

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

196. By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petition of Patricia Rodriguez, president, Puerto Rican Political Women Association, Inc., and 279 others to increase the personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

197. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Gilbert Jewell, international secretary-treasurer, Allied Industrial Workers of America, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming their traditional support for full rights of all citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

198. Also, petition of William L. Higgs, director, Washington Human Rights Project, Washington, D.C., relative to voting rights and evaluation of the administration's civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

199. Also, petition of Emperor A. Hanapi, city clerk, Honolulu, Hawaii, relative to commending the President for his forceful program on civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

200. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., relative to the economic views of Abraham Lincoln as contained in his first annual message to Congress, 1861; to the Committee on House Administration.

201. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting Congress to pass a law requiring every State legislature to publish a journal of its day-by-day proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

202. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., relative to condemning the corrupt rural political machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Yellowstone Park, Wyo., requesting that the House of Representatives pass legislation calling for all public schools under the U.S. flag to cause to be repeated to their pupils the U.S. national motto "In God We Trust," itself a prayer, this to be done at least once a month. Such a demand would have high patriotic and religious overtones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

204. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon City, Wyo., requesting the passage of legislation protesting the omission of Columnist Drew Pearson from the list of those to receive the Medal of Freedom from President Kennedy in September; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 15, 1963

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

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

Our Father, God, at this wayside shrine of prayer, set up so long ago by our fathers, we step aside from the crowded highway, with its clamant voices, that we may become conscious of Thee, knowing that we have been assured by the experience of the ages that if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee.

Only when our vision is cleared and corrected by far horizons can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting.

CIX—788

Set us at tasks with a strength that is not our own, with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world, with an unruffled kindness, and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul.

Especially at the beginning of this week of national remembrance, set aside by the official decree of our free Republic, we lift up to Thy tender mercy the plight of coerced peoples, once free, but now in the fetters of an arrogant tyranny. In this chamber, dedicated to government by consent of the governed, we hear the moaning of the captives and their wail, "How long, O Lord, how long?" and we here vow never for expediency's sake to stifle Thy stern demand: "Let my people go."

We ask it in the name of the living Christ, whose truth brings deliverance to the captive. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request from Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 2461. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., at fair market value, certain public lands in the State of Nevada;

H.R. 4946. An act to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives; and

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE VATICAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule VII, paragraph 5, the Senate be authorized to receive a communication from the Vatican, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

The communication is as follows:

DAL VATICANO, LI,
July 6, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Senate of the United States of America,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

HONORABLE SIR: It is my privileged duty to acknowledge receipt of the specially bound copy of Resolution No. 151 of the Senate of the United States of America, dated June 4, 1963, and expressing the sorrow of the Senate on the death of Pope John XXIII.

I have had the honor of presenting this document to the reigning pontiff, His Holiness Pope Paul VI, and from him have received the honored charge of expressing to you, sir, and through your good offices to all Members of the Senate of the United States, his sincere appreciation and cordial gratitude for this generous manifestation of sorrow and sympathy on the passing of the late beloved Pope John.

Gladly availing myself of the occasion to renew the assurances of my high consideration and esteem, I remain

Sincerely yours,
A. G. CARDINAL CICOGNANI.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES, U.S. SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, I send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 170) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective August 1, 1963, Gregor Macpherson and Herbert N. Budlong are hereby appointed Official Reporters for reporting the proceedings and debates of the Senate until further order of the Senate, subject to all the duties and obligations of the contract made with D. F. Murphy, deceased, and to the supervision and control of the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Printing on behalf of the Senate in all respects therein provided, and to receive payment for such services according to law: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of either Gregor Macpherson or Herbert N. Budlong, the survivor shall discharge all the duties and obligations imposed upon the Official Reporters appointed by this resolution and shall receive payment for such services according to law until the further order of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Vice President is in the Chair and that the nomination of his distinguished successor in the House of Representatives, after he moved to the Senate, is on the Executive Calendar, it gives me a great deal of pleasure at this time to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Pat Mehaffy, of Arkansas, to be U.S. circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Charles R. Ferguson, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the new report on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, to be a U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is an excellent appointment; and when Mr. THORNBERRY assumes his duties as U.S. district judge, succeeding another of our former colleagues in the House of Representatives, Robert E. Thomason, I know he will perform as outstandingly in that capacity as he has done during his many years in the Congress. This is a case of an outstanding jurist being succeeded by an outstanding successor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I remember when Ewing Thomason, from Texas, a former Member of the House of Representatives, and a good friend, was appointed to the Federal bench in Texas. I have had an opportunity to follow his record, and on occasion I have seen Ewing Thomason since that time. Time has dealt quite gently with him, and he has been an outstanding judge.

Now our good friend HOMER THORNBERRY succeeds to a great tradition and a great record made by still another Member of the House with whom we served long ago.

Knowing HOMER THORNBERRY as I do, I am confident that he will not be remiss in following that tradition, and will acquit himself in a style befitting the office and the man. We wish him well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF BOAT BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of a 40-foot motor launch to the National Youth Science Foundation, Science Island, Portland, Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CHANGES IN COSTS OF CERTAIN FACILITIES FOR AIR FORCE RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the changes in costs of certain facilities for the Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENTS TO REGULATIONS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant

to law, amendments to the regulations governing the number of undocumented vessels, promulgated by the Acting Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPACE UTILIZATION ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix and collect rents for the occupancy of space in, on, under, or over the streets of the District of Columbia, to authorize the closing of unused or unsafe vaults under said streets and the correction of dangerous conditions of vaults in or vault openings on public space, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925, TO INCREASE THE FEE CHARGED FOR LEARNERS' PERMITS

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to increase the fee charged for learners' permits (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON RECEIPTS UNDER FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, on net receipts under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964; to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORITY TO PROTECT HEADS OF FOREIGN STATES AND OTHER DESIGNATED OFFICIALS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON AMERICAN STUDIES OVERSEAS

A letter from the Chairman, the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on American studies overseas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON FOLLOWUP REVIEW OF NONCOMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT OF AERONAUTICAL REPLACEMENT SPARE PARTS IN THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the followup review of noncompetitive procurement of aeronautical replacement spare parts in the Department of the Air Force, dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNECONOMICAL USE OF PARTS KITS TO SUPPORT DEPOT OVERHAUL ACTIVITIES IN AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical use of parts kits to support depot overhaul activities in the Air Force Logistics Command, Department of the Air Force, dated July 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON GRANTS MADE TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on grants made to nonprofit institutions and organizations for support of scientific research programs, during

the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR INDIANS OF BATTLE MOUNTAIN COLONY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF NORTH CAROLINA-GEORGIA EXTENSION OF BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the North Carolina-Georgia extension of the Blue Ridge Parkway dated June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., relating to child abuse laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by George Benson, of Chicago, Ill., relating to compulsory arbitration in the present dispute between the railroad unions and management; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY NO. 89—JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD and for reference to the proper committee, a joint resolution of the Vermont General Assembly, relating to Interstate Highway No. 89. The resolution refers to the shortsightedness of the construction of a two-lane road in an area which undoubtedly will require a four-lane road in the very near future.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO INTERSTATE HIGHWAY NO. 89

Whereas the principle upon which the Federal Interstate System of highways is founded is that it shall provide an adequate network of roads for the use of general traveling public and also for military use in the event of national emergency and also for the training of the national Armed Forces; and

Whereas the present regulations of the Bureau of Public Roads approving standards of the American Association of State Highway Officials establishes a formula which forbids the construction of four-lane highways in the Interstate System unless the estimated traffic which will pass over any section of that system will equal or exceed a certain volume by, or before, the year 1975; and

Whereas under that formula, and the estimates made by the Vermont Highway Department pursuant thereto, the Interstate Highway from Swanton to the Canadian border and in certain parts southerly from Montpelier does not now qualify as a four-lane highway; and

Whereas it should be public policy of the Federal Government, in the interests of fu-

ture development of the Nation, to grant equivalent Interstate Highways for traffic through New England as for other areas; and

Whereas it is the sense of the general assembly that the standards established by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads may be unrealistic and may not truly project a correct estimate of the traffic which will pass over the highway after its completion; and construction of two-lane roads eventually will result in greater expense as well as create safety hazards to the traveling public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives: That the general assembly does respectfully urge the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and the American Association of State Highway Officials to reconsider its standards and regulations so that, if feasible, the interstate highways in Vermont shall be constructed as four-lane highways so that they shall adequately serve the needs and safety of the traveling public, save expense, and also serve the possible future military needs of our Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to forward a certified copy of these resolutions to Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN, Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY and Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, and to the American Association of State Highway Officials.
Approved: June 27, 1963.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTHWEST KANSAS IRRIGATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Board of Directors of the Southwest Kansas Irrigation Association at a recent meeting adopted a resolution regarding a fair and equitable wheat program.

The organization is composed of operating farmers who are familiar with the wheat situation in the greatest wheat-producing area of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas there is a state of confusion existing among wheat farmers as to the proper, fair, and equitable wheat program; and

Whereas the Board of Directors of the Southwest Kansas Irrigation Association believe that the following points are the most fair and equitable basis upon which to develop a wheat program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of said association, The following points be considered as a basis upon which to establish a fair and equitable wheat program:

1. Each farm unit to be given a bushel allotment.

2. The percentage of your bushel allotment to be used for domestic consumption will be supported at 100 percent of parity.

3. The balance of your bushel allotment will be supported at 70 percent of parity. You cannot sell more than your bushel allotment any 1 year.

4. That any new program contain no provisions as to conserving or diverted acres.

5. The farmer will be permitted to substitute wheat for feed grains, or feed grains for wheat.

6. That in event a farmer, at his own selection, reduces the bushels of wheat produced, that the farm will not lose its history; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two U.S. Senators and all Congressmen from the State of Kansas.

H. HOBBLE, Jr.,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1627. A bill to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos as provided in article 18 of the protocol to the declaration on the neutrality of Laos (Rept. No. 357).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 1512. A bill to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 358).

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll (Rept. No. 359).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1869. A bill for the relief of Mary Zita Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MECHEM):

S. 1870. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Valle Grande-Bandelier National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1871. A bill to repeal the "cooly trade" laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1872. A bill to establish and prescribe the functions of the Federal Tax Commission; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1873. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Usha Hasnukh Mehta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1874. A bill for the relief of Jillian Vera Griffiths Hussey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

APPOINTMENT OF SENATE OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 170) appointing Gregor Macpherson and Herbert N. Budlong official reporters of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

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

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1945—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MILLER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 628) to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FULL DEDUCTION OF EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES BY THE MINING INDUSTRY—TWO ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of

Senator HART, of Michigan, and JORDAN, of Idaho, be added to the cosponsors of S. 1807, a bill I introduced on June 27 to provide for full deduction of exploration expenditures by the mining industry. I further ask that the names of these cosponsors appear on the bill at its next printing.

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

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on June 19, 1963, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 91 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit prayer in public schools. In the next printing of this joint resolution I ask that the name of the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. ROBERT BYRD, appear as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Editorial, "West Virginia Should Sue," of the July 9 Wall Street Journal; July 15 letter from Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH to the editor of the Wall Street Journal, portions of an editorial, "The Wall Street Journal to the Contrary, We're Lucky To Have a Centennial Stamp," from the July 10 Charleston Daily Mail.

FIRST YEAR OF OPERATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, There has come to my attention a memorandum, dated July 8, from the Secretary of Defense to the President of the United States. The memorandum summarizes progress during the first year of operations of the Department's cost reduction program.

It indicates that the application of the principles of businesslike management to the Department's logistical costs has resulted in savings at the rate of over \$1 billion annually during the fiscal year 1963, and that by the fiscal year 1967 the annual savings will be at the rate of almost \$4 billion annually.

Mr. President, an overall budget of any Department can always be cut, but such cuts are not in themselves evidence of efficiency or of a genuine savings to the people of the Nation. Indeed, if they result in the elimination or curtailment of necessary services, they may in the long run prove very costly. But, so far as I can gather, that is not what is involved in the economy program of the Secretary of Defense. The savings obtained in this case have been obtained by doing what needs to be done, but doing it in a better way, on a more businesslike and efficient basis. The net result has

been that our actual defense capabilities have been, if anything, strengthened over what would otherwise have been the case if this program were not in effect. In short, Mr. President, we might say that this program, quite apart from the question of how many dollars may be involved in the total defense budget, is seeing to it that for each dollar spent, the public is getting more. In a specific example, instead of spending \$2,243 for a certain type of radio, as in the past, the economy program has cut the present cost of the radio to the Defense Department to \$843 although substantially the same radio job will be done as formerly. The techniques involved in bringing about such reductions include competitive bidding, standardization, and elimination of nice, but costly and unnecessary, frills.

The economy program of the Defense Department promises to bring about billions of dollars of savings to the American people within a few years. It reflects great credit on the prudence, the energy, and the leadership of the Secretary of Defense and the responsible civilian and military officials who have worked with him. It also indicates a welcome public-spirited concern for the hard-pressed citizen who, in the last analysis, pays all the bills.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum previously referred to and three editorials printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 8, 1963.

Memorandum for the President.

Subject: Department of Defense cost reduction program—first annual progress report.

A year ago, in a memorandum dated July 5, 1962, I reported to you that, through improvements in operating efficiency, we could cut the Department's logistics costs by at least \$3 billion per year within 5 years, and that we would realize about 25 percent of this goal in fiscal year 1963. I have now completed a review of the results to date and the opportunities that lie ahead, and I find that they are greater than estimated last year:

1. Savings in excess of \$1 billion were actually realized during fiscal year 1963, compared with our estimate of \$750 million last July.

2. The actions now planned for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 will bring the estimated annual savings, to be realized by fiscal year 1967, to almost \$4 billion, compared with the \$3 billion estimated last July.

I should like to review the highlights of our progress to date and some of the ways in which we hope to achieve the ultimate goal of \$4 billion in savings per year.

Let me note that these savings have not in any way been achieved at a sacrifice of national security. Indeed, during the past 24 months we have achieved—

A 100 percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces.

A 60 percent increase in the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

A 45 percent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions.

A 30 percent increase in the number of tactical air squadrons.

A 60 percent increase in airlift capability.

A 100 percent increase in ship construction and conversion to modernize the fleet.

A 200 percent increase in the Special Forces, trained to deal with counterinsurgency threats.

The cost of these advances in our national security will begin to be balanced in future years by the very substantial savings we are assuring through this cost reduction program.

As you know, the savings are being achieved in three ways:

1. Buying only what we need to achieve balanced readiness.

2. Buying at the lowest sound price.

3. Reducing operating costs through integration and standardization.

I. BUYING ONLY WHAT WE NEED

(a) Refining requirements calculations: The best way to ensure that we buy only what we need is to start at the very beginning of the procurement process—the setting of requirements. Through a systematic and intensive review of requirements calculations, we have been able to cancel \$700 million of purchases which otherwise would have been made had our procurement programs still been based on planning factors and inventory levels considered necessary in past years. The largest part of this reduction occurred in spare parts for aircraft and missiles. We expect to increase these savings in fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Here are some of the ways in which these savings were achieved in fiscal year 1963:

1. The Army has introduced the new uniform issue priority system permitting reduction in order and shipping time by an average of 15 percent, thereby reducing on-hand inventory requirements. Fiscal year 1963 annual savings are estimated at \$36.2 million.

