

Is the proposed amendment necessary? Well, its proponents have scared 9 percent, they say, of those who had heard something about it, into saying, "Yes." That is, that we should change the fundamental, basic law—not statute law, but the Constitution of the United States—because some 9 percent of the folks feel it should be done. To me, Mr. President, it is an exceedingly serious thing.

I remember that the Founding Fathers struggled over this problem. There are those who want to make this a nation of 48 nations. Not I. I am a Senator of the United States of America, even though I represent, in part, the State of Wisconsin. A great civil war was fought to determine whether this Nation should be indivisible.

If the camel's nose is allowed under the tent, to permit a return to the concept of yesteryears, we will be doing what a great constitutional lawyer said would be done: we will be committing mayhem upon the Constitution. Mr. President, I am not for that step.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered into, I now move that the Senate, as in executive session, recess until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in executive session, took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, January 25, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 22, 1954:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Whiting Willauer, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Honduras.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Simon E. Sobeloff, of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States, vice Philip B. Perlman, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Roswell Burchard Perkins, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Robert O. Boyd, of Oregon, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1957. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Maurice Paul Bois, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire, vice John J. Sheehan, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Dewey Howard Perry, of Vermont, to be United States marshal for the district of Vermont, vice Edward L. Burke, whose term expires February 10, 1954.

Edward John Pettibon, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana, vice Louis F. Knop, Jr., term expired.

C—43

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Bligh A. Dodds, of New York, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 7, with headquarters at Ogdensburg, N. Y., to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Eugene Mead Caffey, O9329, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as The Judge Advocate General of the Army, and as major general, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army, and major general (temporary), Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 206 and 308, Army Organization Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 267, 270; 10 U. S. C. 211, 61-1); section 249, Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 643; 10 U. S. C. 61a); and sections 513 and 515 (c), Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 901, 907; 10 U. S. C. 559g, 506d (c)).

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, January 22, 1954)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

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

Almighty God, whose loving kindness and tender mercies fail never, and whose fatherly compassion reaches unto the ends of the earth: We come with bowed and reverent hearts at this new dawn of opportunity asking that our attitudes toward each other and toward all men may become the ministers of purity and goodness, of brotherhood and peace.

We thank Thee for this wayside shrine, apart from the clamor of the world, into whose holy precincts no controversy penetrates and where no unworthy rivalries can live within its gates of peace. As we become strangely aware, with all other voices hushed, that together we share our sense of the unseen and eternal, may we be filled with the spirit that makes for unity of purpose amid all the diversities of our thought.

And now, as the week's problems wait with their demanding insistency, we pray that Thou wilt restrain in us every impetuous temper, all ungenerous judgments, all presumptuous claims, all promptings of self-assertion. Grant us the will to contribute our own spirit and influence to remove misunderstanding and suspicion, as we toil and pray for Thy kingdom's coming among all men. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 22, 1954, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2474. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York;

H. R. 1917. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; and

H. R. 6665. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and by unanimous consent, the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy were authorized to meet with the full joint committee during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business as in legislative session, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ROLL-CALL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum, I should like to say that following the transaction of routine business, when the Senate reverts to executive session, it will be my intention to ask the Senate first to take up the nominations on the Executive Calendar, which is on the desk of each Senator; that following action on the nominations, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of the Korean Treaty, which is on the Executive Calendar, and continue the consideration of the treaty today and if necessary into tomorrow, until action on the treaty has been had. It will then be my intention to move that the Senate revert to legislative session, in which the business will be the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1, the proposal to amend the Constitution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. Is it the intention of the majority leader to have night sessions this week?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I intend to consult further with the minority leader, but I will say to the distinguished Senator from New York that it is my present intention to have the Senate move along with the normal daily sessions this week, without night sessions, but that if the

debate goes over into next week, I should like to have Senators prepared to hold evening sessions. I would not expect to ask the Senate to run to any late hour, but would propose that we proceed as we did last Wednesday night and sit until perhaps 8 or 9 o'clock.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 79)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1915, as amended, establishing the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, I transmit herewith the 39th annual report of the committee covering the fiscal year 1953.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1954.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the International Information and Educational Exchange Program, for the period January 1 through June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT RELATING TO PROTESTS OF GRANTS OF INSTRUMENTS OF AUTHORIZATION WITHOUT HEARING

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Communications Act in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of House bill 2344, providing for a salary adjustment for post-office employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CONTRIBUTION TO WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN ACADEMY OF TROPICAL MEDICINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the reputation of the World Health Organization. In 6 years of effective operation throughout the free world, WHO has stimulated and encouraged the improvement of public health and the control of communicable diseases. Its work is important to Americans because, among other reasons, many of our boys in the Armed Forces must serve in disease-ridden countries abroad.

I know that many of my colleagues have received from the American Academy of Tropical Medicine a copy of its resolution urging consideration of a larger United States contribution to the World Health Organization. This contribution is now limited to \$3 million a year. Certainly the American Academy of Tropical Medicine, with its headquarters in Puerto Rico, is in a strong position to see the immediate benefit from WHO operation in that malaria-ridden part of the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the resolution of the American Academy of Tropical Medicine in order to call the attention of the Congress to this vital work.

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

Whereas the experience of the 20th century has shown that good public health in any country contributes enormously to the growth of agriculture, industry, and overseas trade and to political and social progress; and

Whereas the events of the past 50 years have repeatedly demonstrated the deleterious effects upon the United States of underdevelopment and of political and social instability in other parts of the world; and

Whereas the national security of the United States depends to an increasing extent upon basic materials imported from underdeveloped and often disease-ridden tropical countries; and

Whereas the vastly increased volume and speed of intercommunication between the United States and the Tropics have greatly augmented the potential danger which tropical disease presents to our country; and

Whereas throughout the world today our country has political and defense commitments which make it necessary for the United States to deploy its Armed Forces to many regions and, therefore, to maintain a practical interest in reducing the incidence of communicable disease in many overseas areas; and

Whereas the World Health Organization over a period of 6 years has conclusively demonstrated that it is a unique and effective international agency welcomed throughout the free world for its help in stimulating, coordinating, and assisting the development of public health and the control of communicable diseases; and

Whereas there is no doubt that the United States is materially and politically deriving great benefit from the success of the World Health Organization in developing public health in many countries with which we trade, in accelerating the control of such tropical diseases as malaria, and in lessening the chance of an invasion of the United States by disease-producing parasites; and

Whereas the ceiling of \$3 million per year fixed by the Congress as the total amount our country may contribute does not now permit a logical expansion of WHO's activities required by its increased responsibilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Academy of Tropical Medicine and the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene urge the Congress of the United States to raise the statutory limitation placed upon our financial participation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretaries of these respective organizations be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Congress and to other interested organizations and individuals and to inform the press about and to otherwise publicize this resolution to the fullest extent feasible.

PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT'S SHARE OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE DIRECT TO PERSONS 65 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a resolution adopted by the Lake County Board of Commissioners, in support of a plan for the payment of the Federal Government's share of old-age assistance directly to every person of the age of 65 and over, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

STATEMENT BY LAKE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Now the Government gives as much as \$35 a month to the States for certain old people. Would it not be fairer to give \$35 direct to every old person of 65, who applied for it? Of course, there should be a limit on their other income, but make it so high, at least \$200 a month, so as to keep administrative costs to a minimum.

Of course, those who need more would get it from the States, as they do now, but the Federal Government would not pay anything to the States for old-age pensions, except for special services, such as for the blind, for medical care, and to medical institutions.

We know \$35 a month is not an adequate pension in itself, but is rather to supplement other present income. Besides, we would rather have \$35 a month now than a larger amount after we're dead.

The applications could be made through the post office, with the applicant paying a small sum, say 50 cents to the postmaster, as the postmaster should not have to do more for free than he is now.

Mrs. John LeClair again appeared before the county board regarding a plan for the payment of an amount equal to the Federal Government's share of old-age assistance directly to every person of the age of 65 years and over, with reservation as to income.

Resolved, That this board of county commissioners hereby endorses the plan presented by Mrs. John LeClair; be it further

Resolved, That copies of the plan and this resolution be forwarded to Senator THYE, Senator HUMPHREY, and Representative BLATNIK.

Commissioner Houle moved the adoption of the foregoing resolution and the same was declared adopted upon the following vote: Yeas—Houle, Degerstedt, Wilklund, Sandstrom, and Strom. Total yeas, five. Nays, none.

Adopted January 5, 1954.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,

County of Lake, ss.

I, Paul W. Nelson, auditor of Lake County, Minn., do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing resolution with the original filed in my office on the 5th day of January, 1954, and that the same is a true and correct copy of the whole thereof.

Witness my hand and seal of office at Two Harbors, Minn., this 15th day of January 1954.

PAUL W. NELSON,
Auditor, Lake County, Minn.

UNIFORM RULES OF PROCEDURE—
RESOLUTION OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
COMMITTEE OF THE MINNEAPOLIS
LIS (MINN.) YWCA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the public affairs committee of the Minneapolis YWCA at their January meeting this year, urging the adoption of uniform rules of procedure, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATION OF MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 18, 1954.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The following is the text of a resolution passed by the public affairs committee of the Minneapolis YWCA in their January meeting:

"Whereas, under the present procedures practiced by some of the congressional investigating committees, irreparable damages and injustices are suffered by American individuals, their families, and associates, all contrary to the protection guaranteed them by our United States Constitution; and

"Whereas, there is a great need for the adoption of uniform rules of procedure by all of our congressional investigating committees to correct abuses violating our accustomed legal guaranties and procedures: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, the members of the public affairs committee of the Minneapolis YWCA urge our congressional delegation to support actively legislation providing for such uniform rules of procedure, or to initiate same, if necessary."

The public affairs committee is made up of 21 YWCA members representing various departments of the YWCA and the community at large. They are home women, business and professional women from broad ranges of age and affiliations. Actions such as this resolution are taken after studying the pros and cons of the problem.

As you are one of our elected Senators, we are vitally interested in your consideration of this matter. It is my privilege to convey to you this resolution, and these pertinent facts.

Yours very truly,

MARIAN DEININGER,
Chairman, Public Affairs Committee,
Minneapolis YWCA.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—LET-
TER FROM PRESIDENT, LEAGUE
OF WOMEN VOTERS, MINNE-
APOLIS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated January 16, 1954, addressed to me by the president of the League of Women Voters of Minnesota, in behalf

of the league urging my opposition to the Bricker amendment, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minn., January 16, 1954.
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The League of Women Voters of Minnesota respectfully urges your opposition to the proposed Bricker amendment on the grounds:

That it is not necessary.
That it would disturb the division of powers between the executive and legislative branches of our Government, which our Founding Fathers wisely placed in our Constitution.

That it would greatly impede the conduct of our foreign affairs and treaty obligations, which rightly belong in the hands of the Federal Government, with the result that it would constitute a very grave threat to the security of the United States, as well as seriously handicap the United States in its position of leadership in the struggle for world peace and freedom.

We sincerely hope you will vote against this dangerous proposal.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. BASIL YOUNG,
President.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT—RESO-
LUTION OF MINNESOTA UNITED
NATIONS ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Minnesota United Nations Association on December 1, 1953, in opposition to the Bricker amendment, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

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

1. The association reaffirms its opposition to the Bricker amendment expressed in the resolution approved at its annual meeting of May 5, 1953. It considers that the attempt to confine the exercise of the treaty power for practical purposes to subjects within the delegated legislative powers of the National Government would subject the foreign policy of the United States to the special interests and arbitrary attitudes of one or a few States, since legislative implementation by all would be required to give domestic effect to treaties affecting matters within the reserved legislative powers of States. Many such matters are of broad national and international concern, requiring use of the treaty power.

2. In particular the association deplors the effect which such limitations might have upon effective collaboration by the United States in a number of constructive international conventions proposed by organs of the United Nations. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate has wisely eliminated a sweeping and ambiguous section of the original Bricker resolution which would have prohibited all treaties permitting international organizations to "supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States." Nevertheless supporters of the amendment continue to assert in support of their position that the Genocide Convention, the proposed covenants on human rights, and other treaties sponsored by the United Nations would permit it to exercise direct ju-

isdiction over our nationals. These contentions are unjustified. The association challenges anyone to point out such provisions in these treaties.

3. The association heartily commends Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's vigorous and informed comments in opposition to the proposed amendment. It hereby authorizes the president to appoint a committee to wait upon Senator EDWARD J. THYE in order to represent to him the urgent necessity for his support in the fight against the amend-

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit three reports made by its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. In submitting the reports, I will state that, while the committee authorized me to submit the reports, some of the members of the committee desired to make it clear that submitting the reports does not necessarily mean that they approve of the contents of the reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and printed.

The reports submitted by Mr. McCARTHY are as follows:

Report on State Department Information Program—Information Centers (Rept. No. 879);

Report on Waste and Mismanagement in Voice of America Engineering Projects (Rept. No. 880); and

Annual Report of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 881).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 25, 1954, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2474) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the tercentennial of the foundation of the city of New York.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 2805. A bill for the relief of Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On; and

S. 2806. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Hamad Faris (Fares); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2807. A bill for the relief of Theresia Probst Uhl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2808. A bill to provide for the construction of certain reservoirs on the Kentucky and Big Sandy Rivers so as to provide a year-round supply of industrial water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2809. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charles W. McClelland, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2810. A bill to authorize the construction and maintenance of certain harbor improvements at Gold Beach, Ore.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2811. A bill to authorize enrolled members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., to acquire trust interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2812. A bill to provide for the return to the former Indian owners and their successors in interest of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project of all oil and gas rights and interests in such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2813. A bill to provide for a per capita distribution of Menominee tribal funds and authorize the withdrawal of the Menominee Tribe from Federal jurisdiction; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER (by request):

S. 2814. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2815. A bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 2816. A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes;

S. 2817. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; and

S. 2818. A bill to amend sections 4417 and 4418 of the Revised Statutes to authorize biennial inspection of the hulls and boilers of cargo vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2819. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Sasaki also known as Helen Fumiko Sasaki; and

S. 2820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erika Gisela Osteraa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself, Mr. GRISWOLD, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. HUNT):

S. 2821. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2822. A bill for the relief of Jose Cipriano Arias Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2823. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Hedmark, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2824. A bill for the relief of Insel Ruybal (nee Insel Diener y Grumberg); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2825. A bill making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 2826. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Pine River irrigation district, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SINGLE PACKAGE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference my annual single package streamlined appropriation bill for fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

You will recall that the key under my plan is the total of all appropriations which are to be made for the support of the Government for the year. This total represents 100 percent of all appropriations to be made and so every item in the bill is stated as a percentage of this overall total.

This method is in keeping with the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, section 138 (a), which is the statutory law governing appropriations, and that reads as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated overall Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. (Public Law 601, 79th Cong., p. 24.)

It is ironic that while this vital section of statutory law has been on the books for almost 8 years it has never been followed by Congress. In my opinion, the country would have been billions ahead had it been observed.

The exact percentages in the bill which I am introducing today are not intended to be perfected for the next fiscal year. They are the percentages of all of the appropriations voted for the present fiscal year and are used merely to demonstrate how the one package streamlined plan would work.

If this plan were to be used for the next fiscal year the four committees of Congress designated by law to perform that task would determine the overall total of appropriations to be voted in accordance with law. That figure, as I have stated, would represent 100 percent. Then the House and Senate Appropriations Committees would hold hearings in the usual way and express the amount of each item in the appropriation bill in a percentage of the total already determined. Each of these Appropriations Committees would have complete freedom of action provided their total did not exceed the statutory limit determined by the four committees of Congress.

When this streamlined bill was reported out on the floor of either House the only restriction on the Members of either the House or the Senate would be the total which has been agreed upon. If a House or Senate Member desires to raise the amount of an appropriation for a particular function he would have to reduce an appropriation for some

other department by the amount of the increase he sought.

Should the Congress adopt this method of voting appropriations, I am certain that the Bureau of the Budget would fall in line and make its overall recommendations in percentages of the total appropriations requested and that would be a tremendous step forward toward simplicity of handling the country's finances.

The Bureau of the Budget, a function of the executive department, is authorized and directed by Congress to control the expenditures of each department except legislative and judicial appropriations which are arms of the Congress, and, therefore, should not be placed under the direction of the executive department.

It will be noted that my streamlined bill uses only 3 pages as against 300 pages of the usual annual appropriation bills and yet it gives everyone a much better picture of the fiscal policies of the Nation and the relative costs of each function of Government to every other function.

This method, which I am proposing again, would result in a much clearer understanding of appropriations by Members of Congress, the administration, and the man on the street.

I ask unanimous consent that my single package streamlined bill, together with a copy of a statement wherein the percentages of appropriations are reduced to dollars, be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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. 2825) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$64 billion is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for expenditure by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Sec. 2. The sum appropriated by this act for expenditures by the Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is hereby apportioned among the various branches, departments, agencies, and establishments of the Government in accordance with the table contained in section 3 of this act. The sums made available by this act for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, together with any sums remaining available for expenditure from any prior fiscal years, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment shall not be increased by any other act of the Congress.

Sec. 3. The percent of the sum appropriated by this act which shall be available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, by each branch, department, agency, or establishment of the Government is as follows:

Agency:	Percentage
Legislative branch.....	0.109433
The Judiciary.....	.040772
Independent offices:	
Executive Office of the President019284
American Battle Monuments Commission014405

Agency—Continued	Percentage
Independent offices—Continued	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1.647370
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	.005840
Civil Service Commission.....	.081134
Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	.216141
Commerce—Maritime activities.....	.054508
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.....	.000467
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	.000778
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.....	.000778
Defense Transportation Administration.....	.000661
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	.001868
Federal Communications Commission.....	.011524
Federal Power Commission.....	.006696
Federal Trade Commission.....	.006313
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	.072457
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	.004999
General Accounting Office.....	.049806
General Services Administration.....	.267802
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	.097594
Indian Claims Commission.....	.000182
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	.017573
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	.000007
Mutual Security Agency.....	7.057293
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	.097241
National Capital Housing Authority.....	.000066
National Capital Park & Planning Commission.....	.000350
National Science Foundation.....	.012459
National Labor Relations Board.....	.014211
National Mediation Board.....	.001657
Renegotiation Board.....	.008085
Revolving Fund, Defense Production Act.....	.085656
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	.007786
Selective Service.....	.046537
Small Business Administration.....	.003426
Smithsonian Institution.....	.006657
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	.000545
Tariff Commission.....	.002010
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	.293638
Tax Court of the United States.....	.001510
Veterans' Administration.....	6.193663
Department of Agriculture.....	1.329093
Department of State.....	.323697
Department of Justice.....	.291196
Department of Commerce.....	1.060955
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	2.816432
Department of the Interior.....	.676969
Department of Labor.....	.402202
Department of Defense:	
Civil Functions.....	.692559
Military Functions.....	53.904645
Department of the Treasury.....	.953112
Post Office Department.....	4.410898
District of Columbia.....	.018688
Claims and Judgments.....	.018877
Permanent appropriations for general and special accounts:	
Interest on the public debt.....	9.889384
Other.....	6.649506
Grand total.....	100.000000

act for expenditure by each department, agency, or establishment of the executive branch, except the following arms of Congress: the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the United States Tariff Commission.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

How the Johnson proposal would work if the percentage of appropriations each agency received for fiscal year 1954 were applied to a \$64 billion appropriation for fiscal year 1955 (\$64 billion equals 100 percent):

Agency	Percent of total appropriations	Reduced to dollars
Legislative branch.....	0.1094	\$70,040,320
The Judiciary.....	.0407	26,094,080
Independent offices:		
Executive Office of the President.....	.0198	12,725,760
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	.1044	9,219,200
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1.6473	1,054,316,800
Civil Service Commission.....	.0811	51,925,760
Commerce—Maritime activities.....	.0545	34,885,120
Commission on Foreign Economic Policy.....	.0004	298,880
Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.....	.0007	497,920
Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.....	.0007	497,920
Defense Transportation Administration.....	.0006	423,040
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	.0018	1,195,520
Federal Communications Commission.....	.0115	7,375,360
Federal Power Commission.....	.0066	4,285,440
Federal Trade Commission.....	.0063	4,040,320
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	.0724	46,372,480
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	.0049	3,199,360
General Accounting Office.....	.0498	31,875,840
General Services Administration.....	.2678	171,393,280
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	.0975	62,524,160
Indian Claims Commission.....	.0001	\$116,480
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	.0175	11,246,720
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.....	.000007	4,480
Mutual Security Agency.....	7.0572	4,516,667,520
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	.0972	62,234,240
National Capital Housing Authority.....	.000066	42,240
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	.000350	224,000
National Science Foundation.....	.0124	7,973,760
National Labor Relations Board.....	.0142	9,095,040
National Mediation Board.....	.0016	1,060,480
Renegotiation Board.....	.0080	5,174,400
Revolving Fund, Defense Production Act.....	.0856	54,819,840
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	.0077	4,983,040
Selective Service.....	.0465	29,783,680
Small Business Administration.....	.0034	2,192,640
Smithsonian Institution.....	.0066	4,260,80
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	.0005	348,800
Tariff Commission.....	.0020	1,286,400
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	.2936	187,928,320
Tax Court of the United States.....	.0015	966,400
Veterans' Administration.....	6.1936	3,963,944,320
Department of Agriculture.....	1.329	850,619,520
Department of State.....	.3236	207,166,080
Department of Justice.....	.2911	186,365,440
Department of Commerce:		
Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	.2161	138,330,240
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	.0058	3,737,600
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	2.8164	1,802,516,480

Agency	Percent of total appropriations	Reduced to dollars
Department of the Interior.....	.6769	\$433,260,160
Department of Labor.....	.4022	257,409,280
Department of Defense:		
Civil Functions.....	.6925	443,237,760
Military Functions.....	53.904	34,498,972,800
Department of the Treasury.....	.9531	609,991,680
Post Office Department.....	4.4108	2,822,974,720
District of Columbia.....	.0186	11,960,320
Claims and Judgments.....	.0188	12,081,280
Total annual and supplemental appropriations.....	83.461	53,415,110,400
Permanent appropriations, general and special accounts:		
Interest on the public debt.....	9.889	6,329,205,760
Other.....	6.649	4,255,683,840
Total permanent appropriations.....	16.538	10,584,889,600
Grand total appropriations.....	100.000	64,000,000,000

¹ Claims and judgments stated here is a title appearing in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, and includes amounts of claims and judgments that were not provided in the regular appropriation acts, and that were not allocated by department in the supplemental.

² Estimated.

³ "Other" permanent appropriations include primarily refunds of internal revenue (\$2.6 billion), statutory debt retirements (\$0.6 billion), payment to Railroad Retirement account (\$0.7 billion). The refunds of taxes were probably omitted from the table for 1953.

Sources: Public laws and Senate reports of the 83d Cong., 1st sess. Congressional Record (Daily Digest), August 14, 1953, p. D661. Data supplied by Maureen McBreen, Economics Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH PLACING OF STATUE OF MARCUS WHITMAN IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 57), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed with illustrations and bound in such style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress at the unveiling in the rotunda, together with such other matter as the Joint Committee may deem pertinent thereto, upon the occasion of the acceptance of the statue of Marcus Whitman, presented by the State of Washington, 5,000 copies; of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and for the use and distribution by the Senators from Washington; and the remaining 3,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the use of and the distribution by the Representatives in Congress from the State of Washington.

Sec. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to have the copy prepared for the Public Printer, who shall provide suitable illustrations to be bound with these proceedings.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF POSTAL OPERATIONS

Mr. CARLSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 197), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may complete the study and investigation

Sec. 4. The Bureau of the Budget is authorized to control the amounts actually expended from the sums made available by this

of postal operations as authorized by the Senate Resolution 49, 83d Congress, agreed to March 6, 1953, hereby is extended to March 31, 1954.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 198), which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That Mr. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, be, and he is hereby, elected a member on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, vice Mr. PURTELL, of Connecticut.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 189) providing for additional personnel and funds for the Committee on Government Operations, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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. BUSH:

Statement issued by him relating to the report of the Committee on Foreign Economic Policy.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

List of Minnesota's 4-H delegates to the National 4-H Club Congress in Chicago.

UNITED STATES TROOPS HELD IN SLAVE LABOR CAMPS OF CHINA AND SIBERIA

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, a few days ago the free world rejoiced at the news that more than 22,000 United Nations prisoners were to be turned over to the U. N. Command, which most certainly will promptly set them free—free as God made them, free as man was meant to be: to enjoy life, to bask in the warmth of his family's love, to speak his mind, to read what he will, to earn his daily bread in a job of his own choosing, to offer his talent as he will in service of his fellowmen, to worship his God according to the dictates of his conscience. This is something of what it means to be free. This is the world that awaits United Nations prisoners who, now returned, will soon be free.

But amid the exultation, the shouts, the tears of joy, there are cries of anguish, words full of bitterness, disillusionment, anger, and near despair, and the quiet murmur of desperate, pleading prayer from the wives, the mothers, the fathers, and the children of the "forgotten men"—the American boys, variously estimated as between 700 and 944, who are being held in slave labor camps of China and Siberia, in direct violation of the Korean truce agreement which pledged that all prisoners would be returned. We know this

is true from eye-witness accounts of our wounded prisoners who already have been returned, and from other reliable sources.

Our Government has known of this outrage since last fall, but apparently has taken little, if any, action to bring about the return of these enslaved American boys. Why has not action been taken, and when will it be taken? The parents, the wives, the children, the friends of these boys, yes, and the American people, want to know. They want to know whether individual lives have become less sacred in our day, whether in order to please our sometimes spineless allies, we shall remain quiet, whether we shall barter human life for a dishonorable peace. Americans cannot ridicule the patriotism of these boys by leaving them in the lurch, after asking them to risk their lives for their country. In our proper joy over the return of U. N. prisoners, let us not allow the more than 700 American prisoners of the Red slave labor camps to become the "forgotten men" of our day, and the symbols of a betrayed trust, a callous indifference, and a national dishonor which will blacken the pages of world history from here to eternity.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a detailed account of this subject which was printed in the December 18, 1953, edition of U. S. News & World Report.

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

WHERE ARE 944 MISSING GI'S?

PANMUNJOM, KOREA.—Behind the Yalu River, the evidence now indicates, are hundreds of American soldiers and airmen, known to be alive in Communist hands but unreported—left as pawns of the Communist Chinese.

These Americans were positive, identified as being in North Korean prison camps before the shooting ended. Most disappeared from those camps during the tense weeks just before the truce. Some were taken away at night, ostensibly for questioning. They never returned. Others were members of work parties sent from one camp to another. Work parties "lost" 1 or 2 members each before they returned to their base camps. That attrition was virtually unnoticed during the high excitement of impending repatriation.

Altogether, there are 944 Americans now identified as being alive in North Korean camps, but not returned or reported. These are in addition to the 22 Americans who elected to stay behind. They are Americans who urgently wanted to come home, prisoners known to others who have since been repatriated, or whose names or pictures have been definitely identified in Communist propaganda releases. Most of them are almost certain to be still alive, spirited away across the Yalu by Communist guards.

The United States did not win the war in Korea. As a result, it cannot demand and expect to receive any reliable accounting for those still missing. Americans can only protest.

But so far there has been no protest, except for an Army communique last September. There is a seeming reluctance by American officials to press the case of the GI's who are still missing. Emphasis, instead, is on finding a way to make a deal with the Communist Chinese on terms of peace. There is even pressure to speed a United Nations membership for Communist China. Any emphasis on the missing Americans, apparently, could complicate those proceedings.

Military men, unable now to exert pressure on the Communists under terms of the truce, refer to the missing as a diplomatic problem. State Department diplomats, in turn, say the problem of missing Americans is not yet under their jurisdiction, and won't be until a political conference with the Communists either begins or is definitely abandoned. So they are doing nothing.

Meanwhile, new reports about the missing continue to flow in.

There is substantial evidence now, for example, that a number of American prisoners were marched through the streets of Mukden, deep inside Manchuria, in a victory parade. As far as is known here, none of those men has returned. No repatriated prisoner has said he participated in that parade.

Officials here know for certain that some Americans were sent to Manchuria. Capt. Lawrence V. Bach, a 29-year-old fighter pilot from Grand Forks, N. Dak., spent 4 days in Manchuria, where he was questioned by the Chinese, North Koreans, and the Russians. He was followed by Maj. Gen. William F. Dean, who spent some time in the Communist sanctuary in Manchuria. Both of these Americans were repatriated. Others who were sent there were not.

Most of the evidence, however, comes from reports, now evaluated, of American prisoners repatriated during Operation Big Switch here at Panmunjom. En route to the United States, former prisoners were questioned intensively about men who had died or disappeared either during the lengthy forced marches northward or while they were in camps.

During the long sea voyage, when the repatriates, in the comparative comfort of hospital ships and transports, could relax and tell coherent stories of what they saw, trained intelligence men checked and rechecked each report.

A pattern finally emerged out of this long and intensive probing that showed not only systematic atrocities and deaths but slavery as well.

The Chinese Communists did not merely want Americans to work in salt beds of Shantung or the uranium mines of Sinkiang. They primarily wanted—and got—Americans who could handle the sensitive and complex instruments of modern war, such as radar, airborne and ground, and infrared instruments for night combat. They were particularly interested in airmen with technical training, and in artillerymen who knew the secrets of intricate fuzes.

Communists offered General Dean command of a division or corps if he would fight for them. They could do nothing when he refused. But the lower-ranking technicians were not listed as prisoners, as General Dean was known to be. The Chinese were under no compulsion to explain what happened to these men. Communist record on prisoners of war were slipshod. When United States asked the whereabouts of specific Americans known to have been alive in Communist camps, the Chinese merely replied that they had no records to show these men were ever prisoners.

Reports of returned prisoners are that many United States enlisted technicians disappeared from Communist camps in the final weeks of the war. The fact that they vanished indicates that the Communists could not persuade them to cooperate willingly. The Chinese could not afford to turn these technicians over to the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission and hope that they would refuse repatriation. Instead, those Americans became nonexistent, as far as the Communist prisoner-of-war records were concerned.

Not all of the missing were specialists, however. Of the 944 Americans identified in Communist camps and not returned, 610 were ground-force troops with a wide variety of backgrounds. Air Force fliers numbered 312; 19 served as Marines, and 3 as Navy

men. Some were captured as far back as 1950, others as recently as this year. Most of those from the Army and Marine Corps were enlisted men, representing all major ground-force units.

Just where they are now is less certain. There are reports from returning Japanese prisoners, repatriated this month from Russia, that some Americans have been seen in a prison not far from Moscow. War prisoners of many western nationalities are reported to be working in a huge underground project in Siberia. Prison compounds in Manchuria are closed to neutral inspection. So are Communist research and development centers in that part of the world. Some of the 944 may be dead, victims of the torture techniques for "persuasion" widely reported by repatriated prisoners.

But United States intelligence officers believe that most of those missing Americans are probably somewhere in Manchuria. Chinese authorities carefully supervise all travel between Manchuria and the rest of China. Their bases along the Yalu River, at Port Arthur, Changchun, Mukden, and Harbin are closely guarded and restricted for all but the military. There are enough Russians in these areas to make several hundred Americans inconspicuous.

Elsewhere in China, Americans would be noticed and the grapevine would pass the news on quickly. But Manchuria is a closed military area and the Americans could live there, guarded, for years, with no opportunity for escape.

Behind the disappearance of these Americans are reasons that can be inferred, too. The need for technicians in expanding Communist forces accounts for most of the missing specialists, as United States military officials see it. There is conjecture that many of the others, resisting Communist persuasion methods, will be used for an experiment in long-term "brain washing," to see how Americans react. And there are big opportunities for Communists, in withholding some Americans, to enhance their bargaining position or to obtain ransom, as was done with American fliers forced down in Hungary.

What United States will do about Communist withholding of American prisoners, in direct violation of the truce agreement in Korea, is the big question now. Families of the missing men are beginning to wonder if 944 more Americans must be added to the price of going into a war without winning it.

INCREASING OPPOSITION TO THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that some 20 million or more Americans are represented by the organizations which so far have gone on record against the Bricker amendment.

There have come to my attention the names of many organizations opposing the Bricker amendment. The following list is being expanded daily, so that it is possible that I do not have a complete list of the groups representing the millions of Americans who oppose this dangerous, unnecessary amendment:

American Association of University Women.
American Federation of Labor.
American Jewish Committee.
AMVETS.
B'nai B'rith.
Catholic Association for International Peace.
Church Peace Union.
Committee for Collective Security.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Fourth Study Conference on the Churches and World Order, sponsored by the National Council of Churches.

Friends Committee on National Legislation.

League of Women Voters of the United States.

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Council of Negro Women.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Young Women's Christian Association.

LEGAL GROUPS

Committee for Defense of the Constitution by Preserving Treaty Power.

Federal Bar Association.

New York City Bar Association.

Philadelphia Bar Association.

New Jersey Bar Association.

St. Louis Bar Association.

New York County Lawyers' Association, committee on Federal legislation.

Suffolk County Bar Association.

Mr. President, throughout our Nation there is a vast ferment of discussion on the subject of the Bricker amendment. Considerable numbers of letters and telegrams have been pouring in to the Senate on this issue.

The supporters of the Bricker amendment got a head start—as far back as 4 years ago—by getting out to the grassroots their particular side of the story. The opponents of the amendment, on the other hand, have only recently begun to organize their efforts.

I am convinced that, as more and more Americans become familiar with the dangerous implications of the Bricker amendment, vast numbers of messages against Senate Joint Resolution 1 will pour in from the grass roots.

The State of Wisconsin, in particular, for several years has been the target of well-financed barrages of pro-Senate Joint Resolution 1 literature. It has come from organizations which sought to stir up the wildest sort of fears regarding the President's treaty-making power. I have accordingly received a considerable number of messages urging passage of the amendment.

While I do not happen to agree with the views expressed, I welcome the exercise by my fellow Wisconsinites of the right of petition.

Currently, however, I am receiving ever-increasing numbers of messages from those of my fellow citizens in the Badger State who strongly oppose the amendment. They present clear and compelling reasons for their case. At the present time I send to the desk a few of such messages received within the past few days. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD as an indication of the views of thinking citizens of the Badger State.

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

MILWAUKEE, WIS., January 20, 1954.

Re Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: After studying the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1), I find that I am very strongly opposed to it and would

like to urge your aid in defeating this amendment for these reasons:

1. It would alter the basic structure of the Government as established by the Constitution.

2. It is contrary to the basic theory of separation of powers among the three branches of the Government.

3. It would seriously curtail the treaty-making authority of the United States, preventing the Government from entering into many treaties which are beneficial and necessary to the interests of the United States.

4. It would so seriously interfere with the historic and fundamental functions of the Executive and the Senate in the field of foreign affairs that it would jeopardize the influence of the United States in the world today.

Yours very truly,

DOROTHY HEEDERIK.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., January 24, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Join the multitude of women in Milwaukee in opposing Bricker amendment. Am grateful for your strong support.

Mrs. BERTA GUTMANN.

RACINE, WIS., January 24, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Nice work. Stay in there and keep pitching against the Bricker amendment.

RACINE CIO COUNCIL,

HAROLD J. THOMPSON,

Secretary.

RACINE, WIS., January 24, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We attorneys of the city of Racine oppose the Bricker amendment and urge you to continue to oppose it in the Senate. We believe the Bricker amendment would seriously hamper the conduct of foreign affairs and that the Constitution now has adequate safeguards against misuse of Executive power.

Francis Wendt; Kenneth Greenquist;

Manny Brown; Dexter Black, Jr.;

Charles Constantine; Henry Dorman;

Frank Fell, Jr.; Gerald Flynn; Reuben

Growsky; William Stroemer; Morris

Shovers; Robert Goodman; Vincent

Vassallo; Edward Zahn, Jr.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., January 24, 1954.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Milwaukee branch, Women's International League Peace and Freedom supports your stand against Bricker amendment. We believe Senate Joint Resolution 1 would seriously hamper United States conduct in international affairs. We urge you continue firm against this and any compromise bill. Present constitutional safeguards adequate.

Mrs. S. A. MORELL, Chairman.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,

Madison, Wis., January 19, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senator from Wisconsin,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

SENATOR WILEY: Remembering your spirited address at the Madison Lion's Club last fall, may I encourage you to continue your opposition to the so-called Bricker amendment.

Please make no compromises that give in to the idea that we are to attempt isolation from the affairs of the nations.

Respectfully,

RICHARD L. SNYDER.

THE ROBERTS CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 21, 1954.
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I should like to express my unqualified opposition to the so-called Bricker amendment.

It would seem obvious to any student of our form of government that this amendment is a deliberate encroachment of the legislative upon the executive branch. There is a liquidity of movement necessary in the handling of foreign affairs by our State Department. To create and freeze a situation in such a way as to hamper all freedom of movement by our Executive in its treaty-making function would appear to be obviously harmful to our foreign relations.

Our Supreme Court very clearly enunciated the doctrine that our Constitution must prevail when any treaty is in conflict with it, and to the best of my knowledge this has never been contradicted. If the laws of any particular State should be affected by a treaty negotiated for the general good of the entire country, surely the latter consideration must prevail. Certainly the contrary cannot be argued for 1 minute—that the good of the country as a whole must be sacrificed to preserve inviolate the laws of any 1 State.

Because of the most excellent and statesmanlike attitude you have manifested on all our other national and international problems, I feel quite sure that it was unnecessary to write this letter. However, I am sure you will not consider it amiss to know how at least one citizen feels about the matter and I sincerely hope you have received many other letters reflecting the same attitude.

Sincerely,

A. F. LUTTER.

MADISON, Wis., January 19, 1954.
Re Bricker amendment.
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: After giving the matter of the Bricker amendment (S. J. Res. 1) to the Constitution prolonged and careful study over a period of approximately 1 year, I have come to the conclusion that I must write to you and ask that you oppose it in its entirety.

My reasons therefor are as follows:

1. I cannot conceive of a need for such an amendment under our well-established form of government. The responsibilities of the several branches of our Government are well defined. They are a check one on the other; and the electorate is a check on all.

2. The safeguards which were placed in our Constitution when it was so carefully drafted by men who were, even then, well aware of the problems and difficulties which this new form of government would face are, in my opinion, sufficient today to protect the citizens of the United States from possible ill-conceived executive actions.

3. We are, after all, a federation of States. The Federal Government was established because there were (and are) areas in which it is essential that we act as one. While we have retained (and I believe rightfully so) the majority of powers in our separate States, occasions arise when it is essential that the President be in a position to make decisions in the international field which affect our collective interests. I firmly believe that the present powers of our Congress (through the Senate's power to ratify or disapprove treaties, and the Congress' power to refuse to implement treaties or executive agreements) are adequate to protect us from possible unwise executive decisions.

I assure you that I have not come to this decision without carefully and thoughtfully weighing the arguments on both sides of this controversy. I am now definitely opposed to the Bricker amendment, nor do I see the

value of such a compromise as that suggested by Senator KNOWLAND. I hope you will vote to defeat the joint resolution.

Respectfully yours,

CARYL A. REGAN.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., January 20, 1954.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I am writing in support of your stand against the Bricker amendment.

In these times when events demand fast, detailed action, it is dangerous to regulate further the President's powers to take action.

In the matter of treaty-making, the Constitution already protects us and Senate Joint Resolution 1 would delay and hamper our ability to carry out our foreign policy.

Further the Bricker amendment would change the system of checks and balances set up in the Constitution. To make this change would in my opinion be a grave and far-reaching mistake.

Yours very truly,

LILLIAN CRANE FULTS.
JACK J. FULTS.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., January 20, 1954.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: Permit me to register my protest against passage of the Bricker amendment.

It seems to me that the most valid argument against permitting the President to exercise discretion in making agreements lies in the abuse of this power through secret negotiations. Inasmuch as the proper place for the ultimate power should be in the will of the people as expressed through public opinion, and inasmuch as public opinion requires that the public be informed, it seems obvious that the fault lies in the secrecy rather than in the power to make agreements. Why, therefore, is the law requiring publication of all such agreements not enforced?

I feel very strongly that the proposed amendment to the Constitution is much too radical a change for conservative people to support. Let us keep the present balance of powers that has stood for so long and eliminate the present abuses instead. A change of such major proportions may only lead to new abuses which we cannot foresee.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. A. B. BEVERSTOCK.

STANLEY MARSACK POST, No. 442,
JEWISH WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
January 20, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I wish to advise that the Stanley Marsack Post of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States is firmly in accord with the position recently stated by our national commander, Harry T. Madison, relative to the Bricker amendment. Commander Madison indicated that enactment of this measure would seriously shackle the executive branch of our Government in the conduct of foreign relations and make vastly more difficult the vital task of rallying the free world for common defense against communism. Our post has every confidence in the Presidency and feels that it would be unwise to limit the power of the President in the conduct of foreign policy.

We are pleased to find you in the forefront of the fight against passage of the Bricker amendment and pledge you our wholehearted support in this issue.

Yours sincerely,

STANLEY MARSACK POST, JEWISH WAR
VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES,
H. L. KASTRUL, Commander.

COFFEE PRICES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in the past week or 10 days, as a result of the sudden upward spurt in the price of coffee, there has been renewed interest in the question of how coffee is traded on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange and in the possibility that speculation, rather than economic or weather conditions in the coffee-producing countries, may be the chief cause for the price rises.

I have addressed to the Federal Trade Commission a letter urging an examination of the present coffee situation and the development of current statistics on the supply of available coffee and related matters.

My office has been receiving numerous requests for the report on the coffee investigation which was conducted in the 81st Congress by the Agriculture Subcommittee of which I was then chairman. The supply of these reports is nearly exhausted, while the demand for them continues and is growing. I have therefore requested the Joint Committee on Printing to arrange for an additional printing of 1,000 copies of the Coffee Report, which is Senate Report No. 2377, 81st Congress, 2d session, dated August 23, 1950. They will be available tomorrow. Those wishing to obtain copies of the Coffee Report will be able to do so either from the Senate Agriculture Committee or from my office.

It will be recalled that the report made 14 specific recommendations which, if carried out shortly after they were proposed, unquestionably would have gone far to prevent the price gouging which coffee consumers are once again facing today.

I note that the Attorney General has informed the press that his Department is looking into the possibility of violations of the law in connection with the current coffee price rise. Several of the recommendations in our Coffee Report called for action by the Attorney General. If he wishes to make a useful contribution to a permanent solution of the problem of spiraling coffee prices, due to speculation, he might well proceed as proposed under our subcommittee's recommendations. He might, for example, act on the recommendation to investigate the sales and storage practices of foreign coffee interests in the United States, and take appropriate action under the antitrust laws. Up to now the Department of Justice has failed to act on this recommendation. He might also follow the suggestion we made that the Attorney General seek injunctive relief against the continued use of the present D and S contracts on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange as being unduly restrictive of trade in coffee and as tending to create controls far beyond reason.

Other agencies of the executive department could also make important contributions to a cure of this recurring plague. We recommended that the Bureau of the Census undertake to make regular quarterly reports on green and roasted coffee stocks on hand, similar to those prepared at the specific request of our subcommittee in December 1949 and March 1950. Such figures would be in-

valuable in showing how much economic justification, if any, there is for a rise in coffee prices alleged to be caused by shortages.

The Department of Defense could also take useful action if it would adopt our recommendation to change its coffee-buying specifications, so as to permit delivery of any growth equal to or better than Santos 4's.

Likewise, the legislative branch of the Government can take action almost immediately to put trading in coffee under the same kind of regulations as those which apply to trading in domestically produced commodities. Since last March I have had pending before the Senate Agriculture Committee a bill, S. 1386, to which would place trading in coffee under the control of the Commodity Exchange Act. If this bill were enacted, I am sure trading practices in coffee would improve rapidly, to the benefit of all our coffee-drinking consumers.

We further recommended tax legislation which would help curb the undesirable speculation in coffee futures, by requiring taxation of profits gained by foreign interests through trading on our commodity exchanges. The text of a proposed bill to this effect, which I highly recommend for the consideration of the House Ways and Means Committee, is printed on the last page of the Coffee Report of 1950.

Those interested in the other recommendations made by our subcommittee almost 4 years ago, none of which has been adopted, may find them on pages 40 and 41 of the Coffee Report.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, even if all these recommendations were adopted today, none of the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars which have been gouged from the pockets of American consumers since the great speculative raid of 1949 would be returned to them. But, at the very least, the present gouge could be stopped and future ones prevented.

There is need, not so much for any more investigations of the coffee trade, Mr. President, as for action on the findings and recommendations of the investigation of 4 years ago.

What is needed is action, both legislative and executive, to deal with an inexcusable situation, which is rapidly becoming intolerable. We know, Mr. President, that the economic position of several of our sister Republics of Pan America, is heavily dependent on the production and sale of coffee. We should and shall continue to furnish the principal market for their exportations of coffee. But our primary concern is to see that United States consumers are not made the victims of speculative practices, at home or abroad, which place an unjust burden on American families.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of my letter of January 23, 1954, addressed to the Federal Trade Commission.

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

JANUARY 23, 1954.

HON. JAMES M. MEAD,
Commissioner, Federal Trade
Commission, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: The Commission is doubtless aware of the volume of news and editorial discussion relative to the rapid rise in the price of coffee and the consequent burden on the American consumer.

You will recall that some 3 years ago a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the course of its investigation of price spreads made a rather exhaustive study of another rapid rise in coffee prices which pertained at that time. You will also recall that the subcommittee filed its report of the situation as the subcommittee had found it together with some fourteen recommendations for action to remedy some of the conditions then extant.

For various reasons to which it is unnecessary to refer in this letter no real action has been taken to carry into effect the recommendations the subcommittee made.

I feel there is ample justification for the belief that much of the recent drastic rise in coffee prices is due more to certain gambling and speculative practices than to economic factors of supply and demand. You also are aware that coffee was not included in the list of commodities brought under the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act.

There is pending now in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a bill to bring coffee within these provisions which I introduced almost a year ago but which has not yet received favorable action by the Senate.

I have in mind the limitations on the appropriation made for your Commission relative to its use in connection with investigation of price spreads, but I feel that there is ample authority and I know there is great need for the Commission to investigate the operation of the instrumentalities engaged in the importation and distribution of coffee in the United States.

May I earnestly urge that the Commission take cognizance of this situation and bring its valuable machinery into action for the purpose of aiding and protecting the American people from any unreasonable or unjustified burdens in connection with the great increases in coffee prices.

I am addressing this letter to you as a Commissioner and former Senate colleague with the request that it be called to the attention of the Chairman and the Commission. I am not personally acquainted with the Chairman.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATIVE TO TREATIES AND EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, this morning I received from the dean of the Harvard Law School a letter relative to the so-called Bricker amendment. It is brief and to the point, and I shall read it:

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., January 21, 1954.
HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: My mail is full of extensive appeals, obviously well financed, urging me to write to Senators about the Bricker amendment to the Constitution.

The senders of these appeals are supporting the amendment. As a result, I have no

doubt that you will be receiving many letters urging you to vote for the pending joint resolution.

The opposition to the Bricker amendment is not well organized, and not well financed. However, there is strong opposition. As I am opposed to the Bricker amendment, it has seemed to me appropriate that I should write to you and urge you to vote against the adoption of this provision.

I will not trouble you with a long discussion of the reasons for my opposition. In brief, they are as follows: (1) The proposal is not necessary, and (2) its adoption would do far more harm than good. In particular, the so-called "which" clause would make it impossible for the United States to deal effectively with many important areas long the proper subject of the treaty power, as I have pointed out in a letter which was printed in the Wall Street Journal for January 19, 1954.

You will be told that the American Bar Association favors the Bricker amendment. Actually, the decision was made by the house of delegates of that association, a body of less than 200 persons, with much opposition there. The leadership of the association thwarted an effort to take a vote of the members, after full consideration by the membership. The New York Bar Association, the New Jersey Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association, and many lawyers of my acquaintance, are all strongly opposed to the amendment.

There can be no doubt that large sections of the public have been led to have fear of the treaty power. Although I believe that these fears are groundless, there would be no objection to a simple amendment which would allay these fears. But the Bricker amendment goes far beyond that. It is, in final analysis, an attack upon the Union itself. Its adoption would, I believe, have very serious consequences. I hope that you will vote against it in the Senate.

With best wishes from Cambridge.

Very truly yours,

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD, *Dean.*

I telephoned the dean and asked him whether he had any objection to my reading this letter on the floor of the Senate. He said that he had not.

I also had the pleasure of informing him that I had long since made up my mind to vote against the Bricker amendment in its present form.

ALLEGED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF VENEZUELA AND CHARLES P. TAFT, GEORGE W. BALL—CORRECTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from Mr. George W. Ball, in correction of an inaccuracy which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, 1954.

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

CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, FRIENDLY & BALL,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1954.
Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 14, 1954, an article from the Washington Times-Herald of December 21, 1953, was inserted by Senator MALONE. The article states that both

Mr. Charles P. Taft and I have "filed registration statements with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act as agents of Venezuela."

As the article states elsewhere, my firm was retained for several months last year by the Chambers of Commerce of Venezuela, which are private organizations of business firms. However, the implication in the above statement is that we were representing the Venezuelan Government. Such an implication is misleading and inaccurate with respect to my firm, Mr. Taft, and the Venezuelan Government.

I should very much appreciate it if you could have this letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to correct the inaccuracy.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. BALL.

DEATH OF HUME WRONG

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep sorrow at the news carried in the press this morning of the death of Hon. Hume Wrong, formerly Ambassador from Canada to the United States, and recently Under Secretary of State of Canada for Foreign Affairs.

I had the high privilege of knowing Mr. Hume Wrong personally, having gone to the same place in the summer with him, and having had many opportunities to talk with him about the relations between Canada and the United States. I looked upon him as one of the fine type of statesmen whom we can ill afford to lose. He had a sympathetic interest in people, and, above all, he had a firm grasp of the importance of unity between Canada and the United States, and the necessity for the closest working relations between our two great countries.

I tender my expression of sympathy to Mr. Wrong's family in their bereavement, and to Canada, our neighbor, for Canada has suffered a severe loss. The United States also has suffered the loss of a great and true friend. I appreciate the opportunity to make these few remarks on this sad occasion.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by me entitled "A New Approach to Statehood for Alaska."

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

A NEW APPROACH TO STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—
ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER OF NEBRASKA

On Tuesday of last week the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which was then considering the Hawaii statehood bill, voted unanimously to amend that bill by adding the Alaska statehood bill to it as a title II, thus combining the 2 proposals for statehood for the 2 Territories into a single piece of legislation. Before any motions were made, or votes taken in committee, I stated to members of the committee that I would vote to report the Alaska statehood bill from committee as soon as we could get the bill in proper form.

To make my position clear, I will quote briefly from the statement I made in com-

mittee prior to any vote. My statement, in part, was as follows:

"I have decided to vote to report the Alaska statehood bill out of committee.

"As soon as the committee has reported Hawaiian statehood we shall proceed immediately to consideration of the Alaska bill. In committee I shall urge strongly that the committee write a workable bill that will give Alaska control of enough of her timber, mineral, and other valuable resources to be self-supporting, instead of millions of acres of barren tundra.

"This decision to vote for reporting the bill has been reached only after the most careful and conscientious study. I must confess that I still have very grave doubts as to the possibility of the proposed State's raising sufficient revenue to support the functions of State government after the end of the current construction boom. That is why the grants to the State of federally-owned resources are of key importance. Under all the circumstances, however, I believe it is proper that the matter be passed on by the full Senate, not just by the committee."

I believe the statement I have just quoted is clear.

It is plain to me that there is no reasonable position in outright opposition to statehood for either Hawaii or Alaska. The organization of new territories and their ultimate admission to the Union as States has, through the years, become a basic part of our system of government. It would seem strange if the people in these Territories did not aspire to see the Territory become a State. But statehood at any price, which has been the inflexible position assumed by proponents of statehood for Alaska, is just as unsound as outright opposition.

It is time, I think, that a new approach to statehood for Alaska be found. The purpose of that approach must be twofold: (1) To grant statehood on such terms that Alaska will find them workable from an economic and financial standpoint; and (2) to do it now, not in the indefinite future.

The fundamental element of that new approach must be opening up lands, minerals, timber, and other resources of Alaska to development by the residents of Alaska. That means a loosening of the dead hand of bureaucracy which has completely controlled Alaska for nearly a century.

Under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CONDON], a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is now perfecting the proposed Alaska Statehood bill along those general lines. I believe all the members of that subcommittee are convinced of the necessity of opening up these resources for development. I hope that subcommittee and our full committee will not hesitate to make sweeping changes in the provisions of the original bill. Alaska must be given control of the most of its land, timber, mineral, and other resources, if it is to make a success as a State.

The bill as presented to us failed to do that; it would have left virtually all the resources of the new State under the control of the Federal Government. It is not melodramatic to say that the statehood bill as originally presented would turn an orphan out into the storm.

In the past, my position has been that the bureaucrats in the Interior Department sought to retain their supreme authority in Alaska affairs by keeping Federal ownership over the oil, coal, timber, and other resources. Meanwhile, they pretended to sympathize with the operations of many in the Territory, by offering a form of statehood without the substance—without the resources that should customarily go with it.

There was a group in the Territory, albeit a small one but a loud one, willing to accept statehood on these terms because of their

own selfish desires to control the proposed new State government.

