

is customary for another Senator to move that the Senator who was required to take his seat may be allowed to proceed in order. That merely means, does it not, that on the floor of the Senate, where Senators have immunity, we are trying to preserve the right of free speech? Is that a correct assumption?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is a correct analysis, as I understand the rules of the Senate and the duties of Senators. A Senator can be called to order if he uses certain language toward his colleagues or toward Members of the other House.

Mr. WELKER. Inasmuch as we have immunity on the floor of the Senate, I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that we are protected here in the sacred confines of this great body? When a man makes statements off the floor of the Senate, statements which are derogatory to a Senator or to any other person, he is then subject to civil liability in the form of damages, and in many cases to prosecution for criminal libel or slander. That is correct; is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that is correct, but that is not the situation we are facing at the present time. The words which were spoken about the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] were with reference to his conduct as a member of a Senate committee, an assignment which the Senate gave him, and which he fulfilled. I presume he fulfilled it with great competence, because we know that is the way he proceeds with everything. At any rate, he fulfilled it.

Mr. WELKER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. However, when his character is impugned, and when unworthy things are said about him, it becomes the business of the Senate to defend him. He is an official of the Senate. He was laboring under the directions of the Senate, and we have every right to protect him.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator agree with me that, whether or not we like the junior Senator from Wisconsin, many Senators have said things about the junior Senator from Wisconsin and the conduct of his committee—whether that conduct be right or wrong—that are three times as derogatory as any of the things which we have heard the junior Senator from Wisconsin say in my 4 years in the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think many unkind things have been said about the junior Senator from Wisconsin, both on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere. However, the select committee did not have those charges before it. The select committee had 46 specific charges, and we were instructed by the Senate itself to explore those charges and to submit a report. We followed those instructions to the best of our ability. We did not go beyond those 46 charges. We did not expand our assignment in any way. We reported nothing which did not relate to something which had been referred to us in a Senate resolution.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator agree with me that perhaps we should

establish a committee to educate and lecture all young Senators who are so naive as was the junior Senator from Idaho, who came here basing his conduct and his activity—and he hopes justly so—upon the great precedents of this august body from yesteryear?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think it is unfortunate that Senators are showing less respect for their fellow Senators than they did a few years ago. Referring to Senators in the second person is not dignified, in my judgment. I think they should refer to one another as, for example, "the junior Senator from Idaho" or "the senior Senator from Colorado." They should not be addressed in the second person. Formal language should be used, and that is in accordance with the rules of the Senate. I regret that Senators are falling into the bad habit of not living up to the rules of the Senate with respect to matters involving the dignity of the Senate. I regret that that is happening. I can see a great change occurring in the Senate, in the matter of dignity. Senators who have been Members of this body for any great length of time must notice the great change which has come over the United States Senate.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an observation lasting not to exceed half a minute, in order that I may pay my profound respects to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to yield, and I hope I may lose the floor by yielding, because I wish to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Colorado wishes to yield the floor he may do so, and the Chair will recognize the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished friend from the neighboring State of Colorado that I profoundly appreciate his honesty and fairness in answering my interrogations. I shall always hold him in the highest esteem, regardless of the outcome of the case before us, which is unfortunate not only for my friend from Colorado, but for the Senate as a whole.

I wish for my friend the senior Senator from Colorado and his lovely wife, whom we know so well, everything that is good in life. Ed JOHNSON's heart is as big as the heart of a bull elephant. He would never intentionally do anything to harm a human being.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very generous statement. I appreciate it more than I can express. I am sure the Senator from Idaho knows in what high regard and esteem I hold him. I thank him for what he has said.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, if any man should ever become curious to know what Oliver Goldsmith meant when he wrote, in the *Deserted Village*—

Where village statesmen talked with looks profound,
And news much older than their ale went round.

Let him read the proceedings of the United States Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today.

Mr. President, I improve this opportunity to join in the complimentary remarks just made about the distinguished Senator from Colorado. The recollection of my service with him in this body will be to me—

The rainbow to the storms of life,
The evening beam that smiles the clouds away
And tints tomorrow with prophetic ray.

RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore entered into, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, in accordance with the order previously entered, until tomorrow Tuesday, November 30, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, November 29, 1954)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

O God, in whose strong hands are the threads of every life, again we turn un-filled to Thee. Back of all our thinking and striving we are conscious of something divine and eternal that haunts us and will not let us go—something at work behind our fallible minds; sometimes in the stillness we hear it like soft bells at evening pealing; sometimes in hours of mystic insight we feel it and, rising above the trifles which clutter our days, our hungry hearts cry out, "Nearer, my God, to Thee, nearer to Thee." If that petition is but answered in our wayward lives and really, in spirit, we draw near to Thee, we know that always brings us nearer to our fellows.

In these stern, strange times in which our lot is cast, take us as we are, we pray Thee, with doubtings and longings, so often frustrated and thwarted; and even with what is imperfect and broken, through us make Thy purposes prevail for all mankind. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, November 29, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees. (For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There are on the desk credentials of certain Senators-elect for the term beginning January 3, 1955, which, without objection, will be received and placed on file, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the credentials were ordered to be placed on file and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, PAUL H. DOUGLAS was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, William G. Stratton, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield this 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

MISSISSIPPI,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Jackson.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, JAMES O. EASTLAND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Hugh White, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson this the 22d day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

HUGH WHITE,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Robert F. Kennon, and our seal hereto affixed at Baton Rouge this 23d day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

ROBERT F. KENNON,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] WADE O. MARTIN, JR.,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, LYNDON B. JOHNSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Texas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor of Texas, and our seal hereto affixed at Austin, Tex., this 19th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

ALLAN SHIVERS,
Governor of Texas.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] C. E. FULGHAM,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, ESTES KEFAUVER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Tennessee a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Frank G. Clement, and our seal hereto affixed at Nashville, Tenn., this 26th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] G. EDWARD FRIAR,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, MATTHEW M. NEELY was duly chosen by the qualified voters of the State of West Virginia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, Gov. William C. Marland, and our seal hereto affixed at Charleston, W. Va., this 18th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

WILLIAM C. MARLAND,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] D. PITT O'BRIEN,
Secretary of State.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

THE STATE OF WYOMING,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Wyoming a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, C. J. "Doc" Rogers, and our seal hereto affixed at Cheyenne, the State capital, this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

C. J. "DOC" ROGERS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] C. J. "DOC" ROGERS,
Secretary of State.

NOTICE OF ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATOR

STATE OF GEORGIA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Atlanta.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, RICHARD B. RUSSELL was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State

of Georgia a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Herman E. Talmadge, and our seal hereto affixed at Atlanta this 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] BEN W. FORTSON,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, Thad Eure, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify that the State board of elections met on Tuesday the 23d day of November A. D. 1954, in accordance with chapter 163 of the General Statutes of North Carolina, at which time the board did open, canvass, and judicially determine the returns of the votes cast in the election held on Tuesday, November 2, 1954, and certified to me that W. KEER SCOTT was duly elected United States Senator from North Carolina. (Regular term ending January 3, 1961.)

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office at Raleigh, this the 23d day of November 1954.

[SEAL] THAD EURE,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Montgomery.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, JOHN SPARKMAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Alabama a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Gordon Persons, and our seal hereto affixed at the capitol, this 16th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

GORDON PERSONS,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] MRS. AGNES BAGGETT,
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, STROM THURMOND was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1955.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, James F. Byrnes, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, this 23d day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1954.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Governor.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] O. FRANK THORNTON,
Secretary of State.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BROWN] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Committee on Public Works.

That the Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. ABEL] be, and she is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

That the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

That the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Abel	Flanders	Lehman
Barrett	Frear	Martin
Bridges	George	McCiellan
Brown	Gillette	Murray
Butler	Hayden	Payne
Carlson	Hendrickson	Purtell
Case	Holland	Robertson
Clements	Hruska	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Scott
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Thye
Daniel, S. C.	Johnston, S. C.	Weiker
Dirksen	Kefauver	Young
Dworshak	Knowland	
Ervin	Kuchel	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate memorials from sundry citizens and organizations of the United States, remonstrating against the censure of Senator McCARTHY, which were ordered to lie on the table.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES ON THE BASIC AIMS OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the text of the address delivered last evening at Chicago, Ill., by the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles.

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

THE GOAL OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State)

Ten days ago at the White House I discussed our foreign policy with the congressional leaders of both parties, Republicans and Democrats. Afterward the President told me he thought it would be a good idea for me to report also to the American people.

It is not easy to compress the whole story into a short talk. But I shall do my best.

Let me begin by emphasizing the goal of our foreign policy—it is to enable you and me and our children to enjoy in peace the blessings of liberty. That purpose is back of everything we do.

The task is not an easy one, for international communism threatens both peace and liberty, by many means, at many places.

COEXISTENCE

One ever-present danger is the danger of being fooled into dropping our guard before the peril is really past.

The international Communists are masters at the trick of using words which mean one thing to them and another thing to us.

It took us time to learn that the word "democracy" means, to Communists, a dictatorship—what they call "dictatorship of the proletariat."

It took us time to learn that the word "peace" means, to international Communists, a world of conformity—conformity with a pattern of conduct prescribed by Moscow.

Now the tricky word is "coexistence." To us it means tolerance of differences. It remains to be seen what it means to international Communists. It is true that the Russian Communists have recently talked more softly. But it is equally true that the Chinese Communists have talked and acted with increasing violence. They break their armistice agreements and they outrage the elemental decencies of international conduct.

Perhaps international communism is trying by a new way to divide the free nations. They seek to be soothing in Europe. They are provocative in Asia.

Our Nation will react, and react vigorously, but without allowing ourselves to be provoked into action which would be a violation of our international obligations and which would impair the alliance of the free nations. What has happened is a challenge to us, and indeed to all who want peace, to find ways, consistent with peace, to sustain international rights.

We have agreed, by the United Nations Charter, to try to settle international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace is not endangered. Therefore, our first duty is to exhaust peaceful means of sustaining our international rights and those of our citizens, rather than now resorting to war action such as a naval and air blockade of Red China.

Of course, we look anxiously for signs of real change in the attitude of international Communists. We hope that the day will come when they will renounce the effort to rule the world by methods of force, intimidation, and fraud. When that new day dawns we shall greet it eagerly. But we want to be sure that we do not mistake a false dawn for the real dawn.

There is still a vast Russian military establishment, far in excess of any defensive needs. The Chinese Communists are still aggressive. There is still, in every free country, a Communist apparatus seeking to overthrow the established order.

Therefore, we must remain vigilant. We must have, and we do have, policies to meet both the military risk and the subversive risk.

DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST ARMED ATTACK

There are some people in the United States, and there are more in other lands, who contend that it is wrong to be ready and able to fight. They say that the true peace-lovers should be unarmed and neutral.

We have tried that and it did not work.

We were unarmed and neutral in 1914 when the First World War came. The aggressors felt that they could count us out.

We were unarmed and neutral in 1939 when the Second World War came. Again the aggressors thought they could count us out.

The Korean war came after we had largely disarmed, and withdrawn our troops from Korea, and the aggressors thought that they would be unopposed.

Today we take a different view. We believe that the greatest contribution we can make to peace is to be ready to fight, if need be, and to have the resources and the allies to assure that an aggressor would surely be defeated. That does not mean being truculent or provocative or militaristic. It does mean seeking peace not only with the heart, but also with the mind.

In that mood, we make military preparations which, we believe, will deter war. That requires, basically, that a potential aggressor shall not think that aggression is a paying proposition. He must know that he cannot destroy the United States by sudden attack

and that we have the capacity to counter-attack.

So, we are developing continental defense in a major way. It will consist of an elaborate series of early warning systems and interceptors which apply the latest scientific knowledge. These should enable us to knock down a very high percentage of any Red bombers engaged in hostile missions against the United States.

Then, we have our Strategic Air Command which is capable of delivering retaliatory blows against vital parts of the Soviet Union. These blows, we calculate, would do damage far in excess of that which Red planes could inflict upon the United States.

You may ask what foreign policy has to do with this. My answer is: everything. Our continental defense system depends on Canada. And the free nations cannot have effective retaliatory power to deter aggression without airfields in widely scattered places.

Therefore, a vital part of our foreign policy is to have friendly relations with many other countries so that we can work together for our common defense.

I can report that we do have such friendly relations, and that, as a result, we can make it unprofitable for any nation to attack the United States.

DEFENSE OF OTHERS AGAINST ARMED ATTACK

Of course, we could not have that relationship if we thought only of ourselves. The relationship must be for the common good. So, the common defense includes many areas outside the United States.

It is particularly important that the great oceans should be dominated by free and friendly nations. We have made this clear by a series of security treaties. The Atlantic area is covered by the North Atlantic Security Treaty. The Pacific area is covered by a series of treaties, some still in process of consummation, which cover Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Ryukyus (Okinawa), Formosa, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand, and parts of southeast Asia.

To back up these treaty words there are local forces. In some cases the local forces which seem necessary are larger than the local governments can support. If so, we help out. That, however, is not a handout. It is something called foreign aid, although I dislike that phrase. The correct and better phrase is mutual security.

Western Europe, with its vast industrial power, is a prize of first order to any who seek world domination. So it requires special protection. It gets it by NATO. But NATO needs, at its core on the Continent, a greater measure of unity, with German participation. That was the purpose of the historic agreements made last month at London and Paris. These agreements should end the constant warring of European nations against themselves, and at the same time provide Western Europe with effective defense. The prospect of European unity is reinforced by the recent Trieste settlement between Italy and Yugoslavia and the prospective Saar settlement between France and Germany.

In addition to local defense within treaty areas, there is striking power by air or sea. Such mobile forces are needed to deter attack because an aggressor would have a great advantage if he could attack a single locality with assurance of safety against retaliation. We must have the capacity to respond at places and by means of our choosing.

This, however, does not mean that any local war would automatically be turned into a general war with atomic bombs being dropped all over the map. The essential thing is that we and our allies should have the means and the will to assure that a potential aggressor would lose from his aggression more than he could win. This does not mean that the aggressor had to be totally destroyed. It does mean a capacity to inflict punishing damage. We believe that we

and our allies have the power to do that. We also believe that so long as we do have that power, it is unlikely that there will be armed attack upon the areas covered by our security arrangements.

There are some areas in the world which are not covered by special collective security arrangements. That is notably the case with reference to portions of Asia.

However, there are trends toward collective security in this area. For example, Turkey and Pakistan have started to create a northern tier of defense, which would block off the rich oil fields of the Middle East from easy seizure by the Soviet Union. The recent liberation of Iran from the grip of the Communist Tudeh Party, the subsequent oil settlement and the settlement of the Suez base controversy, all open up new possibilities of strength in this part of the world.

In all cases, the United Nations provides an overriding shield against open aggression. This is not negligible—as Korea showed. And it is our policy to support vigorously the United Nations.

In the various ways I have outlined, the free nations are largely protected against the danger of armed attack.

The peoples of the world seem to sense this fact. That is why it is now generally felt that there is less danger of world war than seemed to be the case a few years ago.

MEETING SUBVERSION

Let me turn now to the danger which comes from subversion. This danger is great. International communism has had great experience in fomenting political disorder. These successes are not merely measured by governments actually taken over—nearly a score—but by divisions and obstructions which Communists promote within the free world.

A first concern to us in this connection is the situation in the American Republics. The Latin American countries are in no great danger from open armed attack, but they are vulnerable to Communist subversion. We dealt with this matter at the Conference of American Nations which was held at Caracas last March. They there adopted a declaration to the effect that it would be dangerous to the peace and security of all of the American nations if international communism should gain control of the political institutions of any one of them.

That was a momentous declaration. It may serve the needs of our time as effectively as the Monroe Doctrine served the needs of our Nation during the last century. It made clear that collective action to eradicate international communism is not an act of intervention, but an act to uproot intervention.

The principle of this Caracas declaration had a special bearing on the situation in Guatemala. There international communism had in fact got control of the Government. The American States were about to meet with reference to this danger when the Guatemalan people themselves backed loyal elements who cut out the cancer of communism. The Communist-directed President of Guatemala ignominiously fled, and the leader of the liberation movement is now the President of Guatemala.

This Caracas Declaration and the demonstration that the American States take it seriously, greatly protect this hemisphere against Communist subversion. The Communists know that if they should get control of the political institutions of an American State, they can expect the other American States to be against them. Therefore, there is less incentive to seek control than has been the case heretofore.

The American nations are also trying to achieve sounder economies. There is now taking place at Rio an economic conference. We hope and believe that this conference will stimulate sound measures to develop the economies and lift up living conditions. It

will give practical meaning to President Eisenhower's "good partner" policy.

In Asia and Africa, the dangers of subversion are great. In these continents, there are countries without self-government, many of their political institutions are not yet firmly rooted, the economies are weak and the governments often are insecure. The situation in Vietnam is particularly precarious today, and in North Africa the situation is troubled.

Some of the Asian nations which have recently won independence need help. But they are afraid to take it from the West because they fear that means a rebirth of western colonialism. So they remain exposed to a brand of communism which breeds the most ruthless colonialists in history.

It must be made clear that the Asian and Western nations can work together as equals. We took a big step in that direction at the Manila Conference of last September. There, both Western and Asian participants joined in a Pacific Charter, which proclaimed their dedication to the independence and self-government of all peoples everywhere, able to discharge those responsibilities.

That was an important step toward laying the ghost of Western colonialism which still so frightens some free Asian countries that they hesitate to accept helpful association with the West.

ECONOMIC POLICIES

There is also need for economic policies which will help to develop all underdeveloped countries. In the Communist countries, developments are achieved through a system of forced labor, akin to slavery. Living standards are kept very low and the people are forced to work very hard. In this way, heavy industry is developed. It is a cruel system and is primarily for war purposes. It does, however, have a certain fascination for the peoples of undeveloped countries who feel that their own economies are standing still.

In a free society it is normal that the developed countries lend money to the underdeveloped countries. Our United States, in its early days, was partially developed by European capital. Today, it is the United States which has the most capital available to help develop other countries. We must find a way to put it to work. This is good business, for provident loans are usually repaid, and experience shows that we all profit from an environment of prosperity.

I should mention in this connection President Eisenhower's plan for putting atomic energy to peacetime purposes. This plan, when announced at the United Nations last December, stirred a tremendous response. For nearly a year we tried to get the Russians to contribute to the plan. I personally discussed it several times with Mr. Molotov. However, they refused. Then this fall we said we would go ahead with others, leaving the Russians out. Now it seems that, after all, they want to come along.

By this Eisenhower plan our Nation reappears in its historic role. We have discovered new possibilities for human welfare and are putting our knowledge at the peaceful service of all mankind.

THE CAPTIVE PEOPLES

There is one final aspect of our policies to which I would allude. We believe, as Abraham Lincoln said, that our Declaration of Independence, promises "liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time."

Today, a third of the human race is in fearful bondage to Communist dictatorships. But we do not regard that as immutable.

There is, we know, vast human discontent among the 800 million people whom international communism rules. That comes from the enslavement of labor, the suppression of religion and of individual initiative, and the national humiliation of the satellite countries.

Liberation normally comes from within. But it is more apt to come from within if hope is constantly sustained from without. That we are doing in many ways.

A significant recent development has been the Soviet change of policy toward Yugoslavia. In 1948 Yugoslavia broke free from the grip of international communism and reasserted its own nationalism.

Until recently the Yugoslav Government and Nation were threatened and reviled by the international Communists of neighboring Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Now, however, the Soviet Union treats Yugoslavia with deference, while it continues to treat with contempt the puppet governments of Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. That may embolden the satellites to demand a measure of independence.

Developments clearly portend the change, at some time, of the absolute rule which international communism asserts over the once free nations of Europe and Asia.

CONFERENCES

Our policies do not exclude international conferences even with those who are hostile to us. In that way we ended the Korean war. The scope of conferences with the Soviet Government is necessarily limited by our attitude toward the captive peoples, for the Soviets know that we will not make any deal which would condone and perpetuate the captivity of men and nations.

Also, we do not want to talk with the Soviet representatives when their only purpose is to divide the free nations and prevent their taking necessary measures for their own security.

We had one such meeting at Berlin last January and February. The ostensible purpose was to unify Germany and to liberate Austria. In fact, the Soviet Foreign Minister only sought to block the plans for Western European security.

We do want to find out whether the Soviet Union will sign the Austrian Treaty and whether, after the London and Paris accords are ratified, it will talk seriously about uniting Germany. That is the purpose of a note we delivered to the Soviet Government today.

We are also, of course, deeply interested in the limitation of armaments. A principal purpose of the London-Paris accords is not merely to create defensive strength in Western Europe but to limit and control that strength so that it can never be an aggressive force. There opened today at Moscow a so-called security conference where the Soviet leaders will talk to their puppets and they in turn will respond as ordered. We shall see whether the Soviet Union takes this occasion to match the West by imposing reasonable limits on military establishments in that part of Europe which it controls.

CONCLUSION

There is often a tendency on the part of free peoples to see their own faults and weaknesses and to exaggerate the strength and successes of others. Of course, we should subject ourselves to constant self-criticism. That is the way to betterment.

We need not, however, feel that we are now falling in the great struggle which has been forced upon us. We are entitled to be confident because we are strong in ourselves and strong in the good partnership we have with our allies.

The reality of the matter is that the United States, by every standard of measurement, is the world's greatest power not only materially but spiritually. We have national policies which are clear and sound. They fit a civilization based on religious faith. They are strongly implemented and at a cost we can afford to live with. They have evolved on a non-partisan basis and, in broad outline, they are overwhelmingly backed by our people. Such policies, I am supremely confident, will peacefully prevail.

THE INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 83d Congress approved a new incentive awards program for Federal employees, which goes into effect today.

This new incentive awards program provides for both honorary awards and cash awards, and should prove to be a real incentive to the Federal employees of this Nation in making suggestions and recommendations to the various departments and agencies for the improvement of our Government operations.

It was my privilege to introduce the measure which was consummated in this legislation. Through the cooperation of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the committee reported it to the Senate and the Senate passed the measure.

This legislation was a part of the President's program for an improved Federal civil service. The legislation provides for substantial cash awards, in addition to honorary awards, which may be given upon recommendation of the President and the various agencies.

The contribution of an employee may be in the form of an idea. It may be a new invention or it may be some special performance of duty.

The Civil Service Commission will administer the program, and this should eliminate some of the confusion and overlapping of the actions on the part of the various agencies during the past years.

In the past many of our Federal employees have made suggestions and recommendations that have saved the Government literally thousands and millions of dollars. Under the old legislation, no agency or individual was in a position to give them proper recognition or a substantial award for this outstanding service.

The incentive awards program, which becomes effective today, should be a great encouragement to all Federal workers for the improvement of our Federal programs.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE—BROADCAST BY SENATOR FLANDERS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, it has long been clear to me that we ought to make a distinction between the Soviet Government and the Russian people, and that friendship for the Russian people should be continuously and warmly expressed.

I had the very great opportunity of broadcasting a message to the Russian people on Thanksgiving Day. It was a Thanksgiving Day message, which, I am told, was translated into Russian and was broadcast many times during the course of Thanksgiving Day.

I am also told that at times such messages get through in spots, in spite of the jamming that is done to prevent their going through. I am also told that my message was repeated in broadcasts to all the satellites in the languages of the satellites, and in English to all the transmitting stations of the Voice of America in Europe and Asia.

Believing as I do in the importance of this project of talking with and to the Russian people, I ask unanimous consent that my message may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

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

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Today is our Thanksgiving Day. The day on which the American people give thanks in their homes and in their churches for the harvests of a year of work on their farms and in their factories.

I am talking to you, the Soviet people today, our Thanksgiving Day, to bring greetings and warm affection from the American people, and the hope of an abundant harvest for you as well as for us. And it is in the reverent spirit of Thanksgiving, of friendship, and of the true brotherhood which we feel for you, the Soviet people, that I give you this message:

The American people want earnestly to live in peace and free contact with you, the Soviet people.

Day by day, incidents occur which stretch tensions to the breaking point. These disturbing incidents of current history take place against a background of the mounting armed strength of the Soviet Government and its satellites on the one hand, and the world of free nations on the other. We make anxious comparisons month by month and year by year as to the strength of armies, armament, airplanes, and air forces. These anxieties are heightened by rivalry in the stockpiling of terrible atomic weapons.

We Americans have no ambitions to conquer any people. We covet no one's territory. And yet, we are spending huge sums of money in arms, armament, and armies.

Why?

We are doing so because since the end of the war, your Government has conquered people after people, and we do not think it is right. We therefore feel it necessary to arm ourselves to protect the areas of the earth that your Government has not conquered.

These arms and armies we support are not good for the American people. Given the resources we pour into them, we could have more roads, more dams, more schools, more houses than we have now. We could have more clothing and more food, more of the kind of education the American people want for their children.

As for you, the Soviet people, arms and armaments and armies are also a burden. Too much of your time, too much of your resources go into supporting them. You could have more and better food, more clothing and better houses and schools, if you could rid yourself of the burden of supporting huge armies.

The cost of continuing the arms race cries out for an alternative. Even more so does the danger of continuing the arms race cry out for an alternative.

My friends—my Soviet brothers—there is an alternative, and that is why I am talking to you now with such a sense of urgency.

The free nations of the world have offered your Government a means of removing this load from your backs and this anxiety from your spirit.

We have offered to end the arms race.

We have offered to make no more tanks and warplanes and missiles.

We have offered to eliminate our great armies.

To this offer we have set only one condition: that the disarming of our Government and of your Government shall be done under the eyes of representatives of the nations of the world—so that all the world will be sure it is carried out. We shall be glad to

have representatives of your Government among the international officials who watch our disarming. We ask the similar privilege of inspecting the disarmament of your Government.

The free nations of the world have made this offer to your Government. Your Government's acceptance is all that is required to lift the cost of armies and the fear of war from you, from us, and from all the people of the earth. So that we may all on future Thanksgiving Days have more and more of what our toil has earned for us.

It is with this thought that I leave you. It has been good to talk this way with you, and to bring you the warmest wishes of the American people.

Mr. JENNER subsequently said, during the delivery of Mr. Brown's speech: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada may yield to me for a minute or two, without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cotton in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, every day I grow more bewildered at what is going on.

The airwaves are full of talk of co-existence while the Communists imprison our soldiers who are entitled to the honors of war. Our Ambassador to Moscow attends a banquet and drinks a toast to the Soviet Union, while the radio carries the story of their shooting down an American plane in Japanese waters.

Now I find that on Thanksgiving Day, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Flanders], who may censure me for making this statement, but that is his privilege, and who is at present deeply engaged in a controversy which has suspended all other Senate business, took time out to broadcast over the Voice of America greetings to what he calls the Soviet people.

I wonder if the Senator from Vermont was asked to make this broadcast, or if he himself suggested the idea. I wonder if he was assisted by the Committee for an Effective Congress in preparing this greeting, which has so many of the earmarks of the "peaceful coexistence" propaganda.

I care not which is the truth. I note only that the broadcast was made just after we had learned of the shooting down of the American bomber in Japanese waters. It was made the day before publication of the news that 11 of our soldiers in China were being kept in jail by Communists contrary to the rules of war, and to the cease-fire agreement in Korea. But the Senator from Vermont must know, if he is so familiar with communism, that the Soviet leaders take a special delight in dishonoring our religious holidays by perpetrating or announcing their worst atrocities timed to deride our holidays and our protestations of peace and friendship.

I do not know what the Senator from Vermont means by "the Soviet people." Obviously he does not include the great majority of the people of Russia, China, or the satellite countries, who are so cruelly oppressed by the Soviet system.

I ask the Senator from Vermont just one question, Mr. President. What did he mean when he appealed to these Communist tyrants, who were jailing and shooting American fighting men, "as my friends, my Soviet brothers"?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with the consent of the junior Senator from Nevada, and out of the time allocated to me, because I think we are operating under controlled time, I will yield to the Senator from Vermont for a point of personal privilege.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Indiana is perhaps not aware that during the morning hour I placed that speech in the RECORD.

Mr. JENNER. Oh, yes; I am aware of that.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would appear to me—

Mr. JENNER. I have the speech before me.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would appear to me, however, that the Senator from Indiana had not read it.

Mr. JENNER. I have read it. I want to know what justification the Senator from Vermont had for making that speech. By what reasoning, by what process of mind, by what course of twisted thinking did the Senator refer to these tyrants, these murderers, as "my friends, my Soviet brothers"?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from Indiana is beside himself.

Mr. JENNER. I am not beside myself, but I want to know what goes on in the United States Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator has taken leave of his intelligence. If he had read the message, if he had understood it—

Mr. JENNER. I have read it. Will the Senator answer my question?

Mr. FLANDERS. Just a minute.

Mr. JENNER. Answer my question. Why did the Senator refer to the Communist tyrants as "my friends, my Soviet brothers"? Will the Senator from Vermont answer that simple question?

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me finish my answer to the Senator's question.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator gives me no time to do so. He constantly interrupts.

Let me say that that message, as anyone who has not taken leave of his intelligence would see, was an appeal to the people of Russia over the government which rules them.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege. The Senator says, "anyone who has not taken leave of his intelligence."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. JENNER. My intelligence is my own; it does not come from an organization called the Committee for an Effective Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, let me say first that the message is one which I had prepared at least 2 years

ago, and which I have been endeavoring, by one means or another, to get across to the people of Russia. The single point on which there may be misapprehension is the fact that in condensing this 2-year-old message, which I have suggested and repeated many times in the past 2 years before audiences, and which I think, although I am not sure—I shall investigate and verify whether it is a fact—is already spread on the records of the United States Senate, and in editing it in shortened form, probably for the purposes of diplomatic procedure of some sort of which I am not aware, the message was changed. Instead of being for the Russian people, the message was changed to refer to the Soviet people. That was not my script, but I accepted it for the chance of getting the message over.

Mr. JENNER. Whose script was it if it was not that of the Senator from Vermont? Who wrote it?

Mr. FLANDERS. I wrote it 2 years ago.

Mr. JENNER. At a time when our boys were dying and freezing in Korea, the Senator from Vermont still referred to "My friends, my Soviet friends." Why? Will the Senator tell this body why?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not yield. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. I shall say 1 or 2 simple things more, and then I shall yield the floor. I ask every Senator, whether present on the floor or elsewhere, to read that message and pass his own judgment on it.

Mr. JENNER. I have passed my judgment on it.

Mr. FLANDERS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I introduced into the RECORD an open letter to the Russian people, as it was entitled. It was delivered as a Thanksgiving Day address.

Later the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Jenner] criticized that message. In replying to him I stated that it was my recollection that I had already given the substance of that message on this floor sometime ago. Since the time of that discussion I have looked up the RECORD, and I find that on July 8, 1953, as shown on page 8199, volume 99, part 6, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, beginning at the bottom of the right-hand column, I spoke as follows, as a part of my speech of that day. In order that I may not have to read the context, I will say that where I refer to "national policy" I am referring to the policy of our Government for supporting universal guaranteed disarmament in the United Nations. I now proceed to read the passage:

With this as our publicly affirmed national policy, even on the basis of past pronouncements, we can and must go to the Russian people through the air and by other means with this message of peace. We must tell them in simple language, repeated over and over, that they can have better housing, better food, and better clothing if their government turns its expenditures into the support of the well-being of its people instead

of into the amassing of armaments and the support of armies. We are ready to end all that. Why is not their government ready to join us in ending all that? Why does their government prefer that their people should toil for that which they cannot eat or wear and which will not shelter them instead of devoting the natural wealth of Russia and the work of its people to their own good?

That is the end of the passage. There is one point of difference between the talk which was broadcast on Thanksgiving Day and the earlier statement in the RECORD of the same message. The point of difference is that that message was addressed to the Russian people, while the Voice of America made an editorial change, which referred to them as the Soviet people. I assume that that change had a very practical purpose, because of the fact that the Soviet Government rules over many peoples, and if the message were addressed only to that portion of the people ruled over by the Soviets who are the Russians, it would have a smaller audience than it was desired to give it.

I assume that was the reason for the editorial change.

Let me say in conclusion that when I read those words on this floor on July 8, 1953, no objection was made to the content or purpose of that message.

RESOLUTION OF CENSURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 301) to censure the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the time is now controlled jointly by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have consulted with the minority leader, and it is agreeable to him that I make the first assignment of time. I yield 1 hour to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BROWN].

Taking the statement I am about to make out of my own time, and not out of the time of the Senator from Utah, I should like to say that if there are any Senators who desire to speak on the resolution or on any amendment or substitute, I should appreciate it very much if they would indicate to me the amount of time they desire to have assigned, regardless of which side of the question or what particular amendment or substitute may be involved, so that I may have a list for the allocation of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I join with the distinguished majority leader in expressing the hope that any Senators who may desire to speak will notify the majority leader and the minority leader as to how much time is desired.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BROWN] is yielded 1 hour.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, at the present time there is missing from this Chamber a judge who, without the inter-

vention of Almighty God, would be here, on the other side of the aisle, with his flowing white hair, and would undoubtedly take a part in this great debate. I know that if he were here, seated in the front row, he would not only take a part in this debate, but he would have an opportunity to look through the purported issues concerning individuals and would seek out the great constitutional problem which confronts the Senate of the United States.

I had the privilege of talking to the senior Senator from Nevada, the late Patrick A. McCarran, 2 days before his death. Pat had previously made an announcement in the press of his State that if he were permitted to do so he would cast his ballot against censure. Being a lawyer, Mr. President, I was curious to know how the late Senator from Nevada could have made up his mind without having heard the arguments of counsel or, perhaps, all the evidence which might have been presented in this great debate.

In my conferences with him as a lawyer it was very evident to me that he had read the record, that he had ascertained the important constitutional issue involved in this debate. He stated to me, in effect, that his research and study of the record had indicated to him that if the Senate of the United States were to vote censure in this matter it would accomplish two great constitutional results.

First, it would relegate to the Senate of the United States judicial powers not given to it under the Federal Constitution; and, second, it would limit the unlimited power of the Senate, under the Constitution, to make required inquiry to ascertain necessary facts relating to the fulfillment of the Senate's constitutional legislative function.

I know that if that silver-haired constitutional lawyer were here today he would discern the issue before the Senate as one which bore no relationship to partisan politics, and that, under his oath as a Senator to defend the Constitution of the United States, he would say to his colleagues, in effect, that if censure were to be voted by the Senate it would constitute a violation of what he understood his oath as a Senator of the United States to mean.

I have examined his notes. I have made research to fill them in. While the late great Senator from Nevada may not have expressed himself in the same language in which I now address the Senate, I know that the fundamental issues as he would have seen them, the fundamental conclusions as he would have indicated them, would be essentially the same as mine so far as doing justice is concerned.

Mr. President, Senate Resolution No. 301 and the proposed amendments presented to the Senate an issue of both law and fact. We are the judges of the facts. We are, in a sense a court of final judgment, though of course not the Supreme Court of the United States. I say that because the ultimate conclusion at which the Senate shall arrive is subject to no further appeal or review by the judicial branch of the Govern-

ment. To that extent each of us must constitute himself a Supreme Court Justice in the sense that our obligation is to preserve the balance of power as indicated by the separation of powers under the Federal Constitution.

What are the issues of fact which we as jurors must determine? They can be stated very briefly as follows: What did the junior Senator from Wisconsin do? Resolution 301 states the ultimate conclusions of fact very briefly, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, failed to cooperate with the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in clearing up matters referred to that subcommittee which concerned his conduct as a Senator and affected the honor of the Senate and, instead, repeatedly abused the subcommittee and its members who were trying to carry out assigned duties, thereby obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate, and that this conduct of the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, in failing to cooperate with a Senate committee in clearing up matters affecting the honor of the Senate is contrary to senatorial traditions and is hereby condemned.

That, Mr. President, is the first ultimate fact upon which censure is sought.

The second allegation in the resolution relating to the ultimate conduct of the junior Senator from Wisconsin is stated as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, in conducting a senatorial inquiry intemperately abused, and released executive hearings in which he denounced, a witness representing the executive branch of the Government, Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, an officer of the United States Army, for refusing to criticize his superior officers and for respecting official orders and executive directives.

The issues of law of which we are, in a sense, Supreme Court Justices may be stated as follows: First. What rule of the Senate of the United States did the junior Senator from Wisconsin violate? Second. Did he exceed the privileges of a citizen or of a Senator in exercising free speech in his criticism of the Gillette subcommittee? Third. Did he violate any rule of the Senate in his remarks concerning General Zwicker?

It would be presumptuous for me to take the time of the Senate to reiterate the facts upon which the resolution is predicated, for they have been detailed at length in the RECORD and in the debates in this special session of the Senate. It would, therefore, be well to determine what rules of the Senate, if any, were violated by the failure of the junior Senator from Wisconsin to appear before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. In this respect, the select committee assumed the following rule:

It is the opinion of the select committee that when the personal honor and official conduct of a Senator of the United States are in question before a duly constituted committee of the Senate, the Senator involved owes a duty to himself, his State, and to the Senate to appear promptly and cooperate fully when called by a Senate committee charged with the responsibility of the inquiry. This must be the rule if the dignity, honor, authority, and powers of the Senate are to be respected and maintained.

(At this point Mr. BROWN yielded to Mr. JENNER, whose remarks appear in

today's RECORD following the printing of Mr. FLANDERS' "Open Letter to the Russian People.")

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in asking ourselves what rule of the Senate, if any, was violated by the junior Senator from Wisconsin in failing to appear before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, as I suggested before, the rule assumed by the select committee was that any time charges are filed before a committee which go to the question of the honor or the integrity of the Senate, a Senator, without process of any kind being served on him, is immediately assumed to be charged with the duty of volunteering to appear and prove the negative of those charges.

The select committee also indicated, on the same page, the following assumption of a rule of the Senate:

The appearance which we believe was necessary was before a subcommittee of the Senate itself, to which subcommittee the Senate, through its normal processes, had confided a matter affecting its own honor and integrity. In such a case legal process was not and should not be required.

Mr. President, it is therefore apparent that without either constitutional basis or precedent of the Senate or of Congress the select committee has assumed a duty upon every Senator to volunteer and appear before a committee of the Senate and to disprove any charges which may be made against him when the nature of the charges involves his personal honor and official conduct. This assumed rule, according to the select committee, imposes such a duty upon a Senator regardless of who made the charges, how responsible they may be, and for what purposes they were made. It would still be his obligation to appear voluntarily. This is even assumed to be true without any legal process being invoked to require the appearance before the committee of a Senator of the United States to answer or explain such charges.

The suggested rule further assumes that such duty rests upon the Senator regardless of the fact that he may have failed or refused to appear before a committee in a previous session of the Senate, and whether or not he has been subsequently reelected to the Senate of the United States by the people of his own sovereign State.

The implications of that assumed rule, I respectfully submit to the Members of The Senate, have no basis either in the Constitution of the United States or in the precedents of this august body.

This position of the select committee was further assumed to be the law, as was expressed by the select committee on page 26 of the report in the following language:

The provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, above referred to, make it clear that the subcommittee had the power and right to require the attendance of Senator McCARTHY for purposes of investigation and examination by subpoena or otherwise. It can be stated, therefore, categorically, that it was not necessary for the subcommittee to issue its subpoena for him. Section 134-A of the Legislative Reorganization Act does refer to "requiring" the attendance of witnesses, and the select committee is of the opinion that an invitation to appear, is not

such action indicating a requirement to appear as is contemplated by the act.

Then the select committee made this astounding statement:

It is the opinion of the select committee that a request to appear, such as the letter and telegram from the subcommittee to Senator McCARTHY dated November 21, 1952, was sufficient (aside from any question whether Senator McCARTHY received them in time) to meet the requirements of the law.

Then the select committee further found, as appears on page 28, the following:

Senator McCARTHY testified that he was in Wisconsin, on a hunting trip, and that he did not see the letter or telegram until November 28, 1952 (p. 298 hearings). The select committee accepts this testimony as true.

Considering this request as a formal request, and Senator McCARTHY being unable to appear in the dates fixed because he did not know of the request in time, we believe that this request, considered independently, would not be contempt in the ordinary legal sense.

It will be observed that this language of the select committee is to the effect that any request to appear is sufficient to meet the requirements of the law. This assumes the precedent before stated, namely, that a Senator of the United States, when charges against him are pending before a committee of the Senate, must voluntarily seek out the committee and appear and disprove the charges; and further, that such precedent is the law. If this assumption fails, then the entire case suggested in section 1 of Senate Resolution 301 fails. Furthermore, it must be emphasized that the subcommittee conceded that it did not subpoena or require the attendance of Senator McCARTHY to the extent that failure to appear on his part would amount to a contempt. The wrongdoing on the part of the junior Senator from Wisconsin really alleged is set forth on page 29 of the report, wherein it is alleged that he denounced the Senate subcommittee without justification, and stated, in effect, that they were guilty of stealing the taxpayers' money and turning the loot over to the Democratic National Committee. Mr. President, this requires a further analysis of the assumed precedent or rule purported to have been violated, by examining the right of the junior Senator from Wisconsin to exercise the right of free speech. It immediately raises the question under the Constitution, "Does a Senator have a greater or lesser right to criticize the Government, its officials, and committees than does a private citizen?"

It will be noted that Senate Resolution 301 does not ask for expulsion of a Senator, nor does it ask for the initiation of proceedings as for contempt.

Mr. President, without further imposing upon the time of this body, I believe it will be conceded that there is no precedent that has been found to date where a Senator has ever been censured for remarks, written or oral, not made on the floor of the Senate. The reason for the nonexistence of such a precedent is obvious. The power to discipline or expel

a Senator is given by parliamentary common law, as codified in the Constitution of the United States, to the Senate in the power to punish as for contempt. Mr. President, it is an incident to legislative authority to prevent the obstruction of the performance of the legislative duty and to prevent the defeating of, impeding, or embarrassing the exercise of legislative power. This power is essential to enable the Senate to perform its high functions and is necessary to the safety of the state. As pointed out by Judge Cooley in his work on constitutional limitations, such power is a power of protection, and it is necessary to the safety of the state. But, Mr. President, no precedent can be found where the power of censure or expulsion was ever exercised by one session of Congress or the Senate after the adjournment of a prior session in which the alleged conduct occurred, and after the reelection of the Member to the Senate of the United States. Where punishment has been undertaken, it has been in only three types of cases: First, in cases involving physical violence; second, in cases involving improper language used in debate; and, third, in cases involving corruption of the legislative process. No Congress has the power to punish a contempt committed against a prior Congress, and this power to punish dies with the expiration of the session during which the contempt is committed. This is logical and sound constitutional law, for the reason that the right to punish or the right to censure is directly related to the power of the legislative body to protect itself in exercising the legislative function. What function of a subsequent session could be impeded by either contempts or the conduct as set forth in Senate Resolution 301, and alleged to have been committed in a prior session of the Senate? It is obvious, therefore, Mr. President, that the entire assumption of the select committee was based upon a purported violation of a rule which does not exist and cannot be pointed out by any proponent of censure.

We then come to the serious matter presented to the Senate of the United States; and that is that if we, by censure, as proposed by Senate Resolution 301, adopt the assumed precedents and rules upon which the select committee based its recommendations, is the Senate of the United States abrogating its power and authority, as now existing, to obtain information essential to the exercise of its legislative process? This is true, for by a mere assumption of a rule which does not exist in fact, the entire machinery of a Senate investigating committee may be stopped, and its chairman muted, and its staff languish in a state of enforced inactivity. This is true whether the censure move is instigated by another coordinate branch of the Federal Government or by those who may desire to destroy the legislative branch of our Government.

Mr. President, this entire question, as presented by the report of the select committee, has been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Marshall v. Gordon* (37 Supreme Court Reporter), commencing at page 448. It will be remembered that in that

case a Member of the House of Representatives on the floor charged a Federal district attorney with many acts of misfeasance and nonfeasance. At the time when this was done, the grand jury in the southern district of New York was engaged in investigating alleged illegal conduct of the Member in relation to the Sherman antitrust law and asserted illegal activities of an organization known as Labor's National Peace Council, to which the Member belonged. The investigation as for the latter subject not yet having been reported upon by the grand jury, that body found an indictment against the Member for a violation of the Sherman law. Thereafter calling attention to his previous charges and stating others, the Member requested that the Judiciary Committee be directed to inquire and report concerning the charges against the district attorney insofar as they constituted impeachable offenses. After the adoption of the resolution in the House of Representatives, a subcommittee was appointed, and it proceeded to New York, to take the testimony. Friction arose there between the subcommittee and the office of the district attorney, based upon the assertion that the subcommittee was seeking to unlawfully penetrate the proceedings of the grand jury relating to the indictment and the investigations in question. In a daily newspaper in New York an article appeared charging that the writer was informed that the subcommittee was endeavoring rather to investigate and frustrate the action of the grand jury than to investigate the conduct of the district attorney. When called upon by the subcommittee to disclose the name of his informant, the writer declined to do so, and proceedings for contempt of the House were threatened. The district attorney thereupon addressed a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, avowing that he was the informant referred to in the newspaper article, averring that the charges were true, and repeating them in amplified form in language which was certainly unparliamentary and manifestly ill-tempered, and which was well calculated to arouse the indignation not only of the members of the subcommittee, but of Members of the House generally. This letter was given to the press so that it might be published contemporaneously with its receipt by the chairman of the subcommittee. The Judiciary Committee reported the matter to the House, and a select committee was appointed to consider the subject. The district attorney was called before that committee and reasserted the charges made in the letter, averring that they were justified by the circumstances, and stating that they would, under the same conditions, be made again. Thereupon the select committee made a report and stated its conclusions and recommendations to the House as follows:

We conclude and find that the aforesaid letter written and published by said H. Snowden Marshall to Hon. C. C. Carlin, chairman of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, on March 4, 1916, * * * is as a whole and in several of the separate sentences defamatory and insulting and tends to bring the House into public contempt and ridicule, and that the said H. Snowden Marshall, by writing and

publishing the same, is guilty of contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States because of the violation of its privileges, its honor, and its dignity.

Upon the adoption of this report, under the authority of the House a formal warrant for arrest was issued and its execution by the sergeant at arms in New York was followed by an application for discharge on writ of habeas corpus; and the correctness of the judgment of the court below, refusing the same, was the matter before the Supreme Court of the United States on appeal. The Supreme Court pointed out the issue in that case. Mr. President, as a matter of constitutional law it is identical with the issue which is presented to the Senate by Senate Resolution 301.

The question before the court was whether the House had power under the Constitution to deal with the conduct of the district attorney in writing the letter as a contempt of its authority, and to inflict punishment upon the writer for such contempt as a matter of legislative power, that is, without subjecting him to the statutory modes of trial provided for criminal offenses, protected by the limitations and safeguards which the Constitution imposes as to such subject.

Mr. President, I realize that the position of the select committee of the Senate is that this particular holding of the Supreme Court of the United States is different in two respects. The first respect in which it is said to differ is that Senate Resolution 301 seeks to discipline or punish a Member of the Senate, and not a third party.

Secondly, the select committee endeavors to differentiate this decision of the Supreme Court upon the proposition, generally, that the Senate of the United States is a continuing body. But the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Marshall opinion, delivered by Mr. Justice White—and I may say that it was delivered at a time in the history of our country when we did not have read into the Constitution of the United States either principles of interpretation or language which cannot be found therein—reviewed the English cases and the precedent of Congress and pointed out that no power was expressly conferred by the Constitution of the United States on the subject except that given to the House to deal with contempt committed by its own Members, as the rule concerning the Constitution of the United States is that powers not delegated were reserved to the people or the States. It follows that no other expressed authority to deal with contempt can be conceived of, either under precedent or under the Constitution.

After reviewing the English parliamentary power to punish for contempt the court pointed out that parliament was exercising judicial and legislative functions which did not exist in the Senate or the House under the Constitution of the United States. Then the provisions of the State constitutions as they existed at the time of the formation of the Federal Government were reviewed, and the court held that Congress had the implied power whereby, by reason of article 1, section 5, to punish as for contempt irrespective of its right to

legislate. But, Mr. President, the Supreme Court of the United States then pointed out that the implied power was to be construed strictly and limited to those instances in which the alleged contempt should be punished at once and upon the right of self-preservation to enable the public powers of legislation given to Congress to be asserted. The power to punish for contempt must be exercised only if the particular acts involved result in the immediate prevention of the exercise of legislative authority. The court further pointed out that if this were not so it would be an unconstitutional comingling of judicial and legislative powers which were not granted by the Constitution to Congress, or either House thereof, and would interfere with the guaranties and limitations concerning the assertion of the power to punish criminally.

The Court further pointed out that the contempt was deemed to result from the writing of the letter, and not because of any obstruction to the performance of legislative duty resulting from the letter, or because the constitutional provision relating to the power of the House to carry out its legislative authority was endangered by its writing, but because of the effect and operation which the irritating and ill-tempered statements made in the letter would produce upon the public mind, or because of the sense of indignation which it may be assumed was produced by the letter upon the members of the committee and of the House generally. The decision pointed out that the contempt relied upon was not intrinsic to the right of the House to preserve the means of discharging its legislative duties, but were extrinsic to the discharge of such duties, and related only to the presumed effect which the letter might have upon the public mind and the indignation naturally felt by the members of the committee on the subject. The Court then said:

But these considerations plainly serve to mark the broad boundary line which separates the limited implied power to deal with classes of acts as contempts for self-preservation and the comprehensive legislative power to provide by law for punishment for wrongful acts.

The conclusions which were stated bring about a concordant operation of all the powers of the legislative and judicial departments of the Government, express or implied, as contemplated by the Constitution.

The select committee of the Senate, however, found on page 28 of the report that the conduct of the junior Senator from Wisconsin toward the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections was contemptuous, independently of his failure to appear, and that he did denounce the subcommittee without justification. Nowhere has the argument been made that this session of the Senate may punish by censure an act occurring in a previous session and which in no manner impedes the legislative function. To do so would be beyond the constitutional power of the Senate or the House, as it would be exercising judicial powers not conferred upon this body by the Founding Fathers.

Much is said in the report concerning the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, but

the power to censure is found in the argument presented on page 20 of the report of the select committee, to the effect that the Senate is a continuing body, but by no stretch of the imagination can the select committee's interpretation of Senate rule XXXII constitute the Senate a continuing body justifying the exercise of judicial functions not delegated by the Constitution, for, obviously, in respect to the 83d Congress, the alleged acts of the junior Senator from Wisconsin could not possibly prevent or impede the exercise of the legislative function by the Senate in the latter session.

Assuming the argument contained in the report of the select committee to be true, would not the only proper way that punishment could be inflicted upon the junior Senator from Wisconsin be upon application of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections? The record discloses that no such application for punishment of any kind was ever requested or desired by the subcommittee or its chairman or any of its members. It is clearly, therefore, a moot question and beyond the constitutional jurisdiction of the Senate.

It has been stated in debate by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] that the matter before the Senate now constitutes a proceeding in the nature of an appeal. That reasoning cannot stand up, for the reason that if it were such a proceeding, the Senate would then be exercising a judicial function not delegated to it by the Constitution of the United States, and every Member of the Senate would then violate his oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The junior Senator from Oregon further pointed out that it was his desire to inaugurate new rules for fair judicial procedures before Senate investigating committees. The entire concept is contrary to the legislative function given to the legislature by the Constitution and would substitute therefor judicial powers. But, more than this, it would establish a limitation upon the power of the Senate to proceed in its own way in the collection of such information as may seem important or desirable to a proper discharge of its functions.

The issue then in this case, Mr. President, is very clear. Are we by censure at this late date to usurp the function of the judicial branch of the Federal Government and punish a Senator for conduct which might irk certain Members past or present of this body, when that conduct bears no relationship to the impeding of the legislative function of the Senate?

Are we to impede in our own way the collection of such information as may seem important to a proper discharge of the functions of the Senate? If we are, we have violated our oath to defend the Constitution and to uphold it by asserting and relegating to ourselves the power to punish criminally, without the constitutional safeguards applicable to the judicial branch of the Government becoming available to a Senator or citizen sought to be punished. We are further limiting the right of the Senate to collect required information in any mat-

ter which we seek to do so. But, above all, we are further violating our oath to uphold the Constitution by impairing the right of the citizen and a Senator to exercise legitimate free speech in expressions of condemnation of public bodies, officials, and committees. It is realized that there are limitations upon the rights of free speech.

Judge Cooley, in his Constitutional Limitations, in volume II, page 908, has the following observation to make in respect to a citizen's right of free speech:

There are certain cases where criticism upon public officers, their actions, character, and motives, is not only recognized as legitimate, but large latitude and great freedom of expression are permitted, so long as good faith inspires the communication. There are cases where it is clearly the duty of everyone to speak freely what he may have to say concerning public officers, or those who may present themselves for public positions. Through the ballot box the electors approve or condemn those who ask their suffrages; and if they condemn, though upon grounds the most unjust or frivolous, the law affords no redress. Some officers, however, are not chosen by the people directly, but designated through some other mode of appointment. But the public have a right to be heard on the question of their selection; and they have the right, for such reasons as seem to their minds sufficient, to ask for their dismissal afterward. They have also the right to complain of official conduct affecting themselves, and to petition for a redress of grievances. A principal purpose in perpetuating and guarding the right of petition is to insure the public the privilege of being heard in these and the like cases.

Mr. President, can it be said that under the Constitution, a Senator of the United States has less right than a private individual, to express his condemnation of a committee of the Senate or of any branch of our Government, assuming it is done in good faith? Does a Senator have a lesser right than a citizen? It is obvious, Mr. President, that all the privileges given to a Senator, such as freedom from arrest in certain circumstances, the right to be free from harassment during debate, the right to be free from questions concerning a statement made during debate, are not the privileges of Senators, but, Mr. President, they are the privileges of the people of the United States, given simply to permit their chosen representatives to exercise, fully and unimpeded, the legislative function of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Judge Cooley further pointed out:

When it is among the fundamental principles of the Government that the people frame their own constitution, and that in doing so they reserve to themselves the power to amend it from time to time, as the public sentiment may change, it is difficult to conceive of any sound principle on which prosecutions for libels on the system of government can be based, except when they are made in furtherance of conspiracy with the evident intent and purpose to excite rebellion and civil war. It is very easy to lay down a rule for the discussion of constitutional questions; that they are privileged, if conducted with calmness and temperance, and that they are not indictable unless they go beyond the bounds of fair discussion. But what is calmness and temperance, and what is fair in the discussion of supposed evils in the government? And if something is to

be allowed "for a little feeling in men's minds," how great shall be the allowance? The heat of the discussion will generally be in proportion to the magnitude of the evil as it appears to the party discussing it; must the question whether he has exceeded due bounds or not be tried by judge and jury, who may sit under different circumstances from those under which he has spoken, or at least after the heat of the occasion has passed away, and who, feeling none of the excitement themselves, may think it unreasonable that anyone else should ever have felt it? The dangerous character of such prosecutions would be the more glaring if aimed at those classes who, not being admitted to a share in the government, attacked the constitution in the point which excluded them. Sharp criticism, ridicule, and the exhibition of such feeling as a sense of injustice engenders, are to be expected from any discussion in these cases; but when the very classes who have established the exclusion as proper and reasonable are to try as judges and jurors the assaults made upon it, they will be very likely to enter upon the examination with a preconceived notion that such assaults upon their reasonable regulations must necessarily be unreasonable. If any such principle of repression should ever be recognized in the common law of America, it might reasonably be anticipated that in times of high party excitement it would lead to prosecutions by the party in power, to bolster up wrongs and sustain abuses and oppressions by crushing adverse criticism and discussion. The evil, indeed, could not be of long continuance; for, judging from experience, the reaction would be speedy, thorough, and effectual; but it would be no less a serious evil while it lasted. The direct tendency of which would be to excite discontent and to breed a rebellious spirit. Repression of full and free discussion is dangerous in any government resting upon the will of the people. The people cannot fail to believe that they are deprived of rights, and will be certain to become discontented, when their discussion of public measures is sought to be circumscribed by the judgment of others upon their temperance or fairness. They must be left at liberty to speak with the freedom which the magnitude of the supposed wrongs appears in their minds to demand; and if they exceed all the proper bounds of moderation, the consolation must be, that the evil likely to spring from the violent discussion will probably be less, and its correction by public sentiment more speedy, than if the terrors of the law were brought to bear to prevent the discussion. (Cooley, Constitutional Limitations, vol. II, 8th ed., pp. 900-901.)

Are we, therefore, by censure, to limit the right of the Senate to a greater degree than it can be constitutionally limited in respect to a private citizen, in those instances where the conduct of a Senator does not impede the legislative functions of this body? We therefore should not extend the rule beyond that which is now provided by Senate Rule XIX.

It might be said that the right to punish or expel Members is a right given to the Senate without limitation. Judge Cooley said:

Each House has also the power to punish Members for disorderly behavior, and other contempts of its authority, as well as to expel a Member for any cause which seems to the body to render it unfit that he continue to occupy one of its seats. This power is generally enumerated in the Constitution among those which the two Houses may exercise, but it need not be specified in that instrument, since it would exist whether expressly conferred or not. It is "a necessary

and incidental power, to enable the House to perform its high functions, and is necessary to the safety of the State. It is a power of protection. A Member may be physically, mentally, or morally wholly unfit; he may be affected with a contagious disease, or insane, or noisy, violent, and disorderly, or in the habit of using profane, obscene, and abusive language." And, "independently of parliamentary customs and usages, our legislative Houses have the power to protect themselves by the punishment and expulsion of a Member"; and the courts cannot inquire into the justice of the decision, or even so much as examine the proceedings to see whether or not the proper opportunity for defense was furnished. (Constitutional Limitations, 8th Ed., p. 271.)

It therefore devolves upon us, who are acting in effect, as Supreme Court judges under the Constitution in determining these issues, to make certain that we apply not legislative tyranny, but the rule of constitutional law, as implied from the very taking of our oaths as Members of this body. The distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] pointed this out in his address to the Senate a few days ago. Are we to substitute legislative tyranny for the rule of law?

We must, under our oaths of office, govern our conduct in this legislative trial by the rule of law; otherwise we can defeat the will of the people and exceed our powers under the Constitution. Our power is legislative. Any power to punish must be by limitation, a power limited to preserving the Senate's right to legislate, and no other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is compelled to call the Senator's attention to the fact that his time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from Nevada such additional time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, unless we exercised our judicial discretion in the light of our oaths, it could be contended that we could defeat the right of the people to elect Senators, as provided for by the 17th amendment to the Constitution, by refusing to seat or by expelling new Members simply because they did not represent the then majority party in this body.

A mere reading of article 1, section 5, of the Constitution, without considering the other provisions of the Constitution, might lead to the conclusions as before indicated. But were we to do so, we would have violated our oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. We thus, in every aspect of our delegated power, apply the rule of law in our exercise of our power under the Federal Constitution.

But since the right to censure, to punish for contempt, must relate, as does the power to expel, to the preservation of the legislative function, hence article 1, section 5, of the Constitution provides:

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

This merely codified the common-law rule of parliamentary bodies, that of self-protection in exercising the legis-

lative function. The difference, however, is that the English legislative body had both legislative and judicial power.

The relegation to the Senate of power to censure or punish for contempt not related to the preservation of the current session of the Senate in the exercise of its legislative function or power is unconstitutional.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been listening to the Senator's address, particularly with relation to the Senate carrying over from one session to another. Does the Senator from Nevada interpret the Constitution to mean that while the Senate is a continuing body, its rights over the conduct of its Members in one Congress do not carry over into another Congress?

Mr. BROWN. In answering that point, we come back to the case of Marshall against Gordon. It occurs to me that that decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, as written by Justice White, indicates specifically that, regardless of the argument, or I should say assumption, of the select committee, that the Senate, in contradistinction to the House of Representatives, is a continuing body, nowhere in the Constitution of the United States is there given expressly the power to punish its Members for contempt or to censure them, save and except as it is specifically enumerated in article I, section 5, of the Constitution, or where it is implied as an essential part of the parliamentary common law, to enable the Senate to preserve its legislative function.

In other words, regardless of whether the Senate be a continuing body or not, under Marshall against Gordon the implied power of a legislative body can extend only to those instances of punishment, except in the case of expulsion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield, to permit me to ask one more question?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Nevada dispute the fact that the Senate is a continuing body? Does he agree that the Senate is a continuing body, but that its acts cannot carry over from one Congress to another? Or does the Senator contend that the Senate is not a continuing body?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Senate is a continuing body in certain senses; for other purposes, it is not. But, if I may so suggest in answer to the Senator's question, it is totally immaterial to this argument whether the Senate of the United States be a continuing body, or otherwise, for this reason: There is no proof of any conduct enumerated in Senate Resolution 301 which, if permitted to be censured at this late date, could in any wise relate to the preservation of the legislative function in the 83d or any subsequent Congress.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I assume the Senator from Nevada is familiar with the book

which I used in my remarks in the Senate a few days ago, written by James M. Beck, a doctor of laws, a former Solicitor General of the United States, and also the author of a book, entitled "The Constitution of the United States." Does the Senator agree with Dr. Beck when he writes, on page 50 of the book entitled "The Vanishing Rights of the States," to this effect:

In my judgment, the power of expulsion refers to some act of a Senator during his membership of the Senate, and the act must have some reference to the discipline of the Senate.

Does the Senator from Nevada agree with that?

Mr. BROWN. I certainly do.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. At the bottom of page 50 of the book, The Vanishing Rights of the States—and I might digress to say that the great State of Nevada is one of the great States which believes in State's rights—Dr. Beck further states:

It is, however, equally clear, that the act which would justify his expulsion, must have taken place since his election. What he did prior to his election and qualification has been passed upon by the people of his State. In a political sense, it is res adjudicata. A candidate for the Senate might have been guilty of embezzlement before his election, but the right of the people of that State to send an embezzler to the Senate, if it sees fit, is clear. Such decision is the sole right of the State.

Does the distinguished Senator from Nevada agree with that statement?

Mr. BROWN. I certainly do agree with that statement.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. At the middle of page 51 of the book, The Vanishing Rights of the States, Dr. Beck has this to say:

To permit the Senate to expel a Senator on the ground that, before his election, he had either been a fool or a knave, would revolutionize our theory of constitutional government. All this had been passed upon before the Constitution was framed in the great John Wilkes controversy.

Does the Senator agree with that conclusion?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I agree with that conclusion.

Mr. WELKER. Now inviting my distinguished colleague's attention to page 54 of the book, I ask him if he is familiar with and agrees with, the quotation contained therein, as follows:

The author has thus quoted every pertinent provision of the Constitution. Reading them together, it seems too clear for argument, that each State has the right to select from its people any representative in the Senate that it sees fit, irrespective of his intellectual or moral qualifications, and that the only limitations upon such choice are, that he shall be 30 years of age, a citizen of the United States for at least 9 years, an inhabitant of the State, and that he shall not hold any office under the United States, and that he shall not have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof, unless in the latter contingency,

the Congress, by a vote of two-thirds, shall remove such disability.

Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I agree with that statement as a definite statement of what the law is. However, we know that there may be instances of a person elected by the people being so morally unfit, or so ill, or so insane, as to jeopardize the legislative function of the Senate, which might possibly, after his being seated, but not before, indicate the necessity for expulsion.

Mr. WELKER. I should not think that a censure resolution would be adopted as to an insane man or as to one suffering from a similar disability. Such a situation would come under article I, section 5, of the Constitution, which permits expulsion from the Senate by a two-thirds vote.

If the Senator will yield further, I should like to invite his attention to page 54 of the learned discourse on constitutional law, as it relates to the problem before this quasi-judicial body today. I ask the Senator if he agrees with the following quotation from Dr. Beck:

The people of the United States may justifiably think that the State has sent to Congress an unfit man, who could add nothing to its deliberations, and whose influence may well be pernicious. Nonetheless, the State has the right to send him. It is its sole concern, and to nullify its choice is to destroy the basic right of a sovereign State, and amounts to a revolution.

Does the Senator from Nevada agree with Dr. Beck upon that fundamental constitutional question?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, my answer is "Yes."

Mr. WELKER. If the Senator will yield further, Mr. President, I should like to ask him one more question. At the top of page 55 appears the following:

The State may send a representative to the Senate who has the intellectual ability of Webster and the unimpeachable morality of George Washington, but he may be a member of a political party which, at the time, is in a minority. If the Senate rejects such a man it is possible that the plain usurpation of the power of the State cannot be questioned in any judicial proceeding. The sole remedy may be, as in the case of John Wilkes, in an appeal to the people, but while the victim might represent the majority of the people of his State, his party's representation in the Senate might well be only a minority, and thus, the right of one State to select its own representative could be nullified as long as a majority of the Senate, composed of the representatives of other States, saw fit to refuse his credentials, or as long as two-thirds of the Senate saw fit to expel him.

If such a power exists, then the greatest of all States' rights has become little more than a "scrap of paper."

Does the Senator from Nevada agree with that conclusion?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I subscribe to that conclusion.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator for having yielded to me.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator from Nevada and the Senate will indulge me, before I address a question or two to the Senator from Nevada, I should like to say that I think the debate has been immeasurably enriched by the scholarly approach to the question made by the Senator from Nevada. I may further say that the speech which the Senator from Nevada is making must impress all who have heard it with the feeling that we can only regret that the services of the Senator from Nevada will be available to the Senate for such a short time. He is making a scholarly and able contribution to the question now before the Senate.

I should like to point out a few facts by way of questions in order that we may have the Senator's comments thereon. First, with respect to the interrogations of the Senator from Idaho, the Senator from Nevada, of course, realizes that the quotations recently cited related to expulsions, and that the issue before the Senate relates to censure and not expulsion. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if he has given consideration to the paragraphs which appear at page 30 of the committee report, in which it is stated:

The reelection of Senator McCARTHY in 1952 did not settle these matters.

For the sake of brevity, I skip the first paragraph which follows and read the next one:

Some of the questions, notably the use for private purposes of funds contributed for fighting communism, were not raised until after the election. The people of Wisconsin could pass only upon what was known to them.

That is the first statement in the report to which I desired to invite attention. The second one is in the following paragraph:

Nor do we believe that the reelection of Senator McCARTHY by the people of Wisconsin in the fall of 1952 pardons his conduct toward the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. The charge is that Senator McCARTHY was guilty of contempt of the Senate or a senatorial committee. Necessarily, this is a matter for the Senate, and the Senate alone. The people of Wisconsin can only pass upon issues before them; they cannot forgive an attack by a Senator upon the integrity of the Senate's processes and its committees. That is the business of the Senate.

Did the Senator from Nevada note that paragraph; and if so, what would be his comment?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada did note the paragraph, but I might point out in that connection that the implied power given to this body to censure, which is found in article I, section 5, of the Constitution, can be used only to punish in instances where it would be necessary to preserve the legislative function, as set forth in Marshall against Gordon.

It would appear that the matter brought to our attention by the Senator from South Dakota, as contained in the report of the select committee, on page 30, misconceives the purpose of censure or punishment in its relation to the preservation of the legislative function by

substituting therefor a criterion which must be expressed by the language itself in the last sentence of paragraph 13 on that page:

The people of Wisconsin can only pass upon issues before them; they cannot forgive an attack by a Senator upon the integrity of the Senate's processes and its committees. That is the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, in answer, let me suggest one other concept: Throughout the report of the select committee, I believe that the committee, being absolutely fair, and its integrity being beyond question, carefully considered the brief of Mr. Williams, as well as the advice and memorandum of the select committee's own staff. But I believe it was assumed that an attack in the form of a vigorous denunciation of a Member of the Senate or a Senate committee is synonymous with an attack upon the legislative process, and therefore must be censured or denounced in the interest of preservation of the legislative process.

Inasmuch as the junior Senator from Wisconsin may have made a written or oral attack upon the subcommittee or upon a Member of the Senate, it would seem from the debate, as it has developed thus far, that the burden of the select committee or of the proponents of censure is to demonstrate that what the junior Senator from Wisconsin is alleged to have done did impede—and in that respect I agree with the Senator from South Dakota—the processes of the Senate as a whole, acting by and through its committee machinery.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nevada that I appreciate very much that throughout his argument he has recognized that the conduct complained of, whether it be physical conduct or derogatory language, must impede the legislative processes of the Senate in order to constitute a sound basis for censure. All through the debate I have tried to make clear that it seemed to me that the critical question for us to consider was the one propounded by counsel for Senator McCARTHY, namely—and this is the test—"Did the conduct obstruct or impede the legislative process?"

We are, as the Senator from Nevada has so well pointed out, dealing with a problem where we have no fixed, written rule or standard by which to measure senatorial conduct. We must rely upon the inherent right of self-preservation carried in the constitutional power of either House of Congress to make its rules and to punish Members for disorderly conduct.

What is disorderly conduct? Personally, I believe a reliable guide can be found by asking three questions:

Did the conduct or the derogatory language obstruct or tend to obstruct the legislative process?