2. By closer management control, the Navy has been able to reduce stocks of high demand spare parts on aircraft carriers by 50 percent.

3. By a detailed analysis of repair operations time, the Air Force has been able to reduce repair cycle time on high cost items from 90 to 45 days and on low cost items from 120 to 60 days. In total, the Air Force has reduced requirements on some 400,000 items with annual savings of \$469 million.

(b) Increased use of excess inventories: During fiscal year 1963 almost \$1.2 billion in excess inventories held by the Department and its contractors has been redistributed to other military users for current consumption or mobilization reserves. This is an increase of better than \$200 million in the rate of reutilization, compared with fiscal year 1961. Our goal for the next 2 years is to increase this rate to more than \$400 million over the 1961 level.

Here are some examples of reutilization of excess inventories in fiscal year 1963:

1. More than 1 million 2.75-inch rockets excess to the Air Force were transferred to the Army for use on helicopters. By spending \$10 million to restore them to operational condition, the Army is saving \$41 million over the cost of new procurement.

2. Twenty J-79 jet engines excess to the Air Force were transferred to the Navy for use in KD-20-1 flying targets, thereby saving \$4.4 million.

3. Five M-33 fire control systems excess to the Army were transferred to the Navy to be used as Government furnished equipment on a Navy contract, thereby saving \$2.3 million.

4. Thirty-one unserviceable aircraft engines excess to the Air Force were transferred to the Army for use on Army aircraft. By spending \$372,000 to put them in good condition, the Army was able to save \$806,000 over the cost of new procurement.

5. \$67.3 million worth of parts was reclaimed from excess Air Force aircraft en-

gines during the first 11 months of fiscal year 1963.

With excess stocks now representing a \$12 billion investment, one of our most important logistics management problems is to insure that we use every item having a further useful life. A central clearinghouse has recently been established at the Logistics Services Center in Battle Creek, Mich., where by the end of this calendar year a complete inventory of such items will be available. Requirements of the military departments are already being screened against this central inventory and available stocks transferred from one military department to another to meet valid needs.

(c) Eliminating "goldplating" in specifications: Last year I reported to you that we were undertaking a major effort to eliminate from our procurement specifications costly materials and fabrication processes not essential to the proper functioning of the item being bought. As a result, we are now averaging savings well over \$1 million per week in reduced costs, and we expect these savings to triple during the next 2 years.

The following are some recent examples which illustrate the wide range of opportunities for such value engineering savings:

	Unit cost		Savings on current procurement
	Before redesign	After redesign	
1. "Mule" for opening and closing Minute-man silo: Substituted a commercial hydraulic for a specially designed electronic mule.....	\$555,000	\$80,800	\$1,200,000
2. Air vane for Pershing missile: Substituted an aluminum casting with simplified fittings for a foam-filled plastic skin with special fittings.....	1,512	463	1,140,000
3. Lift truck for ASROC missile: Substituted mechanical lifting device with disk-type brakes for hydraulic device with precision machined brakes.....	2,480	385	245,000
4. Brake fluid reservoir for T-38 aircraft: Reduced capacity from 17 ounces to 4 ounces to eliminate unnecessary capacity.....	178	52	50,400
5. Radiation hazard filter for airborne rocket launcher: Redesigned filter using available standard parts.....	13.02	4.70	83,000

II. BUYING AT THE LOWEST SOUND PRICE

It is not enough to buy only what we need, we must also buy at the lowest sound price.

(a) Shifting from noncompetitive to competitive procurement: Maximizing competition in defense procurement is sound public policy. It is one of the most effective means of broadening the industrial base and insuring that we obtain the lowest sound price on what we buy. The purchase of specialized military items, however, involves unique problems which tend to limit our opportunities to buy competitively. We are attempting, nevertheless, to expand continually the opportunities for competitive bidding even on these specialized items, and in the process of doing so we have achieved savings in the first 10 months of fiscal year 1963 of \$195 million. We have found that when we are able to shift from a single source to a competitive procurement, we normally achieve a reduction in price of at least 25 percent. On 58 major procurements made competitively

during the third quarter of fiscal year 1963, the average reduction was 30 percent of the price formerly paid to the sole source producer.

Here are some examples of shifts to competitive procurements in fiscal year 1963, including both end items and components:

Item	Previous noncompetitive price	1st competitive price	Gross savings on fiscal year 1963 procurement
1. M110 8-inch Howitzer.....	\$68,044	\$41,415	\$7,855,555
2. M107 175-millimeter gun.....	68,036	41,376	3,625,760
3. R-442 radio receiver.....	1,519	1,034	908,890
4. RT-246 receiver-transmitter.....	3,976	2,692	927,048
5. RT-524 receiver-transmitter.....	3,074	2,036	7,338,660
6. AN/PRC-25 man pack radio.....	2,278	843	10,494,312
7. GRC-50 radio sets.....	34,478	17,411	4,300,940

To insure a concerted effort toward competitive buying whenever possible, we establish specific goals to be achieved by each of the military departments and the Defense Supply Agency in terms of the percentage of awards to be made by price competition in each of the fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965. As the following chart [not printed in Record] reveals, the Department of Defense as a whole in the first 10 months of this fiscal year has exceeded the full year 1963 goal; 37.6 percent of all awards were made to the lowest responsible bidder, compared with 32.9 percent in fiscal year 1961.

The estimated \$195 million saved during the first 10 months of fiscal year 1963 breaks down as follows:

Estimated price savings from competition	
	Millions
Aircraft components and parts.....	\$40
Missile components and parts.....	24
Electronic and communications equipment.....	40
Vehicles (combat and noncombat).....	27
Ships and components.....	58
Weapons and ammunition.....	4
Supplies and services.....	2
Total.....	195

The full-year savings may be somewhat greater when final results for May and June are known. Our goal in this area is to increase total price reductions through competition by an additional \$100 million each year for the next 3 years, thereby reaching an annual rate of savings by fiscal year 1966 of \$500 million over the fiscal year 1961 level.

(b) Shifting from cost plus to fixed price and incentive contracts: The increasingly complex weapons systems resulting from the technological revolution of the 1950's led to a great expansion in the use of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. However, both Department and industry officials agree that the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts not only fail to provide incentives for economy, but actually deaden management efficiency by removing the need for either the Department or the contractor to estimate costs accurately, and to plan and control programs tightly.

Accordingly, last year we established specific goals for a reduction in the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts by each military department in each of the 3 fiscal years 1963-65. The goal for fiscal year 1963 was to reduce such contracts to 25.8 percent of total contract awards (compared with 38 percent in the first 9 months of fiscal year 1961) with an ultimate goal of not more than 12.3 percent by fiscal year 1965. This is a very ambitious goal but we are exerting every effort to meet it.

Improvements actually achieved by each of the military departments during fiscal year 1963 are:

	[In percent]		
	9 months of fiscal year 1961	10 months of fiscal year 1963	Change
Army.....	32.8	16.0	-16.8
Navy.....	24.3	18.0	-6.3
Air Force.....	50.6	30.2	-20.4
All DOD.....	38.0	21.1	-16.9

As shown on the following chart [not printed in Record], CPFF contracts during the first 10 months of fiscal year 1963 dropped to 21.1 percent of the total—the lowest level since fiscal year 1955.

As a result of these efforts, the value of annual awards under CPFF contracts has declined by \$3.2 billion on a basis comparable to fiscal year 1961. Our best estimate is that for each dollar shifted to firm fixed-price and incentive contracts, we should be able to reduce final costs by at least 10 percent—a total saving of \$320 million.

III. REDUCING OPERATING COSTS

The third broad area for improving logistics management is the reduction of operating costs by:

1. Terminating unnecessary operations;
2. Standardizing and simplifying procedures; and
3. Consolidating and increasing the efficiency of major operating services: supply, communications, transportation, and maintenance.

(a) Terminating unnecessary operations: Retention of unneeded real estate and facilities constitutes one of the largest hidden costs in defense operations. In 1961 you instructed me to review thoroughly our utilization of real properties, and, wherever possible, to consolidate activities in order to eliminate unnecessary overhead costs, free personnel for higher priority duties, and release property which could be put to more productive use by the civilian economy. Accordingly, we have instituted a permanent program of inspection and review to achieve these objectives. During the past 2 years, actions have been initiated at over 400 locations in the United States and overseas which, when completed, will produce the following results:

Real estate returned to civilian use, 265,905 acres.

Industrial plants with commercial potential made available for sale, 54 plants.

Personnel being released or reassigned, 53,310 men.

Annual operating savings, \$316 million.

During the next 2 years we expect to take additional actions which will increase the annual savings to almost \$450 million, with further savings anticipated in later fiscal years.

The adverse impact of these actions on the local economies is being completely or substantially offset in many cases. The Administrator of GSA recently advised me that in calendar year 1962, 26 industrial plants released by Defense were sold at fair market value of \$49 million, and that these plants are now employing 27,000 workers. In addition, we have an active program to assist employees and communities adversely affected by reduction or termination of defense activities. This program has been successful in minimizing loss of employment as well as in turning the excess properties to productive nondefense uses.

(b) Standardizing and simplifying procedures: During fiscal year 1963, 16 different requisitioning systems were successfully consolidated into one standard system, eliminating extensive rewriting of information and

wasted clerical effort. As a result, manpower reductions are beginning to occur, and over the next 2 years the value of clerical time saved should reach \$20 million per year.

On October 1 we plan to introduce a new single multipurpose shipping document which is designed to replace the 81 different bills of lading and shipping forms now in use. The value of the man-hours which the new improved system is expected to save when fully operational is estimated at more than \$30 million per year.

(c) Consolidating and increasing efficiency of operations: Actions taken during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963 to consolidate and increase the efficiency of other logistical operations of the Department of Defense should produce savings of almost \$220 million per year, somewhat more than our full year goal.

1. The defense Supply Agency, in its first 18 months of operation, has produced results well beyond our estimates prior to its creation. DSA is now managing 1 million items of common supplies, and has proved its ability to provide effective support to military users at substantially less cost than they previously incurred. Overhead savings of \$31 million in fiscal year 1963, and \$35 million in fiscal year 1964 are already assured. Inventories in fiscal year 1963 were reduced by 10 percent or \$240 million and a program was initiated to consolidate DSA stocks at 11 instead of 77 primary locations. Further improvements in DSA's operating efficiency are expected in future years.

2. Communications systems savings: During the past year the responsibilities of the Defense Communications Agency have been expanded and its effectiveness improved. Consolidated procurement of leased line services, and more effective utilization of existing defense and commercial services have produced savings of \$82 million.

3. Transportation and traffic management: Savings of \$13 million reported during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963 resulted from the increased use of economy class air travel, decreased cost of household goods shipments, and more economical use of airlift for cargo movements. Our goal for fiscal year 1963 was a saving of \$17 million. These economies are expected to increase during the next 2 fiscal years, reaching an annual rate of \$41 million by fiscal year 1965.

4. Maintenance management: Among other steps, we are installing detailed cost accounting and information systems to provide a basis for measuring and evaluating the performance of maintenance activities employing more than 1 million military and civilian personnel at some 2,000 locations. Savings from these and other reforms designed to provide more economical maintenance of equipment, family housing, and other property exceeded \$90 million in the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963—approximately double those in all of 1962. Our fiscal year 1965 goal for savings in these areas is over \$400 million per year.

IV. SUMMARY

Last year, I submitted a memorandum on the cost reduction program reporting reforms which I estimated would produce annual savings of over \$750 million in fiscal year 1963—toward a fiscal year 1967 goal of \$3 billion per year. Today I can report savings of \$1 billion in fiscal year 1963—one-third more than planned. Largely because of the rapid progress we have been able to make, we have now raised our goal for fiscal 1967 by about one-third—from the \$3 billion proposed last year, to the \$4 billion which is our current goal. As these savings materialize, they are being reflected in the Department's annual budget, helping us to meet the heavy burden of national defense with the least possible demand on the Nation's resources.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 13, 1963]

TRIMMING THE DEFENSE FAT

Defense Secretary McNamara's first annual progress report on his undertaking to tighten defense spending calls for a little celebration. Somewhere in his stockpile of "medals, outgoing," President Kennedy should have one inscribed "For Saving \$1 Billion in One Year." This is what Secretary McNamara says his department did in bettering by \$250 million his economy goal for fiscal 1963, while at the same time strengthening national security.

Even measured against a \$50-billion budget, \$1 billion is still a considerable piece of change. Looking at it another way, it represents almost the total Federal appropriation of only half a century ago.

Reviewing the entire procurement program from scratch, Defense was able to cancel \$700 million in purchases which under former procedures would have gone through. Part of this was made possible by redistribution of excess inventories from one military service to another in a way to make unification economically meaningful. For example, a million rockets not needed by the Air Force were conditioned for \$10 million for Army helicopter use, saving \$41 million over the cost of new procurement.

More importantly, an inventory of \$12 billion worth of excess stocks is now being compiled at a central clearing house for transfer from one service to another, preventing waste and duplication.

Other savings have been accomplished by trimming goldplating frills from specifications (\$1 million a week) and by increased emphasis on competitive bidding and incentive contracts. All of this only touches the surface of the department's many economy moves which, as much as anything else, dramatize the extent to which mismanagement and bureaucratic bungling had been allowed to bleed the taxpayers in increasing measure.

Secretary McNamara now believes it possible to attain an annual savings goal of \$4 billion by fiscal 1967, \$1 billion more than he estimated last year. In these days of ever-mounting budgets and debts, this all comes as the kind of news we would like to hear more often.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 12, 1963]

McNAMARA'S UNSPENT BILLIONS

Defense Secretary McNamara says savings of \$1.1 billion in taxpayer money were made by the Defense Department in the fiscal year ending June 30.

Mr. McNamara tells in nine pages how this was done, but he does not say anywhere how much the Defense Department spent in total last year. The estimate was \$48.3 billion—\$1.5 billion over the previous year's spending.

For the 1964 fiscal year, Mr. McNamara wanted \$49 billion for the Department—an increase.

So the savings to the taxpayers, if any, are not apparent.

Yet we believe Mr. McNamara when he says the operating changes he has made did result in spending less than otherwise, and that it will lead to more obvious savings in the future. He has been doing things which should have been done long ago—but it isn't easy here in Washington to turn a spend-thrift trend into a make-every-buck-fight policy.

For instance, Mr. McNamara has been increasing competitive bidding on Defense Department purchases. He bought a pack radio for \$843 on competitive bidding which had cost \$2,278 without bids. This lessened the cost of the purchase by \$10.5 million. He got a 40 percent reduction in the price of 8-inch howitzers by taking bids, etc.

This is where the loose money is. It is in the careless spending, in sheer waste, in sloppy methods, in a get-it-but-never-mind-the-price attitude.

If Mr. McNamara is shaking this type of laxness out of his Department, he is on the track of a real accomplishment—which should produce both actual money savings and a better equipped military. Engine Charley Wilson, who tried to run this Department in the Eisenhower administration, set out to get "more bang for a buck"—and his critics, including some high-placed Democrats, accused him of weakening our defenses. But "more bang for a buck" is precisely what Mr. McNamara is shooting for—and may his shots all hit home.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 15, 1963]

McNAMARA TELLS HOW PENTAGON CUTS DOCUMENTED

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara should be the most popular man in the United States. He maintains he has just saved the taxpayer a billion dollars in defense procurement.