Many of the opponents of past versions of statehood legislation were caught between the play of these two forces. They were attacked and smeared as obstructionists. They have been denounced as enemies of Alaska and Alaska progress.

Speaking as one of the victims of this brand of political demagoguery over a period of years, I believe the time has now come when a workable and an honorable statehood bill for Alaska can and should be written.

I can truthfully say that the attitude in high places in the Interior Department has changed, just as the occupants of those high offices in the Department have been changed following President Eisenhower's victory in 1952.

I know of no high official in the Interior Department today who regards himself as vested with a divine right to control the future of Alaska.

I know of none who believes his mission in this life is to control the Alaska fisheries, one of the greatest of the Territorial resources.

I know of none who desires the Federal Government to hold title to Alaska's land. I do know that the release of that land to private owners where it can be put into productivity is uppermost in the minds of many of the Department officials, just as it is and has been uppermost in my mind.

It may not be an easy task to make all the revisions which should be made in the Alaska Statehood bill in line with this new approach. I am not suggesting that our committee should undertake now to rewrite completely the Federal policies and Federal land laws as they apply to the Territory. I do believe, however, that there are certain fundamental elements which must be taken care of for statehood to be a success.

First and foremost is a sharp cutback in the Federal policy of withdrawing into Federal reservations all those resources or potential resources which might form the basis of flourishing industries if developed by private enterprise. I am referring particularly to such withdrawals as the coal reserves, the oil reserves, and the timber reserves.

Somewhat the same thing must be done to the Federal withdrawals of 300- and 600-footwide rights-of-way for all highways constructed in the Territory. This particular policy seems to me to be the worst possible hindrance to the development of adequate facilities for the growing tourist industry in Alaska.

Perhaps even more important is the necessity of taking definite action to clear up the cloud of native possessory claims. The cloud on land titles created by these claims has threatened every settler's security and every settler's investment. Economic development can never proceed without a system of secure land titles.

Finally, we must work out a system better than that provided in the Federal Highway Act to assist the state of Alaska in the construction of roads to tap its resources. In this day and age, roads are the first necessity in any development program.

On Monday of last week, Territorial Governor Heintzleman released a statement reporting on his recent trip throughout the Territory and telling of the sentiment among the majority of Alaskans for statehood under an equitable enabling act.

The Governor states his position very clearly and in the most sensible language.

Governor Heintzleman's statement as it was released to the press in Juneau on Monday, January 18, reads as follows:

"STATEMENT OF GOVERNOR HEINTZLEMAN

"Statehood continues to be a subject of vital concern to the people of Alaska. I have just returned from a trip to Anchorage and

Fairbanks, the centers of greatest population, and find that people there, as well as elsewhere in Alaska, are anxious to know what Congress is prepared to offer in the way of enabling legislation.

"Statehood has also been of the utmost concern to me since April when I came into this office. The principal question facing us as Alaskans and facing Congress is the economic side of the matter. I have long been interested in helping to build our industrial base to the point where we can adequately support statehood and I am confident that the Territory is making rapid strides toward that goal.

"The progress that has been made in Alaska during the past 8 years, or since our local vote on statehood in 1946, is truly remarkable. In this connection, consider what has been done in expanding our highways and improving tributary roads, the expansion in timber processing and coal production, the increase in surveys of mineral, water power, and other resources, and the establishment of additional and improved schools, hospitals, water supply systems, and other community facilities. All of these things spell present and prospective advances in economic and social welfare for Alaska and thus contribute to a sound base for statehood.

"A majority of the people of Alaska favor statehood under equitable enabling legislation. One enabling bill is now before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There is anxiety that this bill may not reach the floor of the Senate this session or that it will come out too late for adequate consideration. I respectfully urge that this bill be brought out of committee at as early a date as possible so that it may be considered and acted upon by the entire Senate."

We need a statehood bill which will do two things—foster the economic development of Alaska, and give the proposed state the financial resources out of which she can support the cost of state government. Statehood is expected to nearly double the cost of government for the inhabitants of Alaska, where taxes are already as high or higher than anywhere else in the country. If we give Alaska statehood, we must give Alaskans the resources out of which to raise that additional revenue. We cannot in fairness make Alaska a state in name only, as provided by the bill originally introduced.

I am hopeful that the subcommittee and our Interior Committee can develop and report such a measure. If a proper bill can be developed, I pledge my wholehearted support to the admission of the Territory of Alaska into the family of States.

HOUSING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 306)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senate now in executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURT L in the chair.) Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Laurence Ballard Robbins, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate for consideration the nominations on the Executive Calendar, which the clerk will state.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the majority leader that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Operations Administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Foreign Operations Administration are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NORTH ATLANTIC ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Webster Bray Todd, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ECONOMIC COORDINATOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator (special representative for Korea).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lothair Teetor, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the majority leader if it is not a fact that all the nominations which have been confirmed by the Senate up to now were approved unanimously by each of the committees to which the respective nominations were referred?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as I am advised, that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, for term of 7 years from July 1, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, one of the most important constitutional duties of the Senate is the consideration of Presidential nominations to executive positions. After the Senate has satisfied itself that the appointments are in the national interest, it is our duty

to approve them; or, doubting that this is the case, we should vote to oppose them.

Today I wish to speak on the nomination by the President of Mr. Robert E. Lee, to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Martin
Anderson	Gore	Maybank
Barrett	Green	McCarran
Beall	Griswold	McCarthy
Bennett	Hayden	McClellan
Bricker	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bush	Hennings	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Murray
Capehart	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Humphrey	Payne
Case	Hunt	Potter
Chavez	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Jackson	Robertson
Cooper	Jenner	Russell
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Schoepfel
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Lennon	Upton
Frear	Long	Watkins
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent because of illness.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as I was saying when interrupted by the quorum call, I wish to speak today on the question of the nomination of Robert E. Lee, who has been appointed by the President to be a Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission. This is a 7-year appointment and if the Senate approves his nomination today, the new Commissioner will serve on this highly important board and in this sensitive post until 1961.

The questioning of an appointment by the President is not a pleasant task to assign to oneself. If this appointment were not questioned today, it would be gavelled through, as are so many other nominations in this Chamber, without any discussion whatsoever.

An appointment to the Federal Communications Commission is one of utmost importance to the future of this

Nation and to its freedoms. No other agency of Government is granted the power to exercise such a vast control over the thought and speech of the people of our country and over the preservation of the freedom of open discussion, and even dissent, as is the Federal Communications Commission.

No longer is freedom of the press the solitary means of preserving liberty. Important as it is, the vast nationwide resources of hundreds of broadcasting stations and TV stations now have as great an impact, or an even greater impact, on the public mind as the printed word.

Obviously, in the public interest, this vast means of communications must be regulated by Government so that the great gifts of radio and television may not become a tower of Babel. But in such regulation lies the inherent danger that this power may be misused. Such vast power of life and death over every broadcasting and television station, which is vested in the Commission by the authority to grant or refuse to grant licenses or to grant or refuse to grant renewals, should, in the public interest, cause us, in the Senate, to be doubly careful that men selected to this Commission be above the abuse of their great power.

To say that this is a sensitive area of Government regulation is putting it mildly. Few stations can operate without at times coming before the FCC for amended orders, for the improvement or change in their facilities, the removal or change in a broadcasting tower, or the installation of extra equipment.

The vast networks, serving hundreds of individual stations, are also subject to the great powers of the Commission. Thus, in the life of an entire industry, cooperation with its regulating body not only is desirable, but an absolute necessity.

Mr. President, we could have a free press and freedom of individual expression of opinion today, and still not be free. No agency of Government can, in any way, interfere with these great constitutional guaranties. But the new power of communicating with 100 million people by radio, or 60 million by television, makes these guaranties of our older forms of communication only part-time insurance of our liberties.

If the time should come, when the FCC would be packed with men of distinct partisan leaning, with men who would seek unfair advantage in behalf of one line of thought, with men who lack dedication to the great principles of freedom of discussion and dissent, or with men whom the broadcasting industry might fear, regimentation of thought and control of comment would become a reality. I dread to think of the consequences to our free society if this should occur.

Yet in the appointment before the Senate today, I believe there is definitely a sense of fear that this situation might be approaching faster than we realize.

A strange silence has been hanging over this appointment. This silence is found especially in the vast radio and television field, which fills the air during

most of the hours of each day and evening with entertainment, political comment, news, and drama. To my knowledge, only one large broadcasting company officially has spoken in behalf of this appointee. There have been some rather private communications, I suppose, but, for the most part, the vast industry, usually so vocal, the industry that can receive a life or death decree at the hands of the Commission—has maintained stony silence.

While many large and respected newspapers have criticized the appointment, the sense of fear that hangs over the industry spells one thing, namely, the admission that this power can and might be misused for reprisals. Many of the newspapers which have spoken out boldly know there is no regulatory body that can affect them by enforcing orders against them.

Yet even the long arm of FCC power does not entirely miss the newspapers, either. A packed Commission could, indirectly, impinge upon the freedom of the press, should it finally be faced with a hostile Commission.

In the vast field of newspaper operations, in many towns and cities the newspapers have become owners of radio and television stations. These operations, requiring large investments and a long-time payout, are under the FCC, regardless of whether the stations are owned by newspapers. Still other newspapers, faced with rising production costs, have pending before the FCC applications for such facilities, which can be parceled out as the Commission decides.

The importance of this new link between the operation of newspapers and radio and TV stations can be judged by the fact that, even at present, 485 newspapers operate one or the other. Thus, as their newspaper operations are intermingled with the operations of radio facilities, they are subject, at least in considerable part, so far as their very existence and financial stability are concerned, on the life or death decisions which can be handed down by this Federal Commission.

Only one individual, a friend of the appointee, appeared before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to testify in behalf of the confirmation of the nomination. Not only did the strange silence run through the broadcasting fraternity but the absence of other industry spokesmen and legal lights also was noticeable.

This strange silence seems to run deep even in this august body.

The FCC is an arm of the Congress. It is a regulatory body set up by the Congress to do a job. Has the threat of this great power, which is subject to misuse for reprisals, become so great that even Members of this body cannot consider the appointment on its merits without thinking that something adverse to the interests of our States might occur if we were to vote wrong?

The Senate must consider this appointment as it would any other, regardless of the consequences. The primary question which faces us on the question of confirmation of the nomination—as it should be in the case of all other nominations is the question of the nominee's

qualifications. Is Robert E. Lee qualified by experience and training to be a member of the FCC?

Of course, the best judge of a man's qualifications should be the man himself. As he sets his goals, he gives recognition, as no other can, to the field he can best fill.

Mr. Lee's ambitions were in the direction of the specialty which he studied and practiced—as an accountant. He was a candidate, and a well-supported one, for Assistant Comptroller General. Nearly one hundred Members of the House of Representatives who knew him recommended him as eminently qualified for that high position.

Having watched his work as a member of the House Appropriations Committee investigative staff, I would be inclined to approve his own judgment of his qualifications, and also the judgment of the members he served.

As his supporting witness, Mr. Charles Kress, of Binghamton, N. Y., stated at the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings:

He was then a candidate for the office of Assistant Comptroller General, and I took it upon myself to try to line up some support, and I talked to a great number of people on his behalf.

It was with great surprise and amazement that I learned subsequently that his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission had been made.

I knew that Columbus got east by going west, but I never knew you could get on the Federal Communications Commission by running for Assistant Comptroller General.

I thought the committee would be interested in my opinion that his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission was certainly no schemed or devised plan. It was just a ricochet romance.

So, Mr. President, now we are faced with the results of this "ricochet romance." Is not the job of judiciously and fairly administering the vast powers of the FCC worth more than a consolation prize?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I notice that the Senator from Oklahoma is criticizing Mr. Lee because at one time he sought another job. I am curious to know whether the Senator from Oklahoma always got every job he sought, or if sometimes he met with defeat, and turned to a different job.

As I recall, the Senator from Oklahoma was not always a Senator. I think he also ran for some minor positions. I do not believe he was always successful.

I may say this is the first time I have heard a man criticized because when he lost in one effort, he came back and tried again.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Wisconsin has brought up that point. I ran for only one office, and was defeated the first time only—the office of serving in the United States Congress, in the House of Representatives. But I ran again for the same job and the next time I made it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would my colleague call it "a ricochet romance," when thereafter he came to the Senate?

Mr. MONRONEY. No, because I did not ricochet. On the contrary, I kept going right along on a bee line. After I reached the House of Representatives, I had a very difficult time crossing the 100-yard span to this body.

But I do not believe Mr. Lee's qualifications, which perhaps would make him an ideal man as an Assistant Comptroller General or an administrative officer of the Bureau of the Budget or an administrative officer in the FBI, give him the sensitivity and keen feeling and great urge to protect our basic freedoms of speech and discussion and dissent. That is why I am raising the question here.

I am sure the distinguished gentleman will have some to speak in his behalf; but I cannot find in his record anything which leads me to believe that for this particularly sensitive job, which may require so much to be done in the 6 or 7 years of his appointment, he has the background or the experience or the judicial mind which would enable him, against all odds and against all exigencies, to preserve the basic freedoms as they apply to the radio and television fields.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at this point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, Mr. Lee had a very distinguished record with the FBI, and then served with the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma, before he arose to criticize Mr. Lee, called J. Edgar Hoover and asked him, "Mr. Hoover, was Mr. Lee one of your outstanding men? Does he have good judgment? Do you have complete confidence in his integrity and honesty?"

I also wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma has contacted the members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, in order to ascertain what they think about the nominee.

Let me say that I have done so; I have contacted a number of the members of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. Without exception, they say this young nominee is one of the most brilliant, one of the most honest, and one of the most dependable assistants they have ever had. They say he has done an outstanding job. He has never played politics. He has rendered just as much service to Democrats on the committee as to Republicans. I am curious to know where the Senator gets any information of any kind which would reflect upon the honesty, integrity, or the good judgment of this young man.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has brought up that question because I should like to advise him that the junior Senator from Oklahoma does not make it a practice, on the floor of the Senate

or elsewhere, to reflect upon the honesty or integrity of anyone. I am raising the question of this gentleman's qualifications for a very highly sensitive position. I know that he had a fine record with the FBI. I think the FBI is one of the world's greatest crime-detection agencies. I applaud the great care which, through the years, the great Director, J. Edgar Hoover, has used in maintaining the FBI in the objective field. However, I doubt whether it is good public policy to turn over our Federal communications to the ex-members of the FBI. Perhaps the Senator might wish to have upon that Commission one FBI operative, a graduate of the FBI school of investigation, one who would be most able and well qualified. But, to follow it through, would we want the entire Commission to be composed of FBI members? Would we want other agencies of Government to use only FBI graduates to administer their functions and deal with highly technical and judicial problems such as those which come before this particular Commission?

I wish to advise my friend that in speaking of his very dear friend—and I am sure he is a warm personal friend of the junior Senator from Wisconsin—nowhere in this speech will I attack the integrity, honesty, or ability of Mr. Lee as a detective or as an accountant. I merely raise the question of his qualifications for this particular position, as is my right. In this case are we fitting a square peg into a round hole? Are we not wasting the very great experience which Mr. Lee has had in the field of balancing the budget or ferreting out a few loafers or excess employees on the Federal payroll, through the Appropriations Committee and in other ways? I believe that we have far too few men engaged in that task, men who have the ability in that field which Mr. Robert E. Lee has demonstrated.

As I stated earlier, I would vote in a minute to confirm the nomination of Mr. Lee for almost any position dealing with fiscal affairs. However, in the realm of the mind and the heart, it is the wish of Americans forever to keep unimpaired their great liberties and freedoms. It is with that thought in mind that I raise this question on the floor of the Senate. I am sure I shall lose. I am sure that only a corporal's guard will vote as I shall vote. However, I cannot help but think that it is important at this time, when too clearly we see that the priceless heritages handed down to us since before the Revolutionary War are somewhat in danger of being lost, either by accident, or because we are too busy to pay attention to some of the things which are happening on the fringe.

It has been frequently reported, as I have said, that President Eisenhower, in keeping with his pledge to find the most experienced and best qualified men to fill positions on boards and commissions, would appoint to this Commission someone who was a practical broadcaster. It was generally felt that, certainly in the Federal Communications Commission organization, it was important that a practical broadcaster should have an appointment. In fact, various men with

years of practical experience as individual broadcasting station operators and network officials were prominently mentioned in the press as the likely appointees. I understand that several such persons were endorsed by Members of the Senate for this particular position. Certainly they were not Democrats. They were not persons whom we were supporting. The growing broadcasting and television industry felt that somewhere in this great machinery of control, perhaps a practical, workaday experience at the local level might be of some importance.

Suddenly something happened, when complications resulted in connection with the General Accounting Office position, and the Federal Communications Commission appointment of Mr. Lee was announced. No one knows exactly what happened. The newspapermen mention various rumors. Apparently the particular place in the General Accounting Office was not to be offered to Mr. Lee, as was originally planned.

So his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission was announced. Apparently it was a surprise to him, as well as to many of those who had endorsed him for the other position, for which he had been trained, and for which he was qualified. His entire background has been one of accounting and of service with the FBI. At the time of his appointment Mr. Lee said:

It is possible that it could be a liability for a man to know too much about the field when he took office.

Certainly Mr. Lee did not know too much about his new field, but if the qualification of lack of knowledge is to be a new hallmark of competence for Government appointment, this places a new twist on the matter of qualifications. It is in strange contrast to the often-repeated goal of the administration to find and use the best-qualified men in their field for important Federal positions.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] asked Mr. Lee the following question:

Have you had any experience at all in this Federal communication field?

Mr. Lee replied:

Only since October 6. Well, in my work in the House of Representatives and in the Appropriations Committee, I had occasion to attend the hearings and advise the members on questions asked. I think I would be safe in saying I was reasonably familiar with the organizational setup.

There again we have the mechanical side. This testimony does not necessarily indicate an understanding of the broad scope of control involved in the work of the Federal Communications Commission.

I continue to quote:

Senator SMATHERS. You have never been in the radio field or the broadcasting field or the technical aspects of it?

Mr. LEE. No; other than a few guest appearances.

Senator SMATHERS. Do you think that experience is desirable or necessary for a Commissioner to do a good job?

Mr. LEE. I don't think so, any more than it might be necessary for the Postmaster General. I don't think he would neces-

sarily have to be a mail man. I do not mean to be facetious.

Certainly, in connection with Mr. Lee's qualifications as an auditor or accountant, he is a man of ability. His work for the Appropriations Committee certainly would qualify him for a position with the Budget Bureau, for the position of assistant secretary in charge of the division of fiscal affairs, or even the position of Assistant Comptroller General, with respect to which the present nomination has become a ricochet romance.

Mr. Lee argued it was necessary, in order to understand any Federal Communications matters, that the Commission should have an accountant who could understand the various reports and statistics, and other documents with which the Commission may deal. He argued that such a man was just as important as an experienced broadcast engineer, or an attorney.

I seriously doubt whether accountancy is such a great asset. The principal duty which the Federal Communications Commission has is not to audit books or submit budgets to Appropriations Committees. The Commission has offices to perform those functions. I seriously doubt whether it is too difficult to understand the balance sheet which is submitted by a man who is applying for a Federal Communication Commission license, whether for radio broadcasting or television. So in considering his qualifications for this particular position, I question whether we should give the top score to the ability which Mr. Lee undoubtedly has as an accountant. The regulatory work of the Federal Communications Commission is quasi-judicial.

I doubt the importance of an expert knowledge of accountancy as a vital prerequisite to this job. What I am concerned with is whether Mr. Lee has the judicial temperament, the background, and the determination to safeguard the air channels in the interest of freedom of speech and freedom of opinion.

I am especially concerned with his former connection and association with Facts Forum, as a moderator, and, more important, as an adviser in the organization of its expanded programs, including television. He was adviser to Mr. H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex.

If he has had any actual radio or television experience it has been with the Facts Forum organization. In his testimony before the committee he showed a considerable understanding of the operational details, and admitted that Mr. H. L. Hunt, its moving spirit, had sought his help in Washington for advice in enlarging the program.

I am certain that this experience was not such as would qualify a man for the important post of member of the Federal Communications Commission. Rather, I think his association with this vast propaganda machine, financed with tax-exempt dollars, raises a big question of the wisdom of the confirmation of this nomination. I should like to read into the RECORD, for the information of the Senate, a few facts about Facts Forum, as developed in a very important series in the well-respected Providence Journal.

I ask the Senate to indulge me as I read a part of the article. I wish Senators to get the whole picture of the importance of what is going on throughout the 48 States. I read from the first of a series of articles which were published on the subject by the excellent newspaper, the Providence Journal:

THE FACTS ABOUT FACTS FORUM No. 1: A RICH MAN, GROWING POWER

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

Haroldson Lafayette Hunt, of Dallas, Tex., may be the richest man in America, which, if true, ordinarily would be of only passing interest.

However, in the last 30 months Hunt has created an organization of growing power in American mass communications and public opinion.

This organization is Facts Forum. It is, Hunt says, a nonpartisan, nonpolitical, educational project with strict rules against carrying on propaganda or attempting to influence legislation. Except for anticommunism, and soil and water conservation, it has no opinions of its own, he says.

On this basis Fact Forum has according to its figures, gathered 125,000 participants in its various activities; it has obtained over a million dollars worth annually of free radio and television time; it has presented many famous Americans in various interview and panel shows; it produces one network radio show and one network television-radio simulcast and is considering taking over a third well-known radio show. Its network time is free.

On this same basis of nonpartisanship, it sends out a mass of literature and public opinion poll to newspapers, radio stations, and to every Member of Congress.

On this same basis it has obtained a Federal tax exemption both for its expenditures and for its contributors. Recently, a former moderator for Facts Forum was appointed to the most powerful single body governing mass communications in America, the Federal Communications Commission.

Facts Forum began officially in June 1951. It helps create local discussion groups whose basic information comes from the description of both sides of national issues as interpreted by Facts Forum. These both sides presentations are broadcast over 222 radio stations on recordings made by Dan Smoot, an ex-FBI agent who is now chief moderator for Facts Forum. The material for these broadcasts comes partly from a free circulating library with hundreds of titles and 20,000 books, which are given free to participants who get six other persons to read any given book first. Transcripts from the both sides broadcasts are sent to interested listeners and are reprinted in the organization's house organ, the Facts Forum News, which is sent to 60,000 persons monthly.

Facts Forum also conducts a public opinion poll on certain selected questions, the results of which it releases as news to 1,800 newspapers, 500 radio stations, and every Member of Congress, some of whom introduce it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Facts Forum also pays for certain newspaper and periodical activities by individuals.

It has 20 paid persons on its staff, mostly in the headquarters in Dallas, with branch offices elsewhere. It has a paid organizer and speech instructor for use in localities where Facts Forum activities are being created.

In recent months Facts Forum has branched out into radio and television network shows. It now produces the Mutual Broadcasting system show, "Some of the Nation," a half-hour radio show on 315 stations on free time. It also produces the American Broadcasting Co. television-radio half-hour show, Answers for Americans, also

on free time. Both shows have been favorably reviewed by impartial critics.

These are in addition to a half-hour television show filmed by Facts Forum in Washington and sent out free to 58 stations. The basic Dan Smoot both sides program is on 222 radio stations.

Incidentally, although the program is called a forum, I may interject here to say that it consists of Moderator Dan Smoot debating with himself. He debates one side of an issue for a part of the program and then takes the other half to debate the other side of the issue.

Of course, Mr. President, it is rather difficult to tell how well he presents the facts on either side of what he calls the two sides of the issue, or on the same Dan Smoot side; and any connection with the concept of a basic fair debate is rather remote.

I continue to read:

The moderator for Facts Forum on its two network shows is now in negotiation to add the MBS half-hour radio program, Reporters' Roundup to the growing list of Facts Forum activities.

The man behind this growing national organization is probably the most obscure individual among the rich men of the world. He broke his lifelong rule against personal publicity by announcing the formation of Facts Forum but before that, H. L. Hunt was unknown even to many citizens of Dallas.

It is problematical whether Hunt is, as he has been labeled, the richest man in America or the man who comes closer than anyone else on earth to being a billionaire. He abhors such terms.

The article continues with some interesting facts on Mr. Hunt's life. I should like to read one more paragraph which perhaps is quite descriptive. It reads:

Hunt made the bulk of his fortune during the depression, a period which, he feels strongly, marked a deplorable tendency among his fellow Americans to demand welfare services from the Federal Government. He feels that the Democratic Party, except for the Dixiecrat movement, is the instrument of socialism and communism in this country, and that the Republican Party as presently constituted displays dangerously radical tendencies.

Hunt supported General MacArthur for the Presidency in 1948 and later, when the general was deposed by President Truman and visited Texas in a special plane, Hunt was on his plane.

I should like to continue by reading more about Facts Forum as published in the excellent Providence Journal. The article continues:

Facts Forum has existed for 30 months. During the first—and relatively quiet—half of its life, Facts Forum spent about 200,000 tax-free dollars, and the Hunts gave Facts Forum 219,000 tax-free dollars. Facts Forum will not say what its current budget is. But in the second 15 months of its operations, it has expanded enormously. It has added at least 4 regional offices with paid organizers (1 in Hunt's birthplace, Vandalia, Ill.), and entered network radio and television activities on a coast-to-coast scale. So there is reason to believe that the \$200,000 expenditures of the early months of Facts Forum is only a fraction of the current budget. In those early months, the Hunts supplied more than 95 percent of the listed contributions.

UNANIMOUS APPROVAL FOR FORUM LACKING

With such admirable aims announced by Facts Forum, one would expect unanimous approval. The town-meeting idea has always been popular in this country. And, indeed, many national figures have expressed publicly their full support of Facts Forum. These include Senator GEORGE MALONE, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, and Senator JOHN W. BRICKER.

But there are some startling demurrers. This is odd for a nonpartisan educational enterprise. One of Washington's better known Washington correspondents, Carleton Kent, of the Chicago Sun-Times, offered money for merely interviewing a Senator on Facts Forum, declared, "I wouldn't touch that organization with a 10-foot pole." Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, who appeared in one of the first Facts Forum television broadcasts, said, "I wish I knew then what I know now about that organization." Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, who appeared on the first Facts Forum television show with Senator MCCARTHY, was asked to make another Facts Forum appearance but declined. This is a pattern repeated by others.

Why there should be such unprecedented distrust of a nonpartisan educational organization will be discussed in later articles.

If Senators will permit me to do so, I should like to read excerpts from the second installment of the excellent series of articles published by the Providence Journal. From it we get a picture of the mass production of propaganda, and the articles show how propaganda can be cleverly brought on the air in America under the disguise of being public features of radio and television stations.

This is article No. 2:

One of the most admirable projects a man of wealth could underwrite would be the stimulation of rational debate among Americans on the problems facing them.

With the destruction of civilization a possible penalty for unwise decisions, a calm and judicious citizenry would have a better chance of surviving the perils of the atomic and the totalitarian age.

When H. L. Hunt, the Texas oilman, came out of a lifelong silence to announce such a program—a nonpartisan, nonpolitical educational organization—many persons hoped that this happy occasion had arrived.

Into this organization, Facts Forum, Hunt poured hundreds of thousands of dollars until today it is a nationwide project of 125,000 participants with a number of network radio-television and other public-opinion projects.

The basic coast-to-coast radio program of Facts Forum is a presentation, largely on free time, of both sides of national issues as interpreted by the staff of Facts Forum and given over the air by Facts Forum's chief moderator, Dan Smoot.

As this basic program progressed the Facts Forum version of both sides made many listeners uneasy. They seemed to feel that both sides were not equal in emphasis as interpreted by Facts Forum.

In January of 1952, for example, Smoot gave both sides of a Facts Forum question, "Should we negotiate whatever peace we can get in Korea?" Of Facts Forum members polled, 85 percent had voted to stay in Korea, 15 percent to get out any way we could. To the argument for staying in Korea, Smoot devoted less than 300 words of the broadcast, to the argument for getting out, more than 1,000 words.

A PROGRAM ON THE DEATH PENALTY FOR THOSE WHO WOULD OVERTHROW THE GOVERNMENT

Some broadcasts also seemed to be not so much both sides of a single issue, but merely two versions of the same side.

For example, Facts Forum devoted one program to the question of whether advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence should be punishable by death. Presumably the two sides of this question would be (1) Yes, the death penalty should be imposed, and (2) No, the death penalty is too severe and present laws should remain.

But as presented by Facts Forum, the pro-death penalty argument was that Communists threaten the security of 150,000,000 Americans and therefore are guilty of a crime worse than murder, which in many States is a capital crime.

Facts Forum's argument against the death penalty was made, in part, in these words:

"The real, subtle, accomplishing influence of communism is achieved not by the card-carrying members of the party or by the publicly known fellow travelers, but by the people in the lunatic fringe which surrounds the party.

IT'S NOT THE COMMIES, BUT SOME WHO THINK THEY ARE ANTI-COMMUNIST

"People in this fringe group are never identified as Communist sympathizers and many of them seem to be unaware of it themselves. * * * It is these people and not the Communists who are responsible for all of the first-rate achievements of communism in the United States."

Facts Forum often repeats the thesis that the Nation is in danger of complete collapse because of subversion and that this is the doing, not of Communists, but of certain people who think they are anti-Communist. Facts Forum concluded that to kill these people who think they are anti-Communist would be to abridge their civil rights.

[Laughter.]

A study of Facts Forum presentations of both sides shows that there is a consistent approach to national issues and that this approach involves these factors:

1. Facts Forum regards as on one side in one camp, the liberal, moderate, and conservative views. The other side is the extremist right.

2. In arguing for what it says is the viewpoint of the liberal-moderate-conservative side of an issue, Facts Forum uses dryly rational, subdued style. In arguing for what it says is the other side—the extremist right—Facts Forum uses highly emotional, inflammatory language.

I am sorry I cannot readily imitate the commentator. I have heard several of his programs.

3. Facts Forum presents what is often a fair and factual description of the liberal-moderate-conservative side. Then, in presenting its version of the other side, it devotes much of its time charging the liberal-moderate-conservative element in this country with subversion, betrayal, and treason.

4. On Facts Forum, personalities and namecalling often dominate and facts are forgotten.

An example of how the both sides technique works is the Facts Forum broadcast of both sides of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. It said of those against the act:

"The gallant fight against the bill was led by Senators Humphrey, Lehman, Kefauver, Moody, Benton, and Douglas. These champions of real democracy and international understanding certainly would not have tried to defeat this bill if it had been a good one." The broadcast then listed some of the organizations against the bill which, it said, "include nearly all religious and racial groups, the CIO and most of the A. F. of L. affiliates."

HOW FACTS FORUM PRESENTS OTHER SIDE

Facts Forum then presented the other side:

Those who want to destroy the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act would throw open the doors of the United States to the Socialist hordes of Europe. They are not worried

about the downtrodden people of Europe. They want to flood America with people who have been drenched by the Socialist propaganda of eastern Europe—people who would swell the tide of Socialist votes in our great industrial centers.

This is the purpose of those who know what they are doing—the Americans for Democratic Action, whose aims and ideals are almost identical with those of the Socialist Labor Party of Britain; the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, an officially cited Communist organization; the National Lawyers Guild, another known Communist front; and the Communist Party itself.

And, of course, rallying around these is the usual clique of innocent dupes who don't know what they are doing—the gulliberals—who have always done the work of the Communist Party.

Dan Smoot ended this Facts Forum broadcast with the words:

"I have just given some views of conservatives who look upon the McCarran-Walter Act as one of the best and most generous pieces of legislation ever enacted in America or elsewhere—and of liberals with an opposite point of view."

Another time Facts Forum presented both sides of the question, Should we continue to handle Korea as a limited police action?

The first part of the program was devoted to the arguments of those who favor American intervention in Korea. It quoted the schoolish terms of Gen. Omar Bradley and the relatively unemotional words of Adlai Stevenson. "Korea," it quoted Stevenson, "is the most remarkable effort the world has ever seen to make collective security work. In choosing to repel the first armed aggression of the Communists, we chose to make bitter sacrifices today to save civilization tomorrow * * *." Thus went in style and tempo the argument for handling Korea as a police action.

Then came, as Facts Forum put it, "the other side":

"It is a strange war for a man who has been taught to love the American flag but who now finds himself fighting under a blue flag representing a world organization of which his enemy, the Soviet, is a member.

"He is in a Korean foxhole as the result of a United Nations order, but our Constitution says that only Congress can declare war. It's called a United Nations police action, but the United Nations' only noticeable contribution is the policy of appeasement which keeps the Americans from winning * * *

"It's cold up here in the winter—sometimes thirty below zero. If a boy cries his tears turn to ice. And then there is the enemy, always the enemy. Joe can feel him out there in the blackness, and sometimes he can hear him. And sometimes when a star shell bursts overhead, he can see him—not one, but thousands, moving relentlessly forward * * *

"Presently the third assault wave starts, and then the noise—the screaming, eerie unearthly noise of mindless men in a banzai charge. And a boy from Texas starts firing as fast as he can feed clips into his automatic weapon. He fires until the gun is red hot in his hands. The Commies die. They die by the hundreds, and fall in heaps; but there are endless numbers of them. For every one that falls, ten come up to charge over his dead body; and some of them get through—1, 10, or a thousand.

"Then it is the kind of fight that man fought centuries ago; knives and fists, fingers groping for eyes, the teeth seeking a soft spot in the neck. Maybe Joe will die in the slit trench, and maybe he will live—his hands sour and gummy with half-digested rice gruel ripped out of the stomach of a bleeding bundle of rags and bones at his feet * * *

"Korea. Police action or war? A question for all Americans. This is Dan Smoot for Facts Forum."

Madam President, I wonder if any Member of the Senate, regardless of which side of these issues he might take, would say that these are facts.

Facts Forum has improved on the business of creating propaganda by the device of writing letters to the editor. The Forum offers prizes for letters, which are printed, to stimulate the ability of people to express themselves to newspapers.

One of the most democratic institutions remaining in America is Letters to the Editor, to which any citizen can express his opinion in public print, barring obscenities, libel, or commercialisms.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What connection does Bob Lee have with Facts Forum?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will try to develop that as I come to it. Mr. Lee was the moderator of the first three Facts Forum television shows. He testified, in hearings before our committee, that on at least three occasions he was called into consultation to advise with Mr. H. L. Hunt, in connection with the expanded program of Facts Forum.

I shall discuss a further connection which sufficiently leads at least the junior Senator from Oklahoma to believe that it is sufficiently important to merit discussion in regard to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lee.

Mr. CASE. Did Bob Lee ever have any financial interest in Facts Forum?

Mr. MONRONEY. Only as a commentator, for which he received \$400 for appearing in 3 shows, \$100 of which, he testified, he gave back.

Mr. CASE. Did he appear as moderator, or did he appear as an arguer on one side or the other?

Mr. MONRONEY. He appeared as moderator on the TV program, and he also testified that in conference with Mr. H. L. Hunt, who apparently was in Washington, he gave advice and discussed programing, talent, and other matters with Mr. Hunt, who has been the guiding genius of Facts Forum, which I am discussing.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that the \$300 or \$400 which he received—

Mr. MONRONEY. I think that is insignificant. I do not raise that point against Mr. Lee.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that that amount was for either his services or his expenses?

Mr. MONRONEY. I presume it was for his services. I do not raise that matter as a reason for disqualification. The Senator from South Dakota asked me if Mr. Lee had a financial interest in Facts Forum. Many persons, including newspapermen, receive stipends for moderating programs.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that Lee tried for the job Smoot got?

Mr. MONRONEY. The record does not show. I rather doubt that he did.

Mr. CASE. In any event, does the record show that Bob Lee has had any connection with getting radio time for Facts Forum since he has been a member of the Commission?

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish the distinguished Senator would allow me to develop that point. I think, first, it is necessary, at least, to let the Senate know what Facts Forum is. If there shall be only one vote against the confirmation of Mr. Lee's nomination, I think the time will have been well spent to have had the Senate realize what can be done with tax-exempt dollars and having hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars' worth of mass-produced programs sent across the country by means of radio and television stations, programs allegedly giving both sides of a question.

I should like to develop that point in my own way. I think there is definite information which the Senate should consider in connection with the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. CASE. Is it not a fact that Facts Forum was on the air long before the present administration took office?

Mr. MONRONEY. It was, but in a rather feeble and ineffective way. The real purpose of the program, the real business, one might say, was to give the appearance of giving the opposition side of a story. That point of view took on new meaning and a new figure about the time of which I am speaking.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator say that was before or after Mr. Lee was named to the Commission?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; that was before. That happened several months before he was named to the Commission.

Mr. CASE. Is the junior Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that the junior Senator from South Dakota was the principal supporter and backer of another candidate for the particular position to which Mr. Lee was appointed?

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand the junior Senator from South Dakota even had ready a press release to announce the appointment, at the time Mr. Lee's appointment was announced.

Mr. CASE. That is not correct. The junior Senator from South Dakota was in Europe at the time the appointment was made. Furthermore, I have not been in the habit of giving press release on anything, much less appointments. In any event, I was interested in the candidacy of one Robert J. Dean, a man who was connected with the industry, and who I felt was very well qualified.

In spite of my great friendship for Mr. Dean, and my belief that he would have been the best man for the place, I think it would be unfair to the deliberations of the Senate for me, knowing Mr. Lee as I do, and knowing also the responsibilities that members of the Federal Communications Commission have, to sit in the Senate and not challenge some of the points of view which are being presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma.

For example, the Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned the fact that Mr.

Lee is an accountant. He is an accountant. I was a Member of the House of Representatives, as was the Senator from Oklahoma. I served on the Committee on Appropriations at the time Mr. Lee joined the staff. I am somewhat familiar with his work. Apparently we thought he was a very fine man, and I think the whole record does not indicate anything other than that he is an able accountant.

I am certain the Senator from Oklahoma must know that the Federal Communications Commission has responsibilities that are not confined wholly to radio and television. There are also responsibilities in the field of the regulation of the telephone and telegraph industries.

A few years ago there was a Commissioner by the name of Walker, who performed very valuable service in connection with the regulation of the telephone industry. As a result, certain orders were issued in consequence of which there was a reduction of telephone rates. Obviously, the examination of the telephone and telegraph industries, particularly the telephone industry, as it was carried on by Mr. Walker, called not for experience in the delineation between freedom and nonfreedom in the expression of opinion, but for a person who knew how to analyze the financial corporate structure of a corporation, depreciation, and items of that sort.

Certainly if the contribution of Mr. Walker to the telephone industry meant anything to the country, it ought to be permissible for the Federal Communications Commission to have in its membership someone who knows how to take apart financial statements.

Mr. Lee has such knowledge. The Federal Communications Commission, which deals with radio, the question of rates, the question of depreciation, the question of financial qualifications, with respect to the granting of permits and licenses, would seem to me to justify having at least one accountant as a member, when already there are 2 or 3 lawyers, a couple of engineers, and perhaps 1 person connected with the industry.

I recognize that the Senator from Oklahoma has been very generous in letting me make a few remarks, while not confining myself to questions. I appreciate his courtesy in that regard.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from South Dakota has always been generous with his time. One could do nothing less than to cooperate in any way he could with the opposition.

Mr. CASE. As I say, I disqualify myself from having any special interest in the appointment of Mr. Lee. As a matter of fact, I was much more interested in the appointment of someone else. I think unless there is a definite connection between Mr. Lee and Facts Forum in a malicious or evil way, whatever the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma may be regarding Facts Forum should not operate to reject the nomination of Mr. Lee. Neither do I think the fact that Mr. Lee is an able accountant would be a liability so far as the telephone and telegraph industries are concerned.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am grateful for the observation of my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota. Commissioner Walker had served a full 6-year term as a member of the corporation commission, the regulatory body of the State of Oklahoma that deals with the handling of communications in that State, and as an administrative officer in a quasi-judicial post. I do not believe he ever was an accountant. I think he was an attorney, an experienced man in handling that type of work. I appreciate the high regard in which the Senator from South Dakota holds one of Oklahoma's distinguished former Members of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. CASE. In analyzing an industry like the telephone industry, with the purpose of determining whether interstate long-distance telephone rates, for one thing, should be modified, the ability to analyze financial returns and corporate structures is of value.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would be of some value, but in my opinion, most of that type of work is done by expert accountants at the staff level. I believe the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was right in the first place in opposing Mr. Lee for the nomination, because a certain seasoning and experience in broadcasting is necessary for one who is to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I think the Senator was right in the first place.

Mr. CASE. I still think my candidate was a better man.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the Senator agree that such practical experience as a broadcaster might be very beneficial to the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. CASE. I think it might be, but I do not think Mr. Lee is not qualified. I think his ability will be valuable. I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MONRONEY. But it is my understanding that the position was to have been filled by one who was supposed to have ability as a practical broadcaster. I had thought the nomination might be given to the industry instead of to Mr. Doerfer. But when his nomination was announced, the disappointment to the broadcasting fraternity was rather great, because there never had been nominated anyone who had been a practical man in the broadcasting field.

Mr. CASE. I do not know about that. I do know that I urged that it would be valuable to have a man who had grown up in the industry and had been in the industry for something more than 23 years. I still believe he would have been an excellent appointment. I do not retract anything I may have said in his behalf. At the same time, that does not necessarily mean that Mr. Lee is not qualified.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I am going to try to be as brief as I can. However, I think that the letter-writing technique in the public forum of the newspapers is rather illustrative of the same technique which is used in this hitch-hiking method of supplying tailor-made propaganda and so-called opinion.

Newspaper readers in the vicinity of Dallas, Tex., have had many opportunities to read letters by a "J. McCarthy, 1348 Highland Road, Dallas" (presumably no blood relation to J. McCARTHY, of Appleton, Wis.).

Once Mr. McCarthy wrote against Truman's having intervened in Korea, another time against social security, another time against all New Dealers and Fair Dealers, another time accusing Truman of promoting socialism and communism, another time pleading for an end of international giveaways, another time attacking then-Secretary of State Dean Acheson, another time charging the United Nations with being "a rabble of nations," another time urging a low legal limit to all income taxes.

These happen to coincide with the opinions of H. L. Hunt, the multimillionaire Dallas oilman who has created a nationwide voter-education program called Facts Forum. Presumably, however, Mr. McCarthy held these opinions sincerely, as he has a right to do.

But what most readers of Mr. McCarthy's letters in the newspapers do not know is that Facts Forum paid Mr. McCarthy for writing these letters.

Mr. McCarthy received, as a result of writing these letters and other promotional efforts for Facts Forum, close to \$600 in the first 15 months of Facts Forum's operations.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish the Senator would make it clear that the McCarthy mentioned as signing the letter is not the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly wish to make that clear. I wish to state that he is not the Senator from Wisconsin and is no relation; yet he received \$600 for writing letters to the editor. I know the junior Senator from Wisconsin is not going to bother to write letters to an editor in Dallas, Tex.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say for the RECORD that the name McCarthy was dug up by what the Senator calls the outstanding Providence (R. I.) Journal, and inserted in the headlines of the newspaper for the obvious purpose of trying to create the impression that the McCarthy mentioned was the Senator from Wisconsin or some relative of his. All through the article "Senator McCARTHY" is mentioned. Then an unknown man from Dallas is headlined. McCarthy was paid by Mr. Hunt for writing the letters. I think it is one of the most dishonest and as snide an act as any of which I have knowledge. The article to which the Senator from Oklahoma is referring attempted to create by innuendo the impression that the unknown McCarthy from Dallas was the Senator from Wisconsin, or some relation of the Senator. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma is not trying to create that impression.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not trying to create such an impression.

Mr. McCARTHY. I realize that the Senator is merely reading the article as a part of a very long series. I am not accusing the Senator from Oklahoma of any improper conduct. I am not accusing the Senator of doing what the newspaper was trying to do. However, I repeat that the newspaper was guilty of a very dishonest and snide attempt in endeavoring to create the impression

that the Senator from Wisconsin was the writer of the letters. I am also sure that the article, again by innuendo, was trying to set forth that Mr. Hunt had contributed to my campaign. If Mr. Hunt had contributed to my campaign, he would have been welcome to do it. I would have welcomed funds from Mr. Hunt or anyone else during the campaign. However, I desire to make it clear that so far as I know Mr. Hunt contributed nothing to any campaign in which I was involved. I may say that he is perfectly welcome to contribute to any campaign, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no "keep out" sign, is there?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; there is no "keep out" sign.

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to my distinguished friend and colleague from Wisconsin that I have other articles which are worse than the ones with the McCarthy headlines, but they do not deal with the citizen from Dallas, Tex.; they are more or less on different matters. The name "McCarthy" on the article I hold in my hand is in 8-point type. There is no headline or even bold-face printing in the article. I merely desire to say that Mr. McCarthy, of Dallas, Tex., has found it very profitable to write letters to the editor and collect money as prizes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

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

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to announce that there is to be a meeting with the Democratic members of the Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Therefore, much as I dislike to do so, I shall have to leave at this time. In the event that the debate is at an end before I return, I desire to make it very clear that I personally have the highest opinion of Bob Lee. He is a friend of mine. However, I had nothing whatsoever to do with his being nominated. Had I known that Mr. Lee was seeking the nomination and could I have been of assistance to him, I certainly would have tried to be of assistance. It happens that I did not help him obtain the nomination. He is a good friend of mine, and I have the highest possible opinion of Bob Lee.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to have yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin. I may say to him that Mr. Lee also has the highest possible opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin. There was demonstrated before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a very warm, close, personal, as well as political friendship.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, getting back to the article, I should like to read further from it:

Thus, out of every \$10 paid to persons who got letters on political issues printed in the newspapers and then sent to Facts Forum for "judging," \$9 went to letter writers expressing the view of H. L. Hunt and \$1 to those with opposing views.

In other words, \$9 out of every \$10 went to writers of letters to the editors expressing the views of H. L. Hunt, and only \$1 out of \$10 went to those writing letters opposing the views of the sponsor of Facts Forum.

In order not to delay the Senate unduly, I should like to conclude as rapidly as possible:

At one time the one-sidedness of these payments attracted attention and Facts Forum announced that from then on the payment would be equally divided between what Facts Forum called "Liberal" letters and "Constructive" letters, presumably meaning what others have called "Liberal" and "Conservative."

But this, apparently, was soon abandoned. In November 1953, Facts Forum announced payments of \$295 for 10 letters, all of them expressing Hunt's opinions. In December 1953, it announced payments of \$360 for 11 letters, \$275 for 9 pro-Hunt letters, \$75 for 1 anti-Hunt letter, and \$10 for one non-political letter.

The letters follow closely the Facts Forum political thought in another respect. The letters sent to newspapers are, at Facts Forum's request, on subjects current in the Facts Forum "public opinion poll."

Each month Facts Forum mails out 120,000 postcards with poll questions on them. It says it gets about 12,000 back. All signed cards are counted in the poll. Facts Forum suggests that members fill out the cards together at their meetings.

The results are then incorporated into a news release which goes to 1,800 newspapers all over the country, 500 radio stations and to all Members of Congress. The news release refers to it only as a "public opinion poll."

However, in its own publication, the Facts Forum News, it is described not as a cross-section poll—which most editors, radio newsmen and Congressmen would assume a "public opinion poll" to be—but as a poll of "informed" (that is, Facts Forum membership) opinion.

Madam President, there is much more on this matter which I should like to discuss, but I do not care to delay the Senate unduly.

I recommend the series on Facts Forum as interesting reading for any Member of the Senate who is concerned with the problem of keeping fair and free discussion alive in this great country of ours.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator putting in the RECORD the article in its entirety, so that it may be available to any Member who desires to read it in full?

Mr. MONRONEY. The entire publication has been put into booklet form. If I can receive permission to insert it into the RECORD, I shall do so. I have left out some of the articles which might be considered highly controversial, regarding the relationships of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and Mr. Hunt, and the Senator from Wisconsin being Mr. Hunt's favorite candidate for President. I did not want to include articles which did not seem properly to belong in this discussion.

From what I have personally heard over the air, and from what I have read of its own publications, I would question whether it is either "Facts" or "Forum."

Yet this new propaganda machine, the largest and most ambitious ever set up in the United States to advocate and slant one point of view, under tax exemptions for a charity foundation, rolls merrily on. Its massive station tie-up is creating a new device in slanting so-called free and equal discussion on public issues to promote the line of thought held by H. L. Hunt, of Dallas, Tex.

This is particularly true in the larger radio tie-up and is beginning to show up in their new television program. I have talked with numerous Senators who have had experience with this program, and they have been doubtful about the claim made for its presentations that they are fair and unbiased.

Yet the newly appointed FCC Commissioner recommends this program as a good example of "public service programs" which radio and television stations carry in justifying their wavelengths on the airways. How much of the new policy of "Facts Forum" and its planning and format are the product of the new Commissioner will never be known.

Mr. Lee did serve to launch the television program, and he moderated the first three programs at the personal request of Mr. H. L. Hunt "who called me," said Mr. Lee, "and indicated that he was thinking about embarking on this program. He wanted my assistance, not because I was a moderator, I don't think, but because I was reasonably familiar with what the issues might be and so forth. I agreed to help him get it started."

In answer to a question by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]:

Do you feel that Facts Forum is a fair and impartial presentation of political issues to the American people?

Mr. Lee replied:

To the best of my knowledge, I do. I have listened to a number of these recordings that were made, and depending on what time you switch it on, you might wonder which side it is on. I think it has been presented very fairly, in my observation. I am not familiar with their literature. I have not read very much of it. I have listened to a number of their recordings and I have listened to a number of their television shows.

As a private citizen, or even as an ordinary Government official, it is not important whether Mr. Lee likes the program or not. But as a member of the highly sensitive Federal Communications Commission, his activity for and on behalf of "Facts Forum" and his relationship with it, plus his approval of its fairness and objectivity, become important questions to be considered by the Senate, in reaching a determination of whether to confirm this nomination.

Let us bear in mind, Madam President, that all radio and television stations are under the life-or-death control of this Commission, and in the choice of what public-service programs will be run on the individual stations the association and approval of Facts Forum could be important factors in tipping the scales of decision in its favor.

Other programs, either the usual forum program or straight commentary

programs, most of them commercially sponsored by non-tax-exempt businesses, do not have the advantages accorded to Facts Forum. If the programs are slanted one way or another, the sponsor may hear of it from the listeners and his customers, and he may withdraw the program or correct the slanting. Commentary programs by various newscasters must stand or fall on the reception of the programs by the listeners. Either a program loses its popularity with its audience, and the station drops it, or it succeeds in the free-enterprise spirit of competition. Thus, in the long run, the public is—as it should be—the ultimate censor of the general run of programs of this type.

But Facts Forum is different. Not only is it completely tax exempt, but if a radio station does not wish to run the program as a free public-service program, time can be purchased by the foundation itself for as long a period as may be desired by Mr. Hunt and his associates.

In some cases the program, through the help of the Facts Forum agents, acquires sponsors to reach key spots for paid sponsored broadcasts and television programs. This has been done, according to one writer from New York, by advertising oilfield equipment to the audience on Long Island.

The big fear, however, regarding such a mammoth propaganda device as this one—which is without any control over the slanting of so-called unbiased broadcasts—is that Mr. Hunt now has a friend on the court.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is there a difference between Mr. Hunt and the ordinary sponsor of a program who depends upon the listeners for their continued support in a commercial sense? Is Mr. Hunt selling anything? Is there any effect upon him in case he does not appeal to the good sense of his listeners?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Arkansas has grasped the very point I have in mind. In the case of an ordinary broadcast by a commercial firm, if the broadcast is slanted, even though it may purport to be an unbiased forum, and if it is not actually such, the advertiser will hear from the listeners and from his customers, and he will either correct the slant or he will drop the program.

Thus, in the ordinary case the great American public exercises a form of censorship, and it certainly has some influence on what is said on the programs. In the ordinary case, the radio station or the sponsor is the judge. Furthermore, the American people exercise a considerable degree of censorship by means of their expressions of approval or disapproval. Moreover, numerous persons may register complaints about the slanting of the program or about any devious means of short changing all over the lot, in the way that I and other Members of the Senate have heard.

The fear about such a slanting of the programs, about the advice given to Mr. Hunt, and about the compatibility between Mr. Hunt and those who are

associated with Mr. Lee, leads me to believe that the Facts Forum will enjoy a very advantageous reception the next time a representative of the Facts Forum calls on the operator of a small radio station and asks him to include the Facts Forum in his programs.

At such a time I do not believe there will be a failure to mention that a member of the Federal Communications Commission was one of the first moderators of the program, and has had a part in it.

As a result, I fear that there will be a loss of freedom of speech and a loss of freedom of discussion on the part of radio-station operators, who may wish to say, "No, I do not wish to carry that program." Under such circumstances, will a radio-station operator be able to say, "No, I do not wish to carry the program"? If the nomination is confirmed, will the average operator of a small radio station, who is asked to carry the Facts Forum as a part of the program of his station, feel, as do most Americans, that he can run his own business in whatever way he may care to do?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know of any other program which might be able to compete with the Facts Forum in presenting the other point of view?

Mr. MONRONEY. I know of no such device.

