantial number of important specific steps can and should be taken to improve these practices.

Revisions in authorization and appropriation procedure: Contract authority and authorizations to spend from debt receipts in basic legislation outside the appropriation process are generally inconsistent with sound standards of budget practice. The recommendations being placed before the Congress in this budget are based upon the principle that authority to make budget obligations and expenditures, whether financed from receipts or borrowing, should be granted by the Congress only in appropriation acts.

The Congress has shown a growing tendency to require the annual enactment of authorizing legislation before appropriations may be made. Space programs, some mutual security programs, military and atomic energy construction in this budget, and much of defense procurement beginning in fiscal 1962, will require separate authorizations before appropriations can be considered. Under this procedure these programs receive a duplicating review each year. At the same time the value of legislative consideration and expression of long-range program objectives and amounts is largely lost, and agency personnel devote an inordinate amount of time to the congressional process at the expense of effective administration of the continuing program. I hope the Congress will find it possible generally to make authorizing legislation cover program requirements for longer periods of time.

In the interest of good government, methods to expedite the authorization and appropriation processes should be found. In order to facilitate early consideration, and also to show the Government program more fully, this budget includes specific proposed appropriations for a number of programs for which authorizing legislation must also be renewed. In most of these cases, proposals for such legislation will be submitted in a very short time. This procedure should be an improvement over the past practice of delaying submission of detailed estimates until the renewing legislation has been enacted.

Before the executive budget is presented to Congress annually, the most careful consideration is given to the relationships of spending to receipts and borrowing, and to relative priorities of various programs. When the budget reaches the Congress, however, its consideration is usually fragmented because of the distribution of responsibilities among the various committees and subcommittees. I believe that the Congress should find means by which it can more effectively examine the budget as a whole and base its actions on the overall fiscal situation.

Provision for item veto: In passing the Alaska and Hawaii statehood acts, the Congress again recognized the value of an item veto by a chief executive by approving provision for its use in their State constitutions. Forty-one State Governors now have item veto authority. Many Presidents have recommended it, but the Congress has not yet granted the President of the United States that power. I again recommend it.

Control of foreign currencies: The Government receives from its operations considerable quantities of foreign currencies each year. Much of this currency is earmarked for grants to and loans in the country concerned, and some is available for programs of the U.S. Government. In many countries the currencies available to us are needed for conducting normal U.S. operations, yet such use is prevented in some cases by statutes or by the international agreements under which the currencies are received.

As a result of a detailed study, this budget includes provisions to bring under budget and appropriation controls all foreign currencies available for U.S. agency operations which are received from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. This change will not alter total appropriations or expenditures, but will increase those of the agencies using the currencies and decrease those of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Accordingly, I intend that no more allocations be made for uncontrolled use after the current fiscal year except for country grants and loans committed in international agreements, and I recommend that at an appropriate time the Congress remove from the laws the provisions which permit uncontrolled use for other purposes. I am also instructing that in future negotiations of international agreements we endeavor to avoid restrictions which would limit our ability to apply normal budget and appropriation controls to the use of those currencies which are earmarked for U.S. agency operations.

Improved funding for public enterprises: Major business-type activities of the Government should, with few exceptions, operate on a self-sustaining basis. Their budgets and accounts should permit ready comparison of their expenses and revenues. They should have simplicity in their financing structure and the flexibility in expenditures necessary to meet unforeseen business conditions, but should be expected to keep their obligations and expenditures within the resources provided by Congress for that purpose, and should be subject to annual review and control by the Congress. Accordingly, I recommend that the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, the power-marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the loan guarantee programs of the Veterans' Administration be financed through revolving funds. Similar recommendations may be made in due time for other business-type activities.

Legislation is again being recommended to bring under budget review the activities of those few Government corporations which are now exempt from such review, but possess authority to draw money from the Treasury or to commit the Treasury for future expenditures. This can best be done by including them under the budget provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act.

Revision of budget presentation: In this budget more than half of the 626 appropriation accounts of the executive branch have been presented on a cost basis. The remaining appropriations, including those for the Department of Defense, will be converted to this basis as soon as possible. This budget also provides for accrued expenditure limitations for 12 appropriations, in accordance with legislation enacted in 1958. Such limitations are recommended to permit closer congressional control over annual expenditures.

The customary totals of budget receipts and budget expenditures are dis-

torted by the inclusion in both of interest and other payments by public enterprise funds to the general fund of the Treasury. Such interfund payments amounted to \$355 million in the fiscal year 1959, and are estimated at \$737 million for 1960, and \$779 million for 1961. While this duplication does not affect the amount of the budget surplus or deficit, it does overstate the size of the budget receipts and expenditures. To correct this it is planned that such amounts, while still shown within the figures for the affected agencies, will be eliminated from budget totals in financial statements on Government operations beginning with the fiscal year 1961. I also plan to present the 1962 budget so as to remove this duplication. However, in order to preserve full comparability with previous budgets, no such adjustments are shown in the amounts in this document. If adjustments had been made, the net totals would appear as follows:

Adjusted budget totals, excluding interfund payments

[Fiscal years. In billions]

	1959 actual	1960 estimate	1961 estimate
Budget receipts.....	\$67.9	\$77.9	\$83.2
Budget expenditures.....	80.3	77.7	79.0
Budget deficit.....	12.4		
Budget surplus.....		.2	4.2

Strengthening of organization and management: From the beginning of this administration I have placed emphasis on obtaining the best possible executive ability in the administration of the widespread and diverse activities of the Federal Government and on providing the best organizational structure in which officials can carry out their responsibilities. This continued emphasis is essential not only to operate the complex machinery of government effectively, but also to meet the constant flow of new problems of organization and management.

In recent years several major organizational improvements have been made, including the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as new organizational structures for defense programs and for civilian and defense mobilization activities. The many actions taken on recommendations of the two Hoover Commissions have also resulted in more efficient administration.

The Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, under which numerous executive agencies and functions have been reorganized, contains a limitation of June 1, 1959, for the transmittal of reorganization plans by the President to the Congress. Accordingly, this authority is not now available. I urgently recommend that this cutoff date be removed in order to permit continued use of that act by me and by my successor in improving the management and organization of the executive branch.

The search for better management and operations is a never-ending process.

Like all large organizations, the Federal Government continues to have management problems. For example, property management offers an enormous challenge, and in the past year greater attention has been focused on it. Application of new data-processing techniques to Government operations is under constant study. The Post Office Department is improving its operations by installing modern methods of mail handling and transportation. The Treasury Department is using up-to-date data-processing equipment to achieve more effective administration of disbursements and revenue collection. These are but a few of many examples, and this budget provides for further improvements.

At my request, the heads of all Government agencies will give renewed emphasis to the review of management procedures and operating activities to make sure that the most modern methods, techniques, and equipment are in use. All agency heads have been encouraged to continue to search for the best practices in other Government agencies, in business, or in industry, to apply them in their own agencies to the extent possible during the term of this administration, and to leave to their successors a legacy of plans for further improvement.

The plans presented in this budget meet the Nation's immediate needs and will support continuing sound economic growth in the future. The achievement of these plans, however, will in the last analysis depend on the people themselves.

I believe our people have the determination to hold expenditures in check, to pay their own way without borrowing from their children, to choose wisely among priorities, and to match sound public policy with private initiative. It is that determination which is the key to continued progress and sound growth with security. It is that determination which reinforces the recommendations I have made.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 18, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, never before has the United States faced such odds as it faces today—both at home and abroad. Abroad we are menaced by an implacable totalitarian power with superior armament, and the imperative necessity of demonstrating conclusively in the near future its control of international affairs. At home we are carrying the greatest debt ever contracted by any nation in the world's history, with rapidly deteriorating credit and the imminent necessity of reversing that trend not later than this Congress.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to one of the most optimistic budget recommendations ever transmitted to the House within my recollection.

The outstanding feature of this budget is the most satisfying assurance that could be given—the promise not only of a balanced budget but the prospect of a surplus of \$4.2 billion at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, to be applied to a reduction of the public debt.

The most disappointing feature of the budget is that it promises to accumulate this surplus through tentative increases in the national revenues and not through reduction of national expenditures. Throughout the lengthy document there is no mention of the word "retrenchment." In fact, the Bureau of the Budget recommends the largest recurring expenditures since the administration of George Washington. It is proposed to exceed current year expenditures by \$1.4 billion. It also includes the largest amount ever spent for interest on our staggering national debt. But it offers not one scintilla of hope of reduced taxation. As a matter of fact, it proposes another extension of wartime taxes in time of peace and in addition the imposition of new taxes not heretofore levied.

At the close of every other war the Government has promptly repealed war taxes. The Korean war ended 7 years ago but this budget still asks the continuation of wartime taxes and new taxes not heretofore imposed, including the irksome nuisance taxes which have so clogged the channels of trade for the past 10 years.

In short, this budget proposes to take from the people \$84 billion, the highest take in any year, peace or war, since the foundation of the Republic.

CONTINGENCIES SURROUNDING \$4.2 BILLION SURPLUS

Even with this unprecedented tax draft upon the taxpayers of the country, there is serious reason to doubt the fulfillment of the promise of any surplus whatsoever, much less a surplus of \$4,200 million. We have learned by sad experience that no prediction of a budget surplus can be taken at face value, and certainly that is true of this budget.

You will recall that in the annual budget submitted to Congress for 1959 we were promised a balanced budget and a small surplus, and we wound up at the close of that year, ending last June 30, with a backbreaking deficit of more than \$12 billion.

The estimates both of revenues of \$84 billion and expenditures of \$79.8 billion rest on a number of assumptions and highly doubtful contingencies. Revenues totaling \$84 billion in the coming year 1961 would involve an increase of \$15.7 billion over collections in fiscal 1959, or an increase of 23 percent between these 2 years. The recordbreaking \$84 billion tax take expected in this budget rests on a rosy outlook predicated on great national prosperity and large profits—with inflated dollars. It assumes the enactment of legislation raising postal income by some \$554 million, a proposal emphatically rejected by this Congress in the last session. It assumes the extension of Korean wartime taxes. It proposes new taxes. In all, of the six budgets previously submitted by the Bureau of the Budget during this administration,

the original spending estimates were exceeded, as shown by the following tabulation:

Variations in Spending
(In billions)

Budget	President's original budget estimate	Actual result	Over (+) or under (-), original estimate
1960 budget (latest estimate).....	\$77.0	\$78.4	+\$1.4
1959 budget.....	73.9	80.7	+6.8
1958 budget.....	71.8	71.9	+1
1957 budget.....	65.9	69.4	+3.5
1956 budget.....	62.4	66.5	+4.1
1955 budget.....	65.6	64.6	-1.0

¹ Revised estimate, as shown in 1961 budget.

NOTE.—Figures represent "net budget expenditures" as used in the budget.

Similarly, there have been wide variations in revenue results contrasted to original budget estimates. The following table of official figures shows that situation:

Variations in Revenues
(In billions)

Budget	President's original budget estimate	Actual result	Over (+) or under (-), original estimate
1960 budget (latest estimate).....	\$77.1	\$78.6	+\$1.5
1959 budget.....	74.4	68.3	-6.1
1958 budget.....	73.6	69.1	-4.5
1957 budget.....	66.3	71.0	+4.7
1956 budget.....	60.0	68.1	+8.1
1955 budget.....	62.6	60.4	-2.2

¹ Revised estimate, as shown in 1961 budget.

NOTE.—Figures represent "net budget receipts" as used in the budget.

And in addition, original budget estimates of deficits and surpluses matched against actual results affords comparisons much in point to the \$4.2 billion surplus figure. The following table shows how far and how often the mark has been missed in the last 6 years:

Variations in deficit and surplus estimates under the present administration
(In billions)

Budget	President's original budget estimate	Actual result
1954 budget.....	(¹)	-\$3.1
1955 budget.....	-\$2.9	-4.2
1956 budget.....	-2.4	+1.6
1957 budget.....	+1.4	+1.6
1958 budget.....	+1.8	-2.8
1959 budget.....	+1.5	-12.4
1960 budget.....	+1	+2
Total for last 6 years.....	-2.5	-16.0
1961 budget estimate.....	+4.2	

¹ Submitted by previous administration but revised and administered by present administration.

² Latest official estimate (in 1961 budget).

NOTE.—Highway trust fund which began with fiscal 1957, not included.

There is no arresting assurance that we can realize these highly desirable predictions this year with any more accuracy than we did last year. Inevitably, the collector, the tax gatherer, working diligently around the clock, bringing in larger and larger amounts, collecting from the taxpayers of the country larger national revenues than were ever en-

joyed by any nation since the beginning of time—the busy tax collector has not been able to keep up with the spenders in the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

As a result, today we are saddled with the largest national debt that ever kindled the fires of inflation; that ever increased the cost of living; that ever debased the currency; that ever limited business expansion; that ever curtailed employment; that ever imperiled national defense in this or any other country.

WHO PREPARES RECORDBREAKING BUDGETS?

All fiscal recommendations start with the President. Congress does not make the budget. The President makes it. It includes only what he recommends. He is directed by law to make such tax, spending, and appropriation recommendations as in his judgment are necessary. The President is in complete command. He is not required to submit his recommendations to anyone before including them in the budget. He is by law completely free to recommend cuts in appropriations of any magnitude and revisions of basic legislation to correspond.

They do not have to recommend more and more spending—as in this budget and as in past budgets.

They do not have to urge extension of war tax rates in time of peace—as in this budget and in every budget.

They do not have to recommend new taxes and new revenues—as in this budget and in past budgets.

So, Mr. Speaker, when the administration talks economy, hope of tax relief, the practice of self-restraint in expenditure, and holding the line on the cost of living—when they talk this but submit record budgets, that is the executive branch of the Government and not the legislative branch of the Government.

Some features of this budget do not comport with the goals announced in this and past messages. And this final effective budget from the President discloses beyond all challenge that this administration, after 8 years in office, has not accomplished a single one of the laudable objectives promised in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns.

The message calls for restraint in expenditure but the budget proposes to spend \$1.4 billion more than this year. It was only a little over a year ago that the President declared war on excessive spending. He was quoted this way:

I think every place we are spending too much money * * * We must start right from the biggest and go right down to the smallest.

He decried what he termed "loose handling of our fiscal affairs." But the budget submitted shortly thereafter proposed to spend more. And it also proposed increased appropriations, both large and small.

You remember the bristling vetoes of last year's public works appropriations and the castigation of the number of new project starts especially because of their long-range expenditure effect. But we find this budget advocating new project starts that will call for even more spend-

ing in the future. In fact, it proposes 42 new starts requiring \$38 million in 1961 and a total commitment of \$500 million over a period of years. This budget was being formulated at the time Congress was being advised in a veto message concerning new starts that

This tremendous expansion in Government expenditures in just this one area in so short a period of time brings into sharp focus how Congress by action in one year builds increases into the Federal budget in future years. * * * This illustrates how easily effective control of Federal spending can be lost.

Overspending in respect to water resources is hurtful to the United States and to the proper development of these resources themselves. The American people are opposed to overspending no matter where it is attempted.

It is almost inconceivable that the sins of the Congress in the last session can be made virtues of the executive branch in just 5 months.

I include a summary of budget receipts, expenditures, and surpluses or deficits for the 8 fiscal years 1954-61.

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (-) or surplus (+), 8 fiscal years, 1954-61
(In billions)

Fiscal year	Net receipts	Net expenditures	Deficit (-) or surplus (+)
1. Fiscal 1954 (from July 1953).....	\$64.7	\$67.8	-\$3.1
2. Fiscal 1955.....	60.4	64.6	-4.2
3. Fiscal 1956.....	68.1	66.5	+1.6
4. Fiscal 1957:			
(a) Including highway trust fund.....	72.5	70.3	+2.2
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget.....	71.0	69.4	+1.6
5. Fiscal 1958:			
(a) Including highway trust fund.....	71.2	73.5	-2.3
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget.....	60.1	71.9	-2.8
6. Fiscal 1959:			
(a) Including highway trust fund.....	70.4	83.4	-13.0
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget.....	68.3	80.7	-12.4
7. Fiscal 1960 (revised estimates in 1961 budget):			
(a) Including highway trust fund.....	81.2	81.5	-.3
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget.....	78.6	78.4	+.2
8. Fiscal 1961 (budget estimates):			
(a) Including highway trust fund.....	86.9	82.7	+4.2
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget.....	84.0	79.8	+4.2
Total, all 8 years:			
(a) Including highway trust fund.....	575.4	590.3	-14.9
(b) Excluding highway fund as per budget.....	564.2	579.1	-14.9

¹ Includes \$378,000,000 from supplementals proposed to be submitted.

² Including revenues from proposed legislation (continuation of certain excise taxes; certain new fuel taxes, etc.)

³ Among other things, assumes enactment of additional \$554,000,000 in postal revenue.

THE PUBLIC DEBT AND INTEREST COSTS

As shown by the pending budget, the national debt this coming June the 30th is estimated at \$284,500 million. Granting that it will be no more than that—and that is an unknown—even that figure represents an increase of \$18,400 million during the first 7 fiscal years

under this administration. The debt stood at \$266,100 million when this administration assumed full control and responsibility in June of 1953.

This is the record.

Our debt today is far above the highest of the World War II debts. It is \$29 billion above the postwar low-water mark. On the first day of this month, the national debt stood at \$290,924,917,717.63. That represents a mortgage of \$1,623.04 against every man, woman, and child in America today.

The President has transmitted to the Congress six straight requests to raise the old statutory \$275 billion debt ceiling. In consequence, the temporary ceiling is today, \$295 billion. The permanent ceiling is \$285 billion.

Now the administration, in this budget, has asked for another extension for next year. Failure to control spending while collecting the highest revenues of all time has forced step by step, piece by piece, and year by year the conversion of the so-called temporary ceilings of earlier years to a permanent status. Even the once restraining influence of the debt ceiling has now gone by the board.

But, Mr. Speaker, the greatest evil attending the flowering and fruition of this astronomical debt is the high jacking of the rate of interest, the carrying charge on the debt, and the influence it has had on American business, individual, and corporate. Formerly, and for years, especially in time of peace, the Government was able to borrow money at less than 2 percent—perhaps a fraction above or a fraction below—and the bond issues of the Government were always oversubscribed.

The public debt—8 fiscal years

[In billions]

1. Actual increase, 6 fiscal years (1954-59):	
July 1953.....	\$266.1
July 1959.....	284.7
Increase in the 6 years.....	+18.6
2. Current budget estimate of change during current fiscal year 1960 (July 1959 to July 1960—from \$284.7 to \$284.5).....	-0.2
3. Estimated increase in the 7 years.....	+18.4
4. Budget estimate of change during fiscal year 1961 (July 1960 to July 1961—from \$284.5 to \$280).....	-4.5
5. Total budget estimate of increase for the 8 years, July 1953 to July 1961.....	+13.9

NOTE.—Old statutory limit of \$275 billion raised as follows:

- For fiscal 1955 by \$6 billion (temporary).
- For fiscal 1956 by \$6 billion (temporary).
- For fiscal 1957 by \$3 billion (temporary).
- For fiscal 1958 by \$5 billion (temporary).
- For fiscal 1959 by \$8 billion (permanently to \$283 billion); \$5 billion (temporarily to \$288 billion).
- For fiscal 1960 by \$10 billion (permanently to \$285 billion); \$10 billion (temporarily to \$295 billion).

NOTE.—Budget message for 1961 indicates request will be made later in session for a temporary increase for 1961 beyond the permanent ceiling of \$285 billion (amount unspecified, but something less than \$10 billion in force during fiscal 1960).

Interest on the public debt

1. The debt:	<i>Billion</i>
June 30, 1959.....	\$284.7
June 30, 1960 (estimated).....	284.5
June 30, 1961 (estimated).....	280.0
2. Interest on the debt:	<i>Million</i>
Fiscal 1959.....	\$7,592
Fiscal 1960 (current estimate).....	9,300
(Increase of \$1,700 million, fiscal 1960 over fiscal 1959.)	
Fiscal 1961 (current estimate).....	9,500
(Increase of \$200 million, fiscal 1961 over fiscal 1960, although debt is estimated to drop by some \$4.5 billions.)	
3. In the current fiscal year 1960, interest on the debt averages \$25,479,400 every day, \$1,081,000 every hour, \$17,690 every minute.	
4. In the current fiscal 1960, interest on the debt exceeds interest cost for fiscal 1959 by \$4,657,000 every day, \$194,000 every hour, \$3,230 every minute.	
5. In fiscal year 1961, interest on the debt is estimated to average \$26,027,300 every day, \$1,084,400 every hour, \$18,000 every minute.	

Now, due to the fact that we have spent and spent and overspent our income, it has been necessary to raise the interest on Government bonds, in order to make them sufficiently attractive to the buyer. Today we are paying in excess of 5 percent for short-term loans. Treasury notes of 6 months or a year, for money which we formerly borrowed for less than 1 percent. It has never happened before in time of peace.

This situation could have been avoided if even in the last fiscal year the administration had recommended and Congress in response to that recommendation, had spent \$12 billion less than the revenues instead of \$12 billion more than the revenues

With the \$12 billion cash in hand we would have paid it on the national debt, the cost of living would have dropped, the dollar would have been stabilized, business would have continued to expand, inflation would have faded and our bonds would have again been marketable at far less than present high rates.

But the sky was the limit and the budget recommended and Congress obligingly spent \$12 billion more than we took in. We were living high on the hog and we spent \$12 billion more than our income. We whistled for the grizzly and the grizzly came. Every month, in an effort to sell that \$12½ billion we spent above revenue, every month more savings bonds were cashed than were sold. The public did not want them. Our credit was slipping. Exports were dropping. Imports were increasing. The balance of trade was heavily against us. Investors abroad were alerted. Foreign creditors, alarmed at our improvidence, began to demand gold. Assurances by Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, have checked only temporarily the demand of foreign creditors for gold. Unless the administration and the Congress can, in the few remaining months of this fiscal year, restore the confidence of the world in the ability of the United States to manage its financial affairs in keeping with accepted business principles, our gold reserves will shortly drop below our

bank requirements. Unheard of. Undreamed of. Incredible.