Did it corrupt or tend to corrupt the legislative process?

Did it destroy or tend to destroy the legislative process?

And, if we carry the question through to other phases, we could ask, Does the conduct of the Senator in question, representing the Senate, tend to destroy the

proper relationships between the executive and legislative branches or between the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government?

But in this case we are dealing with conduct with respect to a senatorial committee. So the question here is, Did the failure of Senator McCARTHY to appear before the Gillette-Hennings subcommittee and did his derogatory language impede the subcommittee's performance of its function?

I have before me part II of the hearings, and I now invite attention to page 45 of the appendix, which reproduces the report of the Gillette-Hennings subcommittee. Without taking time to read all the several questions to be found at that point, I invite the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the last sentence in the center of page 45, just before the heading "Conclusions and Recommendations." There we find the following sentence:

Only Senator McCARTHY or Mr. Kiermas can supply the answers.

Then we find that the next section is headed "Conclusions and Recommendations," and begins with the following paragraph:

The subcommittee itself is not making any recommendations in this matter. The record should speak for itself. The issue raised is one for the entire Senate.

That report was submitted to the Senate with the opening of the 83d Congress. The subcommittee had no opportunity to present the report to the 82d Congress, and it was submitted on the eve of the opening of the 83d Congress. The subcommittee said it could not obtain the answers, and said that only Senator McCARTHY or his assistant could supply the answers.

I may say there are several other instances along that line.

So I wish to repeat and emphasize the first sentence of the subcommittee's "Conclusions and Recommendations," as follows:

The subcommittee itself is not making any recommendations in this matter. The record should speak for itself. The issue raised is one for the entire Senate.

In other words, the Hennings subcommittee found itself unable to make recommendations, because it could not obtain the answers. That is the position which I felt the subcommittee expressed, and I think that is what impressed the select committee, namely, that the net effect of the repeated failure of Senator McCARTHY to appear before the subcommittee—and I have readily accepted the idea that there was not a legal contempt in that instance; there was no due notice to him, or time for him to appear, and so forth; and I so stated some time ago—the net effect of Senator McCARTHY'S repeated failure to appear before the subcommittee by a given date, coupled with his denunciation of the Gillette-Hennings subcommittee, constituted, finally, a situation in which the subcommittee found itself powerless to resolve the question which had been referred to it, and to which its jurisdiction had been affirmed by the Senate as a whole by the vote of 60 to 0.

So the Gillette-Hennings subcommittee found itself unable to obtain the answers; and thus the subcommittee stated in the Conclusions and Recommendations:

The subcommittee itself is not making any recommendations in this matter. The record should speak for itself. The issue raised is one for the entire Senate.

So the subcommittee presented its report on the eve of the opening of the 83d Congress. Thus, as a practical matter, the only opportunity the Senate has had to consider the report or to consider the failure of the subcommittee to resolve the issues before was in the 83d Congress, with the Senate being a continuing body.

What would the Senator from Nevada say with respect to the Hennings subcommittee: Was the subcommittee able to function; or did the conduct of the Senator from Wisconsin impede or obstruct the functioning of the subcommittee, under the responsibilities assigned to it in 1952?

Mr. BROWN. First, Mr. President, let me ask a question of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, before I endeavor to answer his question: Is the Gillette subcommittee still in being?

Mr. CASE. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections is still in being; and the personnel which constituted the Gillette subcommittee, or perhaps I should say the Hennings subcommittee, because Senator HENNINGS was chairman of it at the time when the report was submitted, continued over to the 83d Congress. Rule XXV of the Senate provides that each standing committee shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed. Even so, the issue involved in the question the Senator raises bothered me somewhat during our hearings. So I tried to find whether the subcommittee actually functioned after the 83d Congress opened. We were told it did function in various ways after the election of 1952. Its parent committee proceeded to function after the opening of the 83d Congress until successor members were named. Pursuing this point one very salient fact was developed under questioning by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. It was that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration in the 82d Congress, continued to serve as chairman of that committee during the early days and preliminary organization of the 83d Congress; and at the end of January 1953—during the first month of the 83d Congress—he signed the payroll for the employees of that committee. So the committee had continued in being, and was recognized by the disbursing of funds for services in January on vouchers approved by the old committee at the end of January 1953.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, let me answer in the following manner the question propounded by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota: Those matters were considered in connection with the preparation of my argument in this debate. However, there are two outstanding considerations which impress me tremendously in respect to the mat-

ters to which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has referred. The first is that the Hennings-Gillette subcommittee itself at no time sought any further assistance, either by way of discipline or by way of cooperation, from the Senate as a whole.

A further outstanding fact, which would appear to be most relevant to the ultimate issue, is that the junior Senator from Wisconsin was permitted to be seated in the 83d Congress without objection.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that I think both those points are points which are entitled to consideration. However, it should be pointed out that at the time the junior Senator from Wisconsin was seated at the opening of the 83d Congress, the question was raised as to whether or not the seating should be without prejudice with respect to two other Members, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], as I recall. At least, the question was raised.

The late very much beloved and respected Senator Taft, who was then majority leader, took the position that the Senators referred to could be seated; but whether or not it was stipulated to be without prejudice, the seating would not constitute a bar against any proceeding which might subsequently be instituted. Whether or not the decision with respect to the two Senators whose names were brought up at the time had any bearing upon the attitude of the members of the Hennings subcommittee, I do not know; but I assumed at the time that the principle was applicable to Senators generally, and that if there was anything pending the door would not be closed by their having been seated.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly we must agree that apparently the precedent has been that the seating of a Senator after election does not close the door to further inquiry, which might result in expulsion or other punishment. But let me suggest that there is no connection between the censure resolution and the impeding of the legislative functions of this body. The implementation in this case has come from other sources. I am thinking of the initiation of the Benton resolution, and the initiation of the bill of particulars by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. Unless the conduct complained of can properly be tied up with an immediate, definite, provocative type of conduct which, if not censured or punished, would interfere with or impede our legislative function, it would seem that we have established a new rule, under which we assume something which never existed—a rule which, at any time charges might be pending against a Senator before any committee, would require him to seek out evidence and volunteer to disprove the charges, regardless of how irresponsible they might be, or whether or not they were made for the purpose of defeating his particular function of acting in the Senate as an effective representative of the people of his State.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that I think he has again placed his finger upon a very important point. If charges could be capriciously raised against a Senator in order to impede him in his conduct as a Senator, or as chairman of a Senate committee, it would be an unfortunate day for the Senate.

I recognize also that there is some force in the suggestion that the Senate slept on its rights, so to speak, in not acting earlier in this matter. I do not attempt to justify that lack of action. I had nothing to do with bringing up the question or initiating the charges. Senators who sponsored the resolution or amendments to it did so on their own responsibility. So far as the Senator from South Dakota was concerned, he was busy with other matters, and he did not feel any responsibility on his part.

However, it must be remembered that when the Hennings subcommittee made its report, it specifically stated "The issue raised is one for the entire Senate."

The Senate did not take up the issue immediately. It was taken up only as a result of the initiative of the Senators to whom the Senator from Nevada has referred. Nevertheless, the issue did come before us. Some of us, who were perfectly willing, apparently, to be indifferent to the situation, and who were busy with other things and were not identified with the matter, were, for that reason, assigned the task of serving on the select committee. The next time anything like this arises, perhaps Members of the Senate will take notice and see that they make some expression which would disqualify them from service on a select committee.

Be that as it may, the issue was raised for the Senate as a whole, according to the statement in the Hennings subcommittee report which I have cited. So, although there was delay, although there was not a clear case of legal contempt because of the lack of adequate notice, time to appear, and so forth, it did appear to the members of the select committee that there was an impeding of the legislative process, and that the Hennings subcommittee was not able to function, which fact it reported to the Senate. Finally the issue was presented in Senate Resolution 301.

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

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all, if the Senator will permit it, I should very much like, as the neighbor of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, to pay my respects to him and to tell him that he has made a fine contribution to the discussions which are taking place on the floor of the Senate today.

In line with the question asked earlier by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I should like to understand, if I may, exactly what the conclusion of the Senator is with respect to the power of the Senate to sit in judgment on a fellow Senator for any acts which occurred prior to the time of the session

in which the Senate is asked to take positive action.

I simplify the question by asking it in this form: In the judgment of the Senator, does the Senate have the right to expel a Member for any acts which the Member is alleged to have committed prior to the convening of that particular session of the Congress?

Mr. BROWN. The precedents from the earliest times are clear and easily understood in respect to the House of Representatives, for the simple reason that the sessions definitely begin and definitely end. There are precedents—and I believe the ruling of the Parliamentarian of this body is to the same effect—which hold that the Senate is a continuing body. However, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from California that the real facet of that question is this: Does the Senate have jurisdiction to punish at this late date the acts complained of in Senate Resolution 301, irrespective of the fact that the Senate may be a continuing body, in that we may consider that it has continued from the 82d through the 83d Congress?

Mr. KUCHEL. I appreciate that point, but I am now speaking in the abstract. I ask the Senator whether, in his judgment, the constitutional authority to expel is proscribed in any fashion, so that the time of commission of the alleged acts, upon which an expulsion could be based, would be relevant to the power of the Senate to take action to expel a Member?

Mr. BROWN. My answer would be, based on Marshall against Gordon, that if we assume that the power to expel or to otherwise punish is limited to the preservation of the legislative function, then certainly it would be definitely immaterial, in respect to that preservation, to expel or to endeavor to punish a Senator during the 83d Congress for something that may have occurred in the 82d Congress, irrespective of whether the Senate be a continuing legislative body.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion at this point?

Mr. BROWN. I am glad to do so.

Mr. CASE. If I may, I should like to recall for the immediate purpose the further point which was made by the late Senator Taft at the opening of the 83d Congress. It was to the effect that in the Langer case the conduct in question was conduct which had occurred prior to the then most recent election of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and that if the issue had been whether the Senator from North Dakota should be seated, when the Senator from North Dakota presented himself to be sworn in, a simple majority vote sufficed. The Senate, by a majority vote, however, decided that a two-thirds vote should be required, the same as in the case of an expulsion on the grounds that the conduct occurred prior to the election of the Senator from North Dakota.

Therefore it was explicit that the Senate could expel a Senator by a two-thirds vote on the basis of conduct which had taken place prior to the election.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to permit me

to ask a question of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BROWN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. With respect to expulsion, therefore, if the conclusion of the Senate in the instance cited is a precedent, there was absent at that time any indication that the legislative process had been abused or impeded. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE. I would assume that there was. Of course, there are two different clauses in the constitutional provision on this matter. One provides for punishment for disorderly behavior. As has been pointed out previously, the power to censure is derived from the right to punish for disorderly behavior. The power of expulsion is covered in a subsequent clause in the Constitution which provides that a two-thirds vote is required to expel a Member.

However, I raised the question as to whether a two-thirds vote should be required in this instance on count No. 1, in view of the fact that the conduct complained of did antedate the swearing in of Senator McCARTHY on January 3, 1953. I believe that question is still pending. The Parliamentarian took the question under advisement, and a ruling has not been called for. However, I believe it is a legitimate question for the Senate to consider. I am glad the Senator from California has raised the question.

If the Senate at one time, in the Langer case, by majority vote, held that it wished to set the precedent that in dealing with conduct occurring prior to a current term a two-thirds vote should be required in the case of expulsion, the Senate may wish to say now that a two-thirds vote should be required in this instance for censure of conduct complained of, which conduct antedates the current term of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. I do not know the wishes of the Senate in this regard but it is a fair question.

There is one point that ought to be kept in mind, if we are to be absolutely fair. Although the Senate is a continuing body, the junior Senator from Wisconsin in this instance was not a continuing Senator. That is, his conduct in 1952 was not conduct which occurred in the term in which he is now serving as a Senator. He was sworn in as a Senator on January 3, 1953. Therefore he was not a continuing Senator from the 82d to the 83d Congress. If that point has a bearing on the question before the Senate, I believe we should consider it very carefully.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like first of all to say to my friend from South Dakota that I was presiding at the time he raised the parliamentary question. It was I who referred the question to the Parliamentarian.

Mr. CASE. I recall that and appreciate the action of the Senator as Presiding Officer at that time.

Mr. KUCHEL. In the Constitution the language which is relevant to the question before the Senate reads:

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

I have been considerably bothered by the question whether the Senate can go into what occurred during a prior session with respect to any attempt to punish a Member for disorderly behavior. Probably in this instance, since the right to punish for disorderly behavior is quite separate and apart from the right to punish by way of expulsion, it cannot be said that the right to expel includes the right to punish, since it is specifically dealt with.

However, I do not quite understand the Senator's suggestion, if I state it correctly, that the power to expel or the power to punish can reach back into a prior session, in order to find the necessary basis for action, only if the legislative process was impeded. If he would develop that point a little further, it would be helpful to me.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in the early part of my remarks I pointed out that if the late Senator Patrick A. McCarran were present today, he would indicate what the issues before the Senate amount to.

In answer to the question propounded by the junior Senator from California, let it be remembered that the language of article I, section 5 of the Constitution reads as follows:

Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

There is nothing contained in the article which permits the Senate to censure a Senator. There is nothing contained in the article which indicates that the Senate can find any Senator to be subject to a warrant of arrest for contempt.

However, as pointed out by Mr. Justice White in Marshall against Gordon, the power is implied from the language used in article I, section 5, that the Senate does have a right to preserve order in its legislative proceedings.

Returning to the specific question, the endeavor is not to expel the junior Senator from Wisconsin. It is to punish him for certain alleged disorderly behavior.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator will yield to me briefly.

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Nevada, who has been a Member of the Senate for only a short time, for what, in my opinion, is a wonderful contribution to the debate.

There is more involved in the debate than personalities. Under the Constitution, the Senate itself is involved in this particular matter. I do not see any reason whatever for discussing the right of expulsion. We are not trying to expel the junior Senator from Wisconsin because he did something contrary to the rules of the Senate or the dignity of the Senate. We are approaching it from another angle completely. It is whether we have the authority and the right to scold him or to censure him because he may have expressed an opinion that does not appeal to some of us. I would be one of those. Nevertheless, I believe the Senator from Nevada is making a wonderful

contribution in his dissertation on the rights and the dignity of the Senate. There is only one State in the Union that can expel the junior Senator from Wisconsin, and that is the State of Wisconsin. Pennsylvania cannot do it; Nevada cannot do it; California cannot do it. Only the State of Wisconsin can do it. I hope the Senator from Nevada will continue with that thought in mind.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I know the hour is getting late, and I shall close as rapidly as may be possible.

The real issue before the Senate is whether we shall determine that we must be so self-disciplined that, under the rule of law, we shall apply punishment only as it may be required to preserve the order of the Senate and the legislative processes of this body.

We have rule XIX, which is sufficient immediately to preserve order in this body. If it be necessary to go further than that, we certainly can punish for contempt, provided we do not relegate to ourselves the judicial function of conducting a criminal trial. That is exactly what it would seem to amount to if we let prior acts, in no way concerned with or related to the job we are supposed to do, govern us in our action.

Mr. President, the scope and limitations of the investigating power of Congress have been the subject of debate and investigation by the American Bar Association and the public at large. The 1954 Ross essay contest conducted by the American Bar Association was directed to this very subject. The winning essay published in the September issue, 1954, of the American Bar Journal, page 763, collected all of the Supreme Court cases on the subject matter, and it is apparent that the Federal courts from the time of the first House congressional investigation in 1792 have upheld the power of Congress to investigate any facts which Congress may require in the discharge of its legislative function, granted to it by the Federal Constitution. And where objections have been made by individuals compelled to testify before committees of Congress, the overall presumption has always been indulged in by the courts that the committees in carrying out the investigations were obtaining facts directly or indirectly related to the legislative function of Congress.

The very issues we are debating on the floor of the Senate was the subject of a debate in August of this year before the house of delegates of the American Bar Association. The committee proposed a resolution and code to be adopted by Congress pertaining to investigation procedure. In that debate Hatton W. Summers, of Texas, a distinguished former Member of Congress, and one of the most able constitutional lawyers in America today, had this to say concerning the proposed code and resolution, pointing out that he did not see how a congressional committee could properly conduct its business with the handicaps the code would throw in the way:

When you handicap the House and the Senate in trying to get the knowledge they must have in order to properly legislate, you are doing a tremendously important and

dangerous thing. It is necessary to have the facts, and you had better leave them—they may abuse their powers sometimes—but you had better leave your agents so that they will be free and able to get the facts which they in their judgment need in order to properly legislate.

It should be clear that section 2 of Senate Resolution 301, recommending censure for the alleged abuse of General Zwicker, is no longer an issue in the Senate in view of the additional facts disclosed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

However, let us briefly consider the danger of such a count in a censure resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Before the Senator from Nevada proceeds to count 2, let me say that I have been tremendously interested in his speech; it is one of the ablest addresses I have heard on this general subject matter delivered in the Senate since the discussion began. The Senator is to be complimented upon the research which has been done and upon presenting the facts to the Senate. I am only sorry that all Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle have not been present at all times to hear his remarks, and I hope they will have the opportunity of reading them tomorrow before the debate is resumed, and if they have any questions, they may propound them.

I should like to ask the Senator if I understand him correctly in regard to count 1, relative to the charges growing out of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, whether it is his viewpoint that, first of all, though the Senate is a continuing body for certain purposes at least, and has been generally so considered by the Senate itself, all the Members of it are not continuing Members. In other words, one-third of the Senate comes up for reelection each 2 years, and, therefore, they are not continuing in the sense that the other two-thirds continue. Second, whether it is the Senator's viewpoint that where misconduct has taken place in a prior Congress it is up to the Senate of that Congress to inflict such discipline as in its judgment might be warranted, rather than to pass on the responsibility to a subsequent Senate.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in the light of the implications of Marshall against Gordon, if there be conduct impeding either the Senate or its committees in the discharge of their functions, the remedy must be sought now, not subsequently, regardless of whether, for some purposes, the Senate be a continuing body.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It in part answers it. In addition to that the point might be raised that when a Senator is elected for a term of years and his candidacy is normally resubmitted to the voters of his State each 6 years, unless he happens to have received a short term which may have run for 2 years or 4 years, as the case might be, but having submitted his candidacy to the voters of the State and

they having passed upon it, and the Senator having presented himself at the bar of the Senate to seek admission under his new credentials, if the question has not been raised by that time a certain statute of limitations runs, speaking as a newspaperman and not as a lawyer. Let us consider the Langer case in 1941 when the Senate had the question before it of whether a Member should be permitted to sit or should be expelled. They determined by their vote that he would not be expelled.

But it is inconceivable, unless there were some application of the statute of limitations, that Senators could go back to 1941, dig out material, and determine that they wanted to introduce a resolution of censure. There must be some termination date; otherwise, depending upon the whims of a temporary majority, they might continue to fish out of the past whatever might please a transient majority. Is that the point of view of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BROWN. That is exactly my point of view.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the statute of limitations has definitely been established in the House of Representatives, because it has been held, time and time again, that where the conduct consists of actions committed at a prior session, subsequent discipline is normally considered to be beyond the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives. The effort is, if the rule of law is applied in the manner suggested, to do exactly that, because by what token can we, under the Constitution, punish the junior Senator from Wisconsin for something which he allegedly did in a prior session, and which is in no way connected with the functions of any committee, or the functions, actions, or legitimate powers to be exercised by the 83d Congress?

But the most important result of censure would be the instilling of the fear on the part of any committee member or any committee chairman that if he in the heat of debate were to exceed the bounds of reason and prudence, it would be possible through censure to emasculate the powers of the committee in obtaining the necessary information which we, the Members of the Senate, may deem necessary for the fulfillment of our legislative functions.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the adoption of Senate Resolution 301 would establish the following specific results:

(a) It would foreclose the Senate's power to get the facts from a hostile executive or other branch of the Government.

(b) It would, by recognizing ex post facto rules, relegate judicial functions to the Senate, and enable the enemies of America to preclude investigation. No chairman or no member of a committee would ever take a chance on offending anyone, as it might result in censure.

(c) There is no need for a new code or censure, as witnesses are well protected now by the Constitution.

(d) It would defeat the will of the people by curtailing their duly elected representative from getting the facts for the people and the Senate, which is so

essential to the fulfillment of the legislative function, given by the Constitution.

Let us ask ourselves, would the defeat of the resolution mean that the Senate was without power to retain its dignity and the integrity of its committees? By no means; for example the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections could have invoked its process compelling appearance, then could have pursued the course prescribed by law as for contempt if the witness failed to appear.

I am assuming that that is a conclusion which the select committee reached when they said that under the Reorganization Act they had the power to compel the attendance of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

As a further example, when the junior Senator from Wisconsin spoke from the floor of the Senate, rule XIX could have been invoked, rather than subsequent censure, as suggested by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. President, for the reasons I have given—and I feel confident that if the late senior Senator from Nevada, Mr. McCarran, were present in the front row across the aisle, he would say what I am about to say—I shall be compelled, if permitted to do so, to vote against censure, as to do otherwise would constitute a violation of my oath of office.

RECESS TO 2 O'CLOCK P. M.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until the hour of 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BUTLER in the chair).

RESOLUTION OF CENSURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 301) to censure the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in calling the quorum not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Abel	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Barrett	Ervin	Johnson, Tex.
Bennett	Ferguson	Johnson, S. C.
Bridges	Flanders	Kefauver
Brown	Frear	Kerr
Bush	Fulbright	Kilgore
Butler	George	Knowland
Byrd	Gillette	Kuchel
Carlson	Goldwater	Langer
Case	Green	Lehman
Chavez	Hayden	Long
Clements	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Cooper	Hennings	Mansfield
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Martin
Cotton	Hill	McCarthy
Daniel, S. C.	Holland	McClellan
Dirksen	Hruska	Millikin
Duff	Ives	Monroney
Dworshak	Jackson	Mundt
Eastland	Jenner	Murray

Neely	Saltonstall	Symington
O'Mahoney	Schoeppel	Thye
Payne	Scott	Watkins
Potter	Smith, Maine	Welker
Purtell	Smith, N. J.	Williams
Robertson	Sparkman	Young
Russell	Stennis	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President—
Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. That will be ample. (Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Senate in further reference to his Open Letter to the Russian People. His remarks appear in today's RECORD following the earlier debate on that subject.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—
Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have already, on several occasions, spoken on the subject under consideration. I do not intend to speak very long today. However, I should like to make a few observations before the vote is taken.

At the outset I wish to pay tribute to the select committee as a whole, and especially to the chairman, who did such an outstanding piece of work in presenting this case to the Senate.

The committee had a distasteful duty to perform. All the members of the committee performed that duty in a statesmanlike manner, and the entire Nation owes them a debt of gratitude. My faith in our system of government, and especially in the Senate, was revived and strengthened by the manner in which the members of the committee conducted themselves in this difficult undertaking. Those Senators demonstrated how a committee should be conducted. So out of these hearings the Senate will have learned both how a committee should be conducted and how a committee should not be conducted. Therefore I think these proceedings may be of value in the future.

I wish to pay a very special tribute to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

We owe a special debt to the distinguished chairman of the committee. We are indebted to him for the manner in which he retained control over the hearings. I confess that last August, when this question arose, I was very dubious about the ability of anyone to cope with the junior Senator from Wisconsin in a committee hearing. I do not think anyone had done so successfully prior to the hearings before the select committee.

We are also indebted to the senior Senator from Utah for the magnificent way in which he presented this complex and difficult subject to the Senate. In all my experience in the Senate I have never heard a more moving speech, or one delivered with greater dignity and conviction.

Lastly, we are indebted to the chairman because, as the agent of this body, designated by the Senate to perform this onerous task he was personally subjected to the vilest kind of abuse. He took that abuse on our behalf, so he deserves not only our sympathy, but also vindication by the vote of the Senate, if the Senate has any honor and self-respect left.

If there were no other reason to vote for the resolution of censure, the attempted intimidation of the chairman—and, through him, of the Senate—by the junior Senator from Wisconsin would be ample reason for the censure.

Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from an article published in the Arkansas Gazette of November 24, 1954. It is a reprint of an article written by Bob Fisher, editor of the Crossett News-Observer, and published in a recent issue of that newspaper. It relates to an incident which the Senate should know about. Perhaps it knows about it already. I shall read only a part of it, but I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I quote only a part of it, as follows:

Historians in future generations will surely accord a large place to the tolerance and patience of the American taxpayer—because as we were again shown this week—it is a marvel to behold.

This is Bob Fisher, the editor of the Crossett News-Observer writing:

What brought this fact to light was the receipt of a 20-page booklet from Senator JOE McCARTHY, entitled "Throw the Bum Out," which is composed entirely of excerpts from the Daily Worker, Communist Party propaganda organ published in New York. We are not sure who paid the huge cost of publishing this piece, but we sort of think it was the same fellow who paid the mailing charges on it—namely, you, you, and you, Mr. Average Taxpayer.

Now we don't have any particular quarrel with Senator McCARTHY and what he sends through the mails, if it is information for his own people of Wisconsin, but we think he is carrying his Government free-mailing privilege a bit too far when he mails pieces like this to literally thousands of newspapers all over the United States to try and influence them in his behalf.

The remainder of the article discusses the pamphlet. Apparently it did not make a very favorable impression on the editor of the Crossett News-Observer. I may say that Crossett is a relatively small but progressive town in the southern part of my State. The article, naturally, was well received by the junior Senator from Arkansas.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

McCARTHY: ALL IS NOT RED THAT BRISTLES

The myth that anti-McCarthyism must be considered as synonymous with procommunism was examined last week by an Arkansas editor, Bob Fisher of the Crossett News-Observer:

"Historians in future generations will surely accord a large place to the tolerance and patience of the American taxpayer—be-

cause as we were again shown this week—it is a marvel to behold.

"What brought this fact to light was the receipt of a 20-page booklet from Senator JOE McCARTHY, entitled 'Throw the Bum Out,' which is composed entirely of excerpts from the Daily Worker, Communist Party propaganda organ published in New York. We are not sure who paid the huge cost of publishing this piece, but we sort of think it was the same fellow who paid the mailing charges on it—namely you, you, and you, Mr. Average Taxpayer.

"Now we don't have any particular quarrel with Senator McCARTHY and what he sends through the mails, if it is information for his own people of Wisconsin, but we think he is carrying his Government free-mailing privilege a bit too far when he mails pieces like this to literally thousands of newspapers all over the United States to try and influence them in his behalf.

"Getting back to the booklet in question. It is composed of stories and pictures taken from the Daily Worker to show how much they hate Joe. The inference is that if you hate Joe, too, then you must also be a Communist. If this line of reasoning is true then the ranks of the Communist Party will be swollen overnight. The tactic is one that Joe has used often—that of guilty by association. In short he says, you are either for me or against me. If you are against me then you are anti-American. Nothing could be further from the truth, and if Joe was as well schooled in the fundamental ideals of his native land as he is in its investigative powers, he would know it.

"The mailing of the booklet referred to was timed to coincide with the opening of the Senate censure hearings about Joe's very fitness to sit in the world's highest governing body and no doubt many persons were swayed by it to believe that it would be criminal for us to publicly spank a Senator whom the Communists have so little taste for.

"Perhaps this is true but we still believe that the treasures of our American ideals and liberties must be zealously guarded from all corners and from the manner Senator McCARTHY has conducted himself in the past there is little choice between his methods and these of the Communists. In short if your pocket is robbed it makes little difference who does it, the person is still a thief."

The cost to taxpayers of the McCarthy censure spectacle also was taken up by Bradford Govan of the Melbourne Times:

"Along with a lot of other 'junk' I get in my mail, I received one of those 'Ten Millions Americans' petitions in support of McCARTHY, that so-called Senator from Wisconsin.

"If there has ever been a waste of taxpayers' money, this McCarthy censure thing tops them all. Russia could take over the country while the Senate tosses this thing around.

"It is time that the Senators stand up and be counted and then drop the whole darn thing—then maybe the voters in Wisconsin will drop their junior Senator in the election."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I now wish to pass to another aspect of the subject.

Criticism, vigorous and personal, is a characteristic of public life in our democratic system. All of us are accustomed to it. I do not believe that I am any more thin skinned than any of my colleagues. However, formerly criticism was based on legitimate differences of opinion about issues before the Senate. Of late, especially since the censure resolution came before the Senate, the character of the criticism has changed. It

is no longer criticism. It is unadulterated hate, vituperation, and abuse. It is highly emotional, irrational, and designed to intimidate and overawe Members of the Senate.

I shall read into the RECORD a few communications which I have before me as examples of the character of what has come to be known as McCarthyism. The junior Senator from Wisconsin, by his reckless charges, has so preyed upon the fears and hatred of uninformed and credulous people that he has started a prairie fire, which neither he nor anyone else may be able to control.

If there are 10 million people in this country similar to the authors of these letters, I believe it is something about which all of us ought to be deeply concerned.

I may say that I have received thousands of similar communications. Some of them are so vile that I cannot use them. I shall leave it to Senators to judge the significance of these letters.

The first letter is from San Antonio, Tex., and is signed by G. G. Gurley, president, Chemical Attraction Oil Corp. In a postscript it is stated that a copy of the letter has been sent to Senator McCARTHY. The letter is dated November 19, 1954, and reads as follows:

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., November 19, 1954.
Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, or Notbright,
Care of Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have asked Senator McCARTHY to help us get your name changed to "Notbright" instead of FULBRIGHT. Also, we have asked Mr. McCARTHY to help get you in insane asylum for your safety as a New Deal associated with 20 years of treason. You are judged by the company you keep. You have been a party to the Roosevelt-Truman-Acheson-Hiss gang of traitors for 20 years or more, as per the records I get. We shall ask Senator McCARTHY to investigate you and your leftwing gang of traitors. As per the records, your passed life has not been perfect. When you joined the only Jew to vote against 76 Senators, that proved you were the henchmen for the Jew Deal. H. H. LEHMAN should be deported out of this Nation to Russia, or let Germany take that "bird" in and give him the gas like Hitler did, as per my opinion of his record. We know there is always some crackpot fronting for the Jew, in this case it sounds like its you, as per Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr. I'm for McCARTHY 100 percent like 80 percent of the American people are. When you are up for reelection we want McCARTHY to campaign in Arkansas against you. There will be many Senators defeated in 1956 on that very thing, McCarthyism. McCARTHY is the biggest man in the United States Senate today and you can't defeat him. We are working to get 10 million names, or more, who will work against you leftwingers and the fake New Dealers and traitors. We mean to save America if we have to jail the workers against our Government. All this graft in income tax, housing, mink coats, 5-percenters, Hissism, et al. of some un-Americanism, etc. are fronting for the Jew as per their records. You and your gang of 20 years of treason, put us in three wars. Your Truman-Acheson-Hiss war was promoted to get Truman-Acheson off the hook to prevent a panic. They never intended to permit MacArthur to win that war as you well know. You and your gang put us in debt up to near \$275 billion. As you know, Truman was a Pendergast gangster. That's the record of that faker and traitor as you know. When McCARTHY gets out of the hospital he should get you told. We will

back him 100 percent if he will take you out to the woodshed and give you the paddle.

Yours very truly,

G. G. GURLEY,
President, Chemical Attraction Oil Corp.
P. S.—A copy to Senator McCARTHY.

Mr. Gurley encloses for my information an article by Mr. David Lawrence, and another article by Mr. Pegler, which I shall not burden the RECORD by reading, unless some Senator would like that done.

That letter is one example. I think it is very revealing.

I have another letter before me. It comes from Laverne, Okla. It is dated November 24, 1954, and is signed by Mrs. George T. Whitaker. It reads, in part, as follows:

Every person that fights those that are trying to rid our (?) Government and Nation of the Reds, all shades are branded with Russia's red stick.

In other words, Mr. President, I take it that everyone who does not agree with the junior Senator from Wisconsin is a Red.

I shall not read all of the letter. I ask unanimous consent, however, that the entire text of the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, so that there will be no mistake about the contents of the letter.

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

LAVERNE, OKLA., November 24, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT:

Every person that fights those that are trying to rid our (?) Government and Nation of the Reds, all shades are branded with Russia's red stick. They need a good dose of salvation, so they will act like upright men instead of spoiled children.

Next year 8 Senators will be chosen to study the changing of our Constitution so as to change it in 1956. (Reds again.) We will be worse than slaves. The Devil through the Reds are putting the people asleep.

This Nation is going down. The people have turned their backs on God. Worse now since the Reds have put out the demon possessed New Bible (?). Antichrist is working extra hard these last days. All such will end up in the lake of fire.

It takes backbone to stand up for the right. Few there be that has it. The President is hoodwinked.

As ever,

Mrs. GEO. T. WHITAKER.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will not take the time to read all of the letter, but I shall read another part of it, as follows:

This Nation is going down. The people have turned their backs on God. Worse now since the Reds have put out the demon possessed New Bible (?). Antichrist is working extra hard these last days. All such will end up in the lake of fire.

It takes backbone to stand up for the right. Few there be that has it. The President is hoodwinked.

As ever,

Mrs. GEO. T. WHITAKER.

I have read that kind of letter to show how sad it is for people of that type to be incited by the kind of charges the country has been subjected to for the past 2 or 3 years.

Here is another one, from Philadelphia, Pa., signed "Tufti." It reads as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., November 26, 1954.

SIR: You ask for public support in this phony censure showdown. I am an ex-marine who fought in the South Pacific, to open the gates of this Nation for the commy Jews that Hitler did not kill?

You are one of the phony pinko punks connected with LEHMAN, MORSE, FLANDERS, and BENNETT.

FULBRIGHT, the writing is on the wall, if that great Senator from Wisconsin is censured.

The people of this Nation will take over, and I don't mean ADA or the commy liberals that you and your stooges meet in the capital every evening. Senator Long (Huey) had the Indian sign on a great son from Arkansas, Joe Robinson. The American people are watching you with the halo around you accusing a great American, Hon. JOSEPH McCARTHY, of Wisconsin; why did not the United States Senate censure those corrupt, rotten, racket men like Heflin, Alabama; Robinson, Arkansas; Truman, Missouri; Chavez, New Mexico; Wagner, New York (Whisky Bob); Fulbright, Arkansas.

Stand up in the United States Senate and put this in the RECORD. I will be there watching you.

TUPTI.

[Laughter.]

Here is a rather mild one from Elmhurst, Ill., from Mrs. Barbara B. Crone, which reads as follows:

ELMHURST, ILL., November 18, 1954.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: The resolution to censure Senator McCARTHY should be overwhelmingly defeated. This smear campaign to "get McCARTHY" was devised by the Communist Party, furthered by fellow travelers, aided by people too stupid to think for themselves, and abetted by spineless individuals who will not face the truth. McCARTHY is based on fact and proof, which cannot be said for his accusers. Thinking Americans thank God for McCARTHY, WELKER, JENNER, VELDE. We need many more with their "intelligent fortitude."

Defeat the resolution to censure McCARTHY.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. BARBARA B. CRONE.

P. S.—Have heard on the news this evening that you, along with Senator LEHMAN, voted against adjourning until Senator McCARTHY is out of the hospital and able to be present for the debate on the censure resolution. You certainly have a peculiar sense of fair play, to say the least. But then, the American people have come to expect very little from your breed, so it really is not very surprising.

Here is one from Levittown, Pa., from Mr. John Lavezzoli:

NOVEMBER 21, 1954.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT:

The name assigned to you, Senator Halfbright, is without question proper, especially so, after listening to your comments today.

You stated that you thought this country was not a gone-goose, or words to that effect.

Senator, if people of your type live very much longer, you will see the great Communist conspiracy take over this country, lock, stock, and barrel.

You take the opposite side of Senator KNOWLAND on the question of whether or not we should break off relations with Russia. This, of course, is your proper right, but you evidently have sold out to the Communist thinking. Yes, you should go along with HERBERT LEHMAN, an old hand at subtly pushing for expansion of Com-

munist influences. Keep up the good work, as you certainly will be justly rewarded for all of your misdeeds in your constant neglect to fight to keep this country strong.

At least Senator McCARTHY has always been consistent. He is a great American. He has done more to uncover, expose, and get rid of Communists in Government departments than any other one man in America.

Some unthinking people, including you, Senator Halfbright, say, "Oh, I approve of Senator McCARTHY's objectives, but I do not approve of his methods." Certainly even a Senator Halfbright is not opposed to removing the scum of the earth, the Communist, from our Government. This last statement is just pure assumption, as you may be for the Communist conspiracy. Who knows what is in your heart and mind?

You may even worry more about the communistic press in other countries, with their constant line against McCARTHY. After all, you are only a Senator of the United States of America, so why should you worry about conditions at home?

Under Roosevelt we let the Commies in, under Truman we kept them in, and with the weakling Eisenhower in office we shall continue to keep them in office; yes, with your help, we will destroy all effective steps that possibly could be taken against the Communists in this country, as well as throughout the world.

God help this country, as we surely cannot depend on the likes of you to help clean up this country, keep it for the future generations, so that our children's children will know democracy as we knew it prior to the time that old boy Roosevelt recognized Russia. You, a Democrat, appear to be quite pleased with the election of Senator CASE, of New Jersey. This is what can be expected of a free thinker; always welcome assistance from anyone, even if he is of the opposite party, just so long as he can be counted to work with you and LEHMAN to help keep the Commies in office. We are already well on the road to the loss of all of our democratic principles. Keep up your work for the International Bank, which is part of the Federal Reserve conspiracy. Just keep working with LEHMAN and you surely will become a great Senator, working toward the loss of all of our franchised rights.

May the good Lord, remove you and your type from office in the very near future. Surely the loss to the country will not be great; in fact it might be helpful.

JOHN LAVEZZOLI.

LEVITTOWN, PA.

It is strange, Mr. President, that the supporters of the junior Senator from Wisconsin all seem to think that we are going to be taken over by our enemies. They seem to be pessimists.

Another characteristic is the injection of a rather unrelated idea now and then in these letters. The writer of this one does not explain what the Federal Reserve System has to do with communism.

Here is a letter from Buffalo, N. Y., from Peter Murphy, which reads as follows:

BUFFALO, November 20, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT:

If you knew the contempt the people hold you and HERBERT LEHMAN (Alger Hiss' pal) you wouldn't strut around so cocky. What did you ever do to combat communism? Nothing. You refused to vote one dollar to the McCarty committee. A fine dirty red rat are you.

It's an old saying, and a true one: "Birds of a feather flock together." Who were the birds that voted not to allow Senator McCARTHY time off to recover from his illness? I'll tell you: It was Red loving FULBRIGHT

and the rotten Jew, HERBERT LEHMAN, the pal of Hiss.

Yours truly,

PETER MURPHY,
An Admirer of Senator McCarthy.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair must state to those who are occupying space in the galleries that they must comply with the rules of the Senate. Expressions of approval or disapproval of anything that may be said are not permissible. The Chair kindly requests them to cooperate with us in abiding by the rules.

The Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Some of the writers, Mr. President, do not have as much imagination as others. The next one is very short. It reads:

FULBRIGHT: Tie Hyena MORSE and Jackal LEHMAN around your foul coyote neck and jump into the Potomac.

The next letter I shall omit, because it is a little bit strong in its language.

The next one is from Springfield, Tenn. It begins:

Pseudo Senator SAM ERVIN, Washington, D. C.

I did not notice that. It is a copy of a letter to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. It reads as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, TENN.,
November 17, 1954.

Pseudo Senator SAM ERVIN,
Washington, D. C.:

I have read your tirade against McCARTHY in which you did not utter one word of truth. Your tirade was down the alley of the Daily Worker and 100 percent the voice of that paper. We wonder if the Daily Worker has you in its service. McCarthy haters are Communist lovers. There is no other reason for being a McCarthy defamer. Smoke this in your pipe.

McCARTHY is as much your superior as George Washington was the superior of Benedict Arnold. Same is true of all McCarthy haters.

You impress me as being one of Truman's red herrings. Give you a gentle shove and you would land in the tents of Earl Browder.

Harry Truman sent our boys to start a war in Korea to ward off a Truman depression. In so doing he violated his oath to support the Constitution. He is as guilty of the death of every boy killed in Korea as if he had stabbed them in the back.

He called Drew Pearson's mother a —. He made it easy for his confederates to steal from Uncle Sam. He threatened to smash the faces of his constituents. He is the star member of the vilest machine on earth—the Pendergast. He is the most discredited political degenerate in this country. You have played ball with him from the start. You never chirped when Truman violated his oath, nor did you chirp when he called Mrs. Pearson a vile name. That being true you have concurred in all the malefactions of the star of the Pendergast machine. You are in the same class with all members of that machine, many of whom have served terms in penitentiaries until Truman pardoned them.

The Communists had enough influence to get a bill through the Senate to make it unlawful to call a Communist what he is. This affords protection to McCarthy haters.

One does not have to identify you. You are known by your own words and the stand you take.

ANTI-COMMUNIST.

Here is a rather interesting letter of a little different character. It was forwarded to me by the Secretary of the Senate on November 24. The covering letter says:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
November 24, 1954.

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: The attached letter speaks for itself and is referred to you due to the fact that on page 2, thereof, your name has been mentioned.

Sincerely yours,

J. MARK TRICE.

This letter is from Berkeley, Calif., addressed to the Secretary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., and reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: The talk going the rounds out here in California is that when traitor Hiss is released from prison next week he is going to look for a sponsor to bring censure proceedings against our beloved Vice President, DICK NIXON, for sending the scoundrel to jail.

In view of this talk I thought I should send the information on to you and ask you to relay it to the following Members of the Senate:

Senator LEHMAN, of New York.
Senator MORSE, of Oregon.
Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont.
Senator WATKINS, of Utah.
Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas.
Senator JOHNSON, of Colorado.
Senator ERVIN, of South Carolina.
Senator BENNETT, of Utah.
Senator HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey.
Senator LANGER, of North Dakota.

I feel sure, sir, that one or more of the above-mentioned Senators will be approached on behalf of traitor Hiss and asked to introduce the censure resolution.

Before circulating this to the Senators named above, would you kindly bring it to the attention of that good old-fashioned American and patriot, DICK NIXON, in order that he may be apprized of the expected action on the part of the Commie-loving traitor.

With the assurance of my high regard, I am,

Sincerely,

FRANK J. REYNOLDS.

"America First."

Mr. President, here is one from Teaneck, N. J., having a little different approach:

NOVEMBER 22, 1954.

COMRADE FULBRIGHT: Inclosed find two-bits toward your public schools in Arkansas.

If enough people mail money maybe Arkansas can buy books so the people of Arkansas can learn to read and write. If they could they would know Jeff Davis was not President today, and they would elect a real Democrat to be their Senator. And be sure and wear the red flag of your comrades when you vote censure against the most Honorable JOE McCARTHY.

Who promoted Peress?

BERT B. COX.

Mr. President, the next one is not so original. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR HALF-BRIGHT: Now that Senator McCARTHY has gone under the knife will you still say he is faking? You, sir, are not worthy of being a human being. I would spit on you if I could, but you would not be worthy of my saliva.

Will you apologize, or do you think you should be censured? I honestly wonder how it is possible to look at yourself in the

mirror (if you do). You are plain disgusting.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. NICK,
Middle Village, Long Island, New York,
N. Y.

Mr. President, one of the strangest letters comes from Kansas, and the writer apparently thinks I am a Republican. He says:

CLAY CENTER, KANS., November 22, 1954.

HON. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FULBRIGHT: First, I will introduce myself.

I am 77 years old, I have lived in Kansas all my life, and have voted the Republican ticket ever since I was old enough to vote.

Last night I heard you on the radio, if I understood you right you blamed McCARTHY to be largely responsible for the Democrats winning the majority in the Senate and the House.

Don't kick yourself. We living out here in the sticks and the grassroots can tell you a few things.

First the Republican Party is the cause of loosing the election. You cannot agree among yourselves. KNOWLAND says, break with Russia. Ike says "No." Ike comes up with something and the rest say "No," because you might lose some votes.

You say you are for 90-percent parity. The country is full of grain bins now full of corn and wheat. What are you going to do with it?

We cannot continue to subsidize the farmers forever, and some other plan will have to be worked out.

What are you doing now at the expense of the taxpayers? Quarreling among yourselves how you are going to censure McCARTHY for exposing the Communists. What good did the trial, if we may call it so, between the Army and McCARTHY do? Evidently the Army was sore because McCARTHY investigated Fort Monmouth. What was the result of his investigation? Six discharged; resigned under investigation, 3; suspended and still under investigation, 6. Was that worth investigating?

If you do not do something in the next 2 years to vindicate the Republican Party you will help elect a Democrat President.

First you will have to quit bickering and quarreling among yourselves, at the expense of the taxpayers.

We are getting disgusted with all this and if you cannot do something that will benefit the Nation adjourn and go home, and save the expense.

What do we care who calls who names; what we want is lower taxes.

Respectfully,

PERRY PETERSON.

Mr. President, the next letter comes from Michigan—Cadillac, Mich. It reads as follows:

CADILLAC, MICH., November 22, 1954.

The Honorable Senator FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You should be ashamed of yourself for the way you have insulted Senator McCARTHY during his illness and you should be made to apologize publicly to him. You and that other Red bird FLANDERS haven't the sense God gave a goose and it's no wonder the people of Arkansas have no use for you. All you, FLANDERS, and MORSE have done is to belittle Senator McCARTHY; you haven't done one bit of constructive work this summer or fall—he is so right when he said you Senators were the unwitting tools of the Communists—I don't know if it was

unwitting or not. The rest of you Senators can say anything and not a word of criticism handed to you, but let Senator McCARTHY open his mouth and there's a howl from the red and pink element at once. If you aren't Reds then what Red are you covering for? Who promoted Peress? Who put the Reds in service at Fort Monmouth and who is using Senator McCARTHY as a carry on blind while some more are hid or given honorable discharges so as not to hurt their feelings and to try and cover up what Roosevelt, Truman, and Ike have done? I hope Senator McCARTHY sues every one of you for the way you have mislabeled him, misconstrued his quotes, and maligned his every effort to do as we the people wish him to do. Why didn't Truman honor his subpoena in the H. D. White case; also Tom Clark? Why was Truman not censured and sent to jail when he lied in the H. D. White case? J. Edgar Hoover said that he never told Truman to promote White. Why was the poor brainwashed Batchelor boy given a life sentence and later 20 years because of public sentiment and the slimy, rotten, Roosevelt-lover Hiss, given but 5 years. Why was old chesny cat Ike allowed to issue a directive to obstruct justice and hide some dirty, underhanded, crooked work? Had I or some poor brainwashed soldier done such a thing we would go to prison. Who was the Red that ordered Acheson to order Truman to recall General Mac?

One thing we can thank the Honorable Joe McCARTHY for is that he has given us a chance to see who favor the Reds in Washington. They have exposed themselves in full view without the help of the FBI.

You know the people aren't fools like they were in 1933—we read books of enlightenment and are not going down the Red road so easily as Mandell House and the other Reds had planned. Who in America is financing the Reds in Russia? Couldn't be the rich Jews or the Rockefellers, could it?

Why is Youngdahl allowed to preside over the Lattimore case? Why isn't Acheson sent to prison? That goofy FLANDERS should be censured instead of Senator McCARTHY. No one but a goof or a Red would be so ill mannered or ignorant as to walk into a hearing room as he did, but a Red will do most anything to divert attention when he's almost cornered. I shall insist that he be censured and a full investigation made into his activities in behalf of his friend Hiss and to his flight to Europe and his hideaway at the hotel before he left.

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. CHAS. BERQUIST.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Arkansas that his time has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Arkansas an additional 15 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That will be more than ample. I am about finished, I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma.

As a matter of fact, if it be agreeable to the Chair, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the remainder of these letters, which are of a similar nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

BROOKLYN, N. Y., November 22, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT:

You certainly are out to get Senator McCARTHY's blood. It makes one wonder what kind of beast you are. For one thing, you are a perfect handmaiden of the Commu-

nist conspiracy in this country. I wish the Devil would take you along with Vishinsky. One thing is sure, you would be in your element.

ALICE M. DINAMARCA.

Senator FULBRIGHT:

You dirty, low-down, evil-minded traitor, and the rest of your fellow traitors who are persecuting the great American Senator McCARTHY, saying his illness is a hoax just shows to what length a filthy-minded rat will stoop to. I hope you will have to eat your words, and it will backfire on you, and hope it is not far away. It would do well for you to brush up on some of the past performances of the Senate (as I read David Lawrence), and maybe, just maybe, you can be enlightened on some past censures. Such men as Borah, La Follette, and Wheeler could send you to the river (and your kind), where you belong.

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., November 25, 1954.

FULBRIGHT:

When will you stop fighting McCARTHY and become an American? How have you got the gall to insult us Americans? Do you think we are blind and can't see? Maybe you think that we Americans can't read? How dare you and your Red pals of ADA and Committee for a "Defective" Congress, and the gang at the Waldorf (Goldsmith traitors) insult our intelligence. With the conservative pro-American exceptions your party is the party of treason and corruption of 20 years.

Long live McCARTHY and those who think and love the United States of America as he does and to hell as Vishinsky's companions with those America haters who pretend to hate the McCARTHY methods as an excuse because you really sold out our America. We are ex-Democrats and now conservative protestant American Republicans.

STRINGHAM FAMILY.

P. S.—Who promoted Peress? How is "Stew"?

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., November 24, 1954.

Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,

United States Senator, Arkansas,
Washington, D. C.:

You English louse. Go back to England with your British wife and stay there. McCARTHY was the cause of the English retreat at Dunkirk, where England left poor Belgium stranded. McCARTHY has showed up you and your type of pinko Senators. Ship supplies to England, and England sells it to the Reds to kill our boys. Drop dead, you skunk.

AMERICAN VETERAN.

NOVEMBER 23, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT (but not very bright),
OF ARKANSAS,
Washington, D. C.:

My dream may never reach fruition but it will always be foremost in my mind. That is to plant a healthy punch on your nose. What have you ever done about Communists? There may come a day.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., November 22, 1954.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,

Democrat, Arkansas,
Washington, D. C.

(The hate monger): To a blind, greedy materialistic pig: Where have you been for the past 8 years, you durnd stupid fool. Pearson, the greatest Communist-line smear artist, has been smearing McCARTHY every week all year around, he has mentioned McCARTHY's name up to 20 times in a 15-minute program, plus advertising (and all bad). This rat, Pearson, has, and is doing, more

harm to America than 20 McCarthy's. May you suffer the tortures of hell before you croak, and be damned for all eternity. "Feigning sick." The doctor is a liar. You should be censured.

AN AMERICAN.

Senator FULBRIGHT,

Democrat of Arkansas,
Washington, D. C.:

A boot for JOE is a boost for the Reds. Five million dollars in Washington to censure McCARTHY.

Truman says a snollygoster is a person born out of wedlock.

Will you help take the stars out of Old Glory and put the hammer and sickle there?

Who were the drunken Senators who had to be led off the Senate?

CHICAGO, ILL., November 20, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT OF ARKANSAS,

United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Re McCARTHY.

Aren't you one of the simonized stumble bums that voted out another great patriot, General MacArthur?

Looks as if another 20 years of treason is in the making.

N. HALE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., November 20, 1954.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Senator FULBRIGHT: I would think that you and your colleague Senators, WAYNE (Mugwump) MORSE and FLANDERS or Slanders are very proud of the fuss you have caused regarding a few silly charges against the patriotic Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY. You, et al., are the real parties who should be censured and then given a hard kick in the seats of your pants. It is a shame that we have to have such little freaks as your group in the United States Senate. Senator FRANCIS CASE is a real man who is strong enough to admit the fallacy of the unjust charges recommended by the Watkins committee.

Yours truly,

HARRY R. PALMER.

SAN MATEO, CALIF., November 22, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I see you're one of the cowards who is attempting to stab Senator McCARTHY in the back. How low can you get?

CHAS. THOMAS.

SAN CARLOS, CALIF.

PULLMAN, MICH., November 22, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Would you please do our country a big favor and drop dead?

McCARTHY is an American. What are you?
A. RAWSON.

NEW YORK, N. Y., November 23, 1954.

Senator FULBRIGHT,

Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Red skunk. I will not dignify you with the title Senator. You are a disgrace to the United States Senate. A dirty Red rat like you should be kicked out. You are not fit to clean Senator McCARTHY's shoes. Hope you are struck by God.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., November 20, 1954.

Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,

Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: At one time I was almost convinced that you were a loyal aspirant for the Presidency. Now you have dropped to the lowest

rung of the ladder, fighting a real American, Senator McCARTHY.

I should have seen through that farcial coonskin-cap act at the time. Now you are showing your true colors, along with Alger Hiss and other traitors of the United States.

You are finished politically. You might as well fold up your coonskin cap and sneak into political oblivion.

History will record you as a fourflusher.
PROTESTANT REPUBLICAN.

ASBURY PARK, N. J., November 23, 1954.
Senator FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Senator FULBRIGHT: How a jackass like you got into the Senate is beyond human understanding.

LUTHER B. SCHMITT.

TRENTON, N. J., November 22, 1954.
Comrade Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Are you a Communist? You act like one; you also act like a typical fatuous Senator; that is common these days in the party of 20 years of treason.

Tell me, Senator, is it unlawful for a citizen to come to Washington and use a Senator like yourself as a punching bag and maybe knock him out? Hoping that such a knockout might knock some good Americanism in the likes of you—if that is possible? Understand, I'm not threatening you, I'm only asking you.

I'll be in Washington one day next week, and when you feel as though you were hit by a mule you'll know it was me, coming to pay a debt that you owe to every American for your pro-Commie acts against McCARTHY. Oh, how I hate you, you ———.

A KOREAN VETERAN.

Who had a brother who was a prisoner in Korea and was executed with a Communist sword. Yes, they decapitated his head, you ———.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to read the text of one of three posters which came to my desk this morning. I do not know whether all Members have received them or not. They are issued by an organization with which Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith is identified, and are distributed by the Christian Nationalist Crusade. The one I shall read for the information of the Senate is entitled "Suicide," and is as follows:

SUICIDE

Few, if any Members of the present United States Senate can be reelected without the McCarthy vote. It is now an established fact that anti-Catholic bigots have used Senator McCARTHY's religion as a weapon with which to whip up hate in Protestant communities. Catholic leaders have shown great restraint in issuing no statements, but shrewd politicians who know how to interpret and understand inarticulate sentiment are now aware that 98 percent of the Catholic leadership is pro-McCarthy.

Add to this his great Protestant following among conservative Republicans and right-wing Democrats and you have an intense irreconcilable bloc of votes which cannot be ignored.

If you, Mr. United States Senator, think that the sentiment is not tense, we challenge you to have your picture taken in a cordial, smiling mood, shaking hands with LEHMAN, FLANDERS, FULBRIGHT, or WATKINS. After such a picture has been duly publicized, read your mail and prepare yourself for "Salt Creek."

Distributed by the Christian Nationalist Crusade.

Prepared especially for and only for Members of the United States Senate on the occasion of the special Senate session relating to the Communist-fighting activities of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY beginning November 8, 1954.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks two similar posters distributed by the Christian Nationalist Crusade, one entitled "The Man in the Glass House. Attention: Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina"; the other entitled "A Word to the Wise."

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

THE MAN IN THE GLASS HOUSE

Attention Senator ERVIN, of North Carolina:

Were we correct in understanding that you made a statement which, in effect, said: "Senator McCARTHY should be thrown out of the Senate either for lack of character or for lack of brains"?

Now do you propose to censure Senator McCARTHY because he spoke lightly of Senator HENDRICKSON's supply of brains and guts? The Wisconsin Senator made no reference to HENDRICKSON's character. It might even be implied by generous souls that a man could have character and even sanity without brains or guts. Senator McCARTHY did not even propose that HENDRICKSON be thrown out.

You now ask the Nation to believe that McCARTHY is either a liar and a hypocrite on one hand, or mentally unstable on the other. Do you seriously expect the Nation to believe that you have a judicious mind? Surely you learned in your childhood that people in glass houses should not throw stones, or do you live in a house of non-shatterable glass, made solid and safe by the fact that you have served 5 long months in the Senate and are now wise enough to determine who should be in the Senate, and in violation of constitutional tradition, put yourself above the electorate of Wisconsin?

Please tell the world the difference between your attack on McCARTHY and McCARTHY's attack on HENDRICKSON.

Distributed by the Christian Nationalist Crusade.

Prepared especially for and only for Members of the United States Senate on the occasion of the special Senate session relating to the Communist-fighting activities of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY beginning November 8, 1954.

A WORD TO THE WISE

Unscrupulous politicians in large protestant communities are deliberately introducing the issue of anti-Catholic bigotry in their campaign against Senator JOE McCARTHY. Certain cunning Democrats are saying "sic 'em" to the Republicans, hoping that by this technique they can take from the Republicans the complete Catholic vote.

Representatives of our committee have returned from a 14,000-mile tour of the United States. They find that McCarthy organizations and McCarthy committees are at least two-thirds Protestant.

We are keeping careful tab on all Senators and their political organizations who are exploiting, undercover or above cover, the anti-Catholic trick against Senator McCARTHY. Senators will be defeated 2 and 4 and 6 years from now, not on the basis of party, but on the basis of how they handled the McCarthy matter.

In case of war or the intensification of the cold war, any Senator who made it difficult for McCARTHY will be automatically retired as an appeaser of communism.

You know, Mr. United States Senator, that the pro-McCarthy mail is outnumbering the anti-McCarthy mail as much as 100-to-1. Do not be deceived by the sweet, seductive, perfumed flattery of the anti-McCarthy Washington newspapers. They merely represent the sterile opinion of the voteless jobholders, answerable to McCARTHY's enemies. In addition, these newspapers are more concerned about the persecution (?) of Peress, Hiss, Oppenheimer, and Davies than they are about the unnamed traitors and appeasers who have thus far escaped open and publicized detection; thanks to the dirty job that has been done on JOE McCARTHY by the internationalists, the Marxists, and their thickheaded "handmaidens" in the Congress of the United States.

Distributed by the Christian Nationalist Crusade.

Prepared especially for and only for Members of the United States Senate on the occasion of the special Senate session relating to the Communist-fighting activities of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY beginning November 8, 1954.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I conclude with only this further comment: As I said in the beginning of my remarks, these are typical of the communications I have been receiving for almost a year. I think they evidence a great sickness among our people, and that sickness has been greatly enhanced and increased during the course of the past year.

I sincerely hope that in voting for censure, which I believe the Senate will do, we may put a stop to the reckless incitement of the hatreds and fears of people who are suffering from a lack of information or a lack of understanding.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. WELKER. If the Senator from Idaho heard correctly, the first portion of the distinguished Senator's remarks were dedicated to the use of the franking privilege in connection with a certain document. Would the Senator mind telling me what that document was?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I gave it to the official reporter, but what I was reading was an excerpt from an article which was published in a newspaper published at Crossett, Ark.

Mr. WELKER. Crossett?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Crossett. The editor had been sent one of the documents which were distributed in the Senate, entitled, "Throw the Bum Out." I assumed it was prepared by the junior Senator from Wisconsin or at his request. Crossett is a small, but very progressive, lumber town in southern Arkansas. The editor was complaining about the waste of the taxpayers' money in sending such elaborate documents all over the United States. Apparently if such a document was sent to the newspaper at Crossett, Ark., similar documents must have been sent to every other newspaper in the United States, of which there are several thousand. That was the complaint the editor was making.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Arkansas know such documents were mailed all over the United States or how many of them were sent?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I meant was—and I shall read from the article if

the reporter will have them returned to me—that I think it is a logical assumption that if the document was sent to a newspaper in a small town in Arkansas, similar documents must have been sent to newspapers all over the country, although I did not check every newspaper in the United States.

Mr. WELKER. I take it that the Senator from Arkansas disapproves of the use of the franking privilege for the mailing of such a document?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, just as the writer of the article did. If the Senator would like me to read it, I shall do so. This is what he said—

Mr. WELKER. I am not interested in what he said. I heard what the Senator said, and I understood the Senator to say that he, along with the editor, disapproved of such use of the franking privilege.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true; I agree with the editor.

Mr. WELKER. Has the Senator disapproved of such use of the franking privilege during all his time in the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall an incident quite like this one. I have never done such a thing, and, to my knowledge, no other Senator except the junior Senator from Wisconsin has. That is a remarkable thing about the junior Senator from Wisconsin—he has great originality. He has done so many things for which I know of no precedent in the practice of the Senate.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that on October 3, 1950, and on November 3, 1950, the then distinguished majority leader on the Democratic side of the aisle, and one of the members of the so-called censure committee, was involved in sending over 100 mail bags full of campaign literature, which appeared to be an insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, made into booklet form, and which cost the taxpayers of the Nation about \$15,533, in an attempt to help the then distinguished majority leader, Senator Scott Lucas, of the State of Illinois. Did the Senator from Arkansas rise in the Senate and express his disgust at such an occurrence?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not know anything about it, and I do not know now whether that is an accurate statement or not.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator did not know anything about it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I think there has usually been some recognition in this body of a distinction between the incident under discussion and what is done in an election. That is, I think it would have been legitimate, as the article indicates, for the junior Senator from Wisconsin to have sent such an article to his constituents in Wisconsin. I know I have sent mail to my constituents relating to my activities in the Senate. I am sure that I had it in the back of my mind that the sending of such mail might have some influence in the attitude of my constituents toward me in the next election;

but I did not send any such mail to Wisconsin, I assure the Senator, and I do not think that is customary.

Mr. WELKER. That leads me to a further question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas, intelligent Senator that he is, if he does not know it to be a violation of law for the congressional franking privilege to be used by a private organization, namely, "The Republicans for Lucas," and to send out under frank about 100 mail bags full, or 470,000 booklets? I will ask the Senator if he is familiar with the title 39, United States Code, section 325, which explicitly bars any organization, such as the one mentioned, from using the free mailing privilege of a Member of the Congress? The sections reads:

LENDING OR PERMITTING USE OF FRANK
UNLAWFUL

It shall be unlawful for any person entitled under the law to the use of a frank to lend said frank or permit its use by any committee, organization, or association, or permit its use by any person for the benefit or use of any committee, organization, or association.

Is the Senator from Arkansas familiar with that section of the law?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall accept the Senator's statement as to the law. If that be true, why did not the Senator have a prosecution instituted under the law?

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator mean the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Any Senator who knew about it. I did not know about it, and I am not willing, in such a situation as this, to accept from the Senator that statement as a matter of fact. It is a matter to be proved. Assuming what the Senator says to be true, I doubt that it is a proper excuse or answer to the complaint registered by the editorial which I read to the Senate. I never agree with the approach of the defenders of the junior Senator from Wisconsin who undertake to say that because some other persons may have acted in a certain way or may have violated a law, that is an excuse for anything the junior Senator from Wisconsin may wish to do. In the first place, I do not have any knowledge of those facts, but if a violation of the law were involved, as the Senator says, he or somebody else should have prosecuted the Senator or the persons responsible. I think the facts should be gone into a little further. I do not wish to have the RECORD appear that because I say that is a violation of the law, I agree that those alleged facts are true, because I do not know.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator would not say the alleged facts were not true, would he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say either way. The Senator has asserted them.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator has asked me why I did not prosecute the Senator.

I wish I had been a Senator at that time. It happens that I was at that time engaged in a campaign, without using the frank to help me get elected. I was not in the Senate at the time, but I read about it in the newspapers some 2,500 miles away. I am sure that if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas desires to interrogate a certain member of the censure committee he will find the facts to be as I have related them in connection with that incident.

Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I yield for a question.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator from Arkansas assume that the letters of the type he has read, some of which were trivial, some harsh, and some abusive in nature, have been directed only to him?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I assume that practically every Member of the Senate who has expressed himself in this matter has received similar letters. As I said before, these letters are by no means all I have received. These are typical letters. I have some which are much worse and much more abusive, but I thought it might offend the sense of propriety of this body to read them. I think there are some limits to which we should go even in this kind of proceeding. I read the letters which I did because I think they indicate one of the most evil effects of the activities of the junior Senator from Wisconsin during the past 2 or 3 years.

I think he has inspired and aroused fears for which there is no real justification. As I said before, many of these letters evidence a great pessimism about the future of the United States. In his charges of infiltration of this Government by disloyal people, he has gone so far that he has made many persons in this country lose confidence in their own Government; and in a self-governing democracy, I think that is one of the worst things a man can do. He has directly done that himself. He has had on his staff a man who has made similar charges about the Protestant churches. The Senator himself has made charges about our educational institutions. When a man causes a large number of persons in a free, self-governing democracy to lose confidence in their Government and in their churches and in their schools, he has done a great disservice to that democracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 15 minutes yielded to the Senator from Arkansas have expired.

Mr. WELKER. May I have a little further time?

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Idaho give me some idea of the length of time he needs in order to complete his interrogation?

Mr. WELKER. I shall need only a short time. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Oklahoma yield time to me, or we can take it from the time available to our side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps the additional time the Senator from Idaho wishes to have can be taken from the time available to his side.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well, Mr. President; I yield to the Senator from Idaho

15 additional minutes, if that will suffice.

Mr. WELKER. Yes, it will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WELKER. Yes, 15 minutes, Mr. President.

With respect to the statement the Senator from Arkansas made about a member of the staff who attacked the Protestant clergy—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Idaho knows about whom I was talking; I was referring to Mr. Matthews, who was on the staff.

Mr. WELKER. That is correct. Is it a fact that as soon as the junior Senator from Wisconsin, who now is on trial, was informed of that situation, he was responsible for the dismissal of that man?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am informed by members of the committee that that is not a correct statement of the facts; and I have every confidence that members of the committee who now are on the floor will verify that.

Mr. WELKER. Is that man still on the staff?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, he is not; but I am informed that he left under pressure from other members of the committee, and that the junior Senator from Wisconsin did not take the initiative in that respect, but, in fact, that he resisted the attempt to dismiss Mr. Matthews.

Mr. WELKER. The fact of the matter is that that gentleman is no longer there; is that not correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is true.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Arkansas point out to me one iota of testimony or publicity wherein the junior Senator from Wisconsin demanded that that man be retained as a staff counselor, or, whatever his position may have been?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not have that information available; but certainly I have a very clear memory with regard to conversations about the matter, because it so happens that the senior Senator from my State was a member of that committee. I do not wish to put him on the spot; but I am quite sure that he and other Members would verify what I am saying, because I remember very definitely the discussion of that very matter, for I was deeply shocked by the charge that "the Protestant clergy harbors the largest group of disloyal or Communist-inclined persons in the country"—or something of that sort.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall yield to my colleague from Arkansas, if I may have the permission of the Senator from Idaho, who yielded to me 15 additional minutes, I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] yielded 15 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], in order that his questions might be answered.

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the senior

Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]?

Mr. WELKER. First, let me ask whether the junior Senator from Arkansas heard the statement which was made on the floor of the Senate, the other day, by the alleged defendant in the present action, namely, that his committee had never taken action against a church group, and that that field was outside the sphere of the committee's investigatory power?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did; and I did not say they took any such action. But I said they had on their staff a man who made serious charges about such a group, and I said that his activities have tended to arouse religious prejudices in our country—prejudices which I deplore. I thought we had long gotten away from the problem of religion in politics, and I dislike to see it revived in any respect whatever.

On the other hand, I know of my own knowledge that ministers in my State have been greatly disturbed about that matter, because they have told me of their deep concern about it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield further, I should like to ask another question. Since it has been stated that the committee had on its staff a gentleman who offended the Protestants, does not the junior Senator from Arkansas know it to be a fact that Alger Hiss at one time occupied a quite prominent position as a member of the staff of a Senate committee? Is that not correct? Is it not also correct that his activities, both before that time and since then, have alienated the affections of millions of the American people?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct. However, I do not quite see the relevancy of the Senator's question.

Mr. WELKER. Of course. Let me ask this final question: Does the Senator from Arkansas think it is within the code of ethics of a Senator of the United States to come before this body and publicly disclose letters written to him and disclose the names of those who signed the letters, and also disclose their addresses, without first obtaining the consent of the ones who sent the letters?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Normally I do not make a practice of doing that; that is quite true. However, as I said a moment ago, this action is a very unusual one.

Mr. WELKER. It is, indeed; I agree about that with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As the Senator has said, we are dealing with a most unusual situation, and naturally the procedure is also unusual. This is the fourth time, I believe—the fourth time in this century, at least—when there has been a censure action in the Senate. Most of the actions coming before the Senate, having to do with recalcitrant Members, have been expulsion actions; there have been more expulsion actions in the history of the Senate than censure actions. But, as the Senator from Idaho knows, today we say things, in connection with an action of this kind, which normally we do not say about our

colleagues; it would violate the rules of the Senate if we did say such things. But there would be no possible way of even discussing this matter if we were to follow rigidly the normal rules of the Senate with regard to a discussion of one of our Members.