If the Republican Party or the Democratic Party chose to go on the airways with a political program or an educational program, to be carried on any of the networks, first it would be necessary for that political party to raise funds, by means of individual donations, to pay for the cost of the program. However, the program would be paid for directly; it could not be handled as a tax-free or tax-exempt transaction. None of the funds so donated would be deductible from taxes, as this peculiar privilege enjoyed by Facts Forum.

On the other hand, the device used by the Facts Forum is one which can be used by any wealthy man who wished to have a great impact upon public opinion; and by means of such an arrangement he will be able to write off the cost of the program, because of the tax-exempt feature. In other words, donations to the Facts Forum program can be deductible for income-tax purposes.

As a result, the program goes merrily on its way. An announcer in a very mellow voice declares that he intends to present both sides and give the so-called facts. The program is conducted every week; and if a radio station wishes to carry the program in some of its free time it has the word of the new Commissioner, who seeks Senate confirmation of his nomination, that he considers the program an excellent public service. Thus it will be listed as being a very fine public-service, news-commentary program for a radio station.

Therefore, Madam President, I believe that in this case we are dealing with a new device, one previously unknown in our country, whereby any wealthy man who wishes to adopt such a charity trust or educational scheme could almost monopolize the airways for propaganda.

If a radio station did not choose to carry the program or give time to it—as in the case of one radio station here—then the owners of Facts Forum purchase time for the program. The payment made for that time comes out of some tax-exempt dollars.

As a result, the program would be on the air, regardless of whether it had to be paid for or whether it was carried in free time. If payment were required, it would be covered by a nice, big, tax exemption. That arrangement would allow one man virtually to shout to the millions of American people whatever line of thought he wished them to hear, and in the process he would enjoy a large tax exemption.

Madam President, another item which is quite unusual is that if a radio station does not wish to run the program free, those who operate the Facts Forum program now have agents, so I understand, who go to the operators of radio stations or television stations and say to them, "Let us see if we can find you a sponsor for our program." So instead of spending the money to buy the time, they have employees who go out and sell a sponsor the idea of paying for the Facts Forum program. I have a letter in my files from a man in Long Island, New York, stating that he hears the Facts Forum program. It is sponsored in New York by an oil-well equipment company in Louisiana or Texas. I am sure the oil drillers spudding in the wells on Long Island and the roughnecks and mudhogs will listen every morning eagerly to the advertisement paid for from the income of the oil-well drilling equipment company in Texas or Louisiana. So we have these devices which I believe can smother the voice of freedom and democracy, and of fair, dispassionate discussion and the right of dissent.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that the Senator knows of no precedent for this kind of device for the utilization of tax-free money.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do not. I do not think it has ever been tried before. It is a good device so far as Mr. Hunt is concerned. Its success will probably result in repetition on other fronts, because the device offers an opportunity for one man sitting in his office to reach tens of millions of listeners and carry on his particular line of thought. I have no objection to his carrying on his line of thought with everyone everywhere with whom he can get in contact. He can go up and down the street, or he can buy his own radio time on the air. However, I do not think such expense should be tax deductible. I do not believe we should encourage and build up the power which I think I see building up behind this operation.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The most objectionable thing the junior Senator from Louisiana can see in this picture is a program which tells the public that it is presenting both sides, when actually the entire purpose is to sell only one side, and give the

impression that the other side has been heard when the other side has been only very ineffectively presented. The idea is to present a very weak argument for one side, and marshal many strong—and in many cases misleading—arguments for the other side of the case.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree with my distinguished friend that it is deceptive in the utmost to tell people that they are going to hear both sides, and then wink and say, "We certainly short-changed them on the other side."

Mr. LONG. If a station volunteers free time for a program which, in fact, presents only one side of an issue, the station is in good conscience bound to allow an equal amount of free time for the presentation of the other side of the issue.

Mr. MONRONEY. Under this new device they now say, "We presented both sides." So it is not a question whether 100 words of dispassionate discussion took place on one side and 900 words on the other, with inflammable adjectives and descriptions. The station can say, "We presented both sides." So the offended party or political point of view cannot be heard. It is estopped by this very clever device.

Mr. LONG. Then it is actually a device to give the impression that the law which requires that both sides be heard over the air is complied with when actually that law is being violated.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly agree; but it would be almost impossible in a court of law, or before the Federal Communications Commission, or before the Tax Court, to establish the difference because this is a new device. Who is to be the judge of the fairness of the presentation? First, Mr. Dan Smoot. But Mr. Dan Smoot works for H. L. Hunt, who pays his salary. I wonder if any Senator believes that Dan Smoot, in the program commentary as he debates with himself, would say anything that did not give the impression that Mr. Hunt's side was winning in the argument.

This is something for us to think about. I expressed the fear that the smaller broadcasters, when solicited to put this program on the air, might cave in because the operator had friends high up in the Congress or on the Federal Communications Commission. I wonder how many small broadcasters, wishing to discontinue the free time for Facts Forum, will have the courage to do so, after the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Robert E. Lee.

How many will be fearful when solicited to give their time on new stations to this Facts Forum device?

I am not talking in riddles or imagining ghosts under the bed. Whether Mr. Lee would or would not remember unkindly any lack of consideration shown to Facts Forum is not so important as is the fear that he might. It is that fear about which I think we must worry.

We all remember the nationwide broadcast carried by all three major networks to permit President Truman to answer the charges made against him by Attorney General Brownell in the William Dexter White case. During his broadcast Mr. Truman referred to Mc-

Carthyism in one paragraph of his 30-minute speech. Immediately the Senator from Wisconsin demanded of the networks equal time to answer the former President of the United States. In this demand telegrams were sent to the managers of the three networks, but copies of the telegrams were also sent to members of the Federal Communications Commission, including Mr. Lee.

Whether because of fear of power resting in the Commission or because of persuasion on the part of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, or because of a conception of fair play I do not pretend to know; but 30 minutes of network television and radio time on all networks was forthcoming, and \$300,000 in free air time was awarded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

This was only a short time after Mr. Lee had been placed on the Commission. Would this time have been given by all three networks if they had not realized the strategic importance of the placement on this sensitive agency controlling communications of one of the best friends and political associates of the Senator from Wisconsin?

In many instances of broadcasters we shall not be considering the giants in the field, such as the networks. They will be the small 250-watt radio stations or the daytime stations which long for the privilege of broadcasting at night. They will be operators who must come before the Commission for small orders, unimportant in the national scheme of things, but a matter of life and death to the station owner. Delay in approving a new location for a transmitter; tying up for further discussion permission to go forward on a construction permit after the license has been granted; and the threat of new competition by reshuffling of wavelengths to install another station in the owner's area, all cause the station owner to consider that cooperation with the Commission's wishes is almost mandatory, and that discretion is the better part of valor.

This reshuffling is not an entirely new process, as we have already seen. Probably the most celebrated television case is the Milwaukee case. There are two highly sought after VHF channels allocated for commercial broadcasting in Milwaukee. One has been granted to the Milwaukee Journal, and has been operating for some time, while the other is still under consideration in connection with a contested application. A third VHF channel was allocated for noncommercial educational use.

I believe Members of the Senate are aware of the hot fight which has resulted over this third channel, the so-called educational channel, which has been under contest since March 1951. The efforts of Hearst Radio to acquire this educational channel have resulted in one of the bitterest controversies ever before the Federal Communications Commission.

After some eight orders by the FCC, Hearst Radio finally threw the case into court on July 15, 1953, in an effort to open up the educational channel for commercial broadcasts. In addition to the contests before the Commission itself, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr.

McCARTHY] has demonstrated an interest in assisting in the Milwaukee television situation. On November 17, 1953, the Federal Communications Commission announced that it had turned down the new Hearst bid to get channel 10 in Milwaukee. On November 29, the Senator from Wisconsin announced publicly that the Federal Communications Commission would come under the scrutiny of his Senate Investigations Subcommittee in the new Congress, when he would become chairman.

Senators are probably familiar with the published reports that it was over this question that Acting Chairman Paul Walker, of the Federal Communications Commission, was summoned to the office of the Senator from Wisconsin and questioned in a closed session of considerable length. Apparently he was led to believe that the meeting was an executive session of the Investigations Subcommittee. He found that the whole matter was over not granting a construction order until the change in the control of the Federal Communications Commission had taken place. There has been so much done in this case that it has become a rather celebrated case, which the people are watching.

So it is noteworthy to find that the situation has changed materially in behalf of applicants who have ambitions for a Milwaukee station on the desired VHF band.

On September 30, 1953, almost concurrently with the announcement of the appointment of Mr. Lee to the FCC, whose final appointment was announced by the White House on October 6, Hearst Radio filed a petition requesting the assignment of channel 6 VHF for Whitefish Bay, Wis. This is a suburb that is as near Milwaukee as any good TV station could logically ask to be placed. In other words, although it is called Whitefish Bay, it is literally another channel for those seeking a standard band TV for Milwaukee. Whether Hearst Radio knew of the Lee appointment at the time it petitioned for the location of the new channel is not certain.

However Broadcasting-Telecasting in its issue of October 12, 1953, reported that the Hearst Corp. made its last appeal for a channel in Milwaukee on September 30, 1953. It would appear that Lee was at least under consideration for the post at that time, if it had not already been given him. The following appeared in Broadcasting-Telecasting on October 12, 1953:

First indication Commander Lee had that he was being considered for the FCC vacancy came in September the day before he left for Europe on an inspection trip of foreign aid activities for the House Appropriations Committee. At that time he was one of two proposed appointees for the vacant post of Assistant Comptroller General * * * a couple of days before the new Hearst appeal. While in Europe September 26, the new Commissioner was directed to return to this country and report to the White House. He reported to Sherman Adams, Assistant to the President, October 1, and was at the White House the rest of that week.

Last Tuesday morning he was called to the White House for a 9 o'clock appointment, at which time President Eisenhower signed the FCC Commission.

Almost simultaneously with the appointment the Hearst application to switch a channel from other places into the Milwaukee area was filed, and then things suddenly started to happen. This chronology of events, of course, would not go unnoticed by the television industry. Neither can the speed with which the FCC acted in this matter. Although most broadcasters and TV applicants wait for a long period of time on such matters, while studies are made and consideration given, it took only from September 30, 1953 to October 8, 1953, before the powers of the Commission on Rule Making assigned the new channel to Whitefish Bay as petitioned for by Hearst Radio.

Thirty days were given for complainants to file their objections to this reshuffle of TV bands. Obviously, if a new television channel is to be assigned to Milwaukee, something else must be done around the circle to make it possible, and shifts must be made in other places. It required a change in channels for Marquette, Mich., which formerly had channel 5. In this reshuffle, Marquette, Mich., was assigned channel 6. In addition, to making available TV facilities for Whitefish Bay and Milwaukee, the allocation of channel 6 to Green Bay, Wis., was changed and in its place it became the allottee of channel 5.

Such changes as these, of course, involve other problems. Lansing, Mich., filed a complaint that the new allocation would interfere with their signals and WOC-TV in Davenport, Iowa, also complained to the Commission.

However, with this new burst of speed, 23 days later the Commission approved the order finalizing the new station allocation. It is now undergoing contest by three applicants who are asking for the grant of the license of this newly created channel for the Milwaukee area.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I expect very shortly to make some brief remarks in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Robert E. Lee. In the meantime, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for the speech he is making. In my opinion, he has rendered a very real public service in disclosing the facts to the Senate and, I hope, to a great segment of the American people. They are facts which have not been understood previously and which should be known. Thanks to the Senator's speech, the situation will be much more clearly and fully understood than heretofore.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for his kind remarks.

In closing, Madam President, it should be noted that through the ages the freedom of speech, the right of dissent, and the right of circulation of information have been cherished prizes of a free people everywhere. We need go back only to the case of John Peter Zenger for an illustration of what I have in mind. I have seen the yellow pages of a book, with its old-fashioned s's, dealing with

this great historic event, which did so much to assure us freedom of the press and freedom of speech in this country. We are the custodians, not the owners of this great right which many men have died and fought for to give us in America.

As we consider this important nomination in what I believe to be the most sensitive area of Government touching on these priceless freedoms we should ask ourselves: Is this appointment necessary and should the Senate confirm it?

I would vote in a minute to confirm Mr. Robert E. Lee to almost any fiscal post in the Government. I believe in his honesty. No one has heard me use the Maryland election case, with which he was connected, as a disqualifying item in considering his nomination. My objection goes to a much more important question. It is: Is this man truly conscientious—I say "conscious," and do not use any other word—of the terrific importance of what rests in his hands in preserving the priceless freedom of speech and the right of dissent?

I do not believe his background as an expert auditor or his fine service as a detective is in the line of thought that would lead me, as a reasonable man, or would lead other Members of the Senate, to believe that he would defend with his very life the right of dissent and the right of freedom of speech.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.
Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, may I defer to the distinguished Senator from Ohio? I understand he wishes to leave the Chamber for an appointment downtown. Then, I shall be able to take my time in discussing the nomination before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding to me. I have an important appointment downtown in a few minutes. The nomination of Robert E. Lee came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it was at that time that I first met Mr. Robert E. Lee. I had heard of him and knew of his distinguished service in the House Committee on Appropriations, about which my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], will speak shortly. I knew of his accomplishments as an auditor in the field of finance. However, I can say for a majority of the committee that it has been seldom that a man has made a better impression on our committee than was made by Mr. Robert E. Lee.

His nomination was favorably reported to the Senate by a vote of 11 to 1, with 1 member abstaining and reserving the right to speak on the floor, or to vote against the confirmation of the nomination.

I shall not concern myself with the matters presented this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. He opposed the recommendation by the committee of the confirmation of Mr. Lee's nomination, and voted against the recommendation in the committee.

It would seem to me that, acting as a moderator on free programs, for which a man receives expense money only, as the testimony shows, does not so connect him with an organization, whether it be right or wrong—and I am not passing on that subject—as to be a ground of disqualification. I do not believe we need to pass on that question. I have more confidence in the public than the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma seems to have.

I believe that a radio program either meets with the public's approval or with its disapproval, and that a radio program stands or falls entirely on its record. If a radio program presents propaganda in the form of facts, the listening people soon ascertain that to be the case and pay no further attention to it. If the truth is revealed by a program, and I have no reason to believe that that is not the situation in connection with the program under discussion, the public will approve of the program. Therefore, I believe that fact is relatively insignificant and of little importance in connection with the pending nomination.

Not one question was asked of Mr. Lee which he did not answer honestly and straightforwardly, as it dealt with his relationship either on the outside or in connection with the Federal Communications Commission. I doubt if there are many members of Government commissions or boards who could come before our committees and make a more thorough analysis of their responsibilities and duties than did Robert E. Lee. I think anyone reading the report of the committee will come to that conclusion.

After a few months of association in his responsible position he had a grasp of the functions of the commission which to my mind was very unusual. He had an understanding of its functions and its operating philosophy that marked him, I think, as a man of very great intelligence and of great devotion to the duties of his office. It is very difficult, in the short space of time in which he has served, to pick up the technicalities of a commission such as the Federal Communications Commission. There is not a member of the committee who felt that Mr. Lee was not an able, straightforward, honest, and sensible man. I am one of those, and I believe I speak for a great majority of the committee, who think he will do an excellent job and render a constructive contribution.

I desired to bring this much to the attention of the Senate. I do not want the Senate to consider the extraneous matters which I think have been presented, but I do want it to appraise the testimony of Mr. Lee himself, who was asked every conceivable question in the hearing, and his answers were given in a straightforward, honest manner.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in his capacity as a Member of the House of Representatives, has had a personal relation with this man. He knows his qualifications.

The Federal Communications Commission is a commission dealing with the technical relationships of a new and expanding industry. There are lawyers on the Commission; there are businessmen on it. If ever there was a time in any

of the Government departments when there was need for someone who understands figures, who knows accounting, who can read and understand a balance sheet, and can deal with a great public interest in an efficient manner, that time is now.

So, I think, instead of his being disqualified because he has not been a broadcaster and has not owned a radio station, he shows eminent fitness for the position because of the fact that he has an understanding of finance. He has been associated for many years with Government finance. In his Government representation, he has also been on the side of economy, which is very much needed by the boards and commissions downtown, which too often, I think, have spent beyond the needs of the public interest.

So, Madam President, I am very happy to report on behalf of the committee an 11-to-1 vote in favor of the confirmation of the nomination of Robert E. Lee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, notwithstanding the deep affection I have for my old friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], with whom I served so long in the House of Representatives, I thought his argument and analysis constituted indeed a curious exercise in logic. One might say that he expressed an idea of guilt by association. I could not tell whether the name of Mr. Hunt, of Texas, or the name of Robert E. Lee appeared on the Executive Calendar. As I listened to the argument I tried to attach to it some logical thinking in my own mind. It reminded me of the advice an old lawyer once gave to a young lawyer. He said, "When the law is against you, argue on the facts. When the facts are against you, argue on the law. When both the law and the facts are against you, just raise hell generally."

The argument seemed to be sort of a general observation which it was rather difficult to follow. I thought it was rather philosophical in nature. The Senator said there is a fear that Mr. Lee may not be the right person for the position. Where is that fear entertained?

We have more radio and television stations in one county in Illinois than there are in the whole State of Oklahoma. I think that will stand up as a statement of fact. No television station has written me to express a fear about Mr. Lee. No broadcasting station has called me on the telephone or sent me a letter or a telegram expressing some fear about Mr. Lee's capacity or that his thinking or his objectivity is wrong. None of the stations in my immediate area have written to me about it.

I finished today a program for five television stations, which I do every Monday. I finished a broadcast for five radio stations, which I also do on Mondays, and none of my friends there sent me a line to indicate that they entertained any fear about the state of mind or the attitude or the capacity of Robert E. Lee.

So, Madam President, I wonder where this fear lodges. I have not sensed it.

Manifestly, it has not come to my attention.

It has been recited by my friend from Oklahoma that there has been rather meager oral testimony in behalf of Mr. Lee, that representatives of the industry did not appear. Is Mr. Lee an advocate of the industry, Madam President? Certainly, if we are going to be objective about it, we do not want someone who has an interest to come before the committee and be an advocate. I should much rather have the testimony which Mr. Lee himself presented to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce than to have the testimony of National Broadcasting Co., Columbia Broadcasting System, or any radio or television station in the United States serve as an advocate for his cause, because I am afraid that, then, some suspicion might arise as to whether he was exactly the right person for membership on a quasi-judicial or regulatory body of the Government.

It was said—and I say this in all kindness—"I am afraid he does not have the necessary sensitivity."

That is pretty nebulous, pretty difficult to put one's finger on. But I hope we shall never reach the time when in passing upon persons nominated for Government positions we ask the question, "What is your sensitivity I. Q." What does it mean? Is it that he has not the right kind of urge?

We have to put these things on solid ground. It may be that Mr. Lee has some moral and spiritual allergies. Maybe he has some peculiar sensitivities. But we are heading for many difficulties if, whenever a person nominated to a Government position comes before a committee, we try to ascertain whether he is on the right spiritual frequency. I suppose that is what "sensitivity" means. I should dislike to be in the position of saying to a person who has been nominated for a judgeship or a United States attorneyship, "I am sorry, my friend, but your frequency is all wrong; your urges are bad; your sensitivity goes in the wrong direction."

Obviously, Madam President, we do not turn down a good American citizen who has been nominated by a great President, on the thin and tenuous and slender basis that possibly his vibrations are wrong.

It has also been said that Mr. Lee does not have the necessary experience. My friend from Oklahoma was in the House of Representatives in the days when a lawyer by the name of Lawrence Fly was Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House at that time. I think my distinguished friend from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was there at that time. I know the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. BARRETT], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were all Members of the House at that time. There came before the committee a man by the name of Lawrence Fly, sometimes regarded—and

I trust I do him no injustice—as being a little leftish. I shall let the description stand right there, but I do not know that Mr. Fly, in the sense we are talking of, had experience in this field, as an accountant or otherwise. In fact he was a lawyer.

I remember when Clifford Durr was a member of the Commission. Could it be said that he had any technical experience? He had none whatsoever.

But Bob Lee has had plenty of accounting experience. Senators may wonder at my interest in him. Bob Lee comes from Chicago. He was educated at DePaul University. He has been an auditor and an accountant for a long time. I remember when he came to the FBI. Later he became chief of the investigating staff of the House of Representatives. Never was there a better or more thorough chief of staff. Never did we have consolidated in one personality such a wide acquaintanceship with the ramifications of government.

So when it comes to the nomination of an accountant, what have we in the book? Look in the directory. The accounting section of the Federal Communications Commission is set up separately, and there is plenty of emphasis on it. Is it not about time that we had on the Commission someone schooled in the intricacies of accounting and auditing, to be able, as an expert, to dissociate the items which appear in applications, and to determine what the assets and the liabilities are, and how long the applicants are likely to remain in business?

My friend, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], will recall that when the Western Union-Postal Telegraph merger was under consideration before our committee, it was almost entirely a legal and an accounting proposition. That merger came under the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission.

Thank goodness, we occasionally get an accountant who has some facility in the rather abstruse figures and statistics which are presented, who is able to tear them apart and make them understandable and clear, and who can make his contribution in this field, as he can in any other.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said about the importance of accounting work in the Federal Communications Commission. As I pointed out earlier, not merely was accountancy important in connection with the merger of the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph, but there was a very much publicized investigation relating to the regulation of the telephone industry which was carried on by the Federal Communications Commission. That field is comprised within the duties of the Federal Communications Commission. I am certain the Senator from Illinois remembers when Commissioner Walker made his investigation of the telephone industry. It might have been better if he had known a little more about accounting at the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Along with broadcasting and television, a knowledge of accounting is indeed a valuable addition to the setup of the Federal Communications Commission.

My friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], says that Mr. Lee does not have experience. Sometimes one good accountant is better than a lot of other talent and a lot of other capacity when it becomes necessary to go directly to the heart of a job or to one facet of a job that is expected to be done.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma also says he has some anxiety that Mr. Lee does not have a judicial temperament, and he sought, of course, to implement that premise by referring to Mr. Lee's activities with Facts Forum. The fact of the matter is that I was once on Facts Forum. I appeared with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. We discussed the Tennessee Valley Authority. It must have been a world-shaking program, because it happened that downtown, just about the time we were in the midst of our discussion, debating back and forth, a great bolt of lightning came across the sky and there was a clap of thunder. I thought the blast would blow out the ceiling. I thought, "At long last, we really must have registered on Facts Forum." That was the only time I have been on Facts Forum. I wonder if Senators would care to hold up their hands, to see how many have been on Facts Forum at one time or another. I suppose a very substantial segment of the United States Senate has appeared on that program. But Mr. Lee has served as moderator on three programs of Facts Forum. What does that have to do with judicial temperament? If Senators appear on the program of Blair Moody, a distinguished former Member of the United States Senate, do they invite the criticism that, suddenly, somehow, by some mysterious force, it has had an impact upon their judicial temperament?

If Senators appear on the program Meet the Press, is that to be used as an argument, one way or the other, as to judicial temperament, or does it have any bearing upon one's capacity to serve on a quasi-judicial body or regulatory agency of the Government?

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I think the proper question would be, Because Blair Moody is connected with his program as a moderator, would he be disqualified from acting in a judicial capacity on a Federal board, whether or not he participates in the program?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Under the circumstances, I should prefer not to comment on that. I think every Senator is free to comment for himself, and the answer, of course, would be quite obvious.

The strategy is that because Mr. Lee has served three times as moderator, for which he received \$400, and turned back \$100, suddenly, through the doctrine of guilt by association, he has now become

unfit to serve on the Federal Communications Commission.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I do not wish to leave the matter quite there. I am not against any moderator simply because he is a moderator. The statement has been made that Mr. Lee was never a participant on the program, but that he was moderator. I do not think that should disqualify him. Neither do I think that Elair Moody, or any other moderator, simply because he is a moderator on a program, should be accused of being partisan. In fact, I think to the contrary. I think many Members of the Senate have appeared on Facts Forum as participants.

The Senator has emphasized, I think, that when Mr. Lee was connected with Facts Forum in those three instances, it was at the outset of the development of that program, and had nothing to do with the operation of Facts Forum under Dan Smoot, who has become moderator more recently. Furthermore, it ought not to be forgotten that Facts Forum was on the air long before Mr. Lee ever was a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct.

Let me speak about the question of experience. Suppose Mr. Lee has not been a technical man in the broadcasting field. Suppose he does not know the difference between an ohm and an ampere in the field of electronics. I can only say that if the Commission is a quasi-judicial body, and if we expect judicial determination from the Federal Communications Commission, then there is even some value in making sure there is no prejudice, one way or the other.

The Senate confirms nominations of appointees to the bench whom we expect to have no prejudice on one side or the other. How many persons who are nominated to the Federal district courts for the first time know very much about patent law, or about other specialized fields of law or litigation? But their minds are open. They are selected because they have some judicial temperament and can resolve questions, not from the standpoint of past experience in a technical field, but because their minds have the capacity to deal objectively with all facets of a case presented to a court.

Mr. Lee is in that happy position, but his position is also implemented by the fact that he is an accountant and an auditor, and in that respect he can bring much ability to the Commission. There has been no reflection upon his integrity; there has been no impeaching of his honesty; there has been no reflection upon his moral outlook. I am glad to note that, as a matter of fact.

I think I may say that on an occasion a long time ago, when I talked to our late beloved and esteemed colleague, Senator Taft, about his attitude upon nominations that came before the Senate, and I told him that some persons had scolded because he had approved

the nomination of Dean Acheson, he said:

If there is no showing of moral obliquity, I do not believe that I can very well contest or set myself up against the nominating power in the Government, namely, the President. So if the President wishes to nominate a particular individual, and if the record shows no moral laches, I do not believe I am in too good a position to object, unless there is some other showing in the record that is very, very persuasive, indeed.

There has been no reflection upon Mr. Lee's character, but I think there has been a rather peculiar imputation. First of all, in the discussion by the Senator from Oklahoma we heard the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] intruded. I probably know Bob Lee infinitely better than does the Senator from Wisconsin. I have known him for years. I saw him in action on the House side, and I believe we could get scores of Members of the House of Representatives to testify in behalf of Bob Lee. So I prefer not to see that imputation in the RECORD go unanswered.

The question of the White Fish Bay station was raised, the implication being that there was involved a tiny element which had something to do with Mr. Lee's being nominated and put on the Commission. In response to that let me suggest that Bob Lee is not the whole Federal Communications Commission. It appears to me that there are seven members on the Commission, some of whom are holdovers. Where were they? This is not a one-man show. We expect matters coming before the Commission to be decided by a vote of the Commission. So it is strange indeed that the White Fish Bay case, about which I know nothing, is trotted out here to indicate that its approval was somehow timed with the appointment of Bob Lee to the Federal Communications Commission. Unless the record can establish the truth of such an imputation, it should not be allowed to stand unimpeached and un rebutted. As I have said, this is not a 1-man Commission with which we are dealing; it is a 7-man Commission, and if there was something wrong with the approval of the application for the White Fish Bay station, why not have the appropriate committee of Congress call all the members of the Commission before it and ascertain what they know, because there is a presumption they knew the facts, and there is a presumption also that they were fortified with all the facts before final judgment and approval was given the application.

When all is said and done, what remains of the argument which has been made? Have the people back home telegraphed Senators, or called them up, and shuddered over the telephone as they said, "We are all apprehensive about Bob Lee going on the Federal Communications Commission." Have they called Senators up and said, "He has not the right sensitivity." That is very interesting indeed. I do not know what my sensitivity is. I do not know what frequency I am on, what my wavelength is, but I have known Bob Lee long enough

to believe that his wavelength is pretty good.

It is said that he is not of the proper temperament. Let those who so assert follow that statement out and say whether they mean moral, spiritual, or what. Then I can make a better answer.

It may be suggested that he has no experience. He has had much experience in the field of accountancy, and infinitely more in a specialized field than others who have gone on the Commission. I think his mental processes are pretty sound, and I have had an opportunity to appraise them for a good many years.

So what is left of the argument that is made? Exactly nothing, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will in due course proceed, if a roll call is insisted on, to give Bob Lee a whacking majority, affirming our confidence not only in him, but also in the appointing power, namely, the President of the United States.

Madam President, I have had some experience with personnel. I have had opportunity to recommend the appointment of a number of judges and district attorneys and United States marshals. I have had opportunity to suggest the names of a few people in the Diplomatic Service, some very high, some not so high. I have had a chance to suggest names for appointment to the various agencies of the Government, and I have been happily surprised, I have been gratefully astonished, by the fact that in every case a thorough investigation is made that the committees look into the records of the appointees with a fine-tooth comb, that the President of the United States, before he sends a name to the Senate for its advice and consent, has had the FBI go through the record so that he can in good conscience send the nomination here and say, "This nomination has been adequately investigated before it has been sent to the confirming body, the Senate of the United States."

When we vote today we not only cast a vote of confidence in a young man in whom I have the highest confidence, but also in an appointment made by the President of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to tell us whether he has not heretofore advocated that the broadcasting industry itself should be represented by membership on the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not the slightest idea whether I have or not. My identity with the broadcasting industry, except to speak in the microphone, has been rather tenuous indeed. I know very little about the industry. I have probably broadcast, either with or without a microphone, as much as any other Member of the Senate, but I have no recollection that I have ever gone on record in the field mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Did the Senator endorse someone else for this position?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not that I recollect. I have the names of people on file in my

office for nearly every position in the Government, and I am very glad when I can get an appointment.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has no recollection whether he endorsed this applicant or not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may have endorsed three, and if I had had more, I would have probably endorsed more.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has no recollection whether he endorsed Robert E. Lee for Assistant Comptroller General?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no recollection about it, but if I did, I am very glad I did.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator's idea of the relationship between one job and another is that they are all the same—

Mr. DIRKSEN. And that deserving Republicans should have them. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONRONEY. The administration is certainly appointing Republicans, and we are trying to pick out the most deserving Republicans. The Senator was good enough—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me interrupt the Senator before he gets away from that point. I am not timid about the patronage matter. The Republicans are in control, and I have been serving in Congress for 20 years and never before this year have I had the opportunity to recommend the appointment of a postmaster. I am doing my best to get a few offices now and then, and I am going to work harder at it. If we could not get Bob Lee appointed as Assistant Comptroller General—and he would have made a good one—then, of course, when he is nominated for a place on the Federal Communications Commission I am glad to get behind him and push the appointment.

Mr. MONRONEY. It does not make any difference what the job is?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He must naturally have some attribute to fit him for it, and Bob Lee has; and the Senator from Oklahoma knows he has.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have known him as an auditor, and I still question the Senator's statement; but I will not labor that further with the Senator.

The Senator has mentioned some of the radio programs, among others that conducted by former Senator Moody. Does he not think such a program is different from a program that is slanting the news?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator seems to come to the conclusion that because Bob Lee managed three programs for Facts Forum suddenly it has had an alchemical and magical effect upon his mental capacity and judicial temperament. Does the Senator have that experience when he goes on the program Meet the Press?

Mr. MONRONEY. What I said was that we must believe the testimony. He thinks it is a fine program, he thinks it should be given credit as being a good program, which certainly does more than casually to say that it is a program in which he might appear.

As the Senator has said, I believe the case is made, and whether some of us observe what it indicates and others dis-

regard it, that is their business. But I am afraid that some may be rather careless in considering the question of freedom of speech, and some may even go so far as to consider that some political party might consider boycotting a program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator can mention to me a greater and more devoted citizen in the United States than Bob Lee, I shall just hang my head. I am sure my colleague's experience in the House of Representatives, where he had a chance to observe Mr. Lee's work as chief of staff of the House Appropriations Committee, will cause my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, to bear out that statement.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am not at all unhappy about Mr. Lee's ability as an auditor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. But I wonder about his ability as a judge.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After all, Madam President, a fear can arise only if there is within the person concerned something that excites the fear. But one who has served his country as a patriot and as a good public servant certainly should not excite, in the heart of anyone, any fear as to whether he will be a good citizen.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, I was going to ask whether the Senator was confusing the Facts Forum program as conducted under Mr. Lee with the Facts Forum program as conducted under Mr. Smoot. I understand that Mr. Lee was connected with the program in its early stages, and that he acted solely as a moderator in the presentation of questions to be answered by various other persons who participated in the programs.

I do not care to go into detail about the program, because I do not know enough about it. However, the type of program about which the Senator from Oklahoma complains was the type which was carried on after Mr. Lee left the Facts Forum.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have tried to point out clearly that the new vigor and new life and "new look" of the Facts Forum program occurred after three conferences, I believe, which were stated to have lasted approximately 30 minutes each, with Mr. Hunt, the operator and entrepreneur of Facts Forum. Since then the Facts Forum has had the new imprint. Whether the new moderator or the old moderator is responsible, or who suggested the new format, is not clear.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I know nothing about the "new look" or the new vitality, or that sort of thing; but I know that Bob Lee has the capacity to serve in many stations in Government—not only on the Federal Communications Commission, not only in the General Accounting Office, not only in the FBI, where he served with great distinction, but also in many other capacities and stations.

I do not think there is much to the point that he, of his own volition, or because he was urged to do so, became a

candidate for Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, and then suddenly changed course. I do not believe that is at all material, and certainly it is no reflection upon Bob Lee.

So, Madam President, as the record stands, I think the Senate should confirm the nomination, and should do so without a dissenting vote—although I know that my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] did oppose the nomination in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I shall now surrender the floor, in the hope that the Senate will cast a vote of confidence not only in Bob Lee, but also in the President of the United States, when the Senate votes to confirm the pending nomination.

In that connection, Madam President, I shall be more than delighted if a request is made to have a yea-and-nay vote, in order that Senators will have their votes on this question on record, so that anyone who reads the RECORD will be able to see how the junior Senator from Illinois voted on the question of confirmation of this nomination.

I now surrender the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. In connection with the pending nomination, let me say that, of course, the Federal Communications Commission exercises functions which are vital to the welfare of our country. Some of its functions include the licensing of radio and television stations and operators; the regulation of interstate and foreign communications by telephone, telegraph, cable, and radio; and promotion of safety at sea, through the use of communication facilities. Mr. President, in my opinion these functions deserve the service of the best men available.

I do not think the nominee, Robert E. Lee, has qualifications which justify favorable action by the Senate on his nomination. Mr. Lee has had no practical experience in any of the media of communication. He has had no technical training in any of the work carried on by the various organizations which are supervised and regulated by the Federal Communications Commission. He has had no training as an engineer; he has had no business experience; he has had little, if any, experience as an administrator; and he has had no judicial experience.

Mr. President, I was not surprised by the remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—although I was interested in them—when he very frankly acknowledged that from now on all appointments to high positions will be given to Republicans; and that, as a matter of fact, that has been the policy for the last 12 months. I have no particular quarrel with that policy, for I believe that the political party in power, which is responsible for the orderly conduct of the affairs of the Nation, has a right to select persons whom it believes represent the view of the party which has been elected.

But, Mr. President, 30 million of our people, at least—and I believe I am understating the number—voted the Republican ticket last year. It seems to me that among that great number of United States citizens it should have been possible to find someone who is far better qualified by experience, training, and sensitivity to serve in the position to which Mr. Lee has now been appointed. And may I recall in passing, Mr. President, that the two previous Presidents of the United States, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, frequently appointed Republicans to high office—men like Secretaries Stimson and Knox, Secretary Lovett, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and last but not least, Mr. John Foster Dulles.

Mr. President, the field of communications is obviously ever increasing in size, scope, and, particularly, in influence. It is obvious that television and radio programs can and do greatly affect and influence public opinion. That effect is greatly intensified today by the close connection which has grown up—although unfortunately so, I believe—between the newspapers and the radio and television stations. I do not believe the Congress should ever have agreed to any such concentration of ownership.

I was not a Member of the Senate at the time when the first steps were taken to permit newspapers to acquire radio and television stations. I am not sure what position I would have taken if I had been a Member of the Senate at that time. However, I believe the decision which was reached was an unwise one. Certainly today that decision increases the necessity for intelligent and fair judgment and close, impartial supervision and scrutiny on the part of the Federal Communications Commission.

Accordingly, Mr. President, because of the great influence which the media of communication have on public opinion and on freedom of thought, the operation of such great means of communication and information and their complete independence and fairness are of indescribably great importance. I believe too, that what is of equally great importance is that the members of the Federal Communications Commission have a passion for the preservation of the freedoms of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, we do not sufficiently realize the power which is possessed by the Federal Communications Commission. We refer to it as a supervisory or regulatory body, but it has powers greatly in excess of those of most supervisory or regulatory bodies. The Federal Communications Commission has the power of life or death over the various firms which are engaged in radio, television, and other forms of communication. The Commission can grant a license or can refuse to grant a license. If it chooses to do so, it can act arbitrarily. The Commission can do as it pleases. The Commission can show the greatest degree of favoritism and can get away with it. Its powers are almost unlimited. Because that is so, I feel that it is more important than ever that we have men of stature, men broadly quali-

fied to carry out the duties and responsibilities of membership on this commission. The functions of the Commission are so vital to the interest and well-being of all our people that the Commission should be manned by the best men available.

A little while ago I spoke about the importance of having men on the Commission who show independence, fairness, and a passion for the safeguarding of our freedoms. These men must act just as independently, just as fairly, and with just as compelling a purpose in guarding our freedoms as do our courts. I cannot conceive of the President of the United States appointing to a high court any man who has not had what, in the opinion of the President, constitutes sufficient experience, or any man who has not shown himself by his training and by the record of his life to be a man deeply impressed with the need of safeguarding our freedoms.

I do not mean merely giving lip service to the safeguarding of our freedoms. I mean just what I have said. I have used the word "passion" in speaking of safeguarding our freedoms. I use it in its literal sense. I do not know of any governmental body in which that attribute of its members is more necessary than in the case of the Federal Communications Commission.

I do not believe that the qualifications of this nominee, give me confidence that he possesses the necessary degree of judicial temperament and the overpowering desire to do justice to every man, woman, and child, as well as every organization with which he may deal. Such attributes should be peculiarly characteristic of a man who holds a quasi-judicial position.

So, Mr. President, inasmuch as I am convinced that Robert E. Lee does not possess any of the qualifications necessary to be a useful member of the Federal Communications Commission, I intend to vote against confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert E. Lee to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Holland
Anderson	Eastland	Humphrey
Barrett	Ellender	Hunt
Beall	Ferguson	Ives
Bennett	Flanders	Jackson
Bricker	Frear	Jenner
Bush	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Johnson, S. C.
Butler, Nebr.	Goldwater	Kefauver
Carlson	Gore	Kennedy
Case	Green	Kilgore
Clements	Griswold	Knowland
Cooper	Hayden	Kuchel
Cordon	Hendrickson	Lehman
Daniel	Hennings	Lennon
Dirksen	Hickenlooper	Long
Douglas	Hill	Magnuson
Duff	Hoey	Malone

Mansfield
Martin
McCarran
McCarthy
McClellan
Millikin
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murray

Pastore
Payne
Potter
Purtell
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smathers
Smith, Maine

Smith, N. J.
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thye
Upton
Watkins
Wiley
Williams
Young

NOT VOTING—13
Bridges
Burke
Byrd
Capehart
Chavez
Flanders
George
Johnson, Tex.
Kerr
Langer
Maybank
Neely
Welker

So the nomination of Robert E. Lee was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harmar D. Denny, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I do not want to object, of course, to the confirmation of the nominations, but I should like to speak for about 1 minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the nominations here presented will constitute the first membership of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control. I say for the RECORD that I think the President has chosen an able group of men to serve as the lay members of the Advisory Committee. There are 5 to be designated from various governmental departments and 5 from business and professional fields.

The first name on the list is that of Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, at one time Director of the Budget, at one time Ambassador to Great Britain, and presently engaged in business and in ranching in Arizona. He is sponsoring an institute of business in Arizona at the present time.

Mr. Alfred M. Eberle, of South Dakota, is a native of Montana who has for years been identified with agriculture and knows what it means to conserve the use of water and the importance of rain. As a matter of fact, he has been identified with many of the water-increasing activities and studies during the past few years.

Joseph J. George, of Georgia, is General George, who is known to many because of his connection with the weather-modification activities and research on the part of the Army during the war. He is presently the weather consultant for Eastern Airlines.

Capt. Howard T. Orville, United States Navy, retired, was in charge of weather modification work in World War II.

Kenneth C. Spangler, of Massachusetts, is the secretary of the Meteorological Society, and represents the professional meteorologists in that field.

This is an outstanding group, Mr. President, and I think the country should be congratulated that these men

are willing to devote a portion of their time to the various studies necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations to the Advisory Committee on Weather Control are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Alfred C. Richmond to be Assistant Commandant of the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

FREDERICK A. SEATON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I hope what I am about to say will not have the effect of a kiss of death. I have always said that whenever I can find anything within the Eisenhower administration that I can praise, I shall welcome the opportunity to praise it. The fact that I have had very few such opportunities makes it all the more pleasant this afternoon for me to rise and compliment the Eisenhower administration for its statesmanship in appointing such a fine person to the Department of Defense as Frederick A. Seaton, a former colleague of ours in the Senate of the United States. I formed a very high regard for Fred Seaton when he was a Senator. I have appreciated very much the courtesies he has extended to me in the past.

I am proud, Mr. President, to say these few words in support of the nomination of Fred Seaton. Although it is a rather homely figure of speech, I consider his appointment to the Department of Defense to be a rather sweet deodrant, very much needed in the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FRANK BROWN BERRY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank Brown Berry, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

JOHN SLEZAK

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert E. Lee to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLANDERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have arranged a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Were I to permit myself to vote, I would vote "nay." If the Senator from New Hampshire were to vote, he would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—58

Barrett	Gillette	Millikin
Beall	Goldwater	Mundt
Bennett	Griswold	Payne
Bricker	Hendrickson	Potter
Bush	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Russell
Carlson	Hunt	Saltonstall
Case	Ives	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Stennis
Daniel	Kuchel	Thye
Dirksen	Lennon	Upton
Duff	Magnuson	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wiley
Eastland	Martin	Williams
Ellender	McCarran	Young
Ferguson	McCarthy	
Frear	McClellan	

NAYS—25

Aiken	Humphrey	Monroney
Anderson	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Fulbright	Kefauver	Pastore
Gore	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Green	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hayden	Lehman	Symington
Hennings	Long	
Hill	Mansfield	

HUGH M. MILTON, II

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, for only a few moments, I should like to address a few remarks on the nomination of Hugh M. Milton II, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army. This appointment is one which pleases New Mexico, and I am most happy the President selected a capable executive of General Milton's type for this trying job.

We of New Mexico have known General Milton for a long time. There were thousands of New Mexico boys on Bataan and at various military stations around the world who had gone to school under General Milton and who knew him personally. He has always been the kind of man who liked to know young men and women, who always welcomed them to come to him with their problems, and who has maintained an enthusiastic outlook for youth. He is a career officer and a mechanical engineer by profession, but where his star really shone was in the field of personal relations. He brings to the office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army the warmth and understanding which will be needed at the policy levels for the young men pouring out of our high schools and colleges and into the Army today.

By birth, General Milton is a Kentuckian. World War I found him in military service, and the postwar period took him to Texas A. & M. In 1924 he came to New Mexico as an instructor in the engineering department at New Mexico A. & M. He served as dean of the engineering school and then became president of our State college. All the while he was active in the National Guard of New Mexico.

General Milton was a busy and vigorous speaker at commencement exercises at the various high schools in New Mexico during his time at New Mexico A. & M. At one time there was public mention that he should be drafted to run for Governor of New Mexico. But General Milton showed no inclination for politics, and has not to this date, to my knowledge.

World War II found General Milton—then a lieutenant colonel in the Reserves—called back into service. He went to service in the Pacific and participated in five campaigns, rising to Brigadier General. After the war he went back to New Mexico—this time to become president of the New Mexico Military Institute, one of the top half a dozen military schools in the Nation. In 1951 he was called again to Washington to become executive for Reserve and Reserve officers in the Army, and this led to his becoming Major General Hugh Milton. He retired from military service on November 18 of last year and was appointed by President Eisenhower to be Assistant Secretary of the Army. He is the Assistant Secretary for manpower and Reserve forces.

His unbroken line of endeavors in the field of education and his continuous service either actively in the United States forces or its reserves certainly

qualifies him, as they would few others, for such a responsible position today. We in New Mexico find no need to wish him well—he has always done everything well. What we do wish is that we had more Hugh Miltons in New Mexico, and in the service of the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I concur fully in what my colleague has said, and express my pleasure also at this very fine nomination which the President has made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis B. Toomer, of Georgia, to be Register of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles O. Parker, of Colorado, to be Assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John William Tramburg, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. McConaughy, of Ohio, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read sundry nominations as collectors of customs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of Collectors of Customs are confirmed en bloc.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Aler J. Couri, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise, customs col-

lection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to bring up at this time the list of promotions of junior officers in the Regular Air Force, which is in the hands of the clerk and has been lying on the desk since last week, and to ask that these nominations also be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As I understand, those nominations are not of flag or general officers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They are nominations of officers below flag or general rank. This procedure is in accordance with the system which was followed last year, and, as I recall, previous to that in order to avoid a large amount of printing.

I ask that the nominations to which I refer also be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Without objection, the nominations in the Army, and the nominations in the Regular Air Force, referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts, are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 1 year from February 1, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the mutual defense treaty with Korea.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the treaty by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, a Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953,

reported favorably with an understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

FORMULA FOR PERMANENT PEACE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on Friday last the very able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] gave an unusually thought-provoking address on the Senate floor with respect to the new military program. He presented his viewpoint in a very understandable and convincing manner. As a matter of fact, I do not know when I have heard a better presentation of any subject than was made by the junior Senator from Tennessee. He was ably assisted by several other Senators who agreed with him, and who made comments on the proposal which the Senator presented.

I listened to much of his address, and I have read the remainder of it in the RECORD this morning. I do not agree, however, with the conclusions which he reached. In fact, I find myself convinced that the other kind of defense, the one which has been adopted by the Secretary of National Defense, is better. I do not think it entails such expenditures. It is a program which the country can afford to carry on not only for 1 year or 2 years or 5 years, but for 20 years or 100 years. It would be just as effective as the tremendously costly program offered by the junior Senator from Tennessee, and even more so, in gaining peace for this country and the world.

On Saturday last the very able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] made a statement as reported to the Associated Press, and I should like to read into the RECORD some of the comments the Senator from Virginia made in regard to the address by the junior Senator from Tennessee:

Senator BYRD, a member of the Armed Services Committee, said in an interview he is "strongly in favor" of General Eisenhower's plan to reduce American ground forces while discouraging any aggression with the threat of massive atomic retaliation delivered by air.

"I believe the President is proposing the only program by which we can maintain our defenses without insolvency," Senator BYRD declared.

"We must keep the lead in atomic and other weapons and with the foreign bases which are coming into being we can make this threat of retaliation so real that I don't believe the Communists will dare move toward war."

That is the end of the quotation, though the Senator said more than that. I associate myself with him in his statements. I am in complete agreement with the Senator from Virginia.

On March 22, 1951, almost 3 years ago, I proposed in a Senate address almost the same military program for the United States. I wish to quote a few paragraphs from my remarks, and then to ask that the whole speech, or at least

the major portion of it, be printed in the RECORD. I said at that time:

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We have defenses here. We are not going to put all of our eggs in one basket.

The eastern Mediterranean is not only the fever spot but it is the foremost strategic spot of the world, and therefore the exact location for the United States to deploy its military strength of the air, of the land, and of the sea. During World War II we built a series of airports in North Africa. These should be rehabilitated and activated at once.

Of course, they have been rehabilitated. Other airfields have been built and they have been activated.

Antiaircraft guns should bristle from every hillside in Turkey.

I believe that, at least, has partially come to pass.

New airfields should be constructed in Turkey and sufficient ground troops assigned there to hold them against any eventuality. Acres of jet fighters should be stationed there to insure absolute control of the air. And last, great squadrons of huge bombers should be ready on a moment's notice to spray fire-bombs, TNT, and atomic bombs on every city in Russia if Russia attempts aggression anywhere.

Iceland, one of the original Atlantic Pact states, might well be converted into a similar series of airbase strongholds, so these bombers could shuttle back and forth from north to south, dropping bombs coming and going. Both of these areas can be served readily from the sea. To protect the whole world against Russian aggression, those and supporting airfields in Africa and the United States are about all the military installations which are required to do the job.

All we need say to the Kremlin after these installations have been perfected is "We want peace and we aim to have it. If you want peace also, you can have peace, and for a long, long time; but if you start aggression in any direction, or against any nation, then every Russian city will be pulverized within a few days' time." It is as simple as that. Thus Russia's cold-war program of frustration and disruption and her carefully concealed hot-war threats would be checkmated at one time and with a minimum of cost and imbalance.

Military establishments of that kind could be maintained and controlled by us for 5, 10, or even 20 years, because their cost could not total more than 10 percent of our national income, and we can well afford to devote that much to permanent world peace. If we take that sensible and necessary step promptly, the world will settle down to a long, prosperous, and fruitful peace. This arrangement will stop Russia's cold war cold. And it will stop Russia's hot war before it starts. It is foolproof, Mr. President. I am positive that the adoption and implementation of this plan would reduce the dangers of war with Russia to an irreducible minimum; but if such a war should develop, the locale would be where it belongs, not in America, not in Western Europe, not in Asia, but in Russia. I repeat, Russia can select the time for world war III and we can do nothing about that, unless we wish to engage in a preventive war; but we must be the masters of the locale. I challenge any diplomatic or military leader of this or any other country to pick flaws of this bold, simple, and direct action in behalf of world peace.

Since then China entered the war in Korea and is now associated with Russia on a full-scale basis in the cold war, and is a threat to world peace. Accordingly the Defense Department needs airfields

on Okinawa, Guam, the Philippines, Alaska, and at other points in the Pacific, in addition to those to which I referred 3 years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that the whole speech be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UPTON in the chair). Is there objection?

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

High school and college boys leave their books, farm boys their plows, and factory workers their bench, to learn the goose step, the victims of Russia's cold war. Their older brothers fought, bled, and died in World War II to give our allies and ourselves permanent peace and now one of those allies has made the United States adopt for itself the garrison state. It's a sad story, colleagues, and the saddest part of it is that the whole weird process is merely in its infancy. By no means has it run its full course. In 5 years Russia's cold war has turned our way of life completely upside down. Unless we find the right antidote a few years more and the same bitter poison well may wreck and destroy the liberty and freedom held sacred by the Founding Fathers, who created this Republic. That is why I say with complete assurance and with confidence that unless we stop underestimating the cold war potential of Russia we are doomed.

The truth is, we have been on the wrong track a long time and it is much later than we think. I watched a plane flying through the air without a pilot. A man stood on the ground; nearby was a strange contraption. He touched a button here and pressed a lever there and the plane dipped a wing or turned to the right or to the left, or went up or went down at his will. The United States is that plane; the Kremlin is the control mechanism and the man pushing the buttons and pressing the levers is the Russian Field Marshal and Generalissimo Joseph Stalin. For the last 5 years we have responded to his slightest touch with slavish obedience. We have done everything he has wanted us to do exactly the way he has planned for us to do it. That is why the American people are beside themselves with worry, discouragement, and hysteria.

Under the spell which Stalin has cast upon us, we drew a line on the map and called it the 38th parallel. When he pushed the button, we jumped into the mud and the muck, the unbearable heat, and the arctic cold of Korea. We set out to liberate the Koreans south of that damnable imaginary line, and instead, by the burned-earth technique adopted by both sides, we have destroyed their homes and turned them out on the highways with bundles on their backs to wander back and forth with no place to go, dazed and destitute. Millions of South Koreans have died. Million more will die. Sadly too, American dead lie on every hillside and mountain in South Korea. Our hospitals are full of American amputees and boys with shattered and broken bodies.

When Stalin blew the whistle, we—the revered and traditional friend of China—became her enemy. Now the fat is in the fire, and the Orient, with its teeming hundreds of millions of human beings, is pledged to destroy us regardless of the time required or the cost in lives and treasure. Stalin has given us an enemy worthy of every consideration.

A cold war can be just as deadly as a shooting war. Let's get that truth through our thick skulls. And this other truth we must grasp, too—Russia is the greatest expert of all time in conducting a cold war.

Those 14 cruel, icy, calculating, conniving specialists in the Politburo are the masters of psychological warfare and we are its unfortunate dupes.

With unparalleled generosity we have assisted our neighbors in West Europe to rehabilitate their industries and increase the production of civilian goods to an alltime high. Now, due to our frustration over Russia's cold-war offensive, we are saying to these friendly nations "You must forsake civilian production activities and convert your industries to rearmament." We direct them to do this, even though we know that the switch from the production of civilian goods to war production will result in a new and violent rise in inflation for them all. Under Stalin's lash we have adopted a program of international mobilization for the free world, and whether or not it will undo all the accomplishments toward recovery of the last 3 years we will not swerve from that course of disruption.

Theoretically, if all the Atlantic Pact states contribute armies to General Eisenhower by joint action, the free nations will be strong. In reality, however, exactly the opposite is true. A union of weak states adds up only to greater weakness. We are still extending billions of dollars in relief to the West Atlantic States and West Germany. Isn't that positive proof of their weakness? If they are so impotent they cannot combat political and economic difficulties at home without our assistance, by what magic can they subdue communism away from home? But, regardless of their domestic problems, the relief which we have been giving them now must be cut off so that we may rearrange our affairs on a solid enough basis to conduct a really effective cold war against the common enemy.