But if the Government were the only one to suffer from the effects of this spending debauch that would be bad enough. But the Government is the least of the victims. When you raise the cost of money above 5 percent to the Government, you raise the cost of money—the rate of interest—to every borrower in the United States. And you particularly raise the interest, the cost of borrowing and the opportunity to borrow to those who are least able to pay exorbitant interest. The Government has been lending money for many activities at reasonable rates of interest. But if the Government must pay 5½ percent for short time loans, it cannot lend money for housing, for contractors or builders or workmen or for people who need homes, at a rate they can afford to pay.

Banks and loan associations cannot lend money at 4 or 4½ percent when the Government itself must pay 5½ percent.

One of the greatest beneficiaries of President Roosevelt's wise provisions for credit is the farmer—the farmers in my State and the farmers in your State.

He authorized the now familiar production credit associations to whom he lent money at 3½ percent permitting them to lend it to the farmer for 4½ percent, retaining the extra cent for amortization of their debt to the Government. Farmers who must have capital for crop production but who cannot borrow a cent from any bank, can come to the Production Credit Association and get the money they need at a low rate of interest. These associations are managed by the farmers themselves and have proven remarkably successful. They are operating in every county in my district and in the last 10 years have not lost a dollar. Every loan has been repaid with interest. Bankers who formerly opposed them now approve them because farmers to whom they could not lend have now prospered to the point where they carry substantial bank accounts.

But the Production Credit Associations have received notice that beginning the first of the month interest will be advanced to 7 percent, due to the fact that the Government must pay 5½ percent itself and can no longer lend the money at 3½ percent.

So the farmer's interest goes up to 7 percent. And the farmer, the man who works longest and hardest and receives the lowest pay for his labor and the lowest return on his investment, whose wife and children work with him, who is today receiving the lowest price for his product, and who must pay all of these increased costs of operation, machinery, fertilizer, insecticides, and every other cost of production—the farmer who is getting less all the time and paying more all the time—who is least able to pay—must pay 7 percent for his money. Why? Because this administration and this Congress spent \$12,500 million more than we took in.

In the same category we have the GI loans under which the veteran is to receive money at 5½ percent. But when the Government must itself pay 5½ percent the money sources are dried up and

no one will lend the veteran money which was available to all as long as a prudent operation of Government finances kept governments down to 2 percent.

Likewise the FHA, created to lend money at 5½ percent and under which loans were freely made at that rate, a rate profitable to the Government and the borrower alike, is now wholly unworkable because the Government required to pay 5½ percent interest in the money market cannot relend it at the statutory rate of 5¼ percent.

Numerous other instances indicate faintly the widespread disaster resulting from high rates of interest which the mismanagement of Government finances has brought about.

There seems to be a general impression that money does not cost the Government anything. But the interest alone on the national debt for fiscal 1960, as represented in this budget, is \$9,300 million. Every year the Federal Government must pay \$9,300 million merely for interest, and with nothing to show for it at the end of the year. Only 20 years ago we operated the entire Government on a good deal less than that. Not only does this budget call for \$9,300 million in interest for 1960, but the President tells us that next year—fiscal 1961—it will be \$9,500 million. That is 12 cents out of every dollar of budget spending.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wonder if the gentleman would approve of a request for an extension of time. The gentleman's time is approaching at the end of his speech, and I note there are Members here who wish to comment on his speech. If I should propound a request for a 15-minute extension of time for the gentleman, would he approve?

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad to have the time to yield to other Members.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 15 minutes, in order that some points of his speech might be commented upon and questioned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to advise the gentleman from California that there are other special orders pending immediately at the conclusion of the time allotted to the gentleman from Missouri. However, if the gentlemen who have the special orders have no objection, I can entertain a unanimous-consent request. Is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] here?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 10 minutes immediately following the speech by the gentleman from Missouri. Would the gentleman from California be willing to incorporate that in his request?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I revise my request that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], be allowed to follow the gentleman from Missouri for 10 minutes, immediately thereafter, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman withhold his request? I see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], is here. There has been a request for an extension of time. Does the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from Wisconsin have any objection?

Mr. COLLIER. No objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted, 15 minutes for the gentleman from Missouri and 10 minutes for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the 15 minutes for the gentleman from Missouri come after the gentleman from New York uses his 10 minutes?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then, my original request stands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri will be recognized for an additional 15 minutes, and immediately after that the gentleman from New York will be recognized for 10 minutes.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, heavy defense outlays in recent years has tended to obscure the genesis of these inflationary deficit budgets. The impression persists that they have come primarily from the necessity of heavy defense spending. That is not so. It is the nondefense items that have unbalanced recent budgets, as the following official data unerringly discloses:

Net budget expenditures—Defense and nondefense (8 fiscal years 1954-61)

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Major national security		All other programs		Total net expenditures	
	Defense-military	Total	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year).....	\$43.6	\$50.4	\$23.9	\$23.9	\$74.3	\$74.3
Fiscal 1954.....	40.3	46.9	20.9	20.9	67.8	67.8
Fiscal 1955.....	35.5	40.6	24.0	24.0	64.6	64.6
Fiscal 1956.....	35.8	40.6	25.9	25.9	66.5	66.5
Fiscal 1957.....	38.4	43.3	26.1	27.0	69.4	70.3
Fiscal 1958.....	39.1	44.1	27.8	29.4	71.9	73.5
Fiscal 1959.....	41.2	46.4	34.3	37.0	80.7	83.4
Fiscal 1960 (latest estimates from 1961 budget document).....	40.9	45.6	32.8	35.9	78.4	81.5
Fiscal 1961 (budget estimates).....	41.0	45.6	34.2	37.1	79.8	82.7
Comparisons:						
a. 1961 budget compared with last war year (1953).....	-2.6	-4.8	+10.3	+13.2	+5.5	+4.4
b. 1961 compared with 1st year of present administration (1954).....	+7	-1.3	+13.3	+16.2	+12.0	+14.9
c. 1961 compared with 1st year showing surplus under present administration (1956).....	+5.2	+5.0	+8.3	+11.2	+13.3	+16.2
d. 1961 compared with last completed year (1959).....	-2	-8	-1	+1	-9	-7
e. 1961 compared with current 1960 estimate.....	+1	-----	+1.4	+1.2	+1.4	+1.2

¹ Includes \$378,000,000 estimated to be expended from anticipated 1960 fiscal supplementals, also estimated at \$1,125,000,000 (all but \$23,000,000 of the \$378,000,000 is for nondefense).

² Represents increase of 11 percent over war year of 1953.

³ Represents increase of 63 percent over 1st year of 1954.

⁴ Represents increase of 77 percent over 1st year of 1954.

NOTE.—Highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

As will be noted, the entire increase of \$1.4 billion in spending in this 1961 budget compared to the year 1960 is allotted to nondefense items. The national security total remains unchanged.

For nondefense, this budget for 1961 proposes spending \$13.3 billion, or 63 percent more than fiscal 1954, the first year of the present administration. Including the highway item, it is up \$16.2 billion, an increase of 77 percent.

On the other hand, defense spending for 1961 in this budget is \$1.3 billion below the 1954 total. And it is unchanged from the current year.

The record is plain. Nondefense spending has far outstripped defense spending. And it has come at the urging of the administration in a succession of record-breaking budgets.

Before it is too late—if it is not already too late, before the value of the dollar plummets still further, we must

reverse this relentless trend to ever-increasing expenditure.

This budget is too high. It is inflationary. We must cut it. Nothing within the power of men to alter should logically be regarded as beyond reach of the knife. We should probe deeply into every item. We must dispense with every nonessential. And that includes the defense budgets. It is not so much a question of what we spend for defense as it is what we spend it for. We must dispense with outmoded, obsolete, obsolescent weapons and systems. We are long past the point where we can afford the luxury of adherence to business as usual.

NEW AUTHORITY TO OBLIGATE THE GOVERNMENT

The amount of authority to obligate the Government, either enacted or requested, is the most consistently accurate yardstick by which to measure future spending. That comes first. Spending follows. The President recom-

mends \$79.4 billion of new obligating authority in this budget for 1961. With

the highway fund, the requests total \$82.6 billion.

I include a table for the 8 years 1954-61:

Appropriations and other forms of authority to obligate the Government ("New obligational authority")

[A rearrangement of budget table 7 with certain additions]

[In billions of dollars]

Type of authority	Enacted, 1954	Enacted, 1955	Enacted, 1956	Enacted, 1957	Enacted, 1958	Enacted, 1959	1960		1961 (total proposed)	1961 compared with—	
							Already enacted	Total proposed		1960 enacted	1960 total proposed
1. Appropriations:											
(a) Annual	51.8	45.8	50.8	58.9	61.9	67.7	66.5	67.6	68.6	+2.1	+1.0
(b) Permanent (annual action not required)	6.8	6.8	7.4	7.8	8.1	8.1	9.9	9.9	10.2	+3	+3
Total, appropriations	58.6	52.6	58.2	66.7	70.0	75.8	76.4	77.5	78.8	+2.4	+1.3
2. Public debt receipt authority	3.6	3.0	3.1	3.2	5.7	5.4	1.7	1.7	.5	-1.2	-1.2
3. Contract authority	.9	1.0	2.4	.3	.5	.4	.6	.6	.4	-2	-2
4. Reappropriation of prior funds	.4	1.2	.4	.1	.2	.1	.2	.2	.1	-1	-1
Total, all forms of authority	63.5	57.8	64.1	70.3	78.4	81.7	78.9	80.0	79.8	+9	-2
5. Deduct appropriations to liquidate contract authority previously granted	-.7	-.7	-.9	-.1	-.1	-.3	-.3	-.3	-.4	+1	+1
Net new obligating authority per budget	62.8	57.1	63.2	70.2	78.3	81.4	78.6	79.7	79.4	+8	-3
6. Add highway trust fund for proper comparison with years prior to 1957:											
(a) New contract authority				2.6	3.6	3.4	2.9	2.9	3.1	+2	+2
(b) Tax refunds and interest on general fund advances					.1	.1	.1	.1	.1		
Grand total	62.8	57.1	63.2	72.8	80.0	84.9	81.6	82.7	82.6	+1.0	-1

¹ The budgets for 1959 and 1960 recommended several large supplementals for the respective immediately preceding fiscal years (1958 and 1959) which normally should have been carried in the regular bills for the ensuing year or were otherwise unusual or special items which tend to distort comparisons between years.

² Includes \$900,000,000 under proposed legislation.

HAVE LIVING COSTS BEEN REDUCED?

Mr. Speaker, the inevitable result of these recordbreaking budgets and deficits has been a steady upward march in the cost of living. This was also among the things they promised to halt. But they have failed in that also. The cost of living keeps skyrocketing as the dollar plunges in value. The official index hit a new high water mark last November—and that was merely topping record highs reached in five of the preceding 6 months. The dollar is now worth only 47.3 cents.

Life savings have been eroded; money accumulated for old age is being dissipated; pensions and allowances won't do what they were intended to do; wages buy less and less; every morning it costs more to set the breakfast table.

And it is all because we have spent for non-defense purposes money we did not have—money we had to borrow—for things we could get along without. And it has been done at the urging of the administration in these budgets. As conclusively shown, they asked for more and more.

Here is the official data in support:

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar

YEARS	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar ¹ (calendar year 1939=100)
	All items	Foods	
1939	59.4	47.1	100.0
1940	59.9	47.8	99.2
1941	62.9	52.2	94.4
1942	69.7	61.3	85.2
1943	74.0	68.3	80.3
1944	75.2	67.4	79.0
1945	76.9	68.9	77.2

¹ As measured by the BLS Consumer Price Index.
² New record high.

Consumer Price Index and purchasing power of the dollar—Continued

	Consumer Price Index (1947-49=100)		Purchasing power of the dollar (calendar year 1939=100)
	All items	Foods	
1946	83.4	79.0	71.2
1947	95.5	95.9	62.2
1948	102.8	104.1	57.8
1949	101.8	100.0	58.3
1950	102.8	101.2	57.8
1951	111.0	112.6	53.5
1952	113.5	114.6	52.3
1953	114.4	112.8	51.9
1954	114.8	112.6	51.7
1955	114.5	110.9	51.9
1956	116.2	111.7	51.1
1957	120.2	115.4	49.4
1958	123.5	120.3	48.1
SELECTED MONTHS			
1946—June	79.8	72.1	74.4
1950—June	101.8	100.5	58.3
1952—December	114.1	113.8	52.1
1953—January	113.9	113.1	52.2
1954—January	115.2	113.1	51.6
1955—January	114.3	110.6	52.0
1956—January	114.6	109.2	51.8
1957—January	118.2	112.8	50.3
1958—January	122.3	118.2	48.6
April	123.5	121.6	48.1
July	123.9	121.7	47.9
August	123.7	120.7	48.0
September	123.7	120.3	48.0
October	123.7	119.7	48.0
November	123.9	119.4	47.9
December	123.7	118.7	48.0
1959—January	123.8	119.0	48.0
February	123.7	118.2	48.0
March	123.7	117.7	48.0
April	123.9	117.6	47.9
May	124.0	117.7	47.9
June	124.5	118.9	47.7
July	124.9	119.4	47.6
August	124.8	118.3	47.6
September	125.2	118.7	47.4
October	125.5	118.4	47.3
November	125.6	117.9	47.3

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, debt analysis staff, Dec. 22, 1959.

SEVEN-YEAR COMPARATIVE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, it is timely to submit a comparative accounting of the condition

of Treasury finances administered during the 7 years thus far under the present administration, fiscal year 1954 through the present fiscal year 1960—with the immediately preceding 7 years of fiscals 1947 through 1953 under the previous administration. The figures for the current fiscal year 1960 are still tentative since there are 5 more months to go, but they are probably close enough to the mark to suffice for such comparison. In 3 of the 7 years under the previous administration we were at war in Korea.

Budget revenues during the present administration exceed the previous administration by \$150.9 billion. They have taken more taxes from the people.

Budget expenditures under the present administration exceed expenditures under the previous administration by \$164.3 billion. They have spent more, and as documented, mostly for non-defense purposes.

The cumulative net deficit under the present administration is \$19.1 billion. They have not lived within income. Under the previous administration, it was only \$5.7 billion, including the 3 war years in Korea. Eliminating the war years, there was a surplus, not a deficit.

As to the public debt, up to this coming June 30, the debt under the present administration has increased by \$18.4 billion, whereas under the previous administration in 7 years it was reduced by \$3.3 billion. In the 4 peacetime years, 1947-50, it was reduced by \$12 billion. But even with the Korean war years, the previous administration reduced it. In the last 7 years bigger and bigger debts have been saddled on generations yet unborn.

The following 7-year comparisons are submitted in substantiation:

7-year comparative figures on income spending, deficits or surpluses, and debt changes

[In billions of dollars]

7-year tax take, net budget receipts:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954-60)-----	480.2
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947-53)-----	329.3
Present administration over previous-----	+150.9
7-year outgo, net budget expenditures:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954-60)-----	499.3
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947-53)-----	335.0
Present administration over previous-----	+164.3
7-year deficits:	
Under present administration (fiscals 1954-60, all peacetime years)-----	-19.1
Under previous administration (fiscals 1947-53, of which 1951- 53 were war years in Korea)-----	-5.7
Present administration over previous-----	+13.4
7-year changes in Federal public debt:	
Under present administration (July 1953 to July 1960—from \$266.1 billion to \$284.5 billion)-----	+18.4
Under previous administration (July 1946 to July 1953—from \$269.4 billion to \$266.1 billion)-----	-3.3
Present administration over previous-----	+21.7

¹The net deficit during the Korean war years, fiscals 1951-53, was \$9.9 billion. Thus the 4 peacetime years, fiscals 1947-50, showed a net surplus of \$4.2 billions.

Notes: For simplicity here and so as to tie directly to official "budget" figures, amounts applicable to the Highway Trust Fund for fiscals 1957-60 have been omitted.

Amounts included for fiscal 1960, ending June 30, 1960, are estimated as shown in 1961 budget.

THE RUSSIAN DANGER

Mr. Speaker, the situation is even more desperate than this.

We have witnessed in the last decade one of the most remarkable developments in history; a nation just emerging from barbarism, a nation which had never won a war in all its history has, in the last decade become the reatcst military power in the world today. They have greater manpower, more modern weapons; have attained greater scientific accomplishments; have extended control over a majority of the peoples of two continents. And they have indicated that they cannot live in the same world with our form of government and our system of finance.

They make no secret of the fact that they expect to control the world.

Ten years ago they were not only a backward people, a people without previous cultural training or scientific attainments, their entire land was devastated and impoverished by the ravages of war. The German Army, perhaps the greatest army ever mobilized, had ravaged their country to the very gates of

their capital. They did not leave a bridge, a railroad, a building. They stripped the country clean of food, factories, supplies, and foundation herds. On this side at the close of the war not a single bridge was out of place, not a brick upon any chimney top had been disturbed, not a single railroad rail had been moved. We continued business as usual. We were the greatest scientific nation in the world. And still, incredible as it may seem, they have completely outclassed us, completely outdistanced us in scientific achievements.

Down at the Pentagon they waved away any apprehensions about the future. "Oh," they said, "we can destroy any nation that attacks us." They said the Russians have nothing; do not have to be taken into consideration. They have no mechanical genius. It was not until the Russians presented indisputable evidence, until they put into orbit the first artificial satellite in the history of science that we realized our danger.

Today it is universally conceded that we are 4 years behind them in vital military weapons. It will take 3 or 4 years for us to overtake them, but of course the Russians will not play fair, they will not stand still while we are catching up with them. They will keep going. Perhaps by the end of the 4 years they will then be 8 years ahead of us; at least we have no convincing reason to believe otherwise.

The great need of our Defense Department, the great need for national defense, is money. This \$12 billions we spent above our revenue last year was not spent for war purposes, it was not spent to arm our defense forces, it was not spent to develop missiles or nuclear submarines, it was spent for nondefense purposes. But if the Russians come over it will not avail us much when instant annihilation strikes our centers of population, mobilization, communication, and production.

So, Mr. Speaker, because I want to leave some time for the distinguished gentleman from California, let me earnestly recommend that in this session of Congress, not for the sake of victory, but for the sake of bare survival we keep this budget within the national income.

There is no second place in a world in which Russia is first.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and accepting additional time because, in my opinion, he has made the most important speech on the budget and the rapidly accelerating interest rate problem that has been made in this Congress for many years. The gentleman is eminently qualified from his long years of experience as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to do this particular job which he has done today. I am sure his words will be read far and wide, and probably be reprinted in some of the financial journals of our Nation.

The gentleman has stressed two points, the budget and the interest rate. I want to point out that in the 7 years immediately following the war the average annual budget had an interest rate

of 2.38 percent. During the war, when we averaged a \$52 billion deficit every year for 4 years, we increased from 1940 to 1945 from a \$43 billion national debt to a \$258 billion national debt. Yet, the debt management under the Roosevelt-Truman administration kept the interest rate at 2.38 percent or an average of 2.38 percent notwithstanding this tremendous deficit. In the 7 past years, under the Eisenhower administration, our debt has gone up. The gentleman gave the figure of around \$18 billion. The figures show that in 1953 the debt was \$266 billion and the estimated debt this year is \$284 billion, which would give the \$18 billion debt increase for those 7 years. This is a little less than \$3 billion a year deficit. Yet, the interest rate in that period of time has gone up 60 percent. It is costing 60 percent more on the debt cost. The cost of money, that is, the interest rates, rose under the Eisenhower administration's 7 years from 2.20 percent average in 1953 to 4.25 percent in 1960 on long-term Government bonds or an increase of almost 100 percent and we paid to 5.36 percent in 1960 on short-term notes and bills or an increase of 150 percent. So I believe the gentleman will probably concur in this remark that debt management has a great deal to do with interest rates. Is that not true?

Mr. CANNON. Unquestionably.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I hold in my hand a document known as Document No. 67, which is entitled "Congressional Action on the Presidential Requests for Appropriations and New Obligational Authority," put out by a committee in the other body in which it shows that in the last session, the Congress appropriated \$1,881,410,093 less than requested in the budget estimates of the President. Is the gentleman aware of those figures?

Mr. CANNON. The figures are a matter of record.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And in new obligational authority, we have heard a great deal about the backdoor financing method in new obligational authority, the so-called backdoor financing, there has been asked a total of \$81,227,609,151 and the Congress has granted \$79,428,598,352 or \$2,580,410,093 less than the administration has asked in the so-called "backdoor financing." I think the gentleman will agree that the charge against the Democratic Party that has been in control of the Congress, is unfounded in the light of these figures. If these figures are not right, I would like to have the gentleman or someone at the proper time prove that they are not correct.

Mr. CANNON. The figures speak for themselves.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House, if the gentleman will allow me just 1 more moment to do so, to present January 17 issue of the U.S. News. He will find on pages 50 and 51 an item on this interest proposition which would be of great value to read. It takes different booms and depressions and it points out in every instance prior to a depression there was a series of interest rate raises

as a result of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department actions. This holds true in the depression of 1919-20, 1928-29, 1936-37, 1948, 1952-53, 1955, and in 1957, and it also says that, during the boom of 1958-60, the discount rate already has been raised five times and that another hike is likely. Interest rates are the highest they have been in a generation.

In view of the record which is portrayed of depression which occurred immediately after a series of tight money methods on the part of the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department, are we not justified in expecting another depression such as followed the other, unless this is corrected?

Mr. CANNON. As far as I am aware, there is not a national magazine, or a metropolitan newspaper which does not disapprove of Government deficits, which does not urge upon the President and upon the Congress a retrenchment of expenditures, down to the point where we will live within our income.

I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am just going to go into a few things that I think ought to be called to the attention of the House.

Just before I came to the floor I looked at the current Treasury statement issued on the 12th day of January, and it showed, making adjustment for the 12 days, that the expenditures of the Government during the period from July 1, 1959, to December 31, 1959, increased just about \$1 billion. The receipts of the Government in that same period increased a little over \$6 billion.