In this particular instance, I think these letters show—at least, they do in my opinion—a characteristic result, as I said a moment ago, the actions of the junior Senator from Wisconsin; the letters are characteristic of many of his supporters. I think that is something the Senate should know about.

Mr. WELKER. Let me ask another question. The Senator from Arkansas has related that a situation of this sort brings about a waiver of rule XIX, subsection 2, inasmuch as a Senator could not discuss a matter of this sort without violating that rule. Is it not a fact that the junior Senator from Wisconsin, by virtue of his attempt to defend himself, was not required to take his seat, under the rules of the United States Senate—rules which have been in force in the Senate for many years, indeed—but that by virtue of his attempt to defend himself another resolution of censure was offered against him? Is not that a fact?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I take it that the Senator from Idaho is referring to the added count filed by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. WELKER. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly, even in a censure debate, I think there are limits of good taste and proper conduct, and the lid is not completely off; and I do not think it ever should be. Of course, that is a matter for the Senate to determine. But it is the same with many of the other things the junior Senator from Wisconsin has done. Many of his activities are unprecedented. These matters are not all black and white, with everything about them either good or bad. In this type of situation, there is always a question of degree and a question of the circumstances and the pattern of conduct. All that is to be considered. These are very difficult problems, and we have very few guideposts to help us in our handling of a question of this type. But the disruption of the orderly processes of our Government, both executive and legislative, is quite clear; and to many of us such conduct is intolerable, and it means a breakdown of orderly government.

Mr. WELKER. Does not the Senator feel, then, that if the defendant on trial herein should be put under wraps, the junior Senator from Arkansas should also be quite temperate in his remarks? He is one of the Senators named, with respect to whom I said I would propose a censure resolution because of the remarks made against the defendant in this action, the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Does not the junior Senator from Arkansas feel that we should all be temperate, rather than require the defendant alone to be temperate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree. I think I have been temperate. In fact, I have had great difficulty in restraining my temper. I have been as temperate as I know how to be. I know of no insulting language that I have used. On the other

hand, the Senator from Idaho will remember an incident in the debate of last August, when the junior Senator from Wisconsin challenged 5 or 6 Senators on the floor. He stated that he was going to prove us to be perjurers or liars, I believe, if we would come before his committee. He made a very violent attack upon us. I do not recall that any of us responded in like manner on that occasion. I do not know of anything that I have said today which could be described as intemperate.

Mr. WELKER. Without going further into the matter of intemperance, because no two Senators are alike, does the Senator think he was fair and honest toward the junior Senator from Wisconsin when he accused him of uttering a lie when the Senator from Wisconsin accused Annie Lee Moss of being a card-carrying Communist?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall that I said he was a liar. I said that the manner in which he conducted that hearing was certainly unbecoming a Senator, and unworthy of a chairman of a Senate committee. The same principle is involved as was involved in the Zwicker case. Annie Lee Moss was a rather helpless Negro woman who was brought before a committee. It seems to me that that sort of person deserves decent and gentlemanly conduct and treatment, even more so than does a general, because such a person is relatively helpless. Yet the junior Senator from Wisconsin browbeat that woman in a shameful way. I do not know whether she is a Communist or not. I was not present, but I did read the record. I should say that the way he treated her was unjustified.

Mr. WELKER. Was it any more unjustified that the cross-examination before any other committee the Senator has heard of?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have attended a great many committee hearings. On the whole, I think the chairmen treat witnesses with respect. They have respect for them as people. In all frankness, I must say that the junior Senator from Wisconsin strikes me as having the greatest contempt for the human personality of anyone I have ever seen. I have had several personal experiences with the junior Senator from Wisconsin in which he treated me that way; and if he would treat a Senator that way, he would probably treat others, such as Annie Lee Moss, with even greater contempt.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator does not think he is better than any other human being, does he?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not. I often think the opposite.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator remember presiding at the investigation into the FHA housing scandals several years ago?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not the FHA.

Mr. WELKER. The RFC. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. WELKER. Did the Senator feel that at all times he conducted himself as a kind cross-examiner, who never pressed hard in trying to get the truth?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite see the connection between those two statements. I personally happen to think that treating a witness with respect and decorum is more likely to result in getting the truth than the opposite kind of treatment. I may say that, in all frankness, I feel that the browbeating tactics of the junior Senator from Wisconsin have caused some witnesses to refuse to answer simply because they resented his methods. I cannot prove that, but I think the proper way is to treat them with respect, and that such treatment is more likely to result in getting at the truth. I do not know whether my own conduct was good or not. I do not recall anyone making any charges about it at the time.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator does not recall anyone making any charges against any Senator such as the charges which are made here; does he? Such charges have been made only three other times since the Republic was founded; is not that true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is that?

Mr. WELKER. This is only the fourth time a censure resolution has ever been offered since the Republic was founded; is it not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that is correct.

Mr. WELKER. Has the Senator from Arkansas ever done any cross-examination of Communists or alleged Communists?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator know where Annie Lee Moss is today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I am not a particular friend of hers. All I know is what I have read in the newspapers and in the report of the committee. I have no idea where she is.

Mr. WELKER. I ask the Senator from Arkansas if it is not a fact that the junior Senator from Wisconsin warned the lady that if she did not tell the truth she would be committing the crime of perjury. I think my distinguished friend from Arkansas is an attorney. If not, he certainly acts like one. Would it be unfair cross-examination to advise this poor lady of difficult procedures ahead?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I can only say that I read about the case, including the printed hearings of the committee. I was not present. However, I also heard from some members of the committee. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] did not seem to think that was an entirely proper kind of cross-examination. That, together with what I read in the record led me to believe that this poor woman had been maltreated.

I must say to the Senator that we do not reach a final judgment on a question of this kind based upon a single incident. If that had been the only thing ever alleged against the junior Senator from Wisconsin, I doubt if I would be here mentioning it. However, it is one incident which is typical of the course of conduct which has been going on now for 2 or 3 years. It only fortifies and reinforces the belief of some of us, at least, about the way the junior Senator from

Wisconsin treats witnesses. Many Senators now in the Chamber were present at a hearing when I appeared before the Appropriations Committee to present the case regarding the exchange-of-students program. The junior Senator from Wisconsin undertook to discredit my testimony. At that time many Senators evidenced dislike or disapproval of the kind of tactics he used. The succession of events—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may I have 2 or 3 more minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 5 more minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Arkansas—and I hope he will believe me—that I will not condone the conduct of any cross-examiner or anyone else who would try to embarrass or intimidate a fellow Senator or a fellow human being. If the junior Senator from Wisconsin behaved in any such manner toward the junior Senator from Arkansas, I am sorry for it. I certainly do not wish to be placed in the position of condoning such conduct.

In conclusion, let me ask the Senator this question: Has the Senator, since he filed his charges or amendments to Senate Resolution 301, investigated to determine what happened to Annie Lee Moss, and has he examined the FBI report on her, which is a public record at the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I have not.

Mr. WELKER. Since the Senator filed this additional charge against the defendant in this action, and since it was publicized all over the world, does not the Senator think it would be fair—and I know he is a fair man—to check the record as it exists, a record which caused the Army to fire Annie Lee Moss shortly after certain disclosures were made here on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All I can say is that, in the first place, the committee did not feel that it was worthwhile to go into that subject. My feeling is—although I do not know this—that the committee felt the Zwicker case was perhaps a better case to illustrate this particular characteristic of the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

As often happens, the committee did not take the time to go into a great many of the charges. But I do not know. The charge having been dropped, there seems to have been no particular reason for pursuing it.

Let me mention one further point. The fact that a person has been dropped from the rolls or suspended is by no means final proof that he was guilty of disloyalty. The influence of the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been very great. We know of many discharges in various branches of government which, in my opinion, were without any foundation whatever so far as the loyalty of the persons involved was concerned. In other words, I have never accepted as a fact that 2,000 or 6,000 employees have been discharged for being disloyal.

Mr. WELKER. Let us not get off the subject matter. I am not talking about any 6,000 employees.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe it was the Vice President who used that number. He said that that number of employees had been discharged for security reasons. I do not know anything about Annie Lee Moss. I do not know whether she is a Communist. The point is that the way the junior Senator from Wisconsin interrogated her in committee was absolutely unjustified and unworthy of a Senator. That is the real point I make.

Mr. WELKER. My final question is this: The Senator admits that the charge dealing with Annie Lee Moss was not of sufficient weight for the select committee to pay any attention to it. I assume the Senator knows that 2 days after I made the disclosure, namely, on August 2, Annie Lee Moss was relieved from Government service by the Army. The Senator from Arkansas knows that to be a fact, does he not?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Idaho allege that Mrs. Annie Lee Moss was found to be a Communist, or disloyal to the Government?

Mr. WELKER. The Senator will not get me to call anyone a Communist.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well—

Mr. WELKER. I have had a hundred or a thousand times more experience in investigating these people than has the Senator from Arkansas. Never once did I call any of them a Communist. I let the record speak for itself.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask whether the record shows it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WELKER. I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the record show that?

Mr. WELKER. The record was sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield me half a minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. The record was sufficient to show that 2 days after I made my remarks on the floor of the Senate the Army released Annie Lee Moss, unfortunate person though she may be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That may only show the great power of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator very much. I did not think I would receive such a gracious tribute from the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, what I am about to say is now rather moot, in view of the extended colloquy which has taken place between my distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. During the course of the colloquy my junior col-

league said he did not want to put me on a spot regarding the so-called J. P. Matthews case.

I did not want to leave the RECORD in exactly that light. Therefore I wish to announce, Mr. President, that I am present in the Senate, that I am not on a spot, and that I am prepared to answer any questions either of the two Senators who engaged in the colloquy or any other Senator may wish to ask of me, if they deem such questions pertinent to the issue now before the Senate. I am not on a spot, and I am glad to answer any questions about the case. If any Senator wishes to do so, he may ask the question in his time, and I shall be glad to answer the question.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may I have another minute yielded to me so that I may ask a question of my distinguished friend, the able senior Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Inasmuch as I used about a minute in making my statement, I shall be glad to allow a similar amount of time to the Senator from Idaho in which to ask his question.

Mr. WELKER. Has the Senator's committee ever gone into the field of investigating communism in churches or schools?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That was not the question, but I will say no.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The real question, as I understood, was whether the junior Senator from Wisconsin had voluntarily asked Mr. Matthews to leave his staff position. In other words, did he dismiss Mr. Matthews voluntarily, or did the other members of the committee request his dismissal?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will answer that that I do not know how Mr. Matthews got off the committee. I assume that the resignation was submitted on the day the Democratic members of the committee announced that they wanted to be given some consideration in his appointment, after the article published in the American Mercury magazine, I believe, came to the attention of the three Democratic members of the committee.

It was some 5 or 6 days thereafter, at a meeting of the committee, after a conference or after a discussion with Mr. Matthews regarding the article he had written, that he admitted in the presence of the members of the committee then present—I believe all members were present, but at any rate, in the presence of the members then present—that the tone of the article was such and the content of it was such, irrespective of how sincere he may have been in his belief, that its publication had evidently impaired his usefulness as a member of the committee staff.

When he admitted that to me, I asked him the question, "Why don't you submit your resignation?"

His answer was that he had already submitted it.

I asked him when he had submitted it. He said, "On last Thursday."

It was then that I asked the chairman to accept the resignation. At that time he declined. I then asked the chairman

to permit the members of the committee to vote to accept the resignation. The chairman ruled that the members of the committee had no jurisdiction and no authority in the selection of members of the staff.

Thereafter when the majority members of the committee voted to adopt a motion denying to the members of the committee any voice in the selection of staff members, and investing all the power in the chairman of the committee, the Democrats promptly resigned from the committee.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may I ask one question on that point?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be glad to yield, if I have the time to yield.

Mr. WELKER. After the Democratic members of the committee left the committee, it is a fact, is it not, that the resignation of the staff member was accepted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know.

Mr. WELKER. He is not there now. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know how he got off the staff of the committee.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator from Arkansas knows that Mr. Matthews did not work there when the Senator from Arkansas returned to the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. He was not there when we came back about some 7 months later. I do not know how he got off the staff.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas did not wish to leave the impression that it was only the Democratic members of the committee who were concerned about the J. B. Matthews statement regarding Communist infiltration in churches.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say that the Senator from Michigan is a member of the committee. He can speak for himself.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Arkansas, I am sure, agrees that the Senator now speaking opposed the continuation of J. B. Matthews as a member of the committee staff because a religious controversy had developed as the result of an article he had written, which was injurious to the effective operation of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Michigan is correct. I am happy to have him speak for himself. I did not want to speak for him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me 10 seconds on that point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A member of the press sends me a note, which I am sure is accurate. It is to the effect that Mrs. Annie Lee Moss was suspended by the Army 6 weeks ago, that she has been given a hearing on charges, and that the decision is still pending.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 hour to the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am not sure that I shall use a full hour if there

are no interruptions, but I appreciate the majority leader's yielding me that much time.

Mr. President, a careful study of the hearings conducted by the select committee, its report to the Senate, and the presentations made on the floor of the Senate by the members of the select committee, indicate that basically the issues raised by the committee in its deliberations and in its consideration of Senate Resolution 301 fall into four categories, as follows:

First. Should the Senate vote to censure the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] because his failure to cooperate with the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Committee on Rules and Administration in clearing up matters referred to that subcommittee, which concerned his conduct as a Senator, may have affected the honor of the Senate?

Second. Should the Senate vote to censure the junior Senator from Wisconsin because of statements he made about the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections while they were trying to carry out their assigned duties, thereby obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate?

Third. Should the Senate vote to censure the junior Senator from Wisconsin because in failing to cooperate with a Senate committee in clearing up matters affecting the honor of the Senate, he was in fact acting contrary to senatorial tradition and should therefore be condemned?

Fourth. Should the Senate vote to censure the junior Senator from Wisconsin because of his conduct as chairman of a Senate subcommittee in examining a witness representing the executive branch of the Government by the name of Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, and because the junior Senator from Wisconsin subsequently released the executive hearings of this testimony, and that, by so doing, he tended to destroy the good faith which must be maintained between the executive and the legislative branches in our system of government?

Mr. President, the foregoing appear to be a full listing of the reasons suggested by the select committee of the Senate for favoring a censure of Senator McCARTHY at the time the committee reported the resolution of censure on November 9. Imbedded in the second of these reasons, of course, is the derogatory statement the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] made about the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

I should like to discuss these four factors today as logically and dispassionately as may be possible in view of the complete array of data and evidence now available.

Since my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has presented to the Senate new evidence concerning the second count in the censure resolution, that relating to the Zwicker incident and activities; since he reports that for some reason or other it was not brought to the attention of the select committee at the time of its hearings; and since this new evidence clearly indicates that if

there was any action tending to destroy the good faith which we all recognize to be essential between the executive and legislative branches of our system of government, any breach of faith in this instance was initiated by the Department of the Army rather than by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, it would appear that Senators would not be inclined to vote a censure for Senator McCARTHY on that count.

To say this does not imply that the senior Senator from South Dakota places his stamp of approval on the language used by Senator McCARTHY in trying to induce General Zwicker to be a more forthright and helpful witness during the course of the hearings in question. It should be recognized, of course, that General Zwicker was far from a helpful, forthright, and cooperative witness, but, even so, a more restrained reprimand on the part of Senator McCARTHY would, in my opinion, have been more appropriate and would have served the purpose fully as well. I regret that Senator McCARTHY used the language which he used. I, myself, would not have used it.

Be that as it may, since Senator McCARTHY was aware of the fact that the Department of the Army, which at that hearing was represented in the person of General Zwicker, had permitted the honorable discharge of Dr. Peress despite the letter which Senator McCARTHY as chairman of the investigating subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations had written on February 1 requesting that the whole Peress matter be reviewed and reconsidered before an honorable discharge was consummated, it is understandable that Senator McCARTHY had reached a stage of exasperated frustration at the time he made his statements in the presence of General Zwicker.

The subsequent release of the executive-session transcript was an understandable sequel to the events which followed and which included the partial release to the press by both sides to the controversy of its recollection of the pertinent portions of the testimony. Of course, the record also shows that the release of the transcript to the press was made after the members of the committee had been asked by telegram to approve such release.

Taking the Peress-Zwicker incident as a whole, therefore, it does not seem to this Senator that it is possible to support the recommendations of what now appears to be only a majority of the select committee to the effect that Senator McCARTHY should be censured for his part in trying to bring about the disclosure of the identity of those in the Pentagon who promoted this fifth amendment Communist and who brought about the special consideration of his requests for state-side service as well as his frantic—and successful—request for an honorable discharge to be issued with such speed that it was granted before the investigation headed by Senator McCARTHY was able to bring about its postponement or denial or to give the Army additional information.

I believe, Mr. President, that many Americans would feel that a great injustice had been perpetrated if the man who diligently tried to stop the honorable discharge of Dr. Peress and to disclose the identity of those in the Department of the Army who were granting him unusual favors were to be censured for his efforts—even though some might agree that Senator McCARTHY's efforts were overzealous and unduly vigorous—while Dr. Peress himself continues to enjoy all the benefits accruing to one holding an honorable discharge from the United States Army, and while every single officer of the Army having to do with his promotion or his discharge remain in the safety of obscurity, entirely unrepri-manded and unpunished.

For myself, at least, I cannot participate in precipitating such a miscarriage of justice, insofar as count 2 of the censure resolution is concerned, nor can I, by voting censure on the basis of such a sequence of events, place my personal stamp of approval of the Army's manifestation of a cavalier contempt for an official letter from the chairman of a Senate committee, and for an official letter coming from the properly designated chairman of an established committee of the Senate on the 1st day of February, which was completely and contemptuously ignored.

Mr. President, for a long time in Washington, in the House or in the Senate, sometimes as a member of the minority party and sometimes as a member of the majority party, I have been consistent in believing that the Congress of the United States has been somewhat derelict in maintaining its own position vis-a-vis the executive departments of Government. For many years, under the New Deal, I saw the prominence, the prestige, the importance, and the significance of Congress shrivel and shrink month by month because Members of Congress did not dare to stand up against officials in the executive department of Government. I deplored that in many a public speech at that time, Mr. President; I deplore it just as completely at this time.

As for me, whether we have a Republican President or a Republican Congress, a Democratic President or a Democratic Congress, or some other combination, so long as I am here I shall do what I can to maintain the coordinate importance and position of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. I shall knowingly do nothing to encourage executive departments and agencies to ignore legitimate and official requests from congressional committees.

If there be those among us who feel differently, I shall not criticize them. If there be those among us who are willing to place their stamp of approval on a procedure which would then become a precedent, saying it is perfectly all right for the Department of the Army or any other department of government to ignore completely an official letter from an official committee of the Senate, I, at least, want to have no part in this new surrender of congressional authority to executive importance. I think Senators and Members of the House have a duty, so long as they hold these offices, to

maintain the importance of the branch of government which they represent, and that they serve freedom badly if by their actions they try to reduce or minimize the importance of the legislative branch of government and start where the New Deal left off, surrendering legislative rights, authority, and power to executive authority and executive position.

In passing, Mr. President, I should like to congratulate my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for what I think has been an extremely constructive service in ferreting out this bit of evidence which for some reason the select committee did not have before it, and in bringing it before the Senate and placing his finger upon one of the most vital phases of the decision we are about to make. The basic issue in the proposition before us is crystal clear.

On count 2, are we going to vote to maintain the power, prestige, and dignity of the Senate, or are we going to vote to reduce its power and dignity and importance, and, in the melancholy fashion of the long years of the New Deal, once again discontinue holding our legislative heads erect, and start again to bow low before the shadow of the power coming from the White House and executive agencies?

Let us now return to the three remaining issues raised by the select committee, and consider them in the order in which they appear in the committee's resolution proposing the censure of Senator McCARTHY, all of which can be bundled together and bracketed under one heading, although I shall discuss them separately, because there are separate aspects of each facet. I might add that all of these three issues deal with matters occurring in a previous Congress, and before the election of Senator McCARTHY to his present term in the United States Senate. This, in itself, gives them an unprecedented and a curious aspect.

The first issue is: Should the Senate vote to censure Senator McCARTHY because he failed to cooperate with the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in clearing up the matters referred to that subcommittee which concerned his conduct as a Senator?

On that particular facet, my answer to the suggestion for censure is in the negative, for what I consider to be a very good and valid reason, namely, that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections itself failed to exercise full diligence and failed to use its complete authority in an effort to bring Senator McCARTHY before the group in order to receive any information which it desired to have him provide under oath.

If the evidence before the Senate indicated that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections had been more precise, specific, and compelling in its request to have Senator McCARTHY appear before it on a mutually convenient date, or had the subcommittee manifested the earnestness of its zeal by issuing a subpoena for the appearance of Senator McCARTHY, and had the junior Senator from Wisconsin then failed to appear, I should be quite prepared to vote to censure a fellow Senator under those circum-

stances, because there would then be a clear-cut case of a defiant refusal of the Senator to present himself before a committee of his colleagues.

However, we must deal with realities, and not with the ifs, ands, and buts. In the instant case, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, as indicated by the uncontested record, and for reasons best known to itself, completely failed and failed completely both in the precision and the compelling nature of its so-called invitations to Senator McCARTHY; and it markedly and conspicuously failed to exercise its power of subpoena to induce the appearance of Senator McCARTHY before the subcommittee on a specific day and date.

In failing to exercise these committee prerogatives—and I think they were committee duties—the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections made it impossible for the senior Senator from South Dakota to vote to censure a colleague for failure to answer the type and nature of indefinite and ineffective invitations which were extended to him.

To be guilty to the extent of justifying censure, it appears to me that any Senator must exercise a degree of defiance toward a committee which could be measured only by his willingness or unwillingness to answer a direct and specific summons to appear before it at a time when he was able to be present, and when the committee had exercised its full authority in requiring his presence. Such obviously is not the history found in the hearings of the present case.

Let us now consider the second issue raised by the select committee: Should the Senate vote to censure Senator McCARTHY because of statements he made about the subcommittee and its members while they were trying to carry out their assigned duties, thereby obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate? Let me make my position crystal clear on this specific issue. I do not approve what Senator McCARTHY said about Senator HENDRICKSON. I wish he had not said it. I am glad that he retracted it yesterday, and that he agreed it was an unfortunate choice of words. An apology to that extent seems more than justified.

I realize that Senator McCARTHY was hurt and angered by what he conceived to be important elements of political persecution in the actions of the Gillette subcommittee in giving such sustained attention to the unsupported charges which former Senator Benton placed before the committee by an address on the floor of the Senate. Even so, I believe Senator McCARTHY was unjustified in assailing Senator HENDRICKSON personally for his part in serving on the committee as a minority member under most trying and exasperating circumstances. I do not approve of that or any other excessively offensive language or adjectives which Senator McCARTHY may have used.

If it were in keeping with the rules and traditions of the Senate to censure every Senator who makes an unjustifiable personal attack against a colleague, whether on or off the floor of the Senate, I would unhesitatingly vote to censure Senator McCARTHY for some of the statements

he has made. The most cursory examination of the records of the Senate, however, completely and definitely refutes the theory that it is in the tradition of the Senate to adopt a resolution of censure against any one of our more vigorous and vociferous colleagues who engages in unwarranted, unjustified, and undignified attacks upon a fellow Senator. As a matter of fact, while several Members have used much more offensive and destructive language than has the junior Senator from Wisconsin, none has ever been censured in the history of the Senate for such an offense.

So far I have refrained from taking any part in this debate, hoping for more clarification on the point I am about to make, namely, that up to this late hour—and it is growing late—no member of the select committee and no Senator not a member of the select committee has placed before the Senate any reasonable justification as to why we should adopt one rule of good forensic behavior for Senator McCARTHY, and apply another rule for all the rest of us, or for all the other Senators who have preceded us as Members of this, the most important legislative body of the world. Perhaps there should be a rule which would call for censure of any one of us who intemperately and without justification indulges in personal, derogatory, and damaging criticism of a colleague, whether on the Senate floor, in the heat of a political campaign, or in a careless statement to the press or on the radio.

The fact remains, however, that there is no such rule. If there were one it should, of course, be made effective for future offenses, rather than to be used to penalize a Senator for something occurring before the adoption of the rule.

I fail to see how any Senator in good conscience can justify a vote of censure against Senator McCARTHY for having violated a rule which does not exist, or for having engaged in excesses similar to those which have been practiced by other Senators and which, without exception, have failed to provoke a vote of censure. Justice and discrimination seldom team up to result in equity.

What is there about Senator McCARTHY, this man from Wisconsin, it would seem both fair and appropriate to ask, that sets him off as a man apart, against whom the Senate should legislate, vote censure, or suggest reprimand for offenses which when committed by others of our present membership, or by those who preceded us, go unpunished, unnoticed, and virtually unpublicized?

Is it because Senator McCARTHY, perhaps against his will and wish, and certainly more because of an adverse press and radio than because of anything which he has done, has become a symbol of the fight against communism? Is it because every Communist in America and overseas is determined, at any cost, to discredit anything which Senator McCARTHY may have done?

Is it because every Communist in America and overseas is determined at any cost to discredit everything that Senator McCARTHY may have done to help disclose and punish Communists both in and out of Government? Is it because every left-wing columnist, commentator,

cartoonist, and editorial writer in America has for many months been engaged in a well coordinated plan to "get McCARTHY"? Is it because Senator McCARTHY has attacked some Democrats more harshly than they felt the facts might justify; or is it because Senator McCARTHY has not been willing to call off investigations or hearings which proved embarrassing to some Republicans? Is it because his persistence finally brought Owen Lattimore before the bar of justice, and twice resulted in his indictment by grand juries selected from the people?

Frankly, my fellow Senators, I do not know what the explanation is, and I am not trying to impute motives, but it certainly is more than passing strange that there seems to prevail in this body, and in the country generally, a feeling that we should adopt some sort of double standard of morality in the United States Senate; one for JOE McCARTHY and one for the rest of us. As for me, sirs, I cannot go along with such a hypocritical hypothesis.

I know full well that every member of the select committee is an enemy of communism. I am completely confident that their recommendations stem from the noblest of purposes. I know them all. I admire them greatly. I am afraid, however, that the limitations of time and the pressures created by having to make a report before adjournment, and before a full and careful survey could be made of the annals of the Senate, as well as the far-flung ramifications flowing from their recommendations, prevented our distinguished and able colleagues on the select committee from considering all the factors and all the factors involved in their precedent-establishing proposals for censure.

I respect the members of the select committee for the careful work which they did in the altogether too brief span of time which they had to devote to their duties. However, I am sure that they would be the first to admit, Mr. President, that they have not written the final word on the issues which are involved, or on the historic precedents which we shall establish if, on the basis of the evidence before the Senate, we vote to censure Senator McCARTHY for the reasons set forth in the resolution reported by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on November 9.

As evidence of the fact that the select committee itself recognizes that it has not written the final word, we find them now, at this late date, considering changes, modifications, alterations, and refinements in the product which they brought before the Senate on November 9.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator does not find us changing the report which was filed, does he?

Mr. MUNDT. I did not say I found the committee changing the report.

Mr. WATKINS. The committee reported a resolution, with some amendments. It is customary in the Senate, as the Senator knows, to have clarifying and perfecting amendments to

whatever may be proposed by committees. That is almost universally done. With regard to almost any bill, whether it be an appropriation or any other bill that comes before the Senate, the committee usually has some clarifying amendments.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. As I take it, the Senator is saying in effect that the committee has to be absolutely bound by the proposed amendments to the Flanders resolution.

Mr. MUNDT. No, I did not say that at all.

Mr. WATKINS. We are following the customary procedure adopted in the case of any proposed legislation, or other matters before the Senate, which is to offer perfecting amendments.

Mr. MUNDT. I had pointed out that perfecting amendments were being offered. I was not criticizing the committee for that, but that action bore eloquent testimony to the fact that the committee had not written the final word in the resolution presented on November 9.

Mr. WATKINS. I said so. I said we did not pretend to be perfect.

Mr. MUNDT. To that extent we are in agreement.

Mr. WATKINS. I thought the Senator was "laying it on heavy."

Mr. MUNDT. I am afraid the Senator is assuming something. I would hesitate to "lay it on heavy," the Senator from Utah being a judge, and I not being a lawyer, and the Senator having said this is a court procedure rather than a legislative procedure. As far as my layman's knowledge goes, however, when charges are presented in a court, they are not changed as the witness answers certain of those charges.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The committee did not present charges. The committee was appointed to perform a mission. The Senator from South Dakota was one of the Senators who voted that mission to the committee.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator took enough stock in the charges to vote in favor of having the committee hold an investigation, hearings, and to make a report.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I wanted to find a way to get the facts.

Mr. WATKINS. I think we carried out the spirit of that mission. Nobody told the committee whether it had to find for or against Senator McCARTHY, and that was properly so. We carried out our mission. We think we have rendered a report which will stand up. When it comes to the actual judgment that is going to be finally entered, that will be done by this body. This is the court. After the actual trial of the charges is held, as it is now being held, this body, not the committee itself, will render the final judgment.

Mr. MUNDT. As one of the jurors, I have had some difficulty in reaching a verdict when the charges are continually being changed, and we do not have a fixed picture we can look at. I was hop-

ing that at the end of the deliberations of the committee the committee would bring forth on November 9 a specific set of circumstances.

As I say, I do not criticize the committee for changing the charges; I commend it if it feels changes are now necessary; but I think that fact dramatizes what I said earlier, that under the pressures of time, the members of the committee did not have an opportunity to exhaust all the human wisdom of which they are capable.

Mr. WATKINS. The so-called amendments to the Flanders resolution will be the judgment, not the charges. The charges were given to the committee in some other proposed amendments which were referred to it. The final resolution will be the judgment. The Senator is helping to contribute to that judgment, which will be drawn up in an ironclad expression of the will of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not wish to become involved in any legislative legerdemain with a Senator who has been a judge, when I have never been a lawyer, so I shall not comment on that particular observation. All I ask is that the Senate be given a clear and fixed proposal to examine.

Mr. President, at all events I do not see how the Senate can justify a determination to censure Senator McCARTHY on the basis included in the second section of the resolution, which indicts him for statements and personal criticisms, which I admit were evidences of excessive and unjustifiable language, but which when stated by others in this body have been completely ignored or forgotten.

I return to that point because I, for one, do not see how we can apply two standards of senatorial morality, one, to one Wisconsin Senator, and one to all the other Senators sitting in this Chamber and to all who have sat here in the past. Perhaps it is too complicated or too simple for a layman to comprehend, but it seems to me there should be some element of consistency in anything that is just and proper. I think a rule should have universal application. Unless some Senator can point out why we should have a special rule for Senator McCARTHY which does not apply to all the rest of us, and which did not prevail for all our predecessors, I do not see how we can logically or fairly indict or censure Senator McCARTHY for his indulgence in a practice which has unhappily been employed in this body by other Members of the present Senate in this very session without any effort to censure being made.

This brings us to the third of the reasons listed by the select committee for censuring Senator McCARTHY. The committee suggests that in failing to cooperate with a Senate committee in clearing up matters affecting the honor of the Senate, he was acting contrary to senatorial tradition, and therefore should be condemned.

I have already covered one point in connection with this issue, namely, that in my opinion the failure of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to exercise due care, full diligence, and its maximum authority in requesting the

appearance of Senator McCARTHY on a mutually agreeable day and date destroys the argument that Senator McCARTHY acted arrogantly or was in defiance of the Senate in failing to cooperate with a Senate committee which he felt was being used for purposes of political persecution. No Senator has ever made it clear in the course of this debate just why the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections failed to subpoena Senator McCARTHY to appear before it, as it had a right to do, and as I believe it had a duty to do if it desired to obtain the facts. Had it done so, that would have brought this issue to a head; it would have demonstrated the serious determination, beyond all peradventure of doubt, of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections to bring Senator McCARTHY before it; second, it would have demonstrated that the subcommittee itself felt that the evidence was sufficiently important to justify requiring his appearance; and, in the third place, it would have provided us with crystal-clear, indisputable evidence as to whether Senator McCARTHY would have acted defiantly or in contempt of the subcommittee. That would have been the situation if Senator McCARTHY had received such a serious and specific summons. However, as the matter now stands, we are not in possession of valid evidence on these points.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Will the Senator from South Dakota tell the Senate how he would have enforced a subpoena of the subcommittee, with all the other members of the parent committee of the Senate at home, and with the Senate in a period of adjournment?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I would assume that, as a subcommittee, those Senators had the right to issue subpoenas. Probably they had that standing right as members of the parent Senate committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Suppose the subpoena had been ignored; then where would the subcommittee have been?

Mr. MUNDT. If the subpoena had been ignored, then we would now have before us a clear issue of open defiance on the part of Senator McCARTHY and a good clear cause to censure him.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Has the Senator from South Dakota ever before heard of subpoenaing a Senator?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. As a matter of fact, that question came before a committee of which I served as chairman, somewhat reluctantly, a short time ago. Actually, we did not have to subpoena the Senator. But if we had had to do it we would have done so; we would not have ducked our responsibility.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. But, Mr. President, in the present situation we find ourselves up in the air, uncertain; we do not know whether Senator McCARTHY would have

come or would not have come in response to such a subpoena, for he was not subpoenaed. No one has told us why he was not subpoenaed. The question is asked, "What if he had not come in response to a subpoena?"

Mr. President, if a subpoena had been issued by the subcommittee, and if Senator McCARTHY had not appeared in response to such a subpoena, the Senate would have voted censure. But if a subcommittee fails to exercise its authority in connection with obtaining witnesses, I do not see how it can be determined that a Senator is acting in defiance of the subcommittee, when it has not subpoenaed him. Certainly, he could not defy or demonstrate contempt for a subcommittee that failed specifically to summon him.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. MUNDT. First, Mr. President, let me inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether I have available to me further time which I can use for the purpose of yielding? I contracted for 1 hour, and I did not anticipate these interruptions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Chair how much time remains to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well, Mr. President; if the Senator from New Jersey wishes me to yield for a brief interruption, I think I have time to do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. Does he feel that the Senate of the United States has reached a point—I would term it a lowly point—where the Members of this body have to subpoena each other, in order to get one another before a duly constituted subcommittee of this body? If we have reached such a point, the junior Senator from New Jersey must say it will be a happy moment when he departs this body.

Mr. MUNDT. I have never held that Senators should be entitled to any consideration, privileges, or advantages not accorded the average citizen—none other than those incorporated in the Constitution of the United States. A Senator should have all the rights and all the obligations which accrue to any other citizen. I may point out that in the instant case we have not only the absence of a subpoena, but the absence of specific, serious, direct, and detailed invitations to appear. Instead, there are too many hazy letters and too many instances of failure to make clear whether the subcommittee ever really wanted Senator McCARTHY to appear.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to understand what the Senator from South Dakota means by "hazy."

Mr. MUNDT. I mean hazy invitations, such as "If you so desire to appear" you may, and "come if you like" and fuzzy, hazy phrases like that.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator from South Dakota remember the response of the junior Senator from

Wisconsin to the invitation of the subcommittee?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Has the Senator from South Dakota found in those responses anything hazy?

Mr. MUNDT. No; and I have said that to the extent it was abusive I regretted the language the junior Senator from Wisconsin used in those replies.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, to hold, as some of the select committee members have, that because Senator Benton, of Connecticut, delivered on the floor of the Senate a speech attacking Senator McCARTHY, and that because the Democratic majority of the subcommittee to which the Benton resolution was referred decided to devote serious attention to it, Senator McCARTHY was automatically obligated to volunteer to appear before the subcommittee to defend himself against the long list of Benton charges, is to assume a theory directly opposite to our American concept of jurisprudence that one is innocent until he is proven guilty.

During the past few years we have heard much about an approach called guilt by association. It has a disagreeable connotation. It implies a concept of reckless generalization which I deplore. In our American codes of justice or concepts of fair play I can find nothing which justifies a verdict of guilt by association. However, I must confess I am greatly disturbed and disillusioned when I now find the chief critics of guilt by association applying to Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, an even more fatuous and fictitious criterion of justice, which I presume should be called guilt by accusation.

We now find these opponents of guilt by association—and I join them in their opposition to such an un-American and unwarranted criterion—telling us that Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, should be censured by the Senate of the United States because he did not voluntarily and on his volition present himself before a subcommittee of the United States Senate to answer a long series of unsupported charges made against him on the floor of the United States Senate by another Member of this body, a member of the opposite political faith. If we were to accept as a prevailing concept the idea that any Senator is to be considered guilty of any charge made against him, at any time, by any of his colleagues or by any of his critics, I am afraid that most of us would become candidates for censure by the Senate of the United States, after every political campaign.

In my opinion, Senator Benton had every right to voice his criticisms of Senator McCARTHY if Senator Benton felt they were justified. And if the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections was motivated and felt itself justified either by the practical reason of partisan politics or by completely pure and pious reason of detached adherence to principle to the point that it felt it should dignify the charges by holding hearings upon them, it had a right to hold hearings. However, it should be equally clear that

Senator McCARTHY, likewise, had a right to ignore such unsupported charges made on the floor of the Senate if the subcommittee failed to subpoena him or if he felt such charges were of a partisan nature. In all events, I scarcely feel that the Senate and significant Senate of the United States would want to say by its vote that it believes that a colleague of the Senate should be censured because he failed to seek an opportunity to answer charges which were made about him on the unsupported presentations of a colleague in this body who was a member of an opposite political party. Truly, Mr. President, if we start on such a trail, we are indeed headed down a mighty long road which may have many curious twists and strange detours. As for me, I want it clearly understood that I deny the theory that "guilt by accusation" is so effective a criterion that any of us may be assumed to be guilty of any charge or criticism or accusation launched against us by any writer or speaker whose words we elect to ignore. Moreover, Mr. President, all the reasons listed for censure, and involved in the activities of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, come to us under something of a shadow of doubt, since each and all of them were passed upon by the electorate of Wisconsin, in an election which occurred in 1952. The issues were again passed upon later by the United States Senate, itself, when this body, including the members of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, failed to find a single Member rising to oppose the seating of the junior Senator from Wisconsin when he was sworn in in 1953 after being reelected, and after the charges, hearings, and reports of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections had been concluded.

My good friend from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] has indicated that a Senator should have certain special rights. I do not believe a Senator should have any special rights. I think a Senator should, however, be subject to the same kind of statute of limitations as applies to ordinary people. It seems to me that there must come a time when the Senate of the United States can no longer go behind the votes of the people of a State and, for reasons other than fraud, deprive them of their representation, or cripple the representatives they send here.

If we establish the precedent that we can go back beyond one election, can we go back beyond two? If someone digs up some unkind thing said 30 years ago by the great and good senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has been here for a third of a century, are we to issue a resolution of censure against him, come some happy hour when there are so many Republicans in the Senate that we swagger and become arrogant because of the size of our majority?

I think most persons would agree that 30 years is too long a time. How about 15 years? How should the statute of limitations operate? How about two elections? Where is the line to be drawn? What is to happen to the concept of the rights of States? What has happened to the idea that people have the right to select their own representa-

tives, good men or bad men, so far as abilities are concerned, and so far as concerns manners and mores, provided their election is not brought about fraudulently, but is done honestly?

If the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections was so eager and zealous that it wished to pick up the fumble it made when it failed to subpoena the junior Senator from Wisconsin, what a golden opportunity to rise, when he was being sworn in, after being reelected, and say, "We ask that he step aside." That was their responsibility and duty, if they had the evidence to support such a course of action. That was the time to bring the question before us, and not after an emotional binge such as the Senate went through during a large part of the late summer and early fall.

This brings me to perhaps the most significant and overriding consideration, which in my opinion we should all take into consideration before casting our vote for or against the censure of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, on the basis of the evidence supporting the resolution reported from the select committee by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on November 9, which I construe to be the case before the court today. I know not what new amendments may be brought forward at this late date, when, instead of having time for a new hearing, and time for further debate, we have—and I think wisely so—limited ourselves to 30 minutes on a side. If we are going into the business of censure by quick dispatch and 30-minute speeches, on all kinds of bases, the censure club in the United States Senate may grow rather alarmingly large in years to come.

Therefore the consideration which in my opinion is the difficult determination which we must make in this situation today is the question of which vote, which action, which position, will best serve the longtime general welfare of our Nation and the cause of human freedom. For me that is the important, overriding question. I am not interested in personalities. I do not happen to be a Senator who engages in them; and those who engage in them against me do so at their own peril, because I am prepared to defend myself.

So I am not very deeply involved. I have neither any particular friendship nor any particular antipathy for the junior Senator from Wisconsin. He has caused me more than my fair share of trouble in the past 6 months. I see no particular reason to have any unusual personal concern for him over what I would extend to any Senator. But there is an overriding question, and it should be our major consideration. We ought to begin now to think as Senators, not as Republicans or Democrats, not as friends of McCARTHY or enemies of McCARTHY, not as people who are tough on Communists or soft on Communists, not as left-wingers or right-wingers. Let us take a look at the question as Senators trying to produce something constructive from the existing situation.

During the past few months we have spent a great deal of time, in one way or another, before one committee or another, discussing and debating the ac-

tivities associated with the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Out of it all, if we act prudently, some good may come. But it cannot come from any purely negative action.

The chief consideration should therefore be which decision by the Senate in this difficult situation would best serve the longtime general welfare of our Nation and the cause of human freedom? To me, that is the important, overriding question. That should be our major consideration.

The question now arises in my mind: How can we conclude this chapter of our congressional annals so as best to serve the people of our great country and the traditions of freedom which we all embrace, and at the same time try to restore good will and brotherly feeling among the Members of the Senate? We must all live with each other for some time to come. Will voting for the censure resolution now before the Senate accomplish an important constructive result? Will defeating the censure resolution do it? Or is there some third course of action which can provide the greatest constructive good?

Personally I am one—and I am confident most of my colleagues are motivated similarly—who would freely and firmly vote for any one of these three possibilities or any combination of them in order best to serve the greatest good for the largest number for the longest time. The difficulty is to decide which course of action best serves these constructive purposes. It is easy enough to act, but it is a little difficult to know how to act most wisely.

Let us consider these choices, therefore, not in the light of strained human emotions or of seeking some temporary release from a distasteful situation, but rather from the standpoint of the impact of our actions on the future of the Senate and on our great American traditions of freedom.

Let us also keep in mind the nature of the world in which we live today, as we consider these alternatives.

Admittedly, if we select the first choice and vote to censure Senator McCARTHY, we may feel that we are achieving something of at least a temporary value.

In the first place, we shall have disposed of the resolution and have ended the debate on the issues involved, at least for the immediate future.

Moreover, we may have convinced some people that we are determined to protect and promote the dignity of the Senate by striking back at one of our Members who has used language of which we disapprove in referring to some of our colleagues, as well as to certain other individuals, who may or may not have been witnesses before Senate committees. Furthermore, by doing so we shall perhaps have served warning on other Senators that they too may be subject to censure by the Senate if they deal too vigorously with reluctant witnesses who appear before senatorial committees, or if they indulge in personal criticism of each other during the heat or debate on the floor of the Senate, or in the course of a political campaign.

Perhaps we shall also gain for ourselves some feeling of self-satisfaction or a sense of smug superiority, in that we will have publicly castigated a fellow Senator for making statements of a nature which each of us is convinced he would never make under similar circumstances.

We shall also, of course, have pleased the chronic critics of Senator McCARTHY. While some of these throw their punches only from the left, there are admittedly many good and patriotic Americans who are seriously disturbed by their understanding and analysis of some of Senator McCARTHY's activities.

In the main, Mr. President, I believe the foregoing pretty well summarizes the dividends and advantages which might flow from a vote of censure of Senator McCARTHY. Nothing else will have been changed. After that, we will go on just as we have in the past. Our actions will have been completely negative.

To gain these actual or alleged advantages, Mr. President, by voting censure, we would have to pay a substantial price. In the first place, there is the danger that the precedent we would establish in voting to censure Senator McCARTHY for his statements might come back to plague us again and again when at times a determined majority of the Senate might elect to pillory and censure other Senators with whom they disagree for statements made on or off the floor of the Senate, which might be different in only slight gradations up or down from those uttered by Senator McCARTHY, which comprise the basis of the charges now before the Senate.

Thus, without intending to do so, we might be establishing machinery which could be used excessively in future times to circumscribe the rights of free speech by Members of the Senate and to weaken or destroy the rights of criticism when indignant Senators feel they have cause to attack or criticize a public policy, or some public figure who has proclaimed a public policy, which they consider unjust, or unacceptable.

At least some kind of precedent would be established which would protect the dignity of generals and of Senators, although apparently the precedent would not apply to anyone else in the entire country.

That is all the more true by virtue of the fact that it is now proposed that we censure the junior Senator from Wisconsin for violation of a rule which did not exist at the time of his alleged offenses and, except for the precedent established might not exist for others guilty of the same offenses.

In addition, there can be no denying the fact that by singling out Senator McCARTHY for present punishment, whether for just cause or not, and by voting for the pending resolution of censure, we shall be giving great aid and comfort to the Communists around the world, whom all of us abhor and whom most of us recognize as the sole and sordid source of virtually all our present dangers.

I am completely sure that none of us would wittingly or willfully give aid to our global enemy by any act or action on our part. Unfortunately, however, none

of us can control the repercussions which would flow from the propaganda mills of the leftwingers in America and the Communists abroad as a consequence of an affirmative vote on the censure resolution.

Through no particular fault of his own, and in my opinion far beyond the merits involved in the true facts of the case, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has become a symbol in America's fight against communism. Admittedly, he has fought hard and persistently against this godless menace, but to no greater degree and with no greater success than many others in and out of Congress. It is one of the paradoxes of our day that Senator McCARTHY has become a symbol of anticommunism largely as a result of the editorials and columns carried in a hostile press, of caricatures by antagonistic cartoonists, and of radio commentaries by people who dislike him personally, or who deplore his activities against the Communists.

Be that as it may, if the Senate votes to censure what has rightfully or wrongfully become a symbol of the congressional fight against communism to many good Americans, who share with us our common antipathy to this warlike, godless, global menace, it is as certain as night follows the day that every Communist agency at home and abroad will pull out all the stops in misrepresenting our actions as being a retreat in the fight against communism. I hope and I believe that the number of Americans who could be so deceived would be comparatively small, but I fear that there are a great many people in other areas of the world who would accept this Communist line and believe in their hearts that there was a weakening here in the degree and the determination of our opposition to world communism.

What then are the possible gains or losses if we select the second choice and vote against this censure resolution?

Among the advantages of such a vote, insofar as the long-term viewpoint is concerned, in my opinion, is the fact we would run no danger of having our determination propagandized by the Communists abroad as a softening of our attitude toward communism. It would also be a vote reiterating our conviction that unless fraud is involved at election time the citizens of a sovereign State have the right and duty to select the type and manner of individual who they desire to represent them here in Congress. Thus it would be a vote reiterating and re-emphasizing our belief in the rights of States and our conviction that States rights are something which we should be slow and reluctant to abrogate by capricious use of the power of Congress or of any other Federal authority.

In addition, voting against the censure resolution would emphasize our belief that nobody in America should be punished retroactively for violating rules, regulations, or statutes which were not in being at the time his alleged offenses were committed. Finally, voting against the censure resolution would save us from erecting any vague new screens or standards which might some day return to plague us as a circumscription of complete freedom of speech in the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from South Dakota that his time has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I have an additional 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from South Dakota an additional 5 minutes' time.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, admittedly, voting against this resolution of censure also exacts its price and toll. By voting against censure, we run the risk that many righteously indignant Americans will feel that we have let them down and have failed to uphold the dignity and decorum which they have a right to expect from the world's most important parliamentary body. If we vote against censure, some will make it appear by so doing the Senate has placed its stamp of approval on every word, on every excessive adjective and on every action by the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Others will attempt to make this vote appear as a criticism or indictment of the judgment of the six colleagues of ours who went through the disagreeable task of serving on the select committee. Propagandists, to be sure, will clamor caustically and with reckless disregard for the facts from the camp of those using a vote against censure as their bullwhip just as propagandists will use a vote for censure with equal abandon as a device for trying to make it appear that a vote for censure is in reality a vote for communism. Unhappily, there is no escape from the spiteful spleen of professional propagandists as we approach this vote. There is this to be said, however: insofar as our friends in foreign countries are concerned, a vote against this censure resolution simply cannot be interpreted, or distorted to mean a vote sympathetic to communism or soft toward Communists, either at home or abroad.

Here at home, Mr. President, many good Americans as well as many warm personal friends of each of us find themselves on both sides of this controversial issue. It has divided families, divided husbands from wives, brother from brother. Good people are confused and in conflict with each other; there is no question about that. Unfortunately, too, Mr. President, there are no blacks or whites before us. There is not any clear-cut, easy answer which anyone seriously seeking the facts can easily discern. Most of the evidence and most of the facts are shrouded in the obscurity of dull and misty gray.

But, Mr. President, there is one fact, it seems to me, of which I can be fairly sure. I know, as every other Senator knows, that we cannot satisfy all our friends on this vote. We cannot make them all happy; we cannot please them all. We have good friends on both sides of the issue.

Mr. President, I think I know one thing I can do. I know how I can displease 99.9 percent of my enemies, because I think I know where my enemies stand on this issue. I think I know where the enemies of other Senators stand, also, because their enemies are my enemies and on this our friends are

divided but our enemies are united. The Communists are the enemies of all of us. So are the crypto-Communists; so are the fellow travelers; so are the dull-witted people who are utilized and confused by Communists; so are the left-wingers and divisive forces in our midst. I think I know where they stand. It has been a part of my official business for many years to read, off and on, the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party. I know where it stands. It is seeking the adoption of the censure resolution as its "baby." I know it had nothing to do with bringing about the verdict of the select committee. I do not think it will directly influence a single vote in the Senate. Indirectly, perhaps, a few, but none directly. I am pretty sure I know how I can displease every Communist enemy in this country. I think I know how I can displease the front runners of the divisive forces which are trying to attack and to destroy private enterprise, individual initiative, States' rights, and our great constitutional institutions.

Wrapped up in this argument, Mr. President, is a hidden bomb—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California.

Wrapped up in all this is a secret, hidden bomb which some day, I am afraid, will explode all over Dixie. Wrapped up in this is an element of States' rights more important than are any of the arguments about filibustering or cloture ever made on the floor of the Senate. We may establish a precedent which some day in the sunny Southland will cause great distress if we here establish a precedent that Congress can override the elective selections by the voters of a sovereign State.

Mr. President, there are many enemies of freedom, many enemies of our great way of life. I know where the enemies of the Republican Party are going to be. I do not think there are very many enemies of the Republican Party who have successfully and successively induced us, by their divisive tactics, to split up on other issues and who will bring up still other diverse issues who now would have us vote against this censure resolution. I know that most enemies of the Republican Party are going to be displeased by a vote against censure.

More important are the enemies of freedom overseas. And this brings us now to a third possible choice as we exercise our judgment in the present controversy. In other words, is there some better, constructive alternative confronting us which might accomplish whatever benefits are involved in a vote of censure, avoid any pitfalls and disadvantages involved in a vote against censure, and yet serve to maintain the dignity and decorum of this body and safeguard us against situations like the current controversy coming to confront us at some future time?

Mr. President, I believe there is such a constructive third course of action. I

believe that by refusing to vote for this resolution of censure, we can take steps which will make it clear that we disapprove of some of the expressions and activities which gave rise to the report of the select committee, and that we can do it without trying to punish retroactively a Member of this body or to make an ex post facto application against the junior Senator from Wisconsin of rules and regulations and codes of conduct which the Senate has not yet decided to adopt for itself and all of its Members.

It would be my suggestion that we reject this censure resolution, but that in so doing we establish or substitute or affirm or declare our intention of giving prompt and painstaking attention to two possible types of changes in our book of rules which can prevent recurrences of the type of situation which we now confront.

The first of these proposals would be that early in the 84th Congress we adopt whatever changes in rules may be desired or desirable for use by senatorial committees hearing witnesses. We already have had extensive hearings by the Committee on Rules and Administration on this point. I, myself, appeared before that committee on the 12th of August of this year.

Almost 10 years ago, while serving as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I made the first move in Congress to bring into focus and into being rules for properly conducting investigations. I asked the Brookings Institution to prepare a study, which was done. I had the study incorporated as a part of the hearings, and today it provides a base for most of the rules now used by investigating committees. I think that after 10 years we have learned something, and that we now can improve upon our rules. Many other Senators made similar suggestions. Therefore, from those suggestions it seems evident to me that some new rules might be adopted for universal application; rules which would express the determination of the Senate concerning the type of investigations and hearings it considers appropriate in establishing standards of conduct which would be enforceable by the Senate.

This would provide a constructive result growing from the current controversy and the events preceding it. Once such rules were adopted by a Senate vote, they would be enforceable by Senate action. They would apply to all Senators, not merely to those with whom we may find ourselves in disagreement. I pledge myself to do everything possible to help perfect and enforce such rules.

To this Senator it would seem that a much more constructive purpose could be served by adopting, deliberately and carefully, whatever new rules we desired to write to govern committee procedures and then to enforce them against each of us impartially and honestly, rather than now to apply retroactively the terms of rules and regulations which have never been adopted by the Senate as a whole.

In considering such new rules, however, I wish to caution my fellow Senators, out of an abundance of experience as a member of congressional investi-

gating committees, that we must not so circumscribe ourselves as to make a seat in the witness chair before a congressional committee a cyclone cellar of safety for every crook and Communist in all America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of a statement made by me before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on Thursday, August 12, 1954.

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

(See exhibit A.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader for sufficient time in which to conclude my statement briefly?

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MUNDT. About 3 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 3 minutes to the senior Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the second of these constructive proposals which I would place before the Senate as a third and better choice than voting a resolution of censure either up or down and then hurrying home is that we reject the present resolution of censure and instead instruct either a special committee of the Senate or some standing committee to submit, early in the first session of the 84th Congress, a list of proposals, after adequate hearings, and careful consideration, recommending proper rules of conduct for Senators either on or off the floor of the Senate, or both, including committee room conduct.

I think Senators would wish to consider such proposals very carefully; but certainly if reforms or restrictions or restraints are needed, this would be a more constructive method for achieving them than by the awkward, ill-defined, and unprecedented manner of voting upon a resolution of censure of a fellow Senator, and thereby trying to establish a precedent for future conduct by applying retroactively the punishment which might be prescribed for the violation of a rule not yet adopted.

In considering these rules of conduct, the appropriate committee could decide upon and present to the Senate recommendations as to whether, for example, the failure to accept a mere invitation on the part of a Senate committee to appear before it, should he so desire, is to be considered an act of contempt on the part of the Senator. Personally, I doubt the wisdom of such a rule, unless a Senate committee were serious enough about its business or its charges to issue a subpoena for the Senator's appearance. But whatever the verdict of the Senate might be upon such a proposed rule, all Senators could be expected to live by it thereafter.

Such a committee could also recommend whether hereafter it should be considered censurable for any Senator to criticize another Senator personally, regardless of his degree of provocation, on the floor or off, justifiably or not.

Whatever the ultimate decision of the Senate might be, I am certain we would all be prepared to live by the rules adopted and announced.

During the 10 happy years which I served in the House of Representatives, we were always able to meet a problem like the one presently confronting the Senate by the application of a simple rule providing that when a Member of the House used inappropriate language he could be ordered to take his seat; and in extreme cases the House could vote to strike the words from the RECORD and silence the offending Member for the remainder of the day. What a penalty for any Senator, Mr. President! [Laughter.] If it were made a week, that would be worse than a life sentence in the penitentiary for some Senators whom I know.

Such a committee as I have suggested could give consideration to the adoption of some modification or expansion of this rule for use in the Senate. I am not certain what those rules and regulations should be, nor what restraints should be imposed. Personally, I shall be prepared to vote for any reasonable rules of conduct which appeal to the majority of my associates.

However, I should like to add—and with this statement I shall close—that I think the Senate of the United States has a great record of constructive service to the country, which up to now has necessitated neither special rules of conduct for its Members nor motions of censure for excessive statements by Senators. I hope the Senate will do nothing to weaken or nullify the ability of the Senate to serve in the future with at least the same success and significance with which it has so ably and consistently met the problems of the past. Despite all its shortcomings and the mistakes of its individual Members, both in the present and in the past, I think the Senate of the United States has done and is doing more to hold aloft the torch of human freedom than any other legislative body in the world.

Mr. President, let us do nothing here to dim or darken this great light of legislative authority and of constitutional liberty.

EXHIBIT A

EXCERPTS OF STATEMENT BY SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, REPUBLICAN OF SOUTH DAKOTA, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, THURSDAY, AUGUST 12, 1954

Mr. Chairman, your committee paid me an honor in inviting me to come before you to make any suggestions that I might have in connection with the establishment of a universal set of rules and procedures to be used by all congressional committees engaging in investigations of one kind or another.

You are engaging in an important and constructive study in trying to develop an optimum set of rules and procedures for the very important function of Congress which is represented by its duty to investigate charges and to investigate conditions in which corruption, communism, malfeasance, and maladministration, waste, inefficiency, or the outright failure to comply with the legislative mandates of Congress might be a factor. Despite the fact that I am in the unique position of probably having spent more years as a member of such investigating committees of one type or another than any other Member of the Senate, I would not have the

tendency to come before you on my own volition to intrude my judgment voluntarily into your deliberations. However, in response to your request, I am pleased to come here to answer any questions which you might have to ask and to make a few modest recommendations and observations of my own.

It is my conviction that the investigative function of Congress ranks high among its most important functions and responsibilities. It is not enough that Congress enact legislation and pass appropriation bills approving the expenditure of public funds. Equally, we have the responsibility to see to it that the laws which we pass are properly administered and that the money which we appropriate is efficiently, economically, honestly, and properly expended.

We have a direct responsibility to expose and eliminate corruption whenever and wherever it occurs in any of the agencies of Government since we would indeed be derelict in our duties if we appropriated billions of dollars with no concern as to whether the money is stolen, misspent, funneled into perverted channels because of favoritism or squandered through reckless inattention to the concepts of sound economy.

We would likewise be derelict in our responsibilities if we knowingly permitted foreign agents, Communist sympathizers, saboteurs, and spies to exercise authority and spend public funds within our structure of Government without doing everything within our power to expose and eliminate such disciples of disaster.

I am sure that American citizens who are alert enough to the problems of our times to be Members of Congress are today aware of the fact that human nature is such that on occasion, cheats, chiselers, and crooks will work their way into the executive agencies of any administration and that we are realistic enough to know that the global conspiracy of communism is tough enough and aggressive enough to try to place its agents and sympathizers in positions of public responsibility whether we are living under a Republican or a Democratic President. I believe and hope that present day Members of Congress are also candid and realistic enough to recognize that it is neither sound judgment nor good governmental practice to expect executive agencies to be as zealous in investigating themselves as would be an alert and properly conducted congressional investigating committee carrying out one of the direct responsibilities of its branch of Government.

My own experience on investigating committees began while I was a Member of the House of Representatives serving on the House Committee on Un-American Activities while it was under Chairman MARTIN DIES, of Texas. In those days, the emphasis was on trying sufficiently to protect the powers-of-Congress-to-investigate so as to enable us to at least control a committee room situation against the disruptive antics of the Communists and their associates. Members of that Dies committee were intimidated, and pressures of all types were used to induce them to stop all investigations and to avoid all efforts to dig out and expose Communist agents. Chairman MARTIN DIES was harassed and attacked not only by Communists and left-wingers but by people in high positions of responsibility from within his own administration. The drum fire of attack on MARTIN DIES finally impaired his health and necessitated his retirement from Congress. He has now happily returned from retirement.

However, the committee carried on its unpleasant, unpopular, and unrewarded duties. Under a series of chairmen—both Democrat and Republican—the committee devoted itself to developing techniques of investigations and hearings designed to protect God-fearing and freedom-loving Americans against the brow-beating tactics and the dire

threats of physical and political violence directed by the Communists. Several other chairmen were successively retired to private life, and it was not until the evidence produced by the House Committee on Un-American Activities during the Republican 80th Congress resulted in the conviction and imprisonment of Alger Hiss that service on the House Committee on Un-American Activities was really considered something different from receiving an assignment on the kamikaze squad.

On the Senate side, I watched a succession of chairmen of investigating committees both Democrats and Republicans come under attack at times from the Communists and those they can control or confuse and at times from partisan sources eager to destroy the effectiveness of a given investigation in order to protect a political rampart which would be placed in jeopardy if the truth about malfeasance or maladministration became generally known.

Primarily, however, it is when an investigating committee of Congress attempts to expose a mare's nest of subversion that its members come under direct attack and that its rules of procedure are tested in the crucible of fire. It is in investigations of this type, too, that all of us are called upon to exert our best judgment in evolving and enforcing rules of procedure which will be fair to all witnesses while, at the same time, not sacrificing the best security interests of the free people of the United States who find their cherished Republic coming under the concerted attack of the global Communist conspiracy.

While serving as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities nearly 10 years ago, I asked our committee to have the Brookings Institution make a careful, analytical study for determining un-American activities and suggesting standards for use by our investigating committee. The Brookings Institution responded magnificently and I ask leave at this point in my remarks to insert a copy of the Brookings Institution report in the body of these hearings since only a very limited number of copies of the report are still extant.

I believe that the rules our House Committee on Un-American Activities adopted subsequent to the report we received from the Brookings Institution were one of the first set of rules—if not actually the first—formally evolved and accepted by a committee of Congress in governing its procedures of investigation. You will note that many of the suggested rules of procedure included in the report of the Brookings Institution are presently incorporated in the rules of our investigating committees which now establish for themselves specified rules of procedure.

In the past 10 years, of course, we have learned much about how to conduct a congressional investigation and also how to conduct executive and open hearings which, on occasion, bring recalcitrant or rebellious witnesses before a panel of Congressmen or Senators. Unhappily, the Communists and others determined to disrupt congressional committee procedures have also learned much during the past 10 years.

One of the collateral results, for example, of the conviction of Alger Hiss for perjuring himself before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and before the grand jury was the development on the part of uncooperative and guilty witnesses of the habit of hiding behind the fifth amendment in an attempt to conceal facts from those charged with the responsibility of ascertaining them. Increasingly, those who would give aid or comfort to Communist causes, utilize the fifth amendment as a tactic for deceiving the public, for concealing their duplicity and for pyramiding the difficulties with which a congressional in-

investigating committee or a grand jury is confronted.

Another favorite tactic of those who would destroy America from within by utilizing the protection of our Constitution to help them make a shambles of this great charter of freedom, is to insist upon committee rules of procedure which would be entirely unworkable and which would give those with facts to conceal additional advantages over those charged with the responsibility of revealing the truth. In your deliberations, I urge that you keep these facts in mind as you move forward in an effort to strike a proper balance between the necessity of safeguarding the interests of innocent witnesses and of safeguarding the security of millions of innocent Americans who must depend upon the machinery of Congress—including investigating committees of Congress—to protect against the type of human slavery which the Communists have already imposed on nearly half the people of this globe.

In my opinion, it is entirely possible to devise a universal set of rules of procedure for congressional investigating committees which will strike this happy balance. During the past decade, we have moved definitely in that direction. The successive prosecution of many cases involving citations for contempt of Congress has helped to strengthen the hand of investigating committees while at the same time we have been steadily losing ground against those adroitly employing the mechanism of the fifth amendment. While attacks upon investigating committees are no longer as violent and vicious as they were in the days when MARTIN DIES served as the chairman of our House Committee on Un-American Activities, these attacks do and will continue, but it is good to know that an increasingly large number of Americans are recognizing the inherent devices of the Communist conspirators and are rallying behind those whose duty it is to protect us all from an imperialist, dictatorial Communist threat which, if successful, would make slaves of everybody.

The following specific suggestions occur to me in addition to the rules and regulations normally employed by the Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Investigations, of which I am a member, and by most of the investigative committees with which I am familiar.

1. The first of my suggestions I have incorporated in proposed legislation which is presently before this Rules Committee. I feel that the FBI should be authorized by law to make a complete field check of all personnel employed on any investigative committee.

2. I feel that we should continue our present policy of having one man comprise a quorum on an investigation committee but that every reasonable effort should be made to have at least two committee members present when hearings are actually being held.

3. I feel that before out-of-town hearings are held by any committee they should be authorized by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee, and that at least two members of the committee should be assigned to attend such out-of-town hearings as are scheduled.

4. I think it would be helpful if the chairman of each investigating committee would have his staff director make a weekly summary report to each of the committee members, epitomizing the staff activities of the preceding week.

5. I feel that the present policy of permitting all witnesses to be accompanied by counsel is sound, and that we should continue to limit the participation of such counsel to consulting with his client and to submitting any written questions which he might care to ask to the chairman of the committee, with the understanding that the

committee shall control the decision of whether or not those questions will be asked.

6. I feel that testimony taken in executive hearings should not be released in whole or in part except upon the vote of a majority of the committee or subcommittee.

I suggest the foregoing six rules of procedure to your committee, in addition to calling to your attention and recommending the use of the entire body of procedures now being employed by our investigating subcommittee and which are already a part of your record.

Your committee may desire to ask me questions concerning other recommendations which have come before you and with which I may or may not have had some experience or familiarity. In the main, I think it is the attitude and the personalities of the individual committee members and their chairmen which will determine whether or not investigations are conducted successfully and with proper decorum. I know of no rule that a bad chairman could not break, and perhaps there are none that a good chairman should require. However, I definitely am among those who believe that every committee should have a code of procedure; I believe it should be published and available to the public; and I believe it would be wise to try to have uniform rules of procedure for every committee operating with funds of the United States Senate. However, I repeat, recalcitrant or rebellious witnesses can sometimes make a shambles of any hearing, regardless of the rules of procedure, and impetuous or quick-tempered chairmen can sometimes destroy the dignity and decorum of any hearing quite regardless of any code of committee conduct. Men cannot be made over by the printing of a set of rules of procedure.

Before closing I would like to say a final word about the legislation before us proposing to establish statutory prohibition against the televising and broadcasting of congressional hearings. This is a decision which I believe should be left to the individual committee, and that it should be made on the basis of the nature of the hearing and the purpose which the committee seeks to achieve by conducting it. Undoubtedly, many hearings might better not be televised or broadcast, but to establish a statutory prohibition against them, it seems to me, would be exceedingly unwise.

In my opinion, both television and radio are here to stay. They are legitimate media of communication. They are administered, operated, and staffed by men of the same general respectability and capacity as those employed in the field of journalism. They provide information and service to millions of people. For the great Congress of the United States to pass a law to prevent itself from allowing any of its committees to hold hearings in the presence of television cameras or radio microphones would, in my opinion, be a backward step.

There is much to be said on the positive side in behalf of televising and broadcasting certain congressional hearings. I believe that the time we permitted television cameras to report certain phases of the now-famous Hiss-Chambers hearings during the 80th Congress, at which time I was acting chairman of the group of members on the House Un-American Activities Committee who conducted that investigation and the present Vice President was a member of my committee, that this was the first televised congressional hearing in history. I recently had the additional experience of presiding over the most widely televised series of congressional hearings in history. Out of these experiences, I want to pay a salute to some of the positive results flowing from the use of television and radio in controversial hearings of this nature.

In the first place, these new media which report by sound and picture to John Q. American are a great and mighty conscience for the press. There is seldom any cause to complain about biased or prejudiced reporting when a congressional hearing is conducted before the television and over the radio. Even the most prejudiced of reporters or of newspapers hesitate long before trying to slant a news story on a hearing which the readers have seen before their eyes and have listened to as it unfolded word by word. Television and radio, indeed, make better reporters of the best that we have and good reporters of the rest of those covering Capitol Hill.

In addition, television and radio provide for Americans, generally, the same opportunities to watch and hear a segment of their Government in action as is consistently provided for citizens of the District of Columbia and adjacent Maryland and Virginia who can commute to Capitol Hill and attend any open committee hearings that they choose. Television simply removes the walls from the committee room to let the people living in South Dakota, Colorado, or California have the same access to the deliberations of a committee as would otherwise be exclusively the right of those living within a few miles' driving distance of the National Capital. I submit that the people of my State have the same right to see and to hear what takes place in a committee hearing as the people of Virginia or Maryland. Certain committee sessions should, of course, be closed and held as executive meetings. Once you hold a public hearing meeting, however, I would deplore any statutory provision which would put the great Congress of the United States on record as saying, "It is good that the people living near the Capital should see and hear these hearings. It is well that they be reported by the press. It is proper that photographers should take pictures of the witnesses and that perhaps a newsreel be made of the participating Senators for abbreviated use on some theater screen. But it is not only bad and improper but illegal to permit radio microphones and television cameras to carry the whole story and the true story of these open congressional hearings directly to the people of America wherever they are and wherever they live." Personally, I shall always vote against any legislative measure based on such a discriminatory premise and which endeavors to select from among the media of communication some with which to cooperate and others to condemn.