The greatest danger to the world is that we may spread ourselves too thin and thereby crack up. In these circumstances we must get these friendly powers off our backs. Doubtless it will rock their economies to shut off our relief, but if a common front is to be provided against Russia it must be done. However, let us not add to their economic shock by compelling them to destroy their convalescing economy by a huge program of rearmament. I repeat, nothing is so inflationary as rearmament, and nothing is so destructive of a nation's economy as inflation. Moving too fast too soon in West Europe and on too many fronts is the gravest danger which the free world faces today. America is an impetuous and impatient country, but this is no time for reckless and ill-considered strategy where the risk is so great. I plead with the Congress for solid thinking and caution in this hour of great crisis.

America is naturally not temperamentally qualified nor fit to cope with the Oriental techniques which they employ in conducting this cold war. Is there not some way to make us become realistic before it is too late? We must not underestimate Russia's capacity for making cold war one day longer. The Politburo wants to get an arms race started in West Europe because that will aggravate West Europe's inflationary problem and drive them even farther down the road toward radicalism and revolution. Italy, France, and West Germany are having and will continue to have many impossible economic problems without being compelled to raise and maintain huge armies and without converting their factories and their energies to war production and be driven thereby to severe austerity and extremely low standards of living. Let's face these issues with full consideration of all factors.

Most observers are agreed that Stalin will have the tremendous advantage of selecting the time for starting world war III. Since a preventive war is abhorrent to us there is

nothing we can do about its timing. But if we are smart we will select the locale of world war III. More we cannot do; less we must not consider doing.

The incontrovertible truth is that West Europe is not a good battlefield from our standpoint for engaging our foe either in a cold war or a shooting war. Even less so is the Far East. Yet by adroitness Stalin has succeeded in engaging us in a shooting war in the Far East and a cold war in West Europe. No strategy could be devised that would be more advantageous to him and less advantageous to us.

We plan to dispatch four divisions of United States troops to Europe. Perhaps our friends over there will place 16 or 20 additional divisions under General Eisenhower. What a military joke that will be. At best it can only be a token force and if Russia attacks nothing more than a suicide squad. If Russia does not attack, Eisenhower does not need an army and if Russia does attack he needs not less than 200 divisions not 20. By this display of miserable weakness we are inviting him to go to war. Twenty, forty, fifty or even a hundred divisions stationed in Europe is the old Maginot line complex all over again.

In the summer of 1942, Field Marshal von Bock had 225 German divisions in Russia, plus 42 German satellite divisions. Fifty of the German divisions were armored. The field marshal at that time had in Russia under his direction more than 3 million well-trained, battle-scarred veteran combat troops and admittedly the best and largest army the world has ever witnessed. Russia annihilated them.

That history would appear to make Russia an invincible military power and she is if we fight the war on her terms and in her way but she has many fundamental weaknesses if we are but smart enough to capitalize on them. Her great strength is that she recognizes her own weaknesses and ours. That is why I say that we must not commit the cardinal sins of overestimating the military strength of the Red behemoth nor underestimating her tremendous cold-war effectiveness. We should be just as cold, cruel, calculating, and conniving in appraising her strength and her weaknesses as her politburo has employed in evaluating these easy-to-read characteristics of the free world's defenses.

Stalin is not a fanatic like Hitler. He does not resort to astrology or hocus pocus to reach momentous decisions. He depends upon hard facts and accurate information and he has the good judgment to appraise them. He knows much more about us and our idiosyncrasies than apparently we know about him. We must take time out to learn about him.

He respects our production because he knows and has said that production won World War II. In 1946 he announced that Russia must produce 60 million tons of steel a year to "have insurance against any eventuality." Today Russia and all of her satellites produce less than 40 million tons against our production of over 100 million tons. Russia cannot have enough steel to fight a successful world war much before 1960. That does not mean we have 1 hour of time to waste but it does mean that we have time to plan well for our defenses.

No one in Congress knows how many A-bombs the United States has. Magazine speculation places the number somewhere between 400 and 1,000. Dr. Harold Urey is quoted as saying that Moscow would need "about 200 A-bombs in order to launch a major war." My guess is that she will not have 300 A-bombs before 1960. That guess could be wrong but she is far behind us in production of this lethal weapon. And we do have the planes to carry our bombs to

the target. Furthermore, no nation has such fine targets for A-bombs as Russia. If you think these facts do not send a chill up Red spines, you have no imagination.

In event of war Russia would require vast supplies of oil and high octane gas. All of her war machines move on oil as do most of her vast farming and factory operations. Her production of oil this year is estimated to be less than 40 million tons compared to our current production of 240 million tons. Not only that, but all of Stalin's oil producing areas are splendid bombing targets for Uncle Sam and Stalin knows their destruction would be our primary objective, should he make war on us. He cannot possibly store enough surplus oil in the next 2 or 3 years to conduct a major war. Stalin is a hardboiled realist and not a reckless adventurer. He is certain to count his chicks before he starts a war which could be the end of the great country which he has built.

Russia's food production has been very low and only in the last 2 or 3 years has it exceeded the relatively low production volume of pre-World War II. It still lacks considerable of producing a minimum standard of living much less an adequate food supply for her current needs. It is all the Reds can do to meet Russia's increased demand for food without attempting to stockpile food for war. There is little or no surplus of food in Russia now and only a fool would suggest that it is sufficient to start a war.

Russia has the rough, tough, sturdy, partly trained manpower, but little else upon which she would have even a gambler's chance to win a world war. Her highways, her railroads, and her factories are strictly third class.

But Stalin has many other more dynamic vulnerabilities than supplies of steel, oil, food, and A-bombs. Actually the tyrants of Moscow are sitting on a veritable powder keg of hate and resentment among its own terrorized people. Constant official spying, secret police, and forced labor camps emphasize the precarious situation. Purge trials must operate constantly to afford protection against assassination, plotting, and revolution.

These political problems are multiplied many times in her border satellite states where the vast majority of the people are only biding their time for a chance to start a rebellion. Even the local tyrants ruling these puppet states are imprisoned and executed periodically to keep down the spread of Titoism. If a world war should break out every slave state dominated by Russia would rebel and Stalin knows it. He cannot even trust Mao Tse Tung as far as he can throw a Russian bear by the tail.

The most sensitive section of the globe today is the Persian Gulf portion of the Middle East. Right here the course of history may change its way. In case of another world war its fabulous oil reserves and its current vital oil production will be the coveted prize of the gravest importance to both sides. You may be sure its acquisition will be the primary military objective as the means to the ends sought. Furthermore, the electric sparks which might ignite and touch off world war III are likely to be generated here. The current political trouble in Iran may cast the shadow of things to come. Truly this crucial eastern Mediterranean area has all the ingredients which make it the arena where the greatest military giants of all time will reach a decision.

In modern war in the sea, on the land, and in the air oil provides the energy and the power. Oil is indeed the sinews of war. I do not see how Russia could undertake world war III without controlling these enormous Iranian oil reserves. It is vital, therefore, that this oil be kept from Russia and made currently available to the Allies. For

whoever gains and maintains access to the black gold of the Persian Gulf will win world war III.

The United States has a military alliance with Turkey in which we have agreed to protect their independence against military aggression by Russia. Accordingly, we have assigned military experts to create and bolster their defense establishment in the development of armed strength to repel invasion. We have given them hundreds of millions of dollars to assist in their defense effort, and we have made available to them modern guns and the latest and most effective heavy artillery, including antiaircraft guns. Also highly qualified and expert American engineers were assigned to them to select sites, lay out and construct the airports necessary for their defense. Turkey is not a full member, but is an associate member of the Atlantic Pact states. She is one of the few countries to fight in Korea side by side with us and her troops have given a good account of themselves.

A glance at the map will indicate the highly strategic position Turkey occupies with respect to Russia and the whole Middle East area.

The eastern Mediterranean is not only the fever spot but it is the foremost strategic spot of the world and therefore the exact location for the United States to deploy its military strength of the air, of the land, and of the sea. During World War II we built a series of airports in North Africa. These should be rehabilitated and activated at once. Antiaircraft guns should bristle from every hillside in Turkey. New airfields should be constructed in Turkey and sufficient ground troops assigned there to hold them against any eventuality. Acres of jet fighters should be stationed there to insure absolute control of the air. And last, great squadrons of huge bombers should be ready on a moment's notice to spray fire-bombs, TNT, and atomic bombs on every city in Russia if Russia attempts aggression anywhere.

Iceland, one of the original Atlantic Pact states, might well be converted into a similar series of airbase strongholds so these bombers could shuttle back and forth from north to south dropping bombs coming and going. Both of these areas can be served readily from the sea. To protect the whole world against Russian aggression, those and supporting airfields in Africa and the United States are about all the military installations which are required to do the job.

All we need say to the Kremlin after these installations have been perfected is: "We want peace and we aim to have it. If you want peace also you can have peace and for a long, long time, but if you start aggression in any direction, or against any nation, then every Russian city will be pulverized within a few days time." It is as simple as that. Thus Russia's cold-war program of frustration and disruption and her carefully concealed hot war threats would be checkmated at one time and with a minimum of cost and imbalance.

Military establishments of that kind could be maintained and controlled by us for 5, 10, or even 20 years, because their total cost could not total more than 10 percent of our national income, and we can well afford to devote that much to permanent world peace. If we take that sensible and necessary step promptly, the world will settle down to a long, prosperous, and fruitful peace. This arrangement will stop Russia's cold war cold. And it will stop Russia's hot war before it starts. It is foolproof, gentlemen. I am positive that the adoption and implementation of this plan would reduce the dangers of war with Russia to an irreducible minimum, but if such a war did develop the locale would be where it belongs, not in America, not in

Europe, not in Asia, but in Russia. I repeat, Russia can select the time for world war III and we can do nothing about that, but we must be the masters of the locale. I challenge any diplomatic or military leader of this or any other country to pick flaws in this bold, simple, and direct action in behalf of world peace.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, of course, the plan the Secretary of Defense has presented goes somewhat beyond my recommendations. We have airfields in the Pacific, in Alaska, in Greenland, and we are going to have some airfields in Spain and in other areas of the world. So the administration has gone beyond my proposal; but at least it is in accord with what I suggested 3 years ago. So, naturally, I am pleased that the retaliation plan has been adopted by our Department of Defense, and I believe it will prove to be very satisfactory and will give to the world peace and security.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to interrogate the Senator from Colorado, in view of some of his remarks; and I also desire to comment on them, if I may. My comments will be in line with his discussion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Minnesota do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have listened to the comment of the Senator from Colorado in regard to the very fine address he made 3 years ago. That followed the time of our historic debate on the "troops for Europe" issue, following our action on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I recall vividly the position of the Senator from Colorado regarding a series of key bases around the world, from which we could launch our airpower—a striking force by means of which, as the Senator from Colorado said, we could gain the initiative by way of military retaliation.

As I understand the Senator from Colorado, he has said the Secretary of Defense has more or less adopted or embraced that philosophy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I would not be so conceited as to say that. I do not know whether he ever heard of the speech I made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He should have.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am saying that I am in favor of what the Secretary of Defense is now doing, and I am giving this background of having recommended such a policy 3 years ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Colorado is too modest.

The truth is that some 3 years the Senator from Colorado outlined the use of retaliatory airpower from strategically located bases. At that time I disagreed with the suggested policy, I say with all due respect to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

I say now that when the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made his very fine address on the so-called new look and the new military policy of

our country, he made a great contribution to the Senate of the United States and to public discussion.

My point is that it is rather peculiar and, in fact, somewhat alarming that a fundamental change in strategy on the part of our Defense Establishment and our national security policy should go without full-scale discussion. I am not drawing the issue as to whether the new policy is right or wrong; but I am saying that if a so-called great debate were required on the issue of troops to Europe, surely we should have full-scale review, survey, and analysis of a basic new defense policy.

I have several questions to ask, and I think they merit the fullest consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee.

My first question is this: Does the new policy of massive retaliation from various bases mean that we are forgetting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a basis of our defense? I ask this question because I notice that in recent days some of our friends in Western Europe have said, "We do not want to be liberated by means of massive retaliation. We want defense at the point of contact with the enemy."

My next question is this: Does our methodical withdrawal of troops from Western Europe indicate that we may pull out of Western Europe? Does Dr. Hanna's statement indicate that in the future—by 1956, I believe he pointed out—we shall have withdrawn from Western Europe?

My next question is this: If that is the policy of the administration, how does it expect to obtain cooperation from the European community? How does it expect to have the North Atlantic Treaty Organization develop into a meaningful and useful structure?

My next question is this: If we adopt massive retaliation as a means of gaining the initiative, upon whom shall we retaliate? As the Secretary of Defense has asked, Are we to retaliate upon the head of the octopus or upon its tentacles? As he has pointed out, if we pursue a policy of massive retaliation, I think we shall not attack the tentacles of the octopus, but, instead, the head of the octopus, the octopus being merely another name for the Communist conspiracy which is headed at Moscow.

Furthermore, does the new policy mean massive retaliation by the United States in case of an attack upon Pakistan or elsewhere? Does it mean that world war III will then be at hand?

Mr. President, I believe that when there is a major change of policy, such as the one which has been discussed by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], it is time for the Senate and the country to seek some answers.

Last year the Senate asked for greater air power. I am interested in knowing that now the administration finds that what we said last year is correct, namely, that we need to have a projected Air Force of 147 air groups. In April 1952, the Senate decided by unanimous vote that the United States needed 140 air groups. Now, 2 years later, it is rec-

commended that the United States have 137 air groups.

I am saying that this matter is a very serious one, for it involves much more than dollars and cents.

The main argument which is launched in behalf of the new defense strategy is that it is one we can afford, one for which we can pay. That may be true, but I believe we must take a long look. The Soviet Union may be very well content with permitting us to reduce our basic defense structure and with having us rely upon atomic power and atomic weapons, at the expense of conventional weapons and manpower. But, Mr. President, if our defense system is weakened and if NATO is weakened, from what bases shall we work? Shall we work from French bases in North Africa? Perhaps the French will not want us there. Shall we work from Greenland? We are there now only because of permission from one of the members of NATO. It is increasingly obvious that our operations in Greenland and elsewhere are very largely dependent upon the existence of NATO as a strong and active organization.

Mr. President, it might be well, also, when we speak of massive retaliation, for us to consider what we shall do if there is another Korea. We must ask ourselves whether the American people will permit the Government of the United States to use atomic bombs at the heart of the octopus, and whether that will be economically possible, and whether it will be morally responsible, and whether we shall do it?

I do not have the answers. All I say is that there is a series of questions which need very frank discussion.

Therefore, I wish to pay tribute to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for what I consider to be a very courageous statement in which he explored these many questions.

All we have asked is that there be frank and bold discussion.

Mr. President, in the main I commend the President of the United States for endorsing a mobile and flexible defense structure. I realize that it is extremely important that we have great strength of air power and that we have specific bases from which our air power can operate. But I ask the other questions because such bases will not be available to us unless we have allies.

Furthermore, what does "massive retaliation" mean, and what will be the results of such a policy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is not my intention to engage in debate with the Senator from Minnesota or to endeavor to answer at this time the questions he has asked. However, let me point out that the Senate Committee on Armed Services has held, for 2 days, briefings with Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Those sessions were very full ones. As one member of the committee said, it was one of the most lucid explanations and descrip-

tions of world conditions and our relation thereto that he has heard since he has been a Member of the Senate.

I will state further that the Committee on Armed Services has scheduled for this week the first of a number of briefings with the Air Force, the Army, and the Navy separately, in order to go into the details of some of the problems which the Senator from Minnesota very properly raises in the form of questions.

Also, a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee has spent an entire week listening to and discussing the problem of continental defense, which a subcommittee was appointed to consider. That was a very sensitive briefing, but an understanding of that problem gave me, as one member of the committee, very great confidence in the steps being taken.

The President, in his budget message, found on page 567 and following pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, points out in detail some of the steps which are being taken. As I say, it is not my intention to try to answer the Senator from Minnesota today, but I do intend in the near future to try to point out to the Senate some of the things which the Armed Services Committee has gone into and considered with relation to the questions which the Senator has so aptly asked.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. The Senator is a man in whom we have great confidence. The junior Senator from Minnesota was not speaking in the spirit of acrimony or criticism.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was saying only that this is a question of such basic importance to the American people and to our overall security that I think some of the questions which I asked, quite spontaneously, without prepared manuscript, questions which have been running through my mind, are questions which merit not only discussion behind committee doors, but discussion in public, through the press, on the radio, and on the floor of the Senate. We are making a decision here which could well spell for us very serious results, good or bad, in the days to come.

I have made it quite clear that my comment is not a criticism of the emphasis upon the importance of mobility, flexibility of airpower, and the use of strategic weapons. My only point was that in the emphasis of those things—of mobility, airpower, and strategic weapons—we may run the risk, because of the fear of our allies in Western Europe that all we will do will be to liberate and not to defend at the line, of losing the great North Atlantic Treaty alliances, into which we have poured billions of dollars, and which has been represented to us as the one great hope of building a shield of defense against Communist aggression.

I do not say that we necessarily run such a risk. I only ask, as a good citizen—not as a partisan—the question, Do we run such a risk?

I have great faith in President Eisenhower's abilities. Far be it from me to doubt his military judgment. However, I say that we must not at any time overlook the possibility of a political trap, or political difficulties.

I listened to the Secretary of State testify. I know the Secretary of State feels that there is much that needs to be done to strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. From all the communications I have been able to hear or read, I learn that it is proposed to make regular withdrawals of troops from Western Europe. I read Dr. Hanna's statement this morning. He was interviewed on Sunday on the famous radio program "Youth Wants to Know." Dr. Hanna indicated that we may withdraw completely from Europe by 1956. He did not say "shall," but "may." So there begins to be doubt. I say that we shall never get the French into EDC unless we make commitments. We shall never get a North Atlantic Treaty Organization which is meaningful if we continuously say that our policy is one of massive retaliation, and at the same time withdrawal from fundamental commitments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an announcement to the Senate, without his losing the right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Several Senators have been waiting for me to make this announcement.

I have already taken the question up with the minority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] and the acting minority leader [Mr. CLEMENTS].

While the Senate will be in executive session tomorrow, I wish to ask that, as in legislative session, it take up a series of measures on the calendar beginning with Calendar No. 858, Senate bill 2803. With the exception of Calendar No. 858, Senate bill 2803, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as extended to July 1, 1955, the remainder of the measures, beginning with Calendar No. 859, have been on the calendar, under the rule, for a day. They have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and have been reported back to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It is my intention to ask for their consideration tomorrow. I wanted the Senate to have notice of that fact, because there may be some Senators who are particularly interested. I understand the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is interested in several of these resolutions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was hopeful that the distinguished majority leader would allow us a little more time. I have been most diligent in trying to obtain from the various committees involved, particularly the Committee on Rules and Administration, all the information possible concerning these resolutions.

As the distinguished majority leader knows, last year when similar resolutions

came before the Senate for consideration, I suggested to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that all committees which make requests for funds should fully justify such requests.

On the 15th of January, in line with the thought I have just expressed, I wrote to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, as follows:

I understand that quite a few requests have been made and will be made in the future to continue the activities of certain investigating committees. So as to save the time of the Senate, I wish you would have each committee applying for funds to furnish a full justification for the request. That would include the sphere of activity in which the committee proposes to operate, the number of employees they propose to hire, and an estimate of expenditures other than salaries. I wish you would also insist on having a statement showing how past funds were spent, giving the name or names of all employees, with their salaries, with a thumbnail outline of their duties and a detailed account of the manner and method in which the funds were expended for travel, per diem, and other purposes. As you recall, I suggested that your committee follow this procedure in the past, and I am hopeful that it will be done in this case.

My office has been in touch with the financial clerk of the Senate in an effort to obtain some of the information I am now seeking from you, but all to no avail. The position is taken by Mr. Ellis that no information will be given out by him except through the request of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee involved, or of the Rules Committee.

As I have stated, I should like to obtain the information requested by me. As the Senator knows, a series of reports from the Committee on Rules and Administration was made last Friday. Only about an hour and a half ago was I able to obtain from the minority secretary copies of these resolutions and the reports attached to them. These reports indicate that about the same type of so-called "justification" we have been obtaining in the past has been provided this year. Because I should like to obtain certain information which has not been furnished by the Committee on Rules and Administration, I suggest to my good friend, the majority leader, that he give me a few days longer. The Senate is to consider more than 15 resolutions. If I had been able to obtain the desired information from Mr. Ellis, who is the Senate financial clerk, I might have at hand a great deal of the desired information, but it seems that no Senator is able to obtain such information. Why, I do not know.

Because of that fact, I ask my good friend to postpone consideration of these resolutions, let us say, until Wednesday. I believe that by Wednesday I could be in a position to look into the subject. I know that if I am given sufficient time, the result will be at least a saving of the time of the Senate, and perhaps the saving of otherwise useless expenditures.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from

Louisiana, that I am always desirous of accommodating Senators on both sides of the aisle in matters of this kind.

I have been asked by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and by other Senators, because of the expiration of a number of the appropriations, to expedite action on the resolutions. I had intended originally to ask that the resolutions be called up for consideration today, with the understanding that ample time be given for a discussion of them. However, at the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is today serving as acting minority leader, I agreed that I would make the announcement on the floor today, but would not move to take them up before tomorrow.

I appreciate the problem of the Senator from Louisiana. I shall consult with and call his remarks to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He can be certain that consideration of the resolutions will not be the first order of business tomorrow. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will be able to get the information he is seeking, so that we shall not unduly delay the consideration and disposition of the resolutions, or have the appropriations completely expire.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may point out to the majority leader that in June last year the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] requested the adoption of a resolution appropriating \$50,000, so that he could proceed to organize a subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency. He made a very good presentation, and he assured the Senate that the amount requested would be ample with which to do the job. The committee cut his request from \$50,000 to \$44,000.

In answer to a query by me appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 5, page 5801, the Senator from New Jersey made the following reply:

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us any assurance that the subcommittee will complete its work on or before January 31, 1954?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can give assurance, with the understanding, of course, that I shall be a member of the subcommittee—

As a matter of fact, the Senator from New Jersey serves as chairman of the subcommittee—

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Continuing the quotation from the RECORD—

if I have the good fortune to be a member of it—that I shall insist that we complete our work by the time mentioned.

What is the situation today? The Senator from New Jersey has come before the Senate—

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment I shall be happy to yield. He appears before the Senate and requests an additional appropriation, not of \$44,000, but of \$175,000, to maintain the work of his subcommittee. It may be a good thing, but I believe some of us ought to be given an opportunity to look into the functioning

of the committees. Of course, that applies not only to this committee but to many other committees; in fact, to any committee or subcommittee which comes to the Senate requesting appropriations.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. In a moment. As I pointed out last year, appropriations for the purpose of conducting various investigations have increased by 1,000 percent during the last decade. I am not opposed to granting necessary appropriations for legitimate investigations, but certainly Senators ought to be given an opportunity to look into the various requests and to insist that those who ask for money should justify their requests, in the same manner that any department of Government is required to do when it requests funds.

The Senate will shortly have before it approximately 15 resolutions. If I had nothing to do from now until tomorrow noon but to look through the resolutions, I would not have sufficient time to give them the study they require. I would be able to skim through them, probably. But I could not study them carefully. As it is, I have some very important committee meetings to attend. I do not believe, therefore, that I am asking the majority leader to do very much when I ask him to postpone discussion of the resolutions at least until I have had an opportunity to look into them.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the floor, but I shall be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to respond to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to yield the floor, but before I do so I have three resolutions to submit and three items to insert in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to request that the Senator from Minnesota retain the floor so that my request to ask him to yield will remain open; also, I should like to hear the response of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to accommodate the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at the outset, I wish to state that I concur in everything the Senator from Louisiana has stated with reference to my statement on the floor of the Senate during the last session. What I stated in the colloquy to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred is correct, and I meant every word I said.

What I did not know was the extent of the mission upon which our subcommittee was about to embark. Apparently I was in total ignorance of the problems which would confront us. From the preliminary studies which had been made—and they were only preliminary studies—I believed that \$44,000 would carry us through. I also thought that we could complete the studies by January 31 of this year.

However, after we began public hearings, and I saw how the problem of juvenile delinquency reaches into every

phase of our lives, and that juvenile delinquency was on the increase in all sections of the country, with more than a 60 percent rise in the Nation's Capital alone, I realized that we had to go much further.

In speech after speech in various places in the country, particularly in the States which I visited in the fall of last year, and in discussing the subject with experts and others, I stated that one of the first times that my face would be really red in the Senate would be when I had to return and apologize to the Senator from Louisiana for making a statement concerning a matter about which I knew so little at the time.

Mr. President, I have appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary and I have appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I believe I have justified the continuance of the life of the subcommittee. The resolution was reported unanimously, and I believe I justified, at least to my satisfaction, the amount of money the subcommittee is requesting.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana today that in the last session of Congress the Senate made no better investment than the \$44,000 which it appropriated for the use of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. I have seen the results of it as I have gone about the country. I know that in setting up the subcommittee the Senate has stimulated throughout the Nation a new interest in the youth.

If we have any greater asset or any greater national resource than the youth of the Nation I should like someone to tell me what that asset or resource is.

We appropriate money for battleships and air bases and armaments, all of which are meant for use in a war; yet we think too little about the youngsters who may some day be called upon to man the battlements and supply the sinews which win a war.

I am extremely sorry if I misled the Senator from Louisiana in my statement of last year. I made no statement which I did not think at the time was accurate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I anticipated what the committee was going to do. I believe I suggested in the colloquy last year that the Senator from New Jersey would return with a request for more funds. I am not arguing that a good purpose may not be served. All I am asking for is an opportunity to look into the subject.

I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am a member also of that committee's legislative subcommittee. We recommend the appropriation of various funds, and I believe it is up to us to look into the question of how the funds are spent. The only way we can do it is to have necessary details supplied to us. The Senator from New Jersey may know all about the subject of juvenile delinquency, but I doubt if it has ever been presented in such a way that we could look into it and be in a position to agree with what he says.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I will supply the Senator from Louisiana with complete information.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to confirm what is a fact; namely, that I have yielded the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not my purpose to go into the merits or demerits of any of the pending resolutions. All I am asking for is a little time so that I can look into the resolutions and evaluate them to my own satisfaction. The Senator knows that last year and the year before, because of the position I occupied on the Committee on Appropriations—I was chairman of the legislative subcommittee before the Republicans came into power—I studied such resolutions carefully. I always try to do a good job and I do my best to be fair and objective. All I am trying to do is to look into these matters and find out what they are all about. When I do so, perhaps I shall be in complete agreement with the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one Member of the Senate and as a citizen, I am proud of the record of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I am proud of the fact that he has saved money for this country. I salute him for his services in that respect. But when it comes to economy and the saving of the taxpayers' money, I yield to no Member of the Senate. I would not spend one penny unless I thought there was need for it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

THE DEFENSE PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield with the understanding that he will not thereby lose his rights to the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had an arrangement with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who had a broadcast appointment, that I would make the comments I desired to make regarding his remarks and that he could read them in the RECORD tomorrow.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for pointing out, as he did, the problems concerning the defense programs of our country.

As one who served on the Armed Services Committee for many years, it appears to me that it is not a satisfactory answer to say as indicated by the Senator from Massachusetts, that, because of the fact that these subjects are under study we have no concern about the points which the Senator from Minnesota raised.

I think it is important that we follow the historic practice of the Senate of holding, upon occasion, executive sessions to consider questions affecting the national defense because in such a matter each Senator bears a responsibility and the decision reached will determine, I think in no small measure, the future history of the United States.

I believe it is a great mistake for us to act, as we frequently act in the Senate, with so little information on the issues involving the defense of our country. The Armed Services Committee, during the period of my service on it, too frequently received too little information about our defense problems. We are going to decide, in my judgment, on a great historic policy, and we are entitled to all the facts that can be obtained. If the only way the Senate can secure them is by holding executive sessions, then let the Senate go into executive session.

I do not need any member of the administration to tell me whether it is still true that if Russia should start an air Pearl Harbor tomorrow, 60 out of 75 of her planes would come through and deliver their load. That was the testimony I last heard, and I have received no information justifying the conclusion that defensively we are in position to protect millions of persons on our own continent. We are in a powerful defensive position. We can strike terrific blows against Russia, and we should remain in that position and become even stronger defensively.

The figure which the Senator from Minnesota named as 140 groups should be 143 groups. That was the number for which a small minority in the Senate fought, but the administration cut it down.

Mr. President, in my judgment, during the presentation of the case last spring, a great many misrepresentations were made, such, for example, as that we were going to be able to cut down the number of air wings without the loss of fighter craft. But many months later we received information that there was a loss in production of several hundred planes because of the cut.

There was also the misrepresentation that it was going to be done without the loss of fighter personnel. But we lost several thousand pilots from the Air Force, and the excuse given was that the funds were no longer available to sustain them.

Within a few short months the administration has awakened to what some of us were telling it on the floor of the Senate last spring, namely, that such a cut could not be made without weakening the air defense of the Nation.

I am satisfied that that is the case.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his statement this afternoon, and I say to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that his explanation is not good enough for me. We are entitled to the facts. If the only way we can get them is to have an executive session of the Senate, then I say, let us go into executive session. We are trying to determine the facts concerning the defense program of our country.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the vote on the Lee nomination, in connection with which I did not make a speech, I find that even my silence is subject to misinterpretation. It is bad enough to be criticized for speaking, but now I find that I am criticized for being silent, because some of the gentlemen of the press wanted to know how I could square my vote against Lee with the position I have taken during my 9 years in the Senate on the confirmation of nominations. That, Mr. President, is very easy to do.

Starting in 1945, I have laid down certain historic criteria which I thought should be always followed in confirming nominations under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution. Those criteria included the character of the nominee, his loyalty, his competence to carry out the President's program, and his freedom from self-interest.

In this instance, Mr. President, I do not question this particular nominee on the ground of character or loyalty to the country or competence to carry out Eisenhower's program, but, on the basis of the discussion and of the record, I do question him on the ground of self-interest. The sponsorship behind him, raises grave doubts in my mind as to his freedom from self-interest, and because of those doubts, Mr. President, I did not think he met the historic criteria, and I voted against confirming his nomination on that ground.

Now, Mr. President, there is one other matter to which I desire to advert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the results of a Gallup poll on the question of increasing the salaries of Members of the Congress.

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

[From the Washington Post of January 24, 1954]

THE GALLUP POLL—PAY BOOST TO CONGRESS OPPOSED, 3 TO 1

(By George Gallup)

Although many students of Government agree that higher salaries for Congressmen are not only warranted but might make service in Congress more attractive to capable citizens, the idea of raising congressional pay still gets a cool reception from the people back home.

A coast-to-coast poll by the institute finds that for every voter who would approve an annual boost of \$10,000 in pay for Congressmen, three would disapprove.

The Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries recently recommended an increase of \$12,500 in the salary of Senators and Representatives. This would bring their pay to \$27,500 a year.

The salary is now \$12,500, plus a non-taxable \$2,500 expense allowance. An income-tax deduction of \$3,000 is permitted to cover the cost of living in Washington.

From personal interviews with a carefully

selected cross section of voters, today's survey indicates the following highlights on this problem, always a touchy one for Congressmen.

People in the business and professional classes are most sympathetic to raising congressional salaries, closely followed by white-collar workers. However, a sizable majority in both of these groups is opposed.

The main opposition to the idea comes from farmers and from workers in the skilled, unskilled, and semiskilled groups.

In short, the problem for congressional leaders, if they want public support for higher salaries, is to explain the situation and give convincing reasons to those segments of the population in which \$25,000 seems like a truly bountiful and magnificent sum.

The survey question was:

At present, United States Congressmen receive \$15,000 a year in salary and expenses. Would you approve or disapprove of raising this to \$25,000 a year?

The vote, nationwide and by occupation groups:

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Nation.....	22	68	10
Professional and business.....	33	58	9
White-collar.....	30	62	8
Manual workers.....	18	72	10
Farmers.....	14	76	10

Of particular interest is the fact that the issue is not a partisan one. There is little difference of opinion between rank-and-file Democrats and GOP voters, as the following table shows:

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Democrats.....	20	71	9
Republicans.....	24	67	9
Independents.....	24	64	12

Earlier institute surveys have shown the public consistently tends to resist the idea of raising congressional pay.

In 1945, for example, when President Truman proposed a plan for increasing congressional salaries from \$10,000 a year to \$15,000, after wartime wage ceilings were removed, the public vetoed the idea.

The vote on the proposed \$5,000 increase was: 31 percent approve, 50 percent disapprove, and 19 percent no opinion.

When Congress passed the bill in 1952 to allow Congressmen to deduct the cost-of-living expenses in Washington for tax purposes, an institute survey found public sentiment overwhelmingly opposed to the plan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Members of the Senate will recall that the representative of the Independent Party asserted a few days ago that the raising of the salaries of Members of the Congress would constitute an affront to the public. I repeat that assertion today. I am pleased to invite attention to the fact that apparently a great many persons agree with me on this issue, because in a poll, which indicated a cross section of opinion, they indicated by a vote of 3 to 1 that salaries of Members of the Congress should not be increased.

In my opinion, it is no justification for an inexcusable increase in congressional salaries to say that we would get better men in the Government by so

doing. I challenge that premise, Mr. President. I repeat, that when men and women enter the public service they should do so as dedicated men and women, as having put behind them any aspirations to make money. The salaries we receive are adequate to meet the needs of the average Senator. What we need is an increase in accountable expense allowances by means of which we can better serve our constituents; but let such expenses be an open book.

I hope this drive on the part of public servants to increase their pay will die an early death, Mr. President, because, in my judgment, with increasing thousands of persons in this country losing their purchasing power, we cannot justify putting our hand into the Public Treasury as a grabbag and taking out an unwarranted increase in salary.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY WITH KOREA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Mutual Defense Treaty with Korea.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider Executive A, 83d Congress, 2d session, a mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Korea, signed at Washington on October 1, 1953, which had been reported favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an understanding.

POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP IN THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, 1953 will be recorded in the annals of Government as the beginning of the "spoils deal" for Federal civil-service employees.

The deceitful manner of those presently directing the personnel administration of our Federal Government has revealed itself through the ugly, distorted, and premeditated actions taken in the past 10 months.

Beginning with the disguised effort early in the 1st session of the 83d Congress to expand arbitrary dismissal authority, a move which was defeated only because of an overwhelming vote by the Democrats of the Senate, for which the Republicans now seek to take credit, and ending with the recent court decision involving nonveteran career employees, the Federal civil-service merit system in a few short months has been stripped of 50 years of progressive and hard-won meritorious gains.

Mr. President, actions taken early in 1953, and greatly emphasized with the President's order designating the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission as his chief White House aide on personnel matters, very decisively revealed the new administration's lack of confidence in the bipartisan, nonpolitical atmosphere long prevalent in civil-service affairs.

For the first time, so far as can be determined, a member of the supposedly

bipartisan Civil Service Commission recently delivered a partisan address before a politically partisan group. This same member, who has been a great disappointment to me personally, has consistently engaged in double talk during the past few months.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from South Carolina has mentioned the fact that one of the members of the Civil Service Commission has participated in political discussions or speeches. As I understand, the Civil Service Commission is not a nonpartisan board but is a bipartisan board.

I believe the record will show that one of my personal friends, who was an outstanding member of the Commission some years ago, the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, also participated in some public political meetings, but I would not censure him for so doing. I hope the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will keep that fact in mind.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. Ramspeck made some speeches, but he did not make them on political basis at that time, or not before a political group.

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the record will show that he did speak to groups of Democratic women on some occasions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, every action so far taken by the administration has been designed to strip civil-service employees of all protection and security.

The complete hypocrisy of those doing the damage is pointed up by the almost daily statements of reassurance. It reminds me of a cartoon showing the boss handing the employee his hat as he boots him out the back door while assuring; "Don't worry, Mr. Civil Servant, you have nothing to fear from me."

Mr. President, a great many laws have been enacted for the protection of efficient, loyal, and hard-working career employees. Adequate safeguards also have been provided to allow agencies to eliminate the incompetent, inefficient, and disloyal employees. Laws do not mean much in this case, however, unless the integrity and feeling of those charged with their administration and interpretation believe in the purpose and intention for which the laws were enacted.

Mr. President, it is how a man feels in his heart that counts.

Many of the actions taken during the past 20 years to strengthen and improve the merit system were taken by administrative action.

Most of the responsibility rests with the executive branch of the Government, and the new administration has authority either to strengthen or destroy the merit system.

Today the morale of the Federal employee is at an all-time low.

Employees so plagued with fear that they hesitate even to repeat their own names cannot be performing their work efficiently.

It is almost impossible to ascertain the cost, the unnecessary waste of millions of dollars, created by this low morale.

This terrible fear is causing many mistakes and low production.

An enlightened new administration would have realized by now that the average civil-service employee is a hard-working, conscientious, loyal, and nonpartisan American.

Yet, not one positive action has been taken so far to encourage the civil servant or to offer him any measure of protection.

Under the new "spoils-deal," a Government employee does not have as much job protection as the average private employee working in private industry under union contract.

The new administration has made many claims of inheriting a government of misfits, incompetents, and inefficient employees. Yet in 12 months of riding the Government of this type of employee, it has been able to find in this category only less than one-half of 1 percent of the total number of employees who were on the payroll when it assumed control of the Government.

This is 25 percent less than the number discharged for the same reasons during 1951 and 1952.

The administration also claims that it cannot be held responsible for the actions of a government when it cannot control policy by obtaining enough jobs. Since assuming office, the new administration has been able to make more than 380,000 job placements. By the end of 1956 it will have been able to replace 1 out of every 2 employees. This is at a rate in excess of 1,500 each working day.

Figures such as this label as false and misleading the statements of those in control of the Government about not being able to obtain enough jobs through normal channels.

Mr. President, this is just another glaring instance of how they alibi.

The controversy now raging over the completely misleading figures used by the administration of the number of subversives fired by them since February is but another glaring example of the harm and injustice done for political gain. By an association of words, the impression has been left with the average American citizen that the Government was staffed by subversives.

First, the administration claimed it fired 1,456 disloyal employees. Recently the figure was raised to 2,200.

This, Mr. President, is known as the practice of deceit and demagoguery. The administration knows its claim is false and that it cannot be substantiated.

The new program announced in Executive Order 10450 was designed primarily to confuse the American public by authorizing the use of such figures. It has cost the Government millions of dollars in the duplication of investigations and has not been an instrument for starting the dismissal of one single Communist.

I hold in my hand a copy of the oath of office signed by every Government employee when he enters the service of the

United States Government. In part, it reads as follows:

[Standard Form 61 (revised April 1, 1948) promulgated by Civil Service Commission—Ch. A6, Federal Personnel Manual]

APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS

B. AFFIDAVIT AS TO SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY AND AFFILIATION

I am not a Communist or Fascist. I do not advocate nor am I a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or other unconstitutional means or seeking by force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States. I do further swear (or affirm) I will not so advocate; nor will I become a member of such organization during the period that I am an employee of the Federal Government.

This oath must be executed before a qualified notary public.

Section 1001 of title 18 of the Criminal Code provides a fine of \$10,000 and 5 years' imprisonment for any Government employee who makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement to any department or agency of the United States Government.

If the new administration has found one single Government employee who is disloyal or engaged in subversive activities, or is a member of the Communist Party or a Communist-front organization, then why has it not used the violation of this oath as a basis of prosecuting to the full extent of the law?

If the administration has found one violation, then the Attorney General of the United States has been derelict in his duty is not using the violation of the oath to obtain an indictment.

I firmly believe every means should be used to prosecute. Simply firing a disloyal employee is not sufficient. I think the Attorney General of the United States should immediately tell the public how many indictments he has obtained from among the 2,200 firings claimed by the administration; and if there are none, as I suspect, then he should resign his office.

The answer is very obvious, Mr. President. The word "subversive" is now and has been the political football by which the Republicans have gained control of this Government.

My position on subversives is pretty clear. The records of the Senate will show me to be unqualified in my belief that those disloyal to America, or those engaged in any subversive activities, should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

However, I am not in favor of impugning the character of loyal, faithful, and hard-working American citizens for political gain or for any other selfish motive.

The President of the United States owes it to the American people to cite the true facts in this case, and to release a general breakdown of the figure reported.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, articles appearing in the Evening Star, the Washington Post, and the Washington Daily News, showing the effort which has been

made by the local press to clear up this confused situation.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. COOPER in the chair]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, since much pressure has already been exerted on the President to release a breakdown of these figures, without result, I now submit a Senate resolution ordering the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to require that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission appear before the committee and give such a breakdown. I am glad to say that the chairman of the committee has agreed that we will have some hearings on this matter.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the statement the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has made in regard to a hearing before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. As the distinguished Senator will remember, at the last session of the Senate the matter was discussed, and at that time there was some thought that, in view of the fact that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the House Committee on Un-American Activities were considering the subject, we might let them proceed. I assure the distinguished Senator that the resolution will come to the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I shall be very glad to assist the Senator in getting some consideration of the matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the chairman of the committee for that statement.

The resolution I am submitting reads as follows:

Whereas President Eisenhower, in his address relative to the state of the Union, delivered on January 7, 1954, before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives, informed the Congress that under the standards established for the new employees security program, more than 2,200 employees have been separated from the Federal Government;

Whereas the President did not disclose to the Congress whether any of such employees were separated because they were disloyal or of questionable loyalty to the United States;

Whereas it is essential that the Congress, in order properly to perform its legislative functions, be informed as to the number of such employees who were separated for reasons relating to their loyalty to the United States, and the number who were separated for other reasons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized and directed to take such action as may be necessary to obtain from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission a detailed statement of the reasons for separation in the cases of the 2,200 employees referred to by the President in his address relative to the state of the Union as having been separated from the Government under the standards established for the new employee security program.

The resolution (S. Res. 199) submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina was

received as in legislative session and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am also in possession of certain documentary proof that the Civil Service Commission has been turned into a high-powered searching agency for jobs for the political faithful—proof that will show a member of the Civil Service Commission as a political tool who has twisted law, rules, and regulations to suit the occasion, and the requests of the members of the administration who wish to turn back the pages of progress to the "spoils system."

From time to time during the next several weeks, I am going to have more to say about this situation.

However, in line with my belief that constructive suggestions must always follow criticism, I will in the next few days offer several legislative proposals which will be very encouraging to Federal employees.

First, with respect to displaced career employees, I propose that there be established in the Civil Service Commission a revolving fund for the payment of salaries to displaced career employees who (a) have over 5 years of service; (b) have performance ratings of satisfactory or better; (c) have attained the age of 30 or over; (d) and who are separated through no fault of their own, but because of a reduction in force, abolishment of agency functions, and so forth.

When employees who qualify are attached to the fund, they shall be available for temporary reimbursable detail by the Commission to other Government agencies, Congress, or the judicial branch, until the Commission locates them in a permanent position for which they qualify. The Civil Service Commission would have full authority to effect displacement of "noncareer" employees in Government agencies, to make room for its displaced career employees.

Many thousands of employees who now hold positions in the Government obtained those positions without successfully passing civil service fitness tests, whereas hundreds who came to the Government after passing rigid civil service examinations, without political consideration, are now walking the streets, unemployed. These people had been told they could expect to make the Government service a career.

Second, I will propose legislation that, if enacted would give nonveteran career employees the same right of appeal as that now enjoyed by veterans.

Third, the Congress will be asked to clarify and restate its intentions with respect to the area in which employees may compete in case of a reduction in force.

The Civil Service Commission by a reinterpretation of its rules and regulations has placed severe restrictions of the area of competition. In some instances the limit has been confined to divisions or even to sections within agencies. Congress fully intended that employees be allowed to compete on an agency-wide basis.

Fourth, I intend to propose legislation again to remove the Civil Service Com-

mission from the arena of politics. One of the features of this plan will be to provide for a set term of office for the Civil Service Commissioners, and to establish a civilian Board of Review of Civil Service Activities.

Fifth, I will propose that there be an immediate separation of the Joint Office of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and White House Adviser to the President on Civil Service Affairs. The Chairmanship of the Civil Service Commission must be as far removed from politics as possible. However, the new administration in combining these two jobs has placed the Commission squarely in the political arena, with the political side having the upper hand and making all the decisions, and with no one left to argue the case from the merit system point of view.

Sixth, I will propose an amendment to the Classification Act of 1949 so as to provide for meritorious and longevity step increases in all grades after 1 year of service. In some instances, an employee must now wait 18 months, while others receive this benefit at the end of 12 months.

Seventh, I will propose an increase in the travel allowance to \$12 per day or to the actual expenses, whichever is less.

Mr. President, I have already introduced proposed legislation to provide a more equitable rate of pay for overtime and holiday work, and to provide severance pay for employees who lose their jobs through no fault of their own.

If the President means, as his many statements imply, that he is in favor of a strong civil-service merit system in our Government, then let him give his endorsement to the program I have just outlined. I am sure that if these nine points are given his complete endorsement and if immediate action is taken thereon, there will be no further need for daily statements of reassurance.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Star of January 3, 1954]

GOP TRYING HARD TO JUSTIFY 1,456 SECURITY FIGURE

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The Eisenhower administration, which points with public pride to its new Federal employee security program, is privately embarrassed these days by the ill-considered use it has made of an almost meaningless figure—1,456.

That is supposed to be the number of security risks fired or forced to resign from the Government in the 4 months beginning last May 27, the day the current security program was launched.

What the figure actually signifies, however, has been the subject of heated debate since the White House first used it in an announcement October 23.

CRITICISM BACKED

In attempting to analyze the makeup of this highly publicized sum. The Star has found administration officials extraordinarily reluctant to talk. It also has found evidence supporting two principal criticisms of the disputed figure and the use the administration has made of it.

These are the criticisms:

1. The figure is a catchall—security risks include not only persons believed disloyal but a wide range of other unsuitable types ranging from sex deviates to employees who

falsely word application forms. Yet the administration has used the figure in such a way as to imply that almost 1,500 Reds—perhaps even spies—have been rooted out by the Eisenhower administration after escaping detection in the Truman era.

2. Even on this catchall basis, the administration figure appears to be heavily padded. The Star's survey indicates, in this connection, that included in the 1,456 are cases where the individual concerned had never been confronted with derogatory information.

SOME DEAD INCLUDED

The figure includes, it appears, persons who never were fired or forced to resign, as the White House announcement implied, but who instead were separated through voluntary resignations, reductions in force—even by death—without ever knowing they had been accused of anything. A few apparently had left the Government before the Eisenhower security program was launched.

The arithmetic which produced the 1,456 sum was done at the Civil Service Commission, which supposedly was aided by other departments and agencies in collecting the Government-wide statistics used. Actually, however, the Commission seems to have done a good deal of its own figure-gathering. The embarrassing result has been that several agencies have had great difficulty making their own figures square with those relied on by the White House in making the October announcement.

FIGURES CONFLICT

Thus, when the individual departments were asked to back up the Civil Service Commission by announcing their own figures on security risk dismissals, at least three big ones—Post Office, Navy, and Air Force—came up with different figures than the ones assigned them by the Commission and incorporated in the 1,456 total.

Something of a crisis was reached recently in the administration's efforts to publicize the issue. The Air Force, after lengthy argument with Civil Service as to how many security risks had been removed from Air Force rolls, rebelled against conforming with the already announced official figure. For policy reasons it canceled a press release on the subject.

Privately, Air Force officials tried to get the CSC to announce the Air Force figure—on the ground that only the Commission knew exactly how the October total had been arrived at and what it meant. But the Commission declined to make the announcement itself. And there the matter rests.

NAVY HAS TROUBLE

Earlier, the Navy had run into similar trouble. The CSC which, under National Security Council-White House direction, had quietly set up a press-release schedule for the various agencies to announce their share of the 1,456, asked the Navy to issue a statement on November 2. (Originally it had asked the Navy to be ready on October 31, but the post office, which was the first to announce, also had figure trouble and requested a delay.)

The Navy prepared a release stating that 8 civilian workers had been fired and 12 others suspended as security risks. The Commission immediately replied that it had counted 192 for the Navy and had included that figure in the total reported to the White House. More than a month of wrangling, re-examination, and discussion followed. The result: On December 7, the Navy issued a vaguely worded release, open to a variety of interpretations, which said that 192 persons, against whom a security question existed, had been separated.

An official, conceding that Navy headquarters did not have details from its more than 700 field offices, said the Navy went to the absolute limit to go along with the Commission. "They (the Commission) took advan-

tage of everything the broadest interpretation of the Executive order would allow," he asserted.

ORIGIN OF POLICY

How did the new program and the figure 1,456 actually come about?

In his state-of-the-Union message last January, General Eisenhower announced that a security system, based on the idea that working for the Government was a privilege rather than a right, would be put into effect at the earliest moment.

Attorney General Brownell and his Justice Department lawyers then took over. Robert Minor, first assistant to Deputy Attorney General William Rogers, met with security officers of the various agencies in a series of give-and-take sessions. Out of these meetings came the basis of Executive Order 10450.

The President announced the new program on April 27, to become effective a month later. This ended the old Truman loyalty setup which, in its more than 6 years of life, fired or denied employment to 557 persons about whose loyalty a reasonable doubt existed.

The Eisenhower order was aimed at a much broader target. Besides disloyal persons, it included individuals who are dishonest, untrustworthy, unreliable, or immoral; alcoholics, drug addicts, those with serious mental or neurological disorders, those who conduct themselves disgracefully, and those who may be subjected to coercion or pressure which may cause them to act contrary to the interests of national security.

EXTENDED FIRING POWER

Executive Order 10450 extended provisions of Public Law 733 of 1950 to all departments and agencies of the Government. This law had given the Secretaries of the Armed Services and several other sensitive agencies the power to remove summarily persons suspected of disloyalty or who were believed to be threats to the national security.

The new program gives the accused an opportunity to present his case to a Security Hearing Board, made up of three individuals from agencies outside his own. The Secretary of the accused's department selects these board members from a panel maintained by the Civil Service Commission.

The board recommended action to the department head, who may or may not abide by the recommendation. There is no further appeal. Under the Truman system, a central Loyalty Review Board heard appeals from regional boards and its decision was final.

Executive Order 10450 charges the Civil Service Commission with a continuing study of the manner in which the agencies carry out the security program. Also, the commission is directed to report to the National Security Council at least semiannually on the results of this study.

At a Security Council meeting 3 months ago Philip Young, Chairman of the CSC, and advisor to the President on personnel matters, was asked how many persons had been dismissed as security risks. Mr. Young had no figures available. (Under the order he had until late November to make his first report.) He returned to his office and sent out a call to the agencies for reports. This was on October 5. He asked for replies within 2 weeks. With these, and the Commission's own investigative records, he counted 1,456.

OFFICIALS IN DOUBT

Several security officers have declared that they were not certain as to just what figures the Commission wanted—and still aren't. This undoubtedly explains part of the confusion over figures between the agencies and the Commission. One of the security chiefs asserted that Mr. Young's "extremely hurried" call for statistics, which had to be gathered from thousands of offices in all parts of the world where Government em-

ployees are hired and fired inevitably produced numbers with different meanings.

Mr. Young made his report to the National Security Council on October 22. The next day the White House made its announcement that 1,456 persons had been ousted.

Since then, Republicans from Mr. Eisenhower to Senator McCARTHY has referred to the 1,456 often and lovingly. These references, almost invariably have been made in connection with discussions of the Communists-in-Government problem.

BREAKDOWN REFUSED

While administration officials, like Mr. Young, readily grant that the public generally attaches the same odious meaning to "security risk" and "disloyalty," they have declined repeatedly to give a breakdown of the 1,456 cases. And their public statements have not helped to draw the distinction they conceded is there. For example, the President read the following prepared remarks at a press conference on December 2:

"I repeat my previously expressed conviction that fear of Communists actively undermining our Government will not be an issue in the 1954 elections. Long before then this administration will have made such progress in rooting them out under the security program developed by Attorney General Brownell that this can no longer be considered a serious menace. As you already know, about 1,500 persons who were security risks have already been removed. * * *

"By next fall I hope the public, no longer fearful that Communists are destructively at work within the Government, will wish to commend the efficiency of this administration in eliminating this menace to the Nation's security."

M'CARTHY USES FIGURE

And Senator McCARTHY, in a nationwide radio address on November 24, declared:

"For example, while almost daily from the time I mentioned the 57 Communists and 205 security risks in Government, until the time the Truman-Acheson regime was removed from office—almost daily some leader of the Democratic Party would proclaim to the country that there were no Communists in Government, and that my attempt to dig them out was dishonest and a hoax. The new administration has now gotten rid of 1,456, all of whom were security risks and practically all of whom were removed because of Communist connections and activities or perversion."

Chairman Young denies that statements in which security-risk dismissals are mentioned in the same breath with the Communists-in-Government issue confuse the average citizen and give many the impression that the Government is crawling with Reds and fellow travelers.