In view of the fact that the trend is that way and we have a prospect of better revenues in the last half of the fiscal year, I can see no question but what the receipts of the Government will be at least \$8 billion more in the last half of this current fiscal year. This is going to result in a balanced budget, provided some of these taxes relating to excises are restored and kept going from this point on for another period. That makes practically a balanced budget for this year. I am satisfied, with the trend of the economic situation, that we can count on an increase in the fiscal year 1961 of receipts and that we should not have a terrific increase in expenditures. That is if this Congress and the Members of it will go along with what is needed right straight down the line rather than for all the frills and gewgaws that a lot of people think they would like to have.

Those things can upset the appercart completely, but if we are going to approach anything like a balanced budget and keep it balanced we must hold expenditures down and not authorize all sorts of projects we cannot afford to have. You know and I know that everywhere we look we see governmental expenditures, both Federal, State, and local, getting way out of hand. We must remember, however, that the responsi-

bility lies with us to keep from contributing to that tendency which is so dangerous at this time.

I believe, and I have been watching it pretty closely, that the present operations of the Defense Department have given us an armed force sufficient to take care of our needs. There is no question but what we would be able to repel what the Russians might do in the case of emergency. We have got to keep it that way. At the same time we have got to cull out of the Military Establishment as well as everything else the things that are not needed.

I hope the membership of the Congress will go along with the idea of trying to help those of us on the Appropriations Committee who are trying to keep these expenditures down so that we will be able to make the Congress proper contribution to a balanced budget.

One of the worst things that those of us who desire to see appropriations properly justified and the unnecessary items cut out has for many years been the back-door approach picture. That resulted in over \$5 billion of appropriations that the committee had nothing to do with last year. It is about time that we stop that approach to the Treasury of the United States. I hope that the Budget will not send up any more such things and that the President will not approve any more projects passed on the back-door approach to the Treasury.

DISASTER OR PROGRESS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we stand at the dawn of a new decade—one horizoned with both rich promise and awesome peril. Are our political parties, Republican and Democrat, constituted, organized, and prepared to meet the challenges of the 1960's? In a nation which governs through a two-party system, this is an all important question. In quest of an answer, a series of speeches will be delivered by a group of Republicans in the House. This is the first in that series.

We shall outline three major challenges. We shall seek to analyze the differences in the ways the two parties respond to these challenges.

Why should we attempt this? In the hands of the voter at the polls resides the power to point this country toward the greatest disasters or the most profound progress in our entire history. The decision will be reached cumulatively by a storekeeper in New York City, a dairy farmer in Wisconsin, an auto-worker in Michigan, an executive in Los Angeles, a housewife in Tennessee—and by millions of others. Public political debate over the real issues is an absolute necessity if the American people are to be alerted to the grave choice they cannot escape.

We propose, therefore, to examine the decade ahead.

In the space age, ironically, the exploration of new horizons in human rela-

tions and government on earth will be even more important than the exploration of outer space.

Both in human relations and in outer space, we voyage now into an epoch very much like the first great age of discovery and exploration which uncovered the New World. On Columbus' famous voyage, the crew at one point panicked and wanted to turn back because the waters into which their leader was taking them did not appear on Old World charts and maps. They lacked the vision of the Great Navigator. Indispensable to Columbus' genius was the knowledge that if a new world was to be discovered, courage and pioneer faith were required.

There are those today who would timidly turn to socialism, centralized control and the planned state in human relations and government in order to escape the uncharted waters into which our civilization now ventures. Many would go back to the Old World of the New Deal, to the hackneyed solution of a decade of depression. They would substitute statism for freedom and enterprise. Like Columbus, we must understand that new shores can never be reached by those who shrink from exercising the freedom and initiative required to go forward. Those who want to use the old charts and centrally control every social, economic, cultural, educational, and research problem are placing security above freedom, dictation above individual creativity and materialism above the God-given spirit of man.

As we look to the decade of the 1960's, one course of action would be to meet the challenges of promise and peril by turning back, diluting the pioneer spirit, meeting Russian statism by greater statism at home, spending extravagantly today and letting our children pay the awful debts tomorrow.

The other course is to meet the challenges by advancing toward them with courage, free creativity, meeting Russian centralization and regimentation with greater incentives and leadership at home, putting our financial house in order, providing an inheritance of freedom and prosperity for our children, and granting our Nation the economic health to flourish and grow over the centuries.

Can 179 million Americans pick and choose knowingly and properly between these two routes if the two political parties do not clarify the differences in the routes? Political parties become thieves and robbers in the market place of public opinion when they try to confuse rather than clarify how they plan to respond to the perils and promises ahead. We Republicans who undertake this speech series believe that candor is essential. Our purpose is to clarify the differences in party responses to the challenges of the 1960's.

To face successfully the challenges of this decade, what are the qualities a political party needs?

Our survival and our growth depend upon a much greater sense of purpose and unity than the Nation has evidenced in the last few decades. Indeed, Russia's astonishing accomplishments in a few select fields of endeavor have resulted from her driving sense of unified purpose. The fast moving technological,

industrial, managerial and social advances of today involve such a maze of continuing change that purpose is needed if we are to prevent a totality of confusion, division and frustration.

In the time-space age, our country will constantly cry out for unity and purpose. A party seriously divided against itself will never be able to give the Nation the unity and purpose it so urgently needs. To furnish leadership toward these qualities, a party must have within itself a basic degree of unity. By that, I do not mean that everyone within the party must agree on every issue. But I do mean that disagreement and dissension must not reach the dimensions which exist in the Democrat Party today. Each day we see that party expending its energies on party civil war, and in the end obtaining intraparty peace only by compromising and camouflaging vital issues before they reach the public. There is a strategy of negativism with the public paying the price for party schizophrenia. In the time-space age ahead, political parties must have within themselves basic unity to be effective.

The country today is suffering from the current intraparty disunity which is monopolizing the energies of the Democrat Party.

We cannot as a Nation afford a party in control of the Congress whose Members' time and energies are consumed in intraparty wrangling rather than legislating to meet the needs of the Nation.

Second. If a political party is to be more than just a conspiracy to gain power, it must be a party of principle. A party which is concerned with only day-to-day demands of its lust for power becomes a gathering of officeseekers and their friends. Its concern for self-preservation takes precedence over its concern for national preservation. On the other hand, the party of principle will hold to certain unchanging beliefs about freedom, so precious that they will not be sacrificed for any political victory. And these unchanging principles must flourish into a forward-looking philosophy that seeks out the issues and abhors escapism. To a major degree, the legislative actions of that party must support this philosophy lest its principles and philosophy become a sham.

Third. A political party must have democracy within its ranks. Whether in State committees, the national committee, or in the congressional organization, it must represent the viewpoints within the party. It must shun party dictatorships and organize itself to express rank-and-file views.

Fourth. A political party must have a sense of responsibility toward the future. Open to any political party is the tempting opportunity to buy votes by squandering the public money. For that type of timeserving, selfish politics, the next generation will have to foot the bill. What is more, it is a myopic political party which can see only ever increasing outlays of dollars as the solution to a host of continuing problems. It is an enlightened and farsighted party which chooses, if needed, the difficult way in order to avoid expedient solutions that will harm and impede this Nation a decade or so hence.

The greatest temptation of expediency is to solve a dilemma by placing overriding authority in the hands of the Federal Government. Wielded by a benevolent executive or administrator, such power might be used wisely. But a government of law, not of men who preempt the power of law, was the design of our Republic. Sooner or later, such power in the hands of man is abused and the liberties of the people reduced.

It is much easier for a monopoly or for a large pressure group, or for a small group of unscrupulous politicians to control one national legislature as against control of 50 State legislatures.

The problems of Florida are not the problems of Oregon. The industrial complexion of Detroit is not the industrial complexion of Hollywood. The academic approach at Harvard University is not necessarily the academic approach at North Texas State Teachers College. Overfederalization ignores this and cultivates two massive evils. First is the habit of superficial generalizations—the attempt to standardize the governmental response to every local and specific need.

Second, overfederalization takes the government away from the people. The decisionmaking process becomes remote from the storekeeper in New York City, the dairy farmer in Wisconsin, the housewife in Tennessee. The people find that all aspects of their way of life—their education, their housing, their culture, are being controlled from afar. This is the way for the United States, like ancient Rome, to slip from a Republic to an authoritarian state.

I repeat, four qualities are needed for a political party to meet the challenges of this decade: First, a basic degree of unity and purpose; second, a coherent, forward-looking philosophy based on principle; third, democracy and genuine representation within the party organization; and fourth, a responsibility toward future generations of Americans. Only with these qualities can a party help preserve a free and dynamic America in the years ahead.

Permit me to apply these tests to the Republican Party.

Does it have the unity and purpose to give unity and purpose to the Nation?

The Republican Party is more united today than perhaps ever before in its history. While there will always be room for disagreement between its members, and those disagreements are freely expressed in party councils, there is no cleavage on basic party principles or philosophy.

The Republican Party is not torn apart by regional differences, nor is it in constant battle with itself over fundamental beliefs. There is no strife between its National and State elements. Its leader can speak for the whole party, not for just fragments of it. It is prepared to offer the Nation continuity of executive and legislative leadership because its philosophy and principles, rather than its urge for power, are its motivating force.

Our unity in Congress was dramatized during the consideration of labor reform legislation last year. This was perhaps the most important issue of the session, for labor reform has become a major

concern of our times, just as business reform was a major concern of the 1890's and the subsequent era of Theodore Roosevelt Republicanism. On this crucial issue, almost 90 percent of the Republican Members of this body voted to substitute the Landrum-Griffin bill for the weak committee bill, thus insuring that the Nation would meet the issue head-on with effective legislation. Republican unity contrasted with the remarkable schism in the majority party on this all-important vote.

Does the Republican Party possess a coherent, forward-looking philosophy based on principle?

I believe that ours is the party of principle; the party that would rather be right if it means sacrificing a political victory; the party which believes in a government of laws to prevent seizure of dominant powers by any arm or faction; the party which believes that individual freedom is man's most valuable possession.

We believe, as the preface of the report of the committee on program and progress of the Republican National Committee put it, that:

The Nation's greatness comes from the tremendous, God-given strength in each of us that is unlocked when a man is his own master reaching for his own destiny, with the opportunity to move constantly toward a better life.

This principle underlies our determination to guard against the heedless growth of the Central Government in Washington—and to keep the basic control of Government in the hands of the people, as against those who wish to give more and more authority to the Central Government—away from the people.

It prompts the Republican policy of due care in public spending to avoid eating away the right of the people to save or to invest their own money in their own way, as against those who show no such faith in the ability of the people to handle their own money. * * *

Government paternalism carries a price tag, the surrender of the individual's right to order his own life, to plan his own future. * * *

The unregimented mind has a better chance to reach out for new ideas than the mind that operates as the prisoner of a political dogma; in a space age of limitless horizons, the race will go to the side with the freest, farthest-ranging minds in search of truth.

The third question, Does the Republican Party have real democracy and representation within its ranks?

Political bossism is the exception rather than the rule in the Republican Party organization. The party's strength comes from the grassroots. Its leaders gain office in democratic elections. It is remarkably free from the political machines which plague the other major party.

Nor has the Republican Party allowed itself to be taken over by power-hungry pressure groups. It has refused, for example, to sell its soul for the votes promised by union bosses. The sources of the Republican Party's power are its members. It has not become the appendage of any self-serving economic group.

True democracy in the Republican Party carries over into its party organization in the Congress. Its congressional leaders neither seek nor are given the

dictatorial powers over party strategy and policy which characterize the majority party. We operate through frequent party conferences. Policy advice comes from elected policy committees.

It would not be amiss at this point, I believe, to point out that Republicans in Congress are not feuding about whether to have policy committees or whether or not party policy is democratically determined. Republican policy committees are operating in both Houses now.

They are committees which have been democratically selected and designed to represent all shades of opinion within the party membership. In the House, for example, I can personally testify that the Republican policy committee is a functioning, representative body, assisting in the formulation of Republican legislative policy in the House and providing close liaison between the executive and legislative branches. Its members are elected by fellow members under a system which insures that each geographical area and each newly elected group has representation. The committee meets regularly every Tuesday with special meetings called whenever required.

The effective operation of both Republican policy committees contrast with the situation in the majority party, where in one House, its policy committee is threatened with downgrading into a scheduling committee, and in the other, no policy-formulating committee has ever existed. This denial of democratic procedure within one of our parties is responsible for the constant wrangling in one House over policy matters and the undercurrent of protest in this body against the junta-type organization of the majority party. The substitution of intraparty wrangling in the Democrat Party for effective legislative procedures gives Republicans no comfort. Regardless of party, we know that the Nation suffers when the majority party in Congress dissipates its energies in civil war.

We Republicans place great emphasis upon democratic procedure within our party primarily, of course, because we feel that party practice must coincide with our party's basic belief in the democratic practices of free government. Just as strongly, however, we feel that any party which refuses to provide the channels, within itself, for the free expression of new ideas is doomed to stagnation and becomes ill-equipped to make the decisions necessary for the survival of freedom in the decades ahead.

I would hope that the time will come when both parties, in both Houses, will function through formalized policy committees, similar to those recommended by the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in the 79th Congress.

The fourth question: Is the Republican Party forward looking and concerned with the welfare of future generations?

No other principle of the Republican Party is as deep and instinctive as our belief that no generation can live solely for itself but instead has the heaviest of obligations to preserve the Nation and its institutions, strengthened and improved, for those who follow. What we have now we know was won for us only by the efforts and sacrifices of those who

went before us. We have the high moral duty to labor and sacrifice, if need be, to preserve and protect our heritage for the generations to come.

It is this principle which leads us to oppose programs which can solve temporary difficulties only at the price of the irretrievable loss of national strength or individual freedom. It is this principle which urges us to advance solutions which require effort and sacrifice now but will pay dividends in the future in the form of a sound political and economic structure for us and our children.

As an example, we Republicans are the leaders in the fight against inflation: a battle fought on many fronts—against excessive spending, for sound taxing policies, in support of rational debt management. For our efforts, we often hear Republicans accused of being preoccupied with balanced budgets, as negative, as stand-patters. What could be less negative and more far-seeing than this battle to insure that the next generations inherit freedom instead of economic tyranny? What is more negative, destructive and immoral than to squander money and engage in other acts of irresponsibility today and lose our children their freedom tomorrow?

Daily on the floor of this House, Republicans have battled for the long-range welfare of the Nation and its people; against those who would choose the easy but wrong way; against those who would divide the people into groups, stir selfish passions, appeal to special interests and promise what cannot be delivered.

Republicans in this body have stood for principle in foreign and domestic policy, against those whose addiction to expediency places them in an endless sea of confusion.

The Republican program is geared for the protection of interests of the American family—the interest of that family in preserving peace with justice so that no son of theirs will be sacrificed because of blundering diplomacy; the interest of that family in maintaining a sound dollar, so that their savings for their children's education will not be eroded, so that the power of free decision will not be lost by prices and debts which make us all slaves to an economic monster.

We will articulate these beliefs, this program, our actions to the American people. But, we will go beyond, and that is the principal reason for this series of speeches by Republican Members. We will discuss, in frankness and fullness, the challenges of the age ahead.

Three of these challenges will be examined in detail. First is the challenge of preserving peace with justice. This deeply involves the Communist peril and our response to it. Second is the challenge of maturing labor-management relations into constructive avenues which will protect the public, as well as the parties involved, and help foster economic growth. Third is the challenge of controlling inflation and high prices in a way which will preserve the economic freedom of the average American family. We will examine the way our party and the other party responds to these challenges.

Already, in the decade of the 1960's, we in this body are making history. Just as surely, we make history when we fail to act as when we do act. Our every move carries us one step closer to the dreadful perils or one step closer to the boundless promises. The clock ticks off the time, and each striking hour, our political parties face, irrevocably, a judgment. At the final sounding, either the peril or the promise will have won.

It is the declaration and firm belief of the Republican Party that we can defeat the peril and bring the promise into being if this Nation will harness and put to work the God-given strength of free men and women. To this end, we propose to dedicate ourselves and our party in the decade ahead.

ROLLCALL VOTE ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, while most of us have not had an opportunity to fully digest the 1961 Federal budget which was presented this afternoon, it is certainly not too early to view and review the fiscal situation of the Nation with deep concern as we approach our deliberations on a score of appropriation bills.

The full and final responsibility for balancing the new budget and opening the door to applying any surplus to the national debt lies squarely upon the Members of this body.

Recording of yea and nay votes on all appropriation bills brought before us is, in my opinion, the first step in curtailing excessive Government spending and prudent refinancing of the national debt.

Within the next few weeks Congress will be grappling with a variety of legislation, including a score of appropriation bills for both committed and new Federal programs.

This being a presidential campaign year and politics being what they are on the American scene today, we can expect the usual pressures both internally and externally for programs which will move outside the realm of good fiscal judgment.

With the advent of the end of the steel strike and an era of great prosperity at hand, it may be easier to yield to these pressures.

It is not necessary to remind any Member of this House of the great public consternation which arose less than a year ago over deficit spending and inflation.

While messages of this nature have not flooded congressional offices as yet this year, it is my hope and my prediction that the same sentiment still prevails and these sentiments may well be transmitted to us before this session of Congress is another 6 or 7 weeks old.

It has been easy for Members of this Body to claim economy voting records and it has been just as easy through newsletters and news releases for Members of this body to convey to the folks back home a deep and undying interest in fiscal responsibility.

It is politically popular to take credit for assisting in a balanced budget, particularly when it is also possible to do so in the face of supporting every expanded Federal spending program offered for public or private consumption.

We need only go back to January of 1958 when a boom year was predicted and Congress went its merry way in spending generously of the anticipated tax income, only to encounter a temporary recession which left a deficit of 12 billion 400 million dollars.

Although we should not have to be so warned, one of the outstanding weekly news publications in the Nation has just pointed to this situation with the warning that it could happen again.

But back to the matter of pinning individual responsibility squarely upon the Members of this body from which all spending bills must originate.

Last July, sensing the inability of the average citizen to score his Representative on his record of fiscal responsibility, I introduced a bill providing for amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to require the yeas and nays in the case of final action by the Senate and the House of Representatives on appropriation bills.

I am pleased to say that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, Representative SMITH of Virginia, has advised me that he will bring the matter of this legislation to the attention of the Rules Committee at its first meeting.

I sincerely believe the time has arrived when each of us should be agreeable, if not anxious, to accept our individual responsibility in the matter of our stand for or against such appropriation bills as are presented.

Let me further state that I see no reason why any Member of Congress should, when voting in the good conscience of his convictions on the expenditure of Federal funds, object to the adoption of a rule such as this which simply puts him on record in pursuing such convictions.

Looking to the core of our present fiscal situation, and projecting the cost of our national debt, legislation of some nature in this area has never been of greater demand than it is today.

I believe the average citizen should have an opportunity to itemize, if you please, the appropriation approvals of his Representatives in Congress.

All things being equal, and the high level of prosperity in the country continuing throughout the next fiscal year, any deficit in the new budget would be a shame.

It would certainly be an admission to the American public that this Congress lacks an understanding of the seriousness of our present fiscal problem, which is the hangover of many years of deficit spending sprees.

It has become vitally essential that any surplus that might be accumulated be applied against the astronomical national debt, as recommended by President Eisenhower.

And let me say the day we find ourselves in a position to reduce even a

small portion of this costly obligation would be just cause for a national holiday.

As I have said before, I repeat that it is most unfortunate that the youth of this generation do not have a lobby here in Washington to protect their interest in the dollars they have yet to earn, for most of them will find, with their great American heritage, an obligation which this generation is bequeathing to them.

This problem of fiscal responsibility is certainly no longer one that can be construed as entirely of a domestic nature.

Unless we choose to blind ourselves to what is happening in the world money market, we must realize that our dollar troubles here have a very serious international implication.

Not only are dollars piling up faster abroad than ever before in history, but we are actually losing gold because U.S. payments to other nations are now exceeding our receipts.

Our labor costs in this country, now at an all-time high, are making it more and more difficult to hold foreign markets, although foreign manufactured goods continue to come into this country at an increased pace.

This is naturally going to expedite the growing tendency of industry to move abroad where labor costs are lower, taxes are lower, and potential profits accordingly higher.

This, coupled with the necessity of having to refinance \$25 billion of our national debt by the mid-sixties, and roughly \$2 billion of this within a matter of 5 to 6 months, while interest rates are the highest in the history of this Nation, should have a sobering effect upon any enthusiastic programs of deficit spending in the months ahead.

We continue to spend billions for national defense, yet it frequently appears that we forget that a strong internal economy and a sound fiscal policy are as vital to our national security as any ingredient of its foundation.

Further devaluation of the dollar, increased indebtedness and its eroding effect upon the stability of our economy at home can only be construed abroad as a decay in the general strength of this Nation.

Election year or no election year, the seriousness of the situation faces us as squarely as any national problem before us today.

It can be made either a challenge of statesmanship or bypassed for political expediency.

The choice is before each Member of this House as we move into the legislative task before us.

THE NORTHERN DEMOCRAT-SOUTHERN DEMOCRAT COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bass of Tennessee). Under the previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have entitled these remarks "The Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat Coalition."

Mr. Speaker I drafted a letter to my constituents to inform them of the status of the civil rights legislation. After drafting this letter I thought I would prefer to deliver this on the floor of the House so that anyone who wants to take exception to what I say will have an opportunity.

Dear constituents, the 2d session of the 86th Congress has started on a very curious note. The House has been meeting every day for just a short time, but transacting very little business.

The reason for the meetings, as stated by Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, the majority leader, is "to give the Members of the House an opportunity to sign the discharge petition to bring the civil rights bill onto the floor of the House for debate."

The majority leader, along with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman CELLER, and a few other spokesmen for the northern city wing of the Democratic Party, have been making speeches chastising the Republicans in the House who compose about one-third of the membership for not signing this discharge petition.

Certain members of the working press, TV, and radio commentators have echoed the statements of these congressional leaders. Some have gone a step farther by raising the question whether the Republicans had a deal with the Southern Democrats to get through the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill and now the Republicans are "paying off to the Southern Democrats." Once again a Southern Democrat-Republican coalition is suggested as being the reason the Democratic Party cannot function as a party.