That is only a beginning: By 1967, he contends, he is going to be saving the U.S. taxpayer upwards of \$4 billion annually in military procurement.

If one is skeptical, so it can be said were some of the press who showed up to watch the Defense Secretary tell his story. A billion dollars is a lot of money—and \$4 billion is four times as much.

But after an hour's rapid-fire explanation of how it was done—and going to be done—he had a good portion of his audience ready to admit the man has done some valid trimming.

CASES DETAILED

The former head of Ford Motors gave case history after case history on just how money was being saved—and how much. And he had the figures to back up his claim.

Take the case of a manpack radio that the military had been buying for \$2,278 a piece. By opening the contract to competitive bidding, the price was cut down to \$843.

In this particular case it turned out that the original supplier made the lowest new competitive bid and got the job. If that makes it look as if the firm had been making an unconscionable profit on the first order, it just wasn't so, argued the Secretary. What happened, rather was that when forced to bid competitive for the job, the firm found a dozen ways of cutting costs.

To any doubters the Secretary pointed to a stock of work sheets nearly 3 feet high—the work of 6 months of study and research—to show how, and by how much, the item cost of this particular product had been cut.

No one had the time at the news conference to examine this stack of data. But to most observers the research of those papers seemed to prove the Secretary's point. If a congressional committee should decide to question the Secretary on his claims, it could well find itself drowned in a sea of figures.

Very briefly here are some of the savings achieved this past year:

STOCKS CUT

1. By introducing a new uniform-issue priority system, cutting order and shipping time, and so reducing "on-hand" inventory, the Army has saved \$36,200,000.

2. By closer management control, the Navy has cut stocks of high-demand spare parts on aircraft carriers by 50 percent.

3. By cutting repair time on high-cost items from 90 to 45 days, and on low-cost items from 120 to 60 days, the Air Force has cut requirements on over 400,000 items with annual savings of \$469 million.

4. By using excess Air Force rockets for its helicopters, the Army has saved \$41 million over the cost of new procurement.

CONTRACT SAVING

5. By acquiring 20 J-79 jet engines that were excess to the Air Force, the Navy has used them in flying targets, saving \$4,400,000.

6. By using five excess Army fire-control systems, the Navy saved \$2,300,000 on a specific contract.

7. By taking 31 unserviceable aircraft engines from the Air Force, the Army repaired them and saved \$806,000 over the cost of new procurement.

8. By substituting a commercial hydraulic for a specially designed "mule" for opening and closing Minuteman silos, unit cost was cut from \$555,000 to \$80,800.

UNIT COSTS CUT

9. By substituting an aluminum casting with simplified fittings for a foam-filled plastic skin with special fittings for air vanes for the Pershing missile, unit costs were cut to one-third.

10. By reducing the capacity of the brake-fluid reservoir for T-38 aircraft from 17 ounces to 4 ounces, the unit cost was cut from \$178 to \$52.

11. By redesigning the radiation-hazard filter for airborne rocket launchers, unit costs were cut from \$13.02 to \$4.70.

EXAMPLE GIVEN

The reduction in unit costs in many items resulting from the shift to competitive procurement is startling. For example:

Cost of a M-110 8" Howitzer dropped from \$68,044 to \$41,415.

Cost of a M-107 175mm gun fell from \$68,035 to \$41,376.

Cost of a R-442 radio receiver dropped from \$1,519 to \$1,034.

Cost of a GRC-50 radio set fell from \$34,478 to \$17,411.

It is the Secretary's contention that in shifting from a single source to a competitive procurement, a normal reduction in price of at least 25 percent can be expected.

HUNDREDS OF INSTANCES

These examples of how the Secretary went about trimming a billion dollars off this year's military-supply costs only scratch the surface of the hundreds of instances in which savings were made.

To the observer, almost as impressive as the size of the savings is the wealth of supporting data the Secretary has to back up his claims.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM: CHERISHED HERITAGE FOR ALL AMERICANS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on July 2, 2 days before the 187th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Harlee Branch, Jr., president of the Southern Co., of Atlanta, Ga., addressed the Atlanta Kiwanis Club; and his splendid remarks have received wide acclaim.

Mr. Branch discussed the recent Supreme Court decision on Bible reading and prayers in the public schools and, with great truth, stated that the one thing which has made this Nation great was a lasting faith in a Divine Creator. Along with many other Americans, Mr. Branch fears that this faith is being undermined by decisions of the Supreme Court and that the religious freedom and strong moral fiber of the citizens of this country are at stake.

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

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

IN WHOM DO WE TRUST ANYHOW?

(Remarks of Harlee Branch, Jr., president, the Southern Co., Atlanta, Ga., before the Atlanta Kiwanis Club, July 2, 1963)

On Thursday we shall celebrate the 187th anniversary of our Nation's birth.

The event, as usual, will be marked by parades, picnics, and pageantry. Politicians will seize the opportunity to advance their standings; hucksters to promote their sales. There will be rolstering in the taverns and, if previous records and the predictions of highway patrols are matched, there will be slaughter on the highways.

Too few Americans will bother to ask: "What is there about America, its institutions and traditions, that is of special significance to mankind? What are the foundation principles of this Nation? Do these foundation principles still have validity and, if so, what are we doing to preserve them?"

The determination of our forefathers to throw off the yoke of foreign tyranny and to establish on this continent a nation, uniquely conceived and uniquely dedicated, was first formally declared in the Declaration of Independence. That document marked the birth of the great American dream although it took a long war and years of struggle to confirm it.

The Declaration was first approved on July 2, 1776, when representatives of 12 of the 13 original colonies voted for it. In a sense, therefore, today—July 2—is really our Nation's birthday although July 4 has been historically and officially designated as our date of independence because the tardy concurrence of New York on that date made the vote for the revolutionary resolution unanimous.

The Declaration of Independence was a unique document in many respects. But the salient, the brand-spanking new thing about that document was that it marked the first time that a people had ever dared to declare that their "right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" rested upon natural and divine law; that these rights were the gift of the Creator, not the object of concession by begrudging monarchs; and that governments existed only to protect and secure, not to abolish or to alter these unalienable rights.

This was not a new theory. As Secretary of State Rusk has pointed out, the principle of divine law was "older than the earth itself." It is a universal, unchanging truth "arising out of a discourse on the nature and purpose of man which began in Greece nearly 2,000 years ago." But until 1776, only Locke and a few other political philosophers and religionists had ever talked much about it. Never before had a whole people dared to stake their lives and their futures on the truth of this assertion.

I hope you will not consider it inappropriate for a businessman, who makes no pretense of piety, to suggest that the really significant thing about this Nation is that its laws and institutions, its hopes and dreams, have been made to depend on faith in a Divine Creator. This is a fact that needs reiteration—constant and determined reiteration—in a time when the highest court in the land, with an unmatched judicial absolutism parading under the beguiling label of neutralism, seems to me determined to eliminate God and religion from the curricula of our public educational institutions.

"Religion and morality are our indispensable supports," the Founding Fathers declared, and they added: "Whoever shall subvert these great pillars of human happiness shall not be entitled to claim the tribute of patriotism."

George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson—all of them—acknowledged that only religion can establish the principles upon which freedom and popular Government must stand. "The liberties of a nation cannot be thought secure," they said, "if we remove the only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God."

Benjamin Franklin—the oldest, and in many ways the wisest, of the men who formulated our Declaration of Independence and our national Constitution, put it this way when he arose in the Philadelphia convention to counsel his younger colleagues:

"I have lived, sirs, a long time and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sirs, in the sacred writings, that 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.' I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and byword to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing governments by human wisdom and leave it to chance, war and conquest."

Mind you, Dr. Franklin was not a religionist, not even a churchman in the usual sense of the word.

It is no longer fashionable to talk in words such as those used by Franklin, and Adams and Washington and Jefferson. Virtue and faith and commitment to principle—even patriotism itself—are scoffed at in many quarters. We have become soft and smug and self-satisfied. We speak of ours as an age of sophistication. We are beguiled by politicians and professors who exhort us to abandon the clichés of our political, social and economic pasts, forgetting that sophistication is frequently the product of conceit, cynicism and shallowness; and that a new cliché may be even more dangerous than an older one.

Fortunately, our forefathers were not afraid of clichés nor were they afraid to be called unsophisticated. They were completely willing to embrace change where change was warranted—indeed, they risked their lives in one of the most dramatic assaults on the status quo the world has ever witnessed. But they never sneered at the tried and the true merely because it was old.

We moderns are vastly more knowledgeable than the Founding Fathers, even the most educated of them. Indeed, the sum total of man's knowledge has doubled in the last 10 years alone, and it is estimated that it will double again in the next 5. But knowledge is not wisdom, and one of the greatest threats to our way of life is that we may rely for leadership upon politicians and judges who know more than they understand. Knowledge—mere factual knowledge, unenlivened by spiritual truths—can be a snare and a delusion.

Today, the great threat to our way of life is posed by atheistic and materialistic men, symbolized by the communistic hordes of the East and typified by the first Soviet cosmonaut, Titov, who declared on his return to earth from space: "Some people say there is a God out there but, in my travels around the earth all day long, I looked around and did not see Him. I saw no God or angels—I do not believe in God. I believe in man, his strength, his possibilities, and his reason."

How silly can man get? Who ever suggested that God was such an entity as could be seen by an earthling like Titov?

But, we must not become bemused by the idea that the Titovs of this world are men of ignorance. They are as knowledgeable as we in purely physical aspects of the Universe and, in some areas, their technology is believed to exceed our own. The one—the only—resource we have that the Soviet man does not possess is the resource of spiritual strength which is derived from our recognition of the fatherhood and supremacy of God and our dependence upon Him. Abandon this resource, allow it to become tarnished by sophistication and by conceit over our own assumed prowess, and we shall lose our individual freedoms and our individual dignity as surely as have the slaves of the Soviet superstate.

"Know the truth," said the lowly Nazarene, "and the truth will make you free." Not facts, not scientific formula, not physical abstractions, not beguiling political theories—but the truth as revealed by God.

This was the truth to which the Founding Fathers repaired in their time of national and individual crisis—this was the source of the principles upon which they founded this Nation—notwithstanding the sneers of those who in that day called themselves rationalists.

Now again the rationalists and the atheists and the materialists are clamoring for acceptance—in America and elsewhere. Only a few weeks ago, a prominent American scholar suggested that, since science has reduced the area of the unknown and since technology has increased our ability to use our environment, the relationship between God and man no longer applies. This is sheer philosophical poppycock, the sort of poppycock that is responsible for much of the sickness of our times.

For mankind, with all his knowledge, has not replaced God, nor will he do so. The greatest of our scientific discoveries, properly correlated and evaluated, confirm rather than deny the existence of a divine order and man's dependence upon it.

Those who founded this Republic sought, with God's guidance, to create here a governmental system built on confidence in divine law and the principles of individual freedom, dignity, and responsibility which depend upon that law and not upon human actions and assurances.

It is a tragic thing, I repeat, that their progeny, if enrolled in a public school, may no longer invoke, even in voluntary classroom prayer, the guidance and blessings of the very God upon whom the founders of the Nation so singularly relied. Religious freedom is a cherished heritage of all Americans, but it does seem strange that the principle of separation of church and state should now be tortured into a separation of the state from God—for the two principles are certainly not the same. What we need to do is bring God more vividly into our school exercises, and into our governmental and private affairs as well for, as Justice Frankfurter in a scholarly opinion observed: "The ultimate foundation of a free society is the binding tie of cohesive sentiment. Such a sentiment is fostered by all those agencies of the mind and spirit which may serve to gather up the traditions of a people, transmit them from generation to generation, and thereby create that continuity of a treasured common life which constitutes a civilization."

It is not enough to say that our Supreme Court has still left the individual the right to pray in private and outside the precincts of his State-supported institutions. The individual has that right in Russia, too. But religion cannot be just personal. If it is real, it must be present in all we do in public and in private, and if we take God from our public institutions, we are left with no foundation upon which to build.

We may produce as many and as excellent gadgets as we will (automobiles, missiles,

telephones, radios, television sets, electronic computers, and what have you) but, America and the Western World will not survive unless it also develops excellent men—men of faith; of humility, of truth, of moral stature, of strength and resourcefulness of mind (of pregnant ideas), of courtesy, of universal sympathy and friendship and love. Men such as these cannot be produced in a laboratory. They are produced only in good homes, good churches, good schools, where the presence of God is ever apparent.

In closing, I would like to pass on to you a word of kindly caution from one who, although not a native of the Western World, has shown an extraordinary regard for its institutions. He is Dr. Charles Malik, distinguished teacher and philosopher and former Lebanese Minister to the United States. Dr. Malik has warned that: "If the West thinks that it is going to win or even hold its own without the living God who made it and has sustained its excellence, it is simply mistaken. * * * Not by cleverness, nor by humanism, nor by sentimentalism, nor by the manipulation of force, nor by reliance on reason and genius, nor by the supplying of loaves and the giving of machines—not by any or all of these things alone—is the West going to succeed in defending and extending truth and light and freedom, but by the humble return to the living source of all truth, all light, and all freedom."

BAPTIST "CHRISTIAN INDEX" EDITORIAL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, though I am in disagreement with the views expressed in an editorial of the Christian Index, the official organ of the Baptist Church in Georgia, I was requested to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am doing so today, inasmuch as readers of the RECORD may find it interesting. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Index, June 27, 1963]
CHURCH AND HOME MUST FACE ISSUE

Worship of God suffered little, if any, in the Supreme Court ruling which outlawed required Bible reading recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. Neither did God become a stranger to public ceremony although logic leaves that status to future opinions.

Baptists are dedicated to the separation of church and state. They suffered too long under a state religion in their early years to forget the penalties. They have but to look in some countries dominated by a state church today to know the price for a religion without value when it exists by compulsion.

Constitutional lawyers or future opinions by the Court will decide whether Bible reading is still permissible for a devotional setting of the day. The requirement by law has been killed. Regardless, perfunctory reading is worth little and more especially if our dedication to church-state separation is thereby weakened.

Questions by the score remain. The Court specifically left outside its opinion the opening prayer by a chaplain in Congress. Neither did it touch the court crier who in his final phrase invokes the grace of God. There was no ruling on chaplains in the military. Logic, it would seem, places big question marks about these since public funds are spent for religion.

Similar logic would take Federal funds away from church-operated hospitals and more especially those which impose church dogma. It should—but it has not and prob-

ably will not. "In God we trust" may have to come from our coins. Also, is not tax exemption for churches an indirect subsidy?

These and many more questions can much more easily be raised than answered. We go back to the assertion that God suffered no major handicap in the Supreme Court ruling.

Now, more than ever, the churches and the homes must awake to their responsibility for making religion a personal matter. There must be Bible study. Mere Bible reading does not develop the individual. There must be a personal religious experience and a determination to share this with others.

The church will not provide the training in 20 or 30 minutes of Sunday school. Nor will the home in a 5-minute devotional. These help but to think this sufficient is as foolish as trying to learn geometry by glancing at the text.