If there are questions, gentlemen, I shall do my best to answer them.

During the delivery of Mr. MUNDT's speech,

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me in order that I may submit a unanimous-consent request that the absence of a quorum may be suggested without affecting the right of the Senator to the floor?

I think the most disgraceful spectacle I have ever seen is the one before my eyes when I look at the Democrat side of the aisle and see one Senator seated there. There are two good Democrats now seated on this side of the aisle. I refer to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who are seated on our side of the aisle. Only three Democrats are present while we are debating what rules of the Senate we shall apply. I think the absence of a quorum should be suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield for that purpose?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from South Dakota has the floor. Does he yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, may I complete my statement?

Mr. MUNDT. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin had finished.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to suggest to my Democratic friends, who so mysteriously appear when the prosecution commences, and then disappear when any defense is offered, that I think when we are talking about preserving the dignity of the Senate, this is the most disgraceful spectacle I have ever seen. Perhaps we should consider preserving the dignity of the Senate by having Senators present, because Senators are the jury in this case, which involves the rules.

I mentioned the fact that one Democrat Senator was seated on the other side of the aisle. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is present, and has been present during most of the debate. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is also present, and is seated on the side of the aisle where I like to see him sitting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to announce that the senior Senator from South Dakota yielded for a question. The Chair will have to hold that if the Senator from South Dakota yields in the future he must yield for a question or yield the floor, unless otherwise provided by unanimous consent.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like to ask my distinguished colleague a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from South Dakota yield to his colleague?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Will the senior Senator from South Dakota permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request that I be allowed to suggest the absence of a quorum without affecting my colleague's right to the floor?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should have to object to that, for this reason: While I would like to have all Senators present constantly, if possible, we are now operating under controlled time. Every Senator has had notice of that fact. A number of speakers have requested the opportunity to be heard. By the time a quorum could be obtained, and the call of the roll completed, we have no assurance that any more Senators would be present after the quorum call than are now present. For that reason I must respectfully request that the Senator not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to announce that if a quorum call had been in order, the time would have come out of the time of the Senator from California.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I merely wish to state for the benefit of other Senators that Senators who have been present during the entire day will notice that during most of the day more than 50 percent of the Democratic Senators have been present. I am sure that if the junior Senator from Wisconsin had been present during the entire day he would have noticed that.

Also, it is now about 4:30 in the afternoon, which is a good time for Senators who have been in the Chamber all day to sign their mail. That accounts for the scarcity of Senators during long speeches.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to submit a unanimous-consent request of my own. I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy for which I have just yielded, beginning with the remarks of the junior Senator from Wisconsin and ending with those of the Senator from Louisiana appear, if at all, following my remarks.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield one-half hour to the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the matter now before us, Senate Resolution 301.

At the outset, I desire to compliment the members of the select committee. I am proud of my association with these able and distinguished Senators. I have the highest respect for their patriotism and their integrity.

The distinguished chairman of the select committee, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and I came to the Senate in the same class. I have been his guest in his home State. I have long admired his outstanding Americanism and his conscientious devotion to duty.

The junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] have served with me on the Public Works Committee. Both are devoted Americans and are so appreciative of our ideals.

The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] have served with me on the Finance Committee. Both are sincerely devoted to American principles and dedicated to the public service.

The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has been my friend for many years because of our military association. He is an outstanding American.

I cannot praise too highly the completely fair and extremely creditable manner in which these members of the select committee met the great responsibilities imposed upon them by this body. Theirs was not an easy task. It is not pleasant to sit in judgment upon a colleague who has been widely acclaimed as one of the most vigorous and courageous fighters against the Communist conspiracy in our Nation.

I was very much impressed by the introductory remarks of my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from Utah, in submitting the report of

the select committee. He stated as follows:

The Senate as a body is now in a position to interpret that evidence and applicable law and decide to agree or disagree with the committee findings and conclusions or make findings or conclusions of its own. Our findings do not represent an adversary's brief, and the committee by no means assumes the position of a prosecutor. We are available to explain our report or answer questions concerning it, but we are not here to argue that our findings and conclusions must be followed.

I submit, Mr. President, that this statement, reflecting the views of the individual members of the committee and its chairman, was completely fair and proper and in keeping with the quasi-judicial character of the proceedings in which the Senate is now engaged.

The charges against Senator McCARTHY which, in the judgment of the select committee, justify a resolution of censure have been ably and eloquently discussed, pro and con, at length. I shall not, therefore, take the time of the Senate to elaborate further on the merit or lack of merit with respect to those charges.

I do feel called upon, however, to make mention of the recommendation by the select committee that Senator McCARTHY is deserving of censure because of his remarks concerning my great and good friend, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

I have had a very close and pleasant association with Senator HENDRICKSON over the years. I have the highest regard for him. I honor his brilliant record as a gallant and heroic soldier in both World Wars, his honorable career as a public servant, and the high character of his statesmanship. I shall miss him in the years ahead. In my opinion, Senator McCARTHY's reference to Senator HENDRICKSON had no basis in truth or fact. I feel that every other Member of the Senate shares that opinion. If Senator McCARTHY has not already apologized to Senator HENDRICKSON for his unjust and improper remark, then I hope that he will soon do so.

While I do not condone the remark regarding our distinguished colleague, I submit that we must keep in mind the great principle involved. Even though we do not approve the language or the opinions expressed by Senator McCARTHY, we must regard freedom of speech on the same high plane mentioned by the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: "Freedom for the thought we hate." Or as Voltaire said: "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

I am sure that everything that has been said on the Senate floor, or that I shall say in these remarks, is not intended in any way to be a reflection upon the select committee or upon any other Member of the Senate. I look upon the present case as a quasi-judicial proceeding; one of great importance, not only to the Members of the Senate, but to the Nation as a whole. I have considered the status of the select committee, and have compared its function, in my own mind, with that of a grand jury which is empowered, in our crimi-

nal courts, to sift out the allegations; to consider all the evidence presented before it, and then to determine which, if any, of the charges, shall be returned to the court for further action. When a grand jury returns a true bill, it carries no presumption of guilt. An indictment has the effect of saying that a prima facie case has been made out, or that the grand jury recommends further consideration by the court and the jury.

As we sit here today, we are not only acting as a jury but we are also acting as a chancellor in equity, because we not only have the responsibility of determining the facts but also of deciding what are the proper conclusions of law.

Censuring a Senator is a very serious matter, and in this proceeding serious charges have been made. I believe that we can agree that the burden of proof rests upon those who have made the charges. Any person who is accused of wrongdoing is presumed to be innocent. That presumption stays with him until the evidence satisfies the jury of the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. And where a reasonable doubt exists, that doubt should and must be resolved in favor of the person against whom the charges have been preferred.

Forty-six specifications of wrongdoing were brought against Senator McCARTHY. The select committee broke the charges down into five categories. After carefully reviewing and giving every consideration to the charges, the select committee decided to proceed with hearings on 13 specifications, which were set forth in the 5 categories contained in the notice of hearings. After holding hearings, the select committee has recommended censure on but two of the charges. The select committee recommended dismissal of all the other charges, reporting that these charges, under all the evidence, did not justify a resolution of censure.

The first recommendation that Senator McCARTHY should be censured deals with the Senator's conduct toward the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. The second recommendation for censure deals with the incidents and conduct of Senator McCARTHY in connection with the taking of the testimony of Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, a general officer of the Army of the United States.

On the first count the committee report states:

It is therefore the conclusion of the select committee that the conduct of the junior Senator from Wisconsin toward the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, toward its members, including the statement concerning Senator HENDRICKSON, acting as a member of the subcommittee, and toward the Senate, was contemptuous, contumacious, and denunciatory without reason or justification, and was obstructive to legislative process. For this conduct, it is our recommendation that he be censured by the Senate.

To sustain this conclusion, the select committee cites five incidents. First:

That Senator McCARTHY refused repeated invitations to testify before the subcommittee.

I have examined the record, and I find that in each of the incidents relating to this matter the committee's letters were merely invitations to appear. When a

Senator, or anyone else, receives an invitation to appear, it carries with it the suggestion that he may accept or reject the invitation. In these particular invitations referred to under this category, the invitations even go further than I have suggested, because they state: "Come if you wish." The gist of these letters was to the effect that Senator McCARTHY could appear before the committee if he so desired.

Certainly under such circumstances there was no misconduct on the part of Senator McCARTHY. In my opinion, he had a perfect right to accept or reject the invitations to appear.

The second incident of misconduct given by the select committee to sustain the first count was that Senator McCARTHY had declined to comply with a request by letter dated November 21, 1952, from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, to appear and supply information concerning certain specific matters involving his activities as a Member of the Senate. This letter was entirely different from those to which I have referred, because this letter was not a mere invitation to appear, but was a specific request that Senator McCARTHY appear before the subcommittee on Saturday, November 22, or on Monday, November 24, but in no case later than November 25. The record shows, and the select committee makes reference to the fact, that Senator McCARTHY did not receive this letter or its contents until after November 25. Senator McCARTHY so advised the subcommittee, and at no time was there another request, nor was he at any time subpoenaed to appear before the subcommittee. His failure to comply with a request to appear before the subcommittee on or before November 25 certainly should not be considered a subject for censure when it is admitted, at the same time, that he had no knowledge of such a request until after November 25.

The third incident cited by the committee to sustain the first count of censure was that he denounced the subcommittee and contemptuously refused to comply with its request. The language Senator McCARTHY used toward the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections was indeed most unfortunate. In considering this incident, however, we must keep in mind the conditions under which his statements were made back in 1952. We must remember that that was an election year. It was a year in which Senator McCARTHY was a candidate for reelection. It was a year in which he felt that an attempt was being made to reflect upon him so as to affect his reelection. We must keep in mind that there had come to the attention of the junior Senator from Wisconsin that the investigation which was being conducted did not confine itself to his conduct as a United States Senator, but went back many years into his private life, and into matters concerning members of the Senator's family. It must be remembered also that he had been denied the privilege of appearing before the committee for the purpose of cross-examining the witnesses who testified against him.

The select committee, in its report, has stated that Senator McCARTHY should

have been granted the privilege of cross-examining such witnesses.

We must keep also in mind that Senator McCARTHY stated that he would appear before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections upon oral request by the chairman of the subcommittee if he were given the opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses who had appeared against him. He also stated that he would gladly appear before the subcommittee if he were subpoenaed. In view of these circumstances, can we say that Senator McCARTHY was without some provocation for the attitude he took at the time?

The fourth incident cited to sustain the first count of censure was that Senator McCARTHY continued to show his contempt for the Senate by failing to explain in any manner the six charges contained in the Hennings-Hayden-Hendrickson report. That report was filed during the 82d Congress; I believe it was filed January 2, 1953. The 83d Congress convened on January 3, 1953.

Before Senator McCARTHY was sworn in for his second term in office, on January 3, 1953, he denied the charges made in the report. He made a public statement that the members of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, or any other Member of the Senate who felt that he had been guilty of misconduct, should appear on January 3 and request that he, Senator McCARTHY, stand aside until these matters had been thoroughly investigated and until the evidence against him had been presented. In spite of his public statement, no Member of the Senate raised his voice in opposition to the swearing in of Senator McCARTHY on that day as a Member of this distinguished body.

The fifth incident to sustain the first count of censure deals with Senator McCARTHY's remarks with reference to my good friend, Senator Hendrickson, which I have already discussed.

I cannot agree that the various incidents above referred to resulted in obstructing the legislative process of the Senate. If the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections desired to do so, it could have subpoenaed Senator McCARTHY at any time. The subcommittee had over 15 months in which to take testimony and to prepare its report. If the legislative process was obstructed, it was due to the fact that the subcommittee had failed to compel the attendance of witnesses by using the tools with which it had been provided.

All the incidents enumerated to sustain the first count in the resolution of censure occurred during Senator McCARTHY's first term in office. I do not believe there is any authority for the Senate to punish or censure a Member for conduct which took place during another term of office. If there were objections to his conduct or if he were disqualified in the opinion of any Member of the Senate, such Senator had a perfect right to take appropriate action by asking that Senator McCARTHY stand aside until these matters had been determined.

I, therefore, feel, based upon the record as it now stands before us, that the first

count is not sustained and should be dismissed.

The second count for censure is as follows:

The select committee concludes that the conduct of Senator McCARTHY toward General Zwicker was reprehensible, and that for this conduct he should be censured by the Senate.

To sustain this count the committee claims that, without justification, the junior Senator from Wisconsin impugned the loyalty, patriotism, and character, of Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker, and in his interrogation of General Zwicker resorted to abusive conduct, including a charge that he was unfit to wear the uniform. The select committee states that this was done without provocation.

In the select committee's report, the committee states:

There is no evidence that General Zwicker was intentionally irritating, evasive, or arrogant.

It would seem to me that General Zwicker's intentions are not really material to the issue. I think that whether he intended to be irritating, evasive, or arrogant has no bearing on the question involved. The question we have to decide is whether under all the circumstances that existed on February 18, 1954, when General Zwicker testified before the McCarthy committee, his conduct, his answers, or his demeanor gave rise to a feeling that he was being evasive and that he was withholding proper information from a committee of the Senate. General Zwicker's demeanor and the manner in which he testified before the select committee are not really at issue in the case before us. Here again, the question is what was his demeanor, what was his attitude, what were his answers on February 18, 1954, when it is alleged that Senator McCARTHY was, without provocation, abusive and used improper language toward the general.

We must keep in mind the fact that when General Zwicker was testifying, Major Peress had been promoted from the rank of captain to the rank of major, and that on February 3, 1954, he had received an honorable discharge from the United States Army. We must also keep in mind that General Zwicker was present during the morning session of February 18, the date on which he testified; that he had heard all the testimony offered to establish Major Peress' activities in connection with the Communist Party; and that he knew that Major Peress had invoked the fifth amendment to the Constitution and had refused to answer questions regarding his Communist activities, on the ground that such answers would tend to incriminate him. We must also keep in mind the fact that on the same afternoon General Zwicker testified that all facts which had been developed during the morning session were matters of record with the Army prior to the date of Major Peress' promotion from captain to major. It is hard for me to understand how, with this information of record with the Army, it was possible to promote such an individual from the rank of captain to major, and finally to sep-

arate him from the service on February 3, by handing him an honorable discharge. Regardless of who was to blame for the situation, it certainly would have been irritating and provoking to me to know that the United States Army, in which I so proudly served over such a long period of time, had promoted such a man from captain to major, and then made matters worse by giving him an honorable discharge. Keeping this in mind, I cannot read the testimony of February 18 without coming to the conclusion that General Zwicker was irritating and evasive. I do not want to believe he was intentionally evasive in order to protect his superiors. I would rather assume that he did not know how far he could go under the Executive order under which he was testifying. In any event, his testimony when he appeared before the select committee was a great deal different. Then his answers were not evasive; on the contrary they were direct and to the point. I am sure every Member of the Senate has read that testimony, as it was given on February 18. I am confident that in the mind of each Senator there is some question as to whether the general was somewhat irritating and evasive when he was examined at that hearing. I feel that there was some provocation, perhaps not intentionally on the part of General Zwicker, which gave rise to the unfortunate language used by Senator McCARTHY when he stated that the general was not fit to wear the uniform.

Mr. CASE. Madam President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ABEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MARTIN. Madam President, I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania will wish to qualify the statement he just made, by using the words "the uniform of a general." Such a distinction was made by Senator McCARTHY; he did not say General Zwicker was not fit to wear the uniform of the United States Army, but he said General Zwicker was not fit to wear the uniform of a general.

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to make that distinction, although I wish to say there is no distinction between officers and men, insofar as the uniform of the United States Army is concerned. The uniform of an American officer or of an American soldier is like the flag; we want to keep it unsullied; it must be above reproach. However, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for the correction.

Mr. CASE. Yes; because Senator McCARTHY himself made a point about that.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. I appreciate the correction.

Madam President, the second count for censure is based on occurrences during Senator McCARTHY's second term in office, and during this, the 83d Congress. It is, therefore, a subject of proper consideration by the Senate. I feel, however, that since none of the incidents under either count 1 for censure or count 2 for censure was in violation of the Rules of the Senate, we should not take affirma-

tive action on the resolution. Otherwise, we would be establishing a very dangerous precedent. How can we lay down a code of ethics to guide the Members of the Senate? We have, by rules, set up the procedure by which we can control the conduct and the language of Senators on the floor of the Senate. This is proper because a Member of Congress is immune from the civil and criminal processes of the law for remarks made upon the Senate floor. But for remarks made off the Senate floor, a Senator should have no greater privileges than those had by any other citizen of the United States.

As it appears to me, Madam President, that the question before the Senate is whether the counts on which the select committee recommended that the junior Senator from Wisconsin be censured by the Senate are of sufficient gravity to warrant the taking of such drastic action.

Censuring a Member of this body is punishment of such severity that it should be invoked only after it is established beyond all reasonable doubt that the Member is guilty of deliberate, flagrant, and aggravated disorderly conduct, in violation of the rules of the Senate.

Madam President, I feel that the drastic action called for by Senate Resolution 301 is not justified; and I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. BENNETT obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). How much time does the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been on my feet a number of times during this debate, and a number of times I have expressed the hope that we could approach this problem objectively, without any emotional excitement. The Senator from Utah will attempt to do so now.

Yesterday the Senator from Utah submitted a proposed amendment which would, in effect, broaden the base of possible censure of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. It is my purpose tonight to discuss the language from the point of view of suggesting to the junior Senator from Wisconsin and his friends what the Senator from Utah would consider to be an adequate defense against his own amendment. Before I reach that point however, there are 1 or 2 observations which I should like to make.

During the discussion of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement last night it was suggested that it was unfair to consider any amendment which would broaden the base for the censure proposal. The Senator from Utah respectfully suggests that if that should be the decision, it would be equally unfair to consider any amendment or substitute which would narrow the base or soften it. I am happy that the Senate decided not to place that limitation upon the resolution.

During the same discussion the question was raised that by the submission of the proposed amendment yesterday the junior Senator from Utah was prob-

ably unfair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin, because he and his friends would have no time to prepare a defense, on the assumption that perhaps the Senator from Utah would not discuss his amendment until within 1 hour of the time for voting.

The Senator from Utah has been trying to obtain the floor during the afternoon. His purpose is to suggest the type of defense which might be used, and to give the junior Senator from Wisconsin and his supporters and advocates all the possible time there is left in which to prepare this or any other defense.

Another question was raised—and I think properly so—namely, that this amendment, if it should be voted upon by the Senate, on Wednesday or Thursday, as it will be, will not have been referred to a committee. The Senator from Utah suggests that every act involved in every allegation contained in the amendment of the Senator from Utah has been committed in the presence of the Senate. The earliest date which is attached to any of the language to which the Senator from Utah refers is October 25, 1954. The latest date is November 13, 1954, involving the latest statement by the junior Senator from Wisconsin. So it seems to me that there is no necessity for referring this amendment to any committee to attempt to find the facts in the case.

That leads the junior Senator from Utah to his first suggestion. It seems to me that the allegations in the amendment of the junior Senator from Utah can be divided into three groups. To use the old phrase which the junior Senator from Utah heard when he sat as a juror in an ordinary courtroom, these three hang as a chain. If the junior Senator from Wisconsin and his advocates can completely destroy one group, I think they will have effectively destroyed the amendment of the junior Senator from Utah.

It seems to me that the first question which should be considered, and the first group which could be destroyed, involve a question of fact. Did the junior Senator from Wisconsin actually make certain statements? So far as the junior Senator from Utah knows, he has not denied making them. The junior Senator from Utah is prepared to introduce into the record documentary evidence that they were in fact made, but he will not clutter up the Record with such evidence today. He merely gives notice that if there is a claim that the junior Senator from Wisconsin did not in fact make such statements, the junior Senator from Utah will be prepared to offer such evidence as he has during his half of the limited time available, whenever the opportunity may arise.

It seems to me that the second chain of issues, or the second set of facts which must either stand or fall if the amendment of the junior Senator from Utah is to stand, grows out of this kind of problem: If certain statements were made by any Senator, would they, in fact, merit censure? Or, to phrase it in another way, would they—and I now quote from the language of my proposed amendment—be "contrary to good morals and senatorial ethics and tend to

bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute, to obstruct the constitutional processes of the Senate, and to impair its dignity."

The junior Senator from Utah feels that if it can be shown that none of the statements attributed to the junior Senator from Wisconsin and referred to in these allegations would have the effect mentioned, then the amendment of the junior Senator from Utah must fall. The junior Senator from Utah would like to take a minute or two in discussing each one of them briefly.

The first statement was the one contained in the letter written to the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] under date of October 25, 1954.

For example, it is now unquestioned—

Said Senator McCARTHY—
that three members of the committee, including yourself—

Meaning the senior Senator from Utah—

indicated prejudice toward me before you were selected to act on that committee, and failed to tell the Vice President of your statements in that regard before he appointed you to this committee.

This would appear to be a deliberate deception—

That is where the junior Senator from Utah gets the words which he put into his proposed amendment—

deliberate deception of the Vice President and—

These are the other words—
a fraud upon the Senate which obviously intended that an unprejudiced committee be appointed.

Is it true that any Senator who imputes to members and to the chairman of a committee deliberate deception and fraud would tend to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute?

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

Mr. BENNETT. I have only a limited time available. I do not wish to get off my subject.

Mr. LONG. I merely wished to ask the Senator whether that statement was made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BENNETT. That statement was contained in a letter addressed by Senator McCARTHY to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS on October 25, 1954.

The junior Senator from Utah went to the most obvious source, namely, Webster's International Dictionary. Webster defines a fraud as—

One who perpetrates a fraud; a cheat; an imposter.

I underline this definition:

An intentional perversion of truth for the purpose of inducing another in reliance upon it to part with some valuable thing belonging to him.

It seems to the junior Senator from Utah that the Senate must be persuaded that the three members of the committee did intentionally perpetrate a fraud, and that even the imputation of that intention tends to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute.

The second statement to which I refer is the statement made to the press by the junior Senator from Wisconsin on

November 4, and repeated by the junior Senator from Wisconsin on a television show on November 7, 1954, the day before the Senate came into special session. I have the text of the statement made on the television program, but I shall not read it.

The key word is the word "lynch." In one case the junior Senator from Wisconsin referred to a "lynch party." In another case he referred to a "lynching bee."

It seems to the junior Senator from Utah that to impute to the Senate itself all the implications that go with the word "lynch" is to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute.

Going back to Webster's International Dictionary, Webster defines "lynch" as:

To inflict punishment, especially death, upon a person without the forms of law.

I refer now to volume 25 of Words and Phrases, which defines "lynch" as follows:

It is a term descriptive of action of unofficial persons, organized bands, or mobs, who seize persons charged with or suspected of crimes, or take them out of the custody of law, and inflict summary punishment on them without legal trial and without warrant or authority of law.

An Ohio act defines "lynching" as:

A collection of individuals assembled for any unlawful purpose intending to do damage or injury to anyone, or pretending to exercise correctional power over persons by violence, and without authority of law. A lynching involves situations where a group of persons usurps ordinary government powers and exercises correctional authority over them.

In other words, Mr. President, it seems to me that this part of my amendment raises the question of whether charging the Senate with being that kind of unorganized and unlawful group, proceeding without due process to punish a man even to a degree comparable to death, is bringing the Senate into dishonor and disrepute.

I pass next to the statements made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin and reported as having been made in a speech in Milwaukee on Saturday evening, November 14, after the Senate met in special session. In that speech, in referring to the chairman of the select committee, he used the words:

The most unusual, the most cowardly thing I ever heard of.

He said, further:

I expected he would be afraid to answer the questions, but didn't think he'd be stupid enough to make a public statement.

So far as the junior Senator from Utah is concerned, with all due respect to his senior colleague, these statements present him with the greatest difficulty in this situation, because it might be assumed that these were statements made by one Senator with respect to another, as an individual, rather than with respect to a Senator as an officer of the Senate, namely, as chairman of a committee.

If those statements had been made on the floor of the Senate, undoubtedly they would have been subject to rule XIX.

It is interesting to note in passing that only once in the history of the Senate

has rule XIX been used with reference to a committee or a committee official. It has always been used on a personal basis.

I should like to move on to the next series of statements. These were uttered, shall we say, on the floor of the Senate. The junior Senator from Wisconsin announced on the morning of November 10 that he would make a speech on that day, and he released a copy of his speech to the press. As so often happens in the Senate, he was not able to get time until the session reached the point where he felt he would not have sufficient time to make the speech. Therefore he asked and received permission to have the text of the speech printed in the RECORD. What I am about to quote from is the material which was put into the RECORD. The junior Senator from Utah assumes that the junior Senator from Wisconsin accepts as much responsibility for those statements as if he had actually made them vocally on the floor of the Senate. Those statements, as reported in my amendment, are:

Characterizing the said committee as the "unwitting handmaidens," "involuntary agent," and "attorneys in fact" of the Communist Party, and in charging that the said committee in writing its report "imitated Communist methods."

Can the junior Senator from Wisconsin or his advocates say that that did not bring the select committee, and thus the Senate, into dishonor and disrepute?

Unfortunately, there is a body of legal decisions on this subject. It is pretty definitely determined, at least in some States of this Nation, that to characterize an association as a Communist association in the United States is libelous per se. The courts of New York have held that it is libelous per se to characterize a person as a Communist or as a Communist sympathizer. In Illinois it has been decided that published words reflecting on one's patriotism are libelous per se. One of the most interesting decisions, however, was made in my own State of Utah in a case in which one farm organization sued another farm organization because of statements by the second organization that the first organization was either Communist or Communist-dominated or contained Communist sympathizers. I quote from the decision:

It is the accepted view that to write or speak of a person or an organization as being Communist or a Communist sympathizer is to subject such a person to public hatred and contempt, and is libelous per se.

The court said:

The label of Communist today in these times in which we live, in the minds of average and reputable persons, places the plaintiffs beyond the pale of respectability, makes them a symbol of public hatred, ridicule, and contempt, or to designate the plaintiffs as Communist-dominated is to cripple the functioning, the dignity, and reputation of those organizations in the communities in which they do business.

To call someone or to refer to him as Communist-dominated is a statement of a bald and unambiguous fact. It is not a criticism or a comment on an acknowledged or accepted fact.

It is interesting to me to note that that language contains the idea that to call an organization Communist-dominated is to cripple the function of such organization. I suggest that perhaps here we have a statement which might also include the effect of obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate.

I have one more legal decision before me in the case of Grant against Reader's Digest. The second circuit court held that it is libelous even to write of a lawyer that he acted as a legislative representative of the Communist Party.

Here we have in the statement submitted for the RECORD by the junior Senator from Wisconsin three interesting phrases. The first is the phrase "unwitting handmaidens." Some facetious references have been made to that phrase, and the junior Senator from Wisconsin yesterday suggested that maybe the gender of the words should be changed. But as I look at it, it is probably the most contemptuous phrase used among these 3 or 4; in many ways it might be the most contemptuous phrase that one Senator could address to another or to a committee. The word "handmaidens" imputes the character of a servant, a servant of low degree, or an agent—in this case an agent of what the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has to eloquently described as the Communist conspiracy.

It seems to me that in order to escape the possibility of censure for the use of such a term the junior Senator from Wisconsin has the responsibility of persuading the Senate that such is not the case. The word "handmaidens" would be enough, but the word "unwitting" is added. This implies that his colleagues in the Senate lacked the mental ability to recognize that they were being used as dupes or stooges, and that they were incapable of protecting themselves and the Senate against the machinations of the Communist conspiracy.

I shall not dwell on the phrase "involuntary agent," because I think that whatever criticism might be made of that could also be made, with some force, of the phrase "attorney in fact." Webster's International Dictionary says that such an attorney is a person appointed by another. It is not an office which someone acquires of his own volition or his own choice. He is appointed by another, by letter or by power of attorney, to transact any business for him out of court.

In another legal decision attorneys in fact are defined as persons who are acting under a special power. Attorneys in fact are agents.

By this language it seems to me the junior Senator from Wisconsin has undertaken to show there was a conscious relationship between the members of the committee and the Communist conspiracy, a kind of relationship so close that it involved an appointment on the one side and an acceptance of the appointment. So it involved some kind of contact perhaps with some kind of negotiations. It contains the express delegation of authority from one person or group to another person or group.

If the junior Senator from Wisconsin can persuade the Senate that in calling

the members of the committee "unwitting handmaidens" and "involuntary agents, and attorneys in fact" of the Communist Party, and can somehow take those statements out from under the double implication, first, that anyone who is called a Communist or a Communist sympathizer is brought into disrepute simply by the implication of the words, and, second, that to impute a conscious contractual relationship is somehow not calculated to bring the committee and the Senate into disrepute, I think the suggested amendment of the junior Senator from Utah can be defeated.

The third area in which I think the amendment can be defeated is that the junior Senator from Wisconsin might undertake to prove that even though these charges may seem to bring the Senate into disrepute, they are in fact true, and, therefore, should be allowed to stand, regardless of the disrepute, and that he should not be censured for making statements about the Senate and its committees which are in fact true.

The first one was the statement about deliberate deception and fraud. I have been on the floor many hours during which the junior Senator from Wisconsin and those who have worked with him have questioned members of the select committee, particularly the three referred to in his letter, to attempt to establish the truth of this particular allegation. It is for the Senate itself to decide whether that allegation has in fact been established as true.

We heard the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] yesterday, in his last speech, make a statement with respect to his own attitude, and other Members of the Senate have been equally frank.

If the junior Senator from Wisconsin could establish that the proceedings of this special session since November 8 have been conducted in an atmosphere outside the Senate rules, have been conducted without any semblance of a judicial nature, then he might be able to establish that this is, in fact, a lynching bee, and that perhaps such a statement does not improperly impute dishonor and disrepute to the Senate.

Parenthetically, I can observe only one fundamental change which has taken place in the proceedings of the Senate during this special session, namely, that the Senate has recessed each day for lunch; and we have to thank our friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] for his eloquent speech about the rights of the sheepherders in his State to help us achieve that very worthwhile objective.

But beyond that, so far as I am concerned, there have been no variations either from the rules of the Senate or from its established pattern of procedure.

I will agree that the question of whether the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WARKINS], my colleague, is cowardly and stupid is something which will and must remain a matter of opinion, and is not susceptible of proof.

I also feel that the statements made with respect to the relationship of the

select committee to the Communist Party are likewise not susceptible of proof.

I now desire to quote briefly from the material which the junior Senator from Wisconsin placed in the RECORD on November 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inform the junior Senator from Utah that his time has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I have sufficient time in which to finish this particular quotation?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BENNETT. While my assistant is locating the quotation, I shall attempt to round up my remarks in summary.

I am trying to be completely objective with respect to my amendment, and to suggest the methods by which the charges can be defended, and the type of defense which I feel would be necessary to persuade me that my amendment is improper and out of order.

Included in the text of the material placed in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Wisconsin is the following statement:

In the course of the Senate debate I shall demonstrate that the Watkins committee has done the work of the Communist Party.

I have been waiting patiently for that demonstration. I have no right to suggest any course of action to my colleague from Wisconsin, but I hope that before the debate is ended the junior Senator from Wisconsin will take the floor and, in an affirmative statement, will make his own defense, rather than to depend very largely, as it seems to me he has done, upon the questioning of other Senators. Certainly if the junior Senator from Wisconsin can make that statement good, if he can demonstrate on the floor of the Senate that the Watkins committee has done the work of the Communist Party, then I should say that the last of these problems and charges would fall, and that my amendment would have been successfully defended and therefore defeated.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. WELKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may I have time in which to interrogate the junior Senator from Utah?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the acting minority leader yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Idaho for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEHMAN. I will yield to the Senator from Idaho for a parliamentary inquiry, provided that the time for such an inquiry shall not be taken out of my limited allotment of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so understood, if the

acting majority leader will take the time necessary for a parliamentary inquiry out of his own time.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will state it.

Mr. WELKER. I had asked the majority leader, who yielded time to the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, whether or not I would be granted sufficient time in which to interrogate my friend and colleague from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. The majority leader assured me that I would be given time. In such a situation, is the defendant in this matter to be deprived of the right of interrogation of one who has filed a charge of censure against him?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will have the right to interrogate the Senator from Utah if time can be assigned to him, and if the Senator from New York will yield for that purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. For what purpose?

Mr. KUCHEL. For the purpose of inquiring whether the Senator from New York would be agreeable to having the acting majority leader yield a few minutes of his own time, so that the questions which the Senator from Idaho desires to ask of the Senator from Utah might be propounded now, following the speech of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no objection to yielding. I should think the Senator from Idaho would ask his questions on his own time and in such manner as might seem proper; but I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was not informed of the request made of the majority leader by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from New York, without losing his right to the floor, may yield temporarily to me, so that I may yield time to the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the junior Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Idaho, so that he may ask questions of the junior Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the Senator from California hear me say that I hoped the Senator from Wisconsin and his advocates would develop their case affirmatively? I feel that having presented the material in the manner in which it has been presented, I should prefer to be questioned about it during the period of limitation on debate, when my amendment is before the Senate. My purpose in making the statement today was to give the case to the junior Senator from Wisconsin and his friends for study. Under those circumstances, I shall not ask to have the floor again in order that I might be questioned.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield so that I may make an observation, provided the Senator from New York does not lose the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry, provided I do not lose the floor; I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from New York yield for a very brief observation, not a speech?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will state it.

Mr. WELKER. When did it become the rule of this august body that a Senator who has spoken for more than 30 minutes on the fundamental issues involved in this trial can then shut off the right to questioning, when all the other members of the select committee have submitted to interrogation? I should like to know if that is the rule. If so, I desire to have the RECORD so show at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah relinquished the floor; the junior Senator from New York asked for the floor; the acting minority leader stated the amount of time he would allocate to the Senator from New York; and the junior Senator from New York has the floor at present.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WELKER. Does the RECORD show that the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], promised me that I would have ample time in which to interrogate the junior Senator from Utah?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that the Chair has no such information in his possession, nor has the Chair been informed of the agreement between the majority leader and the Senator from Idaho. The Chair regrets that the information was not available.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I understand this will not be taken out of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding that the Chair has is that the time will be charged to the majority leader.

The Senator from Utah will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, is it not in fact the Senate rule that the matter of yielding for the purpose of questioning is entirely within the power of the Senator who has the floor, and that the asking of questions is a privilege given by the Senator who has the floor, and not a right which any other Senator can demand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so understood by the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit me to make a brief statement without his losing the floor?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader, with the usual understanding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad, out of the time allotted to me, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Utah, to yield 10 or 15 minutes, or whatever reasonable time is desired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from California came into the Chamber after the Senator from Utah made a statement in which he hoped he made it plain that he did not wish to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah does not wish to occupy the floor to answer questions. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York will not yield further.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator. I wish to thank him very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for. The regular order will be observed.

The Chair wishes to inquire from the acting minority leader how much time has been allocated to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Thirty minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, before I proceed with my remarks in connection with the pending resolution, I wish to express my very deep appreciation and my deep gratitude to the members of the select committee who have been engaged in considering, for so many weeks, the highly important and historic issue now before the Senate. I believe that the members of the select committee, the chairman, Senator WATKINS, Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, Senator CARLSON, Senator STENNIS, Senator ERVIN, and Senator CASE have earned and deserve the very real and sincere gratitude of their fellow Members of this body. They have served with devotion, with the utmost fairness, with great skill, and with great consideration. I think very few committees which have served the Senate have performed their missions with greater distinction and with greater fairness, and I may say with greater mercy, than has the select committee.

I wish to commend particularly the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], both for the skill with which he conducted the hearings held by the committee, and for the way he handled the debate on the floor of the Senate. I said

a few days ago that in my nearly 6 years of service in the Senate I do not believe that I have ever listened to greater speeches than have been delivered on the floor of the Senate by the members of the select committee. I cannot emphasize too strongly my sense of gratitude and appreciation for the service those Senators have so unselfishly rendered.

Mr. President, this historic debate is nearing its climax and its end. We shall vote on amendments until the last one has been offered and voted upon, and then finally, before too many hours are gone, upon the censure resolution itself.

I trust and hope that every debilitating amendment will be defeated. It seems unbelievable that the United States Senate, which has been so set upon, so harassed, so long diverted from its vital business by the irresponsible conduct of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, should now weaken in its resolve to approve, as a minimum, the report of the Watkins committee, and the simple resolution recommended by that committee, and recommended, save for one defection, unanimously.

This august body, often called the greatest deliberative body in the world, must not, and will not, I trust, shirk its high responsibility to the American people and to the entire free world. It should not take a single step backward from the minimum terms of censure recommended by the Watkins committee. To do so would arouse a cry of shame throughout our country, and throughout much of the free world.

It is not the junior Senator from Wisconsin who is on trial here before us. It is we who are on trial; we, the Senate of the United States, are on trial at the bar of public opinion in our own country, and at the bar of world opinion, too.

Will we discharge our sworn duty under the Constitution, or will we temporize and compromise, and weigh down the words of justice with phrases of expediency?

There is no personal issue here. It is not Senator McCARTHY, the individual, who is at issue. There is no individual Member of the Senate who would merit, or who could justify, the expenditure of the time and energy we have devoted to this question. No, the junior Senator from Wisconsin is only the symbol of the real issue. The real issue is the nature of the Senate, and its ability to insure that the powers conferred upon each Senator under the rules and under the Constitution—powers provided for the protection of the people—shall not be used to abuse people, to distort the legislative process, and to besmirch the name and dignity, not only of the Senate, but of our country.

To emasculate the Watkins resolution would serve notice upon the Nation that the Senate is unable to control the fair administration of its own processes; and that the Senate can be successfully paralyzed and frustrated by one of its Members—all without discipline by the Senate itself.

The report of the Watkins committee gives in detail the reasons which prompted its recommendations. It has given the Senate the benefit of calm and

restrained conclusions, supported by incontrovertible facts, ascertained by scrupulous inquiry. The explanations made in support of its recommendations indicate with what great reluctance the Watkins committee condemned the conduct of a fellow Senator.

The committee has done its duty as it saw it. Its recommendations, if they are adopted, will do much to restore the prestige and dignity of the Senate, and to repair the injury done it and the Nation by a long succession of improprieties by Senator McCARTHY.

I intend to vote for the Watkins resolution to censure Senator McCARTHY, without crippling amendments. I believe sincerely that he should be censured, not only for the reasons stated by the select committee, but also for many other reasons—reasons which satisfy me as justifying not only censure, but more stringent action.

The committee, as was to be expected from such a group of able and judicially minded Senators, has been more than fair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

I would be less than frank if I did not say that I believe that censure could properly be voted, for instance, on the other grounds chosen by the Watkins committee for consideration.

I accept the committee's statement of its inability, because of time and other limitations, to pass judgment upon many of the charges it has eliminated. But the fact is—and I mention it here for the record—that the charges selected by the committee to support censure, and the others upon which criticism without censure is made, do not even begin to present the true picture of what the Senate, another branch of the Government, and the entire Nation, have suffered from Senator McCARTHY. The detrimental effects of his activities upon our country and upon the Senate are reflected only in part in the original charges filed with the Watkins committee. Available evidence, practically all of which is readily accessible in public documents and in public testimony and statements, gives an authentic picture of McCARTHY and McCarthyism—that dangerous phenomenon which has damaged the morale of the Government service, spread fear and distrust throughout the land, and impaired the prestige of the United States among free people everywhere.

The record of the hearings held by the select committee, together with the summaries contained in its report, is a testimonial to the meticulous care with which the committee performed its important task. The record is in large measure, and except for some oral testimony, a compilation of excerpts from hearings conducted by various committees of the Senate itself, and from reports of Senate committees and from proceedings and statements made on the floor of the Senate. It presents a wealth of evidence on the charges on which censure of the junior Senator from Wisconsin has been recommended.

However, I disagree with several statements made by the committee in its report; and I desire to make clear for the record that my vote in favor of the Watkins resolution is not to be construed as

approval by me of those particular statements, although of course I am strongly supporting the committee's recommendations.

One of the defenses made by Senator McCARTHY to the charge that he treated with contempt the Gillette subcommittee, which in 1950 sought to inquire into his financial dealings, is that the present Senate lacks the power to censure a Senator for acts committed during a session of a previous Congress. In the course of its rejection of this defense, the Watkins committee states, as its opinion, that the Senate is a continuing body. I disagree with this statement. I always have. Personally, I do not believe that the Senate is a continuing body. In speaking on the floor of the Senate in January 1953, during the debate on our rules, I expressed this opinion. I am still of that opinion. But, Mr. President, under any circumstances, that question, in my opinion, is entirely irrelevant here. It has nothing to do with the merits of the case. The resolution of censure now under consideration calls for an expression of the Senate's opinion that one of its Members in several separate and specific matters is guilty of improper conduct. The Senate adopts such resolutions only in cases where it finds that the improper conduct is of such gravity as to bring it into disrepute and to impair public confidence in its integrity. The particular acts the Senate may decide to condemn, and the relevancy of time, place, and circumstance, are all matters confided to the discretion of the Senators, to be exercised by them according to the dictates of their own consciences. For such a purpose, we are not limited by any fixed procedures or rules. If, in the final judgment of the Senate, Senator McCARTHY has at any time so overstepped bounds of propriety as to merit censure, it is within the Senate's power to take the proposed action at any time it chooses.

The illusion has developed—I think it is an illusion—that this is a court of law, and that we are judges, bound by rules of evidence and of procedures applicable in a court of law. In our desire to do justice and to assure fair play, the effect of this illusion may be to make each of us fearful lest we violate rules and procedures to which many of us are strangers.

Mr. President, this is not a court of law. It is the Senate of the United States. We are Senators, elected by the people to serve, not as judges in a court of law, but as Members of the United States Senate, with all the plenary and sovereign powers conferred upon us by the Constitution.

We are bound only by the rules we ourselves adopt, under the Constitution. We are empowered to follow precedent or to make precedents, as we choose. No Congress can bind a succeeding Congress in legislative matters or in any other matters which come within our constitutional jurisdiction. No previous Senate can bind us to any course of action, if we choose to select a new course of action. We can expel a Member or discipline a Member. We are the judges of the qualifications of our colleagues. We can discipline a Mem-

ber for recent acts or for past acts, if our sense of justice indicates the desirability of such a procedure.

In the present case we deal, not really with single acts—although single acts have been selected by the Watkins committee for purposes of convenience in considering the resolution of censure. No, Mr. President; in the present case we are concerned with a whole pattern of conduct, unchanging in its nature down to this very day. This is the real object of our censure. Let us not lose sight of this fact in the forest of legalisms with which we have surrounded ourselves. Let us neither lose perspective nor forget our own powers and functions and responsibilities as Senators, as Members of the Senate of the United States.

The findings of fact made by the Watkins committee on the charges relating to Senator McCARTHY's attitude in 1950 toward the Gillette subcommittee amply support the Watkins committee's conclusion that censure is now warranted.

The other ground for censure recommended by the select committee relates to Senator McCARTHY's abuse of Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker. The Watkins committee found that—

The conduct of Senator McCARTHY toward General Zwicker in reprimanding and ridiculing him, in holding him to public scorn and contumely, and in disclosing the proceedings of the executive session in violation of the rules of his own committee, was inexcusable.

The committee recommended censure for such conduct. I heartily concur in that recommendation and in the statement of the conclusions appearing in the resolution of censure, as reported by the Watkins committee. To vote on that ground for censure is the very least we can do to make amends for the abuse General Zwicker received from a Member of the Senate.

As I said before, I would have voted for censure on the categories of charges on which the Watkins committee confined itself to criticism, without recommending formal censure.

One such category is based upon the charge that Senator McCARTHY issued to Federal employees a public invitation to supply him with classified information, in violation of the law and of their oaths of office. The Watkins committee concluded that the conduct of Senator McCARTHY in this regard "tends to create a disruption of the orderly and constitutional functioning of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, which tends to bring both into disrepute. Such conduct cannot be condoned, and is deemed improper."

Mr. President, I think that conduct was far more than improper. Every Senator is aware of the necessity of obtaining information from executive files, through requests made to the proper authorities. The facts prove conclusively that Senator McCARTHY was seeking confidential information from irregular sources. The gross effect of such improper solicitation, if it were a general practice, would be to destroy all discipline in the executive branch of the Government. Chaos would result. There

would be bedlam and confusion; the Armed Forces could not function successfully, and neither could the Congress.

I am of the same opinion with regard to Senator McCARTHY's receipt and use of the famous phony letter purported to have been sent by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to Major General Bolling. Mr. Hoover denied that any such letter was ever sent by him. It appeared that the letter did contain information copied from a 15-page confidential memorandum from the FBI to the Army. The Watkins committee concluded that—

In offering to make public the contents of this classified document Senator McCARTHY committed grave error. He manifested a high degree of irresponsibility toward the purposes of the statutes and executive directives prohibiting the disclosure to unauthorized persons of classified information or information relating to the national defense.

The Watkins committee, however, decided not to base censure on this action. I think censure, and more, was merited on this ground, too.

There are several other observations I am impelled to make. The Watkins committee expressed reluctance to recommend censure of a Senator for statements made by him on the floor of the Senate on the ground that such censure would place unwarranted limitations on the freedom of debate. One of the statements was Senator McCARTHY's incredible attack on the patriotism of Gen. George C. Marshall. I respectfully submit that the specifications relating to the shameful abuse of General Marshall on the floor of the Senate should not have been eliminated. Senatorial immunity from criminal prosecution, and from claims for damages for unfounded and false and slanderous statements made on the floor of the Senate, is protection enough of the right of free debate, and should in no way provide a Senator with the right to destroy reputations of others at will.

The Constitution contemplates that the Senate itself should take appropriate action to restrain its Members from using their immunity for reprehensible purposes. The Constitution provides for Members of Congress that "for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place." It seems clear that when Members of the House or the Senate exceed, in their speeches or debates, the bounds of propriety or of honesty, the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is not only authorized but has a duty to reprimand or to take whatever action may be necessary to discourage abuse of the right of congressional immunity. I believe that this is the proper interpretation of the congressional immunity provision of the Constitution. I regret that the Watkins committee gave an interpretation which seems to open the doors wide to those whose tongues know no limitations. If such persons are not to be restrained on the floor of the Senate, they are subject to no restraint whatsoever.

Since 1950 Senator McCARTHY has posed as the self-anointed champion of the anti-Communists. His self-asserted

preoccupation has been to find Communists and other subversives in Government and in private industry under contract with the Government. No right-thinking person can quarrel with his alleged objectives. But, Mr. President, the fact is that the tactics he has used are destructive of the very institutions of free government. His unfounded accusations and charges, his invasion of the operations of the executive branch of government, and his many other irresponsible and reckless actions have contributed to bring him and his committee and the entire Senate into disrepute. The fears and suspicions he has engendered have spread throughout the Government departments. Agencies of the State Department and of other branches of the Government have suffered directly from his heavy hand. Others are threatened or are indirectly affected. The Communists themselves could not have accomplished in many years the devastation in public office and public service caused by Senator McCARTHY. So far as I know not a single Government official has been convicted in a court of law on evidence obtained as a result of his labors in the field of internal security. But despite this he has convinced many people that he is the only leader of those who would protect our Government from Communist infiltration. Anyone who criticizes him or his methods is immediately the object of his attack. Any effort to curb or restrain his excesses is labeled the work of Communists or subversives. In his opinion anyone who opposes him is either a Communist, a subversive, a pink, or a dupe. He has attacked committee officials and many other persons who disagree with him or his methods. He has used his authority as a Member of the Senate of the United States to spread confusion and fear, and many have suffered from unjustified and unfounded accusations for which there is no redress.

I resent his attack on the distinguished Senator from Utah, who is the chairman of the select committee, and on other members of that committee appointed by the Senate to inquire into the charges made against him. Indirectly, these charges fall on the shoulders of every Member of this body, whose agent the select committee has been. All of us who love our country and who are alarmed over Senator McCARTHY's attempts to place himself above law and order, using the anti-Communist crusade as a shield, have felt the weight of his irresponsible assaults. But we are not afraid of him or anything he can do. We are just as much opposed to communism and its works as he says he is. We are alive to the danger communism holds for our way of life. But we want to make the fight against it through the duly constituted agencies of our Government and according to the principles imbedded in our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and the duly enacted laws of our land. Any other way invites the destruction of our freedoms and our liberties and opens wide the path for the dictator and totalitarianism. We shall not take that path. We shall remain

true to our oaths of office and to the democratic principles with which we have retained our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe there are no additional speakers for this evening. Certain Senators who had been listed decided to speak tomorrow.

However, we have a very crowded schedule for tomorrow. We are working under a limitation of time. I appeal to Senators on both sides of the aisle to be present promptly, if possible, particularly if a quorum call is to be made, because otherwise a considerable amount of time will be lost. Such loss of time will become far more important tomorrow than it would be today, if taken out of the debate, inasmuch as we shall be operating against the 3 o'clock time limitation, at which time the other part of the unanimous-consent agreement will go into effect.

I have just been discussing with the distinguished minority leader the suggestion that the Senate take a recess until 9:30 a. m. tomorrow, with the understanding that the period between 9:30 and 10 would be used for the purpose of the usual morning hour, under the 2-minute limitation, to allow Senators to place material in the RECORD. Following the morning hour there would be a quorum call. I respectfully urge that all Senators be present promptly, so that we may proceed with the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the unanimous-consent agreement do I correctly understand that 60 minutes are allowed on each amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How many amendments have been filed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that 1 amendment had been submitted previous to today, and 1 was received today, namely, the amendment of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. Those are the only two amendments, aside from the committee amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They consist of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, those are the only two amendments at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so informed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And 60 minutes are allowed on each amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those amendments have been ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And 60 minutes are allowed on each of those amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement the debate on substitutes shall be not to exceed 4 hours. Has any substitute been offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the best of the Chair's knowledge, no substitute has been submitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is the minority leader's understanding that in no event will the Senate start voting prior to 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the minority leader and the majority leader to the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement states "not later than the hour of 3 o'clock."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to say that the minority leader and majority leader agreed yesterday between themselves that in the event all time were not consumed we would move to have the Senate take a recess, so that Senators on both sides of the aisle would know that no vote could possibly be had before 3 o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my understanding, that we would not have a vote prior to 3 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And it could be had as late as 4 o'clock, if the time were used.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wanted to have that point clear in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to state that the understanding of the Senator from California and of the Senator from Texas is also the understanding of the Chair. The time up to 3 o'clock, the Chair wishes to inform the Senators, is controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the Senate has completed the debate and has voted on the various motions and appeals and amendments and substitutes, and so forth, pertaining to the McCARTHY matter, is it the plan of the majority leader to have the Senate adjourn sine die on the same day?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say to the Senator from Texas that that would somewhat depend on the time involved. I certainly would not wish to have the Senate go into an all-night session. I do not believe it would be wise to hold an extensively prolonged session. However, even assuming that additional amendments are presented over and above the two amendments which are now lying on the table, I can see no reason why we cannot conclude the business of the Senate by Thursday. I hope we will be able to do so early in the evening of Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And the distinguished majority leader would then expect the Senate to adjourn sine die?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I would expect to move then that the Senate adjourn sine die.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to make it perfectly clear that while only two amendments are at the desk, other

amendments are in order in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the Chair understands.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire of the distinguished majority leader with respect to one matter in which I am directly concerned? Does he propose to take up any other business at all except the McCarthy matter?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We plan to take up no other legislation of any kind. We would not expect to take up any controversial nominations, or anything else of a controversial nature.

With respect to anything that might be done by mutual agreement on both sides of the aisle, the majority leader and the minority leader are in consultation, as the Senator knows.

Mr. LANGER. The Committee on the Judiciary is very eager to have certain nominations which are pending before the Senate passed upon. One involves a judgeship in Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished majority leader earlier in the day brought to my attention a number of nominations which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary had reported to the Senate. I have no doubt that those nominations will be cleared for action. We have contacted all but one interested Member of the Senate. All other Senators interested have approved the nominations. I believe they come within the agreement which was entered into between the majority leader and the minority leader.

I hope that by the time the Senate convenes at 9:30 tomorrow morning to be able to inform the majority leader that the nominations are not controversial so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, and that they come within our agreement. It is my understanding that prior to adjournment sine die the majority leader will ask that they be considered by the Senate in executive session.

Mr. LANGER. Could they not be taken up tomorrow morning at 9:30?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We shall first have to find out whether they have been cleared for consideration.

Mr. LANGER. The Committee on the Judiciary unanimously reported the nominations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have conveyed that information to the minority leader. I am certain we can work the matter out if the Senator will give us a little time.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow morning at 9:30, after action is taken on the Journal, the Senate may have the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation.

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

RECESS TO 9:30 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there are no further remarks to be made at this time, and again calling the attention of the Members of the Senate to my hope that Senators will be present to respond to a quorum call, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 1, 1954, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 30 (legislative day of November 29), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, now an Assistant Secretary of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 1 to the class of career minister of the United States of America:

Elbridge Durbrow, of California.
Livingston T. Merchant, of New Jersey.
Edward J. Sparks, of New York.
Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado.
Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota.

Thomas J. Maleady, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

William M. Rountree, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut.
Carlos J. Warner, of Maine.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Edgar P. Allen, of Pennsylvania.
Fred L. Hadsel, of Virginia.
Joseph S. Henderson, of Virginia.
Edward A. Jamison, of Illinois.
Allen B. Moreland, of Florida.
B. Winfred Ruffner, of Tennessee.
Francis T. Williamson, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Clement E. Conger, of Virginia.
Frederick B. Cook, of Virginia.
William B. Coolidge, of Virginia.
Henry Dearborn, of New Hampshire.
William B. Dunham, of Virginia.
Walter H. Dustmann, Jr., of Virginia.
James H. Ennis, of Maryland.
L. James Falck, of Maryland.
George M. Fennemore, of New York.
John C. Guthrie, of Virginia.
Jack A. Herfurt, of California.
John L. Hill, of Wisconsin.

Frederick Irving, of Virginia.
Clinton E. Knox, of Maryland.
Thomas H. Linthicum, of California.
David E. Longanecker, of Virginia.
John W. McBride, of Virginia.
William K. Miller, of Illinois.
William F. Niclooy, of New York.
Horace J. Nickels, of Maryland.
Dana Orwick, of Maryland.
Miss Constance Roach, of the District of Columbia.
Eddie W. Schott, of Virginia.
Thomas K. Shields, of California.
Thomas W. Simons, of the District of Columbia.

Erwin Strauss, of the District of Columbia.
Jules H. Wayne, of Maryland.
William L. S. Williams, of Wisconsin.
Roland K. Beyer, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Philip C. Habib, of California, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4 and to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Seburn E. Baker, of Florida.
Mrs. Mildred L. Brockdorff, of Maryland.
Miss Roene G. Brooks, of Iowa.
Thompson R. Buchanan, of Maryland.
Robert A. Clark, Jr., of Oregon.
Wendell B. Coote, of Virginia.
Miss Frances M. Dailor, of the District of Columbia.

Edmund A. da Silveira, of Virginia.
Huston Dixon, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Alice L. Dunning, of New York.
James F. Gorman, of Delaware.
John K. Hagemann, of Maryland.
Harold E. Hall, of Utah.
Miss Betty R. Hanes, of Ohio.
Joseph A. Harary, of New York.
Miss Margaret P. Hays, of Texas.
Adolf B. Horn, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Morris Kaufman, of New York.
John W. Keogh, of Illinois.
John L. Kuhn, of Virginia.
Frank R. LaMacchia, of Maryland.
Jerome R. Lavalley, of Massachusetts.
Neil C. McManus, of New Jersey.
John E. Mellor, of Virginia.
Robert C. Mudd, of Virginia.
George F. Muller, of Maryland.
John F. O'Grady, of Massachusetts.
John L. Ohmans, of Maryland.
William J. Reardon, of New York.
George C. Spiegel, of Indiana.
Isaac A. Stone, of Massachusetts.
Frank J. Wathen, of Texas.
Harry J. Wetzork, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mildred M. Yenchius, of Ohio.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Miss Norma M. Arthur, of New York.
Kyle D. Barnes, of Alabama.
Mario Calvani, of Maryland.
William L. Carr, of Massachusetts.
William M. Childs, of Massachusetts.
Miss Mary W. Cutler, of the District of Columbia.
Edward L. Eberhardt, of Virginia.
Guy Ferri, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alice M. Griffith, of Maryland.
John O. Hemard, of Louisiana.
Deion L. Hixon, of Maryland.
Edward J. Holway, Jr., of Ohio.
Miss Frances D. Howell, of North Carolina.
John Krizay, of Maryland.
James F. Moriarty, of Massachusetts.
Albert D. Moscotti, of New Jersey.

Miss Jeanne C. Nelson II, of Arizona.
J. Stanley Phillips, of Virginia.
Robert E. Rosselot, of Virginia.
Charles B. Selak, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Andrew Stalder, of New York.
Miss Marilyn D. Sworzyn, of the District of Columbia.

William D. Toomey, of North Dakota.
Rene A. Tron, of New York.
August Velletri, of Maryland.
Norman M. Werner, of Texas.
Miss Eugenia Wolliak, of Connecticut.
Amos Yoder, of Virginia.
Miss Olga M. Zhivkovich, of Illinois.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Dwight R. Ambach, of Rhode Island.
George R. Andrews, of Maryland.
Robert B. Borin, of Nebraska.
Ward Lee Christensen, of Oregon.
Douglas McCord Cochran, of Pennsylvania.
John J. Crowley, Jr., of West Virginia.
Thomas W. Davis, Jr., of California.
Thomas De Scisciolo, of New York.
Dirk Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Bernice A. Goldstein, of Pennsylvania.
John J. Harter, of California.
John D. Hemenway, of Washington.
Robert C. Herber, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Irma Lang, of Connecticut.
Dudley C. Lunt, Jr., of Delaware.
William F. McRory, of the District of Columbia.

Charles R. Moomey, of Nebraska.
Miss M. Jane Neubauer, of Oklahoma.
A. Gregory Nowakowski, Jr., of New Jersey.
Don W. Rogers, Jr., of Ohio.
Edward B. Rosenthal, of New York.
Thomas J. Scotese, of Pennsylvania.
Harry W. Shlaudeman, of California.
Miss Nancy L. Snider, of Ohio.
Miss Mary Ann Spreckelmeyer, of the District of Columbia.

Arthur M. Stillman, of Illinois.
Edward H. Thomas, of New Jersey.
Richard N. Tillson, of Massachusetts.
Ross P. Titus, of Illinois.
John E. Williams, of North Carolina.
Eric V. Youngquist, of Illinois.
Earle J. Richey, of Kansas, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

J. Deering Danielson, of Virginia.
Walter K. Schwinn, of Connecticut.
John A. Brogan III, of New York, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a vice consul of the United States of America.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

Christian A. Herter, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be General Counsel, Foreign Operations Administration.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

David W. Kendall, of Michigan, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, to fill an existing vacancy.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

George A. Blowers, of Florida, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named licensed officers of the United States merchant marine to the grades indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be lieutenants

Alexander D. Holman, Jr.
Jay A. Small, Jr.
Charles B. Williams

To be a lieutenant (junior grade)

Walter F. Condon

IN THE NAVY

Adm. John E. Gingrich, United States Navy, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

Vice Adm. Murrey L. Royar, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Chief of Naval Material.

Rear Adm. Ralph J. Arnold, Supply Corps, United States Navy, to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

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

Alford, John M.
Amme, Carl H., Jr.
Armstrong, Warren W.
Arnold, Henry A.
Atkins, Nevett B.
Austin, Marshall H.
Avery, Howard M.
Badger, Rodney J.
Baird, Leonard J.
Barham, Eugene A.
Barnard, James H., 2d
Bartlett, Wilson R.
Bassett, Robert V., Jr.
Baurer, Louis H.
Baum, Ralph J.
Bell, David B.
Bellingier, William C.
P., Jr.
Bennett, Fred G.
Bennett, Warfield C., Jr.
Besson, John H., Jr.
Bjarnason, Paul H.
Blenman, William
Blitch, John D.
Borries, Fred, Jr.
Bowker, Albert H.
Boyd, Alfred I., Jr.
Boyle, Peter F.
Bradley, Richard R., Jr.
Brintle, William F.
Brock, James W.
Brown, James H.
Brown, James A.
Burns, Richard H.
Butler, Ovid M.
Cairnes, George H.
Caldwell, Robert H., Jr.
Caldwell, Turner F., Jr.
Callahan, Edward C.
Campbell, Grafton B.
Carlson, Edward B.
Carmichael, John H.
Carson, Matthew V., Jr.
Casey, Vincent F.
Chenault, Frederic A.
Cherry, Parker E.
Chipman, Briscoe
Christie, Gerald L.
Claggett, Bladen D.
Cole, Otis R., Jr.
Combs, Walter V., Jr.
Connor, Terrell H. W.
Cook, Harry E., Jr.
Coppola, Joseph A.
Cotten, John H.
Crawford, Earl R.
Currier, Prescott H.
Cutter, Slade D.
Dabbieri, Peter V.
Dabney, Thomas B.
Davies, Thomas D.
Dawley, Jack B.
Decker, Arthur T.
Dockum, Donald G.
Dougherty, Joseph E.
Doukas, Nicholas G.
Drake, Francis R.
Dunn, William C.
East, Walter J.
Eastman, Charles J.
Edrington, Thomas C., 3d
Eisenbach, Charles R.
Eldridge, Robert L.
Ellis, William A.
Eppes, Marion H.
Farrell, Richard M.
Faust, Allen R.
Ferguson, Herbert C.
Finnigan, Oliver D., Jr.
Flachsenhar, John J.
Fleming, Allan F.
Folsom, Parker L.
Fowler, Gordon
Fowler, Richard L.
Friede, Richard L.
Furer, Albert B.
Fyfe, John K.
Gabbert, John S. C.
Gage, Joseph A., Jr.
Gambacorta, Francis M.
Gardner, Earle G., Jr.
Geist, John W.
Germershausen, William J., Jr.
Gillette, Norman C., Jr.
Gimber, Stephen H.
Good, George D.
Gray, James S., Jr.
Greenup, Francis A.
Griggs, Paul C.
Groner, William T.
Guest, William S.
Gumz, Donald G.
Gurney, Alfred L.
Hanger, Willard M.
Hansen, James R.
Harmer, Richard E.
Hartmann, Paul E.
Hatcher, Martin T.
Hathaway, Amos T.
Hayler, Frank E.
Hazzard, William H.
Headland, Edwin H., Jr.
Henry, Walter F.
Herold, Frank B.
Hess, John B.
Hilands, William H.
Hinckley, Robert M., Jr.
Hoffman, Edmund J.
Holman, William G.
Holmes, Robert H.
Holmshaw, Harry F.
Holt, Piny G.

Houston, Charles E.
Howe, Wallace H.
Humes, Ralph R.
Hunter, Gould
Icenhower, Joseph B.
Irving, Ronald K.
Jack, Richard G.
Jackson, Robert W.
Jennings, Carter B.
Johnson, Erik A.
Kefauver, Russell
Keithly, Roger M.
Kelly, Robert B.
Kimmel, Thomas K.
King, Ed R.
King, Thomas S., Jr.
Kircher, John J.
Kirpatrick, Harlan G.
Klopp, James W.
Knight, Page
Lairure, Dallas M.
Langston, Charles B.
Lanham, Harvey P.
Larsen, Harold H.
Law, Frank G.
Lederer, William J., Jr.
Lee, George R.
Lewis, Joseph S.
Link, Everett M., Jr.
Logsdon, Earl W.
Loomis, Sam C., Jr.
Lynch, John J.
Lyndon, Dennis C.
Mack, William P.
Mackie, Thomas R.
Mann, Hoyt D.
Marcus, Groome E., Jr.
McCauley, James W.
McDonald, Harold W.
McDonald, Jasper N.
McElrath, Robert W.
McIntire, Harrison P.
McKellar, Clinton, Jr.
McLaren, William F.
McLaughlin, Robert B.
Mecklenburg, Herman J.
Meneke, Kenneth E.
Michael, Fred D.
Michel, Edward A., Jr.
Mini, James H.
Moody, Dwight L.
Moore, Ben, Jr.
Morrison, William F.
Morton, Robert C.
Moynahan, Brendan J.
Munster, Joe H., Jr.
Newcomb, Arnold H.
Neyman, Robert L.
Nibbs, Alan M.
Nimitz, Chester W., Jr.
Nixdorff, Samuel
Noel, John V., Jr.
Obermeyer, Jack A.
O'Connell, George A., Jr.
Odening, Robert E.
Oelheim, Bennett C.
O'Grady, James W.
Okerson, Glenn W.
Orr, Ellis B.
Oseth, John M.
Outlaw, Edward C.
Packard, Wyman H.
Palmer, Fitzhugh L., Jr.
Parham, William B.
Parker, Edwin B., Jr.
Parunak, Aram Y.
Penland, Joe R.
Pennoyer, John H.
Phillips, Jewett O., Jr.
Phillips, Robert A.
Porter, William B.
Pratt, Richard R.
Preston, John P.
Price, William N.
Radford, James C.
Ramey, Ralph L.
Rawlings, John B.
Reifenrath, Wilson G.
Rice, Joseph E.
Richardson, David C.
Roby, Forrest A., Jr.
Romberg, Henry A.
Russell, Hawley
Rutter, James B., Jr.
Ryan, Thomas F.
Ryder, John F.
Sager, John P.
Sampson, William S.
Samuel, Thomas W.
Schacht, Kenneth G.
Schlech, Walter F., Jr.
Schwab, Herbert S.
Schwaner, Henry C., Jr.
Searcy, Seth S., Jr.
Semmes, James L.
Settle, Walker A., Jr.
Shaw, James C.
Shea, William H., Jr.
Sherby, Sydney S.
Sherman, Philip K.
Shetenhelm, Philip E.
Simpson, Ernest L., Jr.
Sleight, Robert C.
Sliny, James G.
Slonim, Gilven M.
Smith, Kerfoot B.
Springer, Frank G.
Stags, William R.
Stark, Harry B.
Stebbins, Edgar E.
Steffanides, Edward F., Jr.
Steinmetz, Everett H.
Stevens, John D.
Stevenson, William A.
Stewart, Jack S.
Stimson, Paul C.
Street, George L., 3d
Sullivan, William A.
Summers, Paul E.
Talman, Benjamin L. E.
Taylor, James O.
Taylor, Leroy T.
Teel, Richard A.
Terry, James H., Jr.
Thacher, Robert A.
Thomas, William B.
Thompson, Floyd T.
Thompson, Marshall F.
Toner, Raymond J.
Torian, Melvin C.
Touart, Richard G.
Turner, Charles H.
Turner, John H.
Turner, Renfro, Jr.
Tyree, Alexander K.
Von Bracht, William G.
Wampler, French, Jr.
Wanless, Robert H.
Ware, Bruce R.
West, Elliott M.
White, Clarence M., Jr.
White, Richard D.
Whiting, George H.
Williams, Robert J.
Willman, Donald E.
Wilson, Donald W.
Winters, Theodore H., Jr.
Wood, Burris D., Jr.
Woodville, Jonathan L. W., Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

Allen, Wallace E. Hebble, Jacob G., 3d
 Amberson, Julius M. Henderson, Robert E.
 Barber, Leonard H. Hill, Harold H.
 Barr, Norman L. Hynes, Edward A.
 Baumgarten, Otto C. Irons, Edward P.
 Beals, Lynn S., Jr. James, William J.
 Berley, Ferdinand V. Junnila, Bruno O.
 Boone, Daniel W. Kenney, Leroy L.
 Burroughs, Clement D. Kirch, Everett P.
 Byrne, Edward T. Krepela, Miles C.
 Canada, Robert O., Jr. Lynch, George M.
 Cohen, Marshall MacGregor, John B.
 Cooperman, Martin Martens, Vernon E.
 Cox, John H. Mershon, Robert H.
 Crawford, James Miller, Donald W.
 Crowder, Roy E. Musso, Nicholas M.
 Curtis, Mark S. Nardini, John E.
 Deranian, Paul Norwood, Emmett F.
 DuVigneaud, DeSale G. O'Connell, Hugh V.
 Fruin, Richard L. Pope, Lester J.
 Fry, Wesley Rambo, Reginald R.
 Fuhring, Shirley A. Richardson, Jesse F.
 Giddings, Harold D. Shaver, John S.
 Gilbert, Walter W. Shepardson, Robert B.
 Gillen, James H., Jr. Sims, Lewis S., Jr.
 Grindell, James A. Slosek, Edward F.
 Gruggel, John S. Stradford, Harry T.
 Hanten, John S. Timmes, Joseph J.
 Hascall, Charles S., Jr. Walters, John D.
 Haynes, Lewis L. Warden, Horace D.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bacon, Walter G. Meade, Randolph, Jr.
 Brady, Norbert C. Moore, Irwin S.
 Brewton, Glenn F. Myers, Richard L.
 Clegg, Glenn W. Peel, Marcus A., Jr.
 Drescher, Carl G. Phillips, Charles K.
 Evans, William A. Sharrocks, Charles S.
 Huey, William M., Jr. Sherwood, Stephen
 Johnson, Billy Sutherland, Elton W.
 Johnston, William J. Vestel, Edgar D., Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bennett, Samuel B. Mannion, Joseph P.
 Hohenstein, Raymond Meehan, Daniel F.
 C. Wood, Harry C.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Barker, Joseph, Jr. Krum, Raymond B.
 Bennett, Earl R. Lovell, Kenneth C.
 Coddington, James A. McManus, William A.
 Cunniff, James F. Morris, Robert B.
 Curtis, Ira N. Neel, Charles H.
 Davidson, Roscoe A. Roulett, John P., Jr.
 Dodd, Jack G. Sease, John C.
 Gans, George M. Spellman, Clemens E.
 Gordanier, John W. Thorson, Robert D.
 Harris, Richard E. Tyrrell, Frank C.
 Johnson, Weston M. Wilson, Samuel K.