WHAT ABOUT THE NORTHERN DEMOCRAT-SOUTHERN DEMOCRAT COALITION?

Now what is the truth of the situation? The truth is easily obtainable by any observer of the Washington scene. The truth has been known for years. Why is not the truth reported to the people so that they can evaluate the situation themselves?

I regret to state that rigged quiz shows and payola rackets are only a symptom of a much more serious disease which has afflicted our Nation. Indeed, some of the loudest cries condemning the decline of morals evidenced by rigged quiz shows and payola come from people who are engaged and have been engaged for many years in a much more serious distortion of the truth to fool the people. They are engaged in no parlor games or selling a particular product to the public, they are engaged in hoodwinking the people on the issues involved in the national security and well-being of our society.

In many instances these people are motivated by good intentions. They believe that the people do not know what is the best for themselves, therefore they must be led into doing what is best for themselves. If it is necessary to deceive them so that they will do what is for their own good, then deceive them.

I am convinced that good intentions can never in the long run compensate for the damage which results from the use of willful deception. I am convinced that the people of this country properly supplied with the facts and arguments sur-

rounding the issues of the day will come to intelligent conclusions and support the policies proposed by the persons they have selected to lead the Nation. The people do not have to be fooled for their own best interests. Representative government can work if we will work at it.

I want to make it quite clear that in my judgment neither political party has a monopoly on this business of trying to fool the people. Likewise, in both political parties, there are persons who are fighting against this debilitating philosophy of fooling the people for their own best interests. On the other hand, those who have been most active and successful in their efforts to fool the people in recent years are in my judgment as wrong in their goals of what is good for the people, as they are in their methods. The members of the group I refer to have styled themselves as liberals. Actually they are not liberal by any dictionary definition of the word inasmuch as their programs invariably call for more government, not less government, and therefore less individual freedom. Their programs call for more Federal Government at the expense of local and State governments. Their programs call for more control by the executive department of the Federal Government at the expense of the Federal legislative and Federal judicial branches of the Government. In essence, this group of liberals are the modern day Federalists who believe that in modern times our society must have more of a centralized planned economy if we are to continue to advance and to compete with the other societies in the world.

Now back to the question about the Southern Democrat-Republican coalition that has been described in the public over a period of years. This proposition is one of the themes advanced by these so-called liberals. What is the truth? The truth is that the real coalition is between them and the Southern Democrats. Congressman CELLER and Congressman McCORMACK and Congressman ROOSEVELT, for example, voted for and influenced their liberal congressional following to vote for Congressman SMITH of Virginia to be chairman of the Rules Committee, and Congressman BARDEN to be chairman of the Education and Labor Committee. In return for this support Congressman SMITH and Congressman BARDEN voted and threw their support to elect JOHN McCORMACK majority leader of this coalition and voted for Congressman CELLER to be chairman of the Judiciary Committee. In the other body a similar situation prevails, the details of which I shall not set out in order to conform to the statement I made in response to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the gentleman made reference to Senators in his speech here?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; I was referring to them.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is that in conformity with the rules of the House?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think in context, it is, because I am not discussing any particular issue or casting any aspersions on them.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The point of order is made to the Chair. As I understand it, the rules of the House prohibit Members of the House from referring to action of the Senators or anything in that relationship. The gentleman has, on a number of occasions, made reference to Senators EASTLAND, HENNING, HUMPHREY, and several others. Now, that is contrary to the rules of the House and should be stricken.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I will say this, if the gentleman wants to insist on his point of order, I will delete the actual names in order to comply with the rules and in order to discuss the issue I was trying to bring out. But, I will be happy to agree to strike those names and proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, then, if the gentleman from Colorado has no objection, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will withdraw the reference to the Senators. That is what I suggest I do, and I agree with the gentleman's point that it is a proper point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As long as you are willing to admit that you are violating the rules of the House, that is all right with me.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now, wait a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Colorado insist on his point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No; I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado withdraws his point of order. The Chair requests that the gentleman from Missouri proceed in order. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the Speaker.

In speaking about the rules of the House, the rule is a very good one, and one I do try to observe carefully, and I think all Members should. The purpose of the rule, though, is to preserve amity between this House and the Senate. Frequently it becomes a very awkward rule, however, in order to discuss some of the pertinent public issues. I think my reference to the Senators was courteous and in no sense a degradation of them or in any way taking issue with them on any specific issue. I was commenting on party organization.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do you think that it is fair to the Senators to make a comparison of what is taking place here in the House by naming them specifically in a letter that you now propose to send to your constituents?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Sure. What I say to my constituents is my own business. And, the rules of the House are

not involved in that, I might say. Certainly, in order to discuss the basic issues that affect the country, it is pretty difficult not to refer to the other body at times, because they do have some influence on both your party organization and mine.

In other words, the obviousness and bigness of the Southern Democrat-Northern Democrat coalition and its long-standing operation has been such that it is completely overlooked in viewing the national scene. Hitler realized that the big lie carried greater weight because human nature tends to overlook the obvious. We tend to dismiss basic truths by referring to them with the conceit of the half educated as platitudes. So this self-styled liberal group establishing their basic coalition with the Southern Democrats has sought to distract the people from this true and obvious picture by calling the splits that occur from time to time in the coalition as the Southern Democrats go a different direction, a Republican-Southern Democrat coalition.

Are there occasions when the split is different and the liberal Democrats go their way and vote with the Republicans? Certainly; and these splits are almost as frequent as are the Southern Democratic lapses from the basic coalition. It happens every time civil rights legislation is before the House. It has been happening with more frequency in the past couple of years, I am happy to state, on farm legislation. But does the self-styled "liberal" group talk about the Northern-Republican coalition when this occurs? It does not. But in the South in order to keep the southerners voting for Representatives who will support the coalition there is plenty of talk about it.

BACK TO THE DISCHARGE PETITION

The liberal groups who make such great protestations about being for civil rights need to be called to task for ignoring and indeed undermining the most basic civil rights which our society possesses. The most basic right is the right to vote and have the vote counted honestly. Both the Southern Democrats as a group and a majority of the Northern city Democrats are guilty to a considerable degree of constant violation of this basic civil right—the southerners in their denial of the vote to the Negro and the Northern city Democrats in their boss-ridden city machines where fraudulent voting is almost a byword. This is not to give the Republican Party a clean bill of health in this regard. But I think the people of the country might well contemplate the contrast of the two parties in this respect.

An independent Congress, acting according to rules, not by personal whim, is a second foundation stone in any code of civil liberties. Why are the self-styled liberals always ready to discredit the rules of the House whenever they have trouble getting through some specific measure they claim to favor? This group was behind the idea of packing the Supreme Court when in the thirties they did not like what the Court was doing. Now they defend the Court

against similar attacks of the southerners, not because they seek to preserve the integrity of the Court—as proven by their previous behavior—but because what the Court is now saying meets with their approval.

This is not to say that the rules of the House are sacrosanct and beyond improvement. Indeed, the rules need constant looking into and improving, but this calls for specific criticism and specific recommendations for reform. For example, 3 years ago I helped to write and to get through new rules for committee procedure in the House. Yet, these rules had scarcely been on the books when one of the committee—the Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—was guilty of gross violation of it, in my opinion. Almost alone I took the floor of the House to try to preserve the integrity of these rules. Not one of the self-styled liberals had the interest to defend rules that they had stated were necessary reforms.

When I first was assigned to the Joint Economic Committee in 1954 I found the committee had no rules of procedure. It took 6 months of complaint and pressure on the then chairman, Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, to get rules written.

Now are the rules of the House adequate to get the civil rights bill on the floor of the House without the discharge petition process? The answer is unequivocally, "Yes." The discharge petition itself is a proper procedure and a part of the rules but it is in the nature of a last resort measure and should only be used if all machinery in the Congress has proved ineffective against arbitrary and unjustifiable action or lack of action on the part of a group of Congressmen. Under the House rules, no one or two Congressmen, no matter what their position is—even if they be Speaker and majority leader—can stop proper measures from coming to the floor of the House against the will of the majority.

The question is, Have all reasonable measures under the House rules to bring the civil rights bill on the floor of the House been exhausted? The answer is, Even the basic procedure of bringing the matter before the Rules Committee has not been undertaken with any real force by Congressman CELLER, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which voted out the bill as the result I might state of a Northern Democrat-Republican coalition. The bill was reported out last August in the closing days of the first session. Chairman CELLER wrote a letter to Congressman SMITH, chairman of the Rules Committee, asking for a hearing on a rule. By Congressman CELLER's own statement on the floor he has done nothing since then to try to get a hearing for a rule before the Rules Committee.

Even if the Rules Committee controlled, as it is by the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition, 8 to 4, were unable to get a rule because the coalition would not hold together on this issue, there are other ways of getting the job done. Incidentally, the Rules Committee would vote out a rule if the Northern Democrats will supply three votes to the Republicans on the Rules

Committee and just bring the necessary pressure on the chairman of the Rules Committee to call the committee together for this purpose. The Northern Democrats have not taken this route because, I presume, they are trying to keep the people of the country from realizing the true story of Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition. That it is not a political party in the proper sense of the word that is an organization of people joining together on the basis of a common belief in certain fundamental principles of government. It is a coalition for power—"You vote for our man, we will vote for yours even though our views are completely discordant on all major issues."

The silence of the Republican Members of the House on this issue stems from their natural reluctance to help the opposition, and specifically their reluctance to help in hiding the truth from the people. The Republican members of the Rules Committee will not state how they will vote on the rule before the matter is presented to them. This is in accordance with good procedure and good precedence. The self-styled liberals know full well these four Republicans will vote for a rule based both on their past actions and votes and on the tradition of the Republican Party. So do the self-styled liberal newsmen who are yakking about a Southern Democrat-Republican coalition know this to be the reasonable prognostication. Furthermore, there should be no doubt in anyone's mind based upon past voting records that probably all of the 153 Republicans in the House, save a handful of less than 10, will vote for the civil rights bill. The Republicans, I hope, are not going to help keep the leadership of the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition from exposing this coalition to the people for just what it is, I regret, a coalition for power and not for principle.

There is an easy procedure to call up the civil rights bill without any reference to the Rules Committee. When the reform was made back in the early 1900's to expand the Rules Committee from a 3-man committee completely dominated by the Speaker—a Republican in those days—to a 12-man committee which would be more responsive to the will of the House membership and so to the people, the reformers wisely realized that even with a 12-man committee and one that was set to have 8 men from the majority party and 4 from the minority, the Speaker might still work with this group of 8 to thwart the will of the majority of the House. Accordingly, they created a procedure entitled "Calendar Wednesday." This procedure guarantees through very careful drafting that any committee which has voted out a bill by majority vote can bring the bill out to the floor for debate and amendment with ample time for debate whether the Speaker likes it or not and with reasonable expedition.

The present Speaker—like, I believe, his Republican and Democratic predecessors—does not like to call attention to the procedures of Calendar Wednesday. Certainly nothing would call

it to the attention of the country more than a proper use of it. The Speakers have not liked and do not like this rule because it is a real diminution on their power as they well know it to be and it was intended to be.

The self-styled liberals almost destroyed any possible effectiveness of Calendar Wednesday back in 1949 by pushing through the 21-day rule. This gave back to the Speaker some of the powers over the Rules Committee which the enlargement from 3 to 12 members had taken from him. The 21-day rule provided that after the Rules Committee had failed to act on a bill for 21 days the Speaker could recognize the chairman of the committee to bring the bill up on the floor of the House for debate. The significance of the rule is that it gave this power which Calendar Wednesday gives to the majority of a legislative committee to call up a bill for debate also to the Speaker. This takes some of the steam, whatever steam there may be, out of the drive to use Calendar Wednesday and gives to the Speaker just one more device to bend the will of the majority to his own will.

Fortunately the next Congress in 1951 repealed the 21-day rule. So this device to keep the Calendar Wednesday procedure from being used does not stand as an excuse for Chairman CELLER not using Calendar Wednesday to bring up the civil rights bill.

The clincher about the deceptiveness of the Southern Democrat-Northern Democrat tactics in resorting to a discharge petition procedure is brought out by the fact that neither the Speaker—a Texan Democrat—nor the majority leader—a Massachusetts Democrat—will sign the discharge petition. Of course they will not. Signing a discharge petition in essence means that the signer has lost complete faith in the ability of the political party in control of the House to live up to its responsibilities as a political party. It also means a complete collapse of the leadership of the House to implement its decisions.

I have never signed a discharge petition since I have been in the Congress. There are many Members who take the same position, based upon the belief in the essential soundness of the House procedures and the importance of preserving these procedures and the procedures of orderly leadership.

That is not to say that the time would never come when I would sign a discharge petition. The time might come but it would only be when there was such a collapse of leadership of a political party that a willful minority segment of that party was thwarting the will of the majority and the issues were of serious nature to our people.

I believe we are approaching such a situation. Civil rights are serious to our Nation. This bill which relates to the basic civil right that of voting should be on the floor for debate and passage. However, I know that the leadership of the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition has not yet collapsed to the point where it cannot work its will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Bass of Tennessee). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Frankly, I wish it would reach this point because I have long felt that it is an unholy alliance which is hurting the cause both of good and of representative government in the United States. Certainly I will not play this coalition game to try to deceive the public about its demise when I know it is still very much alive and kicking. This is not payola or a quiz game we are playing. This is life and it is in earnest. The future of our country is wrapped up in the outcome. If this coalition through its elected leader, the Speaker, SAM RAYBURN of Texas, wishes to state that the coalition has been abolished and that it is no longer capable of providing leadership to this Congress, then I will sign this discharge petition. Otherwise, let us face it, a Congress which is controlled almost 2 to 1 by the Northern Democrat-Southern Democrat coalition, as a coalition has decided it does not want a civil rights bill. This means the northern wing of the coalition has agreed to pay this price to the southern wing in order to keep the coalition going. I hope the Republican Party will stand firm on refusing to aid and abet them. I further hope the truth of what is going on will get through the silken curtain of the liberal newsmen to the public.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this is a letter he is sending out to his constituents?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. This was a letter that I wrote. I regularly send a newsletter to my constituents. This was a letter I was going to send to them. Then, after writing it, as I said at the beginning, I thought I would prefer to deliver it on the floor of the House so that those who might want to take exception to it would have an opportunity to do so. So it will be in the RECORD and those who want to take exception, I hope will do so and I will be very glad to listen to what they have to say.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What was the gentleman's statement about Members of the House voting for the chairman of a committee, like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me, if I were to add the phrase "in effect were voting" that would make it absolutely accurate. I know the gentleman is familiar with the procedure. So when, in effect, you do organize the House through a coalition, and I think that is a fair term, of Northern Democrats and Southern Democratic votes, that perforce means that those

men will become chairmen of these committees, as the gentleman well knows. So, in effect, that is voting for those gentlemen in both senses to be chairmen of these committees. I am trying to bring out the point which I know is true, and I think the gentleman knows it is true, that the coalition is between Northern and Southern Democrats and only incidentally do we Republicans ever get together with the Northern Democrats at times on civil rights, and with the Southern Democrats at times on fiscal policy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman mean when the rules of the House were adopted that the membership or the chairmanship and so forth of the committees was then and there determined?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would say, as a practical effect, yes; and the gentleman knows it. Your party has control and if you do not want to choose chairmen of the committees another way, you could decide that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. One other question. Did you vote against the adoption of the rules of the House?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I voted against SAM RAYBURN for Speaker, yes, and that is the issue. That is the key vote in the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That does not answer the question.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I believe it does.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did you vote against the adoption of the rules of the House?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I submit I answered the real question which is that I voted to organize the House through the Republican Party. The gentleman voted to organize the House through the Democratic Party. The result of that has been just as I have described. The gentleman voted for Judge SMITH to be head of the Committee on Rules; did he not?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In reality was not the House already organized?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no. The organization, the first day, as the gentleman knows, is to elect the Speaker.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman would agree with me that to attempt to bring the civil rights measure up under the Calendar Wednesday procedure would be a very ineffective way to do it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. Why would the gentleman think that would be a good way to do it?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Because it can be done without the Speaker or anyone else stopping it. As the gentleman knows, Calendar Wednesday occurs every Wednesday. All the Committee on the Judiciary has to do is to wait until its turn. No other committee has any bill ready, as I understand it, and the committee could probably get an early Wednesday.

Mr. PRICE. In the first place, any Member of the House can object to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right, and I am going to object it, I may say.

Mr. PRICE. That is, if you really favor civil rights, you would not be doing the cause any good, because what you would be doing under the rules under which the bill is considered under Calendar Wednesday, the bill would still be with us at the end of the session. The gentleman is familiar with the rule which limits the time on Calendar Wednesday to the committee which succeeds in calling up the bill to 2 hours.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh, the gentleman is not correct.

Mr. PRICE. So the committee would take the full 2 hours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. Under the Calendar Wednesday rule the committee on call that handles the bill has 2 hours for debate; 1 hour for the proponents and 1 for the other side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me point this out. The gentleman must realize that then the committee proceeds under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. PRICE. The committee is limited to 2 hours of general debate on Calendar Wednesday. If that time expires and the committee rises they cannot proceed with the reading of the bill, and then the committee may have to wait until its next turn on the calendar.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think this debate should go on further.

Mr. PRICE. I would be willing for the gentleman to check my parliamentary opinion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have checked the Calendar Wednesday rule. I regret it is not used.

Mr. PRICE. It is not used, for this reason—

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. It is used on less controversial bills.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The last time it was used was on a civil-rights bill.

Mr. PRICE. Because they know it would have no effect. It would never finish the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman is incorrect. I will be glad to have debate with the gentleman on this sometime in the very near future.

Mr. PRICE. I do not think it is a question of debate. It can be checked as a parliamentary question.

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KASIM. I wish to commend the gentleman for refraining from the use of the childish words "Democrat Party" that has been indulged in so frequently by Members on the Republican side.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

I yield back the remainder of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

A TRIBUTE TO THE BICENTENNIAL OF RICHARD ALLEN, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the year 1960, February 14 to be precise, is the 200th anniversary of the birth of a great American, Bishop Richard Allen, a former slave who after purchase of his own freedom founded the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

As a civic leader and a citizen dedicated to the principle of brotherhood and equality for all mankind, Richard Allen exemplified the best tradition of his time. It is noteworthy that he was eminently respected by his contemporaries and fellow Philadelphians, Benjamin Franklin, Dr. Benjamin Rush, and others whose names were affixed to the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

To mark the anniversary of Allen's birth, the African Methodist Episcopal Church will hold a year-long observance commencing February 14, 15, and 16 in the city of Philadelphia. A committee of distinguished Philadelphians has been formed to launch this bicentennial with appropriate dignity and ceremony.

The name of Richard Allen is revered not only by the members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in America, but throughout the world wherever the message of brotherhood as a Christian principle has been carried.

It is most fitting that the entire populace of the United States join with the African Methodist Episcopal Church in paying tribute to Richard Allen, and I deem it a signal honor as a clergyman to make this tribute to his life a matter of official record.

The life and philosophy of Richard Allen becomes increasingly meaningful in the year of 1960. Indeed, the struggle for civil rights in which we are now engaged has its roots deep in the fruits of his life and works.

It was Richard Allen's objections to racial segregation in the Methodist Church of Philadelphia that led to the founding of the present African Methodist Episcopal Church as a Christian body foresworn to the right to worship without humiliation and dedicated to the principle: God our Father, Christ our Redeemer, man our brother.

Most of the early fighters for the freedom of Negroes were members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

Hundreds of the first Negro teachers received their early training under its auspices, and Wilberforce University, Xenia, Ohio, the first institution of higher learning for Negroes in the United States, was founded by African Methodists.

Bishop Sherman Lawrence Greene, of Atlanta, Ga., is chairman of the Bicentennial Observance Commission. As senior bishop of his church, Bishop Greene is also the closest link to the tradition and philosophy of Richard Allen. It is pertinent, therefore, to note the following exhortation made by Bishop Greene in a pastoral letter to his colleagues on January 2 of this year:

The 1950's saw many far-reaching changes in our status. Paced by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, we have won victory after victory in the courts of the land. The most singular victory, however, is the raising of the banner of unity and oneness in the goals toward which we are struggling.

We must keep it crystal clear as well as firmly declared the Negro leadership is dedicated to make liberty and justice for all a living reality.

Our preachments of democracy will continue to have a hollow ring so long as we are complacent about the existence of segregation on account of race or religion, or so long as any of God's children are denied their due.

To implement this policy of massive insistence, the A.M.E. Church, both clergy and laymen, must maintain constant vigilance. They must be more concerned with the proper exercise of the right of franchise, and they must vote into office only those who unequivocally share our hope for a bias-free America by 1963.

This statement, calling for massive insistence on first-class Americanism, was warmly endorsed by the national board of directors of the NAACP at its annual meeting—New York, N.Y., January 4, 1960. It exemplifies a spirit and social gospel that is patriotism in its purest sense. It is dedicated to the realization of the principles on which this, our Nation, is founded.

One of the denomination's ranking general officers, Dr. George Arnett Singleton, of Philadelphia, widely regarded as a man of letters and a keen student of history, is editor of the oldest of Negro magazines, the A.M.E. Church Review. Dr. Singleton has compiled the following highlights of the life of Richard Allen:

RICHARD ALLEN

He was born in Philadelphia, a slave of a Quaker lawyer, Hon. Benjamin Chew, chief justice of the Commonwealth, February 14, 1760. Because of financial problems he was sold with his family to a Mr. Stokley, near Dover, Del. At the age of 17 he was converted under the preaching of Freeborn Garretson, and became a preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church. He purchased his freedom. During the Revolutionary War he was a noncombatant and hauled salt for George Washington from Rehoboth, Del. When the Christmas conference met at Lovely Lane, Baltimore, Md., in 1784, and organized the Methodist Church as a connection, Richard Allen was present. He traveled as a preacher, returned to Philadelphia in 1786, joined Old St. George

Church, Fourth and Vine Streets; organized a prayer band of 42 members. Because of segregation, and an attempt to pull his friends from their knees while in the act of prayer, one Sunday morning in 1787 he led them out by faith.