We should be concerned now about how to add hours of Bible study in our church programs. We must return to the emphasis on family worship—in the home. We will take the initiative or the Bible will be the most unread of all books.

There is no gain for those who disagree in crying now about the Court opinion. The 8-to-1 opinion allows no hope for change and especially when a Protestant, a Roman Catholic, and a Jew agreed on the separation clause. Instead it is our responsibility to accept the mandate of Bible teaching which belongs to the church and to the home. Religion can then be personal and only then be of value.

CIVIL RIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE MENNONITE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Mennonite is a publication which is published by the General Conference of the Mennonite Church, of Newton, Kans. Its editor is Maynard Shelly.

In the July 9 issue of the Mennonite, the editorial was a letter to a Member of Congress. The letter stresses the need for action on the part of Congress in the civil rights field, and also discusses the part that the church can play in this field.

Civil rights legislation will soon be before the Senate of the United States for consideration.

It is my view that civil rights is a moral issue and in my opinion must be dealt with as a moral issue. We can pass laws, and will do so in this session of Congress; but the problem goes much deeper than that. Public opinion and human relationship cannot be legislated. Given equal opportunity for education and employment, the minority groups will make their own place of responsibility.

The time has come for us to examine our dedication to the individual. The world is shrinking. Our association with other people from other nations causes us to take a longer look at the purposes and accomplishment of the individual, and to concentrate less on his race, color, or creed.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which appeared in the July 9 issue of the Mennonite be made a part of these remarks.

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

LETTER TO A MEMBER OF CONGRESS

This will be a long hard summer for you. I can see it coming. Besides all your other

duties in the swamps of the District of Columbia, you now face the matter of civil rights of our citizens. I guess we all knew that it couldn't be put off forever. It had to happen sometime. But what?

A number of summers ago another group of Americans put together a document. It talked about life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. What has been happening since then? We all know that there is a big gap between the ideal and the real. We face it in our own lives. We are certainly not the people we know we should be. But we could be if we wanted to be.

This hasn't been the country we wanted it to be. We always knew it. Unfortunately, the rest of the world now knows it too. The people in Africa and Asia are watching us. They are looking to see what you down in the foggy bottoms of Washington are going to do. And, I suppose, you are wondering what the rest of us in the plains and hills and woods are going to say if you act, don't act, or muddle through the middle.

I can't speak for everyone. I do want to speak for myself and I hope for many other Christians. We hope that you will have the courage to do what your conscience says is the right thing to do. We elected you because we thought you knew more about the law than we did. We still agree that you do. But we want you to be more concerned about future generations than about the next election. We believe that President Kennedy has shown some fresh new courage in his profile by asking for new legislation on civil rights. You may disagree, but I think the Supreme Court has been showing considerable courage during the last 9 years. Somehow I don't get the same wavelength when I tune in on Congress. It could be that I am missing some things that you and your colleagues have been doing behind the scenes. But I would wish that this summer Congress could give itself a bit more of the courage image by passing some positive civil rights laws.

Yes, I know that President Kennedy's popularity has been slipping since his civil rights talk, but then we elected him to be President, not popular. This applies to other public servants, too, I feel.

Just now it looks as if there is going to be a lot of discussion about property rights. Does a businessman have a right to keep certain customers out of his shop and off his property? There are many good arguments to support this action. You know the law better than I do. But I would feel that human rights come before property rights. I could find quite a few texts in the Bible to help me here. Being a politician, I'm sure you would also find a quotation from the 1960 Republican platform of interest. It says, "Equality under law promises more than the equal right to vote and transcends mere relief from discrimination by government. It becomes a reality only when all persons have equal opportunity, without distinction of race, religion, color or national origin, to acquire the essentials of life—housing, education, and employment. * * * I am glad that the Republican Party in agreement with President Kennedy doesn't ask for human rights except when in conflict with property rights. It does say that "this Nation was created to give expression, validity, and purpose of our spiritual heritage—the supreme worth of the individual." By the time you come home next fall, I hope that we will have made a new effort in this direction.

It is fair for you to ask what the church is doing in this area. I admit that here also there is a gap between the ideal and the real. We aren't doing as good as we know. But we are involved in these problems in many ways. We have worked with the needs of people in Asia, Africa, and many other places. Yes, these are far away. But these

experiences have made us aware of the needs in our own hometowns. We are working on them. That's really one of the reasons I am writing.

FOREIGN AID AND SENATOR BEALL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, with the perennial question of foreign aid handouts soon to be discussed by the Senate, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the comprehensive and profound study of foreign aid conducted by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL]. The Senator's findings, published July 11, tell us that the \$100-billion giveaway program, which is consuming 1 out of every 17 American tax dollars, has failed miserably in most of the recipient countries. My colleague notes the effect of the Marshall plan on postwar Europe. He points quite correctly to the reluctance of the Marshall plan nations which have benefited the most from our aid to implement their own foreign assistance program or even meet all their multilateral defense obligations.

I have long felt that American tax dollars and private investment capital could form the base on which nations throughout the world would build sound economies, but those nations should first display the desire to help themselves and to help the cause of freedom. As the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] points out, our aid program places no such prerequisite on recipient nations.

Nations aided by us	U.S. aid since 1946	Present situation: How the cause of freedom has fared
Argentina.....	\$640,000,000	Under indirect military domination; suffers from inflationary chaos.
Brazil.....	1,900,000,000	On the brink of communism.
Cuba.....	52,000,000	Once enjoyed immense sugar subsidy; has stolen \$1,000,000,000 in private property of U.S. citizens; is a Red satellite of Soviet Russia.
Haiti.....	100,000,000	Writhes under a murderous tyranny.
Indonesia.....	670,000,000	Her economy wrecked; is an armed dictatorship bent on conquest.
India.....	3,900,000,000	Stands with Russia and against us on nearly all issues; probably faces Red Chinese attack.
Iran.....	1,300,000,000	Now a monarchy without a parliament.
Laos.....	460,000,000	"Coalition" government almost certain to fall to Communists.
Poland.....	522,000,000	Communist, with all freedom gone.
South Korea.....	5,400,000,000	Ruled by its 3d military junta; anti-U.S.A. demonstrations a common occurrence.
South Vietnam.....	2,400,000,000	Ruled by puppet dictator; racked by Red guerrilla war.
Turkey.....	3,800,000,000	Politically unstable; economically weaker than before U.S. aid began.
Venezuela.....	274,000,000	Unstable; much destruction of American-owned property; major target of Cuban 5th column.
Yugoslavia.....	2,400,000,000	Communist, with all freedom gone.

Senator BEALL concluded: "In countries receiving our aid, despots rule by terror, the economy is shattered, inflation is rampant, and Communist-fomented turbulence has put freedom on the run. In pouring billions of dollars into Poland and other countries and receiving in return only condemnation, are we not giving aid and comfort to the enemy? Is there any justice in taking the incomes of hard-working Americans to feather the nests of people who hate us? And what about our allies of Western Europe? Though now prosperous, they shirk their duty. They look to us to continue to carry most of the burden of their economy and military security.

"The American people are in no mood to continue to pour out their money to countries all over the world through a foreign aid program which, indisputably, is badly

For my colleagues' edification, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Maryland, together with his table covering aid payments to 14 nations, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR BEALL DETAILS HOW, WHY FOREIGN AID CAN BE CUT

Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland, announced July 11 that after making a study of foreign aid—and how the cause of freedom has fared in some of the nations which have greatly benefited—he believed the program had failed miserably and if 20 percent were cut from the fiscal year's budget recommendations it would not hurt anyone.

"One out of every 17 American tax dollars goes for foreign aid, and, thus far, American taxpayers have spent more than \$100 billion for foreign aid," the Senator reported.

"Proponents say that it has benefited us by rebuilding the military strength of the recipient nations and that it has promoted the cause of freedom around the world. Opponents dispute this, citing the situation in various countries which have received our bounty.

"Western Europe has prospered with Marshall plan aid from us, but after 17 years and \$41 billion in U.S. aid, Western Europe now meets only a fraction of its defense obligations and, except for commercial loans, its aid to less developed countries is negligible.

"And," Senator BEALL continued, "what about the cause of freedom?" He then gave the following examples of how the cause of freedom had fared in some nations to whom we have given enormous sums of money:

executed, unrealistic, and enormously wasteful, and has failed to accomplish its intended objectives."

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, it will come as a shock of brutal proportions to the millions of people held captive behind the Iron Curtain when they realize that an American cabinet member is touring their countries during Captive Nations Week as the feted guest of their Communist masters.

In keeping with its penchant for submerging the inspiring news of Captive Nations Week under diversionary headlines, the administration has dispatched

its agriculture secretary, complete with wife and entourage, to Poland, Russia, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria at the very time that we in America are dedicating ourselves to the freedom of those captive peoples.

It is perhaps significant then that this fifth Captive Nations Week, with its emasculated proclamation, was declared only with extreme reluctance on the part of the administration.

I should like to address myself a moment to the proclamation. In reading it, I was immediately struck, not by its contents, but by its omissions. In substance it is a weak and ineffective blandishment that fails even to mention the oppressor of the captive nations.

The administration has again produced a proclamation without mention of the Communist jailer of nearly two dozen nations. There is no mention of Hungary, or Berlin, or the people who have fought for nearly 20 years to rid themselves of the hammer and sickle. The newest and most sorely oppressed Communist satellite, Cuba, rated not even a passing reference. It is obvious that the administration, in declaring Captive Nations Week, was extremely circumspect about ruffling the fur on the Russian bear.

The President's proclamation, coupled with events of recent months, leaves little doubt that we are witnessing the administration's acquiescence to Communist control of millions of once free people who look vainly to the United States for assistance.

There was a time when they had reason to believe America's leadership recognized communism's insatiable appetite for world conquest, but their hope for help from the United States is fading as they see our swing away from firmness and determination toward vacillation and compromise. The last remaining colonial empire is ruled by the Soviet Union. It is the cruelest, the most oppressive, and the least responsive to the legitimate aspiration of the captive peoples. The Russian bear has extended its domain to a Caribbean island only 90 miles from American soil. It has flaunted with impunity the Monroe Doctrine. It has violated its own pledges. It is establishing permanent military, political, and industrial institutions in Cuba. The theme of this year's Captive Nations Week, as announced by the Captive Nations Committee, is "Liberate Cuba—To Restore the Faith in All Captive Nations—To Win the Cold War." I fail to understand how the administration's obvious distaste for Captive Nations Week, or the Agriculture Secretary's little junket, or the repressive acts against Cuban refugees in this country are going to accomplish the goals of that theme.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask for 2 minutes additional time.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Captive Nations Committee Chairman, Dr. Lev Dobriensky,

of Georgetown University, said recently "We cannot hope to win the cold war on the basis of anything but truth and well-founded action." To that premise I wholeheartedly subscribe, for we have in our lifetime seen the effect of peace by submission and by compromise. Freedom will not come to the captive nations unless the United States exerts unrelenting pressures to drive the wedge of freedom into the cracks of discontent that are appearing in the Iron Curtain.

The President has called on Americans to reassess their attitude toward the Soviet Union. Why? The United States is not the party at fault here. The United States has not at bayonet point imposed its will on countless millions. The United States precipitated no war in Korea. The United States has not triggered warfare in Laos, Thailand, or Vietnam or broken more than 100 treaties in 18 years. The United States has not built a wall of iron around the world, or driven legitimate government from their capitals. Why then does the administration exhort us to reassess our attitude toward the Soviet Union?

I suggest the administration could better reexamine its own attitude toward the cancer of communism that has engulfed nearly half the earth.

The objectives of communism have not been altered since the time of Lenin. The methods have been made flexible to accommodate changing times, but the common denominator of all Communists—dedication to world conquest—has not changed one iota.

The ultimate objective of communism is to add the bastion of freedom, America, to its growing list of captive nations. Whether or not they succeed will depend not on our readiness to accommodate ourselves to their chicanery but on our courage, our strength, and our dedication to the eventual freedom of all mankind. While communism has pressed Berlin and Cuba, the U.S. Government has pressed accommodation and compromise.

In its misguided attempts to coexist peacefully with the "butcher of Budapest," the administration is deserting the millions of people who look toward America for a fulfillment of their desire to be free. In its obvious reluctance to recognize the congressional mandate for Captive Nations Week, the administration is forgetting that freedom, and not peace by submission, is what our world seeks. We must never place ourselves in a position of surrendering freedom for a compromising peace.

Let us then not regard Captive Nations Week merely as an expression of sympathy for the oppressed. Let us put purpose to our efforts. Let us rededicate ourselves to the freedom of millions of Asians, Europeans, and Latin Americans so that in the years to follow there will be no need for a Captive Nations Week.

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES ACTING IN OTHER CAPACITIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently Mr. Justice Goldberg, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, was pro-

posed as a mediator in a railroad dispute. However, the proposal of mediation was rejected by one side, so Mr. Justice Goldberg did not serve.

The Senator from Mississippi has had no contact, directly or indirectly, with Mr. Justice Goldberg, but expresses the hope and belief that the Justice did not wish to serve. The Senator from Mississippi reemphasizes and reiterates his opinion and position stated last week that no member of the Supreme Court, while sitting as a member of that body, should have any duties, responsibilities, or official capacities of any kind except the direct official duties and responsibilities of that Court. A Supreme Court Justice cannot be partly a member of that Court and partly engaged in outside matters. One is either on the bench, or he is off. The Supreme Court is distinctly a separate branch of our Government, and the most independent of all branches. There is no possible reason why members of the Court should engage in outside activities, be they official or semiofficial, ordinary or extraordinary. This applies to foreign affairs, domestic affairs, and all affairs.

I reemphasize and highly commend the position taken by the late Chief Justice Stone, who during his active tenure on the Court, was called upon to exercise responsibility beyond the direct affairs of that high tribunal. The Justice very respectfully declined the invitation.

Mr. President, under date of July 11, 1953, Arthur Krock, the eminent and highly respected columnist of the New York Times, wrote a column on this subject, in which he gave his reason for his position and set forth the precedents as well. I ask unanimous consent that the column by Arthur Krock be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, July 11, 1963]

OUTSIDE DUTY DRAFTS ON THE SUPREME COURT (By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 10.—President Kennedy can cite many of his predecessors to witness that the selection of a Supreme Court Justice to assume temporarily a nonjudicial role in a matter of great national importance has the sanction of long practice. The first President to levy this draft on the Supreme Court was George Washington.

But with rare exceptions the Presidential draft was for service in the field of foreign affairs. And even in these instances the consequences were frequently unhappy for the individual Justice and for the Supreme Court as an institution.

It is this latter effect which evoked abiding doubts of both the wisdom and propriety of such Presidential drafts, even when they are for an international mission which poses no domestic issue at the time of its undertaking and creates none by its end product. And when the Presidential draft is for service in an area of dispute in which domestic political factors are deeply involved, doubts of its wisdom and propriety have been transformed by subsequent supporting evidence into a conviction that it has injured the Court.

THE PEARL HARBOR PROBE

For example, President F. D. Roosevelt selected Justice Roberts to investigate the causes of the Pearl Harbor disaster at a time

when only the presence of war restrained the language of widespread charges in and out of American political circles that one need travel no further than the White House to disclose the cause. And when the Justice fixed the blame on the Pearl Harbor commanders, he found himself, and through him the Supreme Court, in the midst of a dispute which still infests American politics.