YOUNG BLAMES PRESS

Instead, Mr. Young blames the press for failing to make the public understand that a person may be a security risk without being a member of the Communist Party or in any way disloyal.

Mr. Young does not seem anxious to aid in this education process. The Star tried for a week to learn from CSC the date Mr. Young sent out his request to the agencies for statistics. Commission information specialists said they would have to check with Mr. Young personally. The answer finally came back: This information is "not releasable." (It was obtained elsewhere.)

This reluctance to talk about the program, in its obviously unclassified aspects, occurs in the face of the President's statement of December 2. Speaking of the security program and the Red issue, General Eisenhower said:

"The people must have the facts on this important subject in order to reach sound

conclusions. As provided for in the liberalized regulations of this administration, established facts, so far as the national security permits, will continue to be made available."

DIFFICULT TO BREAK DOWN

The Star asked Mr. Young how many of his 1,456 security cases involved loyalty. He replied:

"I, as a taxpayer, am not interested in whether a person was discharged for being disloyal or for being a drunk, and I don't think the average person is. They just want to know that we are getting rid of this type of person on the Government payroll."

He also pointed to the difficulty of dividing the cases under headings of loyalty and nonloyalty because some persons may have been charged on both counts.

The Star first called attention on December 8 to the fact that the 1,456 figure had been padded with voluntary resignations, reduction-in-force cases, and other persons not fired after having been proven security risks. Proof of this fact was contained explicitly in the release in which the Navy announced its own contribution to the October total. This is what the Navy said:

"Separations in some instances were affected after preferment of charges and hearings. Others were separated through resignation or reduction in force prior to final processing of derogatory information, or by other administrative action during the employee's trial period."

PROCEDURE IN DOUBT

The logical question, of course, is whether the procedures followed in the Navy case were followed in producing the purge figures for other agencies. No one in the administration will say that handling of the Navy figures was typical of the way the whole list was produced. But, on the other hand, nobody will say it wasn't.

James Hatcher, head of the Civil Service Commission's security appraisal unit, was asked whether the figures for other agencies also included voluntary resignations, reduction in force, and other administrative separations found on the Navy list. He said he was not at liberty to discuss the matter and suggested that Mr. Young was the only one who could. Perhaps Mr. Young could. But he wouldn't.

The same kind of thing is encountered in trying to estimate the percentage of the 1,456 figure which actually has to do with loyalty cases.

NAVY RATE LOW

The bulk of the Navy's security separations were blue-collar workers—laborers and helpers and the like. Navy officials know of only 17 cases involving subversive associations or questionable loyalty. They spot checked civil-service records on the 175 others—every fifth one—and found no additional loyalty cases.

According to an Air Force official, instances of questionable loyalty were no higher in his department, percentage-wise, than they were in the Navy. The Air Force employs 289,000 and the Navy 435,000 civilian workers—a total roughly one-third of all Government employees.

The Star has been told by sources it believes to be reliable that the Army and Veterans' Administration also have low rates of loyalty cases. No information on other agencies is available.

One of the reasons for a low percentage of loyalty cases in the military is that for 3 years the Army, Navy, and Air Force have had the authority under Public Law 733 to fire summarily any employee believed to have subversive connections. The State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and several others also have had this authority.

NEW REPORT FORM USED

Of late the administration apparently has recognized that the reporting system which

it has been using has produced confusion and numbers with no clear meaning. The Civil Service Commission, with the advice of the Justice Department and agency security officers, has developed a new monthly report form. This makes clear what statistics are required.

The Commission, however, will not tell the press what information the new report form seeks. Nor will it say whether the form is now in use.

Two weeks ago Mr. Young and Mr. Brownell met with Government security officers at the Justice Department to take critical stock of the program and to discuss, among other things, the new reporting system.

And the Justice Department's Mr. Minor, who perhaps had as much to do with the actual writing of the employee security program as any other, told the Star the administration is not forgetting that dismissals under the Executive order are to be made only in the "interests of national security."

"If the order is being used for any other purpose, we want to know about it," Mr. Minor said.

[From the Washington Post of January 20, 1954]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE TANGLED WEB

Since he returned from France to seek the Presidency Dwight D. Eisenhower has been sold a good many lemons in the name of "smart politics." But about the worst lemon he has been sold yet is the strategy, worked out by certain of the administration's amateur Machiavellis, for dealing with the Communist issue.

As an example of this strategy in action, take the administration's repeated boasts about the 1,456—now 2,200—people who have been fired from the Government as security risks. The privately admitted purpose of these security firings has been to "grab the Commie issue away from JOE McCARTHY."

The idea has been to undercut McCARTHY by broadcasting the notion that the new administration found the Government crawling with subversives; promptly fired the lot; and thus left McCARTHY with nothing further to do but twiddle his thumbs. The story of the State Department's security firings demonstrates how this was to be accomplished.

A grand total of 306 State Department security firings have been announced. According to reliable report, this impressive—even frightening—total was arrived at in the following manner. In the first place, the word was passed down through Assistant Secretary Scott McLeod's security and personnel offices that what was wanted was the largest possible total of such firings.

Two techniques—both palpably dishonest—were therefore used to swell the total. The files of those State Department employees who were in the process of resigning—always a considerable number, since there is a constant turnover—were carefully scrutinized. In the raw files of any Government worker who is not a zombie, there is pretty sure to be some morsel of gossip which can be labeled "derogatory information." Whenever the raw files provided the slightest excuse for so doing, the names of those who were resigning anyway were added—without their knowledge—to the grand total of State Department security firings.

About half the State Department total was arrived at in this way. If the same proportion holds throughout the Government, there must be more than a thousand Government workers who have resigned with a clear conscience and what they thought to be a clear record, and who were nevertheless listed officially as having been fired as security risks.

The second technique was just as dishonest. Large numbers of people were being

transferred from the administrative control of the State Department to Harold Stassen's foreign aid outfit and to the newly independent Information Agency. Many of these people were transferred "with the warning flag up" and then listed as State Department security firings—although the great majority were cleared on further investigation, and never fired at all.

In the vast majority of these cases there was no question whatsoever of disloyalty or procommunism. In about 19 out of 20 cases, the reason, if any, for the firing was heavy drinking, temperamental unsuitability, or the like. Where there was some pro-Communist charge, it was often on the order of the charge against one female Government worker, who was accused of "sympathetic association" with her husband. This woman appealed the charge and on further investigation her husband turned out to be a rather mousy fellow, who had never taken an interest in politics.

In short, there was not a single case of actual subversion in all the State Department's security firings—and it is doubtful if there was one such case throughout the Government. Yet to 99 out of a 100 people, the news that there have been a large number of security firings means that this number of Communists and subversives have actually been uncovered in the Government.

Under the circumstances, it is surprising that any self-respecting person will work for the Government at all. What is even more surprising is that anyone should have thought that this amateurish political fakery should not be exposed for what it is. Apparently it never occurred to the geniuses who thought up the scheme that someone might ask for a breakdown of the security firings. Thus when reporters asked Civil Service Commission Chairman Phillip Young for such a breakdown he could only reply fatuously that he was "not interested" in such matters, and did not believe the "average person" was interested either. The story of the State Department firings make the reason for this awkward evasion perfectly obvious.

But what is downright incredible is that anyone could have supposed that this sort of slick numbers game was an effective way to undercut McCARTHY. McCARTHY has already, of course, profited heavily from the whole business—such as he profited heavily from Attorney General Brownell's attack on former President Truman, which was also supposed to steal the show from McCARTHY. McCARTHY has used the administration's fake figures to "prove" his own ancient, discredited charges against the State Department.

According to report, the President himself, and Chief Presidential Aide Sherman Adams, are beginning to realize that they were sold a lemon, and are by no means pleased by the realization. If so, this may help the administration's amateur Machiavellis to understand that they are no equals to Senator McCARTHY, when it comes to slick political filmflammy.

[From the Washington News of December 21, 1953]

THE CASE OF THE LANGUAGE SPECIALIST—INJUSTICES CREEP INTO UNITED STATES SECURITY PROGRAM

(By Anthony Lewis)

The News today begins a series of articles on a subject which, without any real public knowledge about it, has aroused great interest and political controversy—the new security program for Federal employees.

President Eisenhower put the program into effect last May. It replaced suspected disloyalty as grounds for dismissal from Government service with more general grounds of subversive conduct or associations, of loose

talk and immorality which might make an employee vulnerable to blackmail.

The administration recently announced that 1,456 persons were forced from their jobs under the program through September 30. More than that it is difficult to learn.

The Government says it cannot break down the reasons for the 1,456 employees' removal, or the methods used to get them out. And the ousted employees naturally are not advertising their identities.

FEAR DOMINATES

Some surely know removal was justified. Others, though they feel themselves wronged, fear possible damage to their reputations by the mere charge and do not wish to fight through long appeal procedures while suspended without pay.

Nevertheless, through attorneys and friends, the News has learned the stories of some employees brought up on security charges.

Because of the Government's silence—possibly proper silence—these articles necessarily give only the employees' side of the picture. No suggestion is made that the cases which will be described are representative of all cases. They are simply the ones we have found.

FALTERING MACHINERY

The stories do give a peep into the machinery of the security program, and they show a system not working perfectly in the interest of either the individual or the Government.

Bearing in mind that we were given only one side of the story—they still seem to show some injustice, some pressing or far-fetched charges which might have been avoided by more preliminary investigation. They show some painful delays—appeals which have been pending for months and are still not decided. In all cases names and identifying clues have had to be withheld or changed.

One afternoon last spring 10 employees of the State Department found a letter on their desks:

"This is to advise you that within 48 hours charges involving immorality will be lodged against you. This notice does not abrogate your right to resign immediately or to reply to the charges."

One who got the notice was Mrs. C, a \$6,000-a-year language specialist. The specific charge was that she had slept with her husband before she married him.

She had met Mr. C while he was getting a divorce from his first wife, about 10 years ago. When the divorce became final, they married.

Less than 9 months later a son was born to them.

The Eisenhower security program's strictures on immorality apply not only to sexual perversion, as has been well publicized, but to intimate heterosexual (normal) relations out of wedlock.

KINSEY FIGURES

In the Kinsey report sample, 92 percent of all men and almost 50 percent of women had had such relations, but the theory of the security program is that such an immoral person may be subject to blackmail.

In the case of Mrs. C, the date of her child's birth was public knowledge. Blackmail would seem an impossibility, and she might have pressed an appeal against her dismissal on that ground.

But Mrs. C decided not to fight. The very nature of the charge, she felt, made too great the possible damage to herself, Mr. C and especially the child. She took the strong hint in the Department's notice and resigned.

FORTY DOLLARS A WEEK

Mrs. C left with no favorable reference for her years as a Government worker. The label "security risk" was enough to keep her from private employment in her field, though it is

quite short of trained help. She now works for \$40 a week in a department store.

"She probably did as much to fight communism as anyone in the field over the years," a friend of Mrs. C said. "But she made the mistake of being too much in love with the guy she later married, so the United States Government deprives itself of her services."

Mrs. C's little boy put it this way: "The State Department stunk."

[From the Washington Daily News of December 22, 1953]

THE SECURITY PROGRAM AND THE INNOCENT—MR. G WAS CLEARED, BUT HIS JOB STILL ELUDES HIM

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the second of a series of articles based on a few of the 1,456 persons who were separated from their Government jobs as "security risks." The Government has not told the number of loyalty risks included in this total number of security risks. These few cases by no means are presented as indicative of the whole group, or as indicative of the way in which security cases are generally handled. The circumstances as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants themselves, and their lawyers and friends, since the Government properly refuses to enter a public discussion against them. Defendants' names have been deleted. The facts are as told to us. The reason for presenting them here is because they indicate that improvements in the handling of such cases could be made.)

Two and one-half months ago a Government hearing board recommended that Bernard G be cleared of all security charges against him and that he be given back his job.

Since then, nothing has happened. Mr. G is still suspended.

He is waiting for action by his department head, who must make the final decision on every contested case under the Eisenhower security program.

Is there still doubt about Mr. G despite exhaustive hearings and the board's strong recommendation in his favor? Or is there simply a big backlog of cases for the department head to decide?

A MYSTERY

Mr. G can't find out.

He had been a Federal employee for 22 years when the charges were filed against him, and he had never had any charge brought against him under the old loyalty program.

Under a provision of the Eisenhower program, Mr. G was automatically suspended by the bringing of charges this year, and his \$8,000-a-year salary was stopped. It was more than 2 months before his appeal reached the hearing board.

Mr. G has earned no salary now for almost 5 months. Lawyer's fees are mounting up.

Why is he still waiting and hoping? For one thing, his 22 years as a Government worker have all been in the same office. That is the job he knows. For another, he believes he has been unjustly accused.

"A LOYAL LIFE"

"I have been dependable and have lived a life loyal to God, to my country, to my family, and to my community," Mr. G said in his appeal. "That life should speak for me now in elimination of any possible stain of being considered disloyal or a security risk."

The security charges against Bernard G stem from two important decisions he made in his life.

The first was to become a lawyer.

"For the better support of my family," Mr. G told the hearing board, "I strove to improve myself and so find some honorable source of supplemental income (while work-

ing for the Government). I started law school at night * * * and was admitted to the bar in * * *"

As a lawyer, Mr. G has handled cases in his spare time, with the approval of his Government office. The practice has never amounted to much.

TWO POINTS

The written charges which the security officers sent him when he was suspended included two main points relating to his work as a lawyer. This was the first:

"You at one time were a member of the National Lawyers Guild, an organization cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist organization."

In the written answer he had to file, Mr. G said that some years ago he made an unsuccessful effort to get the lawyer's job in various Federal agencies.

"At one of them, and I do not recall which," he wrote, "the general counsel * * * told me that he was an officer of the National Lawyers Guild and informed me that practically all the top lawyers in the Government belong to it * * *"

"I inferred that I would not be seriously considered for a legal position unless I filled in an application for membership—which he handed me. I filled in the application and paid him, to the best of my recollection, a dollar, which was the only bill I had with me * * *. I did not get the job."

The hearing board met for 3 days on Mr. G's case. It took testimony from him, from his witnesses and from witnesses the Government had called. When the board made its favorable decision on Mr. G, it sent him a "memorandum of reasoning" on each charge.

This is what it found on the Lawyers Guild charge:

"Mr. G became a member of the Lawyers Guild for 1 year. It does not appear that he renewed his membership * * * At that time lawyers of national prominence were members * * * and there is no evidence to indicate that the Lawyers Guild was then considered a subversive organization."

The second charge connected with Mr. G's legal work was:

"It has been reported that (you know) Mr. Z—, a known Communist and subscriber to the Morning Freiheit."

Mr. G answered that he had served as lawyer for Mr. Z and Mrs. Z some years ago in their purchase of a grocery. G's brother-in-law, who was a grocer himself, had referred them to him.

"I saw Z once at the grocery store," Mr. G wrote, "and once with the former owner's lawyer. I have not seen him since, but I have had some indication of his views through a trying incident. * * *"

"My brother-in-law was at my home for my son's bar mitzvah (confirmation in the Jewish faith) when Z called him and said he would drop by."

HE REBUFFED MR. Z

"My brother-in-law then told me he had had an argument with Z in which Z had talked like a Communist. Although I disliked being ungracious, I told him I would not have Z in the house."

"In the circumstances my wife put chairs out in the yard, and Z visited with my brother-in-law there while I remained in the house. Since then my brother-in-law has told me that he became convinced of Z's Commie views and is no longer on speaking terms. * * *"

"It seems to me, although I am not sure, that I have heard of the Morning Freiheit as a Jewish language newspaper. I have never seen it and know nothing of it. I do not know whether Z was ever a subscriber to it. I gather from the charges that it is a Communist newspaper."

The hearing board found:

"The evidence indicates that Mr. G's association with Mr. Z was solely of a professional nature in connection with isolated legal matters."

If these charges against Mr. G could be dismissed in such a brusque, matter-of-fact fashion, why were they ever brought against him at all?

Shouldn't they have been thrown out before they ever got to the stage of formal charge? Wasn't there any preliminary investigation, any sober judgment cast on their value?

There is no answer.

With those charges aside, the hearing board turned to the other interesting aspect of Mr. G's life—his home in Parkview, a pseudonym the News will use for a housing development built here by the Federal Government.

"Parkview is a small town intensified," Mr. G wrote in his appeal. "Kindness and good neighborliness abound. But so, too, do pettiness and backbiting."

[From the Washington Daily News of December 23, 1953]

THREE HEARING DAYS SPENT ON GOSSIP—MR. G'S SECURITY TROUBLES TRACED TO LOOSE TONGUES

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the third of a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as security risks under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

For almost 3 days, the security-hearing board listened to testimony about Bernard G before it decided that there was nothing wrong with him at all.

Mr. G, who had worked for the Government for 22 years, has been suspended for 5 months now as a security risk. He still hasn't been finally cleared.

The hearing board spent most of the time looking into Mr. G's life at Parkview (a fictitious name for a housing project here).

Mr. G, whose case was described in part in yesterday's News, has lived in Parkview for more than 10 years.

"I have assisted in various aspects of the community," he wrote the hearing board. "So I have necessarily met many people in Parkview, not all of them my friends."

ATTENDED MEETING

The first formal charge against Mr. G in connection with Parkview was this:

"There is a record of your attending a meeting at which donations were required. * * * The donations were for the United American Spanish Aid Committee which is on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. * * * It is of record that you solicited and requested other individuals to attend the meeting."

In his written answer to that charge, Mr. G said he had never heard of the Spanish Aid Committee, but that his lawyer had told him it had something to do with the Spanish Loyalists.

"Soon after we moved into Parkview," Mr. G said, "we were invited to a party. As new residents we were glad to go. There were many Parkview residents there, including the mayor.

"The party was social. However, some quiz games were played which cost 25 or 50 cents an entry, with a prize for the winner. My recollection is that I was told the money would go for Spanish war orphans. My wife remembers it as in aid of Loyalist refugees in general.

"Like many Americans my sympathies at the time favored the Loyalists, on the understanding that they were democrats fighting a dictator. I probably played 1 or 2 games at a probable cost of 50 cents."

MIXED GROUP

This is what the hearing board decided:

"The evidence establishes that Mr. G was present at a social party. * * * Guests included some reputed to have radical or left-wing tendencies and others whose reputation was unquestioned.

"Money was raised for some Spanish relief organization, the exact name of which is not clear. The Spanish Aid Committee, which allegedly was the recipient, was not placed on the Attorney General's list until 8 years after the party."

That's how curly the hearing board took care of that charge.

What informer originally made it? Did the security officers investigate before they accused Mr. G formally of soliciting Spanish aid? No one but the security officers knows.

The second charge against Mr. G in connection with Parkview was much broader: "Several reliable informants have described you as a leader and very active in a radical group in Parkview. Many of this group are thought to be of questionable character concerning loyalty to the United States. Some are described as even willing to defend communism in any discussion of ideology."

Mr. G began his answer by flatly denying that he was a radical of any kind. He said nobody had ever dared defend communism in his presence. He said he had belonged only to organizations like the Lions and the Parent-Teacher Association.

CONSERVATIVE

Then he made clear that he regarded himself as allied to the conservative rather than radical element in Parkview.

"The charge probably arises," he said, "out of the hotly contested issue of home ownership in Parkview. It was originally built, owned, and operated by the Federal Government, and in effect rents for low-income tenants were subsidized.

"When the Government indicated it wanted to sell Parkview, a large majority of the residents favored forming a corporation to buy the homes. A highly vocal minority was opposed. Its core consisted of the low-income group who naturally did not want to lose low, noncommercial rent.

"Parkview was finally sold this year to Parkview Housing, Inc., for which I was an attorney. Rents were raised in the lower brackets because the homeowners could not afford to continue subsidies, and this served to madden some of the minority.

"Last year, incidentally, I spoke in favor of requiring a loyalty oath from every director of Parkview Housing.

"I know that hotheads in the minority there have, in their exasperation, thrown around wild and untrue accusations. * * * But any description of me as any kind of radical is simply untrue."

The hearing board took a long, cool look at Parkview, and decided this:

"From its inception Parkview has been a subject of controversy * * *

"From without it has been eyed suspiciously as a 'queer' experiment. The fact that residents had so many cooperative undertakings was associated with something apart from conventional private enterprise. Rumor and gossip has given Parkview a 'radical' reputation."

EPITHETS

"Within, disagreements over management have resulted in heated disputes that often

developed into personal animosities. Such terms as 'crackpots,' 'long hairs,' 'radicals,' 'pinkos,' and 'Communists' have been bandied about loosely by disgruntled individuals. * * *

"In this environment a civic-minded individual—whether conservative or otherwise—is bound to be exposed to criticism. In the case of Mr. G, who took part in many activities, the testimony showed that he was, if anything, a moderating and conservative influence."

Then the hearing board concluded:

"Based on all the evidence heard * * * and the reports of investigation furnished by the Government, the board could reach no other conclusion but that Mr. G's employment is clearly consistent with the interest of national security."

That is not the end of the story. Under the Eisenhower security program the head of Mr. G's agency had to pass on the hearing board's recommendation, and so far he has taken no action. Mr. G is still suspended without pay.

Mr. G's lawyer, who also had some cases under the old Truman loyalty program, said the appeal procedure and personnel in Mr. G's case were fair enough. Certainly no defendant could complain about the board's careful findings.

But the lawyer did express surprise that some of the charges should even have been formally brought. Who were the "reliable informants" who called Mr. G a "radical" at Parkview? Wouldn't any preliminary police work have shown that charge to be absurd?

"G is a pretty conservative guy," the attorney said, "probably a little too conservative for my taste."

The lawyer was also surprised at the time the case has taken—3 full days of hearings and months of waiting—all for a relatively unimportant Federal employee.

"What can it mean for the program as a whole," the lawyer asked, "when they take this long for a case I regard as infinitesimal?"

[From the Washington Daily News of December 24, 1953]

THE CASE OF ATTORNEY D—GUILTY BY ASSOCIATION WITH A SECURITY CLIENT

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the fourth of a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as security risks under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

Along with the basic Anglo-American concept that even the worst criminal is entitled to a lawyer goes the understanding that a lawyer must not be judged by his clients. If he defends a thief or a Communist, that doesn't make him one—yet.

A Government employee who was recently suspended as a security risk found among the specific counts against him a charge that he had associated with Attorney D.

"Attorney D was a chief defense attorney in the Amerasia case," the charge said, "and is suspected of having Communist tendencies."

The Government worker, in his answer to the charge, said he had met Attorney D once—in connection with a lawsuit in which D was on the other side.

At this point our story leaves the accused Federal employee to examine the Government's attitude toward the lawyer he had met once, Attorney D, and especially toward D's connection with the Amerasia case.

PAPERS SEIZED

Amerasia was a magazine, later found to have pro-Communist sentiments, in whose offices the FBI seized some secret State Department papers.

Four editors and writers on the magazine and two State Department employees were charged by the FBI with conspiring to commit espionage. Charges against 4 of the defendants were dismissed, and the other 2 paid small fines.

Was Attorney D accused of being part of the Amerasia conspiracy? Of even knowing the defendants before trial? Of doing any spying himself?

No. He was described by a security officer as having communistic tendencies because he had acted as a defense attorney in the case.

When Attorney D heard that he figured in the security case, he decided to file an affidavit with the security hearing board handling it—even though, again, he was not himself a defendant.

INSINUATION DENIED

In the affidavit Attorney D denied that he had ever belonged to any Communist or Communist-front organization or favored Communist aims in any respect. He then went on to tell how he had come into the Amerasia case.

The Amerasia defendants, Attorney D swore, had hired as their lawyers a New York firm in which an influential and well-known Member of Congress was a partner. But the trial was to be in district court here, and rules of the court require that at least one defense lawyer be from the District of Columbia.

A member of the New York firm called him, Attorney D said, and asked him to be attorney of record from the District in the Amerasia case. He agreed, he said, and that was all he did.

What does the Government think of Attorney D as a security prospect now? What would happen if he should seek a Government job himself? Did his one appearance as an attorney in a case involving communism forever brand him as having Communist tendencies?

As of the moment, the questions cannot be answered. The security hearing board which considered the case of Attorney D's casual acquaintance, the accused Federal worker, made no comment on Attorney D. He was just an incidental factor.

Even the conservative American Bar Association has expressed concern over the difficulty a controversial defendant has in obtaining counsel these days, because lawyers feel the defendant's reputation may rub off on them.

In its convention just this year the ABA passed a resolution urging lawyers to take on unpopular cases, as a duty.

What comment would the bar association have on the case of Attorney D?

[From the Washington Daily News of December 28, 1953]

AN UNHAPPY CASE WITH A HAPPY ENDING— MRS. Q WAS CHARGED WITH ASSOCIATING WITH HUSBAND

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the fifth of a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as security risks under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and

friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

Mrs. Q, who has a nonsensitive job with the Government here, was handed a slip of paper last summer announcing that she would soon be accused as a security risk. The notice said:

"Specifically, it is charged that you continue sympathetic associations with your husband, —, who was reported to be a member of — and — (two Communist-front organizations)."

Whether in a sensitive position or not, an accused employee must immediately be suspended under the Eisenhower security order. Mrs. Q's superior told her to clean out her desk and leave.

Mrs. Q decided to fight for her job. She hired a lawyer, and 1 week after she received the notice, she filed an answer.

She admitted that she was married to her husband and was "continuing sympathetic associations" with him. She was living with him, to be exact. On his behalf, she denied that he had ever belonged to the two front organizations the charge had named or any others.

NO EVIDENCE

Two weeks later, Mrs. Q had a hearing before a three-man board of the type provided for in the Eisenhower security order—its members drawn from other agencies.

The Government presented no evidence, and at the start the board chairman said to Mrs. Q's attorney: "Your case, Mr. —."

In effect, Mrs. Q had to prove that Mr. Q was innocent.

The Government never would say when or where Mr. Q was supposed to have joined the front outfits. If it had, he could have testified at the hearing as to what he was doing then, and could have produced witnesses to back him up.

As it was, Mr. Q brought witnesses who testified to his general good character in business and personal life. They also said he wasn't interested in politics and was therefore not likely to have joined the groups mentioned in the charge.

MR. Q QUESTIONED

The hearing board did ask Mr. Q some questions. These indicated that a confidential informant had charged that someone once suggested Mr. Q to the front outfits as a possible member. No evidence about any membership card or a signed application by Mr. Q himself was mentioned.

A week after the hearing, the board informed Mrs. Q it had decided that the charges against her and her husband were without merit. A few days later her department head ordered her back to duty. She got full back pay for her time suspended, about a month.

Mrs. Q's case was similar to that of Milo Radulovich, the Air Force lieutenant who was accused of being a security risk because of his father's and sister's suspected Communist affiliations. He was later cleared after nationwide publicity on the case.

Not all the cases of this kind end so happily. One which is still pending—but which can never have a storybook happy ending—involves a Miss K.

She was accused of having a brother whose activities were questionable. Miss K appealed and got a hearing. The board told her, not directly, but quite clearly:

If you want to continue working for the Government, you must promise never to see your brother again unless and until he becomes persona grata to the United States.

Miss K weighed her brother against her job and chose the job. She promised not to

see him. The security hearing board has not yet decided her case.

[From the Washington Daily News of December 29, 1953]

DILEMMA FOR THE INNOCENT—FIGHTING DISLOYALTY CHARGES CAN BE LONG AND COSTLY

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is another in a series of articles based on stories of a few persons charged as "security risks" under the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 employees have been removed for security reasons, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved subversion or disloyalty. The cases as presented here reflect the bias of the defendants and their lawyers and friends, since the Government perhaps properly refuses to enter a public discussion about them. The stories are not represented as typical of all security charges or handling of cases. But the facts are as told to us. They offer evidence of thin charges brought, of difficulties faced by employees in appealing, of painful delays in handling of cases. Names and identifications have been disguised at defendants' request.)

When a Federal employee chooses to resign rather than fight a charge that he is a security risk, does he tacitly admit that the accusation is true?

Many members of the public would answer yes. As an anonymous letter writer asked the News recently, "Why waste sympathy on someone who does not even appeal?"

But it isn't that simple. Lawyers and others familiar with the problems say an accused employee who feels the charges against him are entirely untrue might nevertheless have many reasons to resign quietly instead of fighting the charges on appeal.

A LONG ROAD

For one thing the accused employee faces an appeal procedure that can run into months and even years of deliberation.

Department security regulations under the Eisenhower program generally give the Government 30 days to tell an accused employee the specific charges against him. And the Government has 30 days more to amend the charges.

The employee himself is allowed 30 days to prepare a written answer to the specific charges, and 30 days more to file amended answers to the amended charges.

Those are maximum times, of course, but they are not merely theoretical.

In one case described to the News, the Government filed specific charges on the 30th day after it had brought its first broad accusation against an employee, and then sent him amended charges—by special delivery letter—on the 30th day after that.

When the employee's final answers are in, the agency must decide whether to clear the man on the basis of his statements or, as happens in most cases, order a hearing. The agency can take as long as it wants to decide.

Many hearing boards have a backlog of cases, because they were set up and cleared for security themselves only this summer. They have no limit on the time they can take to hear a case and then hand down their recommendations.

DELAY AFTER CLEARANCE

The agency head must make the final decision on each accused worker under the Eisenhower program. In a case described earlier in this series, an agency head has had a favorable board opinion before him for 2 months without acting on it.

Even with the best intentions on the Government's part, then, an accused employee must realistically count on long proceedings. And he will be suspended from his job without pay the whole time.

The Truman loyalty program gave agencies discretion to let employees in nonsensitive jobs keep working while cases were argued.

The formal Eisenhower order is not clear on the point, but the Justice Department has let agencies know that they must immediately suspend any employee charged as a security risk, whether janitor or code clerk. A Justice spokesman confirmed to the News that this is policy for the whole Government.

One agency, the National Labor Relations Board, originally issued security regulations in which suspension was not mandatory. But the regulations were withdrawn and revised after consultation with the Justice Department.

An accused employee can seek a temporary job while suspended, of course—but it must be one that allows time for the preparation and appearances he will have to make in his appeal.

HEAVY LEGAL FEES

If he is eventually cleared, he can expect to get his back pay. But much of that may go for lawyer's fees, which have amounted to \$1,200 in one still active case known to the News.

The legal process itself presents the difficulties which always face defendants in cases involving security—unknown accusers, shadow charges, surprise elements which the prosecution would have to list in advance in a regular criminal case.

Written charges against 1 man, for example, accused him of associating with 4 persons. In the hearing, examiners suddenly brought 12 more names—about which the defendant had not been able to check his records or search his memory. The hearing board gave no reason why the names should not have been listed in advance.

"Inevitably the decent people go through the real torture," a lawyer said, "the bewildering at having to convince your Government. * * * How do you prove you are virtuous? Honest? Patriotic?"

CHANCE OF REPETITION

Last of all, an accused employee trying to decide whether to resign or to fight the charges may fear that standards will change once more in future even if he is cleared this time, that his case will be reviewed again and again, that it will never be closed.

He knows that if and when he wins his fight and returns to the desk he left so hastily months before, some fellow workers will always—if only unconsciously—regard him as a risky sort.

[From the Washington Daily News of January 4, 1954]

A PSYCHIATRIST VERSUS A SECURITY OFFICER—WHEN DOES SEXUAL BEHAVIOR BECOME A BLACKMAIL RISK?

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the seventh in a series of articles on the new Eisenhower security program. President Eisenhower has announced that 1,456 Government employees have been removed under the program, but the Government will not say publicly how many of those cases involved disloyalty or subversion. Previous stories in the News have presented case histories of a few persons charged as security risks, as related by themselves and their lawyers and friends. Today's article is a discussion of opposing points of view on one controversial aspect of the program.)

What bearing should the sexual behavior of a Government employee have on his rating as a security risk?

Notorious conduct has long been reason for dismissal from Government service, under regular civil-service rules. But immorality has only recently come to be regarded as making an employee a bad security risk.

This concept, introduced by the Truman administration, is based on the idea that an

immoral Government worker is subject to blackmail. To put it crudely, a Russian agent might approach the employee and say: "Give me some secrets or I'll tell on you."

In the last administration the concept was applied chiefly to homosexuals in sensitive jobs. Application is now much broader. Many more employees and many different kinds of immorality are being investigated. Enforcement is much more rigorous.

Because the subject is so delicate and so controversial, the relation of sex to security has had little public discussion. To explore the subject the News sought the views of, among others, a psychiatrist and a prominent Republican security officer. Names are withheld at their request.

Critics of the morality-security concept in both past and present administrations say it may lead to a form of blackmail by the Government itself.

"Nearly everyone has done something in his life that he wants to keep secret," one critic said. "He would probably prefer not to argue such private matters before security officers or hearing boards.

"If a department head or security officer wants to get rid of someone he can probably just keep investigating until he finds something of that kind and then threaten to bring formal charges against the employee. Chances are he'll just resign quietly."

TACTICS DENIED

The Republican security officer questioned by the News strongly denied that his own department—or, to his knowledge, any other—was using such tactics.

"Sure, it's possible," he said. "No security system can guarantee against all abuses. But as far as I know we are bringing morals charges only against employees we believe offer a real threat to national security."

The psychiatrist argued that methods used in some Government morals investigations, whether intended as a threat or not, might do great psychological damage to innocent individuals.

LIE DETECTOR USED

He mentioned the case of one of his patients, an unmarried Government girl in her twenties, who, he said, was given a lie detector test and asked these questions:

Have you had sexual relations with a man?

Have you had sexual relations with a woman?

When did you last have intercourse?

"Even we who have been studying human personalities for years do not pry that bluntly," the psychiatrist said. "Imagine the effect of such a test on a sensitive person."

(The security officer confirmed that lie detectors are used in morals cases but said he had no knowledge of this particular case or one like it.)

The basic criticism voiced by the psychiatrist was that the security program casts too broad a net on moral standards—frowning on practices that may be technically illegal but in fact are done by most of the population at one time or another.

LACK OF IMPULSE?

"If we carry this to its logical extreme," he said, "what of the person who has no sexual impulse at all? Is he normal? A good security risk? You are in a dangerous field as soon as you start saying what is 'normal.'"

"Even in marriage, you know, there are sexual habits today that would shock Victorians.

"I don't think the fact that a man is a homosexual, or a heterosexual who sleeps with his secretary, proves in itself that he is likely to divulge Government secrets. It's not the sexuality of any person that should worry the authorities, but the indiscretion."

IT IS RELATIVE

The security officer's point of view coincided to some extent.

"If all our laws were enforced," he said, "everyone would be in jail. We do the same thing a cop does. We go after only the flagrant, public abuses.

"I can't define immorality. It's relative. But if a person is indiscreet, he's got to go—and that means if he has done something our investigators discover. If they can find out about it, so can a potential blackmailer. That's why our investigators have to keep looking."

The security officer said he personally was not taking a strict view of illicit male-female relationships in the past unless they had resulted in illegitimate children.

But in the case of homosexuality, he said, one episode in a person's history means automatic dismissal however long ago it happened. The only exception, he said, would be a case in which someone had been taken advantage of as a child.

"By the time you're out of school you know whether perversion is right or wrong," he said. "And suppose we learn that a boy was thrown out of prep school for some homosexual act—should we keep him on the payroll?"

YOU DON'T NEED KINSEY

The psychiatrist noted the Kinsey Report statistic that one-third of American males have at least one homosexual experience in their lives.

"You don't have to draw on Kinsey," he said. "Any psychiatrist will tell you that many men—and women have a single homosexual episode. That does not mean the person is a homosexual.

"Incidentally, watch out for officials who are determined to root out anyone who ever had a homosexual experience. They are like searchers for pornography. They show an unconscious interest in the subject."

OUT, ANYWAY

The security officer maintained that, however normal a person was now, a single homosexual act in the past could lead to blackmail.

But he agreed with a statement by the psychiatrist that some confirmed homosexuals could actually not be blackmailed—because, as the psychiatrist put it, "they have no guilt feelings; they think they are right and the rest of the world wrong, and they don't care who knows they are homosexual."

"I had one high official in here," the security officer said, "who freely admitted he was a homosexual. But he insisted he could not be blackmailed because he had never tried to keep the fact a secret and did not object to anyone knowing.

"He was probably right, too. We decided to force him out on general grounds of immorality."

FEAR

A criticism often made of the security program as a whole—that it creates an atmosphere of fear—was said by the psychiatrist to apply particularly to sexual charges.

"Peoples who have been leading happy lives begin to worry," he said. "A man may have slipped once years ago, and now for the first time he starts wondering: 'Am I normal? Will I pass?'"

In this connection some critics hold it is the Government's emphasis on morals that has actually made blackmail possible.

In past years, this argument goes, a spy who learned of a morals offense by a Government worker would not have known whom he could threaten to tell about it. Today anyone who wants to put pressure on such a Government worker need only threaten to pass the word to a security officer.

"We all want security," the psychiatrist said. "We're all against sin. But one wonders about the methods."

[From the Washington Post of January 1, 1954]

THOSE "SECURITY RISKS"—ANXIETY AND EMBARRASSMENT

(By Murrey Marder)

In its zealotry to show it has been cleaning security risks out of Government, the administration has produced a set of statistics which has been transformed into a seriously distorted political issue.

The statistics, the administration has said, add up to 1,456 "security risks" removed from Government jobs in the first 4 months' operation of President Eisenhower's Federal Employees Security Program, May 27 to September 30.

This 1,456 figure is causing anxiety, and embarrassment, to some conscientious Federal officials. They have been forced to sit by, silently, while this figure—which they privately admit is open to question—is converted into a major political scare issue which implies that it represents that many spies, espionage agents and saboteurs, or potential traitors.

A survey of all available information indicates that many of these cases would have been terminated in a very similar way before the employees security program came into existence last May, but with no such implications.

The difference is that many of the cases would not have been called security risks under previous administrations. They would have been called dismissals "to promote the efficiency of the Federal service," or some related term.

These dismissals would have been effected in exactly the same manner as many of the dismissals now carried out in the name of security; that, through normal civil-service procedures.

Part of the distinction is in semantics. When the present security program was created, it abolished the loyalty program and bracketed into the term "security" everything ranging from a spy to someone of questionable habits.

It overlapped broadly into many grounds for routine civil service removal. It could be used to trip up the employee who misrepresented facts in applying for Government work, or the employee who engaged in "notoriously disgraceful conduct," as well as the employee in a security-sensitive job who gossiped about the work.

The lumping-together of all such persons in the wide category of "security risk," and publication of the total figure without any breakdown of the degrees of security risk involved, however, has led to sweeping political allegations. Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Republican of Wisconsin, for example, recently made this statement which cannot be substantiated by any available information: "Over 90 percent of the 1,456 security risks were gotten rid of because of Communist connections and activities or perversion."

The only official clarification obtained to date is President Eisenhower's comment last month that not all of the 1,456 could be described as "subversive" or "disloyal." The question of how many could be put in those categories is still unanswered, officially.

The Washington Post has now learned that when called upon to furnish their sets of figures for this total, at least several agencies had no such compilations, and called on the Civil Service Commission to supply figures out of the agencies' recently submitted dismissal statistics.

Thereupon, what was done in some instances, it is reported, was to seek out dismissal cases which would fit the very broad criteria set forth in the security order—without regard to whether the dismissals were made through the security program machinery or by normal Civil Service methods.

The 1,456 figure has been a subject of controversy since it was announced by the White House on October 23. That announcement said, in part:

"These (1,456) separations were for security reasons only; they have nothing to do with continuing reductions in force from the Federal payroll.

"Of the 1,456 employees, 863 were dismissed from Federal service by their various agencies and departments and 593 resigned. In all of the resignation cases, the agencies and departments had unfavorable reports on these employees."

The Washington Post pointed out in its first report on these figures that they gave a "one-sided" view of the program's operation.

The 1,456 employees, in the main, were not workers who had been cleared after hearings under the Truman loyalty program. Many of them were probationary employees on whom investigations had not been completed by the previous administration.

It is apparent that while there may have been unfavorable reports about the 593 who resigned, they cannot possibly all be tabulated as security risks unless the unfavorable reports were found, upon investigation, to be accurate. The fact is that a resignation generally brings an end to such investigations—and it is possible for a person to resign in many instances without ever knowing he was under investigation.

In addition, one official report now directly contradicts the White House statement that the separations counted in the 1,456 figure "have nothing to do with continuing reductions in force from the Federal payroll."

The Navy Department, in announcing on December 7 that it had separated 192 civilians workers out of the 1,456 total, stated:

"Separations in some instances were effected after preferment of charges and hearings. Others were separated through resignation or reduction in force prior to the final processing of derogatory information, or by other administrative action during the employee's trial period."

There is official documentation that at least some of the 863 persons included in the figures on dismissals for security reasons were actually dismissed under normal civil-service provisions rather than as security risks.

The Post Office Department, on October 28, reported that 145 of its employees were terminated and 21 resigned of those processed under the new security program. That statement then added:

"It was pointed out that while the 145 were investigated under the Executive order, the administrative actions taken to effect the terminations were in accordance with regular established civil-service procedure. This latter action is in keeping with the intent of the Department's security regulations which specifically provide that separations under the authority of Executive Order 10450 will supplement and not take the place of normal civil-service procedures where such are adequate and appropriate."

Similar language appeared in the Veterans' Administration's announcement, on December 2, that it had terminated the services of 108 employees under the security program, and that "26 resigned while under investigation."

[From the Washington Daily News of January 6, 1954]

THE NEW POLICY IN PRACTICE—WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE A SECURITY RISK?

(By Anthony Lewis)

(This is the last in a series of eight articles on the new Eisenhower security program. Previous stories in The News have presented case histories of some persons charged as "security risks," as told by them-

selves and their lawyers and friends, and have discussed specific security regulations. Today's article deals with some general questions about the program.)

Administration officials who decided to scrap the old loyalty program last spring criticized its standards as too severe. It was difficult to place the terrible label "disloyal" on a Government worker, they said—and unfair to do so except in the case of a proved spy or traitor.

They argued that under the broader standards of the new security program an employee would be removed simply as "unsuitable for Government service." As Attorney General Herbert Brownell put it, "Many employees could be a security risk and still not be disloyal."

"The new policy," columnist Walter Lippmann wrote, "means the penalty on the individual is much reduced. * * * It should be possible to fire a man without destroying him—without in fact branding him at all."

How has it worked out in practice? Specifically, how has it worked for the 1,456 employees the administration has so far listed as removed on security grounds?

President Eisenhower has cited the 1,456 four times as evidence his administration is cleaning out "Communists in Government." Attorney General Brownell and GOP National Chairman Leonard Hall have used the figure the same way.

Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield referred to the 1,456 as "muddleheads and pinks and fellow travelers." Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY flatly said 90 percent were Communists or perverts.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey put it more colorfully:

"Democrats are afraid the American people will discover what a nice feeling it is to have a Government which is not infested with spies and traitors. In less than 11 months the Justice Department has discovered and dismissed 1,456 security risks planted in the Government."

Whether most of the 1,456 were planted Communists or perverts or spies or muddleheads is impossible to find out officially. The administration has refused to give a breakdown of reasons for their dismissal.

But a few cases reported to the News seemed to indicate that at least some of the Government workers brought up on security charges do not fit such a villainous description.

One man was fired because he had not noted on his job application that he was in an Army psychiatric ward during the war.

Others were charged for having sex relations before they were married.

Several, in various departments, were charged and suspended for having belonged to the admittedly leftist National Lawyers Guild, but for having belonged to it at a time when some of the country's most distinguished attorneys were members.

One was accused of associating with a lawyer who once represented a suspected Communist.

Others were charged because of suspicious relatives.

An even more significant fact about the figure 1,456 is that the Civil Service Commission, in reaching that total, included persons who resigned, died, or were ousted by reduction-in-force without ever being told there were security charges against them.

The Navy confirmed that many of its former employees listed as security removals had security charges placed on their records—charges they might have beaten had they been informed—only after they had left their jobs for nonsecurity reasons.

A Democrat who was a security officer in the last administration argued that the new program has excesses and political distortions brought on by what he called the quota psychology.

"The Republicans campaigned for years on the charge that the Government was full of Communists," this Democrat said. "So once they got into office they more or less had to find some security risks and imply they were Communists.

"Every security officer now knows that he's expected to produce at least some risks, his quota. It's hard enough to keep national security foremost in your mind on these cases anyway, without political pressures."

As examples of what he called political pressures on the security system, this Democrat cited:

Civil Service Commission's listing as security cases many which the departments themselves had not so labeled.

Insistence by the administration that one agency—the Democrat did not name it—classify at least a few of its positions as "sensitive," after the agency first said it had no sensitive jobs.

Threats by Senator McCARTHY to call before his committee security officers who cleared an employee of whom the Senator disapproves. (The threat has not materialized so far.)

"It is always easier to bring charges," the Democratic former security officer said, "than to worry about what some official or Senator will say later."

Supporters of the administration program argue that Government employment is a privilege, not a right; that a private business has the right to fire any employee it chooses and the Government certainly has many unsatisfactory workers it should be equally free to dismiss.

Critics give three specific answers:

While some Government workers are doubtless incompetent and should be fired, that is a matter of personnel policy, not security; it is manifestly unfair to brand them "security risks."

For whatever reason, democratic governments around the world have found they attract better workers if they offer more assurance of continued employment—civil service—than private business.

A Government worker fired as a "security risk" these days suffers far more disability than a dismissed private employee. He may have had his Government job for years and know only that work. If he is a professional—a scientist, for example—he may find it impossible to find private employment in his field.

The critics also make this general argument:

An ever-broadening search for security, with heavy political overtones, may in the long run work against the interest of the Government.

For one thing, they say, continued political emphasis on "Communists in Government" will keep the public wrought up about the issue. President Eisenhower himself has several times expressed the wish that the subject would die down and bitter political feelings over it abate.

There is no question either that excitement over the Communists-in-Government issue hurts our standing abroad.

And what effect will an endless hunt for more security have on the kind of employees the Government ends up with?

In some cases reported to the News, hearing boards curtly dismissed charges brought by security officers. These employees went back to work—but only after long periods under suspension, and with the psychological burden of having fellow workers know they were considered risky.

Employees without civil service standing do not even rate appeals to a board. Presumably charges which a board might dismiss would force these employees out automatically. And some workers who rate an appeal resign quietly rather than face the long and uncertain process.

The effect of the security hunt on possible future Government employees was discussed recently by a Wellesley College senior who wants a Government job after graduation—but whose father has been attorney in some controversial security cases. She said:

"I'm a conservative. I don't agree with my father most of the time. I voted for Eisenhower, and I like what he is doing. But I'm afraid when I ask for a job they'll never even get around to my views. They'll find out who my father is and turn me down."

Her fears are at least partly corroborated in the philosophy of the security program regarding new applicants. A Republican security officer once explained it this way:

"When we investigate someone who's been in the Government for years, we consider his whole record and weigh his good service against any minor slips."

"But if a new applicant has anything at all against him, we don't bother weighing his whole history. We just say 'No.' There are plenty more applicants."

As the definition of security risk broadens to take in more and more people, and security mixes with politics, the question arises whether there will be plenty more applicants—intelligent or sensitive or imaginative one, at least—for jobs in the United States Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to enter into controversy with the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, who has just addressed the Senate. I know of no better friend of the civil-service worker than the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who has served so many years on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, formerly as its chairman, and now as its ranking minority member. It has been my privilege to work closely with him, both at this session and in previous sessions.

I am in accord with the resolution he has submitted, and I hope that much of the legislative proposal he has made will be adopted. I think his proposal is in the interest of the civil-service workers.

I believe it might be well to discuss for a moment the 2,200 positions which seem to have received so much publicity in recent weeks.

Personally, I do not know of anyone who said that all the 2,200 are subversives. As a matter of fact, I know of no one who has used the term "subversive" in connection with them. It has been said that they are security risks; I myself have made that statement.

So I thought it might be well to place in the RECORD the President's statement on that point, as contained in his message on the state of the Union, delivered before the joint session of the two Houses of Congress on January 7. I now quote from his message on that occasion, as it appears on page 80 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and the part to which I refer appears under the heading "Internal Security":

Under the standards established for the new employee-security program more than 2,200 employees have been separated from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, let it be noted that the President used the words "employee-security program."

Then the President said:

Our national security demands that the investigation of new employees and the eval-

uation of derogatory information respecting present employees be expedited and concluded at the earliest possible date. I shall recommend that the Congress provide additional funds where necessary to speed these important procedures.

Mr. President, the removal of such persons has occurred under what I believe is Public Law 733. That measure was passed, as I recall, during either the 81st or the 82d Congress; and it was signed by President Truman. Those persons are the security risks, and that is the test of those who have been removed from the Federal Government service.

I wish to say very definitely that I have no objection to finding out the number of those who have been removed from the service, or to ascertaining the departments of the Government in which they served.

On the other hand, I am absolutely opposed to disclosing their names. I believe it would be most unfair and unfortunate to those who have been removed from office, several hundred of whom, so I am told, voluntarily resigned. I believe that for them and their families and their future it would be a mistake, and I am violently opposed to it. But I am not opposed to getting a list of the particular branches of the service in which they worked.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the only reason for this inquiry is this: If there were 2,200, it ought to be shown who are the real security risks. The President used the term "security risk." I think probably he used it in a broader sense—I hope he did—but he certainly led the people of the Nation to believe that 2,200 people were let out because they were subversives. I think the Senator will agree that the public has jumped to the conclusion that they were subversives. That being so, the situation should be cleared up.

Mr. CARLSON. I certainly agree with the Senator in that respect. I do not think anyone ever said that, or intended that it should be said. I have been very careful with my words, and I know that everyone with whom I have discussed this question has used the term "security risk" and not the term "subversive." So I am in accord with the Senator on that point. I think the situation needs clearing up.

Mr. President, this administration is determined to remove Communists, subversives, and security risks from the Federal Government, and I think we are making some progress. It has been said that we have done nothing when it comes to removing Communists. I refer to the statement of the Attorney General. He stated that this administration has indicted or convicted 54 Communist leaders. We have acted against 12 Communist-front groups, and we have deported more than 200 subversive aliens. I think that is a good record. It shows a determination on the part of the administration to rid the Government of these undesirable persons, and I know that the effort will continue, because the President is insisting that we have people in the Federal service who are not security risks, no matter what classification they come under.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator know of any employee who has been dismissed by the Government because he was a subversive, because he was a Communist, or belonged to a Communist organization or a front organization? Does the Senator know of anyone who has been prosecuted?

Mr. CARLSON. No; I do not. I have made no inquiry. I have simply referred to the statement of the Attorney General. I have every reason to believe that the Attorney General was making a correct factual statement.

The distinguished Senator from South Carolina mentioned the point that this administration was destroying the civil service and getting back to the old spoils system. For the RECORD, I think it should be stated that on June 30, 1932, 80 percent of the Federal positions were in the competitive civil service. By June 30, 1936, 4 years later, the number under civil service had dropped to 60 percent. As of November 30, 1953, the number of Federal jobs under civil service stood at 86 percent, and that is where it stands today. So I do not believe the statement of the Senator from South Carolina was absolutely correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to clear up one point. It will be recalled that in 1933, 1934, and 1935, we were employing a great many persons in the WPA and other organizations. Naturally they were not civil-service employees.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. That is exactly what happened. That is one of the situations which has been confronting this administration. At that time agencies were filled with persons who were not under the competitive civil service, but who were blanketed in either by Executive order or by legislative action.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD 3 tables. First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table designated "Table I," showing the trend of Federal civilian employment from 1932 to 1953. It shows the number in the competitive civil service and the percentage, from 1932, by years, until the end of 1953.

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

TABLE I.—Trend of Federal civilian employment, 1932-53

Date	Total, all areas ¹	Competitive civil service	
		Number	Percent
June 30, 1932.....	583, 196	467, 161	80.1
Feb. 28, 1933.....	567, 697	² 453, 590	² 79.9
June 30, 1933.....	572, 091	456, 096	79.9
June 30, 1934.....	673, 095	450, 592	66.9
June 30, 1935.....	719, 440	455, 229	63.3

¹ Totals through 1941 are taken from annual reports of the Civil Service Commission. After that date the source is the monthly report of Federal Civilian Employment.
² Estimated.

TABLE I.—Trend of Federal civilian employment, 1932-53—Continued

Date	Total, all areas	Competitive civil service	
		Number	Percent
June 30, 1936.....	824, 259	498, 725	60.5
June 30, 1937.....	841, 664	532, 073	63.2
June 30, 1938.....	851, 926	562, 909	66.1
June 30, 1939.....	920, 310	622, 832	67.7
June 30, 1940.....	1, 032, 820	725, 827	72.5
June 30, 1941.....	1, 358, 150	990, 218	72.9
June 30, 1942.....	2, 206, 970	(²)	(²)
June 30, 1943.....	3, 157, 113	(²)	(²)
June 30, 1944.....	3, 312, 256	(²)	(²)
June 30, 1945.....	3, 769, 646	(²)	(²)
June 30, 1946.....	2, 722, 031	(²)	(²)
June 30, 1947.....	2, 128, 648	1, 733, 019	81.4
June 30, 1948.....	2, 090, 732	1, 750, 823	83.7
June 30, 1949.....	2, 109, 642	1, 802, 708	85.4
June 30, 1950.....	1, 966, 448	1, 687, 594	85.8
June 30, 1951.....	2, 486, 491	2, 175, 668	87.5
June 30, 1952.....	2, 603, 267	2, 246, 446	86.3
Jan. 31, 1953.....	2, 566, 482	² 2, 213, 658	² 86.6
June 30, 1953.....	2, 470, 963	2, 137, 705	86.5
Nov. 30, 1953.....	2, 365, 629	² 2, 040, 828	² 86.3

² Estimated.
² Data not collected during war years.