He purchased an old abandoned blacksmith shop for \$35 at Sixth and Walnut Streets, hauled it with his own team of horses to Sixth and Lombard, and founded Mother Bethel, which stands upon the sacred spot.

During the yellow fever epidemic of 1793, under the direction of Dr. Rush he nursed and treated the patients. The sick he carried to the hospital managed by Stephen Girard, and buried the dead.

January 23, 1794, he was given a letter of commendation by the mayor of Philadelphia, Hon. Matthew Clarkson:

"Having, during the prevalence of the late malignant disorder, had almost daily opportunities of seeing the conduct of Absalom Jones and Richard Allen, and the people employed by them to bury the dead; I with cheerfulness give this testimony of my approbation of their proceedings, so far as they came under my notice, their diligence, attention, and decency of deportment, afforded me, at the time much satisfaction.

"MATTHEW CLARKSON,

"Mayor.

"PHILADELPHIA, January 23, 1794."

Allen organized a Sunday school, a day school, and a mutual aid society. For the War of 1812 he organized a regiment of Black Legion to defend the Nation.

Allen was the first ordained preacher of color in America, in 1799. In 1816, with 15 ministers and laymen, he organized the African Methodist Episcopal Church as a connection, because of segregation. Today the denomination has over a million members in the United States, Canada, the West Indies Islands, Bermuda, South America, West and South Africa; 7,000 churches, and 6,800 preachers. He was the first bishop elected and ordained April 11, 1816.

In 1817 he published the first book of discipline, and in 1818, the first hymnal.

The A.M.E. Church now owns and operates the oldest college by people of color in America, Wilberforce University, Ohio; Allen University, Columbia, S.C.; Morris Brown College, Atlanta, Ga.; Kittrell College, North Carolina; Edward Waters College, Jacksonville, Fla.; Payne College, Birmingham, Ala.; Campbell College, Jackson, Miss.; Paul Quinn College, Waco, Tex.; Shorter College, Little Rock, Ark.; and Payne Theological Seminary, Wilberforce, Ohio. And there are schools in South America and Africa. The Douglas Hospital, Kansas City, Kans.; Camp Baber, Mich.; and the Reid Community Center, Charleston, S.C.

The church publishes the oldest religious journal, the Christian Recorder, and the oldest magazine, the African Methodist Episcopal Church Review.

Richard Allen took the leadership in organizing a Masonic lodge in Philadelphia, March 26, 1797, and was the treasurer of the first African lodge.

The bicentennial celebration is in honor of the pioneer champion of religious liberty in America. Upon the foundation which he laid a stride is now being made toward first-class citizenship for all. The motto of the church is: "God our Father, Christ our Redeemer, man our brother."

THE EFFECT OF HIGH INTEREST RATES ON HOME BUYING

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the home buyer is once again one of the first victims of the administration's high interest rate, hard money policy. Once again we are witnessing the paradox of a slump in residential construction at a time when most other sectors of the economy are rising.

The typical American family who wants to buy its own home, like the farmer and the small businessman, is simply unable to compete with the giant corporations for the limited supply of money. Even if home buyers were able to pay ever higher interest rates, this would not solve the problem. Last year, the Congress reluctantly authorized an increase in the interest rate on VA-guaranteed home loans. In spite of this, the discount charged by the Federal National Mortgage Association when it purchases these loans is even higher now than it was at the lower rate.

More direct action is necessary if American families are to realize their deep-rooted hopes of homeownership.

Moreover, we must act and act promptly to halt the decline in home building which has already resulted in the loss of some half a million jobs. We must not forget that the dropoff in housing was a major contributing factor to the recession of 1958.

To meet this serious and growing problem I have introduced the emergency homeownership bill, H.R. 9371, and I have scheduled hearings on the bill before the Housing Subcommittee beginning next Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to place into the Record a section-by-section summary of the emergency homeownership bill, as follows:

EMERGENCY HOMEOWNERSHIP ACT—SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

In general, it is the purpose of the bill to halt the serious slump in residential construction, to increase both onsite and off-site job opportunities, to help achieve an expanding full employment economy, and to broaden homeownership opportunities for the American people.

The first section of the bill provides that the act may be cited by its short title (the Emergency Homeownership Act).

Section 2 amends section 203(b) of the National Housing Act (the regular residential housing mortgage insurance program) to make it clear that FHA may insure mortgage loans made by individuals as well as those made by corporate and other commercial lenders in order to make the program more effective in smaller towns and communities.

Section 3 amends section 203(c) of the National Housing Act so as to fix the premium charge for mortgage insurance granted under the regular residential housing program during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment at one-fourth of 1 percent. Under existing law the FHA Commissioner has discretion to fix this charge at any point between one-half of 1 percent and 1 percent.

Section 4 amends title III of the National Housing Act to provide that it shall be one of the purposes of the Federal National Mortgage Association, in its secondary market operations, to aid in the stabilization of the mortgage market.

Section 5 amends section 302(b) of the National Housing Act to require FNMA, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, to purchase any mortgage which is offered to it regardless of the type of housing covered, so long as title to the property is good and the mortgage is otherwise eligible and not in default. FNMA's authority to limit the age of eligible mortgages would not be changed. (Under current regulations, eligible mortgages cannot be more than 4 months old.)

Section 6 amends section 302(b) of the National Housing Act to prohibit FNMA, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, from selling or otherwise disposing of any mortgage which it may hold.

Section 7 amends section 303(b) of the National Housing Act to fix the amount of FNMA stock which a person is required to purchase when selling a mortgage to FNMA, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, at 1 percent of the unpaid principal amount of the mortgage. Under existing law FNMA has discretion to fix this requirement at any point between 2 percent and 1 percent of such unpaid principal amount.

Section 8 amends section 305(b) of the National Housing Act to require that FNMA, in the performance of its special assistance functions, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, shall not pay less than par for any mortgage.

Section 9 amends section 305(b) of the National Housing Act to provide that the maximum charges or fees which FNMA may impose for its commitment and purchase of a mortgage under the special assistance program, during the 1-year period beginning on date of enactment, shall be 1 percent of the unpaid principal amount of the mortgage, with one-fourth being collected at the time of commitment and the remainder at the time of purchase. Under existing law, FNMA has full discretion to fix these charges and fees. (Under current regulations, these fees total 1½ percent with one-half of this amount collected at the time of commitment.)

Section 10 amends section 305(g) of the National Housing Act to make it clear that mortgages on cooperative housing insured by FHA under section 213 are eligible for purchase by FNMA under its program 11 special assistance operations. (See sec. 11.)

Section 11 amends section 305(g) of the National Housing Act to provide an additional \$1 billion for FNMA's program 10 operations. This program was established by the Emergency Housing Act of 1958 under FNMA's special assistance function for the purchase of mortgages on new construction. This bill retains the present ceiling of \$13,500 per mortgage (or per dwelling unit in the case of sec. 213 mortgages) but adds the further provision that the association may by regulation increase the amount by not more than \$1,000 in high-cost areas.

Section 12 amends section 305 of the National Housing Act to create a \$50 million special assistance fund for the purchase by FNMA of mortgages which are insured under section 203(i) (and which cover new construction). No such mortgage could be purchased from the new fund if any service charges other than the usual origination fee had been imposed. (Under current regulations, FHA permits a special service charge of one-half of 1 percent on the outstanding balance of the mortgage to be added to the monthly carrying cost on loans of \$8,000 or less.)

Section 13 requires the originating mortgagee under an FHA-insured mortgage or a VA-insured or guaranteed loan to report to the agency involved the amount of any fees, charges, or discounts paid in connection with such mortgage or loan.

DANGER IN YOUR DRINKING WATER

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last year I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 169 articles in a series called "Poison in Your Water." This series chronicled the horrifying scandalous waste found in America's use of its water resources for open sewers. They told of the danger to human life from germs and bacteria of typhoid, dysentery, infectious hepatitis, toxic materials like cyanides, zinc, salts, and phenol which are being dumped in hundreds of ton lots into our rivers and streams throughout this country.

An article appeared in the January 1960 issue of Good Housekeeping, entitled "Danger in Your Drinking Water," chronicling more danger to our American people in the poisons, wastes, filth, and germs we find in the water that we drink every day. I hope all will read this splendid article by a distinguished author, Mr. Alvin B. Toffler, together with the remarks of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, who says:

Our water resources must be vigilantly safeguarded. Our Department is providing extensive assistance to States and communities in the control of pollution under the strengthened Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956. The enforcement authority written into this act at the insistence of the Department provides for the first time an effective mechanism of encouraging and if necessary, requiring the construction of waste-treatment plants to control pollution of interstate streams. But the battle must be waged on a broad front—in intrastate as well as in interstate waters. If it is not, we may be confronted with a crisis of such gravity as to jeopardize the further growth and development of many areas of the country and even the health of millions of people.

This article, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11, 1960, by my colleague, the Honorable BYRON L. JOHNSON, of Colorado, puts forth strong arguments why H.R. 3610 should be enacted by Congress at the earliest possible moment and signed into law by the President. It also shows sound reasons why the Congress must appropriate the full \$50 million authorized for grants to the States for water pollution control under the provisions of Public Law 660. It is a compelling argument in favor of my bill (H.R. 8494) to strengthen the enforcement authority of the Federal Government in the field of water pollution control.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY IS PREDICTED AS A BOOM YEAR FOR BIG BUSINESS AND A BUST YEAR FOR SMALL BUSINESS—TIGHT MONEY AGAIN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Sylvia Porter points out in her column today that small business failures are rising. She predicts the greatest wave of

small business bankruptcies in 1960 since the depression thirties.

Last year was a near-record year for small business bankruptcies. The total topped 14,000, or more than 300 a week.

The reason for the rise in small business failures in periods when big business is booming is the Federal Reserve's tight-money policy.

The Federal Reserve authorities still like to say that "the interest rate allocates credit"; but nothing could be further from the fact.

Credit is extended on a kind of priority system. Big industry and big finance have all kinds of interlocking relationships and reciprocal back-scratching arrangements. These are paralleled by the vast interlocking directorates of the big banks, insurance companies, mutual savings banks, investment banks, and, of course, the big industrial and utility corporations.

The big industrial and utility corporations have first priority. When there is adequate credit, small business gets what is left over. When credit is not adequate to meet both big business demands and small business needs, small business gets left out.

To find the deadly shadow of what will happen in the year ahead, we need only to look back to what happened during the last tight-money squeeze. For a 2-year period, beginning late in 1955 and ending late in 1957, credit was made progressively tighter. Many thousands of efficient, deserving small businesses were squeezed into bankruptcy.

At my suggestion the Federal Reserve finally made a survey of its member banks to find out how business credit had been divided up among firms of various sizes at the beginning and at the end of the big squeeze. Despite a large increase in business in this period, the smallest size firms—those with assets of \$50,000 or less—had 3 percent less bank credit in October 1957 than they had in October 1955.

The giant firms—those with more than \$100 million of assets—had 66 percent more bank credit at the end of 1957 than they had had at the end of 1955.

In between these two extremes the various size classes had shared in the available credit in a manner graduated in accordance with their size. In other words, the big corporations got most, the middle-size corporations got less, and the small firms got still less.

For the Members' attention, I will insert Miss Porter's column from the Washington Evening Star of today. No doubt those Members who have small businesses in their districts will be interested in reading this, as will other Members who are concerned about what is happening to the competitive structure of American business and to the public welfare generally.

The article follows:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH
(By Sylvia Porter)

WAVE OF SMALL FAILURES DUE

A wave of bankruptcies among small businessmen is due this year.

The number of small business failures is heading for the highest level since the depression thirties. It's almost certain that

1959's total of 14,000 bankruptcies will be topped. It's almost certain that businesses will be dying at a rate of more than 300 a week as the year rolls on.

The ironic explanation lies in the very fact of prosperity. The economic boom is bringing on the most severe money squeeze in over a generation, and this credit pinch will spell disaster for smaller concerns.

A second explanation lies in the upsurge in competition, older firms without the know-how to compete successfully in a rough period and tender infants without adequate credit lines will die.

I am not guessing about this trend. The background of prosperity and tight money is unmistakable now.

Against this background, all I am doing is making a simple—and conservative—projection of Dun & Bradstreet's authoritative compilations of the total and type of failures which occurred in 1959.

CREDIT IS PROBLEM

As always in a boom cycle, thousands of enthusiastic but inexperienced individuals try to realize the American dream of going into business for themselves.

But the significant fact is that in this boom, credit is becoming tougher and increasingly expensive to get.

A big, established corporation can get credit. Even if it can't get all it wants, it will have the financial connections to raise what it must have to compete and grow.

But the smaller businessman? The Nation's banks aren't organized to supply him with risk capital, and in this era of tight money they understandably favor their long-standing, "safe" customers.

The capital markets aren't set up to provide him at tolerable cost with the long-term funds he needs to grow.

The revolutionary system of small business investment companies created by law in 1958 to help finance small business has so far been an appalling flop.

And even if a small firm can get a loan, the cost in many instances may be just too steep. With the bluest of blue-chip companies paying close to 6 percent for loans, the charges—plus extras—to a little, marginal concern may be unbearable.

COMPETITION GAINING

Nor is there any denying the intensifying competition in this era as domestic and foreign producers scramble for a share of our dollar. In this sort of era, a high-cost, low-efficiency firm is fighting a losing battle on prices, services, research.

The statistics don't show the trend yet. Actually, Dun & Bradstreet's failure statistics were leveling off as 1959 closed. But the lull won't last as the money pinch really starts to pinch.

Most vulnerable will be merchandising and food stores, high-cost service shops, businesses in the \$5,000 to \$25,000 range. Killing them will be not only their experience, but also their inability to get the cash imperative if they are to compete and grow.

Surely we are not so complacent that we will smugly view this trend during a period of record prosperity?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARR (at the request of Mr. DENTON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. WITHROW (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), on account of illness.

Mr. GARY (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Virginia), for 1 week, on account of illness.

Mr. SCHERER, on account of official business participating in discussions on road legislation at American Road Builders Association annual meeting.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CANNON, for 40 minutes, following the reading of the President's budget message today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, for 1 hour, tomorrow.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. KASTENMEIER), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, January 20.

Mr. MURPHY, for 1 hour, on February 16, on independence of Lithuania.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on Tuesday, January 19, for 1 hour.

(At the request of Mr. SISK, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore granted:)

Mr. ADDONIZIO, for 10 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. POWELL, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday and for 30 minutes on Wednesday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. BRADEMANS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. MCGINLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDMONDSON, to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include with his remarks a statement by Mrs. FROST, of Idaho.

Mr. KASTENMEIER, to extend his remarks in the RECORD together with extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CUNNINGHAM) were granted permission to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter in the RECORD:)

Mr. SCHWENDEL.

(At the request of Mr. SISK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. GALLAGHER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 19, 1960, 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:

1670. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1960 in the amount of \$23 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1671. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 302); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1672. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1673. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 304); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1674. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1675. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal home loan banks for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1676. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Federal Facilities Corporation, General Services Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 307); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1677. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) for the fiscal year 1959 (H. Doc. No. 308); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1678. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected phases of low-rent housing and liquidating activities of the regional offices of the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (H. Doc. No. 309); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1679. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 310); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1680. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Tennessee Valley

Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. No. 311); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1681. A letter from the Inspector General and Comptroller, Mutual Security, Department of State, transmitting the quarterly report on utilization of foreign currencies as provided by section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1959 (Public Law 85-853), for the period October 1 through December 31, 1959; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1682. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report required pursuant to the provisions of section 412(a) of Public Law 86-149, approved August 19, 1959; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1683. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting the required report on the Department of the Army aviation personnel above the rank of major receiving monthly flight pay for the period July 1 through December 31, 1959, pursuant to 60 Stat. 20; 37 U.S.C. 118a-1; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1684. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation entitled (1) "A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for public facility loans"; (2) "A bill to authorize use of additional funds, to the extent specified in appropriation acts, for the purchase of mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program"; and (3) "A bill to amend title I of the National Housing Act"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1685. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 47th Annual Report of the Secretary of Commerce for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to the act of February 14, 1903 (5 U.S.C. 604); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1686. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Anthracite Experiment Station of the Bureau of Mines, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1959, pursuant to (56 Stat. 1056); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of contract relating to proposed construction work dealing with the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin project, Oregon, pursuant to the act of June 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 274); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1688. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1689. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the reconveyance of tribally owned lands by the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe of the State of Washington to the original allottees, their heirs, devisees, or assigns"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1690. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to suspend the application of sections 3114 and 3115 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, during periods of war or national emergency, to vessels operated by or for the account of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the

fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign-trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5, located respectively at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle, pursuant to Public Law 566, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1692. A letter from the Director of Personnel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report concerning positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 in the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1959, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Personnel and Reserve Forces), transmitting a report of all settlements made under the authority of section 2732 entitled "Property loss: incident to service; members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, and civilian employees," for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to title 10 United States Code, section 2732(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1694. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to give effect to certain obligations of the United States under the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1695. A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Inc., transmitting the financial report of the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Inc., for the fiscal year August 1, 1958, to July 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 761, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1696. A letter from the national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America, Inc., relative to and confirming the final dissolution and liquidation of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Inc., formerly incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey, pursuant to Public Law 761, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1697. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1203. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6027. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9660. A bill to amend section 6659 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 9661. A bill to amend section 6659 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the procedure for assessing certain additions to tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9662. A bill to make technical revisions in the income-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 9663. A bill to make technical revisions in the income-tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to estates, trusts, partners, and partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 9664. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 9665. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 9666. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 9667. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9668. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm costs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9669. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm costs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 9670. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 9671. A bill to stabilize support levels for tobacco against disruptive fluctuations and to provide for adjustment in such levels in relation to farm cost; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 9672. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 in order to reduce from 10 hours to 9 hours the length of the period in which 8 hours of work per day shall be performed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 9673. A bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of vet-

erinary medical, educational facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 9674. A bill to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9675. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9676. A bill to amend section 4248 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the termination of custody of mentally incompetent prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9677. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 9678. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9679. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 9680. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9681. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 9682. A bill relating to the employment of retired commissioned officers by contractors of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERLONG (by request):

H.R. 9683. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9684. 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 disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9685. A bill to amend section 309 (a) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KITCHIN:

H.R. 9686. 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.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9687. 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 disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9688. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H.R. 9689. A bill to establish a price-support level for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9690. A bill to increase and extend the special milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9691. A bill to create a Federal planning commission to conduct a study of the possible establishment in the District of Columbia of a national fisheries center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9692. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm and define the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9693. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue marketing orders with respect to certain processed fruits; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 9694. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9695. A bill to extend the veterans' home loan program to February 1, 1965; to provide for direct loans to veterans in areas where housing credit is otherwise not generally available; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9696. A bill to extend the conservation reserve program for 5 years, to limit annual payments under it to \$5,000 for any one producer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9697. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9698. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual may qualify for the disability "freeze" and for disability insurance benefits, in certain cases, with 10 quarters of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 9699. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 9700. A bill to provide that the coverage of religious science practitioners under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system shall be on an elective basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 9701. A bill to provide for the installation of the 5-inch guns from the U.S.S. *Colorado* on board the former U.S.S. *Olympia*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 9702. A bill to amend section 2771 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WIER:
H.R. 9703. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:
H.R. 9704. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOLEY:
H.R. 9705. A bill to provide for investment of the civil service retirement and disability fund, for appropriations to such fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H.R. 9706. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9707. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to eliminate the existing requirement that a determination of need be made by the community involved before any hotel or other transient housing can be constructed in the redevelopment of an urban renewal area with assistance under such title; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:
H.R. 9708. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:
H.J. Res. 554. Joint resolution declaring Good Friday in each year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTLEY:
H. Con. Res. 455. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress declaring the policy of the United States relative to the intervention of the international communist movement in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:
H. Con. Res. 456. Concurrent resolution expressing the concern and disapproval of Congress at the recent desecration of places of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT:
H. Con. Res. 457. Concurrent resolution to authorize printing as a House document a publication relating to the nomination and election of President and Vice President, including the manner of selecting delegates to national political conventions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RODINO:
H. Con. Res. 458. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecrations of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SELDEN:
H. Con. Res. 459. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:
H. Res. 421. Resolution to amend House Resolution 107, 86th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:
H. Res. 422. Resolution extending greetings and sincere felicitations to the members and clergy of the African Methodist Episcopal Church on the occasion of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Bishop Richard Allen, the founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:
H. Res. 423. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 81; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. POWELL:
H. Res. 424. Resolution extending cordial good wishes and sincere felicitations on the

occasion of the unveiling of a bust of Noble Sissle, a great American showman and musician; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOSCH:
H.R. 9709. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe De Paulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:
H.R. 9710. A bill for the relief of the surviving widow of Randolph Weum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:
H.R. 9711. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9712. A bill for the relief of Walter L. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:
H.R. 9713. A bill for the relief of Joseph Andrew Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:
H.R. 9714. A bill for the relief of Isabel Perez-Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:
H.R. 9715. A bill for the relief of Otis Drinkard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:
H.R. 9716. A bill for the relief of Maria (Antonina) Kulisic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:
H.R. 9717. A bill for the relief of Masako Ishiguro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:
H.R. 9718. A bill providing for the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor to Dr. Thomas Dooley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY:
H.R. 9719. A bill for the relief of Calogera Virona Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:
H.R. 9720. A bill for the relief of John J. Russell and Emma J. Russell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Small Business Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of opinion among small businessmen throughout the country and in New York State, submitted to me by the National Small Business Men's Association. This survey, conducted last summer, deals with five questions of great interest to the small businessman and to the Nation as a whole. It is of interest to note that percentage-wise the small business community of New York State—numerically the largest in the United States—is in agreement on all five issues with the U.S.

small business community. Each of us—whatever may be our views on each issue—can certainly be helped by this information.