American politics is also deeply involved in the railroads' work-rules controversy for which President Kennedy proposed to the principals a final arbitration by Justice Goldberg. That is because the power of organized labor to paralyze, with legal immunity, the economy of the whole Nation—which could be one of the immediate effects of a general railroad strike—is largely the legislative gift of the wing of the Democratic Party of which President Kennedy is the leader. Another reason is that the dispute is likely to reach Congress, a political arm of Government.

But the further fact that any settlement will probably be finally litigated before Justice Goldberg's Supreme Court "brethren" adds an instance, to the others against President Kennedy's choice of the Justice as railroad work-rules arbitrator. Even though it is obvious that Justice Goldberg's long career as lawyer and legislative policymaker for the unions persuaded the President that he supplied the best instrument to compose a nationally disastrous dispute in which labor unions were the holdouts, this does not outweigh the case against the selection.

CHIEF JUSTICE STONE'S VIEWS

Of all those who have opposed the drafting of Supreme Court Justices for extrajudicial public service, the late Chief Justice Stone was the strongest antagonist. He was deeply disturbed by every Presidential action of this kind, most particularly when Mr. Truman selected Justice Jackson as American prosecutor at the German "war criminals" trials at Nuremberg; when Justice Murphy applied for a wartime commission in the Army, and when Mr. Roosevelt asked Stone himself to head an investigation of the administration's handling of the rubber supply in 1942.

"We must not forget," he wrote to the President in rejecting the tender, "that it is the judgment of history that two of my predecessors, Jay and Ellsworth, failed in the obligations of their office and impaired their legitimate influence by participation in executive action in the negotiation of treaties * * * [and when a judge] participates in the action of the executive or legislative departments of government he * * * exposes himself to attack, and indeed invites it, which because of his peculiar situation, inevitably impairs his value as a judge and the appropriate influence of his office."

This comment applies especially to the extrajudicial service for which President Kennedy chose Justice Goldberg. The more so because it was plainly a move to further Mr. Kennedy's effort to avoid asking Congress for the "wider arsenal of [anti-strike] weapons" that in the 1960 campaign he said were needed in such emergencies as the present.

ATTORNEY GENERAL UNWISELY PREDICTS ACTION OF COURT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Charlotte Observer, of Charlotte, N.C., for July 9, 1963, carried an editorial entitled "Attorney General Unwisely Predicts Action of Court," in which the writer asserts with accuracy that the Attorney General's prediction that the Supreme Court, as now constituted, would overrule the civil rights cases of 1883, lends support to those persons who have been asserting "for 9 years that the nine men

in black have junked legal precedent in favor of sociological amendments to the Constitution."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

ATTORNEY GENERAL UNWISELY PREDICTS ACTION OF COURT

Attorney General Robert Kennedy has come off rather badly in his efforts to justify the public accommodations section of civil rights legislation. Yet he told a House Judiciary subcommittee that the Supreme Court would almost certainly reverse its previous positions on individual discrimination if Congress failed to make it unlawful.

The Attorney General was offering a personal opinion, of course. But his offhand remark only strengthened the arguments of critics of the Court. They have contended for 9 years that the nine men in black have junked legal precedent in favor of sociological amendments to the Constitution.

There is no question that the bill outlawing discriminatory use of private property involves basic constitutional issues. Legislation similar to that proposed by the Kennedy administration was a part of the Civil Rights Act of 1875. This provision was found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1883. The decision held that the 14th amendment applied only to action by a State, not discrimination practiced by an individual.

The Court majority said: "The wrongful act of an individual, unsupported by any such (State) authority, is simply a private wrong, or a crime of that individual; an invasion of the rights of the injured party, it is true * * *; but if not sanctioned in some way by the State, or not done under State authority, his rights remain in full force, and may presumably be vindicated by resort to the laws of the State for redress."

Justice John Marshall Harlan, grandfather of the present justice of the same name, dissented strongly. He contended that operators of places catering to the general public are agents or instrumentalities of the State because of their duties to the public.

But the Harlan view did not prevail. The 1883 decision became "the law of the case" and, by application of its principles to similar cases and by the failure of Congress to legislate further in the matter, "the law of the land."

This accounted for the Justice Department decision to use the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution as authority for the public accommodations law.

Congress is aware that the Supreme Court put off until its next term, starting in October, four cases involving the question of whether segregation in privately owned places is lawful where no law or official policy requires separation of the races.

It is significant, however, that in recent decisions striking down the conviction of sit-in demonstrators where such laws or policies existed, the majority opinions specifically referred to the Court's previous restraint in cases involving a private property owner's discrimination against individuals.

Under the law, the Supreme Court would be hard put to justify a reversal of the 1883 decision and others related to it. Properly, it is a matter for the legislative branch to handle.

Failure of the Congress to enact the public accommodations section—unless it is defeated only by a minority filibuster—would be an even stronger indication to the Court that the people are not in sympathy with additional coercive action in this area of human relationships.

SHALL IT BE VOLUNTARY OR FORCED COMPLIANCE?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N.C., for June 25, 1963, carried an editorial entitled "Shall It Be Voluntary Or Forced Compliance?" This editorial makes some sage comments upon the President's so-called civil rights proposals. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

SHALL IT BE VOLUNTARY OR FORCED COMPLIANCE?

In his civil rights message last week President Kennedy eloquently pleaded the case against continuing segregation practices in places which serve the public: "No one has been barred on account of his race from fighting or dying for America—there are no white or colored signs on the foxholes or graveyards of battle. Surely, in 1963, 100 years after emancipation, it should not be necessary for any American citizen to demonstrate in the streets for the opportunity to stop at a hotel, or to eat at a lunch counter in the very department store in which he is shopping, or to enter a motion picture house, on the same terms as any other customer."

The President's view, we think, is shared by an increasing number of Americans; and progress is being made every day all over the Nation (both because of the pressure of conscience and the pressure of street demonstrations).

Where the rub comes—and this is proper subject for national debate—is exactly how this worthy objective should be sought. For there is no doubt that once Federal compliance laws are enacted they would impinge on the rights of private property as now legally defined.

About 88 years ago Congress passed a law providing for equal accommodations in public facilities—hotels, restaurants, and eating places. But the U.S. Supreme Court in 1883 held that Congress had no power under the 14th amendment to write such laws, that its only power was to nullify State action of a discriminatory character. "It is clear that the law in question cannot be sustained by any grant of legislative power made to Congress by the 14th amendment," the Court ruled then. "This is not corrective legislation; it is primary and direct; it takes immediate and absolute possession of the subject of the right of admission to inns, public conveyances, and places of amusement. It supersedes and displaces State legislation on the same subject, or only allows it permissive force. It ignores such legislation, and assumes that the matter is one that belongs to the domain of national regulation."

In his civil rights message last week, President Kennedy spoke of the venerable code of equity law which commands "for every wrong, remedy." It may well be that 100 years after emancipation, Federal usurpation of this area, through legislative rather than judicial action, is desirable and the Court's decision of the 19th century should be struck down; but the Nation should recognize clearly what is proposed.

Rather than encouraging city-by-city, even lunch-counter-by-lunch-counter, desegregation (which any number of States and cities already has demonstrated can be done but which will, admittedly, be increasingly difficult without violence), the President is asking Congress for massive powers to sweep down such opposition even though ill-advised, everywhere. This would apply as forcefully for "Mrs. Murphy's" boarding-house on the corner as the Waldorf-Astoria

in Manhattan. It would apply, in the words of one Senator, to "every hamburger stand, every barbershop, every beauty parlor, every roominghouse up to every bank and insurance company in America."

And such massive power would be concentrated largely in the hands of the Attorney General. He would determine when and where suits, if any, were to be filed. He could use this new power for good or evil, for noble or ignoble purpose.

The question comes back to this: Is racial injustice pressing enough to justify such power usurpation by the Federal Government? Or should the Government and men of good will continue to encourage city-by-city, voluntary compliance?

The answer is not easy. For demonstrations in the streets and possible violence will surely develop where States or cities refuse to heed voluntarism. Some congressional leaders already have suggested that Congress might agree to bar discrimination by establishments doing a gross annual business of more than \$150,000 or \$250,000, which would exempt the corner grocery stores and Mrs. Murphy's boardinghouse. Still others believe the Federal Government should go no further than providing a program of voluntary desegregation through a community relations service.

The problem is crucial because the mandate requested by the President would be so sweeping as, perhaps, to discourage further voluntary action by local community leaders. At the same time it might deprive such communities of the genuinely rewarding educational process which some cities, like Greensboro, have experienced in voluntary, locally managed compliance.

TOBACCO COMPANIES FEEL SENATOR NEUBERGER'S URGING

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, our esteemed colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], has taken the lead in efforts to bring to the consciousness of the American people the hazards arising from unregulated and unrestricted smoking of cigarettes. Her activities in this regard—which I strongly support—have recently been praised in an article entitled "Tobacco Companies Feel Senator NEUBERGER'S Urging," which appeared under date of June 27, in the East Oregonian of Pendleton, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent that the article praising the Senator from Oregon for her activities may be printed in the RECORD.

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

TOBACCO COMPANIES FEEL SENATOR NEUBERGER'S URGING

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Sooner or later most Members of Congress focus what creative force they bring to their work upon a special field or area of concern by which they soon become identified in the public mind.

Midway through her 6-year term, Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER'S choice of legislative specialty has become evident. It is the general field of consumer protection, with heavy emphasis on doing something to undermine the common American addiction to cigarette smoking.

Medical findings connecting lung cancer and heart disease with cigarette smoking make action imperative to protect the consumers who haven't heard this word or who take it lightly, in her view.

SHE OPPOSES PROHIBITION

The Oregon Senator doesn't fit the mold of Carrie Nation, the hatchet wielding anti-

saloon reformer from Kansas, a State which once outlawed cigarettes. Quite the contrary, Mrs. NEUBERGER believes that prohibition won't work against tobacco any better than against liquor.

The Senator is a more sophisticated reformer. She believes that individuals, especially young people, are induced to smoke by subtle but irrelevant motivational appeals. Cigarette commercials portray rugged athletes and sportsmen, fashionable ladies, or attractive couples in romantic attitudes, all finding great pleasure in cigarettes. Instead of taking an ax to tobacco stands, she would take a shears to cigarette ads and commercials.

Noting the unwillingness of the industry to admit to health hazards from smoking, she thinks the Government must educate and warn the consuming public.

INDUSTRY ON DEFENSIVE

She has even written a book on the subject, entitled "Smokescreen," to be published in the fall as part of her campaign to persuade or needle the Government to move in this direction.

Obviously the tobacco industry is a bit on the defensive, if not on the run. Its announced decision last week to discontinue advertising in college newspapers on grounds that it regards smoking as an adult habit is a tactical withdrawal along the fringe of the market it has most prized in recent years.

Cigarette sales promotion on campuses had doubled in the past 5 years, not only with ads (tobacco accounted for 40 percent of national ads in college publications) but also with contests in which sports cars and hi-fi sets were distributed. The psychology of it was explained by one company's college sales director: "Students are tremendously loyal. If you catch them, they'll stick with you like glue because your brand reminds them of happy college days."

DIDN'T CONCEDE LINK

A year ago the American Cancer Society urged college presidents and the Federal Trade Commission to help curb campus smoking promotion efforts. When the industry last week announced its voluntary retreat, it made no concessions that there might be a link between cigarettes and cancer.

To Mr. NEUBERGER, this retreat should be followed by others which would affect the motivational appeals to the entire population, largely through TV commercials. She notes that cigarette sponsors in Britain comply with guidelines of the British Independent Television Authority, which rates as objectionable, commercials which overemphasize the pleasure to be obtained from cigarettes, feature the conventional heroes of the young, appeal to manliness, use a fashionable social setting to suggest that cigarettes are essential in modern living, or present romantic situations with the pleasure of smoking.

"Surely," said the Senate's specialist in this field, "the American cigarette advertisers can, in all good conscience, do no less."

REPORT DUE IN FALL

President Kennedy has asked for a definitive study of the medical aspects of smoking. A report from the Surgeon's General's Advisory Committee on Smoking is due in the fall.

Assuming it substantiates her conviction that smoking represents a major health hazard, Mrs. NEUBERGER plans to campaign for Executive action to educate the public about the danger and to require appropriate labeling of tobacco products and ads and commercials to warn consumers. She says the Government already has authority to do this much.

In addition, she plans to introduce legislation banning distribution of free cigarette samples to minors, common on campuses; restricting the permissible tar and nicotine

yields from cigarettes; and increasing cigarette taxes to finance education efforts to warn the public about their danger.

WALTER LIPPMANN'S 50 YEARS OF AMERICAN THOUGHT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in the history of our time the name of Walter Lippmann has achieved Olympian proportions in our unceasing battle to separate truth from fiction. The tremendous contribution which this journalist has made to his Nation and to his world of the 20th century was reviewed Sunday in the Washington Post by another keen and capable and truth-loving American, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson. Ambassador Stevenson's review of a recently published collection of Mr. Lippmann's writings during the past 50 years offers us the unusual and fascinating insight when one Olympian mind surveys and assesses another.

I believe Ambassador Stevenson's commentary on Mr. Lippmann's writings has profound meaning for all mankind and is worthy of insertion in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point.

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

HALF CENTURY STRESSES LIPPMANN IMMEDIACY

(By Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations)

If the writings of a public official—by the very nature of his concern with events of the day—tend to be ephemeral, the writings of a journalist often are even more so. The old aphorism that nothing is as dead as yesterday's news is certainly a cardinal rule to be added to a reporter's golden quartet of who, what, where, and when.

But (to fall back on still another aphorism which I both quote and practice) rules are made to be broken. And even if they weren't, no rule could hem in the remarkable perspective that gives the writings of Walter Lippmann a freshness and an immediacy no matter whether the year is 1963, 1913, or any of 48 others in between.

For that reason we owe a debt to Profs. Clinton Rossiter and James Lare, who have had the enviable task of culling through Lippmann's writings over half a century and selecting those that now appear in "The Essential Lippmann" (Random House).

They have obviously performed a labor of love, and an effective one, too, inasmuch as the result escapes the trap of most anthologies by its almost narrative flow of thought. And, as I say, it was an enviable task because they have had occasion to read and reread even more of Lippmann than their book contains.

A SHARPENING PERCEPTION

Now, I know from my own experience that when time makes a hurried rereading possible, what one has written under pressure more frequently is a source of shudder than of satisfaction. Indeed, scanning over the texts of some of the speeches I have made over the years, I recall uncomfortably some words of Froude in his life of Bunyan: "The excitement of perpetual speechmaking is fatal to the exercise of the highest powers."

However, "The Essential Lippmann" is clear evidence that the excitement of perpetual writing—be it column, article, editorial, pamphlet or book—has been far from fatal to the exercise of Lippmann's highest powers. Quite the contrary, it has but sharpened them and made their insight all the greater.

And this is what gives his writings the immediacy I mentioned earlier. So it matters not that 1915 was the year in which he wrote: "Our days are lumps of undigested experience. You have only to study what newspapers regard as news to see how we are torn and twisted by the irrelevant; in a frenzy about issues that do not concern us, bored with those that do."