Mr. CARLSON. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from March 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Congress, through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Congress, carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil service and classification laws.

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

TABLE II.—A list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from Mar. 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Cong., through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Cong., carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil-service and classification laws

COVERAGE OF THE LIST

The list is not exhaustive, although it purports to be comprehensive within certain boundaries. These boundaries are drawn to eliminate references that would not only add to the bulkiness of the list, but would so becloud its purpose that its usefulness and accuracy could well be questioned.

- Therefore, to keep the list within a proper perspective the following kinds of references have been omitted.
1. Laws creating small commissions or committees to exist for a short period of time to perform some specific duty such as "An act to provide for the appointment of a commission to establish a boundary line between the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia."
 2. Laws authorizing participation by the Federal Government in celebrations, expositions, and fairs such as the California Exposition Commission, the Texas Centennial Commission, operation of the Freedom Train, and the Paris Exposition.
 3. Provisions appearing in the annual appropriation acts appropriating sums to various agencies for the employment of experts, consultants, or other personnel usually on a temporary basis. The amounts of money are usually not very large and the provisions seem to have no degree of uniformity. Sometimes they appear only once; sometimes they appear 2 or 3 times and then are dropped.
 4. Laws pertaining to participation in international organizations such as a law providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization.
 5. Laws pertaining to the District of Columbia government such as those dealing with policemen and firemen.
 6. Laws pertaining to employees outside continental United States.

USE OF THE LIST

The short titles of the laws are used if available; otherwise the long titles are shortened.
The date approved means the date the President signed the law.
The page reference in the citations to the Statutes at Large is to the page on which the provision appears rather than to the page on which the law begins.
The section of the law is listed to make it easier to find.
Some of the provisions examined authorized employment without regard to civil-service laws; some authorize the fixing of compensation without regard to the Classification Act; some authorize both. Therefore, the last column is divided into two parts to indicate from which law the employees are exempt. The symbol X is used to show an exception.
Often the provisions exempting personnel from the civil-service laws and/or Classification Act are limited to certain officers and employees. Where such is the case, the limitation is set out in a footnote.
The footnotes appear at the end of the list.

Title of act	Date approved	Citation to Statutes at Large	Section No.	Exempt from—	
				Civil-service law	Classification Act
Agricultural Adjustment Act.....	May 12, 1933	48 Stat. 37.....	10.....	X
Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, 1933.....	do.....	48 Stat. 49.....	33.....	X	X
Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933.....	do.....	48 Stat. 56.....	3 (b).....	X	X
Tennessee Valley Act of 1933.....	May 18, 1933	48 Stat. 59.....	3.....	X
Corporation of Foreign Bondholders, 1933.....	May 27, 1933	48 Stat. 93.....	203.....	X	X
For the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system.....	June 6, 1933	48 Stat. 114.....	2.....	X	X
Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933.....	June 13, 1933	48 Stat. 131.....	4 (j).....	X	X
National Industrial Recovery Act.....	June 16, 1933	48 Stat. 195.....	2 (a).....	X	X
Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.....	do.....	48 Stat. 200.....	201 (a) (b).....	X	X
Emergency Railroad Transportation Act, 1933.....	do.....	48 Stat. 211.....	2.....	X	X
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act.....	Jan. 31, 1934	48 Stat. 345.....	1.....	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1934.....	Feb. 23, 1934	48 Stat. 355.....	4.....	X	X

TABLE II.—A list of laws enacted by the Congress of the United States during the period from Mar. 9, 1933, the beginning of the 73d Cong., through July 7, 1952, the adjournment of the 82d Cong., carrying provisions authorizing employment of personnel without regard to civil-service and classification laws—Continued

Title of act	Date approved	Citation to Statutes at Large	Section No.	Exempt from—	
				Civil-service law	Classification Act
Regulation of cotton industry	Apr. 21, 1934	48 Stat. 605	17	X	X
Securities and Exchange Act of 1934	June 6, 1934	48 Stat. 885	4 (b)	¹ X	¹ X
Communications Act of 1934	June 19, 1934	48 Stat. 1067	4 (f)	² X	² X
To establish a National Archives of the U. S. Government	do	48 Stat. 1122	2	X	
National Housing Act	June 27, 1934	48 Stat. 1246	1	X	X
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	do	48 Stat. 1256	402 (c) (5)	X	X
Tobacco Control Act	June 28, 1934	48 Stat. 1279	10 (c)	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1935	Feb. 20, 1935	49 Stat. 29	4	X	X
To regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products	Feb. 22, 1935	49 Stat. 33	0 (b)	X	X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1935	Apr. 8, 1935	49 Stat. 117	3	X	X
Protection of land resources against soil erosion	Apr. 27, 1935	49 Stat. 164	4 (2)	³ X	³ X
National Labor Relations Act	July 5, 1935	49 Stat. 451	4	⁴ X	
Central Statistical Board	July 25, 1935	49 Stat. 499	4	⁵ X	⁵ X
Social Security Act	Aug. 14, 1935	49 Stat. 636	703	⁶ X	⁶ X
Potato Control Act of 1935	Aug. 24, 1935	49 Stat. 790	218	X	X
Public Utility Act, 1935	Aug. 26, 1935	49 Stat. 837	31	⁷ X	⁷ X
Federal Power Act, 1935	do	49 Stat. 859	310	⁸ X	⁸ X
Railroad Retirement Act, 1935	Aug. 29, 1935	49 Stat. 972	8 (c)	X	X
Federal Alcohol Administration Act	do	49 Stat. 977	2 (c)	X	X
Rural Electrification Act, 1936	May 20, 1936	49 Stat. 1366	11	⁹ X	
Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection	May 27, 1936	49 Stat. 1384	5 (a)	¹⁰ X	
Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission	June 3, 1936	49 Stat. 1399	2 (c)	X	X
For loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during 1937	Jan. 29, 1937	50 Stat. 6	5 (a)	X	X
Providing for the construction and maintenance of a national art gallery	Mar. 24, 1937	50 Stat. 52-53	4 (c)	¹¹ X	¹¹ X
Bituminous Coal Act of 1937	Apr. 26, 1937	50 Stat. 73	2 (a)	¹² X	¹² X
Office of Consumers Counsel	do	50 Stat. 74	2 (b) (3)	¹³ X	¹³ X
To establish a civilian conservation corps	June 28, 1937	50 Stat. 320	5	X	
Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act	July 22, 1937	50 Stat. 528	41 (a)	X	X
To authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of Bonneville project	Aug. 20, 1937	50 Stat. 736	10	¹⁴ X	¹⁴ X
To create a commission and extend further relief to water uses on reclamation and Indian irrigation projects	Aug. 21, 1937	50 Stat. 738	2	X	X
To provide for taking census of partial employment, etc.	Aug. 30, 1937	50 Stat. 883	2		¹⁵ X
Federal Crop Insurance Act	Feb. 16, 1938	52 Stat. 73	507 (a)	X	X
To authorize completion, maintenance and operation of Fort Peck project for navigation	May 18, 1938	52 Stat. 406	9	¹⁶ X	¹⁶ X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1941	June 26, 1940	54 Stat. 622	21 (b)	X	X
Selective Training and Service Act, 1940	Sept. 16, 1940	54 Stat. 894	10 (a) (3)	¹⁷ X	¹⁷ X
Making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo ship construction	Feb. 6, 1941	55 Stat. 6	1	¹⁸ X	¹⁸ X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1942	July 1, 1941	55 Stat. 404	16 (b)	X	X
National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1942	do	55 Stat. 490	Par. 16	X	X
National Archives Trust Fund Board Act	July 9, 1941	55 Stat. 582	8 (b)	X	X
To provide for the planting of guayule and other rubber bearing plants and to make available a source of crude rubber for emergency and defense uses	Mar. 5, 1942	56 Stat. 127	2 (a)	X	X
To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat packing establishments engaged in intra-state commerce only in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies	June 10, 1942	56 Stat. 351	2 (c)	X	X
National Youth Administration Appropriation Act, 1943	July 2, 1942	56 Stat. 573	Par. 15	X	X
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, 1943	do	56 Stat. 642	15 (b)	X	X
Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942	Dec. 18, 1942	56 Stat. 1058	2 (b)	X	X
Surplus Property Act of 1944	Oct. 3, 1944	58 Stat. 768	5 (a)	¹⁷ X	¹⁷ X
To amend Bonneville Project Act	Oct. 23, 1945	59 Stat. 546	5	^{18 20 21} X	^{18 21} X
To establish Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration	Jan. 3, 1946	59 Stat. 679	14 (a), 14 (b)	²² X	²² X
Atomic Energy Act, 1946	Aug. 1, 1946	60 Stat. 771	12 (4)	²³ X	²³ X
Veterans Canteen Service	Aug. 7, 1946	60 Stat. 888	2 (e)	²⁴ X	²⁴ X
To establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System, etc.	Mar. 31, 1947	61 Stat. 32	6 (a) (4)		X
To exclude interns, student nurses, and other student employees of hospitals of the Federal Government from the Classification Act and other laws relating to compensation of benefits of Federal employees	Aug. 4, 1947	61 Stat. 727	1, 2		X
Economic Cooperation Act of 1948	Apr. 3, 1948	62 Stat. 139	104 (e)		²⁵ X
To provide basic authority for certain functions and activities of the Weather Bureau	June 2, 1948	62 Stat. 286	3	²⁶ X	²⁶ X
To authorize establishment of internships in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans Administration	June 19, 1948	62 Stat. 536		X	X
To provide for Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	Apr. 14, 1949	63 Stat. 46	2 (f)	X	X
Classification Act of 1949	Oct. 28, 1949	63 Stat. 954, 957	202, 204, 205		X
Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act	May 3, 1950	64 Stat. 100	4 (a)	X	X
Federal Records Act of 1950	Sept. 5, 1950	64 Stat. 584	503 (o)		²⁷ X
Renegotiation Act, 1951	Mar. 23, 1951	65 Stat. 201	107 (o)	X	X
To confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission.	June 19, 1952	66 Stat. 139	1	X	X
Communications Act Amendments, 1952	July 16, 1952	66 Stat. 711	3 (2)	²⁸ X	

¹ Exemption applies to certain officers, attorneys, and other experts.
² Exemption applies to a secretary, a director for each division, a chief engineer, and not more than 3 assistants, a general counsel and not more than 3 assistants, and temporary counsel for performances of special services.
³ Exemption applies for not more than 8 months after passage of act; thereafter employees are to be appointed in accordance with civil-service and classification laws.
⁴ Exemption applies to an executive secretary, attorneys, examiners, and regional directors.
⁵ Exemption applies to persons appointed for temporary periods, not exceeding 12 months.
⁶ Exemption applies to attorneys and experts.
⁷ Exemption applies to attorneys, examiners, and other experts.
⁸ Exemption applies to certain officers, attorneys, examiners, and experts.
⁹ Exemption applies to attorneys, engineers, and experts.
¹⁰ Exemption applies to technical staff.
¹¹ Exemption applies to Director, Assistant Director, Secretary, and Chief Curator.
¹² Exemption applies to the secretary, a clerk to each Commissioner, the attorneys, the managers and employees of the statistical bureaus, and such special agents, technical experts and examiners as the Commission may require.
¹³ Exemption applies to clerk to the Counsel, the attorneys and such special agents and experts as the Council requires.
¹⁴ Exemption applies to temporary personnel.

¹⁵ Exemption applies to clerical and stenographic employees for local boards.
¹⁶ Exemption applies to personnel engaged in the maintenance, repair, operation, or management of plants or facilities.
¹⁷ Exemption applies to special assistants, certified public accountants, qualified cost accountants, industrial engineers, appraisers, and other experts.
¹⁸ Exemption applies to Assistant Administrator, Chief Engineer, and General Counsel.
¹⁹ Exemption applies to laborers, mechanics, and workmen on construction work.
²⁰ Exemption applies to physicians to examine the laborers, mechanics, and workmen.
²¹ Exemption applies to experts.
²² Exemption applies generally to medical specialists; however, some of the personnel are subject to the civil-service and classification laws.
²³ The law provides that officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with civil-service and classification laws "except to the extent the Commission deems such action necessary to the discharge of its responsibilities, personnel may be employed and their compensation fixed without regard to such laws."
²⁴ Exemption applies to personnel necessary for the transaction of business at canteens, warehouses, and storage depots.
²⁵ Exemption applies to not more than 100 employees.
²⁶ Exemption applies to employees for meteorological investigations in the Arctic.
²⁷ Exemption applies to National Historical Publications Commission.
²⁸ Exemption applies to a legal assistant, and engineering assistant and a secretary for each Commissioner and an administrative assistant for the chairman.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table designated "Table III," showing incumbents granted civil-service status noncompetitively under various pieces of legislation, Executive orders, and civil service rules and regulations.

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

TABLE III.—Incumbents granted civil-service status noncompetitively under various pieces of legislation, Executive orders, and the civil-service rules and regulations between Mar. 4, 1933, and June 30, 1952, by authority and agency

BY LEGISLATION	Number
Act of Congress, Apr. 27, 1935 (Public Law 46): Soil Conservation Service	10, 328
Act of Congress, June 29, 1936 (Public Law 835): U. S. Maritime Commission	894
Act of Congress, May 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 421): The National Archives	293
Act of Congress, June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1076): Post Office Department (postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class offices)	10, 271
Act of Congress, July 2, 1940 (Public Law 719, 76th Cong.): District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board	118
Act of Congress, Nov. 26, 1940 (Public Law 880, 76th Cong.): Ramspeck Act	81, 618
Act of Congress, Dec. 20, 1941 (Public Law 363, 77th Cong.): District of Columbia Board of Public Welfare	966
Total, by legislation	104, 488
BY EXECUTIVE ORDERS	
Executive Order 5817, Mar. 10, 1932: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	192
Executive Order 5859, June 21, 1932: Treasury	191
Executive Order 6134, May 18, 1933: Farm Credit Administration	965
Executive Order 6758, June 29, 1934: Farm Credit Administration	1, 660
Executive Order 7195, Sept. 26, 1935 (as amended by Executive Order 7223, Nov. 9, 1935): Civilian Conservation Corps	809
Executive Order 7458, Sept. 26, 1936: Rural Electrification Administration	288
Executive Order 7732, Oct. 27, 1937: U. S. Housing Authority	388
Executive Order 7852, Mar. 29, 1938: Lighthouse Service	194
Executive Order 7916, June 24, 1938	17, 726
Executive Order 8383, Mar. 28, 1940: Interior (Office of Indian Affairs)	456
Executive Order 8699, Mar. 1, 1941: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	475
Executive Order 8811, June 30, 1941: Office of Government Reports (Executive Office of President)	297
Executive Order 8886, Sept. 3, 1941: Coast Guard	181
Executive Order 8939, Nov. 13, 1941: Farm Security Administration	1, 104
Executive Order 8952, Nov. 27, 1941	1, 282
Executive Order 9807, Nov. 29, 1946	354
Executive Order 10080, Sept. 30, 1949	4, 248
Executive Order 10157, Aug. 28, 1950	16, 520
Total, by Executive order	47, 330

BY OPERATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE RULES AND REGULATIONS (CIVIL SERVICE RULES ARE PROMULGATED BY EXECUTIVE ORDER)

Rule II, sec. 9 (formerly rule X, secs. 11 and 13):
Classified status given to citizens of the United States who had rendered faithful service overseas for not less than 7 years in a civil capacity. This regulation was revoked effective May 1, 1947.

Rule III, sec. 3.101 of the regulations (formerly rule II, sec. 6):
Incumbents of positions brought into the competitive service.

The largest groups included in this total are: 7,286 clerks in third-class post offices and special delivery messengers in first-class post offices; and 7,191 employees of Farmers Home Administration processed under this regulation as a result of the act of Congress, Aug. 14, 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong.).

Rule III, sec. 3.101 (a) (2) of the regulations (formerly rule II, sec. 7):
Post Office Service: Employees in offices advanced from the fourth class to a higher class, or in a post office consolidated with one in which the employees are classified as competitive.

This regulation has been suspended effective Dec. 1, 1950.

Rule III, sec. 3.104 of the regulations (formerly rule X, sec. 4):
Employees who have served at least 2 years in the immediate office of the President or on the White House staff and whose transfer to a competitive position is requested by any agency.

Rule III, sec. 3.2 (formerly rule II, sec. 8):
Appointments in the competitive service without competitive examinations whenever the Commission finds that the duties or compensation of the position are such, or that qualified persons are so rare, that, in the interest of good Civil Service Administration, the position cannot be filled through open competitive examination.

Total, by operation of rules and regulations: 47, 756

Grand total: 193, 574

RECESS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, in executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 26, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, Army of the United States (brigadier general,

U. S. Army), for appointment as the Quartermaster General, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title IV, Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.):

TO BE MAJOR

John H. Swenson, [REDACTED]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 625, 80th Congress, subject to physical qualification:

TO BE MAJOR

Roy A. Highsmith, MC, [REDACTED]
Clement T. Ziegler, MC, [REDACTED]

TO BE CAPTAIN

Elbert B. Fountain, MC, [REDACTED]
Donald W. Hawe, MC, [REDACTED]
Richard B. Krakaur, MC, [REDACTED]
John G. Lovrien, JAGC, [REDACTED]
Major W. Rhodes, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
Philip H. Welch, MC, [REDACTED]
Charles H. Wells, MC, [REDACTED]
John W. Whitten, MC, [REDACTED]

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Dale R. Booth, JAGC, [REDACTED]
Leland R. Branting, JAGC, [REDACTED]
Claude M. Cupp, MC, [REDACTED]
Mary L. Donovan, ANC, [REDACTED]
William S. Fulton, Jr., JAGC, [REDACTED]
Jack W. Halstead, DC, [REDACTED]
William J. Jaffurs, MC, [REDACTED]
Louise A. Lindegger, ANC, [REDACTED]
Robert J. Millard, DC, [REDACTED]
Dorothy J. Rocovich, ANC, [REDACTED]
John F. Schmitz, DC, [REDACTED]
Donald E. Schwartz, DC, [REDACTED]
James E. Simon, JAGC, [REDACTED]
Joseph N. Tenhet, Jr., JAGC, [REDACTED]
Barbara J. Twohey, ANC, [REDACTED]
Marjorie L. Varner, ANC, [REDACTED]
Wade H. Williamson, JAGC, [REDACTED]

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Clarke M. Brandt, MSC, [REDACTED]
Dorothy M. DeLozier, WAC, [REDACTED]
Sarah J. Dempster, WMSC, [REDACTED]
Dixie L. Gilbert, ANC, [REDACTED]
Ruth M. Ibbes, ANC, [REDACTED]
Barbara E. Lane, ANC, [REDACTED]
Phyllis M. Loucks, ANC, [REDACTED]
Betty L. Simpson, ANC, [REDACTED]
Alice C. Thome, WAC, [REDACTED]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Thomas N. Britton, Jr., [REDACTED]
Evan R. Davison, [REDACTED]
Lee R. Roper, [REDACTED]
George P. Shedd, [REDACTED]
Fred D. Smith, [REDACTED]
Joseph S. Sulenski, [REDACTED]
Phillip E. Teague, [REDACTED]

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Victor L. Allebach, [REDACTED]
Benjamin H. Anderson, Jr., [REDACTED]

Sherwin Arculis, [REDACTED]
 Robert M. Bayless, [REDACTED]
 John R. Beers, [REDACTED]
 William C. Benson, [REDACTED]
 Donald L. Blottie, [REDACTED]
 Harold R. Brewster, [REDACTED]
 Grail L. Brookshire, [REDACTED]
 Paul S. Carpinteri, [REDACTED]
 John H. Casey, [REDACTED]
 John P. Casey, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Edwin F. Cavaleri, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William C. Chamberlain, [REDACTED]
 John O. Childs, [REDACTED]
 Glen Clemens, [REDACTED]
 Walter E. Coleman, [REDACTED]
 Nelson P. Conover, [REDACTED]
 John S. Cross, [REDACTED]
 Donald O. Crutchley, [REDACTED]
 Frank M. S. Dean, [REDACTED]
 James W. Debo, [REDACTED]
 Walter M. Denton, [REDACTED]
 Thomas E. deShazo, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ernest J. Dufresne, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James R. Etheridge, [REDACTED]
 Donald D. Fiser, [REDACTED]
 William D. Fletcher, [REDACTED]
 James D. Franklin, [REDACTED]
 Robert G. Friar, [REDACTED]
 Merle W. Fuller, [REDACTED]
 James M. Gabel, [REDACTED]
 John N. Gallaspy, [REDACTED]
 Wright D. Gifford, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Donald I. Goecker, [REDACTED]
 William R. Graham, [REDACTED]
 Robert L. Harbuck, [REDACTED]
 Arthur N. Hartman, [REDACTED]
 William Q. Harty, [REDACTED]
 Lynn C. Hervey, [REDACTED]
 Russell J. Hopley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Eli P. Howard, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James G. Humphrys, [REDACTED]
 William M. Ingram, [REDACTED]
 Theodore G. Jenes, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert H. Johnson, [REDACTED]
 Joseph L. Kennedy, [REDACTED]
 William W. King, [REDACTED]
 Ernest Kitchens, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John G. Kioke, [REDACTED]
 Robert J. Kuhn, [REDACTED]
 William J. Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Alfred S. LeBlang, [REDACTED]
 Howard G. Ling, [REDACTED]
 William H. Mantooth, [REDACTED]
 Floyd M. Maples, [REDACTED]
 Nathan H. Marcus, [REDACTED]
 Willie H. McBee, [REDACTED]
 Sherwood W. McClaren, III, [REDACTED]
 Harold J. McCormack, [REDACTED]
 Robert F. McGuffin, [REDACTED]
 Thomas S. McLean, [REDACTED]
 James H. McMurray, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Edward S. McNulty, [REDACTED]
 Wilbur A. Middleton, [REDACTED]
 Thomas A. Miller, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Alphonso Mitchell, [REDACTED]
 Dan J. Mizell, [REDACTED]
 Robert S. Montgomery, III, [REDACTED]
 Ernest W. Moore, [REDACTED]
 Richard H. Nlms, [REDACTED]
 Dennis L. Norell, [REDACTED]
 James R. Oakes, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Owen, [REDACTED]
 Peter T. Owre, [REDACTED]
 William E. Pantan, [REDACTED]
 Wilbur A. Pawson, [REDACTED]
 Forest E. Pierce, [REDACTED]
 Tommie D. Porter, [REDACTED]
 Willard L. Portteus, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert W. Price, [REDACTED]
 Edwards M. Quigley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 David M. Rainey, [REDACTED]
 Drew F. Reddish, [REDACTED]
 Robert M. Reuter, [REDACTED]
 Walter G. Riley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James H. Ritz, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James W. Rowe, [REDACTED]
 John O. Roy, [REDACTED]
 Cledie B. Russell, [REDACTED]
 James G. Schoebel, [REDACTED]
 Neil W. Schrack, [REDACTED]
 Frank T. Scott, [REDACTED]
 James H. Shaha, [REDACTED]

Henry R. Shelton, [REDACTED]
 Frank Smith, [REDACTED]
 Noel M. Smith, [REDACTED]
 Charles V. Sorrels, [REDACTED]
 Benjamin G. Spivey, [REDACTED]
 Stephan N. Strauss, [REDACTED]
 Baxter R. Stretcher, [REDACTED]
 Wellington J. Strickfaden, [REDACTED]
 Wallace Tervin, [REDACTED]
 James M. Turner, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jeremiah T. Walsh, [REDACTED]
 Allen H. Watts, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Howard M. Williams, [REDACTED]
 John H. Williams, [REDACTED]

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provision of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and also subject to physical qualification:

Warren H. Anderson, [REDACTED]
 Francis X. Blouin, [REDACTED]
 Joseph U. Catudal, [REDACTED]
 Ray H. Crown, [REDACTED]
 Prescott Eaton, [REDACTED]
 Jackson L. Flake, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Osvaldo L. Gil, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Gunnett, [REDACTED]
 Oscar S. Jacquez, [REDACTED]
 Robert L. Kinney, [REDACTED]
 Lary F. O. Lawson, [REDACTED]
 Francis X. Mahoney, [REDACTED]
 Richard J. McCarthy, [REDACTED]
 Gordon E. Moore, [REDACTED]
 Tommy E. Price, [REDACTED]
 Maxwell R. Thurman, [REDACTED]
 Roy J. Young, [REDACTED]

(NOTE.—These persons were given recess appointment on either September 11, 1953, October 27, 1953, or December 9, 1953.)

The following named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Joseph R. Andrews, [REDACTED]
 David H. Sperring, [REDACTED]
 Leonard F. Stegman, [REDACTED]

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Charles A. Meek, [REDACTED]
 Edward L. Spence, [REDACTED]
 John J. Sullivan, [REDACTED]

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, subject to physical qualification:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Robert M. Hall, MC, [REDACTED]
 Sam A. Nixon, Jr., MC, [REDACTED]
 Glenn A. Washburn, VC, [REDACTED]

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

James E. Anderson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Olga M. Beamon, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Joseph E. Beavers, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Milton A. Beerwinkle, VC, [REDACTED]
 Thomas M. Betha, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Lyman Blakesley, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Richard R. Buckius, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Robert M. Bynum, III, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Hugh J. Clausen, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 David S. Cooper, MC, [REDACTED]
 Irven R. Cooper, Jr., VC, [REDACTED]
 Mabel H. Corbin, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Malcolm L. Coy, MSC, [REDACTED]
 John C. Crimen, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Samuel L. Crook, Sr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Davis, MSC, [REDACTED]
 William V. Davis, MSC, [REDACTED]

Edward J. Egozcue, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Charles L. Eveland, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Berniece I. Fairraiz, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Dan S. Ferguson, DC, [REDACTED]
 James S. Fields, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Alice N. Flagg, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Duane F. Ford, VC, [REDACTED]
 Matthew Ginalick, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Raymond E. Graham, MSC, [REDACTED]
 James F. Graziano, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Thomas M. Grzeslow, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Charles M. Hare, DC, [REDACTED]
 Thomas J. Hartford, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 James A. Hemphill, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Edward F. Holman, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Edward L. Hopper, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Lewis H. Huggins, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Clarence M. Hurtt, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Alfred E. Lewis, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Milton A. Lewis, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Bryan T. Lowe, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Paul S. Marshall, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Thomas G. Murnane, Jr., VC, [REDACTED]
 James J. Norton, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Erroll W. Pace, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Roger F. Pratt, MSC, [REDACTED]
 William J. Prescott, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Kathleen E. Quigley, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Wallace D. Riley, JAGC, [REDACTED]
 Theodore R. Sankey, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Wayne L. Simpson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 John S. Snyder, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Ralph A. Spencer, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Harold Stone, MSC, [REDACTED]
 David H. Sudderth, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Alvin A. Therrien, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Samuel J. Turnbull, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Bryce C. Walton, MSC, [REDACTED]
 William M. Wegner, MSC, [REDACTED]
 George C. Welton, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Kenneth K. Wheatley, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Raymond H. White, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Clarence H. Wilkinson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 John J. Wilson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 James J. Young, MSC, [REDACTED]

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Joseph K. Allen, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Charles Anistranski, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Irving H. Bahde, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 William W. Barnes, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Theodore C. Beckett, MSC, [REDACTED]
 George P. Becknell, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 James C. Burke, MSC, [REDACTED]
 John T. Caskey, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Kathleen L. Charles, ANC, [REDACTED]
 Leaton C. Cofield, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Helen E. Cruickshank, WMSC, [REDACTED]
 Gordon Field, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Ellis F. Hall, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Stanley R. Haskins, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Arnold C. Henderson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Frank K. James, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Aaron B. Johnson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Charles L. Kelly, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Cowan J. McFarland, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Robert W. Moody, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Lynn B. Moore, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Harold D. Newson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Merrill C. Peterson, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Roy C. Prince, MSC, [REDACTED]
 John E. Rogers, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Aaron Ryan, MSC, [REDACTED]
 George M. Shea, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Dana S. Slack, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Seth W. Spellman, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Lloyd E. Spencer, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Samuel J. Summers III, MSC, [REDACTED]
 Joseph M. Tuggle, Jr., MSC, [REDACTED]
 Peter C. Welsh, MSC, [REDACTED]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT

Frederick T. Abt, [REDACTED]
 William A. Ahrberg, [REDACTED]
 Julio C. Bae-Murphy, [REDACTED]
 James R. Bailey, [REDACTED]

Daniel L. Baldwin, [REDACTED]
 Ronald R. Baskin, [REDACTED]
 John E. Bell, [REDACTED]
 Myron H. Bengson, [REDACTED]
 Tom L. Bing, [REDACTED]
 Charles E. Boyle, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles W. Bradshaw, [REDACTED]
 Wesley D. Bruce, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Walter C. Butler, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John H. Cain, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Carignan, [REDACTED]
 Maurice J. Castille, [REDACTED]
 Maury F. Cochran, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William R. Cordova, [REDACTED]
 Verne P. Craig, [REDACTED]
 Ted A. Crozier, [REDACTED]
 John W. Currier, [REDACTED]
 Allen R. Denison, [REDACTED]
 Thomas R. Dent, [REDACTED]
 Rex T. Dittamore, [REDACTED]
 Joseph E. Donahue, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles M. East, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Edward A. Ford, [REDACTED]
 Wallace M. Gallant, [REDACTED]
 Thomas A. Ghormley, [REDACTED]
 Charles E. Green, [REDACTED]
 James C. Griffith, [REDACTED]
 Angelo Grills, [REDACTED]
 Norman W. Hammes, [REDACTED]
 John L. Hastie, [REDACTED]
 Solomon L. Hay, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert F. Haynes, [REDACTED]
 Michael D. Healy, [REDACTED]
 Hubert H. Henderson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Kenneth L. Henderson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Harry V. Herlinger, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert H. Hill, [REDACTED]
 John M. House, III, [REDACTED]
 Harvey W. Huntzinger, [REDACTED]
 Douglas P. Hyatt, [REDACTED]
 Carlton L. Jones, [REDACTED]
 Clinton K. Jones, [REDACTED]
 Phillip D. Jones, [REDACTED]
 Francis M. Jurgens, [REDACTED]
 Phillip Kaplan, [REDACTED]
 Arthur L. Knipp, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Daniel W. Knopp, [REDACTED]
 Donald E. Kooker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Raymond H. M. Larsen, [REDACTED]
 Pat J. Lindsay, [REDACTED]
 Robert A. Little, [REDACTED]
 Owen E. Litz, [REDACTED]
 Gerald A. Ludick, [REDACTED]
 Francis W. MacNeill, [REDACTED]
 Harold V. Madden, [REDACTED]
 Edward L. Magill, [REDACTED]
 Wayne C. Mathews, [REDACTED]
 Jack L. McClaran, [REDACTED]
 Earl C. McCrary, [REDACTED]
 Orvil C. Metheny, [REDACTED]
 William B. Middlemas, [REDACTED]
 Milton J. Morgan, [REDACTED]
 Clifford O. Morrie, [REDACTED]
 John J. Morrissey, [REDACTED]
 Edward G. Mundy, [REDACTED]
 James M. Myers, [REDACTED]
 Milford L. Nealis, [REDACTED]
 Kermit A. Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Henry C. Norcom, [REDACTED]
 Charles R. Norris, [REDACTED]
 Frank D. Oblinger, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Norman L. Overton, [REDACTED]
 Martin L. Padalino, [REDACTED]
 Harry E. Padley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James M. Page, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Willard H. Page, [REDACTED]
 Burns I. Perfect, [REDACTED]
 James H. Phillips, [REDACTED]
 William R. Ponder, [REDACTED]
 Richard R. Reardon, [REDACTED]
 Glenn H. Record, [REDACTED]
 Raphael A. Reiner, [REDACTED]
 Charles E. Rich, [REDACTED]
 Richard C. Rogers, [REDACTED]
 Donald C. Shuffstall, [REDACTED]
 William T. Singleton, [REDACTED]
 Earl C. Sturm, [REDACTED]
 James L. Sutton, [REDACTED]
 Ernest P. Terrell, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Raphael D. Tice, [REDACTED]
 Paul M. Timmerberg, [REDACTED]
 Edward B. Turner, Jr., [REDACTED]

Jean L. Turner, [REDACTED]
 John T. Turner, [REDACTED]
 John E. Tyler, [REDACTED]
 William C. Tyrrell, [REDACTED]
 Lawrence Valla, [REDACTED]
 William G. Walby, [REDACTED]
 John J. Walsh, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James M. Whelan, [REDACTED]
 Joseph R. Wisnack, [REDACTED]
 William M. Wright, [REDACTED]

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Benjamin B. Albert, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William L. Albright, [REDACTED]
 Herbert L. Aycock, [REDACTED]
 Stephen W. Bachinski, [REDACTED]
 George F. Backhurst, [REDACTED]
 Harry R. Bailey, [REDACTED]
 Wallace I. Baker, [REDACTED]
 Bob C. Bannister, [REDACTED]
 Ferninand O. Barger, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Sampson H. Bass, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ridsen T. Bennett, Jr., [REDACTED]
 George L. Bernard, [REDACTED]
 Henry H. Bettis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Normand J. Biglione, [REDACTED]
 James F. Blake, [REDACTED]
 Donald E. Boyd, [REDACTED]
 Edward M. Bradford, [REDACTED]
 James L. Brennan, [REDACTED]
 John A. Broderick, [REDACTED]
 Wyndell E. Brogden, [REDACTED]
 Russell L. Brons, [REDACTED]
 John C. Brown, [REDACTED]
 Joseph J. Callahan, [REDACTED]
 William G. Carter, [REDACTED]
 Alfred N. Champion, [REDACTED]
 James N. Chapman, [REDACTED]
 William E. Coleman, [REDACTED]
 James J. Corliss, [REDACTED]
 Manley H. Cosper, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Kenneth D. Cowan, [REDACTED]
 Aiden L. Cox, [REDACTED]
 Eldon L. Cummings, [REDACTED]
 Frank L. Deichmeister, [REDACTED]
 Dalston K. Dennis, [REDACTED]
 German D. Donahoe, [REDACTED]
 John R. Elliott, [REDACTED]
 John M. Fairey, [REDACTED]
 Kermit C. Garner, [REDACTED]
 Frank L. Garrison, [REDACTED]
 Raymond L. George, [REDACTED]
 Albert W. Gieseman, [REDACTED]
 Darrell L. Gooler, [REDACTED]
 Albert J. Grazioli, [REDACTED]
 William A. Green, [REDACTED]
 Philip D. Grimm, [REDACTED]
 Charles E. Hall, [REDACTED]
 Donald M. Hamilton, [REDACTED]
 George C. Harrington, [REDACTED]
 Elwood J. Hein, [REDACTED]
 James B. Hemmer, [REDACTED]
 Benjamin F. Hildebrand, [REDACTED]
 Donald F. Hockett, [REDACTED]
 Robert A. Holloman III, [REDACTED]
 William B. Holwick, [REDACTED]
 John D. Horner, [REDACTED]
 Samuel J. Huffman III, [REDACTED]
 Harvey B. Johns, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Marcus C. Jordan, [REDACTED]
 Noel D. Knotts, [REDACTED]
 Richard S. Krafski, [REDACTED]
 Bert B. Locke, [REDACTED]
 John J. Luxemburger, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John A. Lynch, III, [REDACTED]
 Richard C. Malorino, [REDACTED]
 James H. Mapp, [REDACTED]
 Norman R. Maxfield, [REDACTED]
 Guy H. McCarey, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Troy E. McGowan, [REDACTED]
 Donald R. McMurry, [REDACTED]
 John J. McNamara, [REDACTED]
 Ward W. Miller, [REDACTED]
 George J. Mulcahy, [REDACTED]
 Thomas E. Mullins, [REDACTED]
 Angus M. Mundy, [REDACTED]
 James F. Murphy, [REDACTED]
 Lynn O. Murray, [REDACTED]
 Robert L. Newburg, [REDACTED]
 Robert D. Newton, [REDACTED]
 Thomas E. Nichols, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Ronald F. Ochis, [REDACTED]

Billie L. Oliver, [REDACTED]
 Bruce E. Patterson, [REDACTED]
 James W. Patterson, [REDACTED]
 Paul F. Pearson, [REDACTED]
 Philip S. Pugh, III, [REDACTED]
 Willie Pundt, [REDACTED]
 Gerald W. Purvis, [REDACTED]
 Richard Pyle, [REDACTED]
 Robert L. Quinnett, [REDACTED]
 Leon E. Rademacher, [REDACTED]
 Willard A. Ramirez, [REDACTED]
 Raymond Reason, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Richard D. Reish, [REDACTED]
 William T. Rife, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Stanley Rodwin, [REDACTED]
 Warren F. Schilling, [REDACTED]
 Donald B. Schroeder, [REDACTED]
 Wade L. Shankle, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Edward L. Shirley, [REDACTED]
 James R. Smith, [REDACTED]
 Frank J. Socky, [REDACTED]
 Robert D. Stevenson, [REDACTED]
 Wilmer D. Stewart, [REDACTED]
 Harry L. Sutton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William W. Taylor, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert Tecco, [REDACTED]
 Robert F. Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Thomas E. Thompson, [REDACTED]
 William W. Tombaugh, [REDACTED]
 Horace W. Tousley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lowell D. Twitchell, [REDACTED]
 William L. Van Horn, [REDACTED]
 Ernest A. Van Netta, [REDACTED]
 Edward J. Vaughn, [REDACTED]
 Edward B. Vogel, [REDACTED]
 Bruce W. Wallace, [REDACTED]
 Gene A. Weaver, [REDACTED]
 Jack C. Webb, [REDACTED]
 James S. Welch, [REDACTED]
 Harold H. Whisler, [REDACTED]
 James F. Whitmore, [REDACTED]
 Charles G. Willard, [REDACTED]
 Fred D. Williams, [REDACTED]
 John E. Windish, [REDACTED]
 Arthur C. Winn, [REDACTED]
 Ralph T. Woodrow, [REDACTED]
 William D. Wooldridge, [REDACTED]
 Angus E. Wootten, [REDACTED]
 William G. Wright, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William C. Zabnosky, [REDACTED]

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified:

TO BE CAPTAIN

Harvey S. Boyd, [REDACTED]
 Rodney J. Collins, [REDACTED]
 Gabriel A. Ivan, [REDACTED]
 Richard I. Kostrade, [REDACTED]
 Philip B. Polak, [REDACTED]
 Karl E. Wolf, [REDACTED]

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Richard L. Conolly, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

Adm. Joseph J. Clark, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Alfred M. Pride, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as to fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Director, Office of Foreign Military Affairs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Rear Adm. John R. Perry, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

Rear Adm. Frederick R. Furth, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Research in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 3 years.

Lt. Gen. William O. Brice, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant general while serving as Assistant Commandant (Afr) of

the Marine Corps, Director of Aviation, Headquarters Marine Corps, and Assistant Chief of Naval Operations (Marine Aviation).

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Walter W. Wensinger

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Robert O. Bare
Raymond A. Anderson
Samuel K. Bird

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Randolph McC. Pate Merrill B. Twining
Clayton C. Jerome James P. Riseley
John C. McQueen Albert D. Cooley
George F. Good, Jr. Lewis B. Puller

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Robert O. Bare

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Alexander W. Kreiser, Thomas G. McFarland
Jr. Samuel S. Jack
Ion M. Bethel Henry R. Paige
Nels H. Nelson Joseph W. Earnshaw
David M. Shoup

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marion L. Dawson Alan Shapley
Francis M. McAlister David F. O'Neill

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel:

Jens C. Aggerbeck, Jr. Alton D. Gould
John A. Saxten Hugh M. Elwood
Carl J. Fleps Daniel C. Pollock
Walter F. Layer Monfurd K. Peyton
Carlo A. Rovetta Ralph A. Collins, Jr.
George R. Newton Edward N. Rydalc
Alfred L. Booth Raymond G. Davis
Richard D. Weber Ransom M. Wood
Charles M. Dehority Walter S. Osipoff
Howard B. Bengel Jess P. Ferrill, Jr.
Hamilton M. Hoyle Guy H. Kissinger, Jr.
Richard B. Church Edward H. Hurst
Nathan T. Post, Jr. Donn J. Robertson

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

Margaret M. Henderson
Elsie E. Hill

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Ben A. Day
Mary J. Hale

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:

Nita B. Warner
Jeanette I. Sustad

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:

"C" "P" Clark, Jr. Donald C. Stanton
Ralph W. Tufts Joseph L. Sadowski
George B. Addison, Winston F. Fontaine
Jr. Charles F. Whitehead

Robert E. Gruenler

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty:

Robert J. Anthony

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Charles A. Buchanan Elton W. Grenfell
Ralph S. Clarke Fitzhugh Lee
William G. Cooper William Miller
Kenneth Craig Francis D. McCorkle
Robert E. Cronin Frank O'Beirne
Paul L. Dudley Schuyler N. Pyne
Clifford H. Duerfeldt William R. Smedberg
Laurence H. Frost III
Frederick R. Furth Paul D. Stroop
Roy A. Gano Robert L. Swart

MEDICAL CORPS

Walter F. James

SUPPLY CORPS

Joel D. Parks
James B. Ricketts
Lloyd H. Thomas
For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

SUPPLY CORPS

Clarence G. Warfield

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy:

LINE

Abhau, William C. Jackson, William G.
Antonides, Joseph W. Jr.
Bakutis, Fred E. Kail, Robert B.
Baranowski, John J. Karaberis, Constantine A.
Barleon, John S., Jr.
Barnes, William R. Kauffman, Draper L.
Baskett, Thomas S. Kear, Carleton R., Jr.
Becker, Charles H. Keats, Edgar S.
Bennett, Bradley F. Kilmartin, Alfred D.
Bettens, Warren J. Kirkpatrick, Raleigh C., Jr.
Booth, Blake B. Klein, Irving N.
Brandt, John H. Klinker, Roy C.
Briggs, Chester A. Lee, John M.
Burdick, Robert S. Libby, Rawdon
Carnes, James R. Lindsay, Harry M., Jr.
Carpenter, Stephen W. Lowther, Robert D.
Cassidy, William F. Lynch, Richard B.
Castro, Luis V. Mabley, Louis C.
Clark, Charles H. Mandelkorn, Robert S.
Clay, Donald N. Maples, Hugh M.
Cole, Cyrus C. Maurer, John H.
Conkey, George L. McCallum, James L. P.
DeLong, Henry C. McClintock, David H.
Dodge, Sherwood H. McCormick, John W.
Doll, Raymond E. McElroy, Rhodam Y., Jr.
Dornin, Robert E. McGrath, Thomas D.
Fee, John J. McQuilkin, John H.
Fluckey, Eugene B. Merrick, Gorman C.
Foote, John J. Metcalf, Ralph M.
Foster, Clifford S., Jr. Middleton, John R., Jr.
Freeman, Mason B. Milner, Robert M.
Freeman, Ross E. Moore, Walter A., Jr.
Gage, Norman D. Moynahan, James T.
Gay, Jesse B., Jr. Murphy, Charles H. S.
Gayler, Noel A. M. Murphy, Owen B.
Gerwick, John D. Murphy, William C.
Griffin, Gordon A. Nash, David
Hack, John A. Neyman, Clinton A., Jr.
Harlfinger, Frederick J., II
Harris, Harold J. Nielsen, Homer H.
Hauck, Philip F. North, James R.
Hearn, Wilfred A. Oden, Herbert L.
Heath, John A. Osborn, Edgar G.
Henry, Thomas H. Owen, John
Hess, Franklin G. Paddock, Alton E.
Higginbotham, Grover S.
Houston, Robert C. Parker, Jefferson D.
Howard, Ezra G. Petrovic, William F.
Hunt, William A., Jr. Phillips, Fred N.
Hutchinson, George Purdy, Arthur M.

Ramirez de Arellano, Smith, William R., III
Marion F. Solenberger, Earl K.
Raser, George B., III Stever, Elbert M.
Reeves, Malcolm C. Stiesberg, Frederick M.
Reich, Eli T. Sullivan, George A.
Rhymes, Cassius D. Sweeney, Vincent A.
Jr. Taylor, William C.
Richardson, Norval R. Thompson, William C., Jr.
Riera, Robert E. Thomson, James W.
Rooney, Carl W. Tipton, Henry C.
Ross, Bruce P. Veth, Kenneth L.
Ruehlow, Stanley E. Wade, Benjamin G.
Sanger, Kenneth J. Walker Francis D., Jr.
Sarver, Ben W. Ward, Norvell G.
Schmidling, Matthew S. Ward, Robert E. M.
Schock, Lewis L., Jr. Weldon, Albert R.
Schoenweiss, Carl W. Wesson, Joseph H.
Scott, James, II West, Kenneth
Sellers, Frank E., Jr. Wheeler, Frank K. B.
Senif, Howard Z. Wideman, William B.
Seymour, Jack M. Wilson, J. C. Gillespi
Shaffer, John N. Winkel, Robert P.
Shepard, Evan T. Wulzen, Don W.
Slason, Frank K. Youngblood, Curtis T.
Smith, Frank M.

MEDICAL CORPS

Anderson, Edward A. Kahn, Gustav M.
Berry, Ralph B. Koett, John W.
Calvy, George L. Ocko, Felix H.
Carr, Chalmers R. Palmberg, Karl J.
Coffman, Delphos O. Parker, Ralph C., Jr.
Fankboner, Ronald B. Queen, William F.
Foley, Thomas M. Rollins, Emanuel
Francis, William S. Turnipseed, Derric C.
Grant, Roald N. Wiggins, Howell E.
Greenman, Robert B. Williams, Sylvester
Jamieson, Robert B. Wray, William S.
Jr. Yon, Joseph L.
Johnson, Robert B. Zuska, Joseph J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adams, Woodbury S. Goldberg, Herschel J.
Bottoms, John W. Hyland, William W.
Brown, Thomas A. Lamkin, Fletcher M.
Capell, Delmar R. Lyle, Joseph M.
Cline, John B. O'Handley, John G.
Detweiler, Louis M. Oliver, Warren E.
Ewald, Christian L. Stanley, Emory D., Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Mahler, Walter A.
Peterson, Abbot, Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bathke, Ernest S. Mann Richard L.
Bentley, James A. Plichta, Joseph P.
Husband, Alexander C. Rehler Joseph E.
Johnson, William S. Silliman, Julian W.
Lofland, John H., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Connell, Clarence R. Schork, Charles J.
Farquhar, John C. Smith, Albert T.
Fraleigh, Claud M. Thomas, Lloyd W.
McIntyre, John R.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve:

LINE

Blanchard, Theodore Mitchell, Charles W., Jr.
Gilchrist, Norman S. Jr.
Hill Lester M. Sever, Joseph C.

DENTAL CORPS

Eisenhart, Albert V.

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, Lawrence W., Alexander, James T., Jr.
Abercrombie, Daniel Allendorfer, Harry C., W., 3d
Acker, Guilford D. Aliman, John C.
Adami, William S. Allsopp, Charles A.
Adams, David G., Jr. Amen, William T.
Adams, Don D. Amman, Bernard
Adler, Vance W. Anceny, Charles L.
Aikins, Charles C. Anderson, Andreas P.
Albrecht, Burton F. J. Anderson, Elmer D.