I wish to compliment not only the National Small Business Men's Association for the splendid service they perform in keeping the Congress informed of the currents of small business opinion—information vital to the effective execution of our legislative duties—but I would like to extend a special word of commendation to the small businessman himself, whose sense of responsible citizenship

prompts him to take time out of a busy day to fill out his opinion ballot so that his views may be recorded and made known to us. The motto engraved on the front of each ballot reads: "Eternal Vigilance Is the Price of Liberty." I believe that the small businessman of this country is giving proof of his understanding of these words by his display of civic responsibility in recording his opinion.

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

	National percentage			New York State percentage		
	For	Against	No vote	For	Against	No vote
1. Faster tax writeoff for equipment and machinery.....	83	14	3	87	9	4
2. Ending farm subsidies.....	87	11	2	90	7	3
3. Fair trade laws.....	43	52	5	39	55	6
4. Government insurance to provide old folks' medical care.....	21	76	3	16	79	5
5. Tax-exempt pension plans for self-employed.....	67	30	3	61	32	7

Gas and Germ Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply pleased last week that when the President of the United States was asked in his press conference what he thought of the use of gas or germ warfare, he replied that his own instincts would be against United States use of these agents unless they had first been employed against us.

The President also said that no official proposal had reached him to change the long-standing American policy, which is that only if they are used first by an enemy will the United States employ these agents. But it is clear, as a story in the New York Times of November 10, 1959, said and as a letter to me from the President indicates, that a reevaluation of the policy is taking place. The President's letter to me said that "the Defense Department is reviewing the status of this matter," that is, the use of chemical and biological weapons.

It seems to me that, despite the President's laudable personal view, it is necessary to have a formal national position on record, to stand beyond Mr. Eisenhower's term and to restrain the efforts of certain elements in the Defense Department to free gas and germ warfare to be used "like any other weapon." Last September, I therefore introduced House Concurrent Resolution 433, now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to reaffirm the statement of President Roosevelt in 1943 that "the United States shall under no circumstances resort to the use of biological weapons or the use of poisonous or obnoxious gases unless they are first used by our enemies."

I hope that the President's expression of his personal views will serve to stimulate the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 433, and I am pleased to say that there has been increasing public concern on this matter. For the information of the Congress, as to the President's view, I should like to insert at this point in the Record my correspondence with him and his statement at the press conference:

DECEMBER 21, 1959.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write in the wake of your journey for peace to ask you to restrain unpeaceful demands of the Army.

During the last several months, a public relations campaign has been waged in the press by present and retired armed service officers to change our basic policy of not using chemical and biological weapons.

From various newspaper accounts, it now appears that the Army and other groups within the Department of Defense have recommended, both officially and unofficially, that we change our policy concerning the use of chemical and biological weapons.

Many citizens and Members of Congress, including myself, are very disturbed about

these recommendations. They negate our position as enunciated by President Roosevelt on June 8, 1943, when he stated that the United States under no circumstances would use poisonous or obnoxious gases unless first used by our enemies. The abhorrence of chemical and biological weapons stems from our basic belief that even in war we must preserve the essence of humanity and humane principles.

It strikes me as utter folly that we should accede to the judgment of certain members of the Defense Department, when it is now more important than ever that the United States continue to express itself as repudiating the use of chemical and biological weapons as a preventive or preemptive means of attack.

It is interesting to note that the Soviet Union has recently been taking the propaganda initiative regarding the use of CBR during wartime. At the end of August of this year, Premier Khrushchev stated in a message to a conference of leading scientists who met in Canada:

"We share the concern of scientists, who justly point out that the use of these weapons may have no less horrible a consequence than the use of atomic or hydrogen weapons. Not by chance were chemical and bacteriological weapons condemned by mankind, and their military use prohibited by international agreement through the Geneva protocol of 1925. As is well known the Soviet Union strongly supports the prohibition of all types of weapons of mass annihilation, including nuclear as well as chemical and biological weapons. We hold that their use runs counter to humane principles, the rules of international law, and the conscience of all peoples."

Conversely, it disturbs me that our Nation, which repudiates naked power politics, should consider sacrificing its unassailable position regarding chemical and biological weapons when the people of the world are hoping for a settlement on the armaments question.

While we may be constrained to develop these weapons qualitatively and quantitatively if international negotiation in the CBR area fails and if the realities of the situation demand that we continue to produce these weapons, we should not change our long-standing policy of not using these weapons first in any eventuality. We must reaffirm our resolve never to initiate the use of these weapons.

Because of this, and because of the urgency of the problem, I earnestly suggest international negotiations in the field of chemical and biological weapons. Although this question is one which will be very difficult to negotiate, this should not deter us from seeking both solution and negotiation in this area of armaments activity.

Because of the urgency of the problem, I have introduced in the Congress a concurrent resolution which will reaffirm our policy of nonuse of biological and chemical weapons unless they are first introduced into warfare against us. I sincerely hope that the American position will not be changed. Knowing of your interest in and admiring your efforts on behalf of world peace, I am sure that our policies will not be changed in this area.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., December 31, 1959.

The Honorable ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KASTENMEIER: I appreciate the concern which prompted your December 21 letter concerning the use of chemical and biological weapons. The Defense Department is reviewing the status of this matter with particular reference to some of the new

features mentioned in your letter. You will of course have a further reply as promptly as possible.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CONFERENCE, JANUARY
13, 1960

Ronald W. May, Capital Times, Madison, Wis.: "Mr. President, Representative KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin, has suggested that there might be a change in our traditional policy of not using chemical, germ, or poison gas warfare first. He said that Army people have tried to—indicated that they believed that maybe we should change our policy and use these first either in a large or even in a small war. Is this true?"

Answer: "I will say this: No such official suggestion has been made to me and so far as my own instinct is concerned is to not start such a thing as that first."

Address by Hon. John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a great speech by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. This speech is highly significant because it sets forth the views of one of the leading candidates for the Presidency on his conception of the kind of President the Nation and the times demand.

I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that immediately following the Kennedy speech, there be printed in the RECORD a perceptive analysis of the significance of this speech by the chief of the New York Times Washington bureau, Mr. James Reston.

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

TEXT OF SENATOR KENNEDY'S SPEECH

The modern presidential campaign covers every issue in and out of the platform from cranberries to creation. But the public is rarely alerted to a candidate's views about the central issue on which all the rest turn. That central issue—and the point of my comments this noon—is not the farm problem or defense or India. It is the Presidency itself.

Of course a candidate's views on specific policies are important, but Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft shared policy views with entirely different results in the White House. Of course it is important to elect a good man with good intentions, but Woodrow Wilson and Warren G. Harding were both good men of good intentions; so were Lincoln and Buchanan; but there is a Lincoln Room in the White House and no Buchanan Room.

The history of this Nation—its brightest and its bleakest pages—has been written largely in terms of the different views our Presidents have had of the Presidency itself. This history ought to tell us that the American people in 1960 have an imperative right to know what any man bidding for the Presidency thinks about the place he is bidding for, whether he is aware of and willing to

use the powerful resources of that Office; whether his model will be Taft or Roosevelt, Wilson or Harding.

Not since the days of Woodrow Wilson has any candidate spoken on the Presidency itself before the votes have been irrevocably cast. Let us hope that the 1960 campaign, in addition to discussing the familiar issues where our positions too often blur, will also talk about the Presidency itself, as an instrument for dealing with those issues, as an Office with varying roles, powers, and limitations.

CRITICIZES EISENHOWER

During the past 8 years, we have seen one concept of the Presidency at work. Our needs and hopes have been eloquently stated—but the initiative and follow-through have too often been left to others. And too often his own objectives have been lost by the President's failure to override objections from within his own party, in the Congress or even in his Cabinet.

The American people in 1952 and 1956 may have preferred this detached, limited concept of the Presidency after 20 years of fast-moving, creative Presidential rule. Perhaps historians will regard this as necessarily one of those frequent periods of consolidation, a time to draw breath, to recoup our national energy. To quote the state of the Union message: "No Congress . . . on surveying the state of the Nation, has met with a more pleasing prospect than that which appears at the present time."

Unfortunately this is not Mr. Eisenhower's last message to the Congress, but Calvin Coolidge's. He followed to the White House Mr. Harding, whose sponsor declared very frankly that the times did not demand a first-rate President. If true, the times and the man met.

But the question is what do the times—and the people—demand for the next 4 years in the White House?

RULES OUT CASUAL BYSTANDER

They demand a vigorous proponent of the national interest—not a passive broker for conflicting private interests. They demand a man capable of acting as the commander in chief of the Grand Alliance, not merely a bookkeeper who feels that his work is done when the numbers on the balance sheet come out even. They demand that he be the head of a responsible party, not rise so far above politics as to be invisible—a man who will formulate and fight for legislative policies, not be a casual bystander to the legislative process.

Today a restricted concept of the Presidency is not enough. For beneath today's surface gloss of peace and prosperity are increasingly dangerous, unsolved, long-postponed problems—problems that will inevitably explode to the surface during the next 4 years of the next administration—the growing missile gap, the rise of Communist China, the despair of the underdeveloped nations, the explosive situations in Berlin and in the Formosa Straits, the deterioration of NATO, the lack of an arms control agreement, and all the domestic problems of our farms, cities, and schools.

This administration has not faced up to these and other problems. Much has been said—but I am reminded of the old Chinese proverb: "There is a great deal of noise on the stairs but nobody comes into the room."

The President's state of the Union message reminded me of the exhortation from "King Lear" but goes: "I will do such things—what they are I know not . . . but they shall be the wonders of the earth."

In the decade that lies ahead—in the challenging revolutionary sixties—the American Presidency will demand more than ringing manifestoes issued from the rear of the battle. It will demand that the President place himself in the very thick of the fight,

that he care passionately about the fate of the people he leads, that he be willing to serve them at the risk of incurring their momentary displeasure.

AS CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Whatever the political affiliation of our next President, whatever his views may be on all the issues and problems that rush in upon us, he must above all be the Chief Executive in every sense of the word. He must be prepared to exercise the fullest powers of his Office—all that are specified and some that are not. He must master complex problems as well as receive one-page memorandums. He must originate action as well as study groups. He must reopen the channels of communication between the world of thought and the seat of power.

Ulysses Grant considered the President "a purely administrative officer." If he administered the Government departments efficiently, delegated his functions smoothly, and performed his ceremonies of state with decorum and grace, no more was to be expected of him. But that is not the place the Presidency was meant to have in American life. The President is alone, at the top—the loneliest job there is, as Harry Truman has said.

If there is destructive dissension among the services, he alone can step in and straighten it out—instead of waiting for unanimity. If administrative agencies are not carrying out their mandate—if a brush-fire threatens some part of the globe—he alone can act, without waiting for the Congress. If his farm program fails, he alone deserves the blame, not his Secretary of Agriculture.

"The President is at liberty, both in law and conscience, to be as big a man as he can." So wrote Prof. Woodrow Wilson. But President Woodrow Wilson discovered that to be a big man in the White House inevitably brings cries of dictatorship.

So did Lincoln and Jackson and the two Roosevelts. And so may the next occupant of that office, if he is the man the times demand. But how much better it would be, in the turbulent sixties, to have a Roosevelt or a Wilson than to have another James Buchanan, cringing in the White House, afraid to move.

Nor can we afford a Chief Executive who is praised primarily for what he did not do, the disasters he prevented, the bills he vetoed—a President wishing his subordinates would produce more missiles or build more schools. We will need instead what the Constitution envisioned: a Chief Executive who is the vital center of action in our whole scheme of Government.

AS LEGISLATIVE LEADER

This includes the legislative process as well. The President cannot afford—for the sake of the Office as well as the Nation—to be another Warren G. Harding, described by one backer as a man who "would, when elected, sign whatever bill the Senate sent him—and not send bills for the Senate to pass." Rather he must know when to lead the Congress, when to consult it and when he should act alone.

Having served 14 years in the legislative branch, I would not look with favor upon its domination by the Executive. Under our government of "power as the rival of power," to use Hamilton's phrase, Congress must not surrender its responsibilities. But neither should it dominate. However large its share in the formulation of domestic programs, it is the President alone who must make the major decisions of our foreign policy.

That is what the Constitution wisely commands. And, even domestically, the President must initiate policies and devise laws to meet the needs of the Nation. And he must be prepared to use all the resources of his office to insure the enactment of that legislation—even when conflict is the result.

By the end of his term Theodore Roosevelt was not popular in the Congress—particularly when he criticized an amendment to the Treasury appropriation which forbade the use of Secret Service men to investigate Congressmen.

And the feeling was mutual, Roosevelt saying: "I do not much admire the Senate, because it is such a helpless body when efficient work is to be done."

QUOTES WILSON ON SENATE

And Woodrow Wilson was even more bitter after his frustrating quarrels. Asked if he might run for the Senate in 1920, he replied: "Outside of the United States, the Senate does not amount to a damn. And inside the United States the Senate is mostly despised. They haven't had a thought down there in 50 years."

But, however bitter their farewells, the facts of the matter are that Roosevelt and Wilson did get things done—not only through their Executive powers but through the Congress as well. Calvin Coolidge, on the other hand, departed from Washington with cheers of Congress still ringing in his ears. But when his World Court bill was under fire on Capitol Hill he sent no messages, gave no encouragement to the bill's leaders, and paid little or no attention to the whole proceeding—and the cause of world justice was set back.

To be sure, Coolidge had held the usual White House breakfasts with congressional leaders—but they were aimed, as he himself said, at "good fellowship," not a discussion of "public business." And at his press conferences, according to press historians, where he preferred to talk about the local flower show and its exhibits, reporters who finally extracted from him a single sentence—"I'm against that bill!"—would rush to file tongue-in-cheek dispatches, proclaiming that: "President Coolidge, in a fighting mood, today served notice on Congress that he intended to combat, with all the resources at his command, the pending bill . . ."

But in the coming years we will need a real fighting mood in the White House—a man who will not retreat in the face of pressure from his congressional leaders—who will not let down those supporting his views on the floor. Divided Government over the past 6 years has only been further confused by this lack of legislative leadership. To restore it next year will help restore purpose to both the Presidency and the Congress.

AS PARTY LEADER

The facts of the matter are that legislative leadership is not possible without party leadership, in the most political sense—and Mr. Eisenhower prefers to stay above politics (although a weekly news magazine last fall reported the startling news, and I quote, that "President Eisenhower is emerging as a major political figure"). When asked, early in his first term, how he liked the "game of politics," he replied with a frown that his questioner was using a derogatory phrase. "Being President," he said, "is a very great experience . . . but the word 'politics' . . . I have no great liking for that."

But no President, it seems to me, can escape politics. He has not only been chosen by the Nation—he has been chosen by his party. And if he insists that he is "President of all the people" and should, therefore, offend none of them—if he blurs the issues and differences between the parties—if he neglects the party machinery and avoids his party's leadership—then he has not only weakened the political party as an instrument of the democratic process—he has dealt a blow to the democratic process itself.

I prefer the example of Abe Lincoln, who loved politics with the passion of a born practitioner. For example, he waited up all night in 1863 to get the crucial returns on the Ohio governorship. When the Unionist can-

didate was elected, Lincoln wired: "Glory God in the highest. Ohio has saved the Nation."

AS A MORAL LEADER

But the White House is not only the center of political leadership. It must be the center of moral leadership—a "bully pulpit," as Theodore Roosevelt described it. For only the President represents the national interest. And upon him alone converge all the needs and aspirations of all parts of the country, all departments of the Government, all nations of the world.

It is not enough merely to represent prevailing sentiment—to follow McKinley's practice, as described by Joe Cannon, of "keeping his ear so close to the ground he got it full of grasshoppers." We will need in the sixties a President who is willing and able to summon his national constituency to its finest hour—to alert the people to our dangers and our opportunities—to demand of them the sacrifices that will be necessary. Despite the increasing evidence of a lost national purpose and a soft national will, F.D.R.'s words in his first inaugural still ring true: "In every dark hour of our national life, a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory."

Roosevelt fulfilled the role of moral leadership. So did Wilson and Lincoln, Truman and Jackson and Teddy Roosevelt. They led the people as well as the Government—they fought for great ideals as well as bills. And the time has come to demand that kind of leadership again.

And so, as this vital campaign begins, let us discuss the issues the next President will face—but let us also discuss the powers and tools with which we must face them.

For we must endow that office with extraordinary strength and vision. We must act in the image of Abraham Lincoln summoning his wartime Cabinet to a meeting on the Emancipation Proclamation. That Cabinet has been carefully chosen to please and reflect many elements in the country. But "I have gathered you together," Lincoln said, "to hear what I have written down. I do not wish your advice about the main matter—that I have determined for myself."

And later, when he went to sign after several hours of exhausting handshaking that had left his arm weak, he said to those present: "If my name goes down in history, it will be for this act. My whole soul is in it. If my hand trembles when I sign this proclamation, all who examine the document hereafter will say: 'He hesitated.'"

But Lincoln's hand did not tremble. He did not hesitate. He did not equivocate. For he was the President of the United States.

It is in this spirit that we must go forth in the coming months and years.

SENATOR'S DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENCY OPENS A PRIVATE DEBATE TO THE PUBLIC

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—There are really two quite different presidential debates going on in this country: a private debate and a public debate.

The public debate has dealt primarily with secondary issues. It has dealt with the past. It has centered on personalities. It has discussed Vice President Nixon's record in the forties. It has centered on Adlai E. Stevenson's two defeats, Senator John F. Kennedy's Texas religion, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson's Texas heritage, President Eisenhower's popularity, Governor Rockefeller's wealth, and a variety of technicalities on the tactics and strategy of how to win.

The private debate has been much more limited but much more serious. It has looked to the future. It has inquired into the qualities necessary in a President of the sixties. It has dealt a great deal on the difference between what the public thinks

is true about the present and what is actually true.

Fortunately, Senator KENNEDY made a genuine attempt today to bring these two debates together. In his performance at the National Press Club this noon, he made the first really serious political speech of the formal campaign.

For he dealt with the primary issue. He dealt with the future. He analyzed the Presidency as it is now being interpreted by President Eisenhower, and how he believes it must be interpreted in the future.

SCORNS SURFACE GLOSS

This was no attempt to ride the current popular waves of illusion. He was highly critical of the President in the full knowledge that the President is at the height of his personal popularity. He scorned today's surface gloss of peace and prosperity and insisted on emphasizing the increasingly dangerous, unsolved and long-postponed problems of the missile gap, the rise of Communist China, the despair of the underdeveloped nations, the explosive situations in Berlin and the Formosa Straits, the deterioration of NATO, the lack of arms control, and all the domestic problems of our farms, cities, and schools.

Honest men and women will differ and differ violently about the Senator's characterization of the President as a man who does not follow through on his own goals, as a bookkeeper who feels that his work is done when the numbers on the balance sheet come out even.

In the present mood of wishful thinking in the country, the Senator has taken a chance. But right or wrong, he has at least started to discuss serious issues in a major arena where they cannot be ignored or brushed off.

The President's news conference yesterday illustrates what the Senator is talking about. In that conference, the President made these statements:

On Vice President Nixon's intervention to settle the steel strike: "Any idea that there was threat or pressure brought to bear upon the companies is silly."

On the assertion of Sir Anthony Eden, former British Prime Minister, that he had stopped a U.S. plan to intervene in the Indochina war: "I do know this: that there was never any plan developed to be put into execution in that particular instance."

On the charges that the defenses of the United States are inadequate: "I want to tell you this: I've spent my life in this, and I know more about it than almost anybody. I think, that is in this country. * * * I believe that the matter of defense has been handled well and efficiently * * *"

CONVINCING TO MANY

Now, these statements dominated the news today. They were widely published, and no doubt they were convincing to most people who read them.

Yet it is a fact that there are a great many well-informed people in the Capital today who still believe that pressure was applied to the steel companies to settle, who know that there was a National Security Council debate, provoked by Adm. Arthur W. Radford's proposal to intervene with air power in the delta of Indochina in 1954, and who are still dissatisfied with the President's personal defense of the Nation's arms program.

For months the President's popularity has smothered the debate on defense. He has not satisfied many people even in his own administration by assertions of greater personal knowledge of modern defense requirements.

In short, the President has defeated his critics but has not convinced them. They have continued the private debate, but have been increasingly frustrated in the belief that the President was telling the public what it wanted to hear.

What Senator KENNEDY is at least attempting to do is to force these issues into the open. He is saying quite bluntly that the way to begin a presidential campaign is with a definition of what the Presidency should be in the coming years. And he is saying frankly that if the people want the kind of leadership President Eisenhower has given them, they better not choose the Senator from Massachusetts because he does not think this is what the country needs.

Maybe the people will take him up on this. That remains to be seen. But anyway he is bringing the private debate into the public domain, and that at least gives people a chance to make up their own minds.

Congressman Brock Lauds Truckers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD F. MCGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. MCGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Midwest provides the Nation with the finest meat to be found in the world, and it does it in great volume. This is no accident and is not the single accomplishment of any one group. It is a huge and efficient industry the effects of which are felt throughout the entire economy of the area.

One of the component parts of the livestock empire is a business that has in itself grown to be a strong and valuable industry. This is the livestock trucking industry.

I think the importance of this industry, made up of many big lines and small, independent truckers, is very well outlined in a speech made by my colleague from the Third District of Nebraska, LARRY BROCK, who spoke to the farm-to-market truckers at their 17th annual get-together of truckers and businessmen in Sioux City, Iowa, last month.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address given by my good friend and colleague, LARRY BROCK:

The trucking industry has often been called the mainpring of the Nation's economy in recent years. Throughout the country the motor truck is the important link in the transportation of virtually all commodities, an estimated 75 percent of all tonnage moving daily in the Nation's commerce moving by this method. Although other means of transportation play an important role, their scope of operations is limited by peculiar facilities requirements. All of these methods of transport must be supplemented by the use of trucks for cargo to reach its ultimate destination. The motor truck is the only form of transportation available to more than 25,000 communities in the United States.

In absolute terms, no single transportation service has advanced so rapidly over the past 20 years. But it is significant that the greatest advances in truck transportation have been accomplished without the impetus of major technological breakthroughs which have so drastically changed the airline and water carriers, and even the railroad industries. Though vastly greater in size, trucking seems not to have changed much in character, being still a highly volatile, competitive industry.