Nor does the year matter when he says, as he did in 1945, that the "inner principle of the Western tradition is not local, tribal or national, but universal, and insofar as we are its faithful servants, we shall, in learning how to use our power, win the consent of mankind." Nor that it was 1961 when he wrote, "The only real alternative to communism is a liberal and progressive society."

A SPIRIT RECAPTURED

But even though much of his work over the years has this relatively timeless validity, Walter Lippmann would probably be the first to acknowledge that few assumptions are immutable. Indeed, the fate of men will be decided in the long run by restless thinkers who, like Lippmann, are not afraid to stand up and rock the boat.

I think it was Jefferson who proclaimed that the United States was the strongest Nation on earth not because of its military might or its productive capacity (of course, we had neither at his time) but because of its revolutionary ideas. The American Revolution, he said, "is intended for all mankind."

This is the spirit, I would say, that has been recaptured so magnificently in our day by Walter Lippmann. The ideals he espouses are the ideals of an audacious heritage, one that, alas, is not popular in all sections of our society today; we have only to look at the struggle for equal rights to understand that the American dream from which our heritage stemmed—that of liberty and justice for all—still is unfinished business 187 years after Washington, Jefferson, and Paine.

This is precisely why we need—and why we are fortunate that we have—a Walter Lippmann to prod us and remind us constantly that our aim, perhaps, is not always steady or consistent with our professed goal, and that a respect for truth should be the supreme principle of an open society.

And if I may be forgiven for resurrecting some of my own words, it is truth that is the great need of this shrinking world. In nothing else—certainly nowhere else—will men and nations find genuine security.

We all know in our personal lives that there is no greater danger to our health and sanity than delusions about ourselves, our significance or our status. And so it is with nations. They must command the facts about their own strength, their resources, their standing, their risks, and their opportunities. Otherwise, they have no means of judging policy, estimating risks or steeling themselves for decisions. A nation that disregards truth puts its very survival in question.

Truth and history, including current history, should be one and indivisible. It may be too much to expect this consistently of any one writer, but Walter Lippmann comes close; and perhaps that, above all, is why he has also come to be regarded as the outstanding American political commentator of our day.

A wise man once said that the trouble with this generation of Americans is "they haven't read the minutes of the previous meeting." If now they read "The Essential Lippmann," they will have read the essential minutes, and they will have learned something of the truth that is the might of our destiny.

V. J. SKUTT HONORED BY NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on May 21, the National Conference of Christians

and Jews conferred its national silver medallion and scroll on Mr. V. J. Skutt, a prominent Omaha civic leader.

At the same ceremony in Omaha, Mr. Richard W. Walker, of Omaha, received a certificate of recognition of his leadership in civic betterment.

The dinner speaker was Dr. Marlin Perkins, director of the St. Louis Zoological Gardens.

The award to Mr. Skutt was presented by Dr. Sterling W. Brown, of New York, executive vice president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the presentation by Dr. Brown and the acceptance remarks of Mr. Skutt.

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

REMARKS OF STERLING W. BROWN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, NEW YORK

The chairman asked me to make just a very brief observation in terms of what's going on nationally in terms of relations between the groups in America which differ in religion and nationality of background and race. Of course, the National Conference of Christians and Jews for more than a generation has been carrying on its educational program quietly and without a great deal of fanfare in this country and, of course, we are dealing with intangibles—the attitudes and the practices of human beings with relation to people who are different, and this isn't as easy to measure as the products of a manufacturing concern, but there are a few indications that a number of gains have been made.

First of all, I think, that nearly all social scientists would agree that Catholics and Jews in America are now approaching parity of opportunity in every way perhaps with a slight reservation on the social side with Anglo-Saxon white Protestants. It's true that in New York City and in other places sometimes we smooth this over and on the surface one would think that all the problems are healed because we balance the ticket on both parties, you know, with representatives from the various groups—racial and religious and nationality—but down underneath, of course, there are a considerable number of problems remaining. It is true, however, that we've elected a Catholic President in this country; and the old joke about the shortest cablegram in history being sent from Al Smith when he lost the election in 1928 to the Holy Father—one word, "Unpack"—is no longer simply funny in this country. Thank you, girls, you're, of course, too young to have remembered the 1928 election.

It's also true and not very well known nor have we advertised it, but the National Conference of Christians and Jews has carried on a quiet but persistent program in more than 15 cities of the South and the deep South and the Southwest. We are not professionally prepared to do or to claim a first class contribution to the progress that has been made directly in race relations; but we have been able to accomplish, as a result of our educational program, a number of gains in terms of the struggle that's going on today to give full and equal opportunity to every citizen in this country without regard to race, religion or nationality background. I could enumerate those for you. We've never written a pamphlet on them because, frankly, some of the gains we made we might have lost had we put it in the paper, and we've been content to continue our leadership quietly and effectively. In spite of all of this, I must say that we all recognize, those of us who are in this field

of group relations, that there are a number of differences between Catholics and non-Catholics in this country—honest differences of opinion—differences not only in theology, but difference on the school question and a number of other areas which we have not worked out and which are causing and may cause in the future a number of tensions and disruptions. But the position of the National Conference is to keep the lines of communications open and to work these problems out in the form of public opinion rather than in the actions and attitudes of prejudice.

It's also true, regrettably, that anti-Semitism, although considerable progress has been made in eradicating this social disease, it is after all a deeply imbedded tenacious infection of our social and cultural scene, and it will take more than this generation to finally rout it out of our cultural scene. So much for the work of the conference. In a very real sense, I suppose, it's related to Mr. Perkins' concern and great interest in this similar world of ours—what the national conference is really doing, or attempting to do, is to get human beings to live up to the best actions of the animal world—the other part of the animal world—rather than to set our patterns by the lowest actions of the animal world.

Now this brings me to the honor that I have in making a presentation to one of your guests of honor tonight, and in a very real sense you know in your mind and even more so in your hearts, that V. J. Skutt, in a sense, epitomizes the decency of this world of human beings to which we give the name brotherhood. Actually, I have here a 3-page record from "Who's Who" and other authoritative and accurate objective publications which give something, just bare sketch and outline form, some of the activities and contributions Mr. Skutt has made. It's interesting, by the way, that he came first to this life in Deadwood, S. Dak., and he has been giving life its fullest ever since that time. One might say that he's a student of the law, a community leader, a university board member, a churchman, a business executive, a philanthropist, a board member of the banking, railway, food and insurance industries and in a sense, a person of cultural eminence. In the sense that I'm told that in many ways he's down to earth but idealistic; that he's a middle westerner but also that he's cosmopolitan; that he epitomizes commonsense, but that he is in many ways urbane; that he's an intellectual but appreciative and sometimes participates in the athletic; that he is plain but at the same time suave; that he can be stern when it's required but he's always humorous when it's appropriate. In other words, I think the recipient of our award has really brought and symbolizes the mutuality of business and brotherhood and so it gives me a good deal of pleasure to present to him tonight a national brotherhood award on behalf of the three cochairmen of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. And, Mr. Skutt, if you will drop your modesty and assume your image of facing the audience, as you must, I would like to present to you this lovely silver medallion to V. J. Skutt for his contributions to the cause of brotherhood, May 1963. And with it goes this certificate with all of the rights and privileges, opportunities and obligations appertaining there unto.

RESPONSE BY MR. V. J. SKUTT

Thank you, Dr. Brown, Chairman Frank, Dick Walker, Father Reinert, other members of the clergy, members of the Omaha board and friends. I am quite overwhelmed, Doctor, by the conclusion of your remarks and the honor you have shown me. In the early part of your remarks when you were talking about some of the problems that we face in religions, I began to wonder whether I qualified for this reward. I want to say that this

is a very, very happy occasion for Dick Walker and myself and first of all to thank each of you for taking the evening and sharing this occasion with us. I am happy to share it with Dick and with his wonderful family, Evelyn and Bill and Jan. And certainly as he has said about Omaha—all of us are but a symbol—both of us here and our families are but a symbol of the spirit of brotherhood that exists in our community. And speaking of brotherhood, may I take a moment to also thank that younger and slimmer brother of mine here tonight, Marlin Perkins—and his wife, Mrs. Perkins. I think, Marlin, since you were nice enough to make this trip that I am going to tune in on one of your programs one of these days.

Dr. Brown, I should like to say to you that this award will be deeply cherished by my family and me because of its significance—because of that for which it stands. The tempestuous tensions and penetrating pressures of the world in which we live tend to produce distrust, dissension and discord among people. These deplorable factors feed and flourish on prejudices. Our own and other nations are working hard endeavoring to establish some union in international relations and that is all for the good. In fact, it is a must if we are to preserve civilization.

But I am one who believes that unity—like charity—should begin at home. And Angela and I in our home, to speak provincially, we have endeavored to take a broad-gaged view of our obligations to our community and our fellow citizens—never to be persuaded too much by veneer—superficially veneer—or by sophisticated sophistries, but rather to look to the character, the principles, the purposes and the performance of people. Certainly not to gage any decision upon what, if any, religion they may see fit to espouse; never to be narrow. Finding some comfort and strength in our own, we are happy in the knowledge that others share the same happiness in theirs. And there is not a thing that is new about this little bit of philosophy. In fact, it is as ancient as the Old and New Testaments and without invading the province of the clergy I might say that through both of these great Biblical works we find the theme of brotherly love.

And in our own country our Founding Fathers placed it in the jurisprudence of our land and thus made it possible for us in this generation to share it together. It implies and includes not only privileges, the right to individual dignity, responsibility, the right to self-respect, the importance of the individual in our way of life—privileges and obligations—and I repeat—obligations. You know it is relatively easy to engender a great deal of enthusiasm about privileges and rights. But it is frequently a little more difficult to arouse some interest in obligations and responsibilities. We find that even in business sometimes. The personnel are very unanimous to accept privileges—sometimes with amazing alacrity. But when it comes to obligations—meeting them—now and then they must be reminded.

And so it is with our obligations as citizens. So it is with life—with human nature. And that is one of the great purposes served by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It serves to remind us of our individual responsibilities as citizens. It keeps it before us.

I think in addition to the work of the Conference, which appears on the back of the program, that this great effort in reminding us of responsibilities—each of us—is perhaps the noblest and most effective part of your work. Because one of the great needs of today is the development of a better sense of responsibility—among nations, first of all—to get away from the idea that one nation will take care of all others—and among individuals, the idea that others will take care of them. A sense of responsibility which is

one of the goals, as I understand it, of the National Conference is more important today than ever before and all of us should dedicate our own efforts, in my opinion, to bring about that atmosphere more effectively in our country. As we gain maturity, I think that we obtain and retain a better knowledge of the importance of human relations. There is a great amount of comment today about what the young people should do for the older ones—what the Government should do for them * * * and as one who has not long to wait before being a recipient of some of that potential bounty, I still feel that there are some things that the older can do for the young, and for our country. And one of them is to give them perhaps a little better understanding of the importance of proper human relations—of understanding the other person's problems.

Those are the things that are learned not from books but from experience—from years—yes, from decades of association with other people. Now I am reminded in this connection of a statement that appears in the preface to the autobiography of one of the great elder statesmen of our time. He had made his first fortune at the age of 35 and many more after that. But what is far more important is that he had devoted his talent and his efforts to helping make this a better country and world in which to live. He served as confidante and adviser to some seven Presidents of the United States and to both political parties. I refer, of course, to Bernard Baruch. And in this short preface to his own story he makes this statement in connection with this maturity to which I refer. He said: "If there is a key to my growing up it lay in the systematic efforts I made to subject myself to critical self-appraisal, and as I came to know myself I acquired a better understanding of other people." This simple statement by a great man expresses what I mean—my dear, good friends—in saying that unity begins at home. It begins first of all in our homeland—in our country, in our home communities where we have it so well represented here tonight and throughout our city—and in our home life with our families and our loved ones. But vital—vital above everything else—is that it begins with each of us, right here.

Humbly and appreciatively, Angela—my family and Tom and Sally and the others here tonight, accept this award with a determination to be even better citizens * * * and I thank you most sincerely for the honor you have shown us tonight.

DANGERS OF CERTAIN PROPOSED STATES' RIGHTS AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Bar's Informing Function," published in the Washington Post of July 8, 1963, calling attention to the informed public service of Madison, Ill., Bar Association and Mr. Arthur J. Freund, a St. Louis attorney, in alerting the country to the dangers of certain proposed States' rights amendments to the Constitution.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 8, 1963]

BAR'S INFORMING FUNCTION

The airing of views on the three proposed States' rights amendments to the Constitution, which was arranged by the Madison County, Ill., Bar Association, scarcely attained the status of a great debate in the na-

tional sense of the words. But the bar of Madison County is entitled to commendation for providing a forum for this debate at the suggestion of Chief Justice Warren. If other bar associations had been conducting similar sessions for the public enlightenment, we doubt that these dangerous amendments, or at least two of them, would have been passed by about one-fourth of the State legislatures.

At the conclusion of the debate featuring Justice Millard F. Caldwell of the Florida Supreme Court and Arthur J. Freund, a St. Louis attorney, the assembled lawyers voted overwhelmingly against the proposed amendments. This, we surmise, would be the general response of the bar and the public if both were alerted to the nature of the amendments. For one of them would reverse the Supreme Court's decision which is bringing about widespread reapportionment of State legislatures; a second would make it possible for the States to amend the Constitution, as Mr. Freund said, "without any national deliberation anywhere"; and a third would virtually destroy the Supreme Court by subjecting some of its decisions to reversal by a Court of the Union composed of 50 State chief justices.

Together these amendments are designed, again in Mr. Freund's words, to start the United States down a "ruinous road toward establishing a confederacy." We do not think there is any serious danger of the country taking this road deliberately. But in an atmosphere of apathy and in the absence of full discussion, astonishing gains for the proposals have been made. Bar associations still have a big task to alert their communities to what is doing on.

ADDRESS BY JACOB BLAUSTEIN AT BICENTENNIAL REDEDICATION SERVICE OF TOURO SYNAGOGUE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on June 23, 1963, it was my great fortune to hear Mr. Jacob Blaustein deliver a really remarkable speech at the bicentennial rededication service of Touro Synagogue in my own city of Newport, R.I.

Mr. Blaustein told the story of the Jewish community in Newport and with feeling described what it had contributed to our town, our State, and our Nation. He also touched upon his present important work as senior vice president of the conference on Jewish Material claims against Germany.

Many of us in this body have long been acquainted with the leading role Mr. Blaustein has occupied and the generous support of worthy causes that he has long given.

I ask unanimous consent that his truly excellent speech may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

ADDRESS BY JACOB BLAUSTEIN AT BICENTENNIAL REDEDICATION SERVICE, TOURO SYNAGOGUE, NEWPORT, R.I., JUNE 23, 1963

On a fine summer day in August 1947, 16 years ago, this city of Newport was host to many visitors from all over the country. They were in this city to celebrate the designation, by the U.S. Department of the Interior of Touro Synagogue as a national historic site. This was indeed a far cry from 1759 when the Jews of Newport, few in number and modest in means, undertook the building of this Jewish house of worship.

In biblical times the prophets of Judaism proclaimed that every human being was endowed with inborn dignity. Three thousand years later, Christ in His Sermon on the

Mount called on His followers to live by this preaching. But it remained for a handful of rebels 16 centuries later, followers of Roger Williams who built themselves a settlement in what is now this very city, to guarantee by law in 1641, with no "ifs," "ands," or "buts," the inherent rights of civil and religious liberty.