DENTAL CORPS

Bowers, Aaron N., Jr. Liedman, Sidney C.
 Brandt, Conrad H. McInnis, Harry B.
 Charm, William J. McKinney, Howard B.
 Colby, Robert A. Mudler, James T.
 Eaton, Stanley W. Nilranen, John V.
 Goodell, Fred E. Owen, William D.
 Jeansson, Edmund E. Rendtorff, Herman K.
 Johnson, William B., Jr. Shaw, Richard C.
 Stanmeyer, William R.
 Lesney, Theodore A. Turner, Myron G.
 Lett, Walter B. Wyckoff, Robert D.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Huntsinger, Fay O.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve

LINE

Consolvo, Charles W.
 Kirkpatrick, Claude S.

SUPPLY CORPS

Milling, Clarence H.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bertelsen, Viggi C.

DENTAL CORPS

Dove, Ronald C.

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:

For temporary promotion in the Navy

LINE

Abbott, Cecil, Jr. Betts, Frederick M.
 Abernathy, Buford D. Beyer, Clarence R.
 Abrams, Earle B. Bigham, Frank, Jr.
 Adair, Lallance A. Binnebose, Gustave
 W.
 Adams, Corliss W. Birdsall, Douglas M.
 Adams, Robert S. Bitting, Frederick E.
 Adkins, Aubyn L. Bixby, Norman W.
 Adler, William C., Jr. Black, Rogers L.
 Adrian, Robert N. Blackwell, William P.
 Albrecht, Edward M. Blattmann, Walter C.
 Aldous, Theodore F. Boe, Robert O.
 Allbright, Willard F. Boehlert, William R.
 Alleman, James K. Boone, Daniel A.
 Allen, Edgar L. Bordihn, Irvin H.
 Allen, William B. Bostenero, Guacomo
 A. Aller, James C. Boulton, Thomas A.
 Alley, Justus N. Boyd, William W., Jr.
 Allmon, Clyde E. Boydston, Howard J.
 Ambrosio, William Bradley, Richard H.,
 Amme, Robert G. Jr.
 Anastason, Steven N. Bradshaw, Harold G.
 Anderson, Clyde B. Brady, Francis X. V.
 Anderson, Gene C. Brambilla, Marius G.,
 Anderson, Roy Jr.
 Anderson, William R. Branchi, Titus
 Anderson, William H., Jr. Brand, Ferdinand L.
 Angelo, Raymond L. Braun, John E.
 Appelquist, Theodore L. Brega, Richard E.
 L. Bremer, James R.
 Armogida, Dante Brewer, Cleon A.
 Armstrong, John G. Briggs, Chester E., Jr.
 Armstrong, William H. Briggs, Chester A.
 Ashcraft, Robert L. Brooks, Clarence M.,
 Asmus, Dwight F. Jr.
 Aubrey, Norbert E., Jr. Brown, Alfred E.
 Augenblick, Richard Brown, Carl A., Jr.
 G. Brown, Clifford L.
 Ault, Frank W. Brown, Galen C.
 Austin, William R. Brown, Harry J., Jr.
 Bailey, Daniel G. Brown, James S.
 Baird, Harold J. Brown, Leo R.
 Baker, Albert H. Brown, Melvin W.
 Baker, John G., Jr. Brown, Richard K.
 Baker, Quentin F. Brown, William P.
 Baldridge, Jewett A. Browning, Benjamin,
 Baney, Sidney N. Jr.
 Banks, William R. Brownsberger, James
 Barker, Jonathan A. A.
 Barker, Laughlin Bryan, David, Jr.
 Barnitz, James W. Bryan, Garland B.
 Barrett, Alcus E. Buchanan, Edward S.
 Barrett, John M. Buckwalter, Earl E.
 Barrington, Francis Budding, William A.,
 W. Jr.
 Barry, Charles B. Buehlman, Joseph
 Bartko, John J. Bunce, Lawrence W.
 Bartlett, Lewis C. Burdette, Fred M.
 Basler, Henry L., Jr. Bureau, Arthur L.
 Bass, Stirling W., Jr. Burge, John L.
 Bates, George B., Jr. Burke, Gale C.
 Bayes, Howard S. Burley, Albert C.
 Beadles, Joe W., Jr. Burris, Hugh B.
 Beaver, Robert H. Busik, William S.
 Beavers, Oscar J. Bustard, Melvin E., Jr.
 Becker, Jack L. Butlak, John J.
 Becker, Roger W. Butler, Francis A.
 Behl, John H. Butterfield, Harry E.,
 Bennett, Milton D. Jr.
 Bennett, Vane M. Byrd, James R., Jr.
 Benz, Robert P. Cafferata, William F.
 Berck, Henry F. Cain, William T.
 Berg, Kenneth L. Calhoun, Aubra
 Bergeron, Robert F. Calhoun, John E.
 Bergey, Gale L. Callis, John L.
 Berns, Elbert O. Calvert, James F.
 Berquist, Carl R. Campbell, James M.

Campbell, Thomas M. Detrick, Donald M.
 Caney, Lawrence D. Detweiler, Austin L.
 Caparrelli, Moreno J. Devito, Raymond J.
 Carlson, Allan R. Dice, Paul H.
 Carlson, Walton L. Dickson, Paul E.
 Carmichael, William P. Dickson, William B.
 Dignan, Paul E.
 Carroum, Jefferson H. Dinger, Elmer W.
 Carter, Arthur M., Jr. Dixon, Eugene C.
 Case, Gerald F. Dixon, Thomas F.
 Casler, James B. Dobbs, Harry J.
 Cassell, George L. Dochnahl, Joseph W.
 Cates, Clifton B., Jr. Doherty, James F., Jr.
 Cawthorne, Robert M. Doherty, John P.
 Cevoli, Richard L. Dombroff, Seymour
 Chamberlain, Richard Donahoe, Omer J.
 Donahue, Richard V.
 Champlin, Norman D. Donaldson, James C.,
 Jr.
 Charles, Nelson R. Donnally, Edward W.
 Cherbak, Alfred A. Doran, Homer M., Jr.
 Cheverton, Robert E. Dosskey, Gordon B.
 Christian, Oren R. Douglas, Ivan H.
 Christians, Robert W. Dowd, Robert A.
 Clark, Harry L., Jr. Downin, John E.
 Clark, Henry E. Downs, Fordyce R., Jr.
 Clarke, Robert A. Downs, James A.
 Clayton, Raymond I. Downes, Melvin R.
 Cleaver, Thomas L., Jr. Doyel, Wilbur T.
 Doyle, Patrick
 Cobb, William W. Drachnik, Joseph B.
 Coker, William K. Drelow, Robert W.
 Colenda, Frank Dryer, Orville W. J.
 Coleran, Gerard F. Duborg, Robert W.
 Collins, Cecil B., Jr. Ducky, William
 Conder, Thomas L., Jr. Dudley, John A.
 Condon, Lawrence D. Duell, Lowell F. W.
 Cone, Wade H. Dunham, William S.
 Coningham, Seward B. Dunn, George L.
 Connell, Thomas P. Durborow, James W.
 Conner, Andrew B., Jr. Connolly, Barth J., 3d
 Connolly, Barth J., 3d Durham, Hugh M.
 Connolly, Robert J. Dusch, Robert A.
 Cooke, Henry J. H. Duval, Harold F.
 Cooley, Benjamin C., Jr. Duvall, Charles T.
 Dye, Howard W.
 Coonan, John J. Eaton, Charles H.
 Cooper, Charles T., 3d Eddy, Howard B.
 Cooper, Thomas V. Edgerton, Edwin H.
 Cork, John A., Jr. Edmonson, Edgar T.
 Cormier, Richard L. Edwards, John Q., 3d
 Cosby, Adolphus B. Eichelberger, Robert
 W.
 Coste, John E. Ellerbe, Gail J.
 Cousins, Romolo Ellis, James W., Jr.
 Cox, Albert W. Ellis, Neil L., Jr.
 Cox, Dale W., Jr. Ellis, William S.
 Craig, Russell F. Emanski, John J., Jr.
 Crance, Elmer L. Emerson, Arthur T.,
 Creed, Donald L. Jr.
 Creekmore, Edmund Empey, Robert E.
 W. Emrick, Merwin G.
 Crook, Flatus W. Engler, Clifford W.
 Crossley, Woodrow D. English, William J.
 Cummings, Edward J., Jr. Ensey, Edwin C.
 Epley, Robert H.
 Curtis, Clifford B., Jr. Erdner, Lewis E.
 Cyr, Richard F. Erickson, Harold E.
 Dahlen, Vincent R. Erkenbrack, Philip F.
 Dalley, Elmer W., Jr. Etheridge, Melvin R.
 Dalley, Franklin E., Jr. Eubanks, Jack L.
 Daniel, John J. S. Evans, Herman, Jr.
 Dankworth, Edwin G., Jr. Evans, Marion S.
 Evans, Roy A.
 Danner, Howard E., Jr. Facer, Gordon C.
 Danowski, Frank L. Fearnow, Frederick R.
 Davern, William T. Fehr, Harrison R., 3d
 Davidson, John R. Feightner, Edward L.
 Davidson, Willard H. Fenley, Albert G.
 Davis, Darold W. Fennig, Otto A.
 Davis, George S., Jr. Fernandez, Caesar, Jr.
 Davis, Thomas H., Jr. Fichman, Herbert T.
 Dawkins, M. Vance Field, Leonard E.
 Dean, William E. Finley, Miles R., Jr.
 Deans, Thomas C. Fite, Wallace A.
 Deitchman, Vincent Flanagan, George
 Delaney, Henry Flath, Robert N.
 DeLuca, Joseph D. Flessner, Conrad J.
 Dennis, Milton K. Fluitt, William S.
 Derlin, Howard W. Flynn, Robert D.

- Fogarty, William E.
 Fold, Bernard G.
 Foley, William J., Jr.
 Ford, Arlo
 Ford, George E.
 Forman, Richard E.
 Forrest, Harold M.
 Fowden, Wilbur M., Jr.
 Fox, Elmer L.
 Frady, Raymond A.
 Francis, Arthur E.
 Franger, Marvin J.
 Frank, Fred W., Jr.
 Franklin, Jesse W., Jr.
 Frazier, Edmond F.
 Freeman, Daniel H.
 French, Donald R.
 Fretwell, Uncas L.
 Frey, Saleem D.
 Froscher, Clarence T.
 Frossard, Clarence F.
 Fuller, Charles R.
 Fuller, George H.
 Fuller, William E.
 Gage, Rex A.
 Gaines, Robert Y.
 Gallemore, Roy H.
 Gallon, Roy F.
 Galvani, Amedeo H.
 Gano, John H.
 Gardner, Ned A.
 Garretty, Ned A.
 Garriott, Richard R.
 Gastrock, Martin D.
 Gates, Chester W., Jr.
 Gates, Marshall J.
 Gates, Robert L.
 Gaw, Benjamin D.
 Geise, Emory C.
 George, John E.
 Giblin, Robert B.
 Gibson, Freal J.
 Gibson, James C.
 Gierisch, Jack K.
 Giffin, Ray K.
 Gill, Ronald E.
 Gillissie, John G.
 Gillock, Robert H.
 Gilpin, Harold J.
 Girault, Norton R.
 Glenn, Stuart V.
 Gockel, Bernard N.
 Goetter, Ralph F.
 Golden, William A., Jr.
 Gonzalez, Rene E.
 Goode, William M.
 Gordon, Donald
 Gould, Joseph E.
 Gover, Walter R.
 Grant, Merle A.
 Graves, Harry S.
 Gray, Hugh M.
 Gray, Theodore R.
 Greeley, George R.
 Greene, Vincent M.
 Greer, Richard D., Jr.
 Gribble, William W.
 Griffin, Edwin C.
 Griffith, John T.
 Griggs, John B., 3d
 Griswold, James A.
 Grkovic, George
 Grossetta, Warren A., Jr.
 Guhl, Eldon L.
 Gullett, John H.
 Gulmon, Robert H.
 Guy, James W.
 Haas, Paul, Jr.
 Haase, Richard A.
 Hackett, Bernard E.
 Hadley, Stephen V.
 Hagan, Joseph F.
 Haggerton, Robert J.
 Haines, Joseph E.
 Haisten, Homer H., Jr.
 Haley, Richard I.
 Hall, Alvin W., Jr.
 Hall, George A.
 Hall, Perry
 Hall, William S.
 Hallett, Burton C.
 Hancock, Alex F.
 Hanley, Robert T.
 Hann, Edward N.
 Hannon, Edward J., Jr.
 Hannon, Paul G.
 Hansen, Robert L.
 Hanson, Ralph M.
 Hardcastle, William H., Jr.
 Harlan, George M.
 Harnish, William M.
 Harper, George, Jr.
 Harper, Marvin B.
 Harriman, Russell G.
 Harris, Ernest C., Jr.
 Harris, Floyd L.
 Hart, Ralph W., Jr.
 Hart, Richard H.
 Hartin, Frank R.
 Hatchell, Edward G.
 Havu, Arne W.
 Hawkins, Gordon S.
 Hawthorne, Robert E.
 Haynie, John C., Jr.
 Hayward, Albert W.
 Heady, Richard S.
 Hearrell, Frank C., Jr.
 Heidel, Carl C.
 Heishman, Jack C.
 Helm, Donald F.
 Helme, Charles F., Jr.
 Helms, Daniel G.
 Heisel, Kenneth D.
 Henderson, William T.
 Herder, George L.
 Hershey, Merle M.
 Heselton, Leslie R., Jr.
 Hess, Ernest B.
 Heyworth, Lawrence, Jr.
 Hibben, Carl B.
 Hilbert, Ray A.
 Hill, Fred C.
 Hill, James F.
 Hill, William O.
 Hills, Hollis H.
 Hine, Thomas L.
 Hitchcock, Edwin N., Jr.
 Hobbs, William I.
 Hoffman, Robert C.
 Hoffman, Robert G.
 Holcomb, Fred W., Jr.
 Holcomb, John K.
 Hoil, Trygve A.
 Hollandsworth, Herbert C.
 Holley, Edward B., Jr.
 Hollinshead, Charles W., Jr.
 Holloway, James L., 3d
 Hollowell, Frank W., Jr.
 Holmes, David C.
 Holmquist, Carl O.
 Hoof, Wayne
 Hoot, Willard D.
 Hoover, George W.
 Horrall, Eugene F.
 Horton, William R., Jr.
 Hoskins, Floyd E.
 Hoskins, Ralph E.
 House, James O., Jr.
 Howe, George B.
 Howe, Richard P.
 Howerton, Wilfred M.
 Huber, Harvard C.
 Hudson, Jack G.
 Hudson, William O., 2d
 Huey, Robert N.
 Huff, William H.
 Huggard, John J.
 Hughes, John D.
 Humphrey, William S., Jr.
 Hunt, Daniel, Jr.
 Hunt, John E.
 Hurst, Thomas C., 3d
 Hussong, William J., Jr.
 Hutto, John F.
 Hydinger, Marilyn C.
 Imus, Travis L.
 Ischinger, Eric, Jr.
 Israel, Robert M.
 Iverson, Willard M.
 Jackman, Lawrence S.
 Jackson, Erwin S.
 Jackson, Maurice B.
 Jackson, Robert W.
 Jaep, Charles H., 3d
 Jarnagin, Roy B.
 Jeffords, Joseph D.
 Jenkins, William E.
 Jennings, Douglas H.
 Jennings, Pender L., Jr.
 Jensen, Christian T.
 Jernigan, William A., Jr.
 Johnson, Berendt E., Jr.
 Johnson, Charles W.
 Johnson, Clarence E.
 Johnson, Dwight F.
 Johnson, Earl B.
 Johnson, James M.
 Johnston, Juel D.
 Johnston, Robert B.
 Jonassen, Anthony O.
 Jones, David M.
 Jones, Donald R.
 Jones, Francis R.
 Jones, Jack B.
 Jones, James A.
 Jones, Marvin D.
 Jones, Thomas C., Jr.
 Jones, Walter W., Jr.
 Jullien, Louis H.
 Justiss, "C" "Y"
 Justus, Fowler H.
 Karcher, Daniel M.
 Karl, Robert D.
 Kassell, Bernard M.
 Kauffman, Hal A.
 Kay, Buryl C.
 Keedy, "C" "L", Jr.
 Keller, Harry B.
 Keller, William K.
 Kelley, George A., Jr.
 Kelly, Dean E.
 Kelly, Marion C.
 Kelly, Thomas J.
 Kemp, Robert R.
 Kemper, George E.
 Kenney, Edward F.
 Kent, George L.
 Kern, Donald H.
 Kerr, Edward E.
 Kessler, Horton C.
 Kidd, Frederick C.
 Killingsworth, Samuel B.
 King, Chauncey B., Jr.
 Kinsella, James J.
 Kirkland, William B., Jr.
 Kisner, Homer L.
 Kistler, John M.
 Klein, Walter C.
 Knight, Denman W.
 Knight, Louis F.
 Knight, Olyce T.
 Knowles, Lloyd C.
 Koch, George P.
 Kolakowski, Roman
 Kona, Steve G.
 Kotsch, William J.
 Kreitzer, William R.
 Kubel, Howard L.
 Kunhardt, Robert M.
 Kuntze, Archie C.
 Kurtz, Lawrence A.
 Labyak, Robert W.
 Lackey, Dalton E.
 Lacy, Paul L., Jr.
 Ladley, Herbert V.
 Laliberte, Joseph H.
 Laliberte, William
 Lamar, William W., Jr.
 LaMarre, Allen W.
 Lammi, Weikko S.
 Land, Jay W.
 Lang, Harold F.
 Lanier, Samuel L.
 LaPlant, Lloyd P.
 Laplante, William J.
 Larsen, Frank
 Larson, Wesley L.
 Lasater, Allen N.
 Lassell, Donald L.
 Laurie, Robert G.
 Lavrakas, Lefteris
 Law, Francis E.
 Law, John T.
 Law, Richard R.
 Lawson, Dunbar
 Lazenby, Richard D.
 Leavitt, Guy C.
 Lee, Cyrus S.
 Lee, Jesse E.
 Leehey, Patrick
 Lees, James S.
 Lemaster, Caleb M.
 Lennon, Bernard C.
 Lewandowski, Stanley J.
 Lindstrom, Kenith V.
 Littmann, George C.
 Livingston, Fred J.
 Lloyd, Frederic M., 3d
 Lobdell, John H.
 Logan, Robert C.
 Lorch, Jacques W.
 Lovington, Joseph A.
 Lowry, Allen W.
 Luberda, William S.
 Luke, Raymond W.
 Lumpkin, Pickett
 Lyberg, Robert N.
 MacDonald, Philip N.
 MacGovern, Robert N.
 Mackey, Wendell C.
 Madson, Richard O.
 Magie, Albert H., Jr.
 Maher, David B.
 Malley, Francis E.
 Manby, William J., Jr.
 Manning, James H.
 Mansard, Robert E.
 Margetts, Richard K.
 Marquart, Phillip G.
 Marsden, Roy E.
 Marshall, Walter L.
 Martin, James N.
 Martin, Neal, Jr.
 Marvel, Robert
 Marx, Theodore F.
 Mathis, Kenneth J.
 Maxwell, George T.
 May, Allan E.
 Mayer, Nicolas J.
 Mazurkiewicz, Clarence F.
 McBrier, James W.
 McCain, Audley H.
 McCants, Thomas R.
 McCauley, Brian
 McCauley, Charles N.
 McCauley, John C., Jr.
 McClagherty, Harry C.
 McClellan, Thomas R.
 McClendon, William R.
 McClure, Huston B.
 McCollum, John C., Jr.
 McConnell, Robert M., Jr.
 McCord, Walter D., Jr.
 McCormick, James B.
 McCreery, Homer A.
 McCuddin, Leo B.
 McCulley, William M., Jr.
 McDougal, Clifford A.
 McEwan, Archibald J.
 McGann, Patrick H.
 McGinnis, George P.
 McGinnis, Paul H.
 McGregor, Ronald K.
 McKellar, Robert M.
 McKenzie, James R., Jr.
 McKinney, Grange B.
 McLeod, Don E.
 McLeod, Norman W.
 McLinn, Frank M.
 McMahon, John L., Jr.
 McManus, Philip S.
 McNally, Irvin L.
 McNamara, Paul E.
 McQuilkin, William R.
 McTighe, John A.
 McWhorter, Hamilton, 3d
 Meacher, Leo
 Medbury, Arnold H.
 Medick, Glenn A.
 Meehan, James W.
 Meehan, John B.
 Megrew, Harold R.
 Meigs, Joseph V., Jr.
 Menard, Louis A., Jr.
 Merritt, Clinton J.
 Metzger, John K.
 Metzger, Lewis W., 3d
 Metzger, Robert M.
 Meyer, Edgar R.
 Meyer, Francis A.
 Meyer, George R.
 Michel, Glenn C.
 Mikich, Emil
 Miller, Anthony J.
 Miller, Charles A.
 Miller, Clarence K.
 Miller, Donald A.
 Miller, Edward C.
 Miller, Frank E.
 Miller, John F.
 Miller, Luther R.
 Miller, Stewart C.
 Miller, Stuart R.
 Miller, William T.
 Miller, William J.
 Mills, Alvah V., Jr.
 Mills, Lee G.
 Mink, Robert O.
 Minor, Warner M.
 Mitchell, Forrest R.
 Mitchell, John C.
 Mittenmaier, Ernest P.
 Mix, Arthur E.
 Mize, Wilton S.
 Moeller, Alonzo R.
 Mongogna, Joseph B.
 Moore, Howard S.
 Moore, Larry D.
 Moore, Michael U.
 Moore, Sam H.
 Moore, Willard H.
 Moran, George R.
 Morelock, Jerry P. B.
 Morin, George F.
 Moring, Joe R.
 Morris, Kyle H.
 Morton, Samuel L.
 Mott, Albert W.
 Moulton, Bernard W.
 Moyer, Robert L.
 Moyers, Frederick C.
 Mueller, Gregg
 Mundy, Kenneth A.
 Murphy, John W.
 Murphy, Robert J.
 Murray, Arthur H., Jr.
 Myers, Harold E.
 Napier, Charles E.
 Naumann, Carlton F.
 Naylor, Jesse A.
 Neff, John L.
 Nelson, Hugh M.
 Nelson, Nels J.
 Nemeth, Stephen J.
 Nesbitt, John W.
 Nester, Robert G.
 Newland, John W., Jr.
 Newlon, Arthur W.
 Newman, Hubert F.
 Newton, Arthur G.
 Ney, Robert J.
 Nichols, John L.
 Nicholson, Arthur D.
 Niebuhr, Elmer E.
 Nifong, James M.
 Nolan, John J.
 Nordquist, Arthur W.
 Nuttall, John L., Jr.
 Obert, Orlon J.
 O'Brien, James M.
 O'Brien, John J.
 O'Connell, Daniel J.
 O'Connor, Remi C.
 O'Plaherty, Roderic L.
 Ogden, Myron L.
 Oleksy, John T.
 Oliver, James D., Jr.
 Omohundro, Frank P.
 O'Neill, Martin G.
 Onofrio, Michael J.
 Osborne, Bascome K.
 Osheim, Oscar
 Ottomeyer, Wallace J.
 Pace, Joseph J.
 Padgett, Paul E.
 Page, Horace C.
 Paradiso, John
 Pardee, William M.
 Pariseau, Joseph A.
 Paskoski, Joseph J.
 Peck, John R.
 Peet, Raymond E.
 Pelley, Everett H.
 Pendergraft, Vernon L.
 Pendleton, Charles A., Jr.
 Perce, Earle B.
 Perrin, George W.
 Peterson, Robert F.
 Peterson, Robert M.
 Phelps, Richardson, Jr.
 Phillips, Glenn E.
 Phipps, Richard W.
 Pickering, Herbert W.
 Pickles, Ralph N.
 Pilkington, Marinus
 Piller, Marcel N.
 Pine, Robert E.
 Pittman, Milan L., Jr.
 Polk, Jack O.
 Pollow, Charles H.
 Pomatti, Arthur P.
 Popko, Sigmund
 Porter, John E., Jr.
 Potter, Edward H., Jr.
 Prager, Morton A.
 Prather, Hubert P.
 Prescott, Elmer L.
 Pridonoff, Eugene
 Pruski, Leonard
 Pump, Fred W.
 Purcell, Jones W.
 Puryear, Wilson G.
 Pyne, George C.
 Quillin, James C., Jr.
 Radcliffe, Jessie H.
 Rains, Encl E.
 Ramsey, John W.
 Ramsey, Marvin L.
 Randall, John H.
 Rapp, Lawrence B.
 Rapp, William T.
 Rash, Loole W.
 Rasmussen, Albert L.
 Rathbun, Leon H., Jr.
 Rawls, Hollis C., Jr.
 Rawls, Julian E.

- Ray, Prentis R.
Raynor, Leon T.
Reck, Floyd F.
Reding, Willis B.
Redmond, Richard G.
Redwine, W. J.
Reed, Rollin M.
Reed, Roy E.
Rees, Joseph R.
Reeves, Roy S.
Regan, Robert F.
Reh, Frank J.
Rehnberg, Kay P., Jr.
Reigher, Joseph M.
Reinhardt, William C.
Rhodes, Raleigh E.
Rhodes, Thomas W.
Ribblett, William R.
Rice, Dixon B.
Rice, Eugene J.
Rich, Charles W.
Richards, John M.
Riddle, Meredith C.
Ries, Herbert H.
Ringenberg, George W.
Rivers, William J.
Roach, Walter, Jr.
Roberts, Perry
Robie, Edgar A.
Robinson, Leonard
Robinson, Oscar E.
Robinson, Samuel J., Jr.
Robinson, Wayne D.
Robison, Charles D., Jr.
Rodenburg, Eugene E.
Ross, Donald K.
Rossell, Robert H.
Rourke, Robert A.
Rowell, Ira M., Jr.
Ruffin, Chester E.
Ruiz, Charles K.
Runion, Dallas B.
Russell, Kenneth M.
Russell, Thomas E.
Rustin, John I.
Rutledge, John R.
Ryan, John W., Jr.
Sahaj, Joseph
Salkowski, William F.
Sammons, Robert J.
Sampson, Courtney H.
Sanders, Charles
Sanders, Charles C.
Sanders, Kenneth T.
Sanders, Lewis B.
Sands, James F.
Sands, Pierre N.
Santti, Carl
Sapp, Clyde C.
Sappington, Merrill H.
Savio, Frank H.
Sawula, John
Saxton, Charles E.
Saylor, Richardson W.
Scales, Harrell H.
Schelbeler, Otis L.
Scherer, Lee R., Jr.
Schick, Joseph M.
Schimmelpennig, Walter
Schmalfeldt, Victor A.
Schmidt, Harry E.
Schroeder, William
Schubert, William
Schweitzer, Vance A.
Scott, David A.
Scott, Ivan J.
Sedwick, John W.
Selby, Robert S.
Sell, Leslie H.
Selmer, Robert J.
Semanski, Stanley A.
Sencenbaugh, Donald W.
Sestak, Joseph A.
Sharp, Harry G., Jr.
- Shaw, Frank J.
Shepard, Tazewell T., Jr.
Shepherd, John T.
Sheppard, Charles P.
Sheppie, Byron G.
Shiffer, Kenneth F.
Shirley, James A.
Shively, Howard B.
Shoemaker, James M.
Shor, Samuel W. W.
Short, James W.
Shortall, James E.
Shouldice, Darcy V.
Shriber, Roy C.
Shultz, John W., Jr.
Shuttleworth, W. G., Jr.
Sibold, Arthur P., Jr.
Simdars, Paul H.
Simmons, Andrew K.
Simmons, Glenn E.
Simpson, William A.
Sinclair, Andrew M.
Siran, John M.
Skahill, John J.
Skjel, Sidney M.
Slocum, Winfield S., 3d
Slone, William J.
Smith, Fenton F., Jr.
Smith, Frederick W.
Smith, Kenneth D.
Smith, Lawrence M.
Smith, Leonard G., Jr.
Smith, Norman A.
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Russel D.
Smith, Walter F.
Smith, William C.
Smithy, Talmadge A.
Smithson, Garnet M.
Snyder, Gordon A.
Sollenberger, Harold D.
Sorenson, Norman L.
Souza, Philip E.
Spencer, Howard J.
Spielman, James S.
Spreen, Roger E.
Stack, Martin J.
Stafford, James S.
Staley, David L., Jr.
Staley, Donald C.
Stanczyk, Stanley L.
Stanley, David S.
Stark, Robert E.
Stastny, Charles E.
Stecher, Robert W.
Steffen, Ernest W., Jr.
Stephens, Jerrel D.
Stephens, Walter
Sterrett, David S.
Stevens, Jean B.
Stewart, Charles M.
Stewart, Jamie "B"
Stewart, William G.
Stiling, David F.
Stimac, Naden F. J.
Storey, Stanford E.
Stough, Ben H., Jr.
Stowers, William C.
Strawhorn, Harold
Strayer, Louis M.
Strelow, Reuben E.
Strickland, Guy R.
Strohl, Mitchell P.
Strong, Hope, Jr.
Struble, Arthur D., Jr.
Stuart, Robert M.
Suggs, Charles L.
Suggs, Emmett C.
Sullivan, Arthur D.
Sullivan, Clifford W.
Sullivan, John P.
Sullivan, Joseph B.
Sullivan, Kenneth M.
Sumrall, Elton L.
- Sutton, James C., Jr.
Swain, Ted N.
Sweeney, John M.
Swope, James S.
Symons, Floyd M.
Tabeling, Roy H., Jr.
Talbert, Cornelius H.
Tallafiero, Philip B.
Tate, Albert O.
Taylor, Clarence M.
Taylor, Donald C.
Taylor, Robert E.
Tazewell, John P.
Tefft, John E.
Templeton, Orion A.
Tervo, Aarne J.
Therrien, Leo E.
Thielges, Bernard A.
Thom, John L.
Thomas, John M.
Thomas, Milfred W.
Thomas, Sylvester A.
Thompson, Bert A.
Thompson, John G.
Thompson, Lewis E.
Thompson, Norman
Thorne, Cecil R.
Thorne, Fred H.
Thueson, Theodore S.
Thurmon, Norman E.
Tickle, Paul A.
Tidwell, Charles C., Jr.
Todd, James H.
Tolerton, Raymond C., Jr.
Tolleson, Robert T.
Toof, Robert B.
Toohey, William P.
Toon, Buster E.
Torrey, Julian A.
Torry, John A. H., Jr.
Trapani, Peter G.
Traylor, James T., Jr.
Trexler, Burton R.
Trittipp, Ivan L.
Trohanov, Orville W.
Tuggle, Charles M., Jr.
Turner, Henry C.
Turner, Humphrey L.
Turner, Russell
Turner, Thomas A.
Turnipseed, Truman E.
Tuttle, Louis K., Jr.
Umbarger, Bernard S.
Valencia, Eugene A.
Vallandigham, William W.
Vanaman, Herbert H.
VanNess, Harper E., Jr.
Vescovi, Americo J.
Viegelmann, Adolph
Vitucci, Vito L.
Volonte, Joseph E.
Vroom, Jacques E.
Waggener, Arthur R.
Wagner, Dennis A.
Wagner, Erwin J.
Waldman, Albert C., Jr.
Walkley, Charles U.
Walker, Delmar, Jr.
Walker, Lewis W., Jr.
Wall, Charles B., Jr.
Wall, Maurice E.
Wallace, Kenneth C.
Wallace, Wilfred G.
Walton, Donald F.
Waltrip, Furman D.
Ward, James R.
Warner, Robert E.
Wasco, Michael F.
Waters, Nathan F.
Watkins, Nelson J.
Watkins, Robert J.
Watkins, Walter R.
Watson, Richard
Watson, Samuel E.
Webb, Boyce S.
- Webb, Charles D.
Webster, William S., Jr.
Weed, Sydney R.
Weeks, John M.
Weldon, Harry V.
Welling, Conrad G.
Wentz, Charles A.
Wesolowski, John M.
Wessinger, Hall B.
West, Horace B.
Westrup, Warren E.
Wharton, Claude A., Jr.
Wheatley, Bacil C.
Wheatley, John P.
Wheeler, Robert E.
Whisler, George H., Jr.
White, Gerald T.
White, Richard S., 3d
White, Roy C.
Whiteaker, James G.
Whitlow, Thomas J.
Wilburn, William C., Jr.
Wildfong, Daniel W.
Williams, Richard
Willis, Richard W.
Wills, James K.
Wilson, Archer W.
Wilson, Frederick C., Jr.
Wilson, Walter K.
Winter, Edward J.
Wissman, Robert G.
Witmer, Robert M.
Witting, Maurice E.
Woodall, Reuben F.
Woodside, Robert C.
Woodson, Halford
Woodward, Horace J.
Woodward, Lynn F.
Woodward, Nelson C.
Woolling, Robert F.
Wright, Robert C., Jr.
Wright, Wayne G.
Wunderlich, John F.
Wyatt, Micajah R.
Wynkoop, David P.
Yarnell, Lawrence R.
Yerger, Maury F., Jr.
York, Thomas H.
Young, Felix G., Jr.
Young, Howard S., Jr.
Yutkus, Julius J.
Yuzakewich, Alfred J.
Zeigler, Joseph S.
Zimmermann, Richard G.
Zoeller, Robert J.
Zumwalt, Elmo R., Jr.
Achuff, John N.
Ahdant, John C.
Aldman, Charles C.
Alderman, Loren E.
Aldrich, Virgil F.
Alexander, Clyde E.
Algeo, John K.
Allbritton, Alton S.
Allen, Harold G.
Anderson, Robert K.
Annis, Elliott F.
Avery, Ellsworth C.
Ayres, Bickings T.
Baczinski, Frank J.
Baird, Chester S.
Baird, Ernest
Baldwin, Lucian E.
Barnard, William J.
Barnes, Arthur W.
Barrett, Thomas E.
Bartsch, Lauren H.
Bass, Ralph C.
Baxter, Ernest W., Jr.
Beadle, Robert H.
Beers, John
Bemis, William D.
Bendinelli, Donald A.
Bengel, William G.
Benham, Wallace E.
- Berdalle, Louis J.
Bergmann, John F.
Bergstad, Ralph H.
Bertrand, Raymond A.
Biggers, Charlie C.
Bilderback, Arthur H.
Billig, August B.
Birchmire, Thomas H.
Bird, Leroy A.
Blackmore, William P.
Bloom, Eugene J.
Bonsack, William H.
Bosselet, Alfred J.
Boucher, Ausborn L.
Bowers, Allen G.
Bowman, Clingmon E.
Bramlett, Otho L.
Braun, John O.
Brewer, Charles E.
Bridwell, Paul W.
Briscoe, Carlton F.
Brown, Albert W.
Brown, Harold C.
Brown, John L.
Brown, Reginald O.
Brubaker, Claude C.
Buday, John
Buell, Clement A.
Buffington, Jack H.
Bunting, Arthur W., Jr.
Burr, James K.
Burton, James B.
Busby, Henry R.
Bush, William E.
Bushong, Clyde J.
Butler, Henry L.
Buttler, John F.
Byers, Elmer G., Jr.
Byron, Walter
Cadaret, Albert J.
Carlson, Carl F.
Carlson, Carl A., Jr.
Carmody, Edward A.
Carter, Delmar W.
Carter, Harold G.
Cartwright, Morgan R., Jr.
Chastain, Reagen T.
Chern, John R.
Clark, Cullen C.
Clark, Samuel E.
Coates, Ernest R.
Collier, Charles L.
Collier, Leland H.
Collins, Phillip E.
Collins, Wilson L.
Conley, Loy A.
Conser, Charles S.
Cooley, Wayne D.
Corbett, William C.
Cork, Richard "M"
Corkins, Charles W.
Cox, George E.
Crain, Leonard H.
Crain, Robert F.
Cravens, Eugene D.
Crews, Ellis J.
Cudney, Ellis J.
Custance, Elmer L.
Dallendorfer, Andrew J.
Darcy, John J.
Darrab, Frank
Davidson, Donald K.
Davidson, Thurman
Davis, Eugene R.
Davis, Howard M.
Davis, Robert R.
Davis, William L., 102182
Davis, William L., 113111
Dawson, John E.
DeBlanc, Ernest C.
DeForest, Don C.
DeJarnatt, Dallas K.
Dickinson, Russell C.
Dicks, Tribble J.
Dill, Mason H.
- Dobis, Edward S.
Dodson, Paul W.
Dowdy, Thomas L.
Dower, Victor H.
Drain, Orville D.
Drott, William L.
Dukelow, Clarence W.
Dukes, Jesse M.
Dunn, Harvey G.
Eaton, Charles R.
Eddy, Joseph O., Jr.
Edgeworth, Richard L.
Edsall, Edgar R.
Edwards, Berkeley C.
Edwards, Raymond E.
Elder, Roy T.
Engel, Joseph C.
Epperly, Virgil L.
Ernst, Clyde L.
Eschmann, Walter H.
Eshder, Wilhelm G.
Evans, Samuel L.
Farrar, "J" "C"
Fauber, Robert S.
Fields, William L.
Fisher, Willie C.
Flynn, John P.
Flynn, Leo A.
Flynn, Louis E.
Forman, Conrad M.
Fouks, Ralph E.
Fournier, Joseph O., Jr.
Fowlston, John J.
Frazier, Erwin B.
Fuller, Joseph D.
Gabriel, Harold C.
Gaines, John B.
Galassi, Francis B.
Garrett, Dennis
Geary, John J.
Getzewich, Julian
Giacomelli, Frank J.
Gilmore, Joseph C.
Ginding, Howard F.
Glidden, Harold R.
Golian, Andrew, Jr.
Good, Clarence W.
Gould, James R.
Graves, Rowlett L.
Gray, Kenneth E.
Green, Keith A.
Gregg, James H.
Gregg, Robert A.
Griffin, Bruce M.
Griffin, Raymond H.
Grimes, Joe W.
Groebler, George A.
Gustafson, Karl W.
Gysl, John G.
Hagler, Frank V.
Haglund, Russell M.
Hahn, Vernon M.
Hall, Marlin L.
Hall, Vanessa F.
Halpin, John B.
Ham, Jesse W.
Hammock, William R.
Hansen, Lilo G.
Hanson, Reinold H.
Harman, Julius W.
Harmond, Dolan A.
Harrison, John M.
Hart, Bernice C.
Hart, Marvin
Hartsell, Harry V., Jr.
Haskamp, Alvin J.
Hastings, Harold E.
Hawkins, Joseph K.
Hayford, Lyle D.
Healy, Joe M.
Hearst, Ray
Heck, Chester W.
Heft, Norman E.
Heggie, James B.
Heidenreich, George
Hein, John A.
Henderson, James W.
Henderson, Paul E.
Henderson, Frank J.

- Herb, Alfred B.
Hesson, James F.
Hickey, Chester O.
Hill, Ulmont C.
Hima, Dennis
Hock, Herman E.
Horsman, Donald G.
Housh, Thomas J.
Howard, Marcus N.
Howle, James M.
Hoyt, Leroy L.
Huettel, Roy E.
Humphreys, Maynard E.
Hunter, Murray J.
Hurley, Jack E.
Hutts, James D.
Jackson, Herman V.
John, Herman F.
Johns, Daniel E.
Johnson, Albert M.
Johnson, Leroy T.
Johnson, Melverne E.
Johnson, Russell C.
Jones, Granvil H.
Jordan, Paul C.
Jowdy, Albert M.
Julian, Ned N.
June, Russell Q.
Kane, Harry F.
Keefe, Joseph F.
Keesey, Edward R.
Keizur, Ernest T.
Kelso, Stanley J.
Kemmerer, Carl E.
Kennon, Randall F.
Keys, Stuart D.
Kilborn, Jessie
King, Charles W.
Kinney, Van M.
Kirinich, Andrew
Kisela, Joseph
Kivell, Lloyd M.
Knight, John J.
Kruetzfeldt, Herman B.
Kunz, Melvin M.
Labo, Howard G.
Lacy, Leamond F.
Lahmann, Stephen F.
Langworthy, Richard W.
Lawrence, Oscar O.
Layne, Charles W.
LeCompte, James W.
Lecompte, Melville.
Leewe, Milton W.
Lewis, Aeryn M.
Liechty, Dave A.
Lindhjem, Neil H.
Lindstrom, Julien E.
Linn, Ray S.
Lisenby, Harry C.
Lock, Earl W.
Lockwood, David S.
Logan, William C., Jr.
Lubbock, Clyde G.
Lyles, Glenn E.
Lynch, Claude L.
Lynch, George M.
Lynch, John I.
Lyons, Arthur T.
MacGill, Harry L.
Machalinski, Alois R.
MacNeil, John W.
Mahaffey, Clarke R.
Malone, Odie
March, Warren T.
Martin, John C.
Mathys, Harry E.
Matthews, Isthmael W.
Matthews, Roy J.
Mayabb, Virgil M.
McAnn, James L.
McCabe, James E.
McCarthy, Walter L.
McCormick, Marvin P.
McCown, Walter
McDonald, Francis O.
McGrady, Waldo J.
McIntyre, Francis H.
McKinney, Millard G.
McLaren, David G.
McMillan, Donald J.
McRae, Robert D.
McWatty, Ernest C.
Melvin, Fred H.
Messick, Harry J.
Metz, Frank
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Roy
Minneman, Fred L.
Minyard, William C.
Mitchell, John D., Jr.
Mitchell, Lloyd R.
Morgan, Daniel H.
Morgan, Frederick L.
Moritz, Jack T.
Morris, Arthur S.
Morse, Arthur I.
Moser, Kenneth L.
Mounger, Temple B.
Mountain, Wilbur E.
Mueller, Richard K.
Murphey, Ernest B.
Myers, Arthur R.
Neal, Frank E.
Near, Jesse L.
Nelson, Harry T.
Nelson, Ivan G.
Nichols, Robert L.
Noel, James J.
Norwood, Carroll H.
Norwack, Harry F.
Nuss, Leo T.
O'Donnell, Joseph P.
Olliver, Allen
Olliver, George R.
Olson, Harold P.
Orand, Elden D.
O'Reilly, Henry F.
Ozenberger, Elmer W., Jr.
Palmer, William G.
Pandzik, George R.
Parker, Alvin D.
Parra, Edward J.
Parsons, James C.
Partis, George
Pawela, Frank J.
Peak, Doyle
Perdok, Michael
Perecko, Julius J., Jr.
Peterson, Clarence J.
Peterson, James C.
Pettit, Hubert H. S.
Phillip, Charles
Phillips, Boyce, D.
Phillips, Joseph J.
Pieper, Walter F.
Pilson, Louis J.
Pinch, Jack O.
Pitts, George E.
Pitts, Clyde
Poole, James S.
Porter, Henry L.
Post, Robert W.
Pound, Robert C.
Powell, Henry O.
Pratt, Damon J.
Price, Morris C.
Provin, Lee R.
Prue, Grant W.
Purcell, Jack R.
Quisenberry, Mawyer V.
Raab, Paul J.
Ragsdale, Charles C.
Ramsey, Ira B.
Rath, Robert L.
Raymond, Henry H., Jr.
Reed, Kenneth L.
Reese, David H.
Reid, James E.
Reid, Jewell H.
Rennert, Paul Z.
Richardson, Curtis M.
Riddle, George E.
Riggan, Samuel H.
Riggs, Hiram A.
Rightmeyer, Harry H.
Ripley, Ormel F.
Ritter, Preston R.
Roberts, Nelson E.
Robertson, Thurmond E.
Robinson, James W.
Robinson, Stanley J.
Rocher, Chester R.
Rodgers, Walter U.
Roper, Jasper H.
Rose, Angus W.
Ross, Clarence B.
Rostien, Jack C.
Runyan, Lester E.
Runyon, Donald E.
Sanders, Clinton F.
Satterwhite, George B.
Schafer, Carl J.
Scheffer, Hubert W.
Schmedes, Joseph T.
Schmidt, Augustine E., Jr.
Scholer, Frederick W.
Schwahn, Joseph L.
Scott, Leonard P.
Scott, Walter E.
Seene, Jacob, Jr.
Shannon, Robert C.
Shaver, William R.
Sheller, Lawrence E.
Shenton, Thomas L.
Sherfey, Samuel W.
Shields, Charles W.
Shoemaker, Kenneth Sills, Joseph R.
Simerville, Louis R.
Simpson, Harold M., Jr.
Sinclair, Pierre M.
Skadowski, Karl E.
Skinner, Walter P.
Skjaret, Jalmer H.
Sledge, Milton C.
Smathers, Hilliard C.
Smith, Boudinot L.
Smith, Julius S.
Smith, Walter C.
Smith, William H.
Smithson, Albert E.
Smithwick, Robert W.
Snay, Charles A.
Sokulski, Stanley A.
Sosnowsky, Edward L.
Sotak, John W.
Southland, Johannes
Spangler, Clarence M.
Spangler, Kenneth E.
Spike, Torrance G.
Spilker, Harold F.
Spitzer, Cecil E.
Sproule, Alexander A.
Stanger, John R.
Starck, Louis C.
Stark, Stanley D.
Steenman, Oliver F.
Steffa, Edward D.
Steier, Elmer B.
Stephens, James M.
Stephenson, Joseph E.
Stewart, Erwin R.
Stimpert, Harvey A.
St. Pierre, Francis W.
Strawhecker, Lester O.
Adams, Jesse F.
Atkinson, Thomas E., Jr.
Bachman, Kenneth P.
Banks, Lawrence E.
Beckman, Edward L.
Brooks, Ralph K.
Capron, Manley J., Jr.
Clare, Frank B.
Stuffer, Frank N.
Sumrall, Howell
Sutherlin, Donald E.
Swinson, Walter H.
Talbot, Maurice P.
Tarkowski, Lawrence
Tate, Thomas R.
Teaford, Howard C.
Tellin, Raymond C.
Thompson, Lloyd J.
Thompson, Lowell E.
Thompson, Ralph M.
Thornton, Robert L.
Thorp, David S.
Thorpe, Thaddeus
Timmerman, John T.
Treadwell, James L.
Trimble, Howard S.
Triplett, Franklin A.
True, John R.
Turner, Arcia O.
Turnquist, George
Tutt, Alvin H.
Tyndall, Luther L.
Uht, Christian E.
Underwood, Albert B., Jr.
VanBibber, Charles E.
VanOver, Roswell
Vaught, Claude R.
Vautrot, Joseph N.
Vermeersch, Rennie
Vollman, Leonard W.
Waddell, Harry
Wagner, Richard O. E.
Wagoner, Leonard H.
Walker, Charles H.
Wallace, Johnny L.
Wallace, Martin H.
Walls, "J" Herbert
Ward, Raymond E.
Weaver, Hubert A.
Webber, George W.
Weber, Edgar H.
Weddle, William H.
Weir, George T.
Wells, George B.
Wells, William
Werner, Leonard H.
West, Walter G.
Westergaard, Clarence W.
White, Almon E.
White, Artie F.
Wiegand, Rudolf P.
Wilfong, Thomas L.
Willhoite, Robert B.
Williams, Andy W.
Williams, Charles A.
Williams, Frederick E.
Williams, Loris D.
Williams, Pinckney M.
Willis, Harold R.
Wilson, Edgar L.
Wilson, James C.
Winchell, Albert W.
Wingo, Leonard A.
Wood, Jesse V.
Wood, Malcolm L.
Wood, Ollin L.
Woodliff, Roy A.
Woody, Myrri M.
Wundram, Horace J.
Young, James D., Jr.
Young, William E.
Zuehlke, Arthur R.
Cooper, Henry R.
Courtney, Marvin D.
Cronemiller, Philip D.
deWilton, Edward L.
Faaland, Halvdan G. K.
Hill, Howard W.
Holloway, Charles K., Jr.
Jones, Edward A.
Kibler, Robert S.
May, Albert L., Jr.
McCabe, John F.
Neikirk, William I.
Newton, Charles E.
Palmer, John R., Jr.
Pruett, Carl E.
Robinson, William C.
Root, Charles P., Jr.
Smith, Bruce H., Jr.
Stalter, Robert A.
Stoecklein, Herbert G.
Stover, John H., Jr.
Tarr, George H., Jr.
Watkins, Dale B.
Wetzel, Frederick E.
Wineinger, Gerald E.
SUPPLY CORPS
Adams, Henry T., Jr.
Allen, Stuart R.
Anderson, Eugene F., Jr.
Armstrong, Earl F.
Baldwin, Frank A.
Barbero, Francesco M.
Barlie, Emmett O.
Barnhard, Clyde C.
Barton, John J.
Beasten, Robert C.
Bellew, Michael F. X.
Brittain, Joe T.
Brown, Daniel W.
Burnett, Howard W., Jr.
Caporaso, John J.
Carroll, Claude I., Jr.
Colquhoun, James D.
Cooper, John W.
Corcoran, James E.
Culver, Fred C.
Daniels, Royce L.
Dinsmore, Dale D.
Dreyfous, Lewis E.
Emrick, Charles E.
Farrell, Thomas C.
Findlay, George J.
Flowers, Woodford L.
Foster, Thomas E., Jr.
Furtwangler, Leo E.
Garrett, John H., Jr.
Gerhardt, Robert J.
Gilbert, William O.
Giuli, Vincent P.
Greene, Daniel W.
Gregg, Frank V.
Grey, James E.
Griffin, Gerald L., 2d
Grimsley, Geleter
Guelff, Pierre H.
Halla, George F.
Hanson, Frank O.
Hardacre, Francis W.
Hart, Robert F.
Haskell, John W.
Hauge, George E.
Herrick, Eugene G.
Higgins, Simeon G.
Hoft, John W.
Holtslander, Herman S.
Hooper, John C.
Hubona, Michael
Hughes, Augustus P., Jr.
Jack, Ralph H.
Johnson, Henry R.
Jones, Joseph C.
Jones, William B.
Kasprzak, Stephen L.
Kauffman, Sewell T.
Keefer, John A.
Kerr, Algernon H., Jr.
Kloforn, Kenneth R.
Knapp, Michael J.
Kosky, Walter H.
Kriz, Joseph A.
Krueger, Henry C.
Lampshire, Harvey R.
Landers, Elmer S.
Lanes, Earl V.
Leedy, Ralph G.
Leidel, Oscar W., Jr.
Lewis, John M., Jr.
Lewis, Wellington H.
Linden, Clarence W.
Lindsey, Richard A.
Link, Milton A.
MacDonald, Albert M.
Mago, Bernard A.
Martin, Daniel L.
McKenna, William J.
McWilliams, William G., Jr.
Mogle, Howard N.
Moore, John C.
Morton, Emery L.
Morton, Frank M., Jr.
Newsome, Robert F., Jr.
Nicks, Paul B.
Normile, Walter G.
Parrish, Melvin O.
Peach, William T., 3d
Prince, Carl A.
Rapp, Harry L.
Raynes, James E.
Rhoades, Benjamin A., Jr.
Rye, William A.
Sanders, Joseph E.
Sanford, Edward A., Jr.
Schweizer, Earl G.
Sharon, Horace D.
Shawkey, Arthur A.
Sherer, Ramon A.
Shirley, Joseph R.
Sieck, John F.
Sikes, Thomas J.
Simmons, Robert C., Jr.
Sirginson, Arthur W.
Smith, Frank W.
Smith, William A.
Stevens, Lester L.
Swint, Elwin O.
Tolson, Carlos L.
Tolson, Walter W.
Wade, John W.
Walker, John K.
Warden, John L.
Waters, George C., Jr.
Weatherston, Frederick W.
Wheeler, Lawrence A.
Whelan, Robert E.
Whitaker, Frank A.
Whitcher, Lamar D.
White, Ernest C.
Whitener, John H.
Williams, Douglas O.
Wilson, Robert H.
Wolfe, George M., Jr.
Wood, Russell K., Jr.
Wright, Jack L.
Yadon, James D.
Zivnuska, Robert W.

MEDICAL CORPS

- Adams, Jesse F.
Atkinson, Thomas E., Jr.
Bachman, Kenneth P.
Banks, Lawrence E.
Beckman, Edward L.
Brooks, Ralph K.
Capron, Manley J., Jr.
Clare, Frank B.
Cooper, Henry R.
Courtney, Marvin D.
Cronemiller, Philip D.
deWilton, Edward L.
Faaland, Halvdan G. K.
Hill, Howard W.
Holloway, Charles K., Jr.
Kerr, Algernon H., Jr.
Kloforn, Kenneth R.
Knapp, Michael J.
Kosky, Walter H.
Kriz, Joseph A.
Krueger, Henry C.
Lampshire, Harvey R.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

- Beukema, Henry J.
Ford, Edmund J.
Gendron, Anthony L.
Helmich, Edward C.
Hollingsworth, John E., 3d
Lindquist, Loren M.
MacNeill, Harold A.
Markley, John H.
McManus, Hugh T.
Noce, William S.
Sassaman, Robert S.
Tubbs, Joseph J.
Wiese, Oliver F. L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Avera, Ewing L.
Brown, Woodrow M.
Callahan, John F.
Cline, Warren F.
Corn, Harold D.
Davis, Wendell G.
Denman, Justin D.
Epps, Robert W.
Foster, Edmund R., Jr.
Gassett, Charles M.
Gorman, Joseph W.
Grubb, Clarence A.
Hansche, Frank C., Jr.
Hobson, Harold E.
Jones, Jack J.
Jones, Joseph V.

Lakos, Eugene A.
Larson, Lief R.
Laughlin, Richard A.
Lewis, Chester A.
Martinson, Norman L.
Martiny, Eugene F.
Masters, Claude D.
McPhillips, James E.
Meeks, Arthur F.
Miller, William A.
Nuckel, John, Jr.
Pickett, Bryan S.
Pollock, Jack P.
Trzyna, Zbyszko C.
Underhill, Edward G.
Young, Oran W. V.

DENTAL CORPS

Blackwood, Robert M.
Curreri, Rosolino J.
Hedman, Warren J., Jr.
Hurka, Joseph S.
Joseph, Robert L.
Kalres, Anthony K.
McGonnell, Joseph P.
Moore, Edward W.
Oesterle, Albert R.
Peterson, Richard V.

Phillips, Robert D.
Reilly, John V.
Rudolph, Charles E., Jr.
Schneider, John J.
Scott, Ralph H. S.
Stoopack, Jerome C.
Trick, Wilbur A.
Walter, George W., Jr.
Williams, Robert M.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Anderson, Chalmers L.
Austin, Paul L.
Barboo, Samuel H.
Barunas, George A.
Bond, Leslie E.
Boston, Lester E.
Brenner, Sidney G.
Brooks, Roy T.
Buckner, James F.
Burton, Herman H.
Chartier, Armand P.
Chevrefils, Francis A.
Collins, Joseph W.
Combs, Harry W., Jr.
Cox, Paul R.
Daul, Arthur P.
Dreitlein, William M.
Duwel, Bernard F.
Eisman, Leon P.
Elsasser, Leo J.
Floyd, Thomas M., Jr.
Fowkes, Conard C.
Francisco, Joseph E.
Frontis, Irving
Gadberry, Dwight L.
Haase, Edward F.
Hall, Heyward E.
Henry, Robert L.
Hibdon, Lawrence E.
Hill, Stanley E.
Huber, Melvin P.
Isert, Lawrence L.
Johnson, George A. L.
Keizur, Marques E., Jr.
Kelley, John E.
Kent, Paul R.
Lawson, Clifford R.

Lee, Arve
Lewis, Frederick J., Jr.
Lewis, Ramon C.
Lewy, Roy D.
Lewis, William C.
Linder, Harry H.
Luckie, Robert G.
Maddox, Edgar J.
Mann, Charles F.
Millard, Matthew J.
Miller, Denny S.
Mitchell, Frank J.
Moss, Vernon T.
Oley, John A.
Pittser, Clay E.
Price, Kenneth L.
Pryor, Lawrence E.
Quigley, Charles V.
Roepke, Fred C.
Rutter, John M.
Sant, John
Schweinfurth, Karl E.
Shea, Thomas E., Jr.
Skow, Royce K.
Smith, James P.
Stains, George S.
Stevens, Eugene
Stovall, Earnest R.
Taylor, Andrew A.
Taylor, Hugh M.
Tidwell, Herman B.
Vasa, Ralph L.
Westbrook, Francis L.
White, Erwin W.
Wilford, Walter H.
Willgrube, Wayne W.
Wilson, Percy C.
Witcofski, Louie K.

NURSE CORPS

Burk, Alberta S.
Danyo, Anna
Dolloff, Ellen N.
Dvorak, Gladys E.
Erickson, Ruth A.
Haley, Margaret L.
Lampp, Clara L.
Lange, Estelle K.

Moesser, Maxine M.
Monahan, Dorothy P.
Nelson, Gertrude H.
Quebbeman, Francis E.
Shavia, Rosemary
Warner, Myrtle M.
Wilson, Judy N.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve

LINE

Adams, George M., Jr.
Allen, Clifton C.
Allen, Harold G.
Allen, Louis W.
Anderson, Marvel L.
Arthurs, Richard
Avila, Frank W.

Bagbey, William B.
Bair, James K., Jr.
Bannon, Marvin L.
Bartell, Frederick J.
Baumann, Henry R.
Beebe, Henry P.
Belanger, Henry O.

Belmore, Brainard J.
Bomberger, George K.
Boyd, Herschel B.
Britt, Gilbert A.
Bunch, Walter P.
Burwell, George A.
Bush, George B., Jr.
Bushner, Francis X.
Campbell, Truman F.
Chapman, Cedric L.
Clark, Thomas F.
Clarke, Leo C.
Coletti, Vincent J., Jr.
Collins, Frank T.
Craddock, Felix B.
Crawford, Robert V.
Crispell, Albert E., Jr.
Cross, James J., Jr.
Crowder, William T.
Dallas, Allen K.
Davis, Arthur C., Jr.
DeFay, Theodore G., Jr.
Downes, Robert S.
Drake, Thomas R.
Dyer, William W.
Erwin, James C.
Fagerland, Robert H.
Featherstone, Charles M., Jr.
Fellows, Fred J.
Ferus, Stanley W.
Fey, George W.
Fielden, Robert W.
Foster, John P.
Galvin, Daniel T.
Germain, H. H.
Gore, Charles M.
Graham, Allen J.
Haggard, William H., II
Hammet, Benjamin F.
Hancock, Stoddard P.
Hardenburg, Henry T.
Hardey, James W.
Harrison, William E.
Henson, John G.
Hirschfeld, Henry G.
Hoffman, Deuane M.
Holk, Elmer M.
Horn, Revella W.
Hunnicut, William V.
Jones, Clayton D.
Kastantin, Julius
Knechtel, Alton S.
Knight, Charles M.
Kruse, William C.
Kugler, Edwin B.
Kuhn, Martin, Jr.
Lacy, John C.
Lassiter, James E.
Lawler, Joseph J.
Lee, Charles L.
Leonard, John I.
Lichtler, Leroy L.
Lingar, Ailon B.
Lovejoy, Gordon B.
Lynn, Kane W.
MacCormack, Ewan A.
Madine, Robert W.
Magee, Fred I.
Manson, Armand G.
Marten, William H.
Martin, Edward B.
Masterson, Christopher R.
McAvoy, William J.
McCoy, George W.

McCullough, Harry R., Jr.
McIntosh, Ellsworth L., Jr.
McIntyre, John A.
McLean, Coil H.
Meade, Edward G.
Meehan, Joseph P., Jr.
Menard, Bronley M.
Meyer, Anton A.
Mickle, Francis L.
Mielke, Reyo C.
Millius, Gay E., Jr.
Murray, Joseph P.
Mortensen, Ralph H.
Mueller, Gerald J.
Mueller, Henry V.
Mullenix, Marvin B.
Mullins, Kennedy F.
Mullon, Franklin G.
Munkasey, Paul F.
Nutt, Francis N.
O'Connor, James F.
Orr, Paul P.
Palmer, Glenn I.
Partridge, Benjamin W., Jr.
Patterson, Edward R.
Potter, Robert R.
Powell, John W.
Prade, Nathaniel H.
Prentiss, Paul T. K.
Quinn, Thomas E.
Raish, Leonard R.
Ray, Thomas W.
Riggs, Joe R.
Riveland, Harold R.
Roebuck, Mac J.
Rogers, Colletus A.
Ross, William C.
Rowe, John R.
Rucker, Louis D.
Sanborn, Vincent G.
Saunders, David G.
Schultz, Donald P.
Sellers, Daniel N.
Shaw, Clyde A., Jr.
Sherrard, Andrew C., Jr.
Shoemaker, Robert F.
Simpson, Edward W.
Slane, James F.
Smith, Charles W.
Smith, Harold E.
Smith, Harvey F., Jr.
Smith, Jay B.
Snight, Eldridge A.
Solomon, Bernard S.
Spooner, Gordon F.
Stames, William A.
Taylor, John A.
True, Elroy G., Jr.
VanBuren, Robert L.
Vencill, Charles A.
Vollberg, Ernest M.
Wagner, William R., Jr.
Weland, John E.
Wells, Robert W.
Wendell, John H.
Wheelahan, Edmund J.
Williams, Joshua F.
Williamson, Beverly P.
Zimmerman, Edwin J., Jr.
Zoecklein, Walter O.

SUPPLY CORPS

Brobston, Walter M.
Dellman, William F.
Fox, Karl G.

Fullam, Ralph E. S. E.
Moffett, Virgil V.
Wallis, Fred M.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Andrews, Edwin W.
Boyle, Laurence E.
Burke, Thomas J.
Crain, Loren O.
Geary, Joseph M.
Handran, Ralph E.

Lane, William P.
McMillen, Gervase C.
Naughten, Gabriel J.
O'Connor, Leslie L.
Palubicki, Gregory J.
Tillman, Thaddeus J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Baer, Harold H.
Bittenbring, Charles, III
Capwell, Carl W.

Fales, Willard C.
Jaquess, Ronald C.
Jung, Joseph W.
Nordbye, Lee O.

DENTAL CORPS

Blancherl, Raymond L.
Bostian, Paul
Foss, Calvin L.
Gilson, Thomas D.
Hughes, Francis W.
Kosteletzky, William L.

Kuhrtz, Kenneth L.
MacDonald, Dexter R.
Marquis, Donald T.
Susewind, Simon W.
Solomon, Robert D.
Stowell, Ralph H.

NURSE CORPS

Grimes, Mary C.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Molish, Herman
The following-named officers of the Nurse Corps of the Navy and the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary promotion in the Navy

Adrian, Lois E.
Allgeier, Althea E.
Alvord, Bertha I.
Arnold, June E.
Aycock, Martha O.
Baer, Annette
Ballantyne, Alma C.
Barclay, Kathryn
Bare, Thelma R.
Bartos, Josephine T.
Bates, Virginia M.
Battin, Ethel L.
Becker, Dorothy C.
Bednarski, Pauline M.
Belden, Virginia C.
Benjamin, Lucy R.
Benson, Anna J.
Benson, Wilma M.
Berry, Margaret R.
Beumer, Lucille M.
Blaska, Burdette M.
Boyle, Helen L.
Brandenburg, Martha O.
Brochtrup, Rita M.
Brown, Iva H.
Brown, Lois E.
Brown, Mary J.
Browne, Ruth A.
Bussey, Gladys V.
Carlson, Eloise M.
Cheek, Marie M.
Chipman, Virginia R.
Clark, Hazel E.
Clarke, Rita D.
Coderre, Evelyn I.
Cohen, Ruth M.
Cole, Deon
Collins, Jeannette
Company, Eleanor M.
Coughlan, Joan M.
Coxsey, Essie E.
Crenshaw, Mary E.
Daughtry, Edna M.
Davis, Celia M.
Delfs, Rosa J.
Dunning, Carol L.
Duwe, Elizabeth M.
Egan, Anne M.
Ellingson, Norma A.
Entriken, Helen S.
Erickson, Evelyn I.
Fannan, Helen R.
Feezor, Thelma L.
Flanagan, Rose A.
Flickinger, Ruth L.
Frazier, Florence M.
Gale, Dorothy M.
Gavelek, Tekia S.
Givens, Iris E.
Glancy, Evelyn D.

Goldthwaite, Marie B.
Gresko, Mary
Grzelka, Mary A.
Hankey, Lorraine M.
Hanwell, Muriel
Harrington, Eleanor M.
Harrington, Mary A.
Hase, Thelma B.
Holte, Edna P. H.
Houp, Geraldine A.
Houska, Pearl K.
Jacobs, Grace E.
Janc, Cecilia R.
Johnson, Edna I.
Jones, Dorothy E.
Jones, Virginia E.
Kaes, Anna A.
Kieler, Lydia F.
Kirk, Bertha M.
Klein, Ruth O.
Knowles, Marie A.
Knox, Nathalia A.
Kroush, Nina M.
Lahr, Arleen E.
Langton, Mary M.
Lavigne, Rose H.
Lee, Barbara D.
Lepine, Martha M.
Liebman, Leora B.
Linnenbruegge, Hedwig M. E.
Linnett, Catherine
Linville, Delma U.
Little, Frances L.
Lowe, Nancy C.
Martin, Mary A.
Mauldin, Norma E.
McCarthy, Helen G.
McDaniel, Mona L.
McKinney, Dorothea J.
Messer, Elna C.
Miller, Elizabeth L.
Minkel, Eva M.
Mitchell, Rachel L.
Moeller, Ruth I.
Nelson, Harriet A.
Noteware, Margaret A.
O'Brien, Elizabeth
O'Bryant, Blanche M.
Olson, Louise B.
Otero, Lucille M.
Penkunas, Nellie M.
Phillipps, Dolores C.
Pintnar, Anna M.
Pongratz, Marie A.
Poulter, Marion
Poytress, Anne J.
Pressley, Patricia S.
Price, Frances F.
Reilly, Alice R.

Rhoades, Helen M.
Sagawe, Julia M.
Samonski, Helen
Sanderson, Laura M.
Scheips, Edna M.
Schmidt, Esther L.
Scott, Margaret E.
Seidl, Elizabeth B.
Shedyak, Alice M.
Shurr, Agnes G.
Smith, Catherine I.
Smith, Ellen E.
Smith, Hattie B.
Smoker, Sue E.
Soto, Margaret M.
Springer, Virginia F.
Stearns, Lina
Stickles, Norma V.
Stutler, Edna M.

Styron, Ruth H.
Thomas, Rachel E.
Thompson, Vera E. K.
Thurber, Mabel G.
Townsend, Edna L.
Tulin, Flora
Tyson, Emma E.
Vaubel, Valera C.
Vaughn, Mary A.
Vitulo, Angelica
Von Stein, Marjorie E.
Wallace, Nancy I.
Walton, Maude S.
Warner, Edia C.
Williams, Kathryn E.
Wilson, Doris A.
Wolfgang, Mary I.
Woodall, Gwenevera
Zinkus, Katherine A.

For temporary promotion in the Naval Reserve

Baer, Ardath J.
Baskin, Lois M.
Dominique, Alice H.
Harrell, Esther C.
Jenkins, Margaret B.
Milsted, Lucille H.

Nixon, Frances B.
Retzlaff, Viola B.
Stewart, Lillian
Vecchione, Claire M.
Wilkinson, Olive M. P.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Council, Dorothy I.
Rich, Elinor D.
Shilling, Katherine E.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Backman, Fred M.
Ball, Millard C.
Davis, Cecil C.

Messina, Sylvester C.
Sherman, Lee H.
Skyrud, Jerome P.