The trucking industry has grown from a few thousand one-man one-vehicle operations to include 18,000 common carrier companies subject to ICC regulation; yet these comprise only one-quarter of the trucking industry, the other 75 percent consisting of private and contract carriers. Common carriers operate about 1.5 million of the approximately 11 million trucks on the highways. Some 800 class I carriers (those whose annual revenues exceed \$1 million) were responsible for more than half the industry's earnings in 1957. An estimated 260,856 million ton-miles of intercity freight traffic moved by truck in 1957.

Freight hauled by trucks during the second quarter of 1959 rose 20.5 percent over the similar 1958 period with all geographic regions showing gains. The growth in trucking was particularly great in the central regions of the country where tonnages of truck-hauled freight increased 33.4 percent over a year ago.

The trucking industry is both young and dynamic and will continue to grow with the expanding national economy.

Gifts for National Debt Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the January 15 issue of the Washington Evening Star it was reported that a patriotic American, the late Mrs. W. L. (Will) Clayton, has bequeathed a sizable sum "to my beloved country, the United States of America, to be used for the retirement of the national debt." It does not detract from the splendid patriotism shown by Mrs. Clayton to point out that other Americans also feel deeply about the necessity of reducing our national debt and, from time to time, spontaneously come forward with gifts and bequests to reduce the national debt. On September 3, 1957, it was reported that the late Arthur E. Lamper bequeathed U.S. bonds valued at between \$5,000 and \$10,000 for this purpose. On May 8, 1957, the press carried the story of Miss Sheila M. Martin who gave \$120 to Treasury Secretary Humphrey for national debt reduction. On March 5, 1959, it was reported that an 11-year-old Miami, Fla., girl, Kathy Hewitt, had offered her life savings of \$61 to help pay off the national debt.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Treasury tells me that under present law it cannot give absolute assurance that a gift or bequest for reducing the national debt will be devoted exclusively to that purpose. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6292, which would make it possible to give such assurance. Once this legislation is enacted, it will be possible for a private organization to make concerted efforts to obtain debt reducing contributions from American citizens who feel that they would like to make special contributions to show their love for their country. If Mrs. Clayton and the others mentioned above will make such contributions spontaneously and without

assurance that their gifts will be used to reduce the national debt, how many others will come forward with contributions if given that assurance?

The Need To Redefine Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our social security program is now on the eve of its 25th anniversary. During the almost a quarter of a century that the program has been in operation we have come a long way in securing the future of our workers and their families. But any program needs to be revised from time to time in order to strengthen the areas in which it is weak.

I feel that one of the parts of the social security program which needs to be reexamined and revised is the portion dealing with disability benefits. During the first session of the 86th Congress, I introduced a bill to eliminate the 50-year age requirement for the payment of disability benefits under social security. Today I am introducing a measure which would provide a more realistic definition of the term disability.

Under the rigid requirements of the present law, many thousands of men and women who are considered to be totally disabled by employers and by competent medical authorities still cannot secure disability benefits or qualify for the disability freeze of their incomes. For if such a person can perform any kind of work at all, no matter what it is or how far removed it may be from the type of work for which he is trained, then he is not disabled so far as social security is concerned.

Take, for instance, an accountant who has spent 40 years in that profession and who now is not physically able to continue in this field. If he still is able to sell apples in the street he does not qualify for disability benefits under social security.

This narrow definition of disability works a very real hardship on our senior citizens who no longer work on their regular jobs. Many of these people have no other skills. Employers are reluctant to train older people for new jobs that they would be able to perform. Unskilled jobs usually involve physical labor which is beyond the strength of the aging. As a result, these people suffer financial hardship and the humiliation of having to ask local welfare agencies for assistance.

As a woman from my home district in Wisconsin so ably put it:

You have to be ready for the coffin before you can draw social security disability benefits.

The bill I have introduced would change the definition of disability in the present social security law to provide that an individual shall be considered unable to engage in any substantial gain-

ful activity if he is unable, by reason of his physical or mental impairment, to engage in the occupation or employment last performed by him on a regular basis before he became disabled.

In other words, when a person is disabled to the point where he no longer can do the job for which he has been trained and in which he has been working for years, then he will be eligible for social security disability benefits or the disability freeze.

We cannot turn our backs on our responsibility to this country's senior citizens. When President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the original Social Security Act, he called it "a cornerstone in a structure which is being built but is by no means complete." It is up to us to see that the resulting structure is worthy of its fine foundation.

Senator Green To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, it was with mixed emotions that I received the announcement that Senator GREEN would not seek reelection.

The Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, now in his 93d year, is the senior Senator from Rhode Island, and has been in the Senate since January 1937. He has the distinction of being the oldest man ever to serve in Congress.

I am saddened at the thought that such a great statesman and so excellent a representative of our State will not be with us in the Halls of Congress after this session.

I am happy, however, at the thought that after so many years of arduous service as Governor of our State and as one of our U.S. Senators he will have an opportunity to relax and take life easy.

We will miss his sage counsel and advice in the Halls of Congress but I am confident that while he will withdraw from active service he will continue his keen interest in politics and will be available to us whenever we call on him.

His leaving active political life will leave a void that will be hard to fill. His long experience in public affairs, both foreign and domestic, has been invaluable to our State and country, both under Republican as well as Democratic administrations.

About a year ago Senator GREEN gave us an example of his greatness, of his patriotism, and of his love for America. He did what few, if any, Members of Congress have ever done—step down voluntarily from the chairmanship of a great committee.

He relinquished the chairmanship of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee because he felt that his impaired sight and hearing made it impossible for him to discharge the duties of that high office as he felt it should be done.

He now informs us that medical attention has remedied the condition although it has not done so to a degree sufficient to permit him to discharge his congressional duties as he feels should be done and, therefore, has decided not to seek reelection.

I have known Senator GREEN intimately for more than a quarter century. I served under him while he was Governor of our State and we were both elected to Congress for the first time, on the same ticket, in 1936, he to the Senate and I to the House. I cherish the fact that he has been my friend, and I am thankful for his wide counsel.

He is a man of wealth with a heart of gold. Although endowed with this world's goods he has always taken a keen interest in those less fortunate than himself.

He was one of the first to sponsor cafeterias for workers in plants, and one of the originators of a banking system that made loans to needy people.

He always has taken a great interest in education and made possible the education of a number of youngsters who, without him, never would have been able to attend college.

He has devoted himself to the care of the unfortunates and during his service as Governor of our State he rehabilitated and expanded the facilities at our State institutions. The new and up-to-date buildings that he sponsored there is a monument to his humanitarianism.

This is only a minor part of what could be said of this great man.

Is it any wonder, then, that the leaders and Members of the Senate, and, particularly the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, should have tried to prevail on Senator GREEN to continue as chairman, and paid such high tribute to him when he announced that he would retire? They know of his devotion to duty and his unrelenting efforts in the interest of our country.

In his retirement I wish him health and happiness. He can well rejoice at his many accomplishments for the benefit of humanity and I am sure he will take with him many fine memories that will help him in his retirement.

We of Rhode Island salute Senator GREEN. We love him.

Gordon Canfield Retires and the District Loses a "Champ"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I share in the regrets which have been echoed by Members of Congress upon learning that the dean of New Jersey's delegation, GORDON CANFIELD, is to retire after a long and dedicated service to the people of New Jersey and to the country. I would like to include as part of my remarks the following editorial from the

Paterson News of December 16, 1959, and the following letter which I have written to the editor of the Paterson News:

GORDON CANFIELD RETIRES AND THE DISTRICT LOSES A "CHAMP"

Things won't be the same in Passaic County politics from here on in—at least in the even years of congressional elections.

GORDON CANFIELD has been the Congressman from this Eighth District through a generation and only the youngish oldtimer will be able to recall that it was his "boss," the late George N. Seger, who was his predecessor. That was 20 years ago.

Thus for well nigh two decades CANFIELD has served us in Washington, and as a public servant and as a Republican candidate every 2 years, he was a veritable champion. In the Republican heydays and in the lean years when the magic name of Franklin D. Roosevelt was cutting down Republicans, the people remembered GORDON CANFIELD'S beneficences and he was always top man on his ticket. Some good candidates fell by the wayside before the Canfield juggernaut.

The answer was Congressman CANFIELD'S dedicated service, and in truth, it was this around-the-clock devotion which has finally determined him to retire from the political wars. To have continued in the only way he knows how to campaign or to serve in office might have permanently impaired his health.

So who can quarrel with his decision not to run again in spite of the void he will leave and the heart tug his decision to retire inspires? He has certainly earned the right to call it a day as a candidate after 37 years in Washington.

What was the secret of Congressman CANFIELD'S unmatched success? It was being with and for people. It could just as well have been coined in his name when it was said that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Just a few years ago, an overexuberant Democratic candidate, seeking to probe the CANFIELD success secret, came up with the bombastic charge that all the Congressman had to offer was his friendship for the little man. That did it, touched off such an atomic indignation among the rank and file of the voters that the ingenious candidate was snowed under.

The "little man" was there at the polls to vote for his friend. It has always been so—no letter unanswered, no opportunity for service ignored. Thousands knew his friendly intercession, his always solicitous concern for the people of his district.

During World War II, Congressman CANFIELD became restive at home. So he shipped aboard a freighter, made the rounds of the camps where his hometown boys were serving, comforted them, brought messages back to anxious loved ones. He braved the dangers of the sea, walked in the historical London blitz, was horrified at the Nazi slaughterhouse in Buchenwald. Here was one man who knew firsthand what he talked about to his people, and they believed in him.

In Congress, Mr. CANFIELD stood up and was counted. He was one of the first to warn of the threat of communism, because he had seen its creeping infection spreading when he was in Europe. He fought for proper defenses, for recognition of missile preparedness. He alone of all Republican candidates was endorsed by labor, which constantly was on the Democratic side.

But he was no rubberstamp for any man or any cause. He had courage.

And so when GORDON CANFIELD decides now he cannot rally the strength of another vigorous campaign with all its exactions, when he feels he would like to nestle home with his faithful family and rest a bit on the laurels he has earned, who among us will say him "Nay"?

The Eighth District yields him to the inexorability of time only in Congress.

There will be other opportunities for service for this man of decency, integrity, and dedication.

Meantime, all people of good will, regardless of politics, will wish him well as he begins his final year of service in Congress, and among these the News is happy to be counted as delighted that through all his years of matchless service we were his staunch and unremitting supporters.

Of him it will be said with truth: "Well done thou true and faithful servant."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1960.

Mr. HARRY B. HAINES,
Editor, the Paterson News,
Paterson, N.J.

DEAR MR. HAINES: I wish to applaud your fine editorial on the retirement of GORDON CANFIELD. He is a man for whom it is really difficult to find words adequate for the praise he deserves. You touched the core of the man when you said it was dedicated service. But there is more—for he possessed a sincerity which transcended everything else he did. He extended this sincere desire to help to all men regardless of politics. He believed that the Congress of the United States was deserving of the best effort of the men elected to serve in that body and that this best effort should not be dependent on any political label.

I am sure that some people feel that politics preclude praising men of the opposite party, but as a newly elected Democrat to the Congress, I can say without hesitation that no one was more inspirational to me than the dean of our delegation—GORDON CANFIELD.

He made a great contribution to the United States for no man in Congress was more dedicated, more conscientious or more aware of his responsibility.

I, as well as my colleagues I am sure, will miss him greatly. I join with all of his many friends and admirers in heartily endorsing the wonderful words you expressed in your paper. I hope that in the years to come he will enjoy the good health and happy life he so richly deserves.

With my best wishes.

Sincerely,
CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress.

Dumping of Atomic Waste Into the Waters of the Gulf of Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House of Representatives a most serious and hazardous proposal now under consideration by the Atomic Energy Commission which may have far-reaching and injurious effects on every American citizen now alive and on generations to come.

On January 13, 1958, a private industrial company, the Industrial Waste Disposal Corp., of Houston, Tex., filed application with the Atomic Energy Commission for a license authorizing this company to receive, package and

dispose of certain radioactive waste materials by placing this radioactive material in cement containers and dumping them in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. On December 5, 1958, the Atomic Energy Commission published in the Federal Register a "Notice of Proposed Issuance of Byproduct Material License to the Industrial Waste Disposal Corp.," which would authorize the disposal of this radioactive waste in this manner. The notice stated that the license would be issued unless formal hearing was requested.

Immediate public interest was expressed in this matter and various municipalities and groups demanded a hearing. The State of Texas also requested a hearing. Hearings were held in Houston on January 22, 1959. After these hearings, the AEC issued an intermediate decision the effect of which was to approve the dumping license of the disposal company. An appeal to the full Commission was taken by interested parties, and final hearings are set here in Washington on January 20, 1960.

I most firmly believe, and I think a majority of the Members of this body will feel as I do, that the dumping of atomic waste into waters of the oceans touching our shores poses a possibility of a serious hazard to the health and well-being of our citizens. At best, the evidence introduced by the AEC at previous hearings was speculative and conjectural. I believe the U.S. Congress would be derelict in its duty to the people of this country if we stand idly by and allow without protest a branch of the Federal Government to engage in a practice which may have far-reaching ill effects upon the health of the citizens. I most seriously object to the approval of this disposal license by the Atomic Energy Commission until such time as it has been established beyond any doubt that the dumping of this atomic material in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico will not be harmful to human life or marine life in the disposal area.

I feel, likewise, that it should be definitely determined at this time to what extent this disposal program will be accelerated or expanded in future operations for the disposal of atomic waste. I understand it has been the experience of other waste disposal areas, both in Europe and off the shores of this country, where dumping and disposal operations have been inaugurated, that these dumping operations tend to expand and increase to the point where the number of curies contained in the original operation may be infinitesimal as compared to the vastly increased number of curies contained in the cumulated subsequent dumping operations.

This is not an isolated matter, pertaining to the citizens of the States bordering the Gulf of Mexico alone. I have in my files a list of proposed dumping grounds running the full length of the Atlantic seaboard, around the Florida coast, and the entire Gulf of Mexico. Thus, today we are concerned with one dumping operation in the Gulf of Mexico, tomorrow and in future years, if we open the door for this proposed plan, we may be faced with radioactive waters lapping our shores from Maine to Texas, and from Oregon to California. This

would indeed be a Frankenstein monster which we might not be able to control or rectify.

This problem not only has national significance, but has now become a matter touching on our relations with our neighbor to the South. About a month ago the Government of the Republic of Mexico, acting through channels, protested to our Department of State the dumping of this atomic waste in Gulf of Mexico waters. In a letter dated November 18, 1959, to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State, advised the AEC that the Mexican Government is making formal protest to this proposed action by a branch of the U.S. Government. In his letter of protest to the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Rubottom states:

From the note of the Mexican Embassy it may be inferred that the Mexican Government believes disposal of radioactive wastes so close to its shores would be interpreted in Mexico as a unilateral and arbitrary act on the part of the United States, adverse results from which would present virtually identical hazards to the residents of the two countries. Our Embassy at Mexico City concurs in the Department's view that Mexico's reaction to the granting of the license would be uniformly adverse and would cause harm to our relations with Mexico, regardless of any explanations that might be given. Furthermore, it would be difficult to explain why the United States unilaterally and without the concurrence of Mexico selected a site for disposal of radioactive wastes in an area approximately 180 miles from the shores of both countries, particularly as so little can be known with certainty in Mexico regarding the possible adverse effects oceanic waste disposal might have over a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the Government of Mexico for the future health and well-being of its citizens, and it appears to me that the U.S. Congress might do well to follow the example set us by the Republic of Mexico and express a similar concern for the people of our own country whose lives and health are endangered by this proposed action on the part of one of our Federal agencies.

Lead and Zinc Miners Still Seek Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the lead and zinc miners of the United States are still looking to Washington for justice.

Last week, the Tariff Commission began its third series of hearings in 7 years into the unquestionable distress and injury of our domestic lead and zinc producers.

Another strong showing was made that hundreds of American mines are still shut down, and thousands of American miners are still unemployed, as a result of recordbreaking foreign imports of lead and zinc.

There can be no serious question of the fact that quotas imposed by the ad-

ministration in October of 1958 are not doing the job of reopening our shut-down mines and restoring the vitality and prosperity of our domestic lead and zinc producers.

From coast to coast, the evidence points in the other direction: the quotas have failed in their purpose, and must be strengthened or supplemented by other measures.

One of the splendid statements made on this point before the Tariff Commission was made by my distinguished colleague from Idaho, the Honorable GRACIE PROST, who testified on January 12, 1960.

Mrs. Prost, who has been one of the finest champions of the domestic miner in this body throughout her period of service, called for prompt and fair conclusions by the Tariff Commission.

The complete text of Mrs. Prost's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN GRACIE PROST BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION ON INVESTIGATION OF THE DOMESTIC LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY, JANUARY 12, 1960

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today.

As a Representative of a congressional district in Idaho which is a heavy producer of lead and zinc, and as a member of the House Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, I am especially interested in this investigation by the Tariff Commission.

I understand Mr. Charles E. Schwab, of Kellogg, Idaho, who was until recently executive secretary of the Emergency Lead and Zinc Producers Committee in Washington, D.C., will appear later during these hearings and will give a very comprehensive picture as the situation exists in the lead-zinc field.

He did a tremendous job in coordinating the presentations made in behalf of industry before this Commission and the Congress. Mr. Schwab has recently been appointed superintendent of operations of the Bunker Hill Co. in north Idaho, and while he will be missed here, we are glad to have him home again where he will continue working toward a solution to our problem.

First, I want to express my appreciation to the Commission which has been tremendously helpful in making an objective analysis and the unanimous findings of serious injury in 1954 and 1958. These findings have laid the foundation for this hearing, and for your report to the Congress which I hope will be coming shortly.

This investigation, pursuant to Senate Resolution 162, and passed by the 86th Congress, deals with the full range of lead and zinc products, whether manufactured or unmanufactured. The investigation is timely in view of the clearly adverse effect imported ores and products have upon the depressed lead and zinc mining industry in Idaho and other mining States.

In my judgment, even with quotas operating throughout the entire year, no lead-zinc producer operated at a profit in 1959. In Idaho, the lead-zinc picture has progressively deteriorated since January 1, 1952, the date selected as the base point by the Tariff Commission for its first unanimous finding of injury (May 1954).

In the great Coeur d'Alene mining district in my State, one complete section known as the Pine Creek area, has only one mine working today, where seven mines previously operated.

Underground employment has declined 40 percent in the Coeur d'Alenes during this period and practically all of the moderate and small-size producers have been forced out of business. An estimated 2,000 workers have lost their jobs.

You have only to examine the annual financial reports of those mines still operating

to see that the steady and excessive influx of metal imports continues its devastating and fatal impact upon this area.

It has been conservatively estimated that committees, school districts, counties, and State tax revenues during these 7 years have declined about \$5 million a year in the Coeur d'Alenes, as the mines have closed down. Let me point out too, that the shut-downs do not eliminate the cost of maintaining the mines to prevent serious damage and to protect investments. Large expenditures are needed for pumping, retimbering, and other upkeep to forestall mine flooding and cave-ins.

The citizens of the mining areas in Idaho have had faith that the mining problem will be corrected. They have gone forward with building a new hospital, a new school, and other community projects. The Commission has the opportunity now, because of prior decisions to recommend an answer which will again provide a healthy economic climate in ours and other domestic mining areas.

The need for relief to the domestic mining industry in general has been abundantly established by hearings held last year before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining on House Concurrent Resolution 177. I commend to the attention of the members of this Commission the record of these hearings and the committee's report, House Report No. 708.

The hearings contain statements by 21 Members of the House, 2 State Governors, and 67 other persons. All that these people ask is that the domestic mining industry be allowed to maintain itself in a sound and healthy condition. Such a condition is essential to the wise use of natural resources and the long-range growth and defense of the country.

The domestic industry is entitled to a fair share of the domestic market where economically feasible. The economic feasibility of domestic lead and zinc mining to supply a substantial share of the domestic market has long been established.

The mineral output of the United States in 1959 did not follow the upturn in economic activity. The total value of all minerals, including fuels, was less in 1959 than in 1957. Low metal prices and other factors dropped domestic mine output of lead to 251,000 short tons, the smallest since 1900. Mine output of zinc in 1959 was no higher than in 1958, despite the quota established in October of 1958. The combined price of lead and zinc metals is at present not materially higher than immediately after the imposition of the quotas, and is substantially below the level indicated by domestic mining interests as essential for restoration of production.

Perhaps the most disturbing element in this situation is the severe decline in employment for mining workers. Our so-called magnanimous foreign policy has backfired on U.S. workers.

American know-how has gone abroad. Now cheap foreign labor and the newest machinery installed in foreign lands is causing an invasion of our own shores.

It would be one thing if this invasion had come about gradually through the free enterprise of individuals and firms. Then our domestic firms and workers could have made normal readjustments. But the Government itself has directly stimulated the situation through loans, grants, barter, technical assistance and otherwise in foreign lands.

National policy requires that domestic production at least be reasonably protected from undue hardships arising from the Government's own actions in the economic sphere.

The folly of counting unduly on foreign sources of essential raw materials has been demonstrated once again in the new export taxes on minerals and related measures taken by the Cuban Government of Fidel

Castro. The policy of the Congress, expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 177 and numerous earlier measures, is to avoid critical dependence upon foreign sources. It is essential to maintain a sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry.

The law as it now stands delegates control over tariffs to the executive branch acting on the basis of investigations of the Tariff Commission. It has been urged that Congress should reestablish and exercise direct control over tariffs. In the meanwhile, the existing process should be effectively employed.

Time is of the essence in the Commission's current lead and zinc study. Undue delay in making the report would compound the current injury and might impede the consideration of related measures by Congress.

I urge that the Commission give its close and speedy attention to the testimony presented in this hearing, so that prompt and fair conclusions and recommendations may be made.

Some Suggestions for a Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, when I was in the district this fall, I talked to as many farmers as I could in order to bring back a cross section of ideas which might improve some of the inequities in the farm program.

In many instances, I asked the farmers to whom I talked, to set their ideas down on paper so that I could make them known to Congress.