Six years later, after the settlement of Rhode Island had become a colony, the first general assembly drew up a code of laws which contained these momentous words: "All men may walk as their consciences persuade them, every one in the name of his God."

So Rhode Island became the first haven of complete religious liberty in all the world—either the Old World or the New. And for some years, it was the only one. While Newport was welcoming people of different faiths—Quakers in 1657, Jews the next year, Baptists in 1671—other parts of the country were still in the Dark Ages in this respect. In Massachusetts, Quakers were publicly whipped. Incredible as it sounds, a president of Harvard College was convicted of heresy and compelled to resign because he was a Baptist. In New York—then called New Amsterdam—Jews were threatened with expulsion; because, said Peter Stuyvesant, if they were allowed to stay, how could Lutherans and Roman Catholics be refused?

Of course many of the Colonies were founded for religious asylum, but for their own beliefs alone—Massachusetts for the Puritans, Maryland for Catholics, Pennsylvania for Quakers. For in those early days, none allowed dissenters from the ruling majority—none, that is, except Rhode Island. It was a sanctuary small in size but gigantic in vision, personified in life by its founder Roger Williams, a crusader for absolute freedom of conscience.

The Jewish congregation here was older than the synagogue by almost a century. Its first families, all 15 of them, came to Newport in 1658. Being a tiny flock and of modest means, they met for prayer in one another's homes. Like the 23 Jewish pioneers who had settled in New Amsterdam in 1654, those who sailed into this harbor were fleeing in the main from the Inquisition in Spain and Portugal.

They were not unusual. Their frail little ship was neither the first, the last, the largest nor the smallest. Every American has a ship in his family history. All of us or our forebears were carried here from somewhere else.

Those 15 Jewish families were not searching for gold. They were not looking for lands to conquer. They were not exploring new trade routes to the mysterious East. They were seeking nothing more than a peaceful place to build a few houses and grow some food to eat. That is all—except one more thing. They wanted to worship God without taking orders from anyone about how to do it. They wanted to organize their own congregation. And they wanted to educate their children in the Jewish faith and bring them up to treasure their religious freedom.

The more I work in world and Jewish affairs, the more I realize the absolute necessity of this last point—the absolute necessity of inculcating greater Jewish consciousness into our young people. If we Jews are to present to our fellow Americans—and have them accept—a true, dignified, favorable picture of the Jew, and if we are to strengthen within ourselves the sense of our own worth so as to enable us to withstand and surmount the effects of anti-Semitism, we must have, and must pass on to our children, an understanding and deep appreciation of our fine Jewish heritage.

And while I was not there, I feel sure this was how those Jews of early Newport reasoned and what spurred them into action.

Not being able in 1759 to finance a synagogue undertaking without help, they addressed a financial appeal to the Jewish congregations in other cities. So you see fund raising was a deeply rooted device even among Jews of the 18th century.

The appeal was generously answered by the New York Congregation Shearith Israel which sent them 10 percent of their entire budget, making the enterprise possible.

Smaller contributions were received from such farflung Sephardic Jewish communities as Jamaica, in the British West Indies; Curacao, in the Dutch West Indies (the oldest synagogue in the Western Hemisphere); and from Surinam, Dutch Guiana, in far off South America. Among the gifts from individuals was 100 pounds of wax for making candles. This was truly a united Jewish appeal that reached its goal.

It took faith and dedication and do-or-die persistence to build a new life in the wilderness of the New World. And none proved of tougher fiber, none fought more valiantly for their ideals, none bequeathed a nobler legacy to succeeding generations than those devout forefathers of ours who formed the Jewish congregation of Newport.

And note also they were, from the start, an integral part of this whole rugged community. They marched in its militia. They labored to build its industries—shipping and whale oil, candles, and furniture, iron, brass, and silver—and Moses Seixas founded here the first bank in the United States, it still being in existence. They sailed their vessels up and down the coast and across the seas—helping to make Newport one of the great centers of commerce in the colonies—surpassed only by Boston and Philadelphia. And when, in 1763, they had grown to 80 members and were able to dedicate their own house of worship, the entire community shared in their rejoicing.

The synagogue itself, like those who brought it into being, became a part of the community at large. During the Revolutionary War, the State legislature met here, the supreme court of Rhode Island held its sessions here, and this beautiful building was even used as a barracks. When the British seized the city in 1776, the Jewish citizens, like all the active patriots of Newport, had to flee. But the synagogue proved able to defend itself. In fact, it disarmed the invaders. For when they burst through the doors and looked above the Ark, they saw the Ten Commandments adorned with three crowns—symbols of the majesty of divine law. But in the eyes of the Redcoats, these crowns signified the British throne, and they respectably withdrew.

So it happened that this synagogue with its colonial grace, its domed ceiling and lofty columns, its ancient Hebrew scrolls and eternal light, remained unscarred by war. It survived to become not alone the oldest Jewish house of worship in America; not alone a national historic shrine from which all Americans draw inspiration; but an enduring expression of the spirit that prevailed this community and made it a wellspring of American unity.

How imposing it sounds, and how simple, how homespun it was. Here in Newport, 200 years ago, the few Jewish citizens, having decided to build a synagogue, selected a fellow townsman not of their faith to design it. And no one at that time seemed to consider it remarkable for the noted architect to work, as Peter Harrison did, without charging a fee. Such was the spirit of mutual friendship that prevailed among the free and diversified religious groups of this community.

An unusual feature of this structure is the underground tunnel. One theory suggests this oddity was a reminder to the Sephardic Jews of Newport of the underground passage where Jews were regularly forced to assemble and worship in Spain and Portugal during the Inquisition.

Let me say here that until 5 years ago the few Jews in Spain were still worshipping in secret. Only then, because of the interest and a large portion of the required funds being made available by the conference on Jewish material claims against Germany, was a small synagogue permitted by the Government to be set up in Madrid and to operate openly. It was the first synagogue there since the Inquisition in 1492, when King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella ordered all Jews expelled from the land. It was proudly shown to your speaker last year by the Madrid Jewish community. And I was told then that it was already too small for the growing Jewish population which has been entering Spain from the north African countries.

I sometimes wonder if we Americans adequately appreciate this great democracy of ours, with the freedom of religion and the freedom of opportunity we enjoy here. I fear we are apt to take all our freedoms for granted and do not realize that our religious liberty and our personal opportunities are examples of the countless blessings that flow from our kind of government.

The unsung episode of the famed Episcopalian architect, Peter Harrison, drawing the plans in 1763 for this synagogue without charge, contains a monumental meaning. It heralded a new discovery—unity in diversity. That was what Newport discovered. And it proved to be the making of America. On the great seal of the United States are the words "E Pluribus Unum." Out of many, one. Out of many creeds, many racial origins, many national ancestries, one people. Not cast into one melting pot or one mold, which would make us all of a kind. No. We have found unity not despite of adversity, but because of it. Because people who are free to be themselves will unite to keep themselves that way.

George Washington said it in far more eloquent words. He visited this synagogue in 1790, and then sent the congregation a letter. It stands to this day as the true guidepost of human relations in America. He wrote: "Happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that those who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

No wonder this message has been cherished through the years by all Americans. For it conveys something more than a commander in chief's appreciation of the loyalty of Jewish patriots who battled by his side. It summons each of us to recognize, as did Washington, where our country's strength and genius lie—in a free and equal partnership of all our diverse groups to protect their birthright and fulfill their responsibilities under freedom.

I call these words a summons, for we would be less than honest if we did not acknowledge that they still sound a call to action. True, our Government gives no sanction to bigotry. Today, more than ever before, the Government of the United States is bent on removing roadblocks of inequality, of racial and religious discrimination, that prevent the pursuit of happiness. But what about all the other agencies and institutions whereby we govern ourselves? Can it be said that in our 50 States there exist no laws, in our cities no ordinances, that permit any citizens to be denied their natural rights?

Do our schools and colleges, our industries and union halls, our churches and civic groups, our countless associations, have no rules, written or unwritten, that perpetuate the practices of bigotry?

The answer is plain. Our Federal Government, which reflects the aspirations and the will of the whole American people, has quickened the pace of progress. And what our Nation as a whole is on the road of accomplishing must now be accomplished in

all of its parts. As long as we permit exclusions, restrictions, and rejections that set one group above another; as long as we have sit-ins and picketings, embattled cities and embittered citizens, we have yet to rise to George Washington's standard.

We live in a day of turmoil and anxiety, with age-old hatreds still rampant as well as new ones. Modern standards of ethics and morality are now at a low ebb all over the world. Take a quick glance of 1 day's headlines of this week:

Turmoil in Italy. Bolivia bolts the OAS (Organization of American States). Greek King steps in to end crisis. Macmillan barely survives the Cabinet scandal. And in this country dirty letters and stoning force family to move. Harlem outbreaks of violence. Attack on policemen, and so on. Unhappily, you read similar reports daily.

Now Touro synagogue stands as a symbol of all religions in their endeavor to stem this tide. The Supreme Court decision on religion in the public schools definitely charges the home, the church, and synagogue with the responsibility of upholding moral and ethical standards.

The fathers and children of this synagogue met these standards, as Jews and as Americans. And so did the others of their faith who were on hand at the birth of this Nation. When the first shot was fired in the War for Independence, there were only 2,000 Jews in a population of 2 million. Jewish volunteers were in the militia of every colony and in the Continental Army. One was George Washington's aide-de-camp, Col. Isaac Franks. Four were lieutenant colonels, and three were majors. Not many years later, the young Nation had as its highest naval officer, Commodore Uriah Levy, known as the daredevil of the seas, a hero of the War of 1812, and even more a hero in the eyes of American sailors, for he was the man who persuaded Congress to abolish flogging on our ships.

Another warrior of 1812 was Judah Touro, son of the first rabbi and true father of this synagogue of Congregation Jeshuat Israel. Fighting under Andrew Jackson in defense of New Orleans, Judah was shot down on the battlefield and abandoned as dead. He was carried back to life by his best friend—who was none other than the great-great-grandfather of the present noted Senator from Massachusetts—LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. He was also the devoted friend of Daniel Webster and John Quincy Adams.

Judah Touro lived to carry forward one of the noblest traditions of Judaism. He raised the concept of philanthropy to new heights, becoming perhaps the first American to put the welfare of the whole community above considerations of creed or race. He made possible the completion of the Bunker Hill Monument. In New Orleans, which was his adopted city, he founded the public library and the famous hospital that bear his name.

Judah Touro's will, included a wide variety of bequests to such institutions as a Catholic boys' asylum, a seaman's home, a fund for widows and orphans. He thereby established the pattern of openhearted, nonsectarian giving which has since been followed over the years by many other Jews of this and other communities whose contributions to public welfare, to medical and scientific research, to education and the arts, have reflected an all-embracing love of America.

In our own time, the cavalcade of George Washington's Jewish patriots has multiplied beyond his imagining—250,000 Jewish soldiers and sailors in World War I, 550,000 in World War II. The numbers would astound him, but the performance would not. He would not find it surprising that the famous "lost battalion" of the 77th Division in World War I, which held the enemy at bay for 4 days in the Argonne Forest and refused to be starved or shelled into surrendering, was manned by Jewish recruits from the East Side of New York.

Nor would General Washington marvel at the tragic but wonderful story of Benjamin Hower—an orphan who was liberated from the Nazi death camp at Auschwitz by one of our captains in World War II. The boy had only one wish—to become an American citizen. In gratitude for this gift, he immediately enlisted in the U.S. Army. And, at 19, this new American who had longed for freedom died defending it in Korea.

From first to last—from Pvt. Francis Salvador, the first of his faith to die in the Revolution, to Pvt. Benjamin Hower in Korea—the Jews of this country have fought for a way of life envisioned by their ancestors many, many centuries ago and brought into tangible being by the builders of this synagogue. Its first leaders—Moses Seixas, Jacob Rodrigues Rivera, Moses Levy, Aaron Lopez, Isaac Hart—they and all the rest, together with their fellows of all religions and ancestries, left us in possession of man's greatest gift, freedom of conscience. And in securing this basic human right, they left us equipped, as no other people have been, to help make human rights secure for all mankind.

(Freedom to believe means freedom to act. And when a free and believing people make up their minds to act, their power to achieve is astounding.)

This I saw borne out 18 years ago at the drafting of the United Nations Charter. There, at San Francisco, were gathered the spokesmen of American citizens' groups—religious and educational associations, farm, labor, and business organizations—who had been invited to serve as consultants to the U.S. delegation.

Judge Joseph M. Proskauer and I had the privilege of being among them, as the representatives of the American Jewish Committee and I shall never forget the talk we had with President Roosevelt less than a month before his death. To us, he said: "Go to San Francisco. Work to get those human rights provisions into the charter so that unspeakable crimes, like those of the Nazis, will never again be countenanced by world society."

There, in San Francisco, one could hear the American people pleading the cause of liberty, demanding that provision for an international bill of rights be written into the United Nations Charter. "We know all peoples can live in peace," they said, "but only when the dignity of the individual is secure."

So we were able to play a leading role in having human rights provisions included in the charter of the United Nations. For the first time in history, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms was made a matter of vital, international concern, and goal.

And as a result, the United Nations, 15 years ago, adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—the first bill of rights for the world. While this historic measure is not yet binding in a legal sense, nevertheless, like the message of George Washington, it has raised a standard, and its principles have been adopted in scores of new constitutions and treaties. Its promise of hope has reached freedom-hungry people in every corner of the earth.

The declaration tells men and women everywhere that they are, each and every one, entitled to vote, worship and speak freely, to be assured equal justice and equal opportunity, regardless of color, creed, or nationality. Millions in many lands would not be suffering terrorism and tyranny today if these rights were respected.

Your speaker had a chance to note at close hand the international impact of the principle of human rights, when he had the privilege of serving as a U.S. delegate to the United Nations, along with your distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN O. PASTORE. There is a truly dedicated public servant.

Bear in mind that the happenings we deplore and the tensions which disturb us in our own country are the growing pains of equality. But there are places in the world where equality cannot grow because it is still waiting to be born. There are places where freedom of religion, instead of being celebrated, is being annihilated. There are cities like Minsk, in the Soviet Union, where even as we were preparing for this thrilling event, a synagogue older than this one, the last Jewish house of God in a community containing over 50,000 Jews, was doomed to be torn down. That same city, before the Hitler invasion, had a Jewish population of a quarter of a million. Those who survived the onslaught of nazism now find themselves beset by another regime grounded in contempt for the rights of man.

And here may I say that one of American Jewry's lasting contributions to human welfare is its unceasing effort to help the victims of Hitlerism rebuild their lives and rehabilitate their shattered communities. One of the instrumentalities of this rebuilding is our participation, along with representatives of Jewish organizations in the other free countries of the world, in the conference on Jewish material claims against Germany, and serving as its senior vice president has been one of the most satisfying experiences of my life.

Not that there can ever be adequate compensation in any material sense for the unspeakable crimes of the Nazi era. There is no way of paying for human anguish. Nothing can ever condone the murders and human tortures. But through the claims conference we are succeeding in securing partial restitution and individual compensation for material wrong, so that the lot of many surviving victims now in Israel and in other lands, including our own, is at least being somewhat eased. Also through claims conference assistance the many Jewish communities which were destroyed in Europe are being rehabilitated and assisted in reviving their Jewish traditions.