The following-named lieutenant commander of the line of the Navy for transfer to and permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy with the grade of lieutenant commander:

French, Ferris L., Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy with the grade of ensign:

Aquadro, Lincoln
Coates, Edward E.
Chourea, Jack M.
Elne, Gervase F., Jr.
Fitzgerald, Nathan M., Jr.
Gaskin, Herbert L., Jr.
Haycraft, William R.
Hervey, Frank, Jr.
Huston, Robert J.

Myers, Clayman C., Jr.
O'Haren, Patrick J.
Reedy, Roger F.
Shaw, Robert W.
Stump, Edward J.
Wagner, Ralph L.
Wiederecht, Donald A.

The following-named chief warrant officers W-3 of the Navy for permanent promotion to chief warrant officer W-4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Dougan, George M.
Forkner, Charles A.
Hatch, Ellsworth K.
Kerrell, Joseph H.
Mason, Clyde S., Jr.
Moran, Franklin D.

Myers, John W.
Nolan, Michael A.
Poston, Charles G.
Secl, Joseph
Spear, Russell G.
Sullivan, John E.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Barr, Ronald L.
Bean, Alan LaV.
Blackmar, Frederik S.
Burt, Charles N., Jr.
Craven, William D.
Doyle, William J.
Ferguson, William H.
Fulcher, Clay W. G.

Hays, John T.
Lima, John M.
Livingston, Daniel S.
Pruett, James H., IV
Schott, Charles E.
Shearer, Warren D.
Starke, Clinton J.
Stoner, Charles L.
Swenson, Thomas F.

Wilking, Richard P.
Woolaway, Thomas P.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct name, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Herren, Philip C.
Wetzel, Weslie W.

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT
Bennett, Wayland
O'Connell, Patrick F.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)
Foster, Donald J.
Francis, Percy D.

Gioconda R. Saraniero (lieutenant commander, Medical Corps, United States Navy) to be commander in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Mary T. Lynch (civilian college graduate) to be lieutenant in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Clayton, Walter "B," Jr.
Davis, Joe A.
Holland, Harry W., Jr.
Huffman, William W.

The following-named civilian college graduates to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Belda, Albert G.
Bevan, Leroy A.
Firth, Harry B.

Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
Morgan, Ralph O., Jr.
Williams, LeGrant E.

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER
Gabrels, Wilton R.
Stanford, Walter O.

LIEUTENANT
Carmen, Marvin
Englander, Harold R.
Hancock, Joseph G.

James, Thomas L.
Meeks, Stanley
Pryles, George V.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)
Janus, John T.
Lyons, James J.
Messina, Richard J.
Phillips, James W.

Shreve, William B., Jr.
Slagle, Lowell E.
Swan, Walter D.

The following-named civilian college graduates to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Barrett, Neil K.
Beyer, Charles E.
Brandon, Daniel A.
Brannon, Joe F.
Carpenter, Arden R.
Curto, James C.
Dietch, Michael M., Jr.
Gallaher, Robert E.
Goon, Melvin H.
Hartley, Robert L., Jr.
Holston, Charles A.
Janson, Harold J.
Keesee, Robert C.
Long, William L.
McComb, Gordon S.

Miller, Harry P.
Oleson, Russell H.
Oswald, Charles A., III
Reed, John R.
Richardson, James W.
Riser, Ellis W.
Schaffner, Leslie J.
Sloan, Marshall
Smout, Jay C.
Talley, Russel L.
Tatum, Raymond B.
VanBuskirk, Floyd W.
Woodham, James T.
Morris, Carlton R.

James P. Anderson to be a temporary chief electrician in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve aviators) to be ensigns in the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Anderson, Charles A.
Archer, Burton E., Jr.
Basset, Jerry S.
Benton, Jerry S.
Boehmer, Arthur W.
Bozeman, Henry G.
Bruning, Richard A.
Caines, Robert H.
Cann, Tedford J.
Clare, James S.
Clark, William B., Jr.
Curry, Thomas E.
DaRodda, Aldo J.
Day, Arthur R.
Edwards, Forrest L.
Finney, Jack L.
Harris, James W.
Helms, Harlie B., Jr.
Higgs, Jay D.
Jaburg, Conrad J.
Kling, William T.
Knight, Charles H.
Kugler, Kenneth D.
LeBlanc, George E., Jr.
Lester, Grady D.
Lewis, Robert
McCardell, James E., Jr.
Mann, Robert L.

Merkler, George J.
Nichols, John F.
O'Neil, Louis C., Jr.
Painter, George V.
Pankratz, Carl J.
Patridge, Roger H.
Pearl, Leo J.
Ferrault, Mark E.
Person, Ross H.
Reynolds, Robert F., Jr.
Robertson, Coll E.
Robillard, Malcolm R.
Rosson, James W.
Schaub, John R., Jr.
Sheets, Roger E.
Shepherd, David C.
Stuler, Ashley C., Jr.
Smith, Jason J.
Spear, Willard W., Jr.
Thomas, Donald P.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thoreston, Glyn T.
Tobias, Robert E.
Watts, John E.
Williams, Frank C.
Williams, Randall L.
Wyatt, Charles M.
Zirkle, Forrest E.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Ridgely, Reginald H., Jr.
Litzenberg, Homer L.

Hogaboom, Robert E.
Burger, Joseph C.
McCaul, Verne J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Snedeker, Edward W.
Wornham, Thomas A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to brigadier general:

Jordahl, Russell N.
Juhan, Jack P.
Munn, John C.
Wirsig, Frank H.

Luckey, Robert B.
Binney, Arthur F.
Ennis, Thomas G.

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:

Hansen, Harold D.
Croft, Frank C.
Dyer, Edward C.

Victory, Randall M.
Roberts, Carson A.
Berkeley, James P.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Burkhardt, John W.
Day, Merrill M.
Dean, Raymond L.
English, Lowell E.
Fletcher, Maurice W.
Frash, William M.
Handley, Rodney M.
Hiatt, Robert C.
Leary, Byron V.
Leonard, John P., Jr.
Lucas, Albert F., III
Magee, John C., Jr.

McCoy, Charles W.
McMillan, John H.
Ridge, Thomas L.
Roose, Albert J.
Sanders, Alvin S.
Schmuck, Donald M.
Smith, Andrew G., Jr.
Stiedtmann, Robert F.
Wrenn, Elmer A.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abel, Joseph L.
Abel, Raymond L.
Acker, George K.
Adams, William O.

Akstin, Anthony A.
Allen, Gordon L.
Anderson, Cecil E.
Anderson, Donald V.

- Anderson, Robert S.
Antink, James
Appfel, James A., Jr.
Armstrong, William D.
Atkins, Joseph L.
Avant, Percy F., Jr.
Ayres, Robert R., Jr.
Babashanian, John G.
Bacon, Franklin C.
Baird, William E.
Baldwin, Robert E.
Bale, Edward L., Jr.
Barker, Frank P., Jr.
Barnes, Frederick W.
Bartley, Whitman S.
Bartosh, Walter R.
Batdorff, Richard W.
Bates, William L., Jr.
Belyea, Richard
Bennett, William R.
Bertuff, Max, Jr.
Bibb, Orville L.
Blackburn, George P., Jr.
Blackmun, Arvid W.
Blumenstein, John H.
Boag, Arthur R.
Boggs, Charles W., Jr.
Bolish, Robert J.
Bollmann, Howard W.
Bolt, John F.
Booth, Philip E.
Bourgeois, Henry M.
Bowman, John W.
Boyd, Kenneth B.
Bratten, Paul H., Jr.
Braun, Richard L.
Bridges, David W.
Bright, Cruger L.
Bristow, John B.
Brookes, George J., Jr.
Brooks, Louis V.
Brown, Harold F.
Brown, Robert E.
Bruder, Joseph A.
Buck, Lyle E.
Burgess, Richard
Butler, John J., IV
Caldwell, Frank C.
Calland, Robert M.
Card, Horace W., Jr.
Carney, Robert B., Jr.
Carpenter, James B., Jr.
Carrington, George W., Jr.
Carroll, John H.
Case, William N.
Casey, Dennis P.
Chambers, John S., Jr.
Chase, Norman S.
Chip, William C.
Christie, Wesley R.
Clibik, Steve J.
Clark, Albert L.
Clarke, Maurice H.
Claude, Eugene P.
Cloern, Lawrence R.
Cole, Carlton G.
Cole, Roscoe E.
Conley, Robert F.
Conrad, Robert L.
Conway, John A.
Cook, Howard E.
Cook, Milton M., Jr.
Cook, Richard M.
Costello, William H.
Cramer, John A.
Cronin, Angus J.
Crottinger, James A.
Crowe, William E.
Crown, John A.
Cuenin, Walter H.
Cushman, Thomas J., Jr.
Daigh, Robert E.
Dalton, Carol D.
Davis, Clyde H., Jr.
Dawes, George M.
Dayton, Francis P.
Dees, Harry C.
DeLamar, Richard F., III
Dick, William L.
Dickey, Robert L.
Dickinson, Harry E.
Donahoe, Joseph F., Jr.
Douglass, Graham T.
Downs, John V.
Doyle, Griffith B.
Draper, Frederic F.
Dudley, Remmel H.
Dukes, William P.
Dunlap, Howard I.
Dunn, Elswin P.
Dyer, James R.
Edwards, Grammer G.
Edwards, Jack R.
Edwards, Robert J.
Elliott, Richard M.
Elliott, Richard B.
Ellis, George W.
Elrod, Roy H.
Estes, J. E.
Etheridge, James A.
Eubank, William L.
Evans, Wilbur F., Jr.
Fairbairn, Clifford A.
Fairbanks, Willis L.
Fairfield, Robert J.
Farrell, George E.
Ferguson, Cecil D.
Fetters, James C.
Fields, Thomas M.
Finn, Howard J.
Flynn, Richard J., Jr.
Fogg, Joseph E.
Folsom, Samuel B., Jr.
Foss, David, Jr.
Forsyth, Thomas M., Jr.
Frazier, Kenneth D.
Freeman, Ernest P., Jr.
French, Richard E.
Fristoe, Ashby J.
Fritch, Robert G.
Gall, Walter
Gardner, Joseph S.
Garner, James E.
Geftman, William
Gierhart, George B.
Gilhuly, Fred J.
Gilson, Leslie A., Jr.
Glenn, Norman D.
Gomes, Herbert
Gray, Gordon E.
Green, Bert A.
Greenough, Kenneth C.
Gregory, Marshall C.
Grove, John R.
Grow, Lowell D.
Haberlie, Douglas E.
Hadd, Harry A.
Haigler, Wilson D.
Hale, Arthur M.
Hall, Robert
Hammond, Robert H.
Hannah, Samuel A.
Harbin, Fred F.
Hargrave, Harry D.
Harrington, Frank W.
Hartley, Dean S., Jr.
Hartman, Albert
Hartsock, Edmond P.
Haxton, Floyd C.
Hayes, Irving B.
Haynes, Fred E., Jr.
Hays, John E.
Hazel, George H.
Hearn, Alexander M.
Hendley, Allen C.
Henry, Wallace
Herzog, Lawrence L.
Hewitt, Roy R.
Hey, Richard, Jr.
Hill, Homer S.
Hill, Jake B.
Hill, Milton D.
Hise, Henry W.
Hobbs, Ralph H.
Hoffman, Carl W.
Hogan, John K.
Hollowell, George L.
Hood, Harlen E.
Hood, John A.
Hoover, Ben L.
Horn, Charles H.
Howard, Harold C.
Howie, Robert G.
Hudson, Robert S.
Huff, Henry P.
Hughes, Stanley S.
Hughes, Thomas H., Jr.
Hunt, Sanford B., Jr.
Janson, Russell L.
Jarvis, John J., Jr.
Jeschke, Richard H.
Johnson, Dan H.
Johnson, Floyd M., Jr.
Johnson, Frank
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Richard W.
Johnson, Robert E.
Johnson, William G.
Jones, James L.
Joslin, Henry V.
Keck, Warren H.
Keen, Charles J.
Keith, Bruce E.
Kellogg, Paul H.
Kelly, Irving N.
Kelly, Philip W.
Kelly, Robert E.
Kelso, Lynn N.
Kirkpatrick, Floyd C.
Kohler, William J.
Kollmann, Charles E.
Korf, Charles W.
Kozak, Bolish J.
Kujovsky, Philip T.
Kusiak, John M.
Laing, Robert B.
Landrum, John C.
Langstaff, Harold A., Jr.
Lanigan, John P.
Larson, Bertil E.
Lawrence, James F., Jr.
Leasure, Harry V.
LeClaire, Charles H.
Lee, Howard M.
Lemke, Willard C.
Lengyel, Nicholas P.
Lesko, Stephen
Leu, Reinhardt
Lewis, Earl N.
Lines, John D., Jr.
Lloyd, Warren F.
London, Lyle K.
Lorigan, Robert E.
Lowman, John, Jr.
Loy, John I.
Ludvigson, James D.
Lundrigan, John C.
Lunn, William E.
Lyford, Truman K.
Lynch, John K.
Mahon, John L.
Marston, Coburn
Marston, John, Jr.
Masters, Irvin V.
Matthews, Thomas J.
McArdle, Philip H.
McCabe, Robert A.
McCartney, Henry A.
McClanahan, James F.
McClelland, John C., Jr.
McCombs, Grant W.
McCullah, Carroll E.
McCully, Alton W.
McDonald, Jay E.
McFarland, David W.
McHenry, George W., Jr.
McIntyre, Eugene G.
McKean, Vance F.
McLaughlin, Earl R.
McLean, Carl T.
McMaster, Robert G.
McNeil, John P.
McShane, Bernard
Merritt, Thomas E.
Metzelaars, Charles R.
Mickle, Richard H.
Midkiff, Lynn E.
Mitchell, William P.
Moore, Clarence H.
Moore, Robert T., Jr.
Moriarty, James A., Jr.
Morrissey, Richard J.
Mosteller, Michael
Munday, Jack R.
Nahrgang, Donald V.
Nehf, Arthur N., Jr.
Neelson, Harold E.
Nickerson, Richard L.
Nielsen, Carl A.
Noble, John D.
Noonan, Arthur J.
Nori, Eero
Norris, Glenn E.
Ober, Matt S., Jr.
O'Bryan, Norman
O'Keefe, Arthur F.
Olson, Donald T.
Ourand, William R., Jr.
Pankhurst, Paul L.
Parker, Paul D.
Parker, Ralph J., Jr.
Parnell, Leslie J.
Patrow, Lelon L.
Patterson, William D., Jr.
Paul, John F.
Pawloski, Stephen K.
Pedersen, Edward K.
Pepper, David H.
Percy, Gilbert
Perkins, Robert V.
Persinger, Delmar M.
Petras, Theodore A.
Phillips, James H.
Pierce, Herbert E.
Pierce, Philip N.
Piper, John B.
Poggemeyer, Herman, Jr.
Prescott, Robert B.
Price, Caryl A.
Ramlo, Orvin H.
Randall, Thomas L.
Rankin, William H.
Rathbun, Robert L.
Raynor, Dewey D.
Read, Robert R.
Reamy, John S.
Reese, Paul F.
Regan, Daniel J.
Regan, William D.
Reid, Winfred O.
Reusser, Kenneth L.
Reynolds, Augustine B., Jr.
Richards, Samuel, Jr.
Richardson, Judson C., Jr.
Ridlon, Walter J., Jr.
Risher, Clarence T., Jr.
Roane, Eugene S., Jr.
Roberts, Edward L.
Roberts, Lee E.
Robertson, Charles S.
Robichaud, Clifford J., Jr.
Robinson, Eugene J.
Rogers, Thomas H., Jr.
Rohrabacher, Donald T.
Rosacaker, Ralph C.
Rouse, Jules M.
Roush, Martin B.
Rumbold, Charles S.
Saunders, Donald G.
Sausy, George S., Jr.
Sawyer, Alex H.
Scantling, Frederick H.
Scarborough, Hartwell V., Jr.
Scherr, Robert A.
Schmidt, Maynard W.
Schutt, Richard W.
Schwebke, William V.
Schwethelm, Harry F.
Severance, Dave E.
Sexton, Martin J.
Shepherd, John E., Jr.
Shifflett, Edwin E.
Short, James C.
Shuchter, Gerard M.
Silverthorn, Merwin H., Jr.
Simmons, David H.
Simmons, Edwin H.
Simonds, Frank H.
Simpson, Archie D.
Simpson, Frederick
Simpson, Warren H.
Sims, William J.
Sims, William L.
Skinner, John, Jr.
Slaphey, Wallace J., Jr.
Smith, Jefferson D., Jr.
Smith, Joseph T., Jr.
Smith, Lawrence W., Jr.
Smith, Paul M.
Snead, Morris R.
Snoddy, Lawrence F., Jr.
Sohn, Benjamin F.
Spanjer, Ralph H.
Stadler, Clement J.
Stampfli, Fritz
Steinhaus, Fred-erick M.
Steinkraus, Robert F.
Stevens, John R.
Stockman, James R.
Stockwell, Thomas D., Jr.
Stone, John R.
Sullivan, Frank E.
Sullivan, Richard E.
Sullivan, Richard L.
Sullivan, William J.
Swartley, John N.
Taft, Howland G.
Tatro, Leo F., Jr.
Thobe, Bernard G.
Thoemmes, Edward C.
Thomas, Frank C.
Thomas, Franklin C., Jr.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thompson, Elmer P., Jr.
Thompson, Roy H.
Thomson, David W.
Tillmann, Alfred A.
Titterud, Stanley V.
Tobin, John L.
Tosdal, Orlando S.
Trapnell, Alton P.
Treadwell, James P.
Turner, Henry M.
Turner, Walter W.
Tutton, Marshall R.
Twisdale, Robert H.
Valentin, Alaric W.
Venn, Robert H.
Voorhees, Edward H.
Voyles, Andrew J.
Wagner, Joseph F., Jr.
Walker, Alexander S., Jr.
Walker, Carl E.
Wall, Robert E.
Wallace, Harold
Walter, Howard L.
Wander, William W., Jr.
Warnke, George M.
Wasson, George E.
Watson, William F.
Webber, John W.
Weir, Robert R.
Weir, William A.
Wethe, Wallace G.
Whipple, Warren E.
Whiteside, Madison C.
Whitlock, Claude L.
Wiggins, Austin, Jr.
Wiley, David E.
Wilkinson, Frank R., Jr.
Williams, Grover C., Jr.
Williams, James S.
Wills, Virgil T.
Wilson, James P.
Wilson, Robert S.
Wilson, Robert W.
Windsor, John J.
Winters, Jack B.
Witherspoon, Thomas S.
Witt, Francis X., Jr.
Wolverton, George D.
Word, William E.
Worlund, John E.
Wright, Dorian J.
Wyckoff, Don P.
Young, Russell L.
Zastrow, Herbert E. L.
Zeiger, Clarence L., Jr.
Zimmer, Andrew M.
Zuber, John W.
- The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:
- Anderson, Harry J.
Augustine, Francis W.
Blackwelder, Harry J.
Breneman, John W.
Bryant, Arthur L.
Cameron, Alan D.
Clark, Donald L.
Croyle, William R.
Haehl, Robert J.
Havens, Paul T.
Jones, Clinton E.
Kemper, Franklin L.
Kidney, John A.
McGuckin, John
Merritt, James W.
Ochoa, Edward
Peterson, Roger D.
Presley, Frank H.
Smedley, Kenneth C.
Taylor, Mervin L.
Thorson, Roy A.
Witherspoon, John C.
- The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor, as provided by law:
- Abadie, George G.
Abbott, Harry F.
Abrahams, Charles W.
Adam, Jack H.

- Adams, Harold W.
Adams, Stanley E.
Affleck, William R., Jr.
Agnew, Edward R., Jr.
Airheart, William C.
Albers, George H.
Alberts, Howard K.
Aldworth, James
Alexander, John S.
Allen, Norris D.
Allen, Robert L.
Allen, Victor E.
Aisip, Edward O.
Amann, Emanuel R.
Amundson, Elmer
Anderson, Elmer A., Jr.
Anderson, James B.
Anderson, Robert V.
Anderson, Roy L.
Anderson, William H.
Andres, Russell A.
Andrews, Richard C.
Angle, Charles C.
Anstock, Kenneth L.
Antos, Stanislaus A.
Archer, Thomas E.
Armstrong, Charles B., Jr.
Armstrong, Gerald C.
Armstrong, Victor A.
Arnaut, Joseph R.
Arndt, Russell G.
Arneson, Charles A.
Artnak, Edward J.
Ashman, James S.
Ashton, Clark
Atherton, Walter M.
Atkins, Wade W.
Atwater, William L., Jr.
Austen, Philip N.
Austin, Marshall S.
Aynes, James P.
Bachstein, Roy S.
Baden, John P.
Bagnall, Earle E.
Bailey, Albert N.
Bailey, Almarion S.
Baird, Robert
Baker, Arnold S., Jr.
Baker, Haskell C.
Baker, James W.
Baker, Robert W.
Ball, Vernon E.
Barber, Billy H.
Barber, Neil E.
Barber, Stewart C.
Barber, William E.
Barbour, Robert J.
Barden, Arnold W.
Bardon, Thomas J.
Barnett, John E.
Barney, Irvin J.
Barnhill, Claude O., Jr.
Barrett, Gilbert A.
Barrineau, William E.
Barrow, Robert H.
Barry, Cleveland C.
Barton, Leroy C.
Bass, Julian G., Jr.
Bateman, James W.
Bateman, William E.
Bauer, Richard A.
Bauman, George F.
Bayless, Robert W.
Bays, Leslie W.
Beach, William L.
Beamon, Mont L.
Beau, Jerome J. C.
Beck, Noble L.
Beckett, John W., Jr.
Beckington, Herbert L.
Beer, William J.
Belknap, Earle W., Jr.
Bell, Robert T.
Bell, William C.
Benjamin, Louis W., Jr.
- Bennett, Eugene N.
Bent, Paul F.
Benton, Richard W.
Benton, William C.
Berard, James L.
Berge, James H., Jr.
Berger, Ernest J.
Bethards, Leonard S.
Bianchi, Rocco D.
Bibee, Albert J.
Bidwell, David McC.
Biehl, William, Jr.
Billings, Thomas C.
Bittman, Rudolph L.
Bjorson, Richard A.
Black, Albert A.
Blake, Francis E.
Blake, Wesley C.
Blakely, James A., Jr.
Blanchard, Don H.
Blancheri, Howard A.
Blanchard, Richard L.
Blankenship, Clifford P.
Blatt, Wallace D.
Bledsoe, Willmar M.
Bloomer, Donald M.
Blue, Miller M.
Bohannon, Thomas J.
Bohl, Leighton T., Jr.
Bohn, Robert D.
Boldman, James D.
Boll, Joseph L.
Bolts, Lewis E.
Booker, Jesse V.
Bortz, William H., Jr.
Boswell, Charles E., Jr.
Bowen, Ermel D.
Bowen, Ralph E.
Boyle, Patrick D.
Brandenburg, Paul F.
Brandon, Lawrence H.
Brandon, William E.
Brewer, George W.
Briganti, Emidio
Brigham, George A.
Bristow, Ralph E.
Brook, Willie W.
Bronleewe, Loren K.
Brooks, Donald H.
Broudy, Charles A.
Brown, Charles S.
Brown, James E.
Brown, Nelson E.
Brown, William E.
Brown, Williams P.
Browne, John
Browne, John A., Jr.
Browning, Richard C.
Bruce, Henry K.
Bruce, James P.
Bruce, Ronald L.
Brumfield, Max F.
Bryant, George M.
Bryant, William W.
Buckingham, Clifford W.
Buettner, Robert H.
Buford, Ernest A., Jr.
Burleson, Good
Burnam, Thomas J.
Burt, Edward E.
Bush, Elwood D.
Bushnell, Richard H.
Butcher, Warren A.
Butler, Floyd H., Jr.
Butters, Raymond J.
Cail, Ralph D.
Caldwell, Charles T.
Calhoun, Loren W.
Callen, George W.
Camp, James C., Jr.
Campbell, Charles I., Jr.
Campbell, Donald H.
Campbell, Marshall S.
Canan, Christopher M.
Canton, John S.
Capps, Arnold B.
Card, Eugene T.
- Carlock, Robert O.
Carlson, William C.
Carlton, Edwin T.
Carmichael, Edward W.
Carr, Walter E.
Carraway, Cecil T.
Carter, Bobby
Carter, David V.
Carter, William G.
Carver, Nathaniel H.
Case, John D.
Casey, Daniel A., Jr.
Casey, Thomas P.
Cass, Bevan G.
Cassidy, Earl W.
Caswell, Dean
Caudle, Forrest E.
Causer, Arthur R.
Cavalero, John H.
Challacombe, Arthur D., Jr.
Chamberlin, George E., Jr.
Chambers, Charles B.
Champion, Cecil L., Jr.
Checklout, Henry A.
Childers, Lloyd F.
Church, Charles H., Jr.
Ciampa, Emilittus R., Jr.
Clapp, Archie J.
Clark, Amil K.
Clark, Truman
Clarke, Thomas W.
Clary, Matthew A., Jr.
Claterbos, Henry L.
Clay, Robert B.
Clelland, David
Clements, Edwin M.
Cline, Richard W.
Cloud, Guy M.
Cobb, Thomas L.
Cochrane, Kevin
Coleman, Thomas A.
Collen, Frank R.
Collier, John W., Jr.
Collins, George J.
Collins, Ted H.
Coltrane, James R.
Compton, Joseph O., Jr.
Conkln, Kenneth J.
Conley, Wilbur C.
Connell, Herschel G.
Connelly, Frederick G.
Connelly, Ray
Conroy, Donald
Cook, Dudley
Cook, Robert H.
Cooper, Milton B.
Coplan, Ralph D.
Coppedge, Charles H.
Corbett, Leroy V.
Corboy, Leo J., Jr.
Corcoran, Clement T.
Cordes, Alfred M.
Corley, Clarence E., Jr.
Corley, Ruel H., Jr.
Corman, Otis W. S.
Cosgrove, William P.
Costello, Byron J.
Costello, Keith W.
Cotton, James T.
Cotton, John D.
Cowles, Raymond C.
Cowper, William H.
Cox, John F.
Cox, Lewis J.
Craig, John
Craig, Robert J.
Crapo, William M., Jr.
Crawford, Frank S.
Creel, William B.
Cresap, Charles C.
Crew, Charles E.
Crew, Erskine B.
Crompton, Wallace W.
Cronin, James T.
Crooks, William M.
Crossman, Ralph B.
Crownover, Joe B.
Crum, Calvin C.
- Cullins, George H.
Culp, William E.
Curtis, Oliver W.
Curtis, Paul F.
Cushing, Joseph P.
Cutler, Thomas H.
Daigle, Adlin P.
Dair, William G., Jr.
Dake, Merlin L.
Dalton, John J.
Danckaert, William A.
Daniel, Walter E.
Daniels, Elmer R., Jr.
Danner, John J.
Danowitz, Edward F.
Davenport, Leslie L.
David, Maurice A.
Davidson, Eldon E.
Davidson, Russell A.
Davies, Joseph E.
Davis, Dellwyn L.
Davis, George L., Jr.
Davis, Jefferson A., Jr.
Davis, Oliver R.
Davis, Philip A.
Davis, Raymond N.
Davis, Raymond R.
Davis, Stanley
Davis, William A.
Dawkins, Charles D., Jr.
Dawson, Robert E.
Dayson, Patrick J.
Daze, Louis R.
Dean, Walter P.
Deasy, Rex A.
Deckard, Marion H.
Deeds, William E.
Deering, Harold V.
Dekeyser, Charles F.
Dellamano, Albert F.
Dempster, Donald R.
Dennis, Nicholas J.
Denny, Rex C., Jr.
Derby, William McK., Jr.
Derrickson, Eugene W.
Derryberry, Don G.
DeVol, Austin O., Jr.
DeWees, Raymond, Jr.
Dial, Oliver E.
DiFrank, Joseph, Jr.
Diliberto, Charles O.
Dillow, Rex O.
Diamond, Neil
Dionisopoulos, James G.
Dixon, Gerald T.
Dizney, Charles F.
Dochterman, Lloyd B., Jr.
Dodenhoff, George H.
Doehler, William F.
Doherty, John J.
Dole, Charles E.
Doll, Carl A.
Dominick, Robert L.
Donnell, James W.
Dormady, William K.
Dorsey, James A.
Doswell, James T., II
Doty, William C., Jr.
Dove, Charles E.
Doxey, Donald T.
Doyle, Ernest R., Jr.
Dressin, Sam A.
Drewitz, William H.
Driftmier, John F.
Dumas, James L.
Duncan, William R.
Dunlap, Jack
Dunwiddie, Stanley G., Jr.
Dupre, Paul J.
Durnford, Dewey F., Jr.
Dyer, Phillip G.
Dykeman, Arthur R.
Dykes, Kenneth T.
Earnest, Floyd W.
Earney, William R.
- Ebel, Ardell
Ecklund, Arthur W.
Eddy, Samuel L., Jr.
Edelmann, George J., Jr.
Edwards, Anthony
Edwards, Delmar L.
Edwards, Donald H.
Egan, Charles W.
Egan, John J.
Egan, Thomas R.
Elder, Thomas G.
Eldracher, Frank A., Jr.
Eldridge, William W., Jr.
Elias, George H.
Elzey, William P., Jr.
Emils, Arnold L.
Emswiler, Robert H.
Engelhardt, Lloyd J.
Engelkes, Ernest L.
Estey, Ralph F.
Eubanks, Fred F., Jr.
Evans, Daniel R.
Ewers, Norman G.
Ezell, Dee E.
Ezell, Don D.
Fairchild, Richard H.
Falk, Earl H.
Fallon, Eugene B.
Farish, George B.
Farmer, Chester V.
Farrell, William
Faureck, Frank J.
Fedor, John J.
Feid, Gordon I.
Felton, James A.
Fellingham, Richard J.
Fenton, Donald L.
Ferazzi, Alfio B.
Ferguson, Glenn L., Jr.
Ferris, James W.
Fiegener, Kenneth G.
Fieppo, John J.
Finch, Francis E.
Fine, Dail D.
Finlayson, Edwin H.
Finn, John, Jr.
Finnigan, John E.
Fischer, John J.
Fitzgerald, Austin C.
Fitzmaurice, Charles W.
Flannagan, Melvin J.
Flinn, Norman W., Jr.
Flory, Lester D.
Flynn, John P., Jr.
Foltz, Harold R.
Fornonzini, Benjamin A., Jr.
Foss, Donald H.
Foster, Ted J.
Fowler, Albert
Fox, James G.
Francke, Donald E.
Frankovic, Boris J.
Fraser, Robert M., Jr.
Fredrick, Charles D.
Freitas, Joseph L., Jr.
Frew, James C.
Fribourg, Leonard E.
Frier, Donald G.
Fris, Edward S.
Frisbie, Varge G.
Furimsky, Steve, Jr.
Fuson, Harold C.
Gagy, Alexander
Galbraith, Donald L.
Galford, Troy L.
Gallagher, Burnette R.
Gallentine, Owen V.
Gallo, James A., Jr.
Garrotto, Alfred F.
Gasser, James C.
Gaug, Leland S.
Geishecker, Edward J.
Geissinger, Robert S.
Gentry, Toibert T.
- Gerlach, Leo
Gibson, Baylor P., Jr.
Gibson, George A.
Gibson, John A., Jr.
Giddens, Richard M.
Giles, Walter R.
Gill, John R.
Gillis, Alexander J., Jr.
Gilmore, Richard G.
Githens, Daniel P., Jr.
Gleason, Eugene W.
Gleason, Thomas E.
Glenn, Jack
Glenn, John H., Jr.
Gocke, Charles E.
Goebel, Jerome L.
Goewey, Bruce A.
Goldston, Eugene V.
Golleher, George M.
Goode, Charles L.
Gould, Charles H.
Gould, William R.
Gourley, Norman W.
Graaff, James E.
Graf, David P.
Graham, Paul G.
Graham, Robert J.
Grasselli, Albert A.
Graves, James B.
Gray, Roy C., Jr.
Graybeal, David W.
Green, George H., Jr.
Green, Robert D.
Greene, Daniel
Greene, Joe R.
Greene, John L.
Greene, Richard P.
Greenfield, Gaylord C.
Grey, Jack R.
Gribbin, Thomas A., II
Griffin, Samuel J.
Griffitts, Lynn W.
Griswold, Edmund K.
Groff, Goodwin C.
Guss, William F.
Gutshall, Dale
Guy, Clyde P.
Haddock, Kenneth G.
Haggerty, George L.
Haines, Frederick B.
Haines, Richard B.
Hale, Frederic A., Jr.
Haley, Harold L.
Hall, Harold K.
Hall, Reverdy M.
Hall, W. C.
Hall, William L.
Hallameyer, Donald J.
Halligan, William J.
Halliwell, John E.
Hamilton, John L., Jr.
Hamilton, Robert W.
Hamlin, Curtis F., Jr.
Hamm, Norman L.
Hanes, John V.
Haney, C. L.
Hansen, Dale W.
Hansen, John E.
Hanson, Harry B.
Hanson, Reuben H.
Harlan, Murray V., Jr.
Harmon, Lester G.
Harney, John B.
Harp, Dene T.
Harper, James A.
Harrell, William F.
Harrington, James C.
Harris, Charles W.
Harris, Chester R.
Harris, Donald R., Jr.
Harris, William S.
Harrison, Joseph B.
Hart, Henry
Harvath, Michael D.
Harwood, Edward A.
Hasley, Meriin L.
Hastings, Jesse T., Jr.
Hawkins, Harold W.
Hayton, Robert G.
Healy, Robert M.

- Hean, Howard L.
Heidrick, John G.
Helman, Roland B.
Heitzler, Joseph S.
Helling, Frederick J., Jr.
Helm, Samuel E., Jr.
Helstrom, Roland S.
Hemstad, Robert S.
Hendley, Vernon L.
Henley, Paul B.
Henneberger, Harry G. C.
Henry, Robert A.
Henshaw, George C.
Henson, Joe B.
Hepler, Frank M.
Herndon, John L.
Hess, Theodore D.
Heywood, Ralph A.
Hickey, Thomas R., Jr.
Higgins, William B.
Hilburn, John J., Jr.
Hill, Arthur T.
Hill, Carl L.
Hill, Walter L.
Hinckel, Harvy C.
Hines, Cloyd V.
Hinshaw, Don M.
Hinson, William J., Jr.
Hirt, Paul L.
Hitchcock, Paul L.
Hixson, Wilmer W.
Hodde, Gordon V.
Hoereth, Wayne H.
Hoey, James A., Jr.
Hoffman, Robert W.
Hohl, Robert W.
Holcombe, James V.
Holland, Dan C.
Hollenbeck, Marvin K.
Holloway, Harding H.
Holmes, Henry G., Jr.
Holt, Edgar P.
Holtzclawe, Sylvestus W.
Holzbauer, Joseph F.
Hooper, Ward L.
Hoover, Gene M.
Hopkins, Donald S.
Hopkins, Warren G.
Horgan, Thomas J., Jr.
Horner, Bill E.
House, Charles A.
Houser, Fred C.
Hovatter, Eugenous M.
Howe, Charles R.
Howe, John J.
Howe, Odia E., Jr.
Howerton, Bryce
Hubka, Frank J.
Huffstutter, Hardy V., Jr.
Hughes, John A.
Hughes, Orlin A. P.
Hughes, Thomas H.
Humphreys, Zaphney O.
Hunter, Harry, Jr.
Hunter, Walter G.
Huntington, Kenneth E.
Hurst, Clarence M.
Hyatt, Floyd E.
Hyneman, John R.
Idler, Basil T.
Irick, Joseph N.
Itzin, Martin J.
Jackson, Boyd J.
Jackson, Dewey H.
Jackson, Gordon K.
Jackson, Owen G., Jr.
Jagoda, John M.
James, Thomas A.
James, William C., Jr.
Jannell, Manning T.
Jarrett, Clyde R.
Jedenoff, Alexis A.
- Jefferson, James M., Jr.
Jennings, Francis C.
Jensen, Harvey L.
Jernigan, Curtis D.
Jewell, James C.
Jillisky, Leo R.
Jobe, Harrel K.
Joens, Ray N.
Johnson, Danny W.
Johnson, Earl W.
Johnson, Irving R.
Johnson, James K.
Johnson, James D., Jr.
Johnson, James R.
Johnson, Thirl D.
Johnson, Victor E., Jr.
Johnson, Wayne
Johnston, Glennon A.
Johnston, John C.
Johnston, Thomas J., Jr.
Jones, Alfred M., Jr.
Jones, Charles D.
Jones, Coleman C.
Jones, Elwin M.
Jones, Harold O.
Jones, James R.
Jones, States R., Jr.
Jones, Thomas J.
Joslyn, William G.
Judd, Amo F.
Judge, Donald R.
Judy, James W.
Kane, Eugene S., Jr.
Kapsch, Joseph R.
Kaufner, Edward E.
Keeling, Harvey A., Jr.
Keim, Robert M.
Keleher, Philip J.
Keller, Gordon H., Jr.
Keller, Harold F.
Keller, Joseph
Keller, Karl T.
Kelley, John P.
Kellogg, William H.
Kellogg, Wilbur C., Jr.
Kelly, George E.
Kelly, Jack G.
Kelly, William D.
Kennedy, David H.
Keown, Lyman E.
Kern, Richard H.
Kerr, Melvyn H.
Kerr, William A.
Kew, George D.
Keys, George T.
King, Carl W.
King, George J.
King, Paul D.
King, Robert, Jr.
Kingsley, Daniel R.
Kirkland, John W.
Kirsch, Oscar H.
Kleber, Victor A., Jr.
Klein, Robert G.
Klimek, Walter J.
Klingman, Robert R.
Knapp, George C.
Knauf, Robert C.
Knocke, Jack K.
Koehler, Elmer F.
Koehnlein, William F.
Koester, Oliver J.
Kopas, William J.
Kositch, Alexander
Koster, Edward A.
Kraince, Francis R.
Krewer, Joseph W.
Kross, George
Krumm, George A.
Kuprash, George
LaFayette, Cecil B.
LaFond, Paul D.
Lamar, Robert L.
Lambert, Edward S.
Lanagan, William H., Jr.
Landrum, James, Jr.
Landry, Fernand A.
- Lang, Frank C.
Lansford, Breen G.
LaRoche, Arthur L., Jr.
Larsen, Robert J.
LaSpada, JoIn F.
Latta, Arthur W., Jr.
Lauer, Stewart R.
Lavoy, John H.
Lawrence, George E.
Lawson, Roger C.
Lees, Urban A.
LeFaivre, Edward N.
Lehnert, Robert C.
Leis, Sylvester F.
Leite, Roy J., Jr.
Leland, Harry E., Jr.
Lembeck, Leonard A.
Leogue, John J.
Leon, James
Lesak, Robert J.
Leutz, Charles R., Jr.
Lewis, Claude H., Jr.
Lewis, Edward L. Jr.
Lewis, George F.
Lewis, Leo G., Jr.
Lewis, Woodrow B.
Lillie, James L., Jr.
Limberg, Robert D.
Lindell, Carl W.
Lindley, Dean W.
Lindley, Johnny D.
Livingston, William H.
Lobell, William R.
Lodge, Orlan R.
Lomac, John
Long, Edwin B.
Long, William J.
Longfellow, William J.
Loos, Billie E.
Losse, Robert N.
Lovette, Lenhrew E.
Lucas, Burton L., Jr.
Lucas, William R.
Ludden, Charles H.
Luker, Joseph W.
Lupton, Edward I.
Lupushansky, Chester M.
Luther, James W.
Luther, Robert E.
Lutnick, William A.
Lynch, Duane G.
Lynch, Joseph O.
Lynch, Robert J., Jr.
MacAskill, Ross M., Sr.
Mack, William E.
Maskel, Edward H.
MacQuarrie, Warren L.
Magill, James H.
Magon, Walter E.
Maire, Gerald J.
Malcolm, Joseph W., Jr.
Malone, Crawford B.
Maloney, Emmons S.
Maloney, John H.
Mample, Richard H.
Mangum, Mildridge E.
Manley, Norbert C., Jr.
Manning, Herbert G., Jr.
Mansfield, George S.
Mariades, James P.
Marker, Roland E.
Marr, Robert F.
Mars, William G., Jr.
Marshall, John B., Jr.
Martin, Benjamin G.
Martin, James R.
Martin, Samuel F.
Marzelo, Vincent J.
Mason, John B.
Matthews, Lyle B., Jr.
Matthews, Merlin T.
Maust, Kenneth W.
Mawyer, Ralph P.
Mayer, Henry
Mayfield, Harold L.
Mayo, Dwight E.
McAlister, James S.
McArdle, Gilbert J.
- McArthur, Raymond
McBarron, Aiden
McBee, Lance T.
McCabe, John
McCain, Warren E.
McCaleb, Alfred F., Jr.
McCarthy, Thomas E.
McCarville, Robert E.
McCaslin, William S., Jr.
McClane, George E.
McCormick, Herbert F.
McCoy, Kenneth R.
McCulloch, William L.
McDaniel, James
McGee, Charlie H., Jr.
McGee, James M.
McGlade, Lawrence
McGough, James D.
McGraw, Thomas F., Jr.
McGraw, William C., Jr.
McGuire, Donald
McKiever, Charles F.
McKittrick, Rodney D.
McLaurin, John M., Jr.
McMahon, John F., Jr.
McMakin, William M., Jr.
McManus, John
McMillan, Donald A.
McMullen, Robert A.
McNeill, Edward B., Jr.
McNew, Robert E.
McNiel, Monroe E.
McNulty, John W., Jr.
McPartlin, Charles E., Jr.
McRay, Harold G.
McRobert, Perry P.
McShane, John J.
McVey, John E.
McVicans, Andrew L.
Meehan, James E.
Melancon, Byron J.
Melby, William E.
Melin, Ernest I.
Mendenhall, Herbert E.
Menzies, Henry D.
Merchant, Clark E.
Meyer, Eugene W.
Meyer, Kenneth G.
Meyer, Robert A.
Michael, Richard L., Jr.
Mickelson, Laurel M.
Mika, Edwin J.
Mildner, Theodore J.
Mileson, Donald F.
Millenbine, Otis E.
Miller, Clifford D.
Miller, Edward J.
Miller, Francis L.
Miller, Jack A.
Miller, Lee R.
Miller, Leonard A.
Miller, Lewis L.
Miller, Roland R.
Miller, Thomas H., Jr.
Millet, Eugene
Miner, Ross R.
Minick, Robert W.
Misura, Emil M.
Mitch, Ernest A.
Mitchell, Donald C.
Mitchell, Joseph A.
Mitchell, Randall L.
Mixon, Herman L.
Mixon, Willie J.
Mize, Charles D.
Moise, Frank V., Jr.
Moland, John T.
Moncrief, Malcolm G., Jr.
- Moody, Richard E.
Moore, Harry R.
Moore, John T.
Moore, Richard M.
Moos, Kenneth L.
Moran, Frank P.
Morel, Oscar J.
Morris, Delmer O.
Morris, Roger A.
Morrison, Gene W.
Morrison, Robert J.
Morrison, William R.
Morton, Douglas K.
Mosca, Herbert P., Jr.
Mottl, George
Mouzakis, George E.
Mucciaccio, Patrick H.
Mullane, Raymond W.
Muller, Godfrey
Mulvey, William H.
Mulvihill, Thomas E.
Munro, Roderick J.
Murchall, Frederick A.
Murphy, John J.
Murphy, Joseph T.
Murray, Daniel G.
Murray, Edward D.
Myers, Victor E.
Nasif, George
Nelson, Eugene W.
Nelson, Herbert A.
Nelson, Joseph A.
Nelson, Robert I.
Nelson, Robert E.
Nelson, Wilbur O.
Neuman, Joel L.
Nevill, Harry E.
Newendorp, Arthur W.
Newport, Richard B.
Nichols, Thomas H., Jr.
Nichols, William J., Jr.
Nolan, Keith D.
Norton, Lawrence C.
Nowadnick, William R.
O'Callaghan, Thomas P.
Odenthal, Joseph T.
Oderwald, Richard E.
Oglesby, Edward D.
O'Hara, Frank J., Jr.
Oliver, Roy E.
Olsen, Willard C.
Olson, Ernest R.
Oltmer, Lavern J.
O'Malley, Charles J.
Opeka, Francis C.
Ord, James B., Jr.
Orem, Edward J.
Orr, John N.
Osborn, Frederick V.
Ostby, John L.
Oster, Eugene M.
Ottmer, Walter E.
Padach, John, Jr.
Page, Leslie L.
Painter, Harry F.
Panchision, Walter
Panska, Donald A.
Parker, George W.
Parker, William C., Jr.
Parks, Frank G.
Parks, Fred L.
Parnell, Robert L., Jr.
Patee, Will S., Jr.
Pattee, Eraine M.
Patterson, Russell G., Jr.
Patton, Harvey M.
Patton, Walter B.
Paulson, Robert E.
Payette, James
Payne, Ernest W.
Peacock, Richard H.
Pearce, James T.
- Pearsall, James E.
Pearson, John A.
Pedersen, Poul F.
Peebles, Vernon J.
Peel, Edd F.
Peevey, Nathan B., Jr.
Pendrey, Edwin
Perkins, Don M.
Perrin, John S.
Perry, Jack E.
Persac, Walter L.
Persinger, Harry B., Jr.
Peter, William J., Jr.
Peterson, Richard F.
Petro, George E.
Pett, Raymond H. W.
Pettigrew, Parker O.
Petty, Douglas D., Jr.
Phelps, Boyd M.
Phillips, Arthur E.
Phillips, Allen L.
Phillips, George A.
Philpot, Fred R.
Pietz, Reuel H.
Piland, George W., Jr.
Pillon, George R.
Pippin, Franklin N.
Pitman, Edgar D.
Poage, Jay V.
Pointer, Eugene V.
Pomeroy, William D.
Pond, Darwin B., Jr.
Poor, Ernest E.
Pope, Eugene J.
Poppa, Chester J.
Poppe, Elery G.
Porter, Mervin B.
Potter, Elwood H.
Poulson, George W.
Prestridge, John G.
Price, Elbert F.
Pritchett, Clarence H.
Pultorak, Joseph
Quay, John E., Jr.
Quick, William H., III
Quillian, Stone W.
Quinn, William R.
Quint, Frederick A.
Rainer, Mark A., Jr.
Rainforth, Richard H.
Ramseur, Franklin F., Jr.
Rash, Richard S.
Rausch, John J.
Ray, Grady W.
Read, Benjamin S.
Redalen, Dwain L.
Redmond, Walter L.
Reece, Josef I.
Reed, Harold R., Jr.
Reed, Herbert C.
Reed, Roy L.
Reichwald, Norman R.
Reid, William G.
Reier, Gordon R.
Remington, Edgar F.
Reno, William A.
Richard, Merle G.
Richards, John J.
Rieder, Glenn L.
Rifle, James C.
Riley, David
Rinehart, James H.
Risner, Albert H.
Ritter, Darrell L.
Ritter, Leland C.
Rixey, Palmer H.
Roark, Walter N., Jr.
Robertson, Robert S.
Robinson, Gus
Robinson, Harry G., Jr.
Robinson, James W.
Robinson, Paul L.
Robinson, Robert B.
Robinson, Vincent J.
Roden, John P.
Roe, Murray O.
Roeder, Horton E.
Roley, William H.

Rollins, John J. Smith, Mercer R. Tullipane, Thomas T. Wendt, Harvey E. Bray, Edward A. Hart, Gordon C.
 Ronald, Robert C. Smith, Nathan A. Tuma, James W. Wesley, Rupert C., Jr. Breymaier, Robert S. Hawkins, James J.
 Rooney, John J. Smith, Raymond M. Turcotte, Edward W. Wesley, Robert M. Broker, Darrel E. Heaton, Joseph E.
 Ross, George W. Smith, Richard B. Turcotte, Theodore W. Whitaker, James L. Bruce, Vernon W. Heinley, Phillip E.
 Ross, John D. Smith, Robert L. Turner, Byron C. White, Edwin B., Jr. Buchser, Edmund, Jr. Hembree, J. D.
 Ross, Thomas J. Smock, Kenneth J. Tweed, McDonald D. White, Erving F. Bunker, Joseph L. Henderson, Robert P.
 Roueche, Brett E. Snapper, John N. Urell, John White, Rex A. White, Rex A. Hertzler, Charles A.
 Rowe, Carroll D. Snell, Albert W. Vale, Sumner A. White, Russell C. Hewlett, Robert M., Jr.
 Ruffner, Paul M. Soderberg, Ralph A. VanCampen, Hiel L. White, Thomas A. Holden, William H.
 Rupp, George R. Sollom, Almond H. Vance, Johnnie C., Jr. Whitehill, William Bushong, Herman L.,
 Rushlow, Bruce A. Somerville, Daniel A. Vanderhoof, Judson. Whitescarver, Ken- Jr.
 Rushlow, Ray D. Sparkman, Thomas B. Vatcher, Walter W. neth T., Jr. Cameron, Eugene D.
 Russell, Marvin R. Sparling, Walter E. Veach, Howard C. Whitlock, Roy B. Carpenter, Burson D.
 Rutledge, Rockwell M. Spieker, Ira E. Veigel, Lester E. Wickham, Lawrence Carruthers, Joseph N.
 Sabot, Robert Spielman, Harvey E. Vergote, Alton F. V. M. Cartoski, Edwin J.
 Saiser, Charles A. Squires, Gordon R. Vernon, Frederick A. Wleczorek, Myron P. Cate, Clarence C.
 Sammartino, Angelo J. Stahlstrom, Harry A. Veuleman, Elbert F. Wiedenkeller, Paul T. Catlow, Walter S.
 Sanders, Roger M. Stamford, Edward P. Via, Burks A. Wilcox, Myron E., Jr. Cauthon, Gilbert R.
 Sartor, Louis J. Stanfield, James C. Vickers, Earl K., Jr. Wilder, Charles S. Chacto, Alex S.
 Schanamann, Ray-Stanford, Norman R. Victor, James E., Jr. Wiley, Norman C. Child, Warren C.
 mond H. Stanton, Eldon C. Vining, Norman Wilker, Dean Clark, Elton H.
 Scheffer, Cornelius Stawicki, Theodore A. Volkert, Marvin D. Wilkinson, John H. Clark, Richard H.
 Schick, Edwin S., Jr. Steele, Hugh M. Vonderheyde, Henry A. Willett, William A. Clarke, Donald G.
 Schmagel, Arthur O. Stender, Bernard J. F., Jr. Williams, George L. Clune, Joseph W.
 Schmidt, Carl E. Stephenson, Lyle S. Voht, Stanley B. Williams, James F. Cole, Robert W., Jr.
 Schmuck, Paul A., Jr. Stewart, Grover S., Jr. Wachslar, William J. Williams, Lynn F. Collins, Richard J.
 Schneider, Robert M. Stewart, Walter C., Jr. Wade, Robert Williams, Royce M. Collins, Thomas W.
 Schoneberger, Albert Stien, Laurence J. Wagner, John H. Williams, Robert G. Conlon, Thomas W.
 G. Stingley, Elmo J. Wagner, Taylor H. Williams, Walter L. Cook, Robert E.
 Schoner, Albert C. Stirling, Harold H., Jr. Wagner, William J. Willis, Robert L. Cooke, Weldon C.
 Schriver, Richard J. Stivers, Frank P., Jr. Wailes, Eugene A. Wilson, Alexander George Costos, George
 Schroeder, Charles L. St. John, Roscoe R. Waldrop, Otis R. Wilson, Frank E. Cox, George W.
 Schultz, Leonard L. Stockdale, Allen F. Walker, Edward H. Wilson, James E., Jr. Cox, George R.
 Schuster, Stephen L., Jr. Stone, Wilford L. Walker, John B., Jr. Wilson, John B., Jr. Cox, Raymond R., Jr.
 Jr. Stoneman, Russel H. Walker, William L. Wilson, Norris W. Crabb, Craig C.
 Schwartz, Leo R. Stout, Marvin R. Wall, Calvin Wilson, Rex Critchley, Jack B.
 Schwendimann, Henry Stoyanow, Victor Winneberger, George Cronin, John E., Jr.
 N. Straner, Frank L. L., Jr. Curllison, Robert D. Kern, Peter W.
 Schwenk, Adolph G. Street, Charles E., Jr. Currier, Burton D. Kidd, Donald S.
 Scurrah, Robert G. Street, Lewis C., III Daigle, Bernadin J. Kiestler, Kenneth R.
 Seabaugh, Paul W. Streeter, William M. Daly, Claude W. Kime, Merle A.
 Seabeck, Frank E. Stribling, Joe B. Darfier, Donald Kinsey, Robert T.
 Seaman, Milford V. Stubbs, Robert S., II Davis, David, Jr. Kipp, Gordon E.
 Seibert, Kenneth D. Stuckey, Harry B. Davis, Donald F. Kiselicka, Stephen F.
 Seipp, Leroy A. Sturdevan, Garth K. Davis, James K. Klockzien, Vincent H.
 Sellers, Victor E. Sudnick, Ralph M. Davis, William B. Knowles, Harold R.
 Semb, Allen R. Sullivan, John B. Decker, Gerald Knox, Alvin A.
 Seminoff, Nicholas M. Sullivan, John W. Detmering, Carl S. Knutson, Donald S.
 Sevier, Charles B. Sullivan, Richard J. Detrio, Joseph M. Koyiades, John
 Shank, James W. Sullivan, Walter E., Jr. Dickey, William E., Jr. Lamoreaux, Harold G.
 Shanks, William, Jr. Sumerlin, Earl B., Jr. Dimick, Dexter A., Jr. Lancaster, Wilson G.
 Sharkey, Harold L. Suter, John F. Dixon, John E. Donovan, William J. Langston, Earl W.
 Sharp, James, II Swenson, Lester V. Dobbins, Robert, Jr. Lathrop, Edwin H.
 Shearer, John L. Swetnam, William E. Donovan, William J. Lawlor, John L.
 Shepherd, William A. Swindall, Lee B. Donovan, William P. Lentz, Paul W.
 Shervais, Stephen Swinford, David G. Dufford, John M. Leonard, Clarence E.
 Sherwood, James M. Swinson, James D. Eddens, Frank L., Jr. Levy, Charles F.
 Shields, John E. Takala, David O. Elliott, Robert B. Lewis, George W.
 Shields, Robert F. Taub, Samuel, Jr. Evans, Malcolm D. Lewis, Jesse M.
 Shoden, John C. Taylor, Harry O. Everett, Ernest E. Lewis, Robert, Jr.
 Shook, Frank A., Jr. Taylor, Max C. Ewan, Randolph J. Linen, Charles J.
 Shropshire, Clyde B. Taylor, Paul N. Fagnan, Gerald Q. Locke, Melvin E.
 Shupe, Arthur F. Taylor, Richard M. Feenan, James F. MacDonald, Richard
 Sienko, Walter Taylor, Robert W. Fink, Gerald A.
 Sigler, William M., Jr. Temple, Jack W. Fiske, Russell F. Maginnis, Patrick M.
 Silverthorn, Russell L. Temple, Richard D. Fletcher, Raleigh E. Major, James E., Jr.
 Simlik, Wilbur F. Terry, Wilson C. Folk, Richard W. Manley, Charles L.
 Simmons, Albert W. Theros, John G. Forrest, Shelby M. Marcussou, Peter A.,
 Simmons, Robert L. Thomas, John H. Foster, Francis A. Jr.
 Simons, Robert C. Thompson, Earl W. Foust, Harry L. Mark, Dewey M., Jr.
 Sims, Charles N., Jr. Thornbury, Donald S. Franano, Vincenzo Maxson, Embree W.
 Sinderholm, John K., Jr. Thorne, Nicholas G. W. Friend, Charles, III McCabe, Maurice
 Jr. Tomlinson, Francis K., Jr. Gangnath, Charles R. McCall, Durwood P.
 Skeath, Marvin A., Jr. Tonnema, Peter A., Jr. Gemmell, Ronald H. McCann, Robert E.
 Skow, Duane W. Tope, Lyle V. Gibson, Robert L. McCleery, James H.
 Slack, Arthur B., Jr. Torbert, George W. Gilmour, Robert E. McComber, Franklin J.
 Slaton, Clyde H., Jr. Torbett, Eddie C. Gipple, Guy M. McDermott, John E.
 Slay, Robert D. Torbett, Harry G. Givens, Joseph E. McDevitt, Hugh A.
 Smart, William D. Townsend, Johnnie V. Glaese, Darwin P. McDonald, Roy H., Jr.
 Smith, Ardath C. Trager, Earl A., Jr. Glasgow, Keith W. McDonald, Thomas
 Smith, Arthur R. Trammell, Thomas B. Graham, Byron, Jr. Jr.
 Smith, Burneal E. Trammell, Thomas B. Gravning, Vernon J. McFadden, Leslie T.
 Smith, Edward D. Trantham, Walter E., Jr. Griffin, Clair E. McGuire, Robert C.
 Smith, George E. Traylor, Robert W. Griffin, William W., Jr. McInnis, Robert J.
 Smith, Harold E. Traylor, Richard M. Hanan, John H., II McLaughlin, James A.
 Smith, Jack A. Traylor, Robert W. Hanchbrough, Thomas McMahan, Richard
 Smith, James W. Truesdale, Marion G. Hardy, Irving B. McNab, Robert C., Jr.
 Smith, Jerry B. Tucker, Lud R. Harrington, Jack G. Meadows, Carl S.
 Smith, Leland R. Tucker, Nolan E. Ballant, Dennis W. Branham, Alfred F. Harrison, Joseph L., Jr. Meeker, Robert J.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abner, Edward L. Banks, John S., Jr.
 Ahern, Joseph M., Jr. Barian, Dieran B.
 Allensworth, Raymond M. Barnes, Arch D.
 Anderson, Alva Barron, Thomas W.
 Anderson, Gerald L. Beauparlant, John C.
 Anderson, Phillip B. Beeson, Arley E.
 Andre, Edward L. Bendeich, Charles F.
 Angel, Victor L. Benson, John M.
 Anton, Anthony D. Benton, Robert E.
 Armagost, William I. Berger, Thomas S.
 Aune, Arthur J. Beyes, Warren J.
 Baade, Russel D. Bixler, James L.
 Babb, James M. Borchering, Clarence L.
 Babbitt, Robert E. Bordigon, Romeo
 Babcock, Ira V. Bowen, Vaughn E.
 Bailey, Kelvin W. A. Boyd, Joe T.
 Baker, Ralph A. Brandon, Henry F.
 Ballant, Dennis W. Branham, Alfred F.

- Melcher, Thomas J. Sekardi, Max M.
Menard, James L. Sessi, Victor A.
Miller, Robert L. Shamis, Edward
Mitchell, John D., Jr. Shellito, John L.
Molick, Roy J. Sherman, Richard J.
Monroe, Douglas E. Sherwood, Harry L., Jr.
Morgan, Stacy M. Shevlin, Eugene P.
Mueller, Gilbert N. Shotwell, Harold W.
Munnell, Hugh E. Simmon, Hal K.
Murnane, John P. Sims, Albert C.
Murray, Frank J. Smith, Donald W.
Nelson, Emery E. Smith, Henry G., III
Nichols, Worrell P. Smith, Hicks A., Jr.
Offerle, Laurel E. Smith, John C.
Oldefendt, Glendon E. Smith, William L.
O'Neil, James Snell, Harold D.
Onyett, Jack E. Snyder, Alan J.
O'Reilly, Andrew E., Jr. Soncrant, Edward L.
Orr, Burt M., Jr. Spence, Robert M.
Orr, Leonard L. Spjeldet, Roland E.
Osgood, Clarence W. Stansbury, Charles F.
Owens, Dick Stegman, James J.
Ownbey, Harold C. Stetler, Patrick F.
Palmer, Harold L. Stevens, Merrill E.
Parker, George B. Stewart, Roger A.
Parsons, Lloyd J. Stith, John D.
Peak, Wilbur L. Stone, Gregory S.
Perina, Lambert J. Suter, Merrill F.
Petersen, Robert W. Swafford, Johnny L.
Peterson, Philip A. Swanson, Russell
Pickering, Wilbur W. Swedberg, John E., Jr.
Pierce, Leon W., Jr. Swenson, Merrill E.
Pinkston, Mose T. Tabler, Robert R.
Pitsinger, Rupert C. Tait, Leonard R.
Pittman, Teddy L. Taylor, Raymond B.
Pont, Albert Tebow, William J.
Poppke, William R. Tesko, Stanley
Price, Joseph R. Thomas, John P.
Price, Olen H. Thomason, Hugh M.
Price, Sterling F. Thompson, Foster L., Jr.
Radin, Morris Thomson, Ernest W.
Ratliff, Bert E. Tuttle, John W.
Rause, Robert Wagner, Arthur
Rector, James R. Wagner, Robert E.
Reed, Jack K. Walden, Ennis E.
Reed, Robert J., Jr. Wallace, George M.
Regas, William Warrender, Charles A.
Rich, Richard V. Washburn, Hugh D., Jr.
Rickle, Robert E. Watson, Alexander
Rike, Joe A. Weathersbee, William P.
Riley, Glenn G. Webb, John R.
Riley, John C. Whipple, Charles C.
Ritchie, John A. Whitefield, Donald E.
Robbins, Cecil E. Wicker, Roy W., Jr.
Rose, Albert A. Willis, Charles A.
Rose, Julius R. Wilson, Harry S.
Ross, Kenneth S. Wilson, Sidney J., Jr.
Ruhnam, John W. Wolfe, James E.
Rushfeldt, Collin H. Woodbridge, Charles
Ryan, John T. L. Savage, Thomas F.
Salmon, Robert L. Scarborough, Walter Woodruff, William B. T., Jr.
Samuelson, Richard K. Young, Neil F.
Santamaria, Thomas Young, Robert J.
Savage, Thomas F., Jr. Schuerman, Mervyn T. Young, Robert J.
Scarborough, Walter Woodruff, William B. T., Jr. Schumacher, Paul E. Zagone, Nicasio J.
- The following-named officers of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:
- Abbey, Robert B. Adler, Seymour J.
Abbott, Millard S. Aeschbacher, Herbert
Abbott, Robert G. L.
Abbott, William V. C. Affeld, Francis O., IV
Abercrombie, Harold Agnello, Angelo E.
Abernathy, Thomas R. Ahearn, Joseph M.
Ables, Murray F. Ahlberg, Richard C.
Ackerson, Garrett G., Aichroth, Donald T.
III
Alba, John R.
Adair, James T., Jr. Alber, Charles L.
Adams, George H. Alber, John W.
Adams, John M., Jr. Albers, Vincent A., Jr.
Adams, Sammy T. Albert, Duane H.
Adamson, Clarence E. Albrecht, Robert C.
Adamson, Walter K. Alexander, Dan C.
- Alexander, Tommy D. Archer, Harry J., Jr.
Allaband, Winfield A. Archer, Wayland L.
Allbrooks, Eugene Armbruster, Robert F.
Allen, Albert D., Jr. Armentrout, James R.
Allen, Albert N. Armstrong, William H., Jr.
Allen, Chester W. Armstrong, Max L.
Allen, Clyde E. Armstrong, Frederick R., Jr.
Allen, George M. Arneson, Richard B.
Allen, Norgren B. Arnold, Edwin L.
Allen, Richard J. Arnold, John L.
Allen, Rives C. Arnold, Kenneth G.
Allen, Robert E. Arp, Dudley M.
Allen, Thomas B. Arquette, John B.
Allen, Thomas H., Jr. Arrington, Raymond O.
Allen, William B. Arthur, Charles L.
Allen, William V. Arthur, Ernest W.
Allgood, Frankie E. Arthur, Robert J., Jr.
Allison Lee, J. Arzaniewicz, Joseph B.
Allweiler, Joseph O. Aschenbeck, Theo F.
Alm, Richard A. Ash, Allen H.
Alpert, Leonard Ash, Peter S.
Alsmeyer, Charles R. Ashby, William C., Jr.
Altenbern, Stanley E. Ashenhurst, Frank L., II
Alter, Francis M. Ashley, William C.
Altman, George F. Ashton, Franklin E.
Alvaro, Michael A. Askinosie, Lawrence
Alves, Edward R., Jr. Asmus, Vernon C.
Amaya, Julian Asmuth, Richard J.
Amberg, John M. Aspinwall, Glen S.
Ambrosi, Americo L., Jr. Atha, Donald J.
Ames, Carl S. Atkinson, James P.
Ames, George S. Atkinson, Neil, Jr.
Ames, Sheppard K., Jr. Ator, Donald W.
Ammentorp, Warren L. Atwater, Gerald K., Jr.
Ammons, James F. Ausband, Robert W.
Amo, Jerry L. Austgen, Donald R.
Amos, Paul F. Austin, Harold M., Jr.
Analla, Robert N. Austin, James P.
Andersen, Andrew E., Jr. Austin, James L.
Andersen, Earl R. Austin, John H.
Andersen, Ernest J. Austin, Marion G.
Andersen, Eugene W. Avery, Willard C., Jr.
Andersen, James V. Axton, Robert H.
Andersen, Wayne C. Aycock, James F.
Anderson, Andrew J., Jr. Ayers, Thomas J.
Anderson, Carl E. Ayres, Horace C., Jr.
Anderson, Donald L. Azevedo, Lloyd H.
Anderson, Henry D. Babikian, Charles A., Jr.
Anderson, Joseph C. Babski, Bruce S.
Anderson, Leonard W. Babyak, Joseph E.
Anderson, Milton A. Backus, Edward E.
Anderson, Paul L. Bacon, Dwight G.
Anderson, Robert L. Badamo, Frank J.
Anderson, William L. Bade, Charles R. R.
Anderson, William B., Jr. Badger, Eugene C.
Anderson, William D. Baer, James W.
Anderson, Wilburn C., Jr. Bahner, Robert H.
Anderton, George T., Jr. Baier, Donald I.
Andreos, John A. Bailey, Donald W.
Andresevic, William R. Bailey, Earl W.
Andrew, Joe H. Bailey, Garnett R.
Andrew, Paul B. Bailey, Gerald D.
Andrews, Algie F. Bailey, Leo P., Jr.
Andrews, Clyde P. Bailey, Paul E.
Andrews, Clifton B. Bainbridge, Beryl E.
Andrews, John W. Baird, Jesse F.
Andrillunas, Francis Baker, Bernard B.
Andrus, Kermit W. Baker, Charles E.
Angelo, Leon N. Baker, Clarence M.
Angros, Leo, Jr. Baker, Gerald F.
Angus, Carl J. Baker, John M.
Antczak, Arthur J. Baker, Stephen E.
Anthony, Frederick P. Baker, William H.
Anthony, Garner Balakas, Joseph, Jr.
Anthony, Richard A. Baldwin, James D.
Antoniaci, Gene E. Baldwin, Covert F.
Apker, Joseph E. Baldwin, Harry J., Jr.
Applegate, James L. Bales, Frank N.
Applegate, Frank A. Bales, George W.
Appelquist, Edward R. Balester, Joseph
Jr. Ballus, David H.
Ball, William L.
Ballard, Donald S.
Ballek, Fred J.
- Ballew, Thomas J. Ballou, Ronald M.
Ballou, Frank W. Bancroft, John V.
Bancroft, Richard A. Baney, Lowell E.
Banks, Charles D. Barber, James E.
Bany, John B., Jr. Barberi, John M.
Barbee, Harrison I. Bardell, Donald J.
Barber, George D. Barham, Bobby L.
Barber, James E. Barham, Thomas W.
Barberi, John M. Barker, Lionel A.
Bardell, Donald J. Barker, Paul R.
Barham, Bobby L. Barker, Warren H.
Barham, Thomas W. Barlow, Glen H.
Barker, Lionel A. Barlowe, Donald E.
Barker, Paul R. Barnes, Barry P.
Barker, Warren H. Barnes, Lloyd J.
Barlow, Glen H. Barnett, Gordon P.
Barlowe, Donald E. Barnett, James B.
Barnes, Barry P. Barnett, Thomas P.
Barnes, Lloyd J. Barr, Robert G.
Barnett, Gordon P. Barrer, William S., Jr.
Barnett, James B. Barrett, Richard C.
Barnett, Thomas P. Barron, Thurston B., Jr.
Barr, Robert G. Barth, Olav
Barrer, William S., Jr. Bartl, Charles P.
Barrett, Richard C. Bartlett, Edward A.
Barron, Thurston B., Jr. Bartlett, Kenneth T.
Barth, Olav Bartlett, Robert M.
Bartl, Charles P. Bartlett, Stephen W.
Bartlett, Edward A. Bartley, John T.
Bartlett, Kenneth T. Bartley, William J.
Bartlett, Robert M. Barton, Willis W., Jr.
Bartlett, Stephen W. Bartosik, Frank J.
Bartley, John T. Bartunek, Richard M.
Bartley, William J. Batchelder, Sydney H., Jr.
Barton, Willis W., Jr. Bates, John B.
Bartosik, Frank J. Bates, John W.
Bartunek, Richard M. Bates, Maurice J.
Batchelder, Sydney H., Jr. Bates, William H.
Bates, John B. Battani, Kenneth J.
Bates, John W. Battistone, Carl L.
Bates, Maurice J. Battle, Benjamin G., Jr.
Bates, William H. Batts, Robert E. L., Jr.
Battani, Kenneth J. Bauer, Peter A.
Battistone, Carl L. Bauer, Richard J.
Battle, Benjamin G., Jr. Baughman, Prentiss H.
Batts, Robert E. L., Jr. Baum, Julian F., Jr.
Bauer, Peter A. Baumwart, Eldon L.
Bauer, Richard J. Baxmann, Robert O.
Baughman, Prentiss H. Baxter, Robert M.
Baum, Julian F., Jr. Beach, Andrew D.
Baumwart, Eldon L. Beach, Edward E.
Baxmann, Robert O. Beal, Don D.
Baxter, Robert M. Beam, George H.
Beach, Andrew D. Bearchell, William L.
Beach, Edward E. Beardslee, William C.
Beal, Don D. Beasley, Robert D.
Beam, George H. Beatty, Robert M.
Bearchell, William L. Beauchamp, Glen T.
Beardslee, William C. Beaumont, Charles D., III
Beasley, Robert D. Beaver, Jimmy C.
Beatty, Robert M. Beck, James T.
Beauchamp, Glen T. Beck, Kenneth R.
Beaumont, Charles D., III Beck, William R.
Beaver, Jimmy C. Becker, Leslie R.
Beck, James T. Becker, Teddy J.
Beck, Kenneth R. Beckham, William G., Jr.
Beck, William R. Beckner, Boyd H.
Becker, Leslie R. Beckwith, Bruce W.
Becker, Teddy J. Beers, Richard W.
Beckham, William G., Jr. Beersman, James H.
Beckner, Boyd H. Begines, Joseph
Beckwith, Bruce W. Begley, Kevin M.
Beers, Richard W. Beis, John T.
Beersman, James H. Belcovski, Frederick
Begines, Joseph Belden, Edward B.
Begley, Kevin M. Bell, Douglas L.
Beis, John T. Bell, George N.
Belcovski, Frederick Beldner, Boyd H.
Belden, Edward B. Bell, James B.
Bell, Douglas L. Bell, Ray H.
Bell, George N. Bell, Richard L.
Bellamy, Richard E. Belling, James M.
Belt, James L. Belt, Robert E.
Belt, Robert E. Bench, James D.
Bender, Allen L. Bender, Joseph M.
Bender, Joseph M. Benero, Joseph L.
Benger, Charles M., Jr. Bengele, Charles M., Jr.
Bennack, Cantley P. Benner, Theodore F., Jr.
Bennett, Dale T. Bennett, Homer L.
Bennett, James L. Bennett, James L.
Beno, Joseph P. Benso, Allan J.
Benson, Carl H. Benson, Robert A.
Bent, Russell F. Benton, William D.
Bentsen, William B. Berckmans, Bruce, Jr.
Berg, August L. Berg, Donald R.
Berg, Donald R. Berger, Michael A.
Berghlund, Warren T. Bergmann, Henry C.
Bergstrom, James C. Bergstrom, John W.
Berkley, Stanley G. Bermas, Edward M.
Bernard, Harland W. Bernhardt, John J.
Berolatti, Louis J. Berry, Charles H.
Berrey, Charles H. Berry, Jesse S.
Berry, Wesley E. Berteau, Richard
Bertheau, Franklin R. Berthoud, Kenneth H., Jr.
Bertke, Thomas J. Berube, Raymond L.
Berus, James D., Jr. Besse, James D., Jr.
Best, Edgar N. Bethel, William F.
Bethel, William F. Bickert, Robert G.
Bickert, Robert G. Bickley, Roy W.
Bicknell, Ralph L. Bierhaelder, Dirk C.
Bigelow, William C. Bigley, Richard R.
Billera, Joseph P. Billingham, Ellis D.
Binney, Douglas C. Binnion, William E.
Bir, James E. Bir, James E.
Bird, James H., Jr. Bird, Neale E.
Bird, Philip S. Birdwell, Tom R.
Birou, Francis L., Jr. Bischoff, Joseph J.
Bischoff, Joseph J. Bishop, Charles H.
Bishop, Charles H. Bishop, John W.
Bishop, John W. Bisland, Edward C.
Bisland, Edward C. Bissell, Glenn A.
Bissonette, Charles G. Bitner, Daniel S.
Bivins, George E. Bivins, Harold A.
Bivins, Harold A. Bjerk, Duwain E.
Bjerk, Duwain E. Bjorklund, Kay D.
Bjorklund, Kay D. Bjornaas, Forrest R.
Bjornaas, Forrest R. Bjorvik, Roger A.
Bjorvik, Roger A. Black, James O.
Black, James O. Black, John G.
Black, John G. Black, Theodore H.
Black, Theodore H. Black, William C.
Blackburn, Jason A. Blackstone, George E., Jr.
Blackstone, George E., Jr. Blackwell, James L.
Bladergroen, Charles H.