Mr. Emery Hemingway, Rural Route No. 5, Iowa City, Iowa, a long-time friend and a successful Johnson County farmer, is one of the first to outline the basic ideas which he feels will improve the farm program.

In presenting these suggestions to the Members, I do not make a wholesale endorsement of all of the ideas, but offer them for consideration with the hope that there may be some proposals here which can be incorporated into farm legislation and improve conditions, not only for Midwest farmers, but for the entire farm economy.

Mr. Hemingway's proposal follows:

Any farm program must have at least three goals:

First. Full parity for agriculture.

Second. Be fair and equitable between producers, and protect the smaller family farm from being taken over by the larger farms.

Third. Promote good soil conservation.

Historic bases are erroneous and unfair between producers and we must have a sound base to start from such as the crop acres in the farm.

Some suggestions for a long-time farm program are, first, applying flexible price supports to soil conservation; or second, the higher the soil-depleting crops to the crop acres in the farm the lower the price supports; and third, let the farmer decide at what percent of parity he wants his crops supported, or not at all.

In the old AAA farm program the number of crop acres in every farm were recorded.

Now, let us have this sound, fair, base to work from and apply flexible price supports to a soil-conservation program in about these percents:

First. The farmer who keeps his intertilled crops—soil depleting crops under 30 percent of his crop acres the Government gives him a price support of full parity.

Second. The farmer who plants between 30 and 35 percent of his crop acres in soil-depleting crops the Government gives him a price support of 90 percent of parity.

Third. Between 35 and 40 percent—80 percent of parity.

Fourth. Between 40 and 45 percent—70 percent of parity.

Then if you want to go further than that, classify the farms according to their capabilities and let the higher capability farms have a higher soil-depleting base, or crop base, than the lower capability farms.

No producer should be able to turn all of his crop over to the Government to market in any one year.

The Government should only handle surpluses and not become the marketing agency for a producer's whole crop.

A better way would be to use the sound base we started with—crop acres in the farm—and let the farmer deliver up to 10 bushels to the acre times the crop acres in the farm as a limit.

What we need are longer crop rotations on a lot of farms that have been causing the surplus trouble.

By longer crop rotations some of us have held down our feed grain crops and built a soil fertility bank at our own expense, but the farmer who has been over-producing feed grain crops has destroyed the price and we are penalized for practicing soil conservation.

The soil-bank program has some good features, but in most cases only rewards the producer who has been causing the most trouble by over-cropping his land, and puts all his poor land in the soil bank and lets the Government pay him to build it up again.

If we do not apply flexible price supports to a soil conservation program then we must set a crop base using the crop acres in the farms to start from, and have this base include cotton as well as the feed grains—corn, sorghums, and beans—and the farmer keep the production of all these crops under this base or no supports.

This would bring about cross-compliance on these crops.

Wheat has its own program and there should be some regulation so the wheat producer, if he keeps under his acreage for price supports, he cannot put in other crops that will help defeat the other programs.

Rice, peanuts and tobacco have more or less a program of their own. We should have found out before this that no program will work without some cross-compliance.

A farm program of price supports and acreage controls, two price systems or commodity by commodity approach, will work if you put regulations and controls

on the right producers in the right way at the right time, but none of them will work without these controls.

Not enough farmers will self-discipline themselves to make any voluntary program work.

This is the legislation that needs to be enacted right now.

Now, that Congress and the Department of Agriculture apparently have done nothing to keep production in line with market demand without building up huge abnormal surpluses of feed grains, and are creating an over production of live stock, the farmer is producing at an average of around 78 percent of parity. He is not getting his rightful share of the national income and the livestock producer is entitled to some consideration.

The sheep men have their subsidy program.

The hog producer should have a program in which the Government pays a subsidy between the market price and \$21 for No. 1 hogs, market price; \$20 for No. 2 hogs, market price; and \$19 for No. 3 hogs and only on hogs weighing between 190 pounds and 240 pounds. This is to be based on 400 pounds to the crop acres in the farm up to 75 crop acres or 30,000 pounds as a limit to any one regular farmer producer.

Do the same for the cattle feeder. Pay him a subsidy between the market price and \$32 for prime cattle market price; \$30 for choice, market price; and \$28 for good grade. The same to be paid on 400 pounds to the acre times the crop acres in the farm up to 75 acres and 30,000 pounds limit. No subsidy paid on cattle weighing over 1,250 pounds.

Education—Investment in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the text of an address I was privileged to deliver at the seventh annual National Conference on Federal Legislation of the National Education Association in Washington, D.C., on December 11, 1959.

The text of the address follows:

EDUCATION—INVESTMENT IN AMERICA

I am delighted to have the opportunity to take part in the seventh annual National Conference on Federal Legislation of the National Education Association.

ROBERT WYATT OF INDIANA STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION PRAISED

It is a particular pleasure for me to be introduced by Robert Wyatt, executive secretary of the Indiana State Teachers Association. I think it is fair to say that Bob Wyatt has done more than any other man in recent years to win greater public support for education in Indiana.

I am glad, too, to be able to talk with leaders of the NEA. I come from a family of teachers, and my mother, who started teaching in a one-room country schoolhouse in Indiana and is still teaching school today, is

a life member of the NEA as was my late grandfather, who was a teacher for many years in central Indiana.

During my first year in Congress, I have been deeply impressed by the splendid leadership which the NEA as a national organization and your representatives here in Washington have given to the cause of education. This conference is a first-class example of the continuing dedication of the NEA to lifting the level of education in America.

One of the reasons I have so much enjoyed my first year in Congress was my good fortune in being named to the General Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee and thereby having the high privilege of serving with men like CLEVELAND BAILEY, FRANK THOMPSON, and STEWART UDALL and coming to know a person like LEE METCALF—all men who are deeply devoted to education and all unquestionably among the ablest Members of Congress.

My brief experience on the committee has only reaffirmed my conviction that, as Adlai Stevenson once said, "Our children's needs—the needs of education—have first priority over all other civilian needs."

Today we have more discussion of education, its purposes, its methods, and its facilities than we have seen for many years in this country.

SOVIET GAINS SPARK NEW LOOK AT U.S. EDUCATION

It is unfortunately true that the American people have been jarred into this reassessment not by any apocalyptic vision but by the sudden impact of the technological achievements of the Soviet Union.

We had until recent months been living under what Prof. Denis Brogan of Cambridge University describes as "the illusion of American omnipotence." Our reaction to the symbol of sputnik is represented by the fact that in order to pass an education bill, we had to call it the National Defense Education Act.

Yet Soviet competition should not be the only, nor indeed, the most important cause for our taking a new look at American education. It was Chet Huntley who said last year, "If tomorrow Russia became a pro-Western, two-party democracy, and international communism disappeared from the face of the earth, we should still need more engineers than we have, and many more poets."

STUDENTS MUST LEARN IMPORTANCE OF HARD WORK

Let me suggest that there are two major areas in education today to which we should give our concern.

First is the problem of quality. What are we turning out in our schools and universities?

A late president of Princeton once remarked, "Madame, we guarantee results or we return the boy."

For those of you whose chief responsibility is public education, there is no such simple solution to the problem of the student from whom no results can be guaranteed.

With respect to this first problem in education, I should like to say only this: in our pursuit of equality of opportunity for education, we must give far more attention to the element of quality of education. We must insist in the education of our young people on the central importance of hard work, on the futility of the search for shortcuts.

Let me give you the answer that Soren Kierkegaard, the 19th century Danish theologian, gave to the question, "What is education?"

He said, "I should suppose that education was the curriculum one had to run through in order to catch up with oneself, and he

who will not pass through this curriculum is helped very little by the fact that he was born in the most enlightened age."

AMERICA HAS SHORTAGE OF CLASSROOMS AND TEACHERS

My chief concern this evening, however, is not with the problem of quality but rather with a problem with which Members of Congress can deal more directly—the resources education has for doing its job.

The simple facts are these:

We have in America a continuing shortage of buildings.

We have in America a continuing shortage of qualified teachers.

The result of these shortages is a serious crisis in meeting the Nation's needs in education. And if the crisis is with us today, consider the fact that within the next 20 years the present school-age population of this country will have increased by 60 percent.

Last August, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur Flemming declared that "the number of pupils whose education is being impaired by the classroom shortage is about 10 million."

On October 14 of this year, the Secretary spoke of a shortage of between 130,000 and 140,000 classrooms. Yet he warned that the latest figures on school-bond sales—which showed a drop of fully 20 percent during the most recent 12-month period from the preceding 12 months—indicated that "marked declines in school construction are to be expected."

The State superintendent of public instruction in Indiana said this year that my State was short 3,000 classrooms.

There is widespread agreement then, that we need more school buildings in this country.

There is, however, another serious deficiency in our resources for education. We do not have enough qualified teachers. At the beginning of the 1958 fall term, our school systems were employing 92,300 full-time teachers with substandard qualifications.

INADEQUATE SALARIES A MAJOR CAUSE OF TEACHER SHORTAGE

Study after study has provided evidence of this shortfall, and study after study has pointed to inadequate teachers' salaries as a major cause of the trouble.

President Eisenhower himself, in speaking of "the importance of raising the standing of our teachers in their communities," said, "Higher salaries are a first requirement."

The president of the National Science Teachers Association blames low pay as a key reason for the lack of qualified science teachers.

The Rockefeller Bros. Fund Report on U.S. Educational Needs declares, "the root problem of the teaching profession remains financial. Salaries must be raised immediately and substantially."

And I am sure you are all familiar with Secretary Flemming's contention that doubling teachers' salaries in the next decade is a reasonable national goal.

It is clear then that we are not investing enough money in education, either in my home State of Indiana or in the Nation, either in classrooms or in teachers' salaries.

I use the phrase "investing in education" advisedly. In the American language, to "spend" suggests using up scarce resources—a wasteful and profligate notion. To "invest" however, suggests that dividends will be forthcoming—a wise and prudent course to follow.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION PAYS DIVIDENDS

Of perhaps no other area in our national life can the concept of "investment" more accurately be used than education. Some 10 years ago, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce published a book entitled, "Education, an Investment in People." The study showed

dramatically that those States and communities in America which had the best educational systems had the highest levels of real income as well. The chamber of commerce survey showed that it paid, in dollars and cents, to invest in education. It was good business to put money into schoolrooms and teachers' salaries.

Again, let's look at my State of Indiana. Are we investing enough money in education there? The apostles of States rights piously tell us that there is no need for Federal support for education, because, they blandly assure us, the States can do the job.

The State of Indiana ranks 15th in the Nation in per capita income. If the States-rightsers were doing their job, Indiana would logically be 15th in the Nation in per pupil expenditures for public education. But we are 31st.

Indiana provides from State sources some 30 percent of public school expenditures as against a national average of 40 percent—so that we rank 32d in the Nation in this respect.

HOOSIER GOP POLITICIANS SHORTCHANGE EDUCATION

These facts are telling evidence of the intellectual dishonesty of those who argue that the States are meeting their responsibilities, and I remind you that there are few politicians in America who preach the States rights doctrine more but practice it less than Gov. Harold Handley and his political godfather, ex-Senator William E. Jenner.

At a recent subcommittee hearing, I asked the legislative representative of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, which opposed the Murray-Metcalf bill on grounds that education was a job for the States and local communities, to provide me with a summary showing how State chambers of commerce across the Nation were leading the fight in their respective States for more money for education.

I am still waiting for that summary, not, I may say, breathlessly.

In Indiana, moreover, our State constitution limits the bonding power of school districts to 2 percent of their assessed valuation, a limitation which has forced schools to turn from general obligation bonds, ranging from 1½ to 2½ percent interest, to the transparent device of setting up holding corporations and issuing revenue bonds at 4 to 5 percent interest. How do you like that for sound, businesslike fiscal responsibility? How's that as an example of deep concern for the taxpayer's dollar?

PROPERTY TAX INCREASE NOT THE ANSWER

There may still be a few persons who contend that the way to raise more money for education is to raise the property tax. To understate the case, this is not an exceedingly popular approach in my part of the country, and any Republican who wants to run against me on a "let's raise the property tax" platform will be a more than welcome opponent.

We simply cannot get much more blood out of the property tax turnip.

The several considerations I have suggested with respect to financing education in Indiana and the Nation were among those which led the House Education and Labor Committee this year to report favorably H.R. 22, the Murray-Metcalf bill, a bill which now languishes in the House Rules Committee, another victim of the continuing Republican-Dixiecrat effort to starve America of vital resources at a time of great peril to our country.

MURRAY-METCALF BILL DESCRIBED

Because the NEA played a most significant role in the shaping of the Murray-Metcalf bill, most of you already know that this legislation would provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating Federal funds to the States to be used for constructing classrooms and/or improving teachers' salaries.

The bill provides a program of \$1.1 billion a year for 4 years. Each State would receive \$25 per school-age child.

Each State would be free to divide its allotment between classrooms and salaries, as it saw fit. Any portion of the funds expended for salaries would be distributed within the following guidelines: one-half to school districts on a per teacher basis and one-half on an equalization basis.

BRADEMAS STRONGLY OPPOSES FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

We are all aware that one of the chief obstacles to the passage of the Murray-Metcalf bill is the issue of Federal control. As a former teacher, I certainly want no Federal control of what is taught in our schools. I am, therefore, very glad to say that this bill contains very effective safeguards against such control.

First, the procedures for the administration of the program by the U.S. Office of Education are so simple that the Office will have no opportunity to coerce the States.

Second, the bill provides that once Federal funds reach the State, they are thereafter deemed to be State funds.

Third, the bill explicitly provides that in the administration of the law, the Federal Government shall exercise no direction, supervision, or control over policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration of any school or school system—which is about as clear a declaration of purpose as the English language can supply.

Fourth, each State education agency is required only to certify that funds granted under the act have been expended in accordance with the provisions of the act, the same procedure for Federal fiscal control which has been followed historically under the land-grant college program.

FEDERAL FUNDS NOW USED FOR EDUCATION WITHOUT FEDERAL CONTROL

I think finally that the best evidence that Federal funds can be used for classroom construction and teachers' salaries without Federal control is the fact that we have been using them for both these purposes for some years now.

It has been a source of constant surprise to me to learn that very few citizens in my district—indeed, very few schoolteachers—know that under Public Laws 815 and 874, the impacted area programs for school districts near defense plants or military bases, for example, Federal funds are now being used not only to build classrooms but to pay teachers' salaries and even to buy textbooks.

As a member of the General Education Subcommittee, I asked several witnesses, including Members of Congress and the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the following question this year during hearings on the administration's ill-advised proposal to cut funds for education under the impacted area programs: Have you any evidence that the use of Federal funds for classrooms and teachers' salaries has led to any Federal control of education in these districts?

Here is a typical answer:

One Republican Congressman whose views are normally very conservative but whose conservatism was apparently greatly tempered by the fact that his district receives substantial amounts of such Federal aid to education replied, "I have not, sir. I think that has been one of the outstanding virtues of Public Laws 815 and 874. There has been no Federal control curriculumwise."

EISENHOWER EDUCATION COMMISSIONER ADMITS NO EVIDENCE OF CONTROL

Here is Commissioner Derthick's reply: "I am glad to say, Mr. BRADEMAS, that the question has not come up. On the contrary, there was a doctorate study done up at Teachers College, Columbia University, investigating to determine whether there had been any semblance of Federal control in the administration of these laws throughout the

United States; and the conclusion was impressive and complete, that there has not been any indication in any of these approximately 4,000 school districts."

And the Commissioner went on to assure the committee that his statement applied to the use of Federal funds both for school construction and for teachers' salaries.

For those persons, therefore, who are sincerely troubled about the issue of Federal control but who base their conclusions on facts, I urge a look not only at the safeguards built into H.R. 22, but at the actual record of the administration of Federal funds under present law.

I have tried to suggest why we must invest more in education. I have tried to suggest why it is imperative that we make use of Federal funds for building more classrooms and raising teachers' salaries.

I have tried to suggest why the Murray-Metcalf bill is the most effective avenue for achieving these goals.

And finally, I have tried to suggest that Federal funds can be used to support State and local efforts in education without infringing on their control of school systems.

INCREASED U.S. INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION ESSENTIAL TO SURVIVAL OF FREEDOM

Let me now attempt, briefly, to put the problem of increasing our national investment in education in a somewhat different perspective.

No one who watched television or heard the radio or read the newspapers during the time that Mr. Khrushchev moved across the face of this land can fail now to understand that in him we are confronted with an alert, intelligent, aggressive, and articulate leader and by a people in the Soviet Union who can be described in similar adjectives.

In the decade of the 1960's to begin in just a few days now, the American people will be faced with the most powerful challenge to our survival as a free society that we have known in all the history of this Republic.

It may well prove to be true that in the struggle between ourselves and the Communist world—a struggle both economic and moral as well as political and military—that side will prove triumphant which more effectively marshals its brainpower.

Whether we are able to maintain a free and vigorous and civilized society here at home and to encourage such societies abroad will, in large measure, depend on the quality and resources of our education.

OUR MOST VALUABLE NATURAL RESOURCE: EDUCATED MEN AND WOMEN

It seems to me, therefore, that we in America must invest far more of our national resources in the most valuable natural resource we have: educated young men and women.

I salute you of the National Education Association for your dedication to the purposes of education. We share a common conviction that, as Adlai Stevenson has said, "The goal of education is to teach Western man not just to survive but to triumph, not just to defend himself, but to make man and the world what God intended them to be."

Washington Report by Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 18, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD, I include my newsletter of January 16, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS, JANUARY 16, 1960

The machinery of congressional legislation is picking up speed. Committees are meeting to evaluate their pending bills, Members are preparing speeches, political motivations of candidates and parties are becoming more evident.

The ingredients of this legislative year are these: (1) An election year for Representatives (2 years), the President (4 years), and some Senators (6 years); (2) split government—the legislative body, Congress, under Democrat leadership, and the administration, Republican; only Congress makes the law; (3) various problems or trouble areas, highly controversial, which are, (a) the military and economic cold war with Russia; (b) the monopoly power of unions and dictatorial power of labor leaders; (c) the fiscal situation—a national debt of \$290 billion; plus already incurred c.o.d. bills of \$440 billion or more (\$90 billion now owing and \$350 billion committed as future obligations); plus a \$2 billion built-in budget increase; plus hundreds of billions of legislative proposals for additional spending now pending; (d) a financing problem—Congress expects the Treasury Department to borrow money without a flexible interest ceiling, thus forc-

ing the Government to borrow in the short-term market competing with individuals and businesses; (e) a heavy tax burden with progressive rates that kill incentive; (f) civil rights, welfare programs, and other controversial bills, all politically explosive, are pending.

What will Congress do? The answer will result from the people's demands, of course.

(1) The election year issues and solutions can be politically expedient or statesmanlike as to motivation and outcome. (2) There could be a rash of new spending proposals adopted or a balanced budget with debt repayment and an aim toward tax adjustment and reduction. (3) There will be blaming of the administration for congressional shortcomings or responsible acceptance of the legislative role by Congress. (4) There can be more regimented planned economy or an emphasis on free competitive enterprise. (5) There will be more labor domination by law or placement of unions under antitrust law. My recommendation is the acceptance of the second of each of these alternatives.

The citizens of this great Nation and the Congressmen have reached the place, as I see it, where we must either restate and practice our belief in free competitive enterprise or abandon it, as we continue to legislate ourselves into the planned, regimented society. We don't need more law; we need to examine, evaluate and eliminate stifling, antiquated policies. Balancing the

budget, reducing the debt, and lessening the tax burden are what this Nation needs most, not more welfare spending. The basic choice is between siphoning off money into Federal programs or leaving the money in the hands of the people to reinvest as they see fit. The latter course is the only one possible for sound economic growth and prosperity for all. Only in producing more can we all have more.

The purge of 56 Congressmen threatened by Jimmy Hoffa, head of the Teamsters (including myself) will be met by a counter-offensive by those Members who are now uniting for this effort.

The Ways and Means Committee (of which I'm a member) will: (1) Hold hearings February 1 on the taxation of cooperatives; (2) Bring out a social security revision, possibly including the Forand, allegedly "socialized medicine", provision, as an amendment; (3) Possibly permit a revision of the interest rate ceiling. Some of the language used in the Ways and Means Committee illustrates the special world of taxation (not all are self-explanatory, either)—multiple trust, retroactive correction, conduit, throw-back rule, partial distribution, corpus, aggregating, spin-off, collapsible corporation, traps, loopholes, pitfalls, blind alleys, distribution in kind, election of choice, etc.

The weekly newsletter is available to anyone in Dallas by request.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 1960

Dr. James T. Cleland, dean of the chapel, Duke University, Durham, N.C., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy art Thou, O Lord God of hosts. Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Glory be to Thee, O God most high.

Almighty God, through whose will we live, under whose judgment we stand, in whose mercy we are redeemed, we commend unto Thee those whom we have entrusted to make just laws for our good land. Grant unto them insight to know the truth, courage to face the truth, and consideration to speak the truth in love. Among angry voices that deafen and deaden the ear, before problems that beset and vex the mind, amid rumors of war that frighten the heart, in the multitude of choices that puzzle the will to act, give them peace and poise and the assurance that all things can work together for good, under Thee; to the end that these Thy children may live with integrity and charity, worthy to hear Thy "Well done, good and faithful servants."

And unto Thee, and to Thee only, we shall ascribe, as is most due, honor and majesty and dominion and power, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 18, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9385) to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted for violation of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9385) to provide for the exclusion or deportation of any alien convicted for violation of any law relating to illicit possession of marihuana, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

APPROPRIATIONS TO NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

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

REPORT ON FLIGHT PAY, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on flight pay, Department of the Army, for the period July 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, together with reports covering the operations during the same period of Foreign-Trade Zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5, located at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Seattle, respectively (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REGULATION OF USE OF THE RED CROSS AND OTHER EMBLEMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to give effect to certain obligations of the United States under the Geneva Convention for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, by regulating use of the Red Cross and other emblems, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUDIT REPORTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal home loan banks supervised by Federal Home Loan Bank Board, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to