- Andrews, Clyde C.
 Andrews, Frank A.
 Arey, Richard W.
 Argento, Michael C.
 Armstrong, Parker B.
 Armstrong, Robert M.
 Arthur, William A.
 Ashley, James M., Jr.
 Atkinson, George O., Jr.
 Auckland, Wallace B.
 Augustus, Charles V.
 Austin, William R.
 Ayers, Frank W.
 Bachhuber, Joseph A.
 Backus, Willard O.
 Bahlman, John H.
 Bain, John B.
 Bald, William D.
 Baker, Raymond W.
 Balis, Theodore L.
 Ball, Mottrom J.
 Bannowsky, Clarence J., Jr.
 Barackman, Bruce M.
 Bargeloh, William H., Jr.
 Barker, Jesse T.
 Barnett, William R.
 Barnhardt, Eugene C., 3d
 Barry, William F.
 Bassett, Charles A.
 Bauer, Carl D.
 Baxter, Robert J.
 Bear, John H.
 Beaudine, Robert J.
 Behan, Joseph N., Jr.
 Belew, Harold E.
 Bender, William C.
 Bennett, George S., Jr.
 Bennett, Walter F. V.
 Bergin, Daniel E., Jr.
 Bergquist, Cedric B.
 Berkeley, Green R., Jr.
 Bernhard, Franklin V.
 Berry, Francis J.
 Bertsch, Fred S., Jr.
 Betzel, Albert F.
 Betzer, William E.
 Bill, Wells R., Jr.
 Binion, Vernon E.
 Birch, Thomas L.
 Bishop, Charles B.
 Bishop, Gary W.
 Black, Robert G.
 Blair, Alfred F.
 Blanchard, Frank M.
 Bliss, George L., Jr.
 Blocker, Leo B.
 Blodgett, Robert B.
 Blois, Marsden S., Jr.
 Boe, Nils W.
 Boland, George T.
 Borop, James D. W.
 Bowen, John S.
 Bower, Eric B.
 Boyd, Raymond A.
 Brafford, Robert R.
 Brandon, Walter B.
 Brango, Nicholas
 Brink, John D.
 Brinser, Harry M.
 Britner, George F., Jr.
 Brown, Garrison
 Brown, Joy E.
 Brown, Kenneth B.
 Brown, Robert G.
 Brown, William S.
 Brummett, Joseph D.
 Buck, Richard H.
 Buell, Harold L.
 Buhner, Gordon C.
 Bull, Edward G.
 Bunting, Curtis W.
 Bunting, Davis E.
 Burnett, Robert G.
 Burt, John H.
 Burton, Charles J.
 Butler, David S.
 Butt, Lawrence H.
 Butts, John L., Jr.
 Byers, Alexander D. C.
 Byrne, Kevin E.
 Cain, James B.
 Cain, John L.
 Caldwell, Benjamin F.
 Calland, Robert W.
 Carlson, Harold G.
 Carmody, Martin D.
 Carr, Leslie J.
 Carter, John D., Jr.
 Carter, John Q.
 Carter, Robert R.
 Carter, William D.
 Carver, William E.
 Cason, Arthur C.
 Catlin, Allen B.
 Caton, Clifford E.
 Cauthen, Columbus F., Jr.
 Cheney, Ralph E.
 Cipolat, Aldo A.
 Clark, Waldo W., Jr.
 Clarke, Jared E., 3d
 Clarke, Robert C.
 Clifford, John K.
 Clinton, Jack W.
 Clinton, Robert J.
 Cobb, Phillip W.
 Cochran, Robert C.
 Cole, Howard
 Cole, Phillip P.
 Coleman, George J., Jr.
 Comer, Willard A.
 Compton, Raymond F.
 Conger, James W.
 Cook, James L., Jr.
 Cooledge, Aurelian H., Jr.
 Copeland, James D.
 Coppedge, Thomas N., Jr.
 Coppie, Hal E.
 Coppel, James H.
 Corkran, Richard L., Jr.
 Coulthard, John C.
 Cowart, Andrew H.
 Craig, William B.
 Cramer, Donald S.
 Crandall, Hugh L.
 Crawford, John W., Jr.
 Crawford, William H., Jr.
 Creecy, Richard B. L.
 Cross, William H.
 Crossen, Armand C.
 Crow, Claude A., Jr.
 Crowe, John W.
 Cruze, Jack D.
 Culjat, Leonard M.
 Cullin, William H.
 Culver, Paul D.
 Curtis, Archibald W.
 Curtis, Richard E.
 Dally, James L.
 Daniels, Robert J., Jr.
 Danner, Harry T., Jr.
 David, Floyd J.
 Davidson, Edward V.
 Davidson, James J.
 Davis, Henry C.
 Davis, John B., Jr.
 Davis, Maxey B.
 Day, Robert S.
 Dearth, James S.
 DeCristofaro, Silvio
 de Latour, Lloyd L.
 Dennett, Armistead
 Deodati, Joseph B.
 des Granges, Maino
 Devine, Richard O.
 Dickerson, Vincent M.
 Dierker, John E.
 Dietz, Willard D.
 Dillard, Chester L.
 Dinneen, John H.
 Dinsmore, Samuel H.
 Disque, Robert M.
 Doherty, Robert E.
 Doner, Landis E.
 Dowler, Jack T.
 Doyle, Judson C.
 Dozier, William C., Jr.
 Drew, John G., 2d
 Drozd, Edward J.
 Drum, Henry W.
 Duncan, Max C.
 Dupre, Marcy M., 3d
 Dupzyk, Robert R.
 Durand, Paul H.
 D'Urso, Daniel L.
 Dyer, Bradford M.
 Early, Leo W.
 Earnest, Albert K.
 Eastman, Robert S.
 Edrington, Frank R.
 Eggeman, Benjamin R., Jr.
 Eggen, Arnold W.
 Elliott, Ralph E., Jr.
 Ely, Don L.
 Emmons, James W.
 Engelhardt, Sidney
 Engemann, Robert L.
 Ennis, William W.
 Erb, Leonard
 Erwin, Virgil A., Jr.
 Esler, Clifford M. Jr.
 Estes, George G., Jr.
 Estworthy, Walter H., Jr.
 Ettinger, Raymond L.
 Evans, Jack L.
 Evans, Richard L.
 Fahlgren, Jewell S.
 Fair, John W.
 Fanning, Clifford E.
 Farrell, Eugene H.
 Farrell, William F., Jr.
 Faust, Elwood B.
 Field, Henry C., Jr.
 Pink, Christian
 Fitzgerald, John N., Jr.
 Fitz-Patrick, Edward G.
 Flatau, Howard C.
 Fleck, Bernard A.
 Flint, Lawrence E., Jr.
 Flynn, Russell F.
 Foita, George W., Jr.
 Ford, William R.
 Forger, Frederick D.
 Forrer, Samuel W.
 Forrest, Gaylord T.
 Fox, John P., Jr.
 Fraser, Leroy B., Jr.
 Fraser, Walter R.
 Frazier, Claude R.
 Fredrickson, Harry A.
 Freitag, Robert F.
 Friedman, Malcolm C.
 Froude, Robert S.
 Fry, Harold E.
 Gage, Fred H., Jr.
 Gainer, Charles E.
 Gallagher, Charles P.
 Gallagher, Edward F.
 Gallagher, Thomas J., Jr.
 Gallin, Alvin L.
 Gardes, George A.
 Garland, Leo A.
 Garrett, Wallace H., Jr.
 Garrison, William B., Jr.
 Garvin, Alfred D.
 Gass, Shelby C., Jr.
 Gebert, Wesley R., Jr.
 Gee, Roy P.
 Genta, John L.
 Gerber, Theodore E.
 Gibbs, Harry B.
 Gibson, Robert G.
 Gift, Ronald P.
 Gill, Alfred M.
 Gillette, Robert W.
 Glassman, David E.
 Goldsmith, George H.
 Gommengenger, John A.
 Gooding, Robert C.
 Gorman, Frederick E.
 Gotch, James R. P.
 Graham, Max W. J.
 Grant, Woodrow W.
 Grant, Henry L., 3d
 Gray, Charles B.
 Green, David H.
 Green, Laurence B.
 Gregg, Clarence B.
 Griber, Peter A. M.
 Griffin, William E., Jr.
 Griffith, Ward W., 3d
 Grimes, Alton B.
 Gromada, Matthew R.
 Gullaksen, Gilbert V.
 Gulleed, Kenneth E.
 Gutting, John P.
 Hadden, Mayo A., Jr.
 Haffey, John J., Jr.
 Hager, Donald M. L.
 Halpin, Paul D.
 Halvorson, George G.
 Hamilton, Arthur G., Jr.
 Hankey, John R.
 Hanson, Eugene R.
 Hanson, Robert J.
 Harbert, Thomas C., Jr.
 Harders, Herman J.
 Hargrave, Rahe E.
 Harman, John A.
 Harrison, Edward W.
 Hartley, Gordon E.
 Harwood, Robert H., Jr.
 Haszard, Harry A.
 Hatch, William N.
 Hayler, Robert M.
 Hays, Lyle R.
 Hazard, James D.
 Hazlett, William R.
 Henning, Donald A.
 Herndon, Edward B., 3d
 Heronemus, William E.
 Herzberger, Raymond G., Jr.
 Hill, Harry E.
 Hill, John C., 2d
 Hillberg, Albert G., Jr.
 Hinchey, John J.
 Hinkamp, Maddox N. P.
 Hobson, John P., 3d
 Hoerner, Helmuth E.
 Hollingsworth, Henry E.
 Holm, Stanley R.
 Holmes, Donald T.
 Holmes, Paul L.
 Hood, Benjamin E.
 Hooper, James L.
 Hopkins, Lewis A.
 Hopley, Eric E.
 Hord, Eldridge, Jr.
 Horn, Marcus P.
 Hosey, William B.
 House, David L., Jr.
 Houser, William D.
 Howard, Harold S.
 Howell, Wiley B.
 Hubbell, Charles W.
 Hughes, Richard Z.
 Humphreys, Frederick C.
 Hunt, Robert J.
 Hunt, Wylie M.
 Hurst, William J.
 Hutchinson, John L.
 Hyde, Richard W.
 Iarobino, John H.
 Imholte, Karl H.
 Irwin, Carl B.
 Jackson, Clifton E.
 James, Angy M.
 James, Jack M.
 James, William N.
 Jeffrey, Joseph D.
 Jennings, Lewis B.
 Jennings, Robert H., Jr.
 Johns, Ralph G., Jr.
 Johnson, Ace
 Johnson, Clark W.
 Johnson, Donald H.
 Johnson, Perry W., Jr.
 Jones, Arthur W.
 Jones, Bennie W., Jr.
 Jones, Samuel G.
 Jorgensen, John B.
 Jorgenson, John H.
 Kalin, Morris I.
 Kane, John D. H., Jr.
 Kedigh, Percy E.
 Keegan, John P.
 Keister, Harlin M.
 Kellett, Orville D.
 Kelley, Harry J.
 Kelley, Hugh A.
 Kelly, Andrew J.
 Kelly, William W.
 Kendrick, David C.
 Kennedy, Thomas W.
 Kenniff, James A.
 Kephart, Cecil D.
 Kersting, Christopher J.
 Keys, James E.
 Kidd, Isaac C., Jr.
 Kilgore, Will H.
 King, Richard D.
 Kinne, Francis E.
 Kintner, Edwin E.
 Knight, Francis S.
 Knight, Robert C.
 Knight, Ross A.
 Knox, Robert J.
 Knudson, Angus J.
 Krantz, Carl D.
 Krantz, William F.
 Krause, William B.
 Kurtz, William R.
 Laing, Fred
 Laird, William M.
 Landua, Oliver H.
 Lane, Ariel L.
 Lane, Stanley H.
 Lange, Robert V.
 Langlois, Robert I.
 Lape, Wade W.
 Larsen, Julius M.
 Laughhead, Robert W.
 Lecklider, Russell P.
 Lee, Chester M.
 Leffen, John S.
 Leidel, John S.
 Lemmon, Robert H.
 Lewis, Allen L.
 Lewis, Francis A.
 Liebmann, Howard F.
 Lillich, George T.
 Lindbeck, John A.
 Logan, James W., Jr.
 Loomis, David F.
 Lowe, Richard L.
 Lowell, Robert L.
 Lowentroun Jack L.
 Lowrie, Robert G.
 Lyon, Gaylord B.
 MacKown, Alfred B.
 Maddex, John W.
 Mahler, George H., 3d
 Malone, Eugene I.
 Malone, John D.
 Mansueto, Edmund J.
 Marchand, Dwight L.
 Margolf, Edgar L.
 Marocchi, John L.
 Marshall, James M.
 Martin Robert A.
 Martin, Thomas D.
 Mason, Clifford P.
 Mason, John W., Jr.
 Mattis Johnnie E.
 Maupin, Owen L.
 Maurer Theodore E.
 Mayer, Albert J.
 Mayer, Roland G., Jr.
 Mayo, Robert A.
 McCarty, Lindsay C.
 McClintock Ernest L., Jr.
 McClure, Nathan D., 3d
 McCraney, Virgil H.
 McDonald, James J.
 McFetridge, George W.
 McGarry, Alan R.
 McGrath, Raymond C.
 McGuire, James F.
 McInnis, Alex N., Jr.
 McKelvey Thomas R., Jr.
 McKenna Charles N.
 McKnight, George W.
 McLaughlin, John
 McLaughlin, William E.
 McManus, Joseph E.
 McMillan, Franklin B.
 McMullan, James J.
 McNeal, Horace P.
 McNeues Richard B.
 McQuown, Wymard B., Jr.
 McWethy, Robert D.
 Meehan, William J. 3d
 Meier, Louis L., Jr.
 Melhuse Arthur N.
 Mendenhall Sy E.
 Merchant, Robert E.
 Merrill, Milford A.
 Merritt, Robert S.
 Metke, Harry D.
 Micheel, Vernon L.
 Milano, Louis L.
 Miller, Gerald E.
 Miller, Gordon A.
 Miller, Jack A.
 Miller, James E.
 Miller John A.
 Miller, Kenneth W.
 Miller, Ray H.
 Miller, Ward S.
 Mills, Richard H.
 Mills Robert G.
 Minner, Donald A.
 Mitchell, John J.
 Mohl, Edgar V.
 Momsen, Charles B., Jr.
 Monahan, Robert J.
 Monroe, Edward C.
 Montgomery, William M.
 Moran, William J.
 Morehouse, Harold J.
 Morgan, William A.
 Morrison, Frank P.
 Morrison John A.
 Morrissey, Jack L.
 Morrow, William B.
 Morton, Henry S.
 Moss, Elmo L.
 Mote John L.
 Mottern, Robert E.
 Mounts, Dalton C.
 Mullane, Leo W.
 Mullen, Arthur C.
 Muller, Robert E.
 Mullins, James D.
 Munk, Maximilian W.
 Munro, Winfield S., Jr.
 Murphy, Harold N.
 Murphy, Pleasant L.
 Mansueto, Edmund J.
 Marchand, Dwight L.
 Margolf, Edgar L.
 Marocchi, John L.
 Marshall, James M.
 Martin Robert A.
 Martin, Thomas D.
 Mason, Clifford P.
 Mason, John W., Jr.
 Mattis Johnnie E.
 Maupin, Owen L.
 Maurer Theodore E.
 Mayer, Albert J.

Grader, Donald L.
Gray, David S.
Greer, Earl M., Jr.
Guinity, Oscar M.
Gustafson, Paul F.
Hamilton, George B., Jr.

Harkins, Paul H.
Hartlein, John, Jr.
Hartmann, William C.
Hartnett, John E., Jr.
Hartwell, Robert W.
Haverty, Philip J.
Hearn, Ormond E.
Heckerman, Dan
Heidger, Norman C.
Heitzberg, Thomas S.
Henson, Robert W.
Herrick, Chester E.
Hewitt, William H.
Hibbard, Samuel B.
Hilton, Hermon G.
Hoaster, Victor S.
Hobltzell, James J., III

Holleman, James H.
Horne, Sidney L.
Hulbert, Jack W.
Hume, David
Jenkins, Arthur L.
Johnson, Jack O.
Johnston, Thomas M.
Jones, Darrell M.
Jurewicz, Emil L.
Kadel, Joseph B., Jr.
Kane, John E.
Kellogg, Norman D.
Kenney, Lawrence F.
Kimbrough, William H.

Kline, Walter R.
Kohr, Andrew E.
Kopf, Jack, Jr.
Krogh, Evan L.
Lang, Donald A.
Lasser, Warren R.
Laughton, Armine W.
Lena, Thomas H.
Lewis, John R.
Lohman, Robert W.
Long, Ralph W.
Long, Richard L.
Lowe, Richard B.
Luddy, John P.
Macaulay, Douglas H.
MacLeod, James J.
Maddox, Richard I.
Martin, Robert W.
Masenich, Jay R.
Melde, Karl F.
Melvin, Charles S.
Miller, Charles E.
Miller, Elmon A., Jr.
Miller, Malcolm G.
Mioducki, Edward L. C., Jr.
Mitchell, Sam W.
Mohler, Robert J.
Montgomery, Bascomb
Moore, James M.
Mosier, David W.

MEDICAL CORPS

Maxwell, Joseph A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Carlson, Charles G.
Crowl, William F., II
DeWilde, John B.
French, Lawrence H.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Cunningham, Bernard
Kerrigan, Dennis R. V.
Doyle, James J.
Finan, Arthur P.
Henrich, Rudolph M.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Brandt, John N.
Brown, Lamonte R.

Murch, John A.
Murphy, Henry W.
McCarthy, Robert H.
McGovern, James P.
McGovern, Lawrence H.
McIlvain, John J.
McMahon, Thomas S.
McMillan, James D.
McNeill, David C.
Najarian, Martin A.
Neale, Raphael A., Jr.
Neill, James S., Jr.
Nessler, Richard A.
Norton, John L.
Nulf, George W.
Nyhan, Stanley L.
O'Connor, Arthur C.
Ostapenko, William M.

Pace, William A.
Palmer, Harold B.
Parsons, Joseph M.
Parsons, Samuel G.
Perry, Kempton J.
Petrie, Benjamin R., Jr.
Phillips, Myron D.
Powell, Jesse L.
Privott, William S.
Puhr, Francis P.
Quillman, Thomas E., Jr.
Randall, John A., Jr.
Ratajkowski, Joseph T.
Ray, William D.
Reese, Donald A.
Roberts, Edward N.
Rockwell, George L.
Rohowits, Gerald M.
Rope, Robert B., Jr.
Saltmarsh, Ernest O.
Sandvigen, Ralph E.
Sautter, Frederick R.
Schroder, William T.
Schwab, John W.
Seaman, Donald F.
Seant, David V.
Shapiro, Joseph K.
Smith, James L.
Smith, Roy C., III
Sneath, Samuel B., Jr.
Sorensen, Jay H.
Sprowls, Paul H.
Strong, Charles E.
Teller, Henry D.
Thoeny, Richard F.
Thomas, Edwin C.
Truesdale, Francis S.
Tucker, Victor L.
VanMater, George C.
Waldman, Joseph R.
West, Fred R.
Wheeler, Howard E.
Whitaker, William B.
White, Ralph C.
Williams, Henry P.
Wolfe, Donald P.
Wood, Edward E.
Wright, Albert C.
York, Charles W.

DENTAL CORPS

Hohl, Anthony W.
Parks, Clyde R.
Teitel, Allan L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Farnsworth, Dean

The following named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adams, Henry H., Jr.
Adams, Robert L., Jr.
Adler, Robert E.
Agule, George J., Jr.
Ajemian, Andre V.
Alexander, Henry K., Jr.
Allen, Arnold O.
Allender, Gene T.
Alley, Lester L.
Allison, Cecil J., Jr.
Allsman, Robert L.
Alsager, Richard H.
Alvis, John G.
Anderson, Charles L.
Anderson, George H.
Anderson, Leonard J., Jr.
Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
Anderson, Richard A.
Anderson, Stanley J.
Anderson, William J.
Andrew, Neil H.
Angle, Herbert G., Jr.
Ansel, Willits
Antar, Albert
Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
Ardell, George G.
Armstrong, John E.
Arn, Robert W.
Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
Arst, Philip L.
Ash, Homer L.
Ashurst, Albert J.
Ashworth, Edgar M., Jr.
Asmus, Paul A.
Aston, William J.
Attebury, William H.
Austin, William M., Jr.
Ayer, Lloyd M.
Bachem, Douglas F.
Bachtold, James R.
Bacon, James A.
Bagot, William C.
Bailey, Richard L.
Baker, Alfred W.
Baker, James E. Jr.
Bakke, Harlan J.
Balderson, Robert P.
Baldwin, Robert A.
Ball, George L.
Ballard, Charles R.
Barbazette, William F.
Barlow, Robert M.
Barnard, John H.
Barnes, Clifford P.
Barnes, James P.
Barnes, Wallace R.
Barnett, Howard J.
Barney, Glenn P.
Barrett, Patrick J.
Bartholomew, John L.
Barunas, George A., Jr.
Bassett, Gouvert L.
Bates, Cullen F., Jr.
Bauer, Edward C.
Baxter, Robert C.
Beasley, James W.
Beates, James K.
Beattie, Donald A.
Beattie, Thomas T., Jr.
Beck, Donald M.

Beck, Stanley L.
Beck, Stuart M.
Becker, John I.
Belk, Reece G., Jr.
Benedict, Roger W.
Berg, Irving G.
Bergesen, Andrew J.
Bethel, John W.
Bibby, Lowe H., 3d
Bills, Robert S.
Bills, Robert G.
Bingham, Arthur W., 3d
Birdsong, Harold S.
Biron, Joseph E.
Bish, Arthur A.
Bjorke, Arnvid N.
Black, Donald L.
Blair, Donald S., Jr.
Blaze, William F.
Blemker, Berrien B.
Boakes, William H.
Bobbitt, Charles P., Jr.
Bobo, Charles D.
Bobo, Stephen N., Jr.
Bohlander, James W.
Bolt, Leland E.
Booher, James
Boone, Robert R.
Borgaard, John K.
Bottimore, Robert R., Jr.
Bowen, Albert S., 3d
Bowen, Jack W.
Bowling, William H.
Boyce, James E.
Boyd, Joseph M., Jr.
Boyd, Marion S., Jr.
Boyes, William W., Jr.
Boyle, Richard C.
Bradley, Robert R.
Brady, Allen C.
Bramblett, John J., Jr.
Branch, Alvin D.
Breedlove, James E., Jr.
Breen, Matthew J.
Bres, John H.
Bretschneider, Carl A.
Brewer, Glenn M.
Broadwell, Edward A.
Brobst, William A.
Brodie, Robert, 3d
Brogan, Robert C.
Brooks, George G.
Brown, Arnold B., Jr.
Brown, Peter G.
Brumley, Robert J.
Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
Buck, John A.
Buckley, George F.
Bukowitz, Marvin D.
Burbank, Donald D.
Burbank, Ronald E.
Burch, Walter D.
Burgess, Wallace A.
Burke, Arthur J.
Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
Burnett, James A.
Burns, Thomas S.
Burton, Herbert O.
Busse, Norman W.
Butts, John L.
Buzzell, Carlis W., Jr.
Byrd, Paul R.
Caine, Patrick R.

Caldwell, Earl L., Jr.
Caldwell, William P.
Callahan, Earle R.
Callahan, Thomas D.
Calnan, Alan S.
Camp, Paul D.
Campbell, Neil V.
Campbell, William E., Jr.
Campion, Robert F., Jr.
Cannon, Robert E.
Cappelen, Albert L., Jr.
Capshaw, Leigh R.
Carden, Marshal B., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
Carlson, Burford A.
Carlson, Erland N., Jr.
Carlson, James H.
Carlton, Paul F.
Carmichael, George R., Jr.
Carpender, John N.
Carpenter, Harry E., Jr.
Carter, Edward W., 3d
Carter, Robert B.
Casale, Salvatore A.
Caskey, Donald L.
Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
Catalano, Lee C.
Caulfman, Charles E.
Cericola, Michael P.
Chachera, Robert E.
Chamberlain, John
Chambers, William A.
Chapin, Howard G.
Charles, William O.
Chertavian, Armen
Chesser, Samuel L.
Childers, Donald J.
Childs, John T.
Childs, Richard V.
Chilton, Ralph E.
Christensen, Earl D.
Christenson, Donald A.
Church, Archer E., Jr.
Church, George A.
Church, John H.
Clary, Robert M.
Clausner, Edward, Jr.
Clemens, Robert F.
Clifford, Guy C.
Coale, William A.
Cobern, Ernest L.
Cochran, Sidney A., Jr.
Cochrane, John C., Jr.
Cohoon, James D.
Coleman, Robert I., Jr.
Coleman, William O., Jr.
Colenda, Herbert F.
Collins, Andrew M.
Collins, Charles H.
Collins, Thomas J.
Comella, Joseph F.
Compton, Bryan W., Jr.
Condon, Edward J., Jr.
Conlon, Frank S., Jr.
Cooper, James H.
Cooper, Lawrence T.
Corbett, Howard R.
Cornelius, Winston W.
Cornick, Robert P.
Cornish, Edward H., Jr.
Cornwell, Robert R.
Corwen, Albert S.
Costa, William J.
Cotter, Charles L.
Coughlin, Daniel F., Jr.
Coulter, George P.
Cowan, Thomas S., Jr.
Craig, Dennis J.
Crandall, Hal R.
Crawford, Richard N.
Crawley, Don E.
Creech, Fulton H., Jr.
Cress, William R.
Criner, James E.
Cromwell, John P., Jr.
Crowell, Edwin G.
Crowder, James P., Jr.
Crull, William L., 3d
Crum, Arthur Z.
Cullins, Peter K.
Cunningham, Benjamin H.
Cunningham, Richard B.
Cunningham, Melvil D.
Curran, Thomas P.
Currie, Edgar I.
Curtis, Valleau E.
Cusick, Joseph D.
Dahl, Edmund I.
Dallamura, Richard A.
Dallimore, George R.
Damiani, Benny J., Jr.
Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
Danner, William P.
Darling, Roderick J.
Daugherty, Dean D.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Robert L.
Davis, Jay K.
Davis, Robert H., Jr.
Day, Lloyd F.
Dean, Kenneth L.
Dean, Richard W.
Decook, David W.
Deemer, Reed E.
Degnan, Francis J.
Deniston, Lyle E.
Dennis, Frank S.
Dennis, John C.
DeNoon, Joseph H.
DePuy, Newell E., Jr.
Derby, George K.
Derleth, Harley R.
Desrosiers, Roland J.
Dewey, William C.
Dewey, Jay N.
Deyak, John J.
Dickson, Albert M., Jr.
Diers, Charles E.
Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
Divendorff, Frank
Dillon, Percy M., Jr.
Dion, Paul L.
Dittmar, Louis C.
Dixon, Robert G.
Dobbins, John B., Jr.
Dodd, Charles A.
Doering, Eugene R.
Doggett, Burton L., Jr.
Donnelly, John D.
Dorman, Charles T.
Downs, David L.
Draving, Robert K.
Drew, Roger L.
Driver, Sam N.
Druckemiller, Robert E.
Duane, Rodman F.
Ducharme, Theodore M., Jr.
Duemler, Louis P.
Duke, Marvin L.
Dungan, John D.
Dunham, Richard M.
Dunn, Robert F.
Dunn, Robert J.
Dunne, Francis X.
Duttweiler, Charles
Duvall, John S., 4th
Dwyer, Laurence A.
Dyer, Philip M.
Earl, William C.
East, Robert C., Jr.
Easterling, Crawford A.
Eckert, Richard H.

- Eckstein, John R.
Eden, Harold E.
Edris, Richard J.
Edwards, William B.
Elfelt, James S.
Ellison, David J.
Elmore, Charles P.
Englehart, Harry J.
Entstrasser, John J., Jr.
Erb, Donald P.
Ericson, James K.
Estes, Dana, 2d
Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
Evans, Carl F.
Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
Evans, George J.
Evans, John J.
Evans, Willard E.
Ewanowski, Stanley J.
Fadely, Edward N.
Farmer, Peter A.
Farnham, Rob R.
Farrell, John R.
Fasulo, Robert P.
Feazell, Dale H.
Feldhausen, Eugene J.
Feldheim, Robert J.
Fick, William G., Jr.
Findley, Allen
Fithian, Peter S.
Fitzgerald, James J.
Fitzgibbons, Joseph G., Jr.
Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
Fletcher, Charles D.
Foley, James E.
Fontaine, Richard K.
Forrester, James E.
Forsyth, Robert J.
Fossum, Robert R.
Foster, Robert W.
Foster, William F.
Fowler, John R.
Fox, Kenneth
Fox, Paul F.
Frame, Edward L.
Francis, John P.
Francis, Thomas A.
Franke, Richard D.
Freeborough, Robert M.
Freeman, Warren R.
Fremd, Harry L.
Fricke, Henry G.
Friedman, Arthur C.
Friend, Joseph F.
Frost, William L.
Fry, James W.
Fuchs, Julius E.
Fuchs, Stanley
Fuller, Joe E.
Fuller, Robert B.
Funkhouser, William H.
Furtek, Adolph J.
Gaines, Howard W.
Gale, Robert D.
Galing, Searcy G.
Gallagher, Paul A.
Gamber, Harold W.
Gambke, Frederick C.
Gangloff, Charles A.
Gardner, Richmond
Garner, Charles H.
Garnett, Donald I.
Garrard, Frank U., 3d
Garrett, Bernard H.
Garrett, Charles I., Jr.
Gauldin, Homer C., Jr.
Gebhardt, Robert E.
Geiger, Eugene D.
Gensheimer, David E.
George, James F.
Gergel, John W.
Gifford, Brewster J.
Gilchrist, John F., 2d
Gillen, Thomas W.
Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
Gilmore, William G.
Ginder, Samuel P., Jr.
Gleason, George L.
Gnos, Kenneth R.
Godfrey, James T.
Goebel, Herman E., Jr.
Goelzer, Henry C.
Goers, Ralph W.
Gold, Robert H.
Goldman, Elmer M.
Gombash, William, Jr.
Goslow, Paul
Gottschalk, Arthur W., Jr.
Goulds, Ralph J.
Govan, George W.
Grace, Homer J.
Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
Grant, John T.
Granum, Bradford S.
Grasberg, Alexander
Graves, Harold M., Jr.
Graves, Thomas E.
Greason, David M.
Greathouse, David M.
Green, John N.
Green, Robert E.
Greene, Frank F.
Grey, Richard G.
Griest, Richard A.
Grifferty, Thomas F.
Griffin, Jack R.
Griffin, Richard N.
Grimm, Arthur R. Jr.
Gumkowski, Thaddeus R.
Hackett, Robert A.
Haff, William B.
Hall, Harrell W., Jr.
Halleck, William L.
Hallett, Frederick H.
Halwax, Frank K.
Hamilton, John W.
Hamilton, James E., Jr.
Hamlin, Richard J.
Hand, Charles T.
Handley, John A.
Hannah, Richard G.
Hansen, Allen E.
Hansen, David F.
Hansen, Merle C.
Harnden, Charles G.
Harper, Boyd E., Jr.
Harper, Lorren G.
Hart, Donald F.
Hart, William D.
Hartell, Ronald D.
Harvey, William T.
Hatchett, George L.
Haugerud, Albert R.
Hauser, Robert J., Jr.
Hay, Robert W.
Hayden, Glenn M.
Hayes, Murray L.
Hayes, Winston R.
Haynsworth, Donald D.
Head, John L.
Hearn, Gerald D.
Heberer, Earl G., Jr.
Hedrick, William B.
Heffernan, William D.
Heigl, John T., Jr.
Heneberger, Harry B., Jr.
Henkens, Paul L.
Hennessy, William J.
Henrikson, Theodore P.
Heon, Robert H.
Herbert, Robert J.
Herty, Herschel H., Jr.
Herndon, William J., Jr.
Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
Hieronimus, Henry M.
Higgs, Donald R.
Hightleyman, Searle F.
Hightower, Emmett S.
Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
Hitchner, Alton J., Jr.
Hobbs, Harold W., Jr.
Hobbs, James B.
Hoddeson, Bernard
Hodnett, Robert A.
Hoffman, James P.
Hoffmann, Carl K., 2d
Hofmockel, John L.
Holbrook, Hilliard B., 2d
Holland, Alfred D.
Holland, James S.
Holler, Edward R.
Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
Holman, Donald R.
Holmes, Kenneth L.
Holt, Henry E.
Hood, Wayne M.
Hooper, Ralph W.
Hoover, Richard M.
Hossfeld, James F.
Hounihan, John C.
Hovater, James D.
Howell, Rogers G.
Huber, Henry A.
Huffman, Robert B.
Hughes, Andrew A., Jr.
Hughes, Peter F. H.
Hunter, Charles W.
Huszar, Louis, Jr.
Hutchins, Christopher T., Jr.
Huyette, Carl W., Jr.
Iacona, Michael A.
Ingram, John W.
Inman, Richard P.
Irby, Charles R.
Ismay, Arthur P.
Jacks, Robert G.
Jackson, Howard L.
James, David L.
Jarvis, John E.
Jarvis, Donald H.
Jaworowski, Thomas R.
Jenkins, Norman L.
Jensen, Robert W.
Jett, William S., 3d
Johns, Forrest R.
Johnson, Alfred W., Jr.
Johnson, Allen B.
Johnson, Cecil B.
Johnson, Jay A.
Johnson, Jeremy E.
Johnson, Joseph J.
Johnson, Robert M.
Johnston, Bayard W.
Johnston, Lawrence L.
Johnston, William A., 3d
Johnstone, Richard A.
Jones, Arthur D., Jr.
Jones, Arthur W.
Jones, Carol W.
Jones, Charles A.
Jones, David L., Jr.
Jones, Ray P.
Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
Katzenmeyer, William G.
Kaufman, Frederick H.
Kaulback, Russell D.
Keach, Donald L.
Keathley, Charles C.
Keegan, Richard J.
Kelly, Lawrence J.
Kelahan, John A.
Keleher, Lloyd F.
Keller, Kenneth C.
Kelley, James P.
Kemble, John R.
Kenefick, John M.
Kennedy, Nevin, 3d
Kenning, Robert L.
Kertz, Jacob D.
Kessing, Charles T.
Kieler, Harold E.
Kilburg, Richard F.
Kilmer, Donald A.
King, Cecil
Kinney, Donald P.
Kirchner, David P.
Kirk, John J.
Klett, George J.
Knutson, Donald W.
Koehler, Herman J., 3d
Kollmorgen, Leland S.
Koluch, Nicholas
Kondzella, Frederick J.
Koone, Doyle D.
Kosonen, Charles G.
Kozel, William J.
Kremm, Andrian
Kruse, John W., Jr.
Kuhn, Edwin A.
Kump, Lon R.
Kuzia, Jack R., Jr.
Lachowicz, Michael R.
Laco, Thomas
Lacy, James E.
Laighton, Robert H.
Lake, Charles M., Jr.
Lamb, Derwin T.
LaMontagne, Robert P.
Lancaster, James R.
Landefeld, Emil E.
Lane, Thomas B.
Langenberg, William H.
Larson, Charles D.
Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
Laubach, John P.
Lauff, John G.
Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Lawson, Clifton E. R.
Leach, Everett N.
Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
Leahy, John P.
LeCount, Peter L.
Ledbetter, Jack W.
Leenay, Maurice
Lehan, James E.
Leibold, William R.
Leiser, James M.
Leplin, William F., Jr.
Leslie, Maxwell F., Jr.
Levenson, Lewis M.
Levisee, Donald B.
Lewallen, John D.
Lewis, James R.
Lewis, Roger P.
Liberato, Frank A.
Libby, John D.
Light, John L.
Lillienfeld, Joe J.
Lindblad, William J.
Linder, Richard B., Jr.
Lindgren, Charles P.
Lindsay, John D.
Lindsley, Edward G.
Lindstrom, Roland N.
Liston, John M.
Livas, Basil L.
Livingston, Richard C.
Lloyd, James L.
Loekhart, Glenn S.
Loesch, Robert C.
Long, Thomas F., Jr.
Longhi, William J.
Look, Durmond K. M.
Loomer, Arthur R.
Love, Henry H., Jr.
Lowe, Beverley J.
Lowe, George N.
Lowell, William L.
Luine, Arthur
Lukas, Thomas E.
Lukens, Joseph T.
Lutz, Ray M.
Macaulay, Angus
Macaulay, George W.
Macfie, Richard B.
Mack, Robert P.
Madden, Raymond A.
Madeira, Edward L.
Maice, Lee, Jr.
Malady, John C.
Malone, Roy W.
Maloney, Andrew
Maloney, Francis H., Jr.
Mangas, Darrel L.
Manion, Donald S.
Marangliello, Daniel A.
Marin, William T.
Markey, George M., Jr.
Markusfeld, Lionel
Marshall, Clifford L.
Martin, Donald C.
Martin, Sam T., Jr.
Mathers, William G.
Matheson, Ralph E.
Mathews, Herbert J.
Matousek, Raymond
Mattioni, Blasco
Maxson, Richard B.
May, Porter E.
Maynard, Donald J.
McAlexander, Robert L.
McBurney, William J.
McCarthy, Frank J.
McCarthy, Francis X.
McCormick, Matthew A.
McCoy, Robert B.
McCune, Howard W.
McDonough, William D., Jr.
McElroy, William J.
McFadden, Grafton R.
McGavack, John, Jr.
McGeachy, Francis L.
McGehrin, Edward F., Jr.
McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
McGonigle, John R.
McGuire, Eugene J.
McIntosh, Charles D.
McKee, Kinnaird R.
McKendree, Earl E., Jr.
McKenney, Thomas W.
McKeon, Richard D.
McKinney, William M.
McLaughlin, Leo A.
McLaughlin, Robert F.
McLay, James L.
McNallen, James B.
McNaught, Earl D.
McNerney, James F.
McQueston, Jack E.
McQuillin, John P.
McRae, Daniel D.
Meade, Bruce A.
Meader, Bruce I.
Meagher, Edward
Medcalf, Gene F.
Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
Mehl, James P.
Melchers, Arthur C.
Melesko, Stephen, Jr.
Meltzer, Harvey J.
Mench, Leland E.
Mendenhall, Charles D.
Mercer, Robert J.
Merritt, Glen C.
Meschke, Karl W.
Metcaif, Joseph, 3d
Middleton, Clyde W.
Mikkelsen, Richard E.
Miller, Albert E., 3d
Miller, Carl M.
Miller, Donald A.
Miller, Forrest A.
Miller, James
Miller, James P.
Miller, Robert L.
Minnigerode, John H. B.
Mitchell, Thomas S.
Moffitt, Russell L.
Moffitt, Thomas P.
Molleston, Jerald G.
Mongrain, Richard O.
Montague, Pendleton R.
Montgomery, Graden L.
Moore, Loren I.
Moore, William P.
Moore, Willmot H.
Mooshagian, Maderos
Morehead, Ralph C.
Morellato, Teo J.
Moriarty, John B., Jr.
Morledge, George A.
Morris, Donald R.
Morris, Howard L.
Morrow, Charles D.
Mosley, Aulcey D.
Most, Frank S.
Mow, Douglas F.
Moyer, Donald R.
Mueller, George E.
Mullen, Roger F.
Mullin, James
Muros, Ralph L.
Murphy, Charles H.
Murray, Douglas V.
Murray, Robert W.
Muto, Charles J.
Myers, Clark G.
Myers, Ralph T.
Myers, William B.
Nagle, Robert O.
Nattel, Adolph M.
Naylor, Charles K.
Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
Neihisel, James
Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
Ness, James W.
Nevious, William B.
Newton, Jefferson F.
Nile, Samuel H.
Nix, Henry B.
Noonan, Patrick A.
North, Sylvester F.
Noyes, Russell L., Jr.
Nunneley, John K.
Nyce, William E.
O'Brien, Henry J.
O'Brien, Richard A.
O'Gara, Patrick E.
O'Hara, Jack F.
O'Kane, Albert E., Jr.
Olnhausen, Thomas R.
Olsen, Ralph D.
Olson, Alexius B.
Olson, Paul D.
Olson, Willard R.
O'Malley, William E., Jr.
Orem, John B., Jr.
O'Rourke, Melrose B., Jr.
Osborn, Donald R.
Osbourne, Donald R., III
O'Toole, Kevin J.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
Owen, Robert A.
Paddock, Charles O.
Padgett, James P.
Palmer, Allan V.
Panciera, Vincent W.
Papuga, John P.
Parker, John G.
Parks, William W.
Parler, William C.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Patten, Michael A.
Patterson, William W., Jr.
Peacock, Clifford L.
Peak, Duane E.
Pearlston, Carl B., Jr.
Peck, Edwin C.
Peeler, Philip L.
Pegues, John K., Jr.
Pendell, Carl E.
Pendl, Robert D.
Perlitz, Warner J., Jr.
Perry, Charlie A.
Peterson, Clarence D.
Peterson, Jimmie G.
Peterson, John C.

- Peterson, Lloyd G., Jr.
Peterson, Richard E.
Pettigrew, Raymond A.
Peugh, Everett R.
Pfeiff, Robert L.
Pheasant, Alan G.
Phillips, Alan R.
Phillips, Harry E.
Phillips, William R.
Phillips, William E.
Piette, Robert J.
Pinning, Joseph E.
Piraino, Daniel
Plache, Robert J.
Fogue, David W.
Porter, William P.
Pototsky, William J.
Powelson, Richard R.
Powers, William L., Jr.
Powers, Wilbur P.
Pramann, Robert F.
Prelogar, Archie E.
Prescott, Robert
Pressly, William H., Jr.
Proctor, Donald K.
Pugh, David M.
Purse, William B., Jr.
Putnam, John G., Jr.
Quackenbush, Justin L.
Quinton, Paul T.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
Radford, Grant N.
Radja, James E.
Raison, Robert M.
Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Ramsey, Walter A.
Rapp, Fred L.
Raulston, James W., Jr.
Rawley, William J., Jr.
Ray, Arliss D.
Rdesinski, Maurice P.
Read, Garlin R.
Reagan, Patrick H.
Reardon, Oliver A., Jr.
Reaves, Joseph C.
Reckert, Richard A.
Redfield, John M.
Reed, John G.
Reed, Robert K.
Reeder, John E.
Reedy, Daniel M.
Reid, Albert R.
Reid, Thorburn, 3d
Relly, Kevin P.
Reiss, Robert M.
Reitmeyer, Clayton B.
Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Rhoad, Merritt N., Jr.
Richard, Donald E.
Richard, Harold G.
Richardson, Richard H.
Richardson, John A.
Richardson, Robert L.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Robertson, Douglas B.
Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
Robinson, Gray S.
Robinson, Robert B.
Roche, Clinton E.
Rockwell, Nevin L.
Rockwell, Richard F.
Rockwood, Jerry R.
Rogers, James O.
Rogers, Richard J.
Rogers, Robert P.
Rosati, Joseph
Rose, Jerry H.
Rose, Roy W.
Rosenberger, John E.
Rosendale, Robert H.
- Rothmann, Warren W.
Rough, Jimmie L.
Rowland, Edgar C., Jr.
Rowley, Reginald C.
Rue, Harland J., 2d
Rugg, William R.
Ruggles, Howard E., 2d
Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
Russ, Jack E.
Ryerson, Rogers P.
Safford, Robert D.
Sager, Stanley C.
Salski, Benno W.
Sallin, Robert S.
Sandberg, William G.
Sarosdy, Louis R.
Sasseen, Kenneth D.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Savoca, Joseph A.
Saylor, Eugene H.
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schaefer, Erhard
Schaeffer, David A.
Scherb, Carl F.
Schindler, Fred L.
Schleiger, Richard R.
Schoettle, Harry J.
Schuller, Gordon J.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schutz, Walter J.
Scott, James T.
Scull, John D.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
Seay, Wesley H., Jr.
Segur, Donald L.
Selfors, Henry J.
Semmes, Oliver J., 3d
Seward, John A., Jr.
Sexauer, Charles R.
Shabe, Gerard P.
Shaffer, Guy H. B.
Shald, Robert A.
Shamsky, Burton
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Sharpe, James R.
Shaughnessy, William D.
Shaver, Frank T.
Shea, Edward J.
Shearer, Peter S.
Sheely, Donald M.
Sheffield, John W., Jr.
Shepard, Clayton V.
Sheppard, Robert L., Jr.
Sherman, Peter W.
Sherman, Roy B.
Sherwood, John G.
Shimer, Melvin G.
Shiver, James K.
Shores, Robert M., Jr.
Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
Shuler, Robert L.
Shutty, Michael S.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Silver, Robert C.
Silvestrini, Reno J.
Simmons, Edgar H.
Simonds, Milton R.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Sinclair, George T., Jr.
Skiles, Frank C., Jr.
Skolaut, Paul L.
Slusher, David L.
Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
- Smellie, Rex D.
Smettzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, David D.
Smith, Douglas J.
Smith, James D.
Smith, Lester R.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Wilbur E.
Smith, William A., Jr.
Smith, William F.
- Snowe, Theodore E.
Solterer, Carl F.
Sommer, Donald J.
Soracco, David L.
Stader, John F.
Stafford, Richard M.
Stake, Robert E.
Stallings, Alfred K.
Stamey, Claude R., Jr.
Stanley, Richard M.
Stark, John A.
Starn, Harrison, F., Jr.
Steltzer, Wilbur N., Jr.
Stenke, George
Stewart, Henry L., Jr.
Stewart, Rodney L.
Stieren, Oliver B., Jr.
Still, Donald A.
Stiller, Bertram H.
Stine, Leon L., Jr.
St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
St. Marie, Joseph
Stockdale, Lowell A.
Stocking, Donald E.
Stockman, Charles J., Jr.
Stoddard, James G.
Stodder, Page W. T.
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Stone, Jeff H.
Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Story, Travis L., Jr.
Stothard, Ralph B.
Strawmire, John R.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strella, George G.
Strode, Charles D.
Strohm, James J.
Stump, John S.
Stump, John M.
Sullivan, Donald F.
Sullivan, Joseph L., Jr.
Summers, David L.
Sundry, Arthur P.
Surman, William V., Jr.
Swank, Donald E.
Swart, Robert L., Jr.
Sweeney, Raymond J.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Taylor, Charles M.
Tetrick, Claude J.
Thomas, Gerald E.
Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Preston G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thomas, Archibald S.
Thompson, David A.
Thompson, Robert M.
Thompson, William S.
Thompson, William J.
Thomson, William O.
Thornton, Raymond H.
Thrasher, Milton F., 2d
Tillotson, Ted K.
Tillson, John G.
Tillson, Roger W., Jr.
Toal, James F.
Tobias, Ralph W.
Tollefson, Norris M.
Tollefson, Charles H.
Tomb, Paul D.
Tomsy, Jackson M.
Tonkin, Norman M.
Trafzer, William H.
Traub, Charles, 3d
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Treat, Charles W.
Trens, Mike J.
Tressler, Arthur G.
Trout, Thomas W.
Turnipseed, Elton G., Jr.
Tuzo, Paul B., 3d
- Uhrege, William R.
Ulmark, William A.
Updegraph, John M., Jr.
Urban, Frank M.
Utterback, Paul W.
Vail, Harold W.
Vandermaillen, Ralph E., Jr.
VanHook, Gordan
Veenstra, Richard J.
Vercellotti, Joseph F.
Villines, William M., Jr.
Voegelien, Gordon R.
Von Christierson, William W.
Vonier, William H.
Von Readen, Harold W., Jr.
Vrieze, Edwin H., 3d
Wachenfeld, Howard G.
Waddel, Robert C.
Wade, Donald R.
Wageck, Donald R.
Wagle, William E.
Wakelee, David M.
Wales, John R.
Walker, Benjamin S.
Walker, Frank A., Jr.
Walker, William H.
Wall, Joe A.
Wallace, Charles J.
Walsh, Eugene J.
Walston, Donald E.
Wandres, Victor C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Ware, Owen H.
Warriner, David D.
Washenfelder, Leroy
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Wassell, James W.
Waterfield, Willard F.
Waterhouse, Charles N., Jr.
Watson, Donald A.
Watson, Thomas W.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Wear, James H.
Weaver, Earl J.
Webb, James R.
Webster, James E.
Weeks, Robert H.
Weidenkopf, David W.
Weinbaum, Bennett
Weisheit, Burton A.
Welch, Clyde R.
Welch, William E.
Wellner, Robert F.
Wettrich, John R.
Wheeler, Peter B.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
Whitaker, Robert M.
White, Arthur C.
White, Douglas C.
White, John E.
Whitehouse, Kenneth R.
Whitman, George W.
Whitner, William C., 3d
Whittemore, Frederick H.
Whyte, Kent E.
Wiita, Richard A.
Wilcox, James C.
Wilkinson, Miles R.
Wilkins, Robert C.
Wilkinson, Raymond O.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Alfred J.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, Gerald P.
- Williams, Gordon D.
Williams, Richard S.
Williams, Ross N.
Williamson, Lee F.
Willings, Thomas H., Jr.
Willis, Francis R.
Willis, John H., Jr.
Wills, Donald S.
Wilson, Herbert E., Jr.
Wilson, Joseph R.
Wilson, Sheldon R.
Wilson, Warren R.
Winberg, William, 3d
Winkles, Paul F.
Winnefeld, James A.
Wobser, Donald C. O.
Wood, Edward H.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Woolwine, Emmon H., Jr.
Wright, Harry W.
Wright, Richard L.
Wunderlich, Robert M.
Wylie, David C.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yarwood, William R.
Yeager, George E.
Yeomans, Franz S.
Yoran, George F., Jr.
Young, Noel S.
Young, Robert A.
Younglove, Benny A.
Youngman, Dean R.
Yourison, James E.
Zerda, Kenneth V.
Ziemba, John C.
Zoehrer, Herbert A.
Zwart, Robert L.
Barrett, Charles W.
Chapman, Howard M., Jr.
Cook, Carroll T.
Duffy, Charles G., Jr.
Durham, Homer G.
Eells, Gerdin D.
Erhart, James W.
Feldman, Harry G.
Fenton, Robert E.
Fitzpatrick, William A.
- Gaches, John W.
Higginbotham, Leonard H.
Kinsley, Donald T.
Morris, Everett L., Jr.
Novak, Russell S.
Paulk, Joseph M.
Peters, Robert E.
Pittman, Jack R.
Porter, Orland A., Jr.
Rose, James A.
Rylee, James E.
Schubert, Leslie H., Jr.
Schultz, John L., Jr.
Schwarz, Ira N.
Smyth, James M.
Stewart, Merle A., Jr.
Waggoner, Kenneth K.
Woodbury, Robert F.
Wilber, Walter E.
Wilson, Clarence E.
Adams, Joan F.
Arenth, Rosemary D.
Barnett, Mary M.
Beecher, Nancy L.
Bittroff, Margaret F.
Brenner, Marion C.
Carpenter, Hillewy N.
Casanova, Jean O.
Connors, Mary T.
Forsman, Louise E. G.
Grieve, Nellie M.
Hart, Elizabeth
Hodges, George
Jacobson, Mitzie L.
Kuhnle, Sibyl L.
McNair, Diana
Moore, Mary V.
O'Connell, Camille
Panoff, Kathleen D. B.
Patch, Frances M.
Sheffels, Mary E.
Spera, Suzanne S.
Small, Ethel R. K.
Spiegel, Helen I.
Summers, Doris E.
Thompson, Bobbie J.
Wallace, Myra
Webster, Ann E.
Whitfield, Ruth V.
Whitgrove, Eleanor A.

SUPPLY CORPS

- Abbey, Alfred E.
Abraham, Donavan E. R.
Armitage, Thomas K.
Baker, Clovis M.
Barrett, Roger F.
Barton, Gerald
Bartuska, Anthony J.
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyd, David T.
Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Bruch, Herbert W.
Burlay, Newton S.
Camfield, Howard M.
Chapman, Allen F.
Chapman, Darrell S.
Clark, Laurence E.
Covey, Richard L.
Daniel, John M., Jr.
Day, Jack R.
Dowdye, James E.
Dreese, Richard N.
Dunlevy, John H.
Ellis, Anthony T., Jr.
Foll, Arthur C.
French, Walter H., Jr.
Ghostley, Gary D.
Ghysels, David G.
Gillette, Claude G., Jr.
Gordon, Donald B.
Grant, Howard M.
Guillo, Louis S.
Hale, Paul A., Jr.
Hannah, Joseph L.
Hassenplug, John F.
Hauser, Derrell B.
Hedrich, Richard H.
Hendershot, Theodore
Ingle, John H., Jr.
Innes, Robert E.
Jackson, Alexander, 3d
James, Billy M.
Johnson, Jack G.
Kerwath, Richard C. F.
King, Gerald H.
King, Rufus M.
Kiplinger, Willet B.
Kirms, Frederick O.
Kneece, James F., Jr.
Kohler, John A.
Koller, Bertil R.
Koonce, Calvin B.
Leighty, Gary C.
Lesh, Franklin J.
Lewis, Alan G.
Lewis, John B.
Little, Wilfred R.
Malkemes, Robert F.
Mawhorter, Richard J.
Maxwell, Paul M.
McKenzie, Charles H.
Mitchell, William F.
Mulder, John R.
Murphy, Donal J.
Murphy, Wilford K.
Nalley, John V.
Naughtin, John D.
Nehez, James R., Jr.
Nelson, George W.
Niehaus, Robert J.
Olson, Douglas J.
Patterson, James S.

Praeger, John R.
 Reade, Lowell A.
 Reed, Clarence E.
 Rice, Charles E.
 Rixey, Charles W.
 Samuelson, Charles H.
 Schofield, John S., 3d
 Shinn, Leonard M.
 Short, Jack L.
 Slattey, Hugh M.
 Smith, Herbert R.
 Smith, James D.
 Snyder, Rembrandt B.
 Speckman, Herman G.
 Stouder, Robert P.
 Stratton, Dene B.
 Stroup, Floyd O.
 Sullivan, John P.
 Thurtchley, William E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Biederman, Richard J.
 Bodtke, David H.
 Courtright, Carl
 Davis, Walter E., Jr.
 DeGroot, Ward W., 3d
 Jones, Robert L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Akers, Thomas G.
 Alexander, Ross D.
 Anderson, Kenneth N.
 Asche, Clifton A.
 Berrian, James H.
 Bloom, Henry H.
 Boudreaux, Joseph C., Jr.
 Brown, Marvin J.
 Buck, Charles W.
 Caruso, Homer A.
 Chansky, Ralph D.
 Connery, Horace J.
 Cox, Richard M.
 Dowling, James H.
 Edwards, Billy M.
 Ferris, Ezra F.
 Feuquay, Donald E.
 Haden, Hulot W.
 Hine, Charles M.
 Holcombe, John T.
 Johnson, William H., Jr.
 Jonas, Richard S.
 Jordan, Robert D.
 Kathan, Ralph H.
 Ledbetter, Rufus K.
 Lipes, Wheeler B.

NURSE CORPS

Adams, Elise A.
 Bair, Betty D.
 Beaulieu, Mary P.
 Beeman, Ednah M.
 Berkman, Virginia O.
 Bingham, Mildred E.
 Bracy, Edith L.
 Brookfield, Barbara E.
 Bruce, Martha E.
 Carmichael, Ruth M.
 Chalker, Emily J.
 Cole, Elizabeth E.
 Conder, Maxine
 Constans, Mary C.
 Copeland, Winifred L.
 Cowden, Elnora J.
 DeAmicis, Betty A.
 DeMarco, Delphine
 Denison, Beverly J.
 DiGiandomenico, Jennie C.
 Dwyer, Dolores R.
 Elsesser, June M.
 Evans, Hilda
 Finn, Celine A.
 Fogarty, Anna L.
 Foht, Evelyn C.
 Friga, Elizabeth
 Garbutt, Clara A.
 Hamlen, Nancy A.
 Hanley, Susan M.
 Hanson, Dorothy M.

Todd, Alexander W., Jr.
 Tracy, John J., Jr.
 Ulrich, Eugene A.
 Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
 Urban, Robert
 Van Order, Matthew H.
 Walsh, Andrew J.
 Walsh, John E.
 Ward, Allen C.
 Ward, Maxwell G., Jr.
 Webb, George H.
 White, George H.
 Young, Bruce C.
 Allison, Elizabeth L.
 Cook, Clair
 Tomljanovich, Marianne E.

Osborne, Leah V.
 Osborne, Loah G.
 Pampush, Ruth G.
 Parent, Shirley M.
 Piper, Jeannette M.
 Pope, Elizabeth
 Rigsby, Helen M.
 Ristau, Nancy M.
 Ritchey, Helen G.
 Roberts, Mary Y.
 Rundstrom, Frances E.
 Saavedra, Berta M.
 Scarcello, Julia E.
 Shields, Dorothy J.
 Ristau, Dorothy L.
 Skaggs, Elizabeth S.
 Skrinak, Margaret M.
 Sossamon, Willie M.
 Spears, Lola G.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grades indicated:

REAR ADMIRAL, LINE

Robert L. Campbell, Jr.
 Ralph E. Wilson
 Elmer E. Yeomans
 Wallace M. Beakley
 Ephraim R. McLean, Jr.
 Richard F. Stout
 Bernard L. Austin
 William V. Davis, Jr.
 Aurelius B. Vosseller
 Marcel E. A. Gouin
 Dale Harris
 Henry C. Daniel
 Harold P. Smith

REAR ADMIRAL, MEDICAL CORPS

Thomas F. Cooper

REAR ADMIRAL, SUPPLY CORPS

Charles G. DeKay
 James B. Ricketts

REAR ADMIRAL, SUPPLY CORPS, NAVAL RESERVE

Clarence G. Warfield

REAR ADMIRAL, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Charles L. Strain

REAR ADMIRAL, DENTAL CORPS

Ralph W. Malone

CAPTAIN, LINE

Francis E. Wilson
 Leland G. Shaffer
 Noah Adair, Jr.
 Jesse H. Motes, Jr.
 George G. Molumphy
 Justin L. Wickens
 Porter Lewis
 Donald I. Thomas
 William R. Wilson
 Theodore S. Lank
 John H. S. Johnson
 William Winter, Jr.
 Henry H. McCauley
 Lionel A. Arthur
 David H. McDonald
 Charles E. Perkins
 Arthur J. Barrett, Jr.
 Thomas M. Davis
 Bennett M. Dodson
 William R. Sheeley
 Philip P. Leigh
 Elgin B. Hurlbert
 Harold R. Badger
 Adolph J. Petersen
 Thomas G. Wallace
 Harry A. Adams, Jr.
 Norman E. Smith
 Herbert G. Claudius
 Chauncey S. Willard
 Morton Sunderland
 John H. Kaufman
 William M. Ryon
 Thomas D. F. Langen
 George E. Pierce
 Frank A. Dingfelder
 Alexander Kusebauch

Spence, Ruth G.
 Spencer, Golda R.
 Stahr, Delores L.
 Steele, Mary L.
 Sterling, Elinor B.
 Stock, Iris M.
 Stratton, Rosalind C.
 Taylor, Mazie C.
 Tomac, Dorothy A.
 Urban, Myrtle E.
 Vanatta, Rose L.
 Van Cleave, Patricia J.
 Venishnick, Anna E.
 Walter, Anna L.
 White, Dorothy A.
 Wienček, Clara P.
 Wilson, Adeline M.
 Zimmerman, Nancy V.