- Blair, Anthony L.
Blair, John H.
Blair, Richard R.
Blais, Robert A.
Blaisdell, Nesbitt C.
Blalack, Victor E., Jr.
Blanchard, Lee E.
Blandy, John F.
Blankenship, Leroy I.
Blanton, Harold L., Jr.
Blasko, William A.
Blaydes, Aquilla M.
Blaylock, Hulen A., Jr.
Blayton, Walter E.
Block, Robert E.
Blomquist, Robert F.
Bloom, Allan H.
Bloom, John C.
Bloom, Ronald J.
Bloomfield, William P.
Blyler, Donald N.
Boccheri, Ronald J., Jr.
Bodnar, Nicholas K.
Bogan, Harold J.
Bogg, Charles F.
Boggs, William G., Jr.
Bohler, Ludwig G.
Bohn, William G.
Boles, Robert D.
Bolin, Harold R.
Bolton, James H.
Bolives, Rudolph W.
Bomgardner, George I.
Bonadio, Robert A.
Bond, David T.
Bond, Leighton McG.
Bond, Royce L.
Bonne, Nell S.
Bonsall, William O.
Boone, Owen B.
Booth, Charles L.
Booth, Frank R., Jr.
Booth, Lewis H.
Borcherdt, Edward R., Jr.
Borda, Richard J.
Boring, Harry R.
Borjesson, Stanley G.
Bornell, Donald G.
Borom, Perry L.
Bossert, George J.
Boswell, Benjamin L.
Boswell, George S.
Boswell, John D.
Bott, William J.
Bottoms, Lemuel M.
Bottorff, Harry J.
Bourne, Arthur H.
Bourne, Richard E.
Bousman, James S.
Boutiette, Richard C.
Bowen, David W.
Bowen, Gregory L.
Bowen, James T.
Bowen, Virgil G.
Bowen, William T.
Bower, Edward L.
Bowers, James M.
Bowman, Richard D.
Bowron, Walter F.
Bowser, James R., Jr.
Boyages, Zack
Boyd, Clarence C.
Boyd, Clarence A., Jr.
Boyd, Daniel Z.
Boyd, Frank M.
Boyd, Mose W.
Boylan, Thomas B.
Boyle, Francis G. X.
Boyle, John K.
Boyles, Cullon S.
Boynton, Robert H.
Brace, Ernest C.
Bracken, John C.
Bracken, Wallace D.
Brackett, Joseph E.
Brackett, Richard C.
Brackett, William D.
Bradberry, Joe E.
Braddon, John R.
Braden, Russell J.
Bradley, Bobbie B.
Bradley, Joseph V.
Bradley, Thomas E.
Bradley, William C.
Brady, Arthur F., Jr.
Brady, John A.
Brady, Robert C.
Brake, James W.
Brand, Vance D.
Brandon, Francis X.
Branson, William B.
Brassette, Maurice, Jr.
Brassfield, John T.
Bratt, Eugene J.
Brause, Bernard B., Jr.
Bray, Richard P.
Brazelton, Robert S.
Breckenridge, Floyd S., Jr.
Breedon, Robert F.
Breen, Joseph
Breeze, John R.
Brenden, Gene W.
Brennan, Gregory L.
Brennan, James J.
Brenneman, Wilmer E.
Breslau, Charles K.
Breth, James R.
Bretscher, Arthur J.
Brett, Richard A.
Breuer, Harry, Jr.
Brewer, Arnold J.
Brewer, Clyde W., Jr.
Brewer, Glenn D.
Brewster, Albert E., Jr.
Bridges, Henry M.
Bridgen, John K., Jr.
Brigham, John M.
Bright, Ray E., Jr.
Brindell, Charles R.
Brinkley, Harvey D.
Brody, James J.
Britton, Thomas N.
Broad, Alfred T.
Broadwell, Franklin C.
Brockman, William A.
Broderick, Richard A.
Brog, Robert L.
Bromm, Harold J.
Brooks, Gene E.
Brooks, Stephen J.
Brooks, Thomas D.
Brooks, William E.
Broscio, Anthony J.
Brosnahan, Thomas R.
Brosnan, James S.
Brothers, William B.
Broughton, Phillip C.
Brower, Joseph P.
Brown, Bernard M.
Brown, Carl D.
Brown, Carroll E.
Brown, Guy L.
Brown, H. P.
Brown, Harry W., Jr.
Brown, Irvin C.
Brown, John H.
Brown, John S. L., Jr.
Brown, Joseph B., Jr.
Brown, Lewis A.
Brown, Phillip J., Jr.
Brown, Phillip W. T., Jr.
Brown, Richard A.
Brown, Richard E.
Brown, Robert L., Jr.
Brown, Ronald A.
Brown, Thomas J.
Brown, Thomas S.
Brown, Wadsworth S.
Brown, William R.
Browne, James F., Jr.
Browne, Joseph E.
Browne, Richard C.
Brownell, Richard L.
Brownson, John C., Jr.
Bruce, Edgar W.
Bruce, Frank H., Jr.
Bruce, Lowell L.
Bruce, Richard O.
Bruce, Walter K.
Bruce, William K.
Bruggemeyer, Roger A.
Brunson, Aubie W.
Bryant, Ernest A., III.
Bryant, Thomas M.
Bryson, Walter J., III.
Buchanan, Robert B.
Bucher, William E.
Buckholtz, Edgar E.
Buckley, David
Buckman, John G.
Buckridge, Richard D.
Budd, Talman C., II.
Budny, Stanley J.
Budow, Lawrence S.
Buechl, William K.
Buechner, Robert, Jr.
Bugg, John S., Jr.
Bujan, Charles D.
Bump, Judson C.
Bunce, Truman G.
Bunnell, Ruskin C.
Buonocore, Gregory P.
Buran, Philip F.
Burchard, Harold W., Jr.
Burcher, Eugene S.
Buren, John W.
Burgess, Horace W.
Burgh, Donald A.
Burgin, Henry N.
Burgon, Edwin L.
Burin, Michael
Burk, Thomas K., Jr.
Burke, Edward J.
Burke, Richard R.
Burkley, Francis E.
Burlage, Gerald J.
Burnette, Thomas D.
Burnham, Daniel A.
Burns, John J.
Burrill, Richard R.
Burrows, Thomas E.
Burton, Jerry B.
Buschman, Theodore W.
Buskirk, Charles D.
Buss, Herbert F.
Butler, John H.
Butler, John K.
Butler, Larry R.
Butler, Owen J.
Button, William H., III
Buzbee, Richard L.
Byers, Bradley C.
Bymaster, Cortlandt O.
Byrd, Charles R.
Byrnes, Peter J.
Byron, Robert J.
Cable, Wiley R.
Cabral, Louis A.
Cadenasso, Eldon J.
Cadrin, Lewis H., Jr.
Cadrin, Leo A.
Cadwell, Robert A.
Cahill, Edward D., Jr.
Cahill, John J.
Cain, Pat
Cain, Thomas L.
Calandrella, Carmine A.
Calder, James D.
Caldwell, John T.
Callif, Irvin D.
Callery, William J., Jr.
Callison, Harold R.
Calvert, Jonathan C.
Camp, Gene F.
Campagnone, John E.
Campbell, Albert J., Jr.
Campbell, Harold R., Jr.
Campbell, James R.
Campbell, John W.
Campbell, James N.
Campbell, John P.
Campbell, James A., Jr.
Campbell, Joe A.
Campbell, Laurence A., III
Campbell, Paul F.
Campbell, Paul T.
Campbell, Ronald W.
Campbell, Thomas R.
Campbell, William H.
Campbell, Walton M.
Campbell, William S.
Campe, John N.
Candy, Thomas R.
Cannon, George W.
Cannon, Robert O.
Cannon, Samuel P.
Cantienny, John B.
Capinas, Donald J.
Capriano, Michael P.
Caputo, Ernest, Jr.
Carbone, Martin R.
Carchietta, Anthony J.
Cardinale, Peter T.
Cardinale, Anthony
Carey, James E.
Carey, Raymond A.
Carey, William E.
Carleton, Welby A., Jr.
Carlisle, Ralph C., Jr.
Carlo, Jerry M.
Carlson, Francis J.
Carlson, Richard T.
Carlson, Wilbur M.
Carlton, Claudius L., Jr.
Carney, Leo G.
Carney, Stephen P.
Carothers, James H., Jr.
Carpenter, Donald R.
Carpenter, Earl E.
Carpenter, John W., Jr.
Carr, George, Jr.
Carr, Howard E., Jr.
Carr, Roger A.
Carr, William L.
Carroll, Arthur A., Jr.
Carroll, Charles W.
Carroll, John F., Jr.
Carruthers, Robert E.
Carson, Alan T.
Carson, Richard H.
Carter, Denton
Carter, Shelby H., Jr.
Caruso, Salvatore C.
Carver, Thomas R.
Casey, Patrick J.
Cash, Richard A.
Cassedy, Logan
Cassell, Richard T.
Cassidy, James F., Jr.
Cassidy, John M.
Castagna, Edward J. A.
Castellana, Alphonse J.
Catallo, Merico L.
Catt, Jack R.
Caudill, Curtis E.
Cavallo, Louis J.
Cavendish, John C.
Cavness, Joseph R.
Cavros, Steve N.
Cawfield, Francis R.
Cawthon, Walter C., Jr.
Caynak, John P.
Cecil, Earl D.
Centola, David D.
Cerninara, Umberto V.
Cervenak, Michael W.
Cesare, Donald J.
Chace, Frank C., Jr.
Challgren, Stanley A.
Chambers, James W.
Chambless, William S.
Champion, William M.
Chandler, Charles R.
Chaney, Earl D., Jr.
Chaney, Guy R.
Chaney, John B., Jr.
Chapell, Donald R.
Chapin, Robert W.
Chapman, Edward J., Jr.
Chapman, Edward J.
Chapman, John L.
Chapman, Leland L.
Chardon, Alain J.
Charon, Larry P.
Chase, Frederick, Jr.
Chase, Marshall C.
Cheatham, Willard E.
Chellis, Thomas W.
Chernack, Boris J.
Chesla, Edward J., Jr.
Chester, John W., Jr.
Chez, Joseph M.
Chiles, Charles H.
Chisholm, William H.
Chisnell, Thomas C., Jr.
Chittick, John M.
Chockley, Robert S.
Chrisman, Robert A.
Christ, George M.
Christensen, Don R.
Christensen, John D.
Christian, Eual R.
Christiansen, Hyrum E.
Christlieb, Beryl T.
Christopherson, James W.
Christy, Robert A.
Cianci, Francis X.
Ciardi, Dominick R.
Cicala, George
Cignotti, Louis J.
Cinciarelli, Roland F.
Cincotta, Donald J.
Clapp, Frederick H.
Clark, Arthur D., Jr.
Clark, Bernard E.
Clark, Bobby E.
Clark, Frank A.
Clark, Fred E., Jr.
Clark, Gerald E.
Clark, James E.
Clark, Merideth M.
Clark, William M.
Clark, William H., III
Clary, Robert E.
Clatworthy, John
Claunch, J. M.
Clayton, Charles B.
Clayton, Philip C., Jr.
Clayton, Walter E., III
Clemens, Glenwood A.
Clement, Ralph F.
Clements, Frederick D.
Clemons, Girard L., Jr.
Clendening, Carl C.
Cleveland, William L., Jr.
Click, James C.
Clifford, Henry C., Jr.
Clifford, Martin L.
Clifton, James A.
Cline, Austin R.
Cline, Frank E.
Coates, Franklin W.
Cobb, John L.
Coble, James H.
Cochran, John E.
Cochran, William A.
Cockey, John M.
Cockrum, James E.
Cody, James B.
Cody, Thomas G.
Coffey, William F.
Coffin, Charles T.
Coffin, George J., Jr.
Coffin, James H.
Coggan, Leland L., Jr.
Cohn, William A.
Coit, William H., II
Coladonato, Falco J.
Colbert, Arthur B.
Colby, Dwin A.
Cole, Doyle H.
Cole, Frank H.
Cole, Joe M.
Cole, Robert C.
Cole, Robert E.
Cole, Ronald D.
Coleman, Daniel C.
Coleman, Donn G.
Coleman, Edward C., Jr.
Coleman, James F.
Coleman, Joseph E., Jr.
Coles, Laurie B.
Colleton, Francis X.
Collier, William R.
Collins, Charles E.
Collins, Donald L.
Collins, Jessie R.
Colo, Marshall A.
Colquitt, Roy S., Jr.
Colson, Charles W.
Colven, Richard A.
Colyer, Charles C., Jr.
Comer, Andrew G.
Comer, Robert E.
Comfort, Clayton L.
Como, Joseph A.
Conaway, Charles R.
Conlin, John C.
Conlon, Arthur B.
Conlon, Bernard P.
Conlon, James F.
Connell, Richard F.
Connely, Francis J.
Connors, William L.
Connolly, James J.
Connolly, Walter J., Jr.
Connor, Fred W., Jr.
Conrad, Billy D.
Conrado, James S., Jr.
Conroy, Eugene L.
Conroy, Richard J.
Conroy, Thomas M., Jr.
Consodine, Thomas J., Jr.
Convissor, Samuel M.
Conway, Alfred G.
Conway, William H.
Conyers, John F.
Cook, Edward C.
Cook, Gorton C.
Cook, Howard L.
Cook, John D.
Cook, John F.
Cook, Marcus H.
Cook, Robert E.
Cook, Thomas B.
Cook, Walter T.
Cooke, Richard M.
Cooley, Gordon R.
Coombe, Phillip W.
Cooper, Francis W.
Cooper, Gary D.
Cooper, Jesse G.
Cooper, Joseph M.
Cooper, Kenneth L.
Cooper, Robert M.
Cooper, Virgil G.
Cope, John F.
Copeland, Edwin
Copland, John S.
Corbet, Jimmy A.
Corbin, Joseph G.
Cordiel, James B.
Corliss, Gregory A.

Corn, Donn E.
Cornelius, Franklin L.
Cornell, Marion H.
Corning, Nathan E.
Cornish, Chester L.
Cornwall, Gerald B.
Cornwallis-Stevenson, Cyril H., Jr.
Corr, James R.
Corregan, Bradley W.
Cosby, Leslie C.
Cosgrove, George P.
Costeira, James H.
Costello, Frank P., Jr.
Costello, Thomas L.
Cotreau, Gerald S.
Cottingham, Robert P., Jr.
Cotton, John W.
Cotton, Joab, Jr.
Cottrell, James E., Jr.
Cottrell, Johnnie C.
Couch, Wallace M.
Coughlin, Richard L.
Coulter, George F., Jr.
Coulter, Richard W.
Courtney, Richard G.
Courtney, Thomas H., Jr.
Courts, Carl E.
Covalt, Theodore L.
Cowper, Thomas J.
Cox, Donald L., Jr.
Cox, Jay M.
Cox, John V.
Cox, Lemoin.
Cox, Robert B., Jr.
Cox, Stanley D.
Coyle, Thomas J.
Craemer, George H., Jr.
Craig, Winchell M., Jr.
Craine, James E.
Crawford, Charles W.
Crawford, Harden L., Jr.
Crawford, John M.
Crawford, Raymond M.
Crawford, William J.
Creamer, John F., Jr.
Creekmore, Gregory, Jr.
Cresswell, Charles W.
Cretney, Warren G.
Crews, Duane D., Jr.
Crews, Eugene E.
Cribb, George F.
Cribben, John P.
Cripe, Frederick J.
Cripps, Willie S.
Criss, Edward M.
Criss, Jackie L.
Crist, George B.
Crist, Raymond F., III
Criswell, Dale W.
Crittendon, Robert R.
Critz, Richard L.
Cronic, Daniel M.
Crocker, Robert W.
Croll, Robert M.
Cronk, Robert A.
Cronk, Robert R.
Crosby, Allan R.
Crosby, Donald A.
Crouse, Richard T.
Crow, Arthur E.
Crowe, Patrick J., Jr.
Crowley, Jerome F., Jr.
Crowley, Maurice D.
Crutchfield, James R.
Cucka, John
Cull, Albert L.
Cullen, Thomas P.
Culligan, James M.
Culligan, Thomas M.
Cullom, James H.
Culpepper, Richard H.
Cummings, Dale D.
Cummings, John M.
Cunningham, Robert F., Jr.
Cunningham, Roy T.
Cuppy, Will C., Jr.
Curley, Herbert J.
Curley, James M.
Curran, Maurice F.
Curran, Thomas L.
Currie, Thomas R.
Curry, Edward H., Jr.
Curtis, Conrad M.
Curtis, James A.
Cusack, George G.
Cushman, James R.
Cusick, George C.
Cutler, Jesse T.
Cytewski, Sigmund J., Jr.
Daake, Duane L.
Dabney, Donald J.
Daglis, Arthur J.
D'Agostino, Thomas S.
Daigle, Chester J.
Daily, Roger M.
Dalbey, Rolland M.
Dalena, Albert F.
D'Alessandro, Louis W.
D'Alessandro, Joseph J.
Daley, John J., Jr.
Daley, Richard F.
Dalkiewicz, Thaddeus E.
Daly, Daniel C.
Daly, Joseph P., III
Damone, William F.
Dandrea, Louis A.
D'Angelo, John J.
Daniell, Paul L.
Daniels, Otis D.
Danielson, Donald C.
Danielson, Darrell C.
Danner, Richard L.
Darby, Donald W., Jr.
Darco, Anthony J.
Darling, Eugene R.
Darron, Robert R.
Daut, John D.
Davenport, Richard K.
Daves, Joel T., III
David, Edward L.
David, Joseph B., III
Davidson, Bobby E.
Davidson, Darrell U.
Davidson, Thomas L.
Davies, Ed R.
Davis, Bennie E.
Davis, George R.
Davis, Jack Wolfe
Davis, Jack William
Davis, Jesse D.
Davis, Joseph W. S., Jr.
Davis, Leland L.
Davis, William H., Jr.
Dawes, Lyell C., Jr.
Dawson, Bobby G.
Dawson, Carl F.
Dawson, Forest G.
Dawson, William A.
Day, James L.
Day, Marvin E.
Day, Richard L.
Deadwyler, Joe D.
Deal, Nelson F.
Dean, John M.
Dean, Roland H.
Dean, Stanley W.
Dearmon, James D.
Decker, John H.
Decoursey, John E.
Decrane, Alfred C.
Deem, Richard G.
Deen, Charles H.
DeFazio, Ernest L.
Deffebach, William T.
DeGanahl, Carl B.
Dolan, Samuel E.
Dolan, James R.
Dolan, Leslie B.
Deimer, Theodore J.
DeLahr, Marvin L.
Delahunty, William R., Jr.
DeLaine, Louis, Jr.
Delaney, Gerald R.
Delaney, James J.
Delaney, John P.
DeLaTorre, George F.
Delcuze, Godfrey S.
Dell, Melvin E.
DeLong, Clyde S., Jr.
DeLong, George J.
DeSanto, Pasquale
Delucia, Ralph, Jr.
Demarest, John B.
Demaris, John C.
Demers, Charles O.
Demmerly, Harry W.
Demos, John
Demott, Harry J., Jr.
Dempster, James F.
Deneen, Bruce T.
Denehy, Harry A.
Dennerlein, Cyril J., Jr.
Dennis, Utah G. L.
Denora, John
Dent, Robert H.
Dentler, Paul J.
Deprima, Joseph
DeSario, Louis
DeSchuytner, Victor R.
DeShazo, Thomas D.
DesJardines, Lawrence J.
DesJardines, Fabian E.
DesMarais, Robert N.
Desmet, George W.
Desmond, Robert C.
Detroy, John W.
Dettman, James A.
Deuser, James F.
Devanney, William T.
Dewell, Jack L.
Dewey, Robert R.
Dhonau, Donald D.
Diamond, Donald L.
Dianetti, Albert R.
Dickerson, Lawrence E., Jr.
Dickey, David K.
Dickey, Donald R.
Dickson, Robert E.
Diehl, John J.
Dietrich, George R.
Dignan, George J., Jr.
Dillard, James L.
Dillard, Julian M.
Diller, Jack K.
Dillie, Donald K.
Dillon, James L.
Dininger, Charles F., Jr.
Dion, James W.
Dion, Robert F.
Disher, William H.
Ditch, Winfield S., III
Dittmann, Wayne R.
Divoky, Robert J.
Dix, Kenneth M.
Dixon, John C.
Dobbratz, Joseph R., Jr.
Dockstader, Richard W.
Dodd, John F.
Dodson, Grayson E.
Dodson, Warren McL., Jr.
Doescher, Wilmer F.
Doherty, James M.
Dolan, Eugene T.
Dolan, Francis A.
Dolan, John E.
Dolan, Russell E.
Dolan, Samuel J.
Dollard, Charles W.
Dolmetsch, Robert E., Jr.
Dolphin, Robert E.
Dolsen, Norman M.
Donahue, Arthur J.
Donahue, John T.
Donald, William A.
Dondey, Leon
Donnellan, Richard P.
Donnelly, Donald E.
Donnelly, Peter E., Jr.
Donnelly, Thomas E.
Donnelly, Vincent C.
Donnelly, William R.
Donoghue, Joseph C.
Donovan, Orval E.
Doolan, Leonard W., III
Dooley, Francis M.
Dopler, John R.
Doran, James J., Jr.
Dore, Cornelius M., Jr.
Dore, Robert P.
Dorfield, Charles E.
Dorman, John F.
Dorn, Alvin K.
Dorr, George C.
Dorsett, Thomas M.
Dotson, Courtney J., Jr.
Dotter, James E., Jr.
Dotterer, Robert A.
Doty, David S.
Doub, Jay A.
Doublet, Alvin J.
Doudna, Thornton E.
Dougherty, John E.
Douglas, James B.
Douglas, Thomas J.
Douglass, Dwight F.
Douglass, William E.
Douvelle, Charles G.
Dove, David R.
Dowd, Anthony J., Jr.
Dowd, John A.
Downey, Kenneth W.
Downing, James B., Jr.
Downs, Roy
Dowsett, John E.
Doyle, Donald A.
Doyle, John M.
Doyle, Joseph E., Jr.
Doyle, Peter E.
Doyle, Teddy J.
Doyle, Thomas A.
Draper, William W.
Drazich, George
Drennan, Lawrence T., Jr.
Drescher, Herbert W.
Dresely, John W.
Drew, William B.
Driscoll, Bernard E.
Drovedahl, Robert
Duane, Daniel J., Jr.
Dubeau, Leo F.
Duchesne, John W.
Duck, John E.
Duckworth, Donald J.
Dufendach, Paul E.
Duff, John C.
Duffield, Daniel M., Jr.
Dugan, John E.
Dugan, John W.
Duhnkrack, Alan R.
Dumont, Thomas J.
Dunbar, Robert D.
Dunbaugh, Charles R.
Duncan, Billy R.
Duncan, William B.
Dunham, William J.
Dunn, Hollis T.
Dunn, John H.
Dunn, Walter F.
Dunphy, John J.
Dunwell, Ronald P.
Duphney, Randall W.
Dupont, James A.
Dura, Andrew
Durbun, Hugh C.
Dure, Leon S., III
Durham, Edwin A.
Durham, John A., Jr.
Durkin, Robert J.
Dutton, Frank W.
Dutton, Harold K.
Dutton, Thomas A.
Duvall, Raymond L., Jr.
Dyer, Robert J.
Eagan, Arthur J.
Eaheart, John F.
Eames, Stewart V.
Earle, George H., Jr.
Eastman, Robert J.
Eastwood, Gerald W.
Eaton, Carl G.
Eckenfels, Gerald T.
Ecker, Donald D.
Eckert, John F., Jr.
Eckert, Shirian L.
Eckmann, Ronald P.
Eddy, James R.
Edebohl, Hans G.
Eden, David J.
Edgerton, Edward J.
Edinburgh, Lester E.
Edson, Richard D.
Edwards, Charles
Edwards, Donald A.
Edwards, Thomas E., Jr.
Egger, Charles H. F.
Eggleston, Joseph N.
Ehlers, Clifford C.
Ehm, Charles H.
Ehrlich, Maxwell
Elchor, James R.
Eilers, Albert D.
Eitel, Robert J.
Elam, David L.
Elder, Wilbur M.
Eldridge, Francis H., Jr.
Eleazer, William R.
Ellason, Arthur F., Jr.
Elkins, Jim T.
Ellery, Thomas G.
Elliott, George F.
Elliott, Joseph A.
Elliott, John M.
Elliott, Lyle B., Jr.
Elliott, Nathaniel R., Jr.
Ellis, Theodore, Jr.
Elmendorf, Carlin T.
Elmer, Neil B.
Elmiger, Robert P.
Elmunder, Herbert W.
Elmwood, Robert E.
Elrod, Terrell L.
Elstner, Earl T.
Elting, John D.
Elwood, William R.
Elzea, William D.
Emery, John M., II
Emmons, Charles D.
Emmons, Robert W., Jr.
Emrich, William R.
Enderle, Rodolfo R.
Enders, John F., Jr.
Engel, Edward A.
Engels, Frank J.
Engler, Robert H.
Enley, William M.
Enoch, John T.
Enright, John R.
Eppley, Arthur
Erickson, Charles B.
Erickson, Eldon L.
Erickson, Kenneth D.
Erickson, William F.
Ericsson, Robert D.
Erkenbeck, James B.
Erman, Robert J.
Ermatinger, Paul J.
Ernst, Alfred R.
Erspamer, William F.
Erwin, Louis O.
Esther, John R.
Etchart, William M.
Etnyre, William R.
Etvanko, Leonard
Evans, Donald C.
Evans, Gary N.
Evans, James R.
Evans, John L., Jr.
Evans, John R.
Evans, Richard D.
Evans, Richard L.
Evans, Robert D.
Everett, Wilbur D.
Everhart, John D.
Eversole, Carl J.
Ewald, William F.
Eyster, Charles R.
Faber, William A.
Fagot, Robert J.
Fahlstrom, Paul G.
Fairchild, Charles T.
Fairley, William F., III
Fairhurst, William A.
Fairley, Willis
Faist, Richard M.
Falce, Louis R.
Faley, Thomas J.
Fancher, Clifton C.
Farnsworth, Ward, Jr.
Farnsworth, Francis W., Jr.
Farrell, Frederick L., Jr.
Farrell, John J.
Farrington, Norman C., Jr.
Farris, Harry W.
Farris, William E.
Fatherree, Bobby D.
Faulk, Samuel G.
Faulkner, Howard E.
Fauver, Ronald E.
Fay, John E.
Fazzano, Henry W.
Fear, Norman B., Jr.
Feaster, Richard C.
Fechtig, Charles W.
Fein, Louis I.
Feldmann, Jerry J.
Feldon, Richard A.
Felton, James J.
Fenenga, Gerit L.
Fenn, Delbert S.
Fennell, Patrick J., Jr.
Fenton, Philip S.
Ferguson, James E.
Ferguson, Richard J.
Ferrell, Doyle M.
Ferrington, George B., Jr.
Ferry, Richard T.
Fibich, Michael J., Jr.
Ficke, Howard W.
Field, Harold J., Jr.
Field, Wells L., III
Flertz, Alden L.
Fikrie, George E.
Filler, William C.
Fine, David S.
Fink, Arden L.
Fink, Jack D.
Finnegan, John E.
Finnessey, James F.
Finney, Howard, III
Finney, Lawrence A.
Finney, Robert E.
Fipps, Roger E.
First, Ralph D.
Fischer, Robert W.
Fischetti, Patrick R.
Fish, Thomas E.
Fisher, Albert T.
Fisher, Arthur R.
Fisher, Farris C.
Fisher, George D.
Fisher, Gerald

- Fisher, Lawrence W. Freburger, Hamilton
Fisher, Ronald F. P., Jr.
Fisk, Billy E. Freda, James A.
Fitch, William E. H. Frederick, Joseph F.
III
Freeman, Don L.
Fites, Malcolm V. Freeman, George C.,
Fitzburgh, Alexander Jr.
R.
Freeman, Richard A.
Fitzgerald, Norman P. Freeze, Wayne E.
Jr. French, Kenneth G.
Fitzgerald, Paul N. Freudenberger, Victor
Fitzgerald, Edward F. D.
Fitzpatrick, Richard Friberg, James W.
E. Fridell, John R.
Fitzpatrick, Michael F. Friedman, Arthur D.
Flaherty, Ambrose E., Friend, Victor S., Jr.
Jr. Frisbie, Clark W.
Flanagan, Bruce Frisbie, H. R., Jr.
Flanagan, James W. Fritsch, Billy D.
Flanagan, John H. Fritsch, George W.
Flanagan, Lawrence J. Fritz, Martin F.
Fleck, William E. Fritzen, James W.
Fleming, James S. Frizzell, Glenn K.
Fleming, William M. Froemdsdorf, Douglas
Flemons, John L. M.
Fletcher, Edward S. Froncek, Richard A.
Flint, George, Jr. Frosch, Kenneth M.
Flora, Talbert T. Frudeger, Earl L.
Floren, Duane W. Fry, Charles H.
Florence, David W., Jr. Fry, Henry C.
Florence, John O. Fry, John H.
Florence, John W. Fry, Raymond S.
Floyd, Donald S. Fry, Robert L.
Floyd, James E. Fuellgraf, Charles L.,
Floyd, Joseph C. Jr.
Flynn, Alexander J. Fuiks, Jack D., Jr.
Jr. Fulcher, Lester M.
Flynn, James G. Fulham, Donald J.
Flynn, John J. Fuller, Bruce C.
Foerster, Henry Fuller, George E.
Fogarty, Richard A. Fuller, Thomas C.
Fogle, Rupert L. Fullerton, John, Jr.
Fojtlin, Louis Fulton, Samuel J.
Folck, Chester A. Fuqua, Calvin L.
Foley, Charles D., Jr. Gabriel, Douglas J.
Foley, John P. Gaffen, Malcolm C.
Foli, Victor Gaffney, Joseph I.
Folmar, Jesse G. Gaffney, Paul L.
Folsom, Arthur E. Gage, Carl, Jr.
Folsom, Charles A. Gagliardo, Joseph P.,
Fonburg, John D., Jr. Jr.
Fontenot, Karl J., Jr. Gajewski, Francis J.
Forbes, Arthur L., III Gale, John R.
Ford, Aubry P. Galisdorfer, John C.
Ford, Charles T. Gallagher, Eugene P.
Ford, Daniel J. Gallagher, James A.
Ford, Robert R. Gallagher, John H.
Fordham, Palmer B. Gallagher, Edward W.
Forrey, Wilmer H. Gallagher, John O.
Fortie, Ralph Gallagher, Edward P.
Fortine, Dale O. Galloway, Janice
Fortmeyer, Raymond Galloway, Jack J.
D. Galloway, William M.
Foster, Bennett P. Gambill, Malcolm W.
Foster, Carl C. Gamble, Ross M.
Foster, David L. Gambrel, James E.
Foster, Don M. Gamon, Albert T.
Foster, Richard H. Gandy, Robert R.
Foster, Richard M. Ganey, Thomas P.
Foster, Roger D. Gannon, Robert E.
Fournier, Norman D. Ganshow, Robert A.
Fow, Ben F., Jr. Gantt, Robert B.
Fowler, Charles C. Gardiner, Edward E.
Fowler, Frank R. Gardiner, Joseph C.,
Fowler, James V., Jr. Jr.
Fowler, Richard M. Gardner, Jack S.
Fowler, William H., Jr. Garity, Thomas H.
Fox, David W. Garlick, Ewing D.
Fox, John R. Garman, William E.
Francis, Paul Garretson, William B.
Francisco, Dwight R. Garrett, Donald J.
Frank, Philip T. Garrett, Elmer T., Jr.
Frank, Roger R. Garrett, Jonathan R.
Franklin, Quentin I. Garrison, Gerald W.
Franks, Robert B., Jr. Garrison, Raymond W.
Franz, Edgar R. Garrison, William W.
Frappollo, Paul S. Gartin, Luther E.
Fraser, Paul H. Gartrell, Craig B.
Fraser, Robert H. Garvey, William F., Jr.
Fray, Frank S. Garvin, James F.
- Gaskill, Howard H., Jr. Goodness, Paul J.
Gates, Hardy D. Goodsell, William J.
Gaughan, Peter J. Goodson, George O.,
Gaut, Donald L. Jr.
Gauvreau, David L. Goodwin, Robert E.
Gear, Joseph P., Jr. Gordon, Alexander J.,
Gearns, William J. III
Geddes, David G. Gordon, Bascom F. J.
Gehring, Lavaughn W. Gordon, Robert F.
Gehrsitz, Richard N. Gordon, Samuel F., Jr.
Geiger, William J. Gore, John W., Jr.
Gelhardt, Herbert G. Gorman, William B.,
III
Jr.
Genco, Henry L. Gormley, John D.
Gende, James J. Gott, Michael J.
Gentile, Vincent J. Goudelock, William F.
Gentry, Billy J. Gould, Edward P.
Gentry, George H. Gould, Gerald A.
Georgalas, Anastasius Gould, John F., Jr.
J., Jr. Gould, Stanley J.
George, Charles W. Gouty, Wayne G.
George, Gus J. Gower, Joseph W.
Geraghty, Ronald E. Gozigan, George
Gerding, Edward E. Grabinski, Bernard F.,
Gerichten, William S. Jr.
Germagian, Barker P. Gracie, George S., Jr.
German, Paul K., Jr. Gradl, Herbert M.
Gervais, Alfred A. Gragan, David E.
Getz, Richard E. Graham, Bruce E.
Geyer, George W., Jr. Graham, Edward T.,
Gibbons, James J. Jr.
Gibson, Charles R. Graham, Raymond H.
Gibson, James R. Graham, Robert E.
Gibson, John P., Jr. Graham, Robert B.
Giesel, Joseph R. Graham, Wallace H.
Giglio, William P. Graney, Thomas E.
Gilberg, Richard L. Gravel, Marcus J.
Gilbert, Clifford R. Gray, Alfred M., Jr.
Gilbert, Eugene W. Gray, Dwayne
Gile, Robert N. Gray, James C., III
Giles, Kenneth M. Gray, John S.
Gill, Bronislaus A. Gray, John G.
Gillen, John P. Gray, Thomas W.
Gilliam, Ronald R. Gray, Thomas F.
Gillick, Richard O. Green, Albert D.
Gillies, Warren D. Green, Allen J.
Gillis, James E. Green, Austin H.
Gillis, Paul A. Green, Billy R.
Gillis, Robert D. Green, Claude F.
Gillotti, Robert W. Green, Gordon G., Jr.
Gillum, Donald E. Green, Jack C.
Gilman, George L., Jr. Green, Leonard F.
Gilmore, Willis H., Jr. Green, Marlon R.
Gilstrap, Roderic W. Greene, Frank B.
Gimple, Walter L. Greene, John W.
Giordani, Paul R. Greene, Robert H.
Gipson, Sam M., Jr. Greene, Thomas H.
Gish, Raymon A. Greene, Vincent L.
Gjertsen, Harold G. Greenwood, John
Glaeser, Robert G. Greer, MacDerald
Glahn, John P., Jr. Greer, Roger W.
Glancy, Robert F. Greer, Thomas N., Jr.
Glasgow, Harold G. Gregerson, Johnny O.
Glass, James M. Gregory, Malcolm G.
Glattly, Charles D. Gregory, Rawley M.
Glaves, Virgil M. Gregory, Richard K.
Gleason, Louis E., Jr. Gregory, Robert O.
Glendrange, Theodor M.
Glenka, John M. Grekin, Norman
Glidden, Thomas T. Grenier, John E.
Glidewell, Clarence, Gresham, John F.
Jr. Griffin, John J.
Glist, Arnold R. Griffin, Thomas L., Jr.
Glynn, Thomas W. Griggs, Edwin B.
Goar, John W. Grimes, Ronald W.
Goddard, Carl D. Grimes, Sammy L.
Goelzer, Robert A., Jr. Grimm, Paul E.
Goeringer, Louis F. Grocott, John
Goers, Alvin H., Jr. Groeniger, William C.,
Goff, Richard C. III
Goggin, Thomas P. Groome, Edwin W.
Goldberg, Robert L. Grooms, Bernard D.
Golden, Laurence E. Grove, Bobby R.
Goldman, Donald Grunwald, Harry H.,
Gooch, Robert S. Jr.
Goodale, Richard W. Guarino, Frank, Jr.
Goodall, Robert L. Guay, Gerald F.
Goodin, James C. Guay, Robert P.
Goodman, Norman D. Gubany, Michael W.
- Guempel, Donald R. Harlow, Charles V., Jr.
Guidone, Frank J. Harman, Donnie N.
Guimond, Leon A. Harney, James P.
Gulas, Edward J. Harnick, Keith D.
Gulling, Louis A. Harp, James J.
Gunn, John A. Harper, Francis R., Jr.
Gunther, Donald E. Harper, Jack W.
Gurtner, Louis R. Harper, James C.
Gustafson, Warren H. Harrah, William F.
Gustafson, Walter C. Harrell, Charles S.
Gustitis, Bernard V. Harrington, James A.
Guter, Joseph G. Harris, Charles J.
Haaker, William E. Harris, Charles F.
Habash, Lewis C. Harris, Clifford P., Jr.
Haberman, James D. Harris, Frederick L.
Hackett, Eugene D. Harris, George C., Jr.
Hackler, Kent C. Harris, James S.
Hackman, Alfred J. Harris, James R.
Haddock, Thomas R. Harris, James B.
Hafeman, William C. Harris, John C.
Hafey, Robert J., Jr. Harris, John B.
Hafley, David L. Harris, Ramsey V.
Hagaman, Harry T. Harris, Rex E.
Hagan, Frank E., Jr. Harris, Richard M.
Hagel, Norman B. Harris, William C., Jr.
Hagen, Jerome T. Harris, Winfred F.
Haggard, Robert G. Harrison, Charles L.
Haggerty, John G. Harrison, Freddy D.
Hahn, Billy N. Harrison, Richard F.
Hahn, John S. Harry, Lawrence E.
Hale, Nathan S. Hart, Albert E., Jr.
Hales, Noel J. Hart, Henry J.
Haley, John A., Jr. Hart, James M.
Haley, Lawrence A. G. Hart, Joseph E.
Haley, Wendell E. Hart, Leo T.
Hall, Bobby R. Hart, Rudy J.
Hall, Douglas W. Hartley, William H.
Hall, Edward E. Hartwick, John A.
Hall, Howard H. Harvey, Charles R.
Hall, James D., Jr. Harvey, Donald L.
Hall, Paul W. Harvey, James W., Jr.
Hall, Walter G., Jr. Harwood, Russell M.
Hall, Wilmer R. Hasemeyer, Clyde R.
Hallisey, Michael J., III
Hallisey, William J.,
Jr.
Hallowan, Thomas L. Hassall, James W.
Hamby, Ronald L. Haskins, Francis W.
Hamer, Myron C. Haskins, Harold J.
Hamilton, Alexander Haske, Robert F.
S., III
Hamilton, Carl D. Haskins, Sidney S.
Hamilton, John A. Haslam, Charles B.
Hammel, Charles F. Hassam, Eugene N.
Hammond, Orrin B. Hasse, Otto K.
Hampton, Richard R. Hasse, Robert F.
Hanafin, Roger A. Hasselfeldt, Ronald G.
Hane, John D. Hastings, Albert W.
Hanford, Norbert N. Hastings, John T.
Hanlon, Edward E.,
Jr. Hastings, Paul F.
Hanlon, Joseph H. Hastings, Paul G.
Hanmore, Robert C. Hatch, Richard L.
Hannan, Richard D. Hatch, Robert D.
Hannegan, Richard T. Hatfield, David M.
Hanniff, George E. Hathaway, George B.
Hannon, Robert E. Hatzilambrou, Lam-
Hannum, James A. bros
Hansberry, John J. Hauck, Walter R.
Hanscom, Richard J. Haviland, Harold D.
Hansen, David A. Hawkey, William S.,
Hansen, Gunnar O. Jr.
Hanson, James W. Hawkins, David H.
Hanson, Robert B. Hawkins, Harold E.
Hanson, Robert H. Hawkins, Lawrence R.
Hardacker, Nelson S.,
Jr. Hawkins, Robert G.
Hardy, Gordon W. Hawley, Richard L.
Hardin, Harley S. Haws, Virgil B.
Hardin, Robert L. Hawthorne, Walter E.,
Hardt, Lloyd E. Jr.
Hardy, Tom K., Jr. Hawthorne, Thomas P.
Hare, Othello O., Jr. Hayden, Dale L.
Hargadine, Walter W. Hayden, William K.,
Hargrove, Alton J. III
Hargrove, Arthur W. Haydock, Robert A.
Harkey, Herbert J., Jr. Hayes, Philip S.
Harkey, John N. C. Hayes, Raymond J., Jr.
Harkins, Daniel D. Hayes, Thomas J., Jr.
Harlan, Gale Hazen, Charles E.
Hazen, Clifford H.

Heacox, William J.
 Head, Joe M.
 Healy, Donald J.
 Healy, Martin J.
 Heap, Virgil I.
 Hearn, James R.
 Hearn, Thomas M.
 Heath, Francis J., Jr.
 Heath, Webster C.
 Hebson, Kenneth L.
 Hecht, Leon, Jr.
 Heckenhauer, John F.
 Hedden, Robert W.
 Hedges, Richard C.
 Hedin, John A.
 Hedloff, Richard J.
 Heering, David P.
 Heesch, Robert W.
 Heffernan, Michael A.
 Heffley, Henry S., Jr.
 Hefty, Milton T.
 Hegyi, Stephen J.
 Heidkamp, George L.
 Heidt, George L., Jr.
 Heintz, William H.
 Heintzelman, John E.
 Heist, Lewis C.
 Heitner, John A.
 Helm, Wallace H.
 Helsel, James F.
 Helsing, Paul M.
 Helton, Herbert J.
 Hemenway, Porter A.
 Hemmingway, Richard E.
 Hemphill, Meredith, Jr.
 Henderson, Walter J.
 Hendricks, James W.
 Hendricks, Robert G., Jr.
 Hendricksen, Milan B.
 Henley, Robert J.
 Henn, Howard R.
 Hennegan, Joseph E.
 Hennelly, John A.
 Henner, Dale E.
 Hennessy, George M.
 Hennessy, John A.
 Henney, Howard E.
 Henriksen, Paul H.
 Henry, Charles W., Jr.
 Henry, Clark G.
 Henry, Eugene J.
 Henry, Gaylord L.
 Henry, John O., Jr.
 Henry, John P.
 Henry, Wilson W.
 Henson, Ronald A.
 Henson, William E.
 Hentz, Albert G.
 Herber, John C.
 Herbert, Clayton G., Jr.
 Herbruck, Walter H.
 Herbst, Richard W.
 Herman, George C.
 Herndon, Gerald G.
 Herriotts, Charles I.
 Herron, David G.
 Herron, Robert S.
 Hershey, Rodger E.
 Hertz, James O.
 Herzog, William F.
 Hessel, Allan J.
 Hetterich, Joseph A., Jr.
 Hettich, David J.
 Heyn, George R., Jr.
 Hitchborn, Hal D.
 Hieber, George A.
 Hielscher, Dalton W.
 Higbie, Donald M.
 Higginbotham, Charles W.
 Higgins, Grove L.
 Higgins, James G.
 Higgins, James H.
 Hight, Peter G.
 Hightin, William J.
 Hilbish, Joseph M., Jr.
 Hill, Arthur S.
 Hill, Billy J.
 Hillyard, Gordon L.
 Hills, Donald W.
 Himmer, Donald R.
 Himmerich, Robert T.
 Hinchman, John S.
 Hine, Richard B.
 Hines, Jack D.
 Hines, Julian R.
 Hines, Robert G.
 Hippler, Rollin E.
 Hirlinger, Charles L.
 Hirsch, Henry, II
 Hirschfeld, Thomas J.
 Hise, Howard L.
 Hissong, John D.
 Hite, Harry W.
 Hittle, Kenneth E.
 Hiza, Michael J., Jr.
 Hoag, Harry L.
 Hoag, John N.
 Hoagland, George T.
 Hobbs, Billy H.
 Hoblit, Robert E.
 Hoch, Louis A., Jr.
 Hochull, Robert H.
 Hocking, Floyd D.
 Hodge, Roy B.
 Hodges, Ervin E.
 Hoefling, Eugene A.
 Hoefling, Thomas J.
 Hoesly, James R.
 Hoever, John H., Jr.
 Hoffert, Duwayne W.
 Hoffman, Robert C.
 Hoffmann, John G.
 Hoffmeister, Jack A.
 Hoffner, Charles W.
 Hofstetter, Robert E.
 Hogan, John J.
 Hogue, Truman C., Jr.
 Hojnacki, David M.
 Holden, John F.
 Holdridge, Forrest B.
 Hoken, Marvin L.
 Holesves, Robert L.
 Holland, Jack
 Hollingshead, John S.
 Hollis, John S.
 Holly, Eamon P.
 Holman, John E.
 Holmes, Joel H.
 Holmes, Lee M.
 Holmes, Page H.
 Holmsen, Theodore W.
 Holst, Donald L.
 Holt, Gilbert S.
 Holt, Ralph P.
 Holt, Richard H.
 Holzinger, Bernard E.
 Homewood, Frederick H.
 Homire, James L., Jr.
 Hood, David W.
 Hook, Robert A.
 Hookey, Robert J.
 Hooper, Bruce H.
 Hoornbeek, Frank K.
 Hoover, Francis H.
 Hope, James A.
 Hopkins, Johns, Jr.
 Hopkins, Joseph M.
 Hopper, Richard F.
 Horais, Walter G.
 Horan, Leonard F.
 Horlacher, David E.
 Horn, Robert D.
 Horne, Ivan F.
 Horner, Edward S., Jr.
 Horton, Robert G., Jr.
 Hossli, Carl C.
 Hosty, John R.
 Hotchkiss, Gerald G., Jr.
 House, William E., Jr.
 Houston, Stanley S.
 Hout, Robert G.
 Howde, Leroy L.
 Hovey, Louis M., Jr.
 Howard, Benson F.
 Howard, Jack H.
 Howard, John G.
 Howard, John S.
 Howarth, Darrell L.
 Howe, Bradley W.
 Howe, James F.
 Howell, David W.
 Howell, William K.
 Hower, Raymond R.
 Howle, William O.
 Howren, Donald R.
 Howson, Robert E.
 Hoxie, Robert F.
 Hoxsey, James J.
 Hubbs, Howard L.
 Huber, Leonard E.
 Huckle, Richard A.
 Huddleston, Charles P. W.
 Hudson, Jack J.
 Hudson, Russell I.
 Huerlimann, Ernest A., Jr.
 Huerta, Genaro
 Huffman, John A.
 Hughes, Arlie P.
 Hughes, Drewry T., Jr.
 Hughes, Louis S., Jr.
 Hughes, Nathaniel C., Jr.
 Huguenin, Sidney A., Jr.
 Huizenga, Elmer F.
 Hukle, Edward J.
 Hultman, Earl C.
 Humphrey, Donald L.
 Humphrey, Jack W.
 Humphreys, Richard H.
 Hunkele, Theophile J.
 Hunkins, Thomas L.
 Hunt, John D.
 Hunter, Antone P.
 Hunter, Bobby G.
 Hunter, Charles W.
 Hunter, Earl R.
 Hunter, Harold J.
 Hunter, Jack E.
 Hunter, Maurice
 Huntley, Charles N., Jr.
 Huntzinger, Ralph A.
 Hurd, Archer D.
 Hurst, James J.
 Huston, Wayne B.
 Hutchins, Walter P.
 Hutchinson, Myles H.
 Hutchinson, Robert N.
 Hutchinson, Kenneth P.
 Hutchison, Gerald J.
 Hutchison, Donald D.
 Hutson, Albert F.
 Hutter, Harold H., Jr.
 Hyatt, John K., Jr.
 Hyland, Richard L.
 Hyland, Robert C., Jr.
 Hyndman, Gerald H.
 Hyslop, Kenneth D.
 Iannuzzelli, Vincent F.
 Ihli, Leo J.
 Ilig, Harvey G.
 Incontro, Sam J.
 Ingman, Kenneth R.
 Ingram, Keith S., Jr.
 Ippedico, Joseph V.
 Irion, John W., Jr.
 Irish, James F.
 Irons, Milton E.
 Irvine, Eugene C.
 Irving, Walter H.
 Ison, Lee F.
 Istel, Jacques A.
 Iverson, Alfred J.
 Iverson, Rhonald D.
 Iverson, Ronald L.
 Ivey, Aaron C.
 Jachimczyk, George M.
 Jackson, Barry W.
 Jackson, Claude S.
 Jackson, Edwin F.
 Jackson, Harold L., Jr.
 Jackson, James W.
 Jackson, Jared J.
 Jackson, Lawrence B.
 Jackson, Robert D.
 Jackson, Thomas
 Jacobs, James P.
 Jacobs, Merrill M.
 Jacobs, Walter D.
 Jacobsen, Hans W., Jr.
 Jacobsen, Richard C.
 Jacobson, Douglas T.
 Jacobson, Lawrence L.
 Jacobson, Raymond
 Jaksina, Stanley C.
 Jameison, Timothy C.
 James, Charles A.
 James, Erich W.
 James, John H.
 Jameson, Robert D.
 Janecsek, Lionell J.
 Jarboe, John M., Jr.
 Jarman, Lewis W.
 Jarnot, Fidelas W.
 Jeffery, Richard D.
 Jeffreys, Gilbert V.
 Jelly, Thomas J.
 Jellison, Harold M., Jr.
 Jenkins, Robert E.
 Jenkins, Robert M.
 Jenkins, Samuel L.
 Jenks, Harry E., II
 Jenks, Thomas E.
 Jennings, Charles H.
 Jennings, Richard
 Jenny, Thomas G.
 Jensen, Clayne R.
 Jensen, James C.
 Jensen, John D.
 Jerabek, Milton H.
 Jerome, William J., Jr.
 Jerrell, James D.
 Johansen, Gerald C.
 John, Carl F.
 John, Edward S.
 Johnson, Addison J.
 Johnson, Albert D.
 Johnson, Albert J.
 Johnson, Andrew H., Jr.
 Johnson, Brooks, Jr.
 Johnson, Charlie P.
 Johnson, Clifford H.
 Johnson, David H.
 Johnson, Donald H.
 Johnson, Edward C.
 Johnson, Floyd J., Jr.
 Johnson, Frederick S.
 Johnson, George A.
 Johnson, George D.
 Johnson, George E.
 Johnson, Harvey B.
 Johnson, Herbert L.
 Johnson, Herschel L., Jr.
 Johnson, Howell J.
 Johnson, James P.
 Johnson, James T.
 Johnson, John P.
 Johnson, Lee R.
 Johnson, Lyle R.
 Johnson, Mannon A., Jr.
 Johnson, Oliver K., Jr.
 Johnson, Paul K.
 Johnson, Peter G.
 Johnson, Reid L.
 Johnson, Robert A.
 Johnson, Robert S.
 Johnson, Roy L.
 Johnson, Thomas R.
 Johnson, Wilbur E.
 Johnston, Charles A., Jr.
 Johnston, David M.
 Johnston, Homer R.
 Johnston, John A.
 Johnston, Paul M.
 Jones, Edwin R.
 Jones, Franklin H., Jr.
 Jones, Gordon R.
 Jones, Gordon E.
 Jones, Jack D.
 Jones, James J.
 Jones, Joseph F.
 Jones, Robert C.
 Jones, Robert Dwayne
 Jones, Robert Duane
 Jones, Robert Earl
 Jones, Robert Edward
 Jones, Robert F.
 Jones, Robert I.
 Jones, Robert K.
 Jones, Robert T.
 Jones, Robert W. G.
 Jones, Therin H.
 Jones, Thomas H.
 Jones, Vernon E.
 Jones, Wendell W.
 Jones, Whitley A.
 Joos, Robert J.
 Jordahl, Joseph S.
 Jordan, Floyd N.
 Jordan, James T.
 Jordan, John C.
 Jordan, Joseph P.
 Jordan, Robert D.
 Jordan, Thomas E.
 Jordan, William L.
 Jorgensen, Harry S., Jr.
 Jorgensen, George N.
 Joy, Lester H.
 Joyce, Danna
 Joyce, George E.
 Joynor, William K.
 Judy, Paul R.
 Julian, Martin D.
 Jurinski, John N.
 Jurkovich, Mark T., Jr.
 Justice, Harold E.
 Kaasmann, Bernard A.
 Kachergis, Alfred P.
 Kachulis, Louis C.
 Kahler, Richard W.
 Kain, Edward W.
 Kalita, Walter J.
 Kalus, Thomas
 Kammeyer, Willard R.
 Kane, Edward L., Jr.
 Kane, Thomas A.
 Kansier, Raymond H.
 Kantorowski, Henry P.
 Karker, Floyd A., Jr.
 Karpfinger, Barnabas
 Karski, John J.
 Kasanof, Anton N.
 Kash, Steven N.
 Kaufman, James D.
 Kazlauskas, William J.
 Keagle, Byron W.
 Keane, John E.
 Keast, Donald G.
 Keast, James D.
 Keeling, Arlen D.
 Keeling, Harold J.
 Keenan, William M.
 Keene, Gerald A.
 Keffer, Karl, III
 Kehoe, James P.
 Kehoe, Lawrence O.
 Keightley, Charles C.
 Keimling, Herbert S., Jr.
 Keister, Charles F.
 Keith, William H.
 Keller, Albert W.
 Keller, Dale H.
 Kelley, Bobby L.
 Kelley, Donald F.
 Kelley, Floyd P.
 Kelley, Jennings D.
 Kelley, Samuel G., Jr.
 Kelly, Bradley H.
 Kelly, David A.
 Kelly, Donald G.
 Kelly, Edward L., Jr.
 Kelly, Edwin F.
 Kelly, John F. J.
 Kelly, Joseph T., Jr.
 Kelly, Mortimer J., Jr.
 Kelly, Robert T.
 Kelly, Thomas E., Jr.
 Kelly, Thomas J.
 Kelm, Robert G.
 Kemp, Ralph C.
 Kemper, Richard J.
 Kendrick, Harold L.
 Kendrick, William M.
 Kennedy, Paul T.
 Kennedy, Raymond G.
 Kennedy, Thomas D.
 Kennedy, Thomas L.
 Kennedy, William B., Jr.
 Kennon, John W.
 Kenny, William F., III
 Kent, Brian B.
 Kent, Donald R.
 Kent, James A., Jr.
 Keogh, Paul E.
 Keoughan, Sidney F., Jr.
 Kepcke, Paul L., Jr.
 Kern, Richard J.
 Kester, John K.
 Keyes, Gerald W.
 Kiely, Jack K.
 Kiernan, Francis R.
 Kiernan, James J.
 Kiggen, John A., III
 Kilcarr, Andrew J.
 Kilduff, Charles E.
 Kiley, Eugene F.
 Kiley, Paul C.
 Killam, George R.
 Kilmer, Erich V. N.
 Kimball, Alan B.
 King, Charles A., Jr.
 King, Jackson T.
 King, John W.
 King, Milton S.
 King, Robert V.
 King, William T., Jr.
 King, William R.
 Kinniburgh, John A.
 Kiraly, George, Jr.
 Kirby, Jerome R., Jr.
 Kirch, Jacob, Jr.
 Kirincic, Joseph J., Jr.
 Kirk, Bruce P.
 Kirk, James W.
 Kirkman, Donald I.
 Kirkpatrick, Richard H.
 Kison, Daniel J.
 Kisten, Stuart D.
 Kistler, Frederick C.
 Kittler, Simon J.
 Kitzinger, Joseph A.
 Klaybor, Stanley J., Jr.
 Klefeker, Joseph A.
 Klein, Herbert H.
 Klein, James E.
 Klein, Robert D.
 Klepek, Benjamin
 Klinedinst, James C.
 Klisiewicz, Edward R.
 Knapp, Charles W.
 Kneale, Charles R.
 Kneuss, James K., Jr.
 Knight, Charles W.
 Knobel, William H.
 Knox, Bruce E.
 Knudson, Charles C., Jr.
 Kobel, Robert P.
 Koch, Edward T., Jr.
 Koch, William C., Jr.
 Koelper, Donald E.
 Koethe, Frank R.
 Kohanowich, Albert J.
 Kohler, Alfred G.
 Kohler, William L.

- Kohlhoff, Henry W.
Koleber, Leroy E.
Kolling, Donald E.
Kolva, George Y.
Kominus, Nicholas A., Jr.
Konopka, Stanley J., Jr.
Koppenhaver, Howard M.
Kosanke, James E.
Koscs, Nicholas
Koss, Robert J.
Kotchick, Joseph R.
Kothman, Francis A., Jr.
Kotomski, Joseph T.
Kovach, John, Jr.
Kramer, Anthony W.
Kramer, Milton C.
Kramer, Raymond H.
Kramer, William K.
Krass, Edward S.
Krause, Albert C.
Krauss, Richard L., Jr.
Kravet, Robert D.
Kraynak, John P.
Krege, Raymond M.
Kritzler, Charles A.
Kroeger, Henry R.
Kroloff, Kirk
Kronholm, Conrad J., Jr.
Kroonen, Jack W.
Krueger, Robert B.
Krugh, Robert C.
Krygowski, Eugene E.
Kucharski, Charles R., Jr.
Kuci, Richard A.
Kudart, Ronald A.
Kuehl, William B.
Kuhn, Harold F.
Kuhn, Rolf O.
Kull, Frederick J.
Kummerow, Ray G.
Kutchmarek, Jene R.
Kwiatkowski, Joseph D.
Kyle, John S.
Labarbera, John V.
Ladd, Clayton E.
Lafever, Harry L.
Lafin, Albert A.
Laird, Robert B.
Lake, Fred L., III
Lamarre, Ronald
Lamekovski, Nick R.
Lamm, Mack A.
Lamont, Delbert E.
Lanotte, Homer A.
Lanahan, William J.
Land, Henry L., Jr.
Landers, James H., Jr.
Landrigan, Robert
Landy, Richard P.
Lang, Robert H.
Laning, Edward A.
Lannan, Ronald J.
Laporte, Alphonse A., Jr.
Lappetito, Paul W.
LaPreese, Eugene R.
LaPresto, Ralph F.
Largay, Henry C., Jr.
Larghey, Peter J.
Larkin, James T.
Larkin, Michael M.
Larsen, Robert R.
Larson, Roger R.
Lasauskas, William P.
Lasota, Franklin E.
Lassoe, Peter B.
Latempa, Henry J., Jr.
Latimer, Richard L.
Laubach, Ellis K.
Lavigne, Arthur W. D.
Lawendowski, John J.
Laws, Robert B.
Lawler, George P.
Lawler, Lawrence E.
- Lawlor, Joseph T.
Lawrence, Charles W., III
Lawrence, George M., Jr.
Lawrence, Richard T.
Lawrence, Rodney O.
Lawrence, Samuel F.
Lawson, Herbert B.
Lay, Francis A.
Layne, Donald Q.
Lazzo, James W.
Lea, William P., Jr.
Leahy, Raymond H.
Leathers, Robert L.
Leavitt, Edward J.
Leavitt, James N.
Leavy, Horace J.
Lebas, Maurice A.
Leberz, James E.
LeBlanc, Leo J., Jr.
LeCrone, George S.
Ledbetter, Archibald C.
Lee, Edwin A.
Lee, George
Lee, Richard J., Jr.
Lee, Robert W.
Lee, Robert E.
Lee, Thomas I.
Lee, Tony G.
Leer, John D.
Leeves, Edward J.
Leftwich, William G., Jr.
LeGrand, Maurice G. J.
Leh, Marcus K.
Leibovitz, Herbert A.
Leisy, Robert R.
LeLouis, Edward C., Jr.
Lemley, William A.
Lenihan, John D.
Lennen, Harry T.
Lennon, Frank J.
Lenz, Robert R.
Leonard, Roger D.
Leone, Kenneth L.
Lepp, Joseph R.
Lepper, Francis D.
Lesser, Paul A., Jr.
Lester, Jimmie D.
Leve, Harvey A.
Levin, Harold W.
Levine, Thomas C.
Lewis, Edwin B.
Lewis, Harold E.
Lewis, James L.
Lewis, John C.
Lewis, Richard J.
Lewis, Robert H.
Lewis, Richard T.
Lewis, Robert W.
Lewis, Robert E.
Lewis, Robert Hilton
Lyles, Walter A.
Libby, Robert G.
Libby, Robert M. G.
Lichtenwalter, Eugene
Liddle, Chester A., Jr.
Lien, Ronald L.
Lifset, Edward W.
Light, William H., Jr.
Likens, Eugene E.
Lilley, James W.
Lilley, Neil H.
Lilly, Roy A.
Limbach, Walter R.
Lincoln, Thomas G., Jr.
Lindell, Clifford A.
Lindell, Glenn R.
Lindley, Ronald E.
Lindsay, Prentice A.
Lindsay, Robert O.
Lindsey, Joe A.
Lindsley, Charles H.
Linsteadt, Donald F.
Lippold, Orville V., Jr.
Litchfield, Kenneth J.
- Little, Eugene E., Jr.
Little, Jack L.
Litty, Robert D.
Litzenberger, Earle D.
Litzenberg, Homer L., III
Ljungberg, David E.
Lofton, Charles E.
Lloyd, Elroy E.
Lobo, Walter R.
Lockard, Edwin W.
Lockett, David M.
Lockhart, William C., Jr.
Lodwick, David D.
Loeb, Louis S.
Lofgreen, Ted L.
Lofton, James F.
Loftus, James A.
Logan, Thomas G.
Logie, Donald Q.
Lokker, Robert W.
Lonergan, Harold S.
Long, Larry S.
Long, Russell P., Jr.
Lono, Luther A.
Looney, George M.
Looney, Lamar K., Jr.
Looney, Thomas A., Jr.
Loper, Robert E.
Lorenz, Henry J.
Losee, Ronald M.
Losten, John
Louder, Joseph J.
Loughlin, Donald J.
Loughran, Anthony H.
Loui, Herbert H. K.
Love, Edgar J.
Love, Edwin L.
Love, Erno G.
Love, John C.
Loving, Robert L.
Lovullo, Joseph A.
Lowe, Clyde T.
Lown, Robert G.
Lowndes, John F.
Lowrey, Horace S., Jr.
Lowry, William M.
Loy, Lorán D.
Lubin, Irvin
Luccarini, Louis J.
Luce, Donald L.
Lucket, Jackson R.
Luffkin, Dan W.
Lugger, Marvin H.
Luley, Ronald E.
Lumpkin, Aubrey L.
Lund, Lloyd L.
Lundbeck, Lawrence W.
Lundberg, Donald R.
Lunsford, William T.
Lurkins, John F.
Lutes, George W., Jr.
Lutz, Theodore J., Jr.
Lyles, George R.
Lyles, James H.
Lynch, Barry E.
Lynch, Daniel F.
Lynch, Francis J., Jr.
Lynch, Kevin P.
Lynch, Richard A.
Lynch, Ronald J.
Lynch, Walker R.
Lyon, C. Bentley
Lyon, James A.
Lyons, Robert J.
Lyons, Robert D.
Lytle, William V.
Maas, Bertram A.
MacAlpine, Donald B.
Maccini, Leonard G.
MacDonald, Robert E. Jr.
MacDonald, Herman A., Jr.
MacDonald, Glenn A.
MacDonell, Angus G.
MacDougall, Robert H., Jr.
Mace, Robert I.
MacEwan, Eldridge J.
- MacInnis, Joseph A.
Macko, Jack
MacLean, Angus L., Jr.
MacLeod, Joseph L., Jr.
MacMichael, David C.
Macy, Arthur A.
Macy, William T.
Madden, Byron E.
Madden, John
Maddox, George F.
Madera, Leroy A.
Madigan, William J.
Madison, Bennet S.
Madory, Richard E.
Madsen, Roy E.
Magee, Charles F., Jr.
Magee, James R.
Magee, Robert J.
Maggio, Salvatore A.
Maginnis, Paul F.
Maglione, Ben S., Jr.
Magnusson, Carl A., Jr.
Maher, Brian E.
Mahler, Frederic C.
Mahlin, Edward A.
Mahoney, Thomas H.
Mainland, Keith F.
Mainzer, Francis K.
Mals, Raymond S.
Malmgren, Everett L.
Malone, Gordon E.
Malone, Richard J.
Maloney, John H.
Malovich, Arthur D.
Manchester, Leslie D.
Mandery, John C.
Mandula, John C.
Manfre, Salvatore F.
Manhard, Albert H., Jr.
Manhart, Doyle B.
Manion, John W.
Manion, Joseph E., Jr.
Manley, William E.
Mann, Bennie H., Jr.
Mann, John W.
Mann, Mitchell M.
Mann, Ralph G.
Manning, James P.
Manning, Kenneth C.
Manning, Martin F., Jr.
Manning, William J.
Mannix, Edward V., Jr.
Mannix, Gerald J.
Manoogian, Norman V.
Mansell, Richard L.
Marable, James L.
Marcus, John C.
Mardis, Wayne F.
Marhofer, John G.
Markle, John, Jr.
Marohn, Marvin A.
Marques, Preston P., Jr.
Marren, Martin J., Jr.
Marsh, John C.
Marshall, Echol S., Jr.
Marshall, Henry R., III
Martin, Charles A.
Martin, Humphrey J.
Martin, James A.
Martin, James R.
Martin, Lawson E.
Martin, Manuel J.
Martin, Richard L.
Martin, Robert W., Jr.
Martin, Robert L., Jr.
Martin, Theodore L., Jr.
Martin, Thomas M.
Martin, William F.
Martin, William Q.
Martinielli, Joseph W.
Marting, Henry A.
Marts, Austin M.
Martson, Richard L.
Maryanski, Bernard J.
- Mash, Virgil L.
Maska, Edwin C.
Mason, Floyd S., Jr.
Mason, John C.
Mason, Lawrence M.
Mason, William P., III
Massanopoli, Paul
Massen, Donald G.
Massey, Lonnie M.
Massidda, William R.
Masters, William A.
Masterson, Frank C., Jr.
Masucci, Louis P.
Matchetts, John P.
Maten, Robert J.
Matheson, John R.
Mathews, William H.
Mathias, Robert B.
Mathysengerst, Koennraad E.
Matlack, Walter L., Jr.
Matthews, Jeter R., Jr.
Mattson, Gilbert B., Jr.
Maurer, Donn W.
Maurer, Robert T.
Maxwell, Glenn K.
Maxwell, Hurdle L.
May, Bernard F. R.
May, David H.
May, Francis T.
Mayer, Donald F.
Mayer, Gerald S.
Mayer, Jonas H., Jr.
Mayhew, Donald K.
Mayock, Robert S., II
Mazerov, Paul H.
Mazmanian, Edward M.
Mazzurca, Val S.
McAdams, Donald J.
McAllin, John H. P.
McAllister, C. C., Jr.
McAneny, Alan M.
McAuliffe, Lawrence C.
McAuliffe, Andrew M., Jr.
McAuslan, Barnaby W. Jr.
McBrayer, William L.
McBride, Frederick J. H.
McBride, Glenn E.
McCabe, Michael N.
McCabe, Morley E.
McCafferty, John J.
McCaffrey, Joseph J.
McCaman, Wallace
McCamey, Robert E., II
McCan, Claude K., Jr.
McCandless, John R.
McCann, Henry J.
McCarthy, Eugene C.
McCarthy, Joseph J.
McCarthy, Joseph E.
McCarthy, Robert L.
McCarthy, Theodore C., Jr.
McCarty, Howard J.
McCasin, Donald G.
McCauley, Bertram W. E.
McCauley, Eugene H., Jr.
McClarín, William H., Jr.
McClatchey, John F.
McClearen, John M.
McClellan, William O., Jr.
McClelland, Oliver H.
McCleskey, Francis R.
McClistock, Charles H., Jr.
McCloskey, Gerald L.
McCloy, Frank T.
McClure, Lewis F.
McCluskey, John C.
McCluskey, William T.
McConnell, Richard R.
McConnell, Warren M.
McCormac, Charles E.
- McCormick, Robert W.
McCormick, Thomas P., Jr.
McCormick, Cecil N.
McCormick, James G.
McCormick, James T.
McCoy, Donald R.
McCracken, William J.
McCreery, Lew E.
McCreight, Jack D.
McCurdy, Kenneth F.
McDaniel, Gary A.
McDermott, Arthur T.
McDonald, Daniel V.
McDonald, Donald T.
McDonald, Everett R.
McDonald, John J., Jr.
McDonald, Richard C.
McDonald, Robert J.
McDonough, John J.
McDonough, John F.
McDougal, Jack P.
McDougall, Robert W.
McDowell, Thomas D.
McElheny, Ralph A.
McElroy, Gerald J.
McEwan, Frederick J.
McFadden, Orville A.
McFarland, Robert L.
McGahan, James F.
McGarry, James P.
McGee, John P.
McGee, William R.
McGihon, Glenn E.
McGillcuddy, Paul W.
McGinnis, Rolland S.
McGlasson, James C.
McGlone, Vincent P.
McGovern, Raymond D.
McGowin, Norman F., Jr.
McGrane, Lawrence M.
McGrath, Cletus P.
McGreen, Michael J.
McGrew, Wayne D., Jr.
McGuane, William N.
McGuire, James F.
McHenry, Byron K.
McHugh, Patrick J.
McInerney, John J.
McInnis, Robert W.
McIntyre, Philip G.
McIver, Donald J.
McKay, Charles I.
McKay, Conrad L.
McKay, David N.
McKee, Richard C.
McKee, Roland D.
McKellar, Robert E.
McKenney, Tom C.
McKenzie, Robert W.
McKibben, Mason E., Jr.
McKillop, William D.
McLane, Donald C., Jr.
McLaughlin, Charles E.
McLaughlin, Richard B.
McLaughlin, Leighton B., II
McLean, Austin J.
McLean, Robert D.
McLellan, Howard S., Jr.
McLendon, Charles R.
McLendon, Luther A., Jr.
McLoughlin, Martin P.
McLoughlin, Hubert P.
McLoughlin, John J.
McMahon, Robert A.
McManus, Walter J.
McMillan, David R., Jr.