Waldemar F. A. Wendt
 Edwin S. Miller
 Ward F. Hardman
 Norman W. Gambling
 Willard R. Laughon
 Ralph L. Shifley
 Kenneth Loveland
 James B. Burrow
 Charles E. Robertson
 James G. Franklin
 Enrique D. Haskins
 John A. Tyree, Jr.
 Wallace A. Sherrill
 Elmer H. Conklin
 Carter L. Bennett
 Julian S. Hatcher, Jr.
 Hayden L. Leon

Theodore R. Voageley
 Gilbert L. Countryman
 John S. Coye, Jr.
 Arthur M. Blamphin
 Michael J. Luosey
 Albert L. Shephard
 Earnest G. Campbell
 James H. Fortune, Jr.
 Frederick H. Wahlig
 James H. Campbell
 Robert A. Keating, Jr.
 William C. Fortune
 Jack C. Titus
 Lester C. Conwell
 Charles L. Moore, Jr.
 Hubert E. Thomas
 Raymond B. Jacoby
 Joseph W. Williams, Jr.

Bruce E. Wiggan
 Frederick L. Ashworth
 Antone R. Gallaher
 James M. Elliott
 Ruben E. Wagstaff
 Thomas H. Moorer
 Warren B. Christie
 Joseph F. Enright
 Frederick W. Bruning
 Roy M. Davenport
 Arnold F. Schade
 William L. Dawson
 Dale Mayberry
 Harold E. Cross
 John S. Lehman
 John Shannon
 Henry D. Sturr
 Lorentz D. Bellinger
 Benjamin B. Cheatham
 Philip W. Garnett
 Horace V. Bird
 Irvin S. Hartman
 David L. Martineau
 Charles B. Jackson, Jr.
 George L. Phillips
 Frank D. Schwartz

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL CORPS

John L. Hatch
 Walter Welham
 Herbert H. Eighmy
 Stephen J. Ryan
 Marion T. Yates
 Eugene F. Harris
 James B. Shuler
 John F. Foertner

CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS

Ralph M. Humes
 DeWitt C. MacKenzie
 James S. Dietz
 Paul L. Weintraub, Jr.
 Albert F. Ryan, Jr.
 Donald W. Twigg
 Alfred T. Magnell

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

John D. Zimmerman
 Joseph F. Dreith

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Madison Nichols
 Clifton B. McFarland

Martin A. Shellbarger
 Charles E. Loughlin
 Otto W. Spahr, Jr.
 Hugh R. McKibbin
 Lemuel M. Stevens, Jr.
 Edward E. Shelby
 Hugh R. Awtrey
 James O. Cobb
 James B. Grady
 Ralph M. Pray
 Merrill K. Clementson
 Kenneth S. Shook
 Charles T. Fritter
 Bernard M. Strean
 Frank M. Slater
 Thomas A. Christopher

Joseph I. Manning
 George K. Hudson
 Harold F. Crist
 Robert W. Leach
 Ray Davis
 Carl Tiedeman
 Paul Masterton
 George H. Miller
 Robert A. Macpherson
 John T. Blackburn
 Raymond L. Fulton
 Richard B. Derickson, Jr.
 Joseph W. Koenig
 Selby K. Santmyers
 William S. Howell
 Richard C. Gazlay
 Stephen Jurika, Jr.
 George D. Rouillard
 William R. Kane
 William W. R. Macdonald

Archie T. Wright, Jr.
 Carlton B. Jones
 James J. Vaughan
 Clifford M. Campbell
 Ralph E. Styles
 James W. White
 Donald E. MacIntosh
 Everett J. Foster
 John L. Counihan, Jr.
 George P. Rogers
 John B. Smith
 Robert S. Riddell
 John M. Steinbeck
 George M. Price
 Harold E. Ruble
 Charles F. Garrison
 Walter H. Newton, Jr.
 Paul D. Buie
 Francis J. Blouin
 William V. Pratt 2d
 Albert C. Ingels
 Robert I. Olsen
 Edward F. Jackson
 Joseph P. Costello
 Joseph O. Christian
 David A. Sooy

Robert S. Poots
 Thomas Ferwerda
 James G. Bulgrin
 Roy R. Powell
 Murray W. Ballenger
 Thomas P. Connelly
 Harold R. Berk

Thomas P. O'Connell
 Donald O. Lacey
 Charles A. LaFarge
 Leland P. Kimball, Jr.
 Lamar Lee, Jr.
 Howard T. Bierer
 Charles A. Blick

Robert W. Schepers
 Harry H. Bagley

Norman J. Drustrup
Joseph A. McHenry
Henry J. Fitzpatrick
Henry C. Shaid
Lewis M. Davis, Jr.
George C. Emery

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

William R. Burns
Clifford J. Waas
John E. Krieger
Charles F. Hoyt
Emmet L. Manson
William Seidel
Morris C. Craig
John C. Allen
Edward C. Raffetto
Williard J. Goldring
James A. English

COMMANDER, LINE

John W. Shields
Francis W. Dely
Karl H. Stefan
Franz N. Kanaga
George T. Elliott
Cyril G. Griffin
William T. O'Dowd, Jr.

John P. Gleeson
William R. Bottenberg
Earl C. Collins
Page Goldbeck
Noel V. Bird

Harry J. Conway
Arthur Parris
Robert F. Nuttmann
Walter H. Barckmann

Willard W. De Venter
Henry E. Schmidt
Clifford A. Lenz
John P. Fleet
Howard J. Hoffberg

Joe C. Davis
John E. Kennedy
John R. Bowen II
Maxwell "D" McDonald
James P. English, Jr.
Marion A. Mason
Edwin E. Ogren
Frank B. Stone
Ralph M. Bagwell
James O. Brady
James B. Filson
Ernest M. Beauchamp
Joseph C. Anderson
James M. Tippey
Harry A. Jackson
James W. Newhall
Lloyd E. Sloan
Aldred H. Wunderli
Toivo V. Kyllonen
Joseph E. Thompson, Jr.

Frederick R. Hoeppner
William N. Durely
Donald A. Regan
Richard J. Reid, Jr.
John H. Hitchcock
Antoine W. Venne, Jr.
Herbert S. Klenk
Paul Gano
Charles M. Sturkey, Jr.

Oliver D. Compton
Andrew P. Burgess, Jr.
David M. McIntosh
Karl B. Kohler
Charles A. Darrah
Leland S. Denning
Willard J. McNulty
Albert L. Kobey, Jr.
Winton, C. Sharpe

Benjamin F. Worcester II
Jack R. English
George H. Rood

George E. Fischer, Jr.
John A. Stelger
Joseph White
George S. Robinson
Carl J. Scheve
Raymond Lamoreaux

Frank E. Frates, Jr.
Karl V. L. Berglund
Walter W. Lippold
Jesse V. Westerman
Charles T. Pridgeon
James L. Wanger
Daryl S. McClung
John J. Hilt
Frank I. Gonzalez, Jr.
Miller H. Cosby
Wendell Naish

Thomas J. LaForest
Charles W. Turner III
Robert S. Guy
James P. McGrady, Jr.
Arthur H. Damon, Jr.
Marvin L. Beadle
Elliott V. Converse, Jr.
John K. Williams
Kipling W. Wise
Walton N. Saunders
Paul C. Combs
William E. Norrington, Jr.

Gerald W. Rahill
James Mercer
James B. Sweeny, Jr.
Jennings P. Field, Jr.
Sidney Brooks
George G. Moffatt
Robert L. Mohle
William A. Fabrick
Sol Neman
Charles G. Spoerer, Jr.
Charles H. Grainger
Marcel Desgaller, Jr.
Daniel F. Larkin, Jr.
Frank V. Mason
Henry M. Murphey
Donald A. Dertien
Gene R. LaRocque
Neil B. MacIntosh
Seth T. Howard
Robert A. Scurlock
Jere J. Santry, Jr.
Philip G. Dye
Malcolm G. Evans
John J. Reidy, Jr.
Richard N. Billings
Maurence D. Callahan
James E. Hackett, Jr.
William T. Luce
Meredith L. Scott
Richard W. Parisian
Andrew W. Long, Jr.
Louie W. Barnard
Frank M. Murphy
Harry J. Hulings
Keith T. Shortall
Charles A. Bellis
George P. Sotos
Jacob A. Rinker, Jr.
Harold N. Poulsen
Elmer T. Stonecipher
Stanley R. Craw, Jr.
Wyman N. Jackson
James S. Bryant
Wallace P. Buerschin-ger

Dana P. French
Dale E. Fairchild
Edward L. Foster
John S. Harris
Morton N. Black
Wilbur P. Collins
Paul H. Shropshire, Jr.

Gerald F. Carney
Daniel V. James
Norman A. Young
Burton L. Bikle

Max E. Cawley
Di J. Dierks
Cornelius J. Smits, Jr.
James R. Kittrell
Coleman H. Smith
William M. Foster
Bernard A. Lienhard
William B. Coley
Edwin H. Kiefer
Jack H. Tripp
David B. Patton, Jr.
Robert H. Wheeler

George C. Calderwood
James K. Cunningham
Robert S. Hill
Samuel Y. Walker
Philip W. Evans
Thomas H. Bruno
Joseph L. Howard
Bernard L. McCreery
Irving F. Macey
Frederick A. Lyon

Prescott B. Wintersteen
William J. Valentine
Donald R. Rooke
Victor G. Stevens

Harold W. Feder
Gus J. Jerkofsky
Ann A. Bernatitus
Mildred Terrill

Harold W. Feder
Gus J. Jerkofsky
Ann A. Bernatitus
Mildred Terrill

Ann A. Bernatitus
Mildred Terrill
The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Arthur L. Andrew
Edward L. Ardoyno, Jr.
Hugh T. Boland
William B. Chubb
Howard E. Clark, Jr.
William D. Coats
Eugene W. Coler
George R. Cress
Roger D. Crotteau
George L. Derendinger
Lee W. Douglas
John McD. Duffie, Jr.
Bobby L. Dunn
Walter R. Ebling
Thomas G. Farrell
William J. Funkhouser
Thomas G. Groover, Jr.
Robert A. Gruber
Lloyd B. Hartsough, Jr.
Daniel J. Helbeck
Virgil K. Holland
Frederick B. Hunt
Barry W. Hutchings
John P. Jackson
James S. Jacobs
William J. Johnson, Jr.
William A. Jones
John K. Kracha
James A. Loomer
Clyde P. Martin, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy:

Joseph R. Blackshaw
Jack K. Ehlers
John G. Haase
Marvin W. Mog

Robert R. Rodgers
Samuel T. Orme
James J. May, Jr.
Robert L. Abbott
Robert E. Sorensen
John R. McKee
Donald L. Irgens
Joseph O. Buchanan, Jr.
George H. Hedrick, Jr.
Harold J. Kicker
Allan Rothenberg

George C. Calderwood
Rufus J. Pearson, Jr.
Carl E. Wilbur
James W. Firoved

David P. Andross
Evert R. Sharp
Kenneth D. Strickler
Clark O. Martin
Arramanus C. Lyles, Jr.
Arthur G. Beale

Frederick A. Lyon
Prescott B. Wintersteen

William J. Valentine
Donald R. Rooke
Victor G. Stevens

George H. Sandman
Leroy R. Frantz

Jesse D. Hodge
Minnie O. Overton

Robert T. Meyer
Ralph P. Michaelsen
George E. Miller
Ronald F. Moore
Thomas J. Murray
David E. Oleson
William E. Pippin
Joseph J. Proffiet
Richard C. Pugh
Alexander H. W. Quartly
Charles E. Rambo
Edwin S. Redkey
Lester H. Reinke
Percy T. Rittenhouse
Richard M. Rogers, Jr.
Richard C. Rostmeyer
Harold E. Roush
George S. Schulte
David W. Shenton
Richard H. Six
William P. Speed
Virgil P. Stuart
Richard J. Verbrugge, Jr.
Roger K. Wadsworth
Dexter A. Washburn
William R. Watson, Jr.
Paul J. Weitz, Jr.
Glenn R. Wiggins
Bobby J. Williams
Howard M. Williamson
Richard C. Wise

Robert T. Meyer
Ralph P. Michaelsen
George E. Miller
Ronald F. Moore
Thomas J. Murray
David E. Oleson
William E. Pippin
Joseph J. Proffiet
Richard C. Pugh
Alexander H. W. Quartly
Charles E. Rambo
Edwin S. Redkey
Lester H. Reinke
Percy T. Rittenhouse
Richard M. Rogers, Jr.
Richard C. Rostmeyer
Harold E. Roush
George S. Schulte
David W. Shenton
Richard H. Six
William P. Speed
Virgil P. Stuart
Richard J. Verbrugge, Jr.
Roger K. Wadsworth
Dexter A. Washburn
William R. Watson, Jr.
Paul J. Weitz, Jr.
Glenn R. Wiggins
Bobby J. Williams
Howard M. Williamson
Richard C. Wise

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

Alfred B. Nelson
Donald L. Schmidt
Willard M. Schmidt
Russell L. Vance

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Robert J. Allen
Edward M. Armstrong
Gerald P. Barnett
Thomas Bingham, Jr.
Bruce B. Bloomquist
Jerald W. Bucklin
Howard L. Carlson
John G. Cave
Durward C. Cecil
James H. Cochran
William A. Cody
Charles L. Coffman
James W. Cornwell
Alan R. Cunningham
Charles A. Duffy
Joseph F. Dunn
Alfred C. Eastman III
Richard E. Engel
Marshall E. Ewing
Francis C. Gehres
John E. Gilbertson
Donald R. Gibbs
Forrest D. Goetschius
Robert L. Grappi
Wilbur E. Greenleaf
Neil G. Holt
Frank J. Horstmann
James R. Hughes
Edmund W. Ingley
Maurice M. Johnston, Jr.

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

John E. Jones
James T. Kearns
Elbert D. Lighter
Paul L. Millis
Charles H. Monroe, Jr.
Ray D. Murphy
Carroll E. Myers
William S. Myers
Anthony Nesky, Jr.
Thane N. Olson
Trent R. Powers
Donald D. Ritchey
Charles T. Roberts
Donald D. Rzewnicki
John L. Schultz, Jr.
Robert C. Sherar
Walter W. Stovall
Leo A. Thibault
Richard A. Tuttle
Don LeR. Upton
Max W. Wakeland
Carl B. Ward
Allan P. Weintraub
Robert E. Wickham
Bobbie D. Williard
Beverly R. Williford
Raymond N. Winkel
Gerald J. Witvoet
James R. Wolcott III

LEUTENANT COMMANDER

Lewis C. Bartlett James F. McRaith
James M. Ireland Thomas J. Moriarty
Howard L. Kubel Joseph M. Parsons

LEUTENANT

Albert J. Bartlett Cary E. Landis
William J. Coleman William B. Murray, Jr.
William F. Feely

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

James B. Acton Will E. Lassiter
Robert D. Adams Ernest P. Lehnig
William F. Casper William E. Llewellyn
George V. Eidson Warren W. Lord
Robert Ennis Kirby LaR. McClain
Francis E. Field III
Eugene I. Finke Donald S. May
Harold J. Fiore Lewis M. Moss
John H. Fitzgerald Pehr H. Pehrsson
Richard E. Flynn Henry J. Ray, Jr.
Robert A. Gideon, Jr. Reuben G. Rogerson
Paul Gonzalez Clayton E. Royce, Jr.
Raymond W. Gresham George A. Sayre
William Hann Frank A. Smith
Charles R. Hannum Charles R. Stephan
James B. Hardgrave James W. Strobel
Harry O. Hellberg Leslie A. Taylor, Jr.
William B. Hoofstetter Emmett H. Tidd
Mark Hopkins, Jr. Gerald P. Timoney
Warren R. Kiernan Leonard L. Tucker, Jr.
Robert L. Kneedler, Jr. Leland J. Underwood
John T. Wells
Gordon H. Wiram

ENSIGN

Alden B. Anderson Joseph J. McBeth
Robert J. Anderson Harold A. McGrath
Leon L. Andrews Albert S. McLemore
Donald L. Angier Gilbert H. Maatta
James J. Arnold Robert E. Mann
James H. Ayres Robert C. Mason
Philip A. Barnes John A. Mazzolini
Roy F. Barrett Joe C. Mitchell
Robert J. Bova Edward J. Mountford
Russell B. Bridgham Austin C. O'Brien, Jr.
Tandy W. Carter Robert L. Obrey
Albert N. Chandler, Jr. Peter H. Orvis
Howard Chereskin Morris A. Peelle
Eugene T. Connors Donald C. Pette
Raymond B. Corob William E. Poling
Everett D. Corseptus John N. Postak
Harold E. Dame Jean R. Pouliot
Wilfrid Devine Maurice V. Rea
Richard A. Dickens Benny J. Ricardo
Laurent N. Dion John D. Rodda
Robert F. Dussault Eugene C. Rueff
Kenneth W. Echols Jesse E. Sampson
Eric N. Fenno Henry E. Schubert
James R. Floyd Patrick J. Sciarretta
Arthur D. Fowler, Jr. George W. Shaffer
Jack T. French John K. Skomp
John E. Gardner, Jr. Sherwin J. Sleeper
Richard E. Gleason Edmund A. Smith, Jr.
Fredric Gnadt Leonard J. Sobieski
Harry R. Graf George A. Sorg
John Guetschow Stanislaus J. Sowinski
William J. Gunn Dean Stockmeir
Thomas D. Hall Philip S. Talkin
Vinton O. Harkness, Jr. Clinton W. Taylor
Robert L. Thomas
James H. Harrison, Jr. Robert L. Thompson
Robert R. Harvey, Jr. Hubbard Trefts
Lennart G. Holmberg Billie C. Tyson
Willie M. Jones, Jr. William B. Uslton
Vernon G. Kidd Floyd P. West
Harry B. Knecht Howard W. Wilkins
Alan Kvello James G. Williams III
David J. McAnulty Paul W. Williamson
Robert F. McBain Thomas H. Wood

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line (aviation) of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Jack D. Martin

LEUTENANT COMMANDER

Thomas V. McEnery

LEUTENANT

John S. Christiansen Alexander Vraciu
Ralph W. Corson James Waddell
Jack H. Crawford

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Donald A. Cook Lee C. Miles
Henry M. Dibble Frederick W. Norman,
Richard W. Ilgen Jr.
Leland R. Jepsen Andrew J. Van Tuyl,
Charles H. Lindberg Jr.
Henry B. McCaulley Glenn W. Ward
Joseph P. Massey Donald McK. Wyand

ENSIGN

John C. Duck Richard Rich
Hugo L. Ecklund, Jr. Fred D. Snyder
James H. Gray Alfred B. Sullivan
Jerome R. Pilon Richard C. Winkler
Harlan E. Reep

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

LEUTENANT

Glover H. Cook
Jerome J. Scheela
Joe G. Schoggen

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Thomas F. Ball, Jr. LeRoy E. Hopkins
Alyn L. Borchers Kenneth G. McGrath
Darrell N. Coba Joseph F. Ouellette
Clifford L. Crook, Jr. Raymond C. Stubbs
Dick H. Francisco Gordon E. Welch
Walter Garballinski Paul V. Westin
Raymond G. Gunn James C. Will
Jack E. Honsinger William L. Winfrey

ENSIGN

John J. Boyle William E. Nast
John E. Bozewicz Harold P. O'Neill
William H. Dickey Charles B. Paul III
Paul M. Gralton James B. Ramey
James E. Hammond Gerald M. Robison
Ivan J. Klatt John E. Sandrock
Thomas E. McCoy, Jr. William G. Vroman
James W. Mead William B. York, Jr.
Quinn B. Morrison

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

LEUTENANT

Clarence F. Mobley

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Gordon W. Schley

ENSIGN

Curtis R. Williams, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

ENSIGN

Louis R. Kaufman
John P. Quinn
Henry D. Baldrige, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Francis L. McGann

LEUTENANT COMMANDER

Hugh C. Embry

LEUTENANT

Malcolm A. Carpenter

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert F. Barlik Peter G. McKnight
John E. Bell Thomas E. Moyer
George T. Boyd Everett B. Nelson
Hal H. Eaton Edward L. Richardson
Joseph A. Frank Lowell R. Rogers
Charles E. Hailstone Robert W. Smith
Victor J. Ivers Charles W. Solomon
Ernest R. Lineberger, Jr. John H. Tackett

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LEUTENANT

Velia C. Covolo Dorothy E. Read
Alene B. Duerk Caroline L. Scharf
Juanita F. Hutchens

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Alice M. Crowell Kathryn L. T. Doherty
Natalie M. Dewar

Barbara Haviland Betty E. Rigby
Dellabelle Herbert Stanislaus J. Smith
Harriet P. McAlpin Wilhelmmina H. Staf-
Gabrielle R. Pepin ford
Elizabeth A. Richard-Kathryn L. Thompson
son

ENSIGN

Dona D. Boyack
Rebecca H. Jackson
Rose A. Kirsch

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy:

LEUTENANT

Margaret J. Gravatt
Mary M. Hill

LEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Helen A. Chrobak
Charlotte L. Safford

ENSIGN

Mary A. Bachtel Patricia E. Kiley
Veronica E. Baker Ethelyn M. Koch
Margaret L. Barnes Ruth M. Kohl
Carolyn M. Beane Joan Koons
Elizabeth A. Black Nadene B. LaBonte
Alice V. Bradford Catherine Lintott
Nancy M. Bradley Mary J. Lotspeich
Joy J. Brisben Earlene Lowrimore
Leone B. Brisben Shirley A. McNamara
Irma J. Brooks Barbara A. Mader
Julia A. Brown Elizabeth A. Maloney
Elizabeth H. Burgess Maxine A. Mandt
Stacy C. Burke Margery E. Masback
Patricia E. Byrne Jane Meadow
Sylvia S. Cass Nancy J. Miller
Mary P. Cauthen Rosemarie L. Nardi
Marion J. Clark Louise F. Nyman
Margaret A. Coder Shirley M. O'Neill
Jean E. Cummings Elizabeth C. Phillips
Audrey DeF. Dantley Edith E. Prewitt
Lois V. DeWitt Martha L. Robnett
Barbara J. Dickey Lois J. Rupp
Patricia R. Donovan Peggy A. Savage
Dixie L. Dunham Georgia L. Shapland
Shirley L. Ellis Maureen M. Sheehan
Mildred J. Frawley Mary L. Slater
Joan Garoutte Claire L. Smith
Helen Gautreaux Martha B. Smith
Amarette N. Gilbert Barbara T. Sullivan
Mary-Jo Goggin Lloyd L. Thompson
Elinor F. Hanson Faris A. Tomlinson
Miriam M. Harris JoAnn E. Watkins
Loretta T. Higgins JoAnn E. White
Sarah P. Higgins Mary L. Wier
Barbara JoA. Hoy Barbara A. Williams
Jean A. Ineson Mary L. Williamson
Mary V. Kalaskey Betty J. Windham

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ENSIGN

Nellie K. Allen Cynthia C. Dunne
Gertrude M. Antolo-Ruth M. Tomsuden
witz

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, pursuant to title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (a), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

James P. Ahearn Robert A. Bain
Jefferson Alison III Richard F. Baker
Tom C. Allen, Jr. Herbert S. Ball
Herbert M. Ammer- Peter A. Banker
muller Vincent C. Banker
Donald E. Anderson Douglas B. Barfield
James W. Anslow Charles R. Barnard
John C. Antonio Charles R. Barr
Thomas E. Ashlock Duane A. Baukus
Merle W. Asper, Jr. Freddie P. Bayless
David B. Asperheim Lawrence L. Beason
Donald E. Ather Richard A. Beatty
Hollis L. Augee David W. Bell
Paul C. Augustine, Jr. James A. Bernhart
Grady Avant, Jr. William J. Bicker
John J. Avignone Robert D. Bickerstaff
Roger W. Badeker Michael H. Biggs

- Arthur Bjorlykke, Jr.
Eustace S. Blair, Jr.
Mord Bogie III
Richard C. Bolesky
Thomas G. Bond
Dale J. Bowen, Jr.
Thomas B. Bowling
Harvey D. Bradshaw
Norman J. Brandes
Jerome W. Brown
Alfred D. Bruce, Jr.
Michael M. Brunner
William C. Bryson, Jr.
Gordon H. Buckner II
Louis H. Buehl III
Robert F. Buntrock
Leland E. Butler
Harvey H. Caldwell, Jr.
Ralph L. Campbell
Norman E. Canfield
Sterling K. Carlow
Richard C. Carmichael, Jr.
Richard D. Carr
Donald C. Carroll
George F. Carter
Raymond Ceragioli
Burr T. Chambless
Michael R. Cheripka
Duane J. Chittenden
Julian H. Clark, Jr.
Walter L. Clarkson
John K. Cochran
Charles P. Coleman
John P. Cousland
Robert H. Cowan
Michael B. Cwayna
Andrew W. Danielson
Thomas B. Davinroy
David O. DeGrandpre
Arthur J. Deichmann, Jr.
Orville L. Deniston
Odilio M. Diaz
Clarence W. Dilworth
Constantine A. Dimarco
James E. Dirlam
Emmett E. Doherty, Jr.
William O. Doll
Joseph C. Donoghue
Joseph F. Dooley
Vincent J. Dooley
Terence J. Dougherty
George E. Dow, Jr.
Edward F. Doyle, Jr.
John M. Drabelle, Jr.
John H. Dreiske, Jr.
Donald Ducoff
John L. Dury
Thomas A. Eastland
William E. Eckhardt
Orville R. Edmondson
Thomas L. Edwards
Charles J. Egan, Jr.
Martin J. Egan, Jr.
Charles H. F. Egger
Robert B. Eldridge
Fred T. Eslick
John E. Fant
Joseph L. Felter
Roland B. Field
Kenneth P. Finch
William D. Fletcher
Jeremiah Ford III
Sheldon L. Foreman
William F. J. Fortune
M. P. Frank, Jr.
Peter W. Gage
Joseph M. Gaither
Patrick E. Gallagher
William D. Garner
Richard M. Geisler
John C. Gillman
Thomas R. Glass
Edwin J. Godfrey
Joseph R. Good
Lloyd E. Goodwine
Henry C. Gordon
- Lewis H. Gordon
Robert F. Gore
George S. Gorman, Jr.
Vincent J. Gorman
Donald D. Greek
Schuyler E. Grey, Jr.
Jimmie D. Grimm
John E. Gutknecht
Donald F. Hagan
Frederick S. Haines III
Edward D. Haley
William J. Hallam
Joseph R. Harrington, Jr.
James J. Hart
John A. Harvey III
Leif E. Hatlestad
Dale C. Hawkins
Frank E. Haynes, Jr.
Clyde C. Helmer
Duffern H. Helsing
Wilfred Herrera
Andrew C. Hess
Royl J. Heyl
James R. Hilbert
David V. Hollen
Henry A. Holmes
Richard L. Hopkins
Francis M. Horn
Walter D. Hull, Jr.
Donald H. Humphreys
Earl B. Hunt
Samuel W. Ingram, Jr.
James B. Isbill, Jr.
Charles S. Isherwood
John G. Jasper
Warren I. Jaycox
Robert L. Jenkins
Robert B. Johnson
Russell E. Johnson
Victor H. Joliat
Robert Jones
Michael Jordon
Francis J. Kane
Clarence E. Kaufman, Jr.
Leon F. Kazmierczak, Jr.
John J. Keenan
John R. Kennedy
Clair V. Ketch
Homer L. P. King
Robert A. King
William A. Kish
David A. Klopp
Walter W. Knitz
Donald G. Koehlinger
Tristan E. G. Krogius
Ronald H. Kruse
Larry L. Kurber
Fred E. Lacey, Jr.
Daniel H. Laidman
George L. Lange
Ted L. Langford, Jr.
Ronald L. Larsen
Donald E. Larson
Raymond J. Lavanture
Curtis G. Lawson
Stimson T. T. Lee
Jerry P. Leonard
David A. Lerps
Kenneth E. Lewis
Stanley P. Lewis
William N. Lofroos
William R. Loss
Robert L. Loucks
Candido H. Lucero
Anthony Lukeman
Ronald B. Luther
Robert H. Lutz
Eddie R. Maag
Michael Maas
Robert T. MacPherson
Samuel J. Marfia
Richard E. Marquardt
John A. Marshall
David W. Matthews
Franklin P. Matz III
David B. May
Lewis R. McCann
Donald C. McCarthy
John H. McCarthy
- John S. McCarthy
William L. McCarthy
Richard L. McCombs
William C. McCormick, Jr.
Richard K. McCulloch
Robert L. McDonald
Kent A. McFerren
William C. McKeehan, III
William H. McKim
Thomas F. McNichol
David E. Meagher
Peter W. Melhuish
Robert G. Merrick, Jr.
Robert F. Mitrione
James E. Monson
Charles W. Montgomery
Daniel T. Mooney
Austin F. Moore
Jimmie G. Morgan
Bernard A. Morin
Gene S. Morris
Lasse O. Moseley, Jr.
Bartholomew J. Moynahan
John H. Mueller
Bruce U. Munger
Max D. Murray
Curtis S. Murton, Jr.
Joseph J. Musial
James W. Nachazel
James R. Norman
Patrick G. Obelrue
John E. Orton, III
Paul J. Otis
Kenneth G. Patterson
Donald P. Pattee
Ray B. Patton
Homer Paul, Jr.
Fred H. Fearson
James R. Peterson
Russell P. Peterson
John A. Pfeifer
George A. Phelps, Jr.
Howard E. Phifer
Charles G. Pierce
William H. Pierce
Robert L. Pugh
Alexander H. W. Quartly
Joseph J. Quinn
John T. Raleigh
Robert E. Randall
Richard E. Ransom
Thomas R. Reckling, III
John A. Reed
Henry C. Reister, III
Richard Y. Remley
John V. Reschar
Edward J. Riordan
David L. Roberts
Jay L. Robinson
John R. Rogers
Donald A. Roos
James P. Rourke
Evan W. Rowe, Jr.
Ronald G. Russell
Paul M. Ryan
Norman E. Ryder
Benjamin F. Sands, Jr.
The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (b):
John H. Flanagan
Rodney W. Miller
Charles H. White
The following as second lieutenants, Marine Corps, pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (b), or title 34, United States Code, section 634 (basic course graduates):
Albert N. Allen
Joseph O. Allweller
Robert N. Analla
Carl E. Anderson
- Lawrence H. Schell
Henry W. Schoenlein, Jr.
Martin J. Schubilske
Larry G. Schultz
Howard L. Schuster, Jr.
Gerald A. Scofield
Robert C. Scott
Charles C. Seabrook
Thomas A. Shantz
John J. Shapley, Jr.
Robert N. Shea
Irving F. Sherwood, Jr.
James E. Shildneck
Harold W. Sill
Clarence B. Simmons, Jr.
James D. Skinner
James T. Smith
Park B. S. Smith
Robert E. Smith
Sydney S. Souter
Donald B. Southard
William D. Stephani
James R. Stewart
John D. Stewart
Thomas M. Stokes, Jr.
Russel H. Stolf
Charles H. Stoy
Adelbert L. Suwalsky, Jr.
Howard C. Sweet, Jr.
William G. Swigert
Dan G. Switzer
Robert D. Thomas
Charles E. Thompson
Raymond M. Tierney, Jr.
Richard H. Tierney
Carl U. Tinnon
Eugene R. Tirk
Robert F. Toalson
James R. Todd
Thomas J. Tomeny, Jr.
Robert W. Topping
John M. Towle
Hugh J. Van Hatten
John N. Vanness
James D. Van Pelt
Richard G. Vass
Richard W. Walker
John K. Walters, Jr.
James R. Warren
John F. Washington
Peter W. Watkins
Barrett S. Wayburn
Bruce L. Weston
Richard V. Wheilan
Maurice G. Wilkins
James P. Williams
Willis E. Wilson, Jr.
George R. Wislar
Eugene A. Wodeshick
Ernest J. Woelfel, Jr.
Daniel E. Wojciechowski
Watson B. Woodruff
Rike D. Wootten
Thomas O. York
Thomas C. Zay
Frank W. Ziegler, Jr.
- Richard A. Bancroft
Warren H. Barker
Robert M. Bartlett
Willis W. Barton, Jr.
Don D. Beal
George N. Bell
Warren T. Berglund
Robert H. Boynton
Thomas E. Bradley
William C. Bradley
Charles K. Breslauer
Wadsworth S. Brown
Edward J. Burke
James R. Campbell
James H. Carothers, Jr.
Walter C. Cawthon, Jr.
Fred E. Clark, Jr.
James E. Clark
Walter E. Clayton III
William A. Cohn
Henry J. Conlin
James S. Conrado, Jr.
Edward C. Cook
Walter T. Cook
Richard M. Cooke
Francis W. Cooper
Jimmy A. Corbet
Dale W. Criswell
Robert A. Cronk
Thomas M. Culligan
John M. Cummings
Robert F. Cunningham, Jr.
John J. Daley, Jr.
Daniel C. Daly
William F. Damone
Carl F. Dawson
Godfrey S. Delcuze
David K. Dickey
George R. Dietrich
William H. Disher
Richard W. Docksta-der
John A. Dowd
Roy Downs
Donald A. Doyle
John C. Duff
Walter F. Dunn
Thomas A. Dutton
John F. Eckert, Jr.
Joseph A. Elliot
Patrick J. Fennell, Jr.
David S. Fine
Arden L. Fink
Farris C. Fisher
George D. Fisher
James E. Floyd
Louis Fojtlin
Wilmer H. Forrey
Richard M. Foster
Arthur D. Friedman
"H" R. Frisbie, Jr.
Joseph I. Gaffney
John H. Gallagher
Ross M. Gamble
James E. Gambrel
Donald J. Garrett
Craig B. Gartrell
Gus J. George
Harold G. Glasgow
Robert A. Goelzer, Jr.
Richard W. Goodale
John D. Gormley
David E. Gragan
Robert O. Gregory
Robert P. Guay
Charles F. Hammel
Robert L. Hardin
James P. Harney
James J. Harp
William F. Harrah
James B. Harris
Richard L. Hatch
Walter R. Hauck
William M. Hayes
Thomas A. Haygood, Jr.
Paul M. Helsher
Clark G. Henry
George A. Hieber
Jack D. Hines
- Charles L. Hirlinger
Harry W. Hite
Elmer F. Huizenga
Milton E. Irons
Lee F. Ison
Edwin F. Jackson
James W. Jackson
Merrill M. Jacobs
Douglas T. Jacobson
Harold M. Jellison, Jr.
James D. Jerrell
Herschel L. Johnson, Jr.
Reid L. Johnson
Robert D. Jones
Vernon E. Jones
Lester H. Joy
Edward W. Kain
John J. Karski
James D. Keast
James P. Kehoe
Bradley H. Kelly
David A. Kelly
Gerald W. Keyes
Charles A. King, Jr.
Jacob Kirch, Jr.
Roger W. Kunz
John D. Lenihan
William H. Lightfoot, Jr.
Irvin Lubin
Jackson R. Luckett
Marvin H. Luggar
Donald R. Lundberg
Henry J. McCann
Theodore C. McCarthy, Jr.
Ralph A. McElheny
James F. McGahan
Theodore F. McIntyre
Conrad L. McKay
Herman A. MacDonald
John W. Mann
Preston P. Marques, Jr.
Henry A. Marting
Richard L. Martson
Glenn K. Maxwell
Hurdle L. Maxwell
James W. Medis
Edward R. Modzelewski
James H. Montague
William H. Morgan
Loyd E. Morris, Jr.
Donald L. Murphy
Francis R. Murray
Robert C. Nelson
Charles H. O'Brien
Billy M. Owen
Hosea Owens
Salvatore F. Padilla
Vincent B. Pagano
Richard Perez
Jack A. Peters
Charles F. Pitchford
Robert A. Plamondon
Walter O. Poitvent
George A. Porter
William T. Powers
William R. Pulliam, Jr.
John M. Rapp
Percy D. Ratcliff
Clifford J. Reesman
Harrison L. Richardson, Jr.
William R. Riddell, Jr.
Austin C. Rishel
James D. Roe
Iiow M. Rogue
Robert J. Rutherford
Paul H. Sallade
Herbert C. Sanford
Ernest R. Savoy
Ruel T. Scyphers
Walter E. Sears, Jr.
David F. Seiler
Thomas L. Sheetz
Edward A. Shields, Jr.
Loyd R. Shoemaker

James E. Shuttleworth
Gerald J. Slack
Daniel B. Smigay
Bernard B. Smith, Jr.
Conway J. Smith
Harold W. Smith
Kenneth L. Smith
Harold B. Snyder, Jr.
Paul A. A. St. Amour
James H. Stewart
Charles L. Stitt
Charles E. Tayntor
Robert B. Thompson
Paul J. Tighe
Kenneth M. Timmerman
Charles Treble

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 347, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended (34 U. S. C. 15):

CAPTAIN

Philip N. Austen
William M. Crooks
Ralph F. Estey
James H. Honeycutt
John H. Johnstone

FIRST LIEUTENANT

William F. Alsop, Jr.
Richard C. Andersen
John F. Barr, Jr.
James D. Barrett
Milton H. Baugh
Darel E. Bjorklund
Russell E. Blagg
Clarence W. Boyd, Jr.
Joseph J. Brady
Thomas J. Brierton
Charles R. Burroughs
Kenneth M. Buss
Harry E. Carey, Jr.
Norbert D. Carlson
Roland L. Colella
Joseph M. Cullinan
William M. Cummings
Nevin E. Dayvault
John R. Debarr
Grover C. Doster, Jr.
Henry C. Ellenberg
Chester V. Farmer
Robert W. Ferguson
Thomas I. Gerard
Ronald C. Groome
Everett Hampton
James M. Haney
Wilbur V. Hansen
Robert H. Harter
William K. Horn
Richard D. Humphreys
Clyde W. Hunter
Emmett J. Hyde
Alfred L. V. Ingram
Clark V. Judge
Douglas T. Kane
Frederic S. Knight
Robert N. Kreider
George R. Lamb

SECOND LIEUTENANT

Lewis H. Abrams
Warren L. Ammentrop
Donald W. Anderson
Charles E. Baker
Robert O. Barnes
William G. Bates
Carl L. Battistone
Lester E. Bazinet
James H. Bird, Jr.
Charles H. Bishop
Anthony L. Blair
Louis A. Bonin
Albert R. Bowman II
John R. Bradley
Bruce G. Brown
Joseph B. Brown, Jr.
Richard O. Bruce
Edward D. Cahill, Jr.

John W. Carpenter, Jr.
Charles M. Chidester
James H. Coffin
James F. Conlon
James K. Coody
Henry T. Cook
Joseph A. Corvi
Frank P. Costello, Jr.
Wallace M. Couch
Franklin G. Cowie, Jr.
Richard H. Culpepper
Thomas L. Curtis
John R. Day
Warren H. Day, Jr.
John W. Detroy
Frank Diccillo, Jr.
Alfred N. Drago

Milton D. Drummond, Jr.
John H. Dunn
Gerald W. Eastwood
Ronald P. Eckmann
William F. Erickson
Robert J. Fagot
Francis W. Farnsworth, Jr.
Frederick L. Farrell
Edgar R. Franz
Raymond S. Fry
Leonard E. Fuchs
Samuel J. Fulton
Jack J. Galloway
Richard V. Gamsby
Kenneth C. Garner
Luther E. Gartin
Edward T. Graham, Jr.
Ernest H. Graham
Billy R. Green
David I. Greenstone
Gerald F. Guay
Lewis C. Habash
Harry T. Hagaman
James W. Hanker
Charles L. Harrison
John F. Helland
William H. Heintz
Howard R. Henn
Maurice S. Hensler
Dwight E. Howard
Robert C. V. Hughes
William K. Hutchings
Robert N. Hutchinson
William R. Hutchisson
Kenneth J. Idol
Leo J. Ihli
Ronald L. Iverson
Robert E. Jenkins
Chester T. Jones
Floyd A. Karker, Jr.
William H. Keith
Thomas J. Kelly
Ralph F. Kenyon
Robert M. Kersbergen
James W. Kirk
Richard H. Kirkpatrick
Robert F. Koehler
Charles R. Kucharski, Jr.
Arthur W. D. Lavigne
Maurice A. Lebas
Robert J. Lyons
Raymond S. Mals
William P. Mason III
Bertram W. McCauley
Charles L. McElheny
Vincent P. McGlone
William D. McKillop
George H. Menning, Jr.
Robert B. Miller
Willard E. Miller
Louis L. Mills
Andrew V. Mincey
Orville L. Mitchell
Paul C. Mogensen
Richard V. Molesky

The following-named to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 105c, or title 34, United States Code, section 625:

Joan G. Bantzhaaf
Mary L. Clough
Frances M. DeVos
Mary M. Donahoe
Marie J. Halvorsen
Theresa M. Hayes

The following-named for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps in accordance with the provisions of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended:

Chester V. Farmer
Theodore J. Mildner

The following-named personnel of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to

the grade of second lieutenant for limited duty:

Donald D. Amick
James L. Anderson
Ewell J. Arceneaux
Ray W. Arnold
Jesse G. Baker
Thomas Baker
Monroe L. Bracey
Nicholas Cappeletto
Leslie P. Day
John H. DuBois
Raymond F. Fitzsimmons
Ivan L. P. Fritz, Jr.
John A. Fullinwider
George M. Garner
Ross E. Gidley
Walter E. G. Godenius
Able Gordon
James H. Graham
Edward E. Grebenstein, Jr.
Elvis G. Hammons

James B. Harris
Daniel F. Layman
Joseph L. Lee
Guy M. Long, Sr.
William G. Luttrell
Kenneth S. Matson
Donald E. McAlexander
Joseph E. Mullen, Jr.
Jack W. Newman
Anthony J. Palonis, Jr.
Roy I. Parker
James W. Ratigan
George A. Ridgway
Bernard P. Simmons
Richard F. Skinner
Jimmie L. Stewart
Joe Vuckovich
Robert J. Werder
John L. White
Billy L. Whitley

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 25 (legislative day of January 22), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

Preston Hotchkis, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the countries indicated with their respective names, to which offices each was appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, to the Republic of Chile.

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, to the Republic of Panama.

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr., of Virginia, to the Republic of Indonesia.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to the Republic of Costa Rica.

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to the Republic of Czechoslovakia.

H. Freeman Matthews, of the District of Columbia, to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Dempster McIntosh, of Pennsylvania, to the Oriental Republic of Uruguay.

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, to the Republic of Guatemala.

Rudolph E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, to the Republic of Colombia.

AMBASSADOR AND ENVOY

George Wadsworth, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Wiley T. Buchanan, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL COUNSEL

Morris Wolf, of Pennsylvania, to be General Counsel.

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, Foreign Operations Administration, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mrs. Mildred C. Ahlgren, of Indiana.
Richard L. Bowditch, of Massachusetts.

Arthur J. Connell, of Connecticut.
Miss Helen G. Irwin, of Iowa.
Allan Blair Kilne, of Iowa.
Mrs. Lucille Leonard, of Rhode Island.
Herschel D. Newsom, of the District of Columbia.
James G. Patton, of Colorado.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Abbott McConnell Washburn, of Minnesota, to be Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency.

NORTH ATLANTIC ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Webster Bray Todd, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States Mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Regional Organizations.

ECONOMIC COORDINATOR

C. Tyler Wood, of the District of Columbia, to be Economic Coordinator (special representative for Korea).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Frederick A. Seaton, of Nebraska, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Frank Brown Berry, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Hugh M. Milton II, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

Louis B. Toomer, of Georgia, to be Register of the Treasury.

Charles O. Parker, of Colorado, to be assayer in the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

John William Tramburg, of Wisconsin, to be Commissioner of Social Security.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Lothair Teetor, of Indiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert E. Lee, of the District of Columbia, to be a member, Federal Communications Commission, for term of 7 years from July 1, 1953.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Harmar D. Denny, of Pennsylvania, to be a member, Civil Aeronautics Board, for term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1959.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

George C. McConaughy, of Ohio, to be member of the Renegotiation Board. Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL

FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS TO BE MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WEATHER CONTROL, TO WHICH OFFICE THEY WERE APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE

Lewis W. Douglas, of Arizona.
Alfred M. Eberle, of South Dakota.
Joseph J. George, of Georgia.

Capt. Howard T. Orville, United States Navy, retired, of Maryland.
Kenneth C. Spengler, of Massachusetts.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Rear Adm. Alfred C. Richmond, to be Assistant Commandant in the United States Coast Guard, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS PROVIDED BY LAW

To be commissioned commander

Glenn W. Moore

To be commissioned lieutenant

Steven L. Hollis, Jr.

To be commissioned lieutenants (junior grade)

John B. Watkins, Jr. Bruce E. Greene
Jack E. Guth Robert E. Williams
James D. Hodges

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS TO BE COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS FOR CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT SHOWN WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE NAMES

Jessie Dixon Saylor, of Georgia, customs collection district No. 17, with headquarters at Savannah, Ga., to fill an existing vacancy.

Douglas Butler, of Texas, customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

Edward C. Ellsworth, Jr., of Montana, customs collection district No. 33, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

Edward M. Elwell, of Maine, customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

J. Chalmers Ewing, of Colorado, customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo.

Frank W. Hull, of Washington, customs collection district No. 30, with headquarters at Seattle, Wash.

John G. Kissane, of Vermont, customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

Josiah A. Maultsby, Sr., of North Carolina, customs collection district No. 15, with headquarters at Wilmington, N. C.

Anne A. Mitchell, of Connecticut, customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE

Aleer J. Couri, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise, customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Paul Frailey Yount, [REDACTED] to be Chief of Transportation, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Hickey, [REDACTED] to be commanding general, IX Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, [REDACTED] to be commanding general, I Corps, with the rank of lieutenant general, and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, [REDACTED] to be Chief of Ordnance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under provisions of sec. 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and sec. 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. John Max Lentz, [REDACTED]
Maj. Gen. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, [REDACTED]

Maj. Gen. Riley Finley Ennis, [REDACTED]
Maj. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, [REDACTED]

To be brigadier general

Maj. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore, [REDACTED]

Maj. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, [REDACTED]
Maj. Gen. James Maurice Gavin, [REDACTED]
Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, [REDACTED]

Maj. Gen. Richard Warburton Stephens, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. Lawrence Russell Dewey, [REDACTED]

Maj. Gen. Gordon Byrom Rogers, [REDACTED]
Maj. Gen. Joseph Pringle Cleland, [REDACTED]
Lt. Gen. William Morris Hoge, [REDACTED] to be commander in chief, United States Army Europe, with the rank of general, and as general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO POSITION INDICATED AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 504 AND 515 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lavinus Parks, [REDACTED] commanding general, Second Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Walter Leo Weible, [REDACTED] Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Administration, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER PROVISIONS OF SUBSEC. 515 (C) OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Shepard Biddle, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. John Alexander Klein, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. John Charles Macdonald, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. Albert Carl Lieber, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. Philip Edward Gallagher, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Murphy, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, [REDACTED]

Brig. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. Donald Prentice Booth, [REDACTED]
Brig. Gen. John Gibson Van Houten, [REDACTED]

To be brigadier generals

Col. Sherman Vitus Hasbrouck, [REDACTED]
Col. Emery Ernest Alling, [REDACTED]
Col. Frederick Prall Munson, [REDACTED]

(NOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Brig. Gen. Robert William Crichlow, Jr., [REDACTED] to be major general in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER PROVISIONS OF TITLE V OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be major general

Maj. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, [REDACTED]

To be brigadier general

Brig. Gen. George Bateman Peplow, [REDACTED]

FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER PROVISIONS OF SUBSEC. 515 (C) OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

To be brigadier generals

Col. Cyrus Quinton Shelton, [REDACTED]
Col. Oscar William Koch, [REDACTED]
Col. Stephen Bowen Elkins, [REDACTED]
Col. Hugh Cort, [REDACTED]
Col. Paul LaRue Neal, [REDACTED]
Col. Harris Fulford Scherer, [REDACTED]
Col. Thomas Benoit Hedekin, [REDACTED]
Col. Charles Alvin Pyle, [REDACTED]
Col. Richard Powell Owenshine, [REDACTED]
Col. Terence John Tully, [REDACTED]
Col. Reginald Pond Lyman, [REDACTED]
Col. Howard John Vandersluis, [REDACTED]
Col. Herbert Davis Vogel, [REDACTED]
Col. Harry Van Wyk, [REDACTED]
Col. John Gillespie Hill, [REDACTED]

Col. Conrad Stanton Babcock, [REDACTED]
 Col. Samuel Roberts Browning, [REDACTED]
 Col. William Lewis Bell, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Col. Ned Dalton Moore, [REDACTED]
 Col. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Col. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel 3d, [REDACTED]
 Col. Maddrey Allen Solomon, [REDACTED]
 Col. Robert Nabors Tyson, [REDACTED]

OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT AS RESERVE COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE ARMY UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952 (PUBLIC LAW 476, 82D CONG.)

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton II, [REDACTED]

To be brigadier general

Col. Wendell Westover, [REDACTED]

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, [REDACTED]

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Nelson Andrews, [REDACTED]
 Col. Louis Dalhoff Burkhalter, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Col. Harold Vincent Gaskill, [REDACTED]
 Col. William Henry Harrison, [REDACTED]
 Col. Gerald Onell Hodge, [REDACTED]
 Col. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Col. Perrin Hamilton Long, [REDACTED]
 Col. Daniel Joseph Manning, [REDACTED]
 Col. Alexander Marble, [REDACTED]
 Col. Thomas Murray Mayfield, [REDACTED]
 Col. Edward Josephus McGrew, Jr., [REDACTED]

Col. James Clarence Mott, [REDACTED]
 Col. Harry Lynn Ostler, [REDACTED]
 Col. William Christian Otten, [REDACTED]
 Col. Elmo Logan Patton, [REDACTED]
 Col. Harold Glendon Schele, [REDACTED]
 Col. Robert Lee Watkins, [REDACTED]
 Col. Frank Elmore Wilson, [REDACTED]

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Homer Oliver Eaton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Maj. Gen. Carl Lawrence Phinney [REDACTED]

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Lucien Abraham, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Harold Arthur Doherty, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Waldo Henry Fish, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Henry Kimmell Fluck, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Joseph Ward Henry, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Robert Milliard Ives, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. John Rutherford Noyes, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Maxwell Evans Rich, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. John Darrell Sides, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. John Walter Squire, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. James Edward Taylor, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Edmund Robert Walker, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Raymond Watt, [REDACTED]
 Brig. Gen. Oscar Ivy Wrenn, [REDACTED]

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Jack Lawrence McCluskey and other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 11, 1954, and appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jack Lawrence McCluskey, which is shown on page 123, and ending with the name of Barbara Merle Hodgkins, which appears on page 128.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 1 year from February 1, 1954.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Rev. William H. Huseman, St. Gregory Seminary, offered the following prayer:

We are come, O God, we are come before Thee, we are gathered in Thy name. Vouchsafe to enter our hearts; teach us what we are to do; show us what we must accomplish, in order with Thy help we may please Thee in all things.

Suffer us not to disturb the order of justice, Thou who lovest equity above all things; let not ignorance draw us into devious paths nor partiality sway our minds; neither let bitterness of passion or prejudice pervert our judgment; inasmuch as we are gathered together in Thy name we should in all things hold fast to justice tempered by pity; that in this life our judgment may in no wise be at variance with Thee, and in the life to come we may attain to everlasting rewards for deeds well done.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 21, 1954, 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. Hanks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1399. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes;

S. 1577. An act to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes; and

S. 2583. An act to indemnify against loss all persons whose swine were destroyed in July 1952 as a result of having been infected with or exposed to the contagious disease vesicular exanthema.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6665) entitled "An act to amend certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to cotton marketing quotas."

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications, which were read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 25, 1954.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
 Speaker, House of Representatives,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the

standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

JANUARY 25, 1954.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
 Speaker of the House of Representatives,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Most sincerely yours,

EUGENE J. McCARTHY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted.
 There was no objection.

COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 418) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the 83d Congress the Committee on Banking and Currency shall be composed of 30 members;

The Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be composed of 30 members; and

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall be composed of 28 members.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 415) and ask for its immediate consideration:

The Clerk read 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 Banking and Currency: EUGENE J. McCARTHY, Minnesota;

Committee on Foreign Affairs: THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut;

Committee on Government Operations: HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey;

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky; LESTER JOHNSON, Wisconsin.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy may sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMUNISTS IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

(Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation of utmost importance to all citizens in the United States, a bill designed to clear Com-