McMillan, William W., Jr.
 McMonagle, James J.
 McMullen, Harold J.
 McNair, William G.
 McNally, Charles B.
 McNamara, John T.
 McNamee, John F.
 McNary, John H.
 McNeill, Charles S.
 McNeill, George S.
 McNussen, Ned E.
 McPartlin, James W.
 McPeak, Jack D.
 McPhail, Clark B.
 McPhail, Larry K.
 McSherry, Joseph M., Jr.
 McSorley, Arthur, Jr.
 McWhirt, Jimmie L., Sr.
 McWhorter, Fonville, Jr.
 Meaney, Thomas P., Jr.
 Mears, William G., Jr.
 Medina, Antonio
 Medis, James W.
 Meehan, Charles M.
 Meehan, Joseph F., Jr.
 Meek, Earl C.
 Meler, Orval
 Meler, Robert H.
 Meindl, Allen P.
 Meisenheimer, Robert E.
 Melfi, Robert
 Mellis, Frank J.
 Melly, Lee T., Jr.
 Meloche, Donald L.
 Mennig, George H., Jr.
 Mercer, Frank W., Jr.
 Mercer, Willis J.
 Meredith, Robert C.
 Mergens, Edward H.
 Merola, Armando J.
 Merrick, Richard J.
 Merrill, John R.
 Merrill, Richard R.
 Merrill, Will A.
 Mertes, David H., Jr.
 Mertz, Edward P.
 Merwin, Miles P.
 Metas, John G.
 Metcalfe, Richard T.
 Metskas, Thomas S.
 Metzko, John J.
 Meyer, Frederick W.
 Meyer, George W.
 Meyer, Kenneth H.
 Meyer, Richard L.
 Meyer, Robert G.
 Meyer, William A.
 Meyers, George E.
 Meyers, John F.
 Meyers, Robert E., Jr.
 Meza, Raymond C.
 Michael, John E.
 Michaels, William R.
 Michel, Thomas F.
 Michelet, Allen H.
 Michot, William H.
 Mickle, Don A.
 Middleton, Willis D.
 Mies, Peter M.
 Mies, Richard C.
 Mignardot, George C.
 Miguel, Jarvis G.
 Mihailides, Emmanuel
 Mikelson, Charles L.
 Mikulics, Michael C.
 Milbrad, Robert L.
 Miles, Hubert D.
 Millard, John R.
 Miller, Earl F.
 Miller, Edison W.
 Miller, Edmund H.
 Miller, Edward A.
 Miller, Gerald J.
 Miller, Hubert E.
 Miller, James W.
 Miller, Jesse A.
 Miller, John H.
 Miller, Murray J.
 Miller, Raymond O.
 Miller, Richard M.
 Miller, Robert A.
 Miller, Robert Baker
 Miller, Robert Borris
 Miller, Robert D.
 Miller, Robert H.
 Miller, Robert K.
 Miller, Rodney W.
 Miller, Roger D.
 Miller, Rufus B.
 Miller, Thomas F.
 Miller, Thomas L.
 Miller, Willard E.
 Miller, William, Jr.
 Miller, William S., Jr.
 Miller, William E.
 Millett, Elmer W.
 Millett, Chester J., Jr.
 Milligan, James F.
 Millikin, Dudley L., Jr.
 Mills, Lewis L.
 Milner, Emil A.
 Minica, Jack L.
 Minor, Lewis D.
 Misenhimer, Joy B., Jr.
 Mitchell, Frank H., Jr.
 Mitchell, Farrell J.
 Mitchell, Joseph P., Jr.
 Mitchell, John F.
 Mitchell, Louis L., Jr.
 Mitchell, Mack E.
 Mitchell, Wilfred G.
 Mitchell, William J., Jr.
 Modzelewski, Edward R.
 Moeder, Joseph A.
 Moehle, Albert B.
 Moehlenkamp, Donald E.
 Moeller, Alwin L., Jr.
 Moeller, Gordon G.
 Moeller, Richard L.
 Moen, Charles H.
 Moffett, Bobby G.
 Moise, Michael F.
 Molineux, Walter L., Jr.
 Moller, Frederick A., Jr.
 Monahan, Paul A.
 Monath, Lewis R.
 Mondo, Louis V.
 Mondy, David A.
 Monfort, Robert A.
 Monroe, Clyde C., Jr.
 Montagne, Robert J.
 Montague, James H.
 Montague, Paul G.
 Montgomery, William H.
 Moody, Gilbert D.
 Moody, Jasper A.
 Moody, Robert R.
 Moog, David C.
 Mooney, James H.
 Mooney, Thomas G.
 Moore, Donald L.
 Moore, Edward B., Jr.
 Moore, Elmer L.
 Moore, Jacques J.
 Moore, Johnes K.
 Moore, Paul F.
 Moore, Richard D.
 Moore, Robert B.
 Moore, Robert J.
 Moran, John F.
 Mordine, Glenn I.
 Moreau, Paul L.
 Morgan, Donald C.
 Morgan, Graham W.
 Morgan, James W.
 Morgan, John
 Morgan, Thomas R.
 Morgan, William H.
 Morgenthaler, Wendell P. C., Jr.
 Morrill, David W.
 Morrin, Wardell C.
 Morris, Clark S.
 Morris, Irving L., Jr.
 Morris, John N.
 Morris, Loyd E., Jr.
 Morris, Robert W.
 Morris, Wilbur J.
 Morrissey, Robert B.
 Morrison, Alexander J.
 Morrissey, Michael F.
 Morrow, Gene S.
 Morrow, Thomas E.
 Morse, Arthur H., II
 Morse, Clayton E.
 Moser, Charles F.
 Moser, Edgar S.
 Moses, Richard L.
 Mosher, Edwin T.
 Mosier, Travis E.
 Mostardi, Stephen
 Moughon, John L.
 Mounce, Michael J.
 Mounie, John R., Jr.
 Mouvier, George J.
 Mowbray, George B.
 Moyer, Ross H.
 Moynihan, James E.
 Moynihan, Robert J.
 Mueller, Charles E.
 Mueller, J. Robert
 Mueller, Karl N.
 Mueller, Norman D.
 Mujlig, John R., Jr.
 Muldoon, Donald
 Mulhall, Harry G.
 Mullen, Arthur L., Jr.
 Mullen, Francis A.
 Mullen, Thomas W., Jr.
 Mullin, Edward A.
 Mulrennan, Timothy C.
 Munger, William H., Jr.
 Munsell, Vernon S.
 Munson, James D.
 Munter, Weldon R.
 Murdock, Burt A.
 Murdock, Robert S.
 Murnane, Jeremiah T., Jr.
 Murphy, Albert G.
 Murphy, Bernard F.
 Murphy, Charles L.
 Murphy, Clarence M., Jr.
 Murphy, Desmond H.
 Murphy, Donald L.
 Murphy, Gerald E.
 Murphy, James L.
 Murphy, John E.
 Murphy, John F.
 Murphy, Leo P., Jr.
 Murphy, Martin C.
 Murphy, Maurice M.
 Murphy, Maurice L.
 Murphy, Paul V.
 Murphy, Richard E.
 Murphy, William D.
 Murray, Donald C.
 Murray, Francis R.
 Murray, John D.
 Murray, Richard P.
 Murray, Thomas C.
 Murtha, John P., Jr.
 Mushett, Howard F.
 Musselman, Dale T., Jr.
 Muth, Harold F.
 Myers, Donald A.
 Myers, Robert D.
 Nagler, Oscar F., Jr.
 Nail, James R.
 Nash, James W.
 Nast, Christian A., Jr.
 Natarelli, Daniel S.
 Natiello, Robert A.
 Naylor, John W., Jr.
 Naze, Allen F.
 Neary, Bernard J.
 Nebbett, Sidney S.
 Nee, Thomas H.
 Needham, Michael J.
 Neel, George E., Jr.
 Neilan, James J., Jr.
 Neilson, Roger B.
 Nelson, Charles D.
 Nelson, Delbert L.
 Nelson, Lawrence F.
 Nelson, Robert C.
 Nelson, Ronald E.
 Nelson, William A.
 Nemetz, Roger J.
 Nesbit, Charles L.
 Neth, Dale L.
 Neuenschwander, William J.
 Neveux, Richard E.
 Neville, Patrick G.
 Newbill, Merrill S.
 Newburn, William H., Jr.
 Newcomer, John E.
 Newell, Donald L.
 Newman, Bruce W.
 Newman, Buel B., Jr.
 Newman, Franklin S.
 Newmark, Charles C.
 Newsom, Robert B.
 Newton, Bernard J.
 Nichols, Ernest D.
 Nichols, Louis R., Jr.
 Nichols, William S.
 Nicholson, Robert E.
 Nickel, James B.
 Nickerson, Glendon B.
 Nicol, Francis R.
 Nicoll, John
 Nicolls, William L.
 Niehoff, Ralph J.
 Nielsen, Berturm H.
 Nielsen, John M.
 Nielsen, Paul K.
 Nielsen, William J.
 Niles, Eugene R.
 Nilsen, Donald A.
 Ninichuck, Paul
 Noia, John C.
 Nolan, William A.
 Noland, Kenneth E.
 Noonan, Joseph F.
 Norcross, Charles C., Jr.
 Normandeau, Joseph P.
 North, William J., Jr.
 Northfield, Charles H.
 Norton, Robert R.
 Norwood, James T.
 Nosun, Robert D.
 Novak, Lawrence A.
 Nugent, Edgar H., Jr.
 Nugent, Edward O. B.
 Nugent, Raymond J.
 Nugent, Thomas F. E.
 Nyland, William T.
 Oakes, Bernard F., Jr.
 Oatley, Rollie, Jr.
 O'Brien, Charles H.
 O'Brien, Daniel F., Jr.
 O'Brien, Eugene J.
 O'Brien, Eugene K.
 O'Brien, George E., Jr.
 O'Brien, John D.
 O'Brien, John A.
 O'Brien, Joseph W., Jr.
 O'Brien, William J.
 O'Connell, John J. F.
 O'Connell, John T.
 O'Connell, Patrick J.
 O'Connell, William J.
 O'Connor, John J.
 O'Connor, Karl W.
 Oden, Thomas S.
 Odermat, Victor D.
 O'Donnell, Harold F.
 Oerly, Samuel H.
 Ogden, Bruce F.
 Ogden, Robert F.
 Ogelsby, John C. M.
 Oglesby, Howard S.
 O'Grady, Lawrence R., Jr.
 O'Hara, William H.
 O'Hare, Robert F.
 O'Harra, Robert P.
 O'Kane, John T.
 Olander, James M.
 Olds, James H.
 O'Leary, Donald R.
 Oleinik, George
 Olexa, John J.
 Oliver, Joseph H., Jr.
 Oliver, Robert B.
 Oliver, Robert W.
 Olney, Herbert F.
 Olsen, Herbert F.
 Olsen, Robert J.
 Olsen, Robert A.
 Olson, George A., Jr.
 Olson, Milton J.
 Olson, Paul I.
 Olson, Reynold M.
 Olsovsky, Richard J.
 Ondek, Joseph P.
 O'Neal, Jerry
 O'Neil, Edward V., Jr.
 O'Neill, James E., Jr.
 O'Neill, John E.
 O'Neill, John F.
 O'Neill, Patrick J.
 O'Neill, William H.
 Ordean, John T.
 O'Rourke, Francis J.
 O'Rourke, James K.
 O'Rourke, William T., Jr.
 Orr, Arnold J.
 Orth, Donald G.
 Osenbaugh, Roger T.
 O'Shea, John T.
 Oshirak, Paul L.
 Osterhoudt, Peter C.
 Osterman, Leo V.
 Ostlund, Donald P.
 Ostrowski, Edwin F.
 Oswald, Frank G., Jr.
 O'Toole, John L.
 Otott, George E.
 Ott, Arthur L.
 Ottenville, William N.
 Otteraaen, Robert M.
 Owen, Billy M.
 Owens, Charles R.
 Owens, Hosea
 Owens, William D.
 Owens, William L.
 Pack, Kenneth L.
 Padilla, Salvatore F.
 Pagano, Vincent B.
 Page, David P., Jr.
 Page, James D.
 Paige, Fred E., Jr.
 Palaoro, Edward C.
 Palic, Eugene
 Palmer, Charles B.
 Palmer, Charles W.
 Palmer, James N., Jr.
 Palmer, Kenneth P.
 Palmer, Richard L.
 Palmer, Robert P.
 Palmer, Thomas P.
 Paltz, John C.
 Palumbo, Nicholas E.
 Pangburn, Charles E.
 Pape, William L.
 Papetti, Robert A.
 Pappas, Charles W.
 Parand, Carl A.
 Paratore, Joseph F.
 Parish, Lowell W.
 Parrish, William M.
 Parker, Evan L., Jr.
 Parker, Hubert D., Jr.
 Parker, Hubert L.
 Parker, James S.
 Parker, John K.
 Paro, Eugene E., Jr.
 Parrish, Darold D.
 Parrish, James P.
 Parsons, Francis M.
 Parsons, Rex D.
 Partridge, Richard C.
 Passano, William M., Jr.
 Pastore, Robert C.
 Pastorino, Edward T.
 Patberg, Norman B., Jr.
 Pate, Gerald S.
 Pate, Robert A.
 Patrick, Charles E.
 Patrick, George L., Jr.
 Patsko, Andrew M.
 Patterson, Francis H., Jr.
 Patterson, Paul F., Jr.
 Patterson, Paul W.
 Patterson, Richard E.
 Patterson, William D.
 Patton, Robert T.
 Paul, Murray S.
 Paulson, George N.
 Pausch, Henry M., II
 Payne, Elmer S.
 Payne, Thomas J.
 Paynter, Richard A.
 Pearlman, Stanley L.
 Pearson, William R.
 Pearson, Lyndon L.
 Pearson, Russell C., Jr.
 Peck, Kenneth D.
 Pedersen, Verner C.
 Pegues, Dock H.
 Peirson, Frank H.
 Pelletier, Phillip L.
 Pellicane, Richard
 Pels, John M.
 Pence, Clarence J.
 Pence, Ronald C.
 Pennell, Guss H., Jr.
 Penny, James R.
 Percival, Donald E.
 Percy, Stephen
 Perdue, John D.
 Perea, Horacio E.
 Perez, Richard
 Perkins, Frank A.
 Perkins, John T., Jr.
 Perkins, William R.
 Perrette, Cecil L., Jr.
 Perrin, Jack W.
 Perrott, Charles M.
 Perry, Aydlette H., Jr.
 Perry, James M.
 Perry, Victor A.
 Perry, Warren R.
 Perry, William H., Jr.
 Peschke, Edward D.
 Peters, Edward W., Jr.
 Peters, Elbert L., Jr.
 Peters, Jack A.
 Peters, Richard A.
 Peters, Robert J.
 Petersen, Frank E.
 Peterson, Bob K.
 Peterson, Burdette H.
 Peterson, Carl D.
 Peterson, Gerald L.
 Peterson, Herbert N.
 Peterson, James O., Jr.
 Pettibon, John E.
 Petrarca, John A.
 Petrunic, John M.
 Petty, Howson W.
 Pevoto, Ovie R., Jr.
 Peyla, Louis R., Jr.
 Pfeiffer, Karl J.
 Pfeiffer, Jack M.
 Pfeifle, Richard C.
 Phelps, Barry C.
 Phelps, Charles H., Jr.
 Phenix, Ronald C.
 Philbrick, Charles A.
 Phillips, Bernard P.
 Phillips, James S.
 Phillips, Jerry K.
 Phillips, Jimmie R.

Phillips, John
Phillips, Norman G., Jr.
Phillips, Rhys J., Jr.
Phillips, Russell G.
Phillips, William R.
Phinney, George E.
Pickett, Bayard S.
Pickett, Rex L.
PICKFORD, Thomas M.
Pidgeon, Arthur J., Jr.
Pieper, Karl B.
Pierce, Robert H., Jr.
Piercy, Samuel E.
Pierre, Everett G.
Pierson, Earl F., Jr.
Pierson, Robert A.
Pile, Thomas N.
Pillars, James E.
Pina, Wallace M.
Pinfield, George W., Jr.
Piontek Edward
Pirhalla, Paul P.
Pirman, Frank E.
Pishock, Stephen J.
Pitcher, Bert R., Jr.
Pitchford, Charles F.
Pitsenbarger, James W.
Pittman, Gary E.
Pizarro, Richard A.
Plamondon, Robert A.
Pland, Richard H.
Plateau, Anthony P., Jr.
Platt, Charles L.
Plimpton, Hollis W., Jr.
Plume, Walter J.
Plummer, James R.
Plummer, Rex L.
Plunkett, Joseph A.
Pohlman, Jack R.
Poindexter, John E.
Poitevent, Walter O.
Polakoff, Gerald H.
Polites, William C.
Polk, Ronald S.
Pollard, Jack G.
Pollard, Merel E.
Poorman, Donald W.
Pope, James F.
Pope, Richard D., Jr.
Porter, Arnold J.
Porter, George A.
Porter, Walter T.
Potter, Charles W.
Potter, Harold D.
Potter, Richard J.
Pound, Jere M.
Powell, Donald R.
Powell, Rollin R., Jr.
Powers, Alexander D., III
Powers, Olney H.
Powers, William T.
Prater, William T.
Pratt, David C.
Prawel, Sherwood P.
Prebhalo, Robert G.
Pretzel, Paul W.
Pribble, Harry A.
Price, Joseph V.
Price, Kenneth R.
Priest, Donald E.
Prince, Charlie J.
Pritchett, Donald E., Jr.
Proctor, Louis G.
Prosser, Robert J.
Provine, Carl R.
Provow, Joe F.
Pryatel, Robert L.
Pryor, Taylor A.
Pucher, George E.
Puckett, Charles R.
Pullar, Walter S., Jr.
Pulliam William R., Jr.
Pullin, Millard E.
Pupkar, Ralph E.

Purcell, Robert D.
Purcilly, Joseph C., Jr.
Purdy, David M.
Purdy, Douglas R.
Puryear, Herbert B.
Pyle, Charles B., Jr.
Quargnenti, James J.
Quick, Daniel J.
Quinlan, Owen M.
Quinn, Francis X.
Quinn, James W.
Quinn, John D., Jr.
Quinn, Joseph T.
Raad, Emil J.
Rabe, Leroy D.
Radabaugh, Harold V.
Rademacher, Robert C.
Radhuber, Stanley G.
Radich, George J.
Radjeski, Theodore G.
Radtke, Paul G.
Radwell, Francis J.
Rago, Vincent J., Jr.
Rahill, James W.
Rala, Richard M.
Rainbolt, Richard E.
Raines, Thomas E.
Ralph, Kenneth E.
Ralsou, Lesley L.
Ramer, Ralph J.
Ramphay, Richard E.
Ramsey, James E.
Ranck, Robert B.
Randall, Heaton H., Jr.
Raney, William E.
Rankin, William A., Jr.
Rapaich, Eli
Raper, Clarence H.
Rapp, George W., Jr.
Rapp, John M.
Rappe, J. C.
Rasco, Sammie J.
Rasdal, Robert W.
Ratcliff, Percy D.
Ratliiff, Dale
Ratzlaff, John S.
Rauch, Karl A.
Rawlings, Richard J.
Ray, Billy W.
Ray, Edwin A.
Raymond, Phillip C.
Rayner, Charles F.
Read, Charles G.
Read, William A.
Reagan, Kenneth H.
Realsen, Arvid W.
Reames, Louis G.
Reardon, Harry T., Jr.
Reddick, Cleveland N. F., Jr.
Reddick, Dorris A., Jr.
Reddick, William H.
Reed, Charles E.
Reed, Donald C.
Reed, Kenneth S.
Reed, Robert W.
Reedy, Thomas M.
Reese, Donald R.
Reesman, Clifford J.
Rehbock, Alan R.
Rehbus, James R. A.
Reich, Daniel O.
Reich, Nathaniel N.
Reich, Stephen G.
Reid, Benjamin H., Jr.
Reid, Charles E.
Reilly, Donald J.
Reilly, Joseph H.
Reilly, Laurence J.
Reimer, Donald D.
Reiners, Robert P.
Reinholm, Arthur W., Jr.
Reiss, Philip S.
Reiter, Herbert C.
Remmert, Theodore C.
Repetski, Jerry J.
Reppert, James G.

Resnik, Edward D.
Resnisky, Andrew F., Jr.
Retzke, Harold I.
Rexroad, Donald N.
Reynolds, Frank E.
Reynolds, Thomas A., Jr.
Reynolds, Thomas H., Jr.
Reynolds, Waldo R.
Rhine, Wesley E.
Rhodes, James V.
Ribar, George W.
Riichi, Francis L.
Rice, Frank T.
Rice, Keith M.
Rice, Wesley H.
Richard, Roy
Richards, Daniel W.
Richards, Harry R.
Richardson, Edwin J., Jr.
Richardson, Harrison L., Jr.
Richardson, John A.
Rickard, Norman G.
Ricker, Richard L.
Ricketson, John H.
Ridenour, Allen R.
Ridge, Joseph S.
Ridgway, Alvin P., Jr.
Riedy, Richard V.
Riehl, John H., III
Rierdon, James C.
Rifino, William R.
Rigsbee, John W.
Riley, William E., Jr.
Rill, John C., Jr.
Rilling, Fred C., Jr.
Rilo, Joseph J.
Rinaldi, Joseph A.
Ringer, Gerald J.
Ringler, Jack K.
Ringwood, Stewart H.
Ripley, George H.
Riseley, James P., Jr.
Rishel, Austin C.
Ritter, Otto W.
Rivard, Ronald I.
Rives, Robert A.
Rizzo, Barry H.
Roach, Colin D.
Roark, Hugh W.
Robb, Allan H.
Robb, John M.
Robbins, Kenneth G.
Robbins, Laurence B., Jr.
Robbins, Morris G.
Robbins, Raymond B.
Robbins, Sanford H.
Robbins, William L.
Roberts, Richard T.
Roberts, Stanley G., Jr.
Roberts, Thomas L.
Roberts, William C., Jr.
Robertson, Duncan J.
Robertson, John W. P.
Robinett, Henry M.
Robinson, Alan K.
Robinson, Allan C., Jr.
Robinson, Frank C., Jr.
Robinson, Gene P.
Robinson, James C.
Robinson, Ralph K.
Robinson, Robert J.
Robinson, Thomas M., Jr.
Robinson, Wilbur R.
Rocha, Thomas, Jr.
Roche, John F., III
Roche, Thomas G.
Rochford, Edward J., Jr.
Rochford, Thomas F.
Roder, John R.
Roderick, Benjamin A., Jr.
Rogers, Kenneth A.
Roe, James D.
Roe, John M., Jr.
Rogers, Charles J., Jr.
Rogers, Francis P., Jr.
Rogers, Franklin B.
Rogers, George F., Jr.
Rogers, James G.
Rogers, Lane
Rogers, William M.
Rogers, William W.
Rohde, Alfred W., Jr.
Rohlman, Walter C.
Rojo, Manuel, Jr.
Roles, Wayne L.
Roman, John D.
Romano, Carlo
Romans, Donald B.
Romine, Richard E.
Rood, Paul M.
Roop, Robert L.
Root, Edward R.
Root, Thatcher W., III
Ropkey, Fred N.
Roque, Ilow M.
Roschlaw, John K.
Rosen, Joel M.
Rosengrant, John A.
Rosenthal, James D.
Ross, John T.
Ross, Thomas E.
Rossi, Gene A.
Rostad, John D.
Rothblatt, Melvin
Rothermel, Raymond V.
Rourke, Anthony J.
Rouse, Frank E.
Rovegno, Donald C.
Rowe, Lawrence B.
Rowe, Richard J.
Rowell, Robert W.
Rowett, John C.
Rowland, Harold W.
Rowlands, Cledwyn P.
Roxburgh, Richard E.
Roy, John B., Jr.
Rubenoff, Richard P.
Rubin, Leonard H.
Ruby, Jimmy G.
Rudicus, Walter J.
Rudolph, Philip M.
Rudolph, William E.
Rueckel, Frederick A.
Ruete, Alfred W., Jr.
Rumble, Wilson B.
Rumbough, Roy A.
Rumps, Bernard R., Jr.
Runkle, Harry M.
Rupp, Robert R.
Rush, Andrew W., II
Rush, Wesley M.
Russell, Frederick H.
Russell, George F., Jr.
Russell, Raymond H.
Russell, Richard S., II
Russell, Robert A.
Russin, Stanley J.
Russo, Anthony S. F.
Ruth, Clarence M., Jr.
Ruthazer, Warren C.
Rutherford, Robert J.
Ryan, Henry L., Jr.
Ryan, James K., Jr.
Ryan, James, Jr.
Ryan, John P.
Ryan, Phillip J.
Ryan, Robert L., Jr.
Ryan, Thaddeus J., Jr.
Ryan, Timothy
Ryan, Warren J., Jr.
Ryhanych, George W.
Sader, Raymond H.
Sadler, Stephen L.
Saffelle, Robert L., Jr.
Salisbury, Ralph W.
Sallade, Paul H.
Salls, Carroll E.
Salter, Martin E., Jr.
Salvagno, Ralph G.

Salzman, Frederick P., Jr.
Sammons, W. Baird, Jr.
Samora, William J.
Sample, Edward J.
Sampson, George
Samuels, Frank D.
Sanborn, Earle L., Jr.
Sanderson, Dudley B.
Sanderson, John M., Jr.
Sands, Terence J.
Sandy, Allen D.
Sanford, Herbert C.
Sanks, William E.
Sanseverino, Patrick J.
Sansom, Howard D.
Sarafny, James C.
Sarago, Thomas J.
Sartor, Victor H.
Saucier, Frederick W.
Saul, Jacque L.
Sautter, Melvin H.
Savage, John M.
Savoy, Ernest R.
Sawyer, Harold L.
Sawyer, Robert H.
Sayce, Donald H.
Scaife, William M., Jr.
Schaaf, Alfred N.
Schackne, Stewart, Jr.
Schaefer, Thomas L.
Schaeffer, Thomas A.
Schantz, Melvin R.
Scharback, Ronald
Schatzle, Joseph N.
Schaub, Edward J.
Schauf, Robert W.
Scheirman, Charles C.
Schenck, Paul E.
Scherer, Robert D.
Scherner, Roger A.
Scherr, Emil A., Jr.
Schlarp, Jack E.
Schlichte, Miles J.
Schlotzhauer, William P.
Schlueter, Stanley R.
Schmid, James A.
Schmid, Robert, Jr.
Schmidli, Donald L.
Schmidt, Kenneth R.
Schmidt, Lavean D.
Schmidt, Louis F.
Schmidt, Michael E.
Schmitz, John G.
Schmulbach, James C.
Schmults, Edward C.
Schneider, Arthur C.
Schneider, Charles A.
Schneider, Donald E.
Schnell, Emil R.
Schnitzler, Harold V., Jr.
Schoen, Thomas L.
Schoenberger, Leonard
Schomp, Donald D.
Schramm, Charles F.
Schremp, George R., Jr.
Schrepferman, John F.
Schroeder, John W.
Schroering, Charles J., Jr.
Schryver, Gilbert D.
Schuberg, Richard E.
Schubert, Charles J.
Schuette, Henry G.
Schul, Allan D.
Schuler, Raymond T.
Schulte, Lawrence A., Jr.
Schulthesz, Henry J.
Schultz, Robert H.
Schuman, George F., Jr.
Schureman, Charles E.
Schuyler, Terry E.
Schwab, John J., Jr.

Schwanderla, Edward A.
Schwartz, Carl
Schweigerdt, Richard F.
Schweiss, Elmer J.
Schwendt, Edwin O.
Schwob, Charles E.
Scobell, George A., Jr.
Scoppa, Joseph, Jr.
Scott, Donald E.
Scott, James K.
Scott, John A.
Scott, Joseph W., Jr.
Scott, Louis G.
Scott, Robert P.
Scott, Robert E.
Scoville, Charles D.
Scribner, Raymond E.
Scruggs, James W.
Scyphers, Ruel T.
Seaman, Donn E.
Seaman, George W.
Searle, Richard H.
Sears, Walter E., Jr.
Seaver, George F., Jr.
Seay, James L.
Seay, William L.
Secrest, Richard T.
See, Russell W., Jr.
Seeds, Ian S., Jr.
Seely, Gerard H.
Segel, Sheldon
Seiden, Stanley
Seiler, David F.
Seitz, John E.
Selby, Donald F.
Self, Joseph M.
Selke, Albert C., Jr.
Sequella, Louis A.
Serup, Donald K.
Severson, Donald E.
Sewell, Leonard G.
Sexton, William G.
Seymour, Kenneth F.
Shackelford, James L.
Shackelford, John K.
Shaffer, John C.
Shaffer, Raymond A.
Shafter, Robert L.
Shaklee, Harold G.
Shanahan, James L.
Shanberg, Robert
Shannon, Eugene F.
Sharpe, James R.
Shauer, Walter H., Jr.
Shaver, Donald B.
Shaw, John F., Jr.
Shawver, John W.
Shea, John R.
Sheahan, Robert R.
Shedden, Harry B.
Sheely, Harold E.
Sheetz, Thomas L.
Shelburne, Robert M.
Shelton, Allen C., Jr.
Shelton, Thomas R.
Shepherd, David L.
Shepherd, John A.
Schramm, Charles F.
Schremp, George R., Jr.
Sheppard, Charles R.
Sherlock, John, Jr.
Sherman, Robert P.
Sherrill, Benjamin C.
Sherwin, John M.
Sherwood, Donald K.
Shields, Edward A., Jr.
Shifter, Ernest
Shilan, Arthur B.
Shildneck, Donald P.
Shimanoff, Morris S.
Shinbaum, Marvin S.
Shine, John F.
Shinkle, Raymond C.
Shirar, Donald J.
Shiver, Clements W.
Shoefstall, Adrian A.
Shoemaker, Loyd R.
Shore, Bruce J.

- Shore, Sumner A. Smith, Kenneth E.
Shorter, Walter W. Smith, Norman J.
Shortsleeves, Vernon Smith, Ray L.
C. Smith, Richard D.
Shoultz, Eugene E. Smith, Robert L.
Showar, John F. Smith, Robert G.
Shryock, Meredith G. Smith, Robert E.
Shultz, Edward C. Smith, Robert R.
Shumsky, Frank J., Smith, Robert H.
Jr. Smith, Robert S.
Shure, Alan H. Smith, Stanley W.
Shuttleworth, James Smith, Thomas S.
E. Smith, William D.
Siedler, Wilbert A., Jr. Smith, William R.
Siegfried, William G., Smola, John K.
Sr. Snare, Joseph C., Jr.
Sievors, Harry J. Snead, Douglas L.
Sigler, Andrew C. Snell, Bradley S.
Sildar, William P. Snell, Thomas C.
Silies, Donald E. Sniffen, Robert L.
Silk, John B. Snodgrass, Clyde R.
Silvestri, Leonard A. Snodgrass, Thomas F.
Simas, Frank J. Snow, Avery C.
Simich, John Snyder, Arthur K., Jr.
Simkowski, George R. Snyder, Franklin A.
Simmons, Jack A. Snyder, Fred, Jr.
Simmons, John E. Snyder, Harold B., Jr.
Simmons, Peter F. Snyder, Louis G.
Simmons, Vernon H. Snyder, Theodore O.
Jr. Sobol, Harold
Simms, Thomas S. Solbach, Harry G., Jr.
Simon, Francis Sollitto, Francis V.
Simons, Benton R. Solomon, Charles V.
Simonson, James T. Somers, Allen H.
Simpkins, Billie D. Somes, Donald H.
Simpson, Donald R. Sommerville, Herbert
Simpson, Marvin E. C.
Simpson, Thomas H. Soper, Melvin A., Jr.
Simpson, William A. Sorenson, Ralph J.
Sims, Frank E. Sorenson, Richard K.
Sims, George R. Sorenson, Sigurd A.
Sims, Tony L. Sorgenfrei, Carl J.
Sincclair, John E. Sottile, Louis T.
Sirois, Byron K. Soudan, Thomas A.
Skagerberg, Alan E. Southworth, Thomas
Skipper, Kenneth J. J., Jr.
Skymm, James M. Sparks, John A.
Slack, Gerald J. Spaulding, Robert E.
Slack, Robert K. Speeler, Hardin L.
Slack, Thomas W. Spellacy, John F.
Slavens, Daniel L. Spence, Allan J.
Slee, Don J. Spence, Morgan L.
Slepin, Ronald B. Spencer, Ralph B.
Sloan, Richard E. Spencer, Ray
Slocum, Clyde W. Spencer, Richard O.
Small, Robert S. Spencer, Thomas H.,
Jr.
Smalley, William G. Sperisen, Richard L.
Smigay, Daniel B. Sphon, Charles E.
Smlanich, William E. Spiers, Homer F.
Jr. Spinella, Vincent S.
Smith, Bernard B., Jr. Spiotta, Robert A.
Smith, Blakeslee A. Spivey, Harold G.
Smith, Bobby N. Sprague, Bernard
Smith, Boyce D. Spranger, Gary S.
Smith, Buck D. Spring, Carlton J.
Smith, Charles D. Sproul, Robert J.
Smith, Clarence L. Spry, William R.
Smith, Clifford E. Spurling, George N.,
Smith, Conway J. Jr.
Smith, Craig S. Spurlock, David A.
Smith, Donald J. Spurr, Thomas L.
Smith, Edwin D. Stackhouse, Norman
Smith, Elbert G. R.
Smith, Erik T., Jr. Stallings, Henry G., Jr.
Smith, Frank R. Stamour, Paul A. A.
Smith, Frederick A. Stamp, Lloyd V.
Smith, George D. Standish, Cameron
Smith, Graham W. Stanford, William L.
Smith, Harold W. Stanley, David G.
Smith, Harvey D. Stanley, John R.
Smith, Haywood R. Stansel, Edward H.
Smith, Howard M. Stanton, David R.
Smith, James H. Stanton, Thomas P.
Smith, James M. Staples, Ernest L., Jr.
Smith, James Robert Staples, Joseph S.
Smith, Jean V. Starbuck, William E.
Smith, John H. Stargel, Louis R.
Smith, Joseph N. Stark, Clifford M.
Smith, Keith A. Stark, Clifford M.
Smith, Kenneth L. Stark, Robert T.
Stark, Robert W.
Starnes, Cullen G., Jr.
Starr, Donald I.
Staton, Thomas H.
Statzer, Merlin V.
Stayton, John P.
St. Clair, Fred W.
Steadman, Henry W.
Steck, Louis J.
Steeber, Robert A.
Steele, John G., Jr.
Steffens, Charles T.
Stein, Alfred F.
Stein, Francis E.
Stein, William E.
Steinberg, Melvin J.
Steinmann, David E.
Stenback, Norman E.
Stenzel, Joseph A.
Stephens, Paul R.
Stephens, Ray A.
Stephens, Walter E.
Stern, Laurence
Stevens, Joseph W.,
Jr.
Stevens, Marvin B.
Stevens, Nicholas L.
Stevens, Richard L.
Stevenson, Charles C.
Stevenson, William H.
Stewart, Billy F.
Stewart, Douglas C.,
Jr.
Stewart, Harvey C.
Stewart, Hugh M.
Stewart, James H.
Stewart, Kenneth R.
Stewart, Lawrence E.
Stewart, Robert A.
Stewart, Robert D.
Stewart, Robert J.
Stice, Ray B.
Stidger, Howe A.
Stiffer, Charles R.
Stiglitz, Robert A.
Stillman, Charles W.,
Jr.
Stillwagon, James E.
Stitt, Charles L.
St. Jeor, Leroy A.
Stockton, Robert L.
Stockton, Walter S.,
Jr.
Stoffa, Joseph J., Jr.
Stoffelen, Peter L.
Stokes, Robert L.
Stokes, William A.
Stoll, Charles E.
Stone, James E.
Stone, Richard J.
Stone, Robert R.
Stouch, Raymond E.
Stover, Frank B., Jr.
Stow, Donald W., Jr.
Strain, Donald H.
Strambi, Rudolph C.
Strandquist, John H.
Strange, James E., Jr.
Stratton, Robert A.
Strickland, Donovan
C.
Strickland, George E.
Stringfield, Thomas
R.
Stucker, Gayle G.
Stuckey, John S.
Stuckey, William K.
Studt, John C.
Stuhldreher, Michael
W.
Stultz, Raymond D.,
Jr.
Sturm, August J.
Styles, Michael J., Sr.
Subowsty, Edward B.
Sudinski, Norbert L.
Sugarman, Alan C.
Sulik, Richard A.
Sullivan, Cornelius J.,
Jr.
Sullivan, Francis J.
Sullivan, George E.,
Jr.
Sullivan, Joseph R.
Sullivan, Lawrence F.
Sullivan, Michael L.,
Jr.
Sullivan, Thomas L.
Sullivan, William J.
Sullivan, William M.
Sultz, Barnet M.
Summers, Harry E.
Sumner, Alton W.
Sumner, Donald W.
Sumner, Philip D., Jr.
Surlis, Jerry T.
Sussen, Daniel C.
Sutphin, Ronald J.
Sutter, Rudolf S.
Swalm, Johnny R.
Swallow, Richard P.
Swank, James E.
Swanson, Allan R.
Swanson, Anton R.
Swanson, Donald L.
Swanson, James L.
Swanson, Roger D.
Swartz, Herbert I.
Swearingen, Robert B.
Sweeney, Lawrence P.
Sweeney, Walter E.
Sweeney, William B.
Swenson, Louis S.
Swift, George W.
Swinburne, Bruce R.
Swinney, James T.
Swope, Charles E., Jr.
Syers, James D.
Szydoski, Wayne T.
Tabar, William J.
Taber, Richard D.
Talbert, Robert L.
Talbot, Lee M.
Tallentire, Gilson A. D.
Tallon, John E., Jr.
Tammen, John W.
Tarkington, Friench
S., Jr.
Tarr, James G.
Tashjian, Arthur F.
Tassini, John T.
Taylor, Brooke P.
Taylor, Charles F.
Taylor, Charles H., Jr.
Taylor, Clyde E.
Taylor, Harry E.
Taylor, Irving G.
Taylor, Joseph F., Jr.
Taylor, Laurence A.
Taylor, Najah C., Jr.
Taylor, Robert D.
Taylor, Robert M.
Taylor, Samuel B.,
Jr.
Taylor, Wayne D.
Tayntor, Charles E.
Teague, Charles E.
Teare, George W., Jr.
Tellkamp, John W.
Tenley, Walter B.
Terrell, Daniel E., Jr.
Terrill, Herbert L.
Tharp, Ross G.
Thatcher, John L.
Thayer, Richard E.
Thoman, Richard B.
Thomas, Charles L.
Thomas, Charles P.
Thomas, David E.
Thomas, Donald N.
Thomas, Hasl S.
Thomas, James C., Jr.
Thomas, John E.
Thomas, Keith N.
Thomas, Lance D.
Thomas, Louis C.
Thomas, Milford J.
Thomas, Richard W.
Thomas, Spencer F.
Thomas, William J.
Thompson, Alva F.,
Jr.
Thompson, David F.
Thompson, Gerald E.
Thompson, James P.
Thompson, James S.
Thompson, John T.
Thompson, Joseph A.
Thompson, Joseph H.
Thompson, Lawrence
L., Jr.
Thompson, Lester H.,
Jr.
Thompson, Robert B.
Thompson, Robert H.
Thompson, Roland E.
Thompson, Richard
K.
Thomson, Richard S.
Thompson, William
D., Jr.
Thompson, William E.
Thornbury, Billy D.
Thornton, Bozzie F.,
Jr.
Thorsen, Timothy J.
Threfall, William L.
Throckmorton, Roger
R.
Thurber, William M.
Thurman, Winfred
M., Jr.
Thurston, Lyle E.
Tiaga, Silverio V.
Tiago, Joseph L., Jr.
Tidemann, Andrew H.
Tiede, Herbert R.
Tieman, Robert E.
Tiemann, Richard K.
Tiernan, Richard E.
Tighe, Paul J.
Till, Joseph P.
Till, Martin
Tillis, James G.
Tilly, Robert C.
Tilton, Robert E.
Tilton, Robert C.
Timmerman, Kenneth
M.
Timmons, Glenn W.
Tinney, William H.,
Jr.
Tipton, Dale L., Jr.
Tipton, Walker T.
Tobin, Edward P.
Tobin, Thomas L.
Tockstein, Robert E.
Todd, William S.
Toller, William M.
Tolnay, John J.
Tomlin, James E.
Tomlinson, Robert H.,
III
Tomlinson, Richard
W.
Tomlinson, Herbert W.
Toms, Edward H.
Tonetti, John S.
Toney, Buford L.
Toolajian, Vahan
Toole, Lee H.
Toomey, Charles J.
Topalian, Theodore S.
Tormey, John L.
Torok, Robert J.
Totten, Frederick R.
Totten, Gerald H.
Touchton, Elbert R.
Toulmin, Hugh H.
Townsend, Charles L.
Townsend, Donald B.
Townsend, Edward J.
Townsend, Gerald E.
Townsend, Joseph B.,
Jr.
Townsend, Kyle W.
Townsend, Ronald L.
Tracey, Joseph E.
Trahan, Francis J.
Traub, Ellis, Jr.
Travers, Thomas R.
Treble, Charles
Trebson, Iver W.
Trefny, Rudolph A.
Tremblay, Laurier J.
Trepagnier, Wade H.,
Jr.
Trescott, Eugene H.
Tress, David M.
Trexler, Richard T.
Tribe, Stanley G., Jr.
Troupe, Ralph J.
Trout, Robert G.
Trowbridge, Clyde A.
Troxel, J. B.
Thompson, Robert H.
Troxler, George W.
Truesdale, Bruce A.
Tryon, Raymond L.
Tryon, William A.
Tuchek, John B.
Tucker, George A.
Tucker, John O.
Tucker, Leland W.
Tucker, Robert W., Jr.
Tull, James R.
Tuller, Charles H.
Tulley, William E.
Turley, Gerald H.
Turner, Bobby C.
Turner, Charles F.
Turner, Frank P.
Turner, James A.
Turner, Robert M.
Tuszynski, Ervin J.
Tuteral, Marion E.
Tuttle, David L., Jr.
Twaddle, William M.
Tweedy, James E.
Twining, David S.
Twyman, Gayle F.
Tyksinski, William A.
Tyler, William H., Jr.
Tyner, Neal E.
Tyson, Charles J., III
Uhlemeyer, Ted, Jr.
Underwood, Malcolm
S., Jr.
Unger, Robert G.
Upschulte, Phillip P.
Urban, Joseph A.
Urbanske, Thomas B.
Ustach, Vincent A.
Uster, William H.
Valencia, Edwin J., Jr.
Valentine, Ira S., Jr.
Valentine, Herbert J.
Valento, Donald J.
Vallee, Robert A.
Vallette, Charles W.
Vamosi, Joseph S.
VanCamp, James W.
VandeBossche, Robert
Y.
Vandeburg, Clyde M.,
Jr.
Vandemark, Charles E.
VanDenElzen, James
R.
VanderLans, John A.
Vandersluis, Jan P.
VanDeusen, Larry R.
VanDyke, Richard P.
Vanek, Kenneth D.
VanFleet, Thomas R.
VanFossen, Harry E.
VanGaasbeck, Leonard
S.
VanGeffen, Carroll D.
VanGorder, Lawrence
A.
VanHook, Edward H.
VanInwegen, William
C.
Vann, Joseph W., Jr.
VanNatter, James H.
VanSant, Frederick N.
VanSant, Thomas R.
VanStone, Edward L.
VanTine, Kenneth G.
VanWinkle, Roy L.
VanWinkle, Archie
Varian, Homer A., Jr.
Vaughn, Thomas A.
Vaught, Richard H.

- Vaum, Richard C.
 Veal, Beverly P.
 Veasey, John E.
 Veda, Edward P.
 Veno, Frederick E.
 Verdon, Donald J.
 Verrier, Alfred J., Jr.
 Vey, Willis D.
 Vezzani, Daniel L.
 Vibberts, John L.
 Vidano, Albert J.
 Vidmar, Paul R. R.
 Viera, Daniel J.
 Viers, Willard G., Jr.
 Vieten, Vincent G.
 Vigneron, Raymond H.
 Vilches, Samuel N., Jr.
 Villar, James W.
 Visage, Billy F.
 Vitali, Henry R.
 Vitalis, William N.
 Vittitoe, James A.
 Vlachos, Theodore J.
 Vochatzer, Charles D.
 Vogt, Timothy S.
 Voight, Delbert G.
 Voll, Richard W.
 Volz, Fritz
 Vorhauer, George F.
 Vosburgh, Peter B.
 Voss, Henry R.
 Votava, Robert J.
 Vreeland, Norman H.
 Vueteveen, Harold L.
 Vukelich, John J., Jr.
 Waddell, Lamar P.
 Wade, Ray B.
 Wager, Charles P.
 Wagner, Daniel C.
 Wagner, David H.
 Wagner, Douglas A.
 Wagner, Peter K.
 Wagner, Richard D.
 Wagoner, Earl L.
 Waguespack, William J., III
 Wahlfeld, Howard W.
 Wahlstrom, Donald H.
 Wakefield, Henry S.
 Waldera, Gerald J.
 Waldow, Richard E.
 Walker, Allen R.
 Walker, Dallas R.
 Walker, Ernest R.
 Walker, George, Jr.
 Walker, James H.
 Walker, James W.
 Walker, Joe G., Jr.
 Walker, John B., Jr.
 Walker, Phillip C.
 Walker, Royal H.
 Walker, Thomas C.
 Wallace, Bruce T.
 Wallace, Charles F.
 Wallace, John J., III
 Waller, Marben G.
 Wallig, Raymond J., II
 Walling, Robert P.
 Walls, Robert T.
 Wallwork, Donald T.
 Walser, Grover B.
 Walsh, Gerard J.
 Walsh, James A.
 Walsh, James T.
 Walsh, John E.
 Walsh, Michael J.
 Walsh, Patrick P.
 Walters, Raymond D.
 Walton, James A.
 Walton, Theodore C.
 Wamel, William W., Jr.
 Wampler, Elton R.
 Wander, Robert E.
 Ward, Donald E.
 Ward, Fred D.
 Ward, George W.
 Ward, Guy W.
 Ward, John J.
 Wardman, John M.
 Warfield, Clifford D.
 Warholak, Michael E., Jr.
 Warner, John D.
 Warren, Frank R.
 Warren, Harold R., Jr.
 Warrender, John W.
 Washington, Harold M.
 Waterman, Philip C.
 Waters, George J.
 Waters, Herbert R., Jr.
 Waters, Joseph E.
 Watkins, Joel S., Jr.
 Watkins, William A., Jr.
 Watson, Howell E., Jr.
 Watson, Jack B.
 Watson, Laurence W.
 Watson, Lee J., Jr.
 Watson, Leroy E.
 Watson, Robert W.
 Watson, Robert C.
 Watson, Thomas W.
 Watts, Dale E.
 Watts, Elwood J.
 Watts, Ivan L.
 Wawrzyniak, Stanley
 Weatherly, James G.
 Weatherspoon, James A.
 Webb, Lonnie L.
 Webber, Charles L.
 Weber, Albert C.
 Weber, Charles F., Jr.
 Weber, Daniel B.
 Weber, Gerald V.
 Weber, John E., Jr.
 Weber, Paul L.
 Wedel, Paul A., Jr.
 Weems, Benjamin F., III
 Wehr, William W.
 Weigle, Robert F.
 Weiland, Gerald A.
 Weiland, Joseph K.
 Weiland, Robert E.
 Weill, Paul D.
 Weinert, Frederick R.
 Weir, Kenneth W.
 Weir, Richard M.
 Weise, William
 Weissner, Lawrence M.
 Weitkamp, Lawrence E.
 Weithman, James C.
 Welch, Homer L.
 Welch, Robert C.
 Welker, George J.
 Wells, Burt A.
 Wells, Glenn T.
 Wells, Laverne M.
 Wells, Ullie C.
 Wendt, James W.
 Wenner, Howard T., Jr.
 Wenrich, Jay H.
 Wensing, Donald R.
 Went, Joseph J.
 Wenzel, Gerald A.
 Werner, Joseph C.
 Wersel, William J.
 Werz, Francis J.
 Wescott, William J.
 West, Donald K.
 West, Frank K., Jr.
 West, Hugh S.
 West, Jack W.
 Westbay, Harry H., III
 Westbrooke, Lewis E.
 Westendorf, Robert J.
 Wester, Joseph M.
 Westerman, Ronald M.
 Wetherill, Ira D.
 Wetzel, Fred J., Jr.
 Weybright, Walter E.
 Whalen, David F.
 Whalen, Robert P.
 Whaling, Robert W.
 Wheatley, Paul R.
 Wheeler, Charles K.
 Wheeler, James R.
 Wheeler, John D.
 Wheelock, Richard J.
 Whelan, William L.
 Whelen, James W., Jr.
 Whidden, Gilbert L.
 Whipple, Chester L.
 Whitaker, Donald J.
 White, Charles H.
 White, David R.
 White, Edward D.
 White, Jean P.
 White, John N.
 White, Joseph H., Jr.
 White, Leonard N., Jr.
 White, Michael E.
 White, Neil V.
 White, Robert E.
 White, Robert D.
 White, Terry H.
 White, Thomas H., Jr.
 White, Walter P., Jr.
 White, Warner L.
 White, William A.
 Whitley, Hubert S.
 Whitmer, James A.
 Whitmore, William H., III
 Wiborn, Richard J.
 Wickersham, William S., Jr.
 Wickham, Howard E.
 Wickman, George A.
 Wiedrecht, George P.
 Wiedhahn, Warren H., Jr.
 Wieland, Philip J.
 Wiese, James J.
 Wiet, John P.
 Wigginton, William B.
 Wightman, Gene F.
 Wiita, Clifford B.
 Wilcher, Charles E.
 Wilcher, David W.
 Wilder, Mack E.
 Wiley, Teddy R.
 Wilhelm, Baker
 Wilhelm, Melvin J.
 Wilkins, James R.
 Wilkins, John W.
 Wilkinson, Bobby R.
 Will, David H.
 Willcox, Clair E.
 Willford, Milton D.
 Williams, Bruce C.
 Williams, Carl D.
 Williams, Estas L.
 Williams, Earl L.
 Williams, Frank P., Jr.
 Williams, George J.
 Williams, Gary C.
 Williams, Hugh M.
 Williams, James W., Jr.
 Williams, Jack C.
 Williams, Jack L.
 Williams, Justin, Jr.
 Williams, Kenneth L.
 Williams, Marshall E.
 Williams, Perry H.
 Williams, Robert G.
 Williams, Robert T.
 Williams, Ralph
 Williams, Thurman L., Jr.
 Williamson, James E.
 Willis, Joe E.
 Willis, Lawrence J.
 Willis, Maxey A.
 Willis, Daniel
 Willis, William P.
 Willwerth, James A.
 Wilson, Billy E.
 Wilson, Donald W.
 Wilson, Douglas H.
 Wilson, Edwin P.
 Wilson, Francois S.
 Wilson, James R.
 Wilson, James R., Jr.
 Wilson, Joe D.
 Wilson, Raymond B.
 Wilson, Richard O.
 Wilson, Robert G.
 Wilson, Robert L.
 Wilson, Robert L., Jr.
 Wilson, Warren L.
 Wilson, William C.
 Wiltsie, Russell E.
 Wimber, Melvin L.
 Wimpey, Garrette J.
 Winans, James W.
 Wincentsen, Bruce M.
 Winder, Charles R.
 Windsor, Billie W.
 Winfield, Charles R.
 Winrock, Frederick H.
 Winslow, John D.
 Winter, Wallace E.
 Winter, Wilbert C.
 Winters, James E.
 Wintersteen, John, Jr.
 Winton, John N., Jr.
 Wiper, Harold A., Jr.
 Wiseman, Thomas R.
 Wissel, Conrad, III
 Withers, Merlyn H.
 Witt, Lewis C.
 Witty, Loren G.
 Woehle, Fritz
 Wolber, James E.
 Wolcott, Frank B., III
 Wolf, Andreas W., Jr.
 Wolf, Jerry H., Jr.
 Wolf, John B.
 Wonhof, Alan E.
 Wood, Charles D.
 Wood, Donald E.
 Wood, Erman E., Jr.
 Wood, Josiah A.
 Wood, Paul A.
 Wood, Robert H.
 Wood, Stanley B.
 Wood, William F.
 Wood, William G., Jr.
 Woodard, Floyd P.
 Woodring, Willard J., Jr.
 Woodroof, Robert H.
 Woods, Otray J., Jr.
 Woods, Preston D.
 Woods, Roderick D.
 Woodward, Richard W.
 Woodyard, Harvey J.
 Woolery, Dean
 Wooten, Perry R.
 Worley, Daniel E.
 Worley, David E.
 Wray, Desmond C., Jr.
 Wright, Charles C.
 Wright, Dennis W.
 Wright, Francis E.
 Wright, Harvey
 Wright, Herbert L.
 Wright, James H.
 Wright, James R.
 Wright, Jerry H.
 Wright, Willis M.
 Wulf, Jerry C.
 Wyatt, Willard J.
 Wyman, Todd L.
 Wynn, Neal B.
 Yale, Robert S.
 Yant, John T.
 Yardley, Thomas J.
 Yeager, Richard A.
 Yeager, William E.
 Yeagan, William C.
 Yeck, Kenneth R.
 Yelek, Don L.
 Yeienick, Joseph T.
 Yohe, Francis L.
 Yoshioka, Arthur H.
 Young, Carl L.
 Young, Dale E.
 Young, Earnest G.
 Young, George D.
 Young, Harold G.
 Young, Norman L.
 Young, Rex J.
 Young, Robert G.
 Young, Timothy R.
 Young, William H., III
 Yourishin, George P.
 Zaloski, Alfred R.
 Zang, Gerald L.
 Zedekar, Stanley L.
 Zehmer, Edward E.
 Zeigler, Lewis I.
 Zern, Joseph C.
 Zero, Walter E.
 Zience, Walter J.
 Zimmerman, Eugene H.
 Zimolzak, Frank
 Zingone, Frank C.
 Zisi, William Z.
 Zook, John E.
 Zuccarello, John W.
 Zuck, Walter S.
 Zuelsdorf, Gerald R.
 Zuern, Robert L.
 Zuersher, Ronald W.
 Zurlini, Jack G.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent promotion to first lieutenant, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Herbert M. Baker
 William R. Beeler
 Louis A. Bonin
 Ernest C. Brace
 William Q. Brothers
 William E. Caslin
 Robert L. Closson
 Robert W. Cooney
 Franklin G. Cowie, Jr.
 Paul L. Davis
 Jimmie L. Dillon
 Raymond L. Duvall, Jr.
 John Havlik
 Lawrence R. Hawkins
 Richard L. Hawley
 James E. Hendry
 Hershel H. Henson
 Laverne D. Highhouse
 Willis L. Kay
 Charles E. Kiser
 Leo J. LeBlanc, Jr.
 Charles H. May
 Russell W. McNutt
 Arthur S. Ohlgren
 George M. Olszewski
 John W. P. Robertson
 Edward J. Sample
 Baxter W. Seaton
 Ronald I. Severson
 Charles A. Sewell
 George H. Shutt, Jr.
 Luther S. Smith, Jr.
 Lawrence A. Taylor
 James S. Thompson
 Ronald Trepas
 Ted Uhlemeyer, Jr.
 David Y. Westling
 Bobby R. Wilkinson

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Barbara J. Bishop
 Emma H. Clowers

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Shirley J. Fuetsch

The following-named woman officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Doris V. Kleberger

The following-named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Elaine T. Carville
 Essie M. Lucas

Francis N. Berdanier (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William R. VanHarten
 Henry G. White, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Harold E. Arney, Jr.
 Eugene M. Bass
 Joseph W. Blocker
 John G. Celli
 David M. Clautretie
 Barry S. Colassard
 Charles J. Guida
 Hunter B. Hadley, Jr.
 Hussain R. Hellett
 Charles J. Kirkhoff
 William A. Rasmus-
 sen
 Thomas C. Ricel
 James C. Roddy
 Thomas P. Rosandich
 Joseph F. Schappa
 William S. Shea
 Gordon E. Shockley

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant:

Jack R. Christensen
Lucion N. Sowell, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant:

Donald R. Baum	James R. Johnson
Max Bearden	Harry P. Jones
Kinsman G. Boso	William R. Kueker
James D. Chandler	Raymond Labas
Roger U. Chaput	Marion E. Lewis
George W. Colburn	Jacques B. Loraine,
George D. Cox	Jr.
Wallace E. Fogo	Joseph M. Magaldi,
Harold J. Ford, Jr.	Jr.
Ralph B. Fuentes	Horace L. Mann
Joseph G. Gardiner	Charles A. Miller
Ralph G. Getman	Van A. Norman
Arthur L. Graves	Richard L. Prather
Ralph N. Hardin	Herbert J. L. Reid
Donald L. Harris	Charley Robinson
William J. Hartmeier	Anthony V. Rocha
Frederick R. Hasler	William J. Shetzer
Thomas W. Hendrick-	Jerome E. Stephens
son	Jack R. Taylor
Gerald J. Hepp	Donald J. Thomas
Vernon J. Hicks	David C. Turner
John E. Holland	Robert G. Unger
Ralph E. Holler	Bethel A. Vass
Don C. Hunter, Jr.	John H. Webb, Jr.

The following-named Reserve officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Roger J. Bartels	John E. Mead
Edward H. Berger	Richard M. Myers
Richard E. Bourne	David J. Naugle
Joseph P. Brower	Bert W. Peterka
Thomas K. Burk, Jr.	James S. Phillips
Thomas D. Burnette	Raymond R. Powell
Ellsworth P. Coleman	Daniel Prudhomme
Karl F. Christman	Harold P. Relland
Jack L. Dewell	Francis N. Riney
Arthur A. Dittmeier	George M. Shiffler
William Drebushenko	Allan J. Spence
Ronald M. Giannotti	Henry G. Stalling, Jr.
Herbert M. Gradd	Robert W. Topping
Paul R. Jones, Jr.	John J. Tolnay
Robert E. Jones	Edward R. Wagner, Jr.
Willard T. Layton	Allen R. Walker
Charles P. Lindsley	Billy E. Wilson
Eugene C. McCarthy	Paul A. Wilson, Jr.

The following-named Women Reserve officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ann C. Anderton	Natalie H. Lowell
Claudette Y. Berube	Marilyn A. Maines
Doris J. Burke	Mary T. Malloy
Mary J. Callahan	Audra D. Marshall
Beverly A. Cearley	Patricia A. Mc-
Martha A. Cox	Donough
Katharine M. Donohoe	Aurora M. Mondo
Elizabeth M. Faas	Margaret R. Pruett
Jane P. Grundy	Elisabeth M. Strand
Ada J. Harris	Jane L. Wallis
Patricia Kuehn	Antoinette S. Willard
Florence E. Land	Catherine Yoyos

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment to the 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. Thomas Wade Herren, O7430, United States Army, to be commanding general, First Army, and senior United States Army member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479, United States Army, to be deputy commanding general, Army Forces, Far East, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Frank Otto Bowman, O12090, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Louis Watkins Prentiss, O14672, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Kenner Fischer Hertford, O15120, United States Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Richard Joseph Werner, O29107, United States Army.

Col. Norman Hayden Vissering, O41603, United States Army.

Col. Edgar Thomas Conley, Jr., O17665, United States Army.

Col. William Richard Frederick, Jr., O29388, United States Army.

Col. Briard Poland Johnson, O29393, United States Army.

Col. Andrew Thomas McAnsh, O38667, United States Army.

Col. Philip Campbell Wehle, O18067, United States Army.

Col. Isaac Sewell Morris, O18806, United States Army.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Brig. Gen. Karl Truesdell, Jr., 1023A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for temporary appointment as major general in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1954

(Legislative day of Monday, November 29, 1954)

The Senate met at 9:30 a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

O Thou source of our strength and hope, humbly we come, trusting not in our feeble hold of Thee, but rather in Thy mighty grasp of us. Our minds are puzzled and confused—full of doubt and questioning; wickedness seems so rampant and triumphant, goodness so rare and spoiled by lurking evil.

Give us, we beseech Thee, the faith which in the darkness still believes in the dawn. Out of dense darkness has leaped the light of this new day, touching into loveliness the fields, the hills, and the sea, filtering into the deepest woods—into the darkest homes. Come to us, Thou Light of the World. May we become sure of Thee as men who watch through a long night are confident of the dawning. Scatter our doubtings. Fill us with life anew. Send us forth as sons of the morning to bring Thy light to every shadowed area of human relationships. 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 Tuesday, November 30, 1954, was dispensed with.

CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are on the desk the credentials of the Senator-elect from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for the term beginning January 3, 1955, which, without objection, will be received, placed on file, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the credentials were ordered to be placed on file and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November 1954, JOHN L. McCLELLAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1955.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Francis Cherry, and our seal hereto affixed at Little Rock, this 15th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1954.

FRANCIS CHERRY.

By the Governor:

C. G. HALL,
Secretary of State.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, the Senate is about to have its customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation. Following the transaction of routine business I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Routine business is now in order.

RETURN OF CERTAIN PAPERS BY COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an order may be issued relative to certain papers which were obtained by the Subcommittee on Crime and Law Enforcement of the Committee on the District of Columbia in 1952. These papers and documents were produced by Mr. William L. Taylor, and he has written me as chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, asking that they be released from the custody of the committee. I am informed that they may be released only by an order of the Senate.

I have consulted with the ranking minority member of the committee and he informs me that he has no objection to this procedure.

I submit the order, and ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the order was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia be, and is hereby, authorized to return to Mr. William L. Taylor, 3301 North George Mason Drive, Arlington, Va., the following documents which were produced by the said William L. Taylor in 1952 to the subcommittee of the Committee