The reparation and compensation protocols and legislation which we obtained from West Germany in 1952 were historic and large in scope. They have done great good. They will cost West Germany approximately \$5 billion. But there are still deserving, essential categories that will not be met by that legislation, and we must, therefore, get enlargements of the existing legislation, which it is estimated may cost West Germany another \$1 billion.

Your speaker returned just a few days ago from West Germany where, with the other two senior officers of the claims conference, we had several days of vital conferences with each—Chancellor Adenauer, Vice Chancellor Erhard, Foreign Minister Schroder, Finance Minister Dohring, and other government officials—and also valuable help from our new U.S. Ambassador to Germany, George C. McGhee. We are making progress, but are having difficulty getting Germany to acquiesce in doing as much as the circumstances warrant and require. We will persist in our demands.

The inescapable truth revealed by World War II is now driven home to us by the space age. Distance is obsolete. Whatever disaster strikes at any group or any nation must ultimately affect all groups and all nations and the peace of the world.

The era of escape is past. Our American ancestors escaped oppression on many different boats. But today peoples everywhere are in the same boat. Whether we survive or perish depends not on fair winds or foul, but on our wisdom in adhering to the course of unswerving conviction which guided the builders of this congregation and this community. The rulers that drove them to these shores, the potentates and persecutors who tried to silence and subdue their faith are no more. But this Touro Synagogue stands undiminished in its grandeur.

And as we celebrate this 200th anniversary of the dedication of this synagogue, I end with a quotation of Carl Van Doren, spoken at a previous Touro celebration:

"When, as this afternoon, a generation honors a shrine consecrated to justice and holiness, that generation does honor to the best in itself as well as to the shrine. Those who here pay tribute to history now make further history, and become themselves a part of it."

THE RUSH OF AUTOMATION

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it is commonplace to say that today's world is moving swiftly. I am afraid many of the people who say this, however, are still unaware of just how fast the automation pace is and how much it will influence our lives.

We have grown up in a world where work is the accepted role of most human beings. It is almost inconceivable to imagine a world in which most of us did not spend our most productive hours in earning our daily bread.

Yet the time has already come, in selected pockets of U.S. industry, where machines do the real work and man is only a caretaker. His work is negligible to what is accomplished.

And the machines are getting more competent all the time. They are gobbling up at a tremendous rate the work humans used to do.

It appears to me that a tide of industrial revolution is engulfing us, yet the force of the tide is felt chiefly by those swamped by it and those in industry dealing with it.

This is why I introduced last year, and again this year, a bill calling for a White House Conference on Automation, a conference which would be preceded by a thorough study of automation by local and State groups. Such a national forum, I believe, would help greatly to acquaint the country at large with what is going on. The country needs to know. Everyone is being affected, one way or another. It is becoming increasingly rare, for instance, for a person to be able to choose a career as a youth with any firm expectation of being able to follow that career for the rest of his working life.

A White House conference would focus concerted emphasis on automation, and hopefully suggest avenues for coping with its problems as well as enjoying its benefits.

The current issue of Life magazine carries an article on automation by Keith Wheeler which effectively, if perhaps a little frighteningly, summarizes the extent of automation today, and hints at prospects for its future. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this important article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AUTOMATION—BIG LABOR HUNTS FOR THE HARD ANSWERS

(By Keith Wheeler)

Recently John I. Snyder, Jr., a conscientious man of 54, sat in the darkened Park Avenue boardroom of U.S. Industries Inc., in New York City watching his mindless monsters at work. They both pleased and trou-

bled him. Snyder is chairman of the board of U.S.I., whose chief pursuit is the design of automated production machines.

On a movie screen, two of U.S.I.'s mechanical gremlins were showing what they can do. Now and then a pair of flesh and blood hands would appear and demonstrate that almost anything that hands born of woman can do the gremlins can do better, faster, more cheaply.

Snyder knows well that his contraptions—and their bloodless brothers now being turned out by about 200 American firms—already have provoked crises in the human hives of organized American labor. But extension of this thought goes beyond the problems of labor unions—and worries him even more. It is the idea that, unless society summons the will and imagination to alter itself to the rhythms of a new kind of technology, his kids and yours and mine may grow up with nothing much to do but loaf.

Snyder's worry is not new and his is by no means the only mind wrestling with it. But it is too big a problem for the imagination to take a firm grip on it. A few weeks ago in a labor-industry-Government seminar on what to do about automation, labor-management relations counsel John F. O'Donnell from Columbia University thought the conference was shot through with unreality.

"We now have 68.1 million people working and 4 million out of work," he said. "But if the Labor Department's own 5-year projections are correct and if you convert percentages into people, we'll have only 64 million working and 14.6 million crying for work in 1968."

However, there is more than one way to skin a statistic. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz recently held a 2-day meeting with the country's labor press editors in Washington. During the discussions, Robert Myers, a Department statistician, used the same general statistical projections to estimate that our unemployment will have increased by only 1.6 million by 1967.

Under Secretary of Labor John F. Henning suggested a less sanguine prospect by calculating that in the 1960's the economy must provide 36.5 million new jobs to stay even. Population growth, he said, will produce 12.5 million new humans in the work force, while at the same time the increase of productivity per worker—largely as a result of automation—will eliminate 24 million jobs in this decade. These are the rough dimensions of the problem and worthy of all the attention they can get.

Nobody—not even the labor unions most directly affected—asserts that automation, by itself, is an evil. The people, the economy, the Nation already reap enormous benefits from the technological explosion. It provides more goods and services of higher quality at lower prices. The highly automated telephone industry, for example, has tripled its volume of traffic in 23 years; were it not for automation, the phone companies alone would now need the services of nearly all the working women in the country as operators to handle their increased business load. Also, as its momentum gathers, automation creates new industries of its own—and with them, new jobs of its own. Importantly, it helps the Nation maintain a competitive position in world markets.

But while automation promises a fuller life for most people some day—if it can be understood and controlled—it offers no comfort to human beings caught right now in the undertow of the technological tide. This article will show how the machines lie somewhere near the core of today's surprising wave of anger against American labor unions. It will suggest that, at the same time, the machines have begun to force a subtle but healthful change in the traditional, hidebound hostility between labor and capital. It will outline some of the more imaginative and fruitful, but so far

inadequate, efforts to save man from his own creations.

But first, a look at two of the machines and their maker. One of John Snyder's performers, called by the glamorous title of Vibratory Bowl Feeder, is a lustrous disk with a spiral ramp rising at the edge. It can be loaded with a helter-skelter of things—erasers, screws, metal parts. The disk appears to be rotating but is not; the illusion is caused by an invisible vibration which sets the load into a sedate, outward-trending waltz until, one by one, the pieces leave the dance floor and move up the ramp. Crisis awaits them at the top: Those which arrive right side up and front end to are allowed to pass; but any maverick which comes upside down, backward, topsy-turvy, or is in any way defective or unlike its fellows is contemptuously flicked back to try again.

The other machine, with the sexier name of TransfeRobot, is a swinging arm and hand, but infinitely superior to any human arm or hand. It is absolutely tireless. Whatever it picks up and puts down it always picks up and puts down in the same place and attitude to within 0.002 of an inch.

Alone or in combinations, the disk and arm sort things or take things from one place to another or, getting more complicated, bring together and assemble the parts of complex electrical switches or, getting delicate, sort, select, and pack boxes of chocolates. The hand can exert any kind or degree of force, from that of a vice to something more tender than a lover's caress, and can be adapted to use mechanical fingers, electromagnets or, for such cozy stuff as a chocolate cream, a gentle vacuum.

"So far," Snyder says, "we have not been able to find any material or any shape or any size it can't handle."

How many human hands might these machines replace?

"Depends on the job and depends on how far you want to carry the process," Snyder says. "The number could be close to infinite. We built an automated stamping line for Nissan Motors in Japan. It has six presses with TransfeRobot-type machines to take the stuff out of one press and feed it to the next. One man watches raw sheet metal go in and one more watches finished fenders come out. It replaces, oh, maybe 20 men altogether. But that's not all; you could extend the process right up to bolting the fender to a car. Even considering how cheap labor is in Japan, the thing saves money."

What, then, does all this mean to the muscles and hearts and minds of men who not only need to work in order to live but also, by eons of instinct, have been conditioned to understand that they need work for the sustenance of their souls?

"It means they are out of work," Snyder says. "Optimists like to compare this to the industrial revolution—but the analogy is wrong. People got hurt then because we were breaking out of an agrarian society to build an industrial society. Today we live in an industrial society, but with these new tools we are obsoleting not only our conventional machines but modern men as well. The industrial revolution created jobs. Now we're using sophisticated machines to destroy jobs."

When you destroy the job, do you also destroy the man?

"Very likely. Take yourself. Say you're sent home and there's nothing to do and no prospect of anything to do. How long does it take you to go crazy? A month, a week, a day, or just 15 minutes? Probably the last."

Well, then, why are we doing it?
"Because we must. It can't be stopped. They tried it in the industrial revolution. They even legislated against the powered spindle—but it didn't work because England had to export. It won't work today for the

same reason. We're living in a competitive world."

All right, it's a competitive world. But what happens in the paradox of a world competing to make more things better and cheaper for the use of man while, simultaneously, the facts of competition begin to eliminate the need for man's muscles and, by the same token, threaten to eliminate his paycheck as a customer for the things? Obviously, the first to ram into the question head on are organized labor and industry. But the question is a cosmic one and the ultimate answer cannot yet even be sensed.

Still, under the unprecedented pressures of the new technology, a few wondrous things have come to pass. The most significant came on that traditionally bloody battleground between the steelworkers and the industry. There, just a month ago, labor and management negotiated an amicable settlement guaranteeing at least 2 years of labor peace. The agreement's chief feature was one designed to spread the diminishing work by giving senior employees a 13-week vacation every 5 years. The agreement, which includes no wage increase as such, was worked out by the labor-management human relations committee, which was created to ease the agonies of automation and solve the frictions of strike deadlines by keeping the two sides in continuous contact.

This was the first big payoff in what one observer describes as "a feeling that some parts of both labor and capital are trying to find a new place to stand. There's a small but noticeable trend away from the old idea of the-hell-with-him-he's-my-enemy and toward the hope that maybe they can work it out as partners."

Here and there, the groping for sensible answers—though it sometimes hurts—results in tangible action. To save "King Coal" from fading into a dethroned memory, the United Mine Workers cooperates with management to automate the mines. American Motors shatters industry precedent by offering its employees a profit-sharing plan. One aristocratic union, New York Local No. 1 of the Amalgamated Lithographers, led by its energetic and unorthodox president, Edward Swayduck, violates all union tradition by paying for full-page ads denouncing featherbedding and opting for all the automation the industry can devise. In partnership with one employer, Kaiser, the steelworkers actually agree to go whole hog for ultra-advanced technology and split whatever it saves. The Chicago local of the Flat Janitors Union digs its treasury out of the mattress and risks it all on a creative project designed to make more jobs for its members.

But these are the brilliant exceptions. For the most part, both management and labor still stand toe to toe and ready to slug it out. Now, however, there is a mighty difference. Thirty years ago labor marched in the battle for wages and hours and for the right to organize. Today the machines are marching against the blue-collar workman and the battle is elemental—the struggle for survival.

The unfortunate result is that lately organized labor has been causing and catching more hell than it has for a generation. The most compelling force in the railroad crisis has been the battle to save almost all of an entire occupation—the firemen—from extinction. In their grim efforts to hang on somehow, the firemen are denounced for featherbedding, hanging around the neck of the economy like a decaying albatross. They are by no means alone; uncounted thousands of other American workers whose jobs have been eliminated by improved technology still cling to them, although their actual usefulness has become highly debatable.

The struggle to hang on in the face of widening automation was behind the costly and resentment-breeding newspaper stop-

pages in Cleveland and New York and the east and gulf coasts' longshoremen's strike.

To the printers the real enemy was punched or electronic tape which, when fed to the keyboards of modern linecasting machines, can reduce the composing room work force by two-thirds; so the printers fought the tape for use in setting such material as stock market reports. The beasts opposing the longshoremen were called by the perplexing new names of prepalatizing, containerizing or unitizing—all modern cargo-handling techniques which are estimated to have reduced the longshoremen's work by about 10 percent in the last 5 years.

The trouble was that these strikes tramped on a lot of more or less innocent toes. It has been estimated that the strike and lock-out of 3,000 New York printers threw at least 20,000 out of work in the newspaper industry and cost the city in general at least \$250 million in business.

The strike stirred up such a blast of temper that even President Kennedy condemned the stoppage as long past the point of public toleration.

The strike by 70,000 longshoremen crippled vital shipping along half the Nation's coasts and racked up costs in lost work and the breakdown of commerce that amounted to \$975 million.

President Kennedy's concern about such burdens on the economy brought the re-activation last May of a long-dormant labor-management committee to fend off strikes affecting the public interest. Meanwhile, as the unions get roundly damned as barefaced pickpockets of the Nation, none of organized labor's present goals escapes suspicion. George Meany's announcement that the AFL-CIO will drive for a shorter workweek fetches a howl of condemnation to the effect that, in blind greed, labor demands ever more for doing ever less.

Making a survival drive for countrywide and industrywide contracts, the unions stand charged as ruthless monopolists—and there is talk of antitrust legislation. Actually, however, the strength of organized labor has been waning for at least 10 years, rapidly in the last 5. In 1955, when at last AFL and CIO reached the altar in a loveless marriage of convenience, President Meany pledged that the couple would then go out and organize the unorganized. Eight years have passed but the only major union to pick up significant new membership has been Jimmy Hoffa's Teamsters—who are not even recognized as respectable in-laws. Total union membership in the United States today is about 18 million—almost exactly where it was in 1955 when, of course, the population was smaller. The grand total of members is only one-fourth of today's civilian work force of 72 million plus.

Various excuses are advanced for the dwindling of the ranks. It is said that the crusading fervor of the 1930's and 1940's has faded into fat-cat complacency. Some say that labor's reputation is too hoary and heavyhanded to win acceptance by the growing white-collar class. It is charged, and justifiably, that jealous unions wrangle so over who is going to organize whom that nobody gets organized. A company-to-union liaison officer in General Electric's big Schenectady, N.Y., plant believes that "unions have become an anachronism to workers. In this plant the average guy makes about \$138 a week, has two cars, a house, and a kid in college."

While such opulence may still be true of skilled workmen—though that second auto would seem hard to come by on \$138 a week—it is anything but true of the area where machines are hitting first and hardest. This is on the production lines of basic manufacturing, traditionally the largest sector of the economy. Since 1957, the Labor Department reported in a recent manpower survey, 775,000 actual production jobs have been

wiped out; automation was cited as a major contributing villain to this destruction. As individual unions, the heaviest sufferers so far has been the autoworkers, down 168,000 members since 1953, despite the glittering fact that 1963 is that industry's alltime Golconda; the steelworkers, down 200,000 since 1956; the mineworkers, down 500,000 working miners since 1945; all railroad workers down 670,000 since 1947. The erosion of productions jobs of all kinds became clear by 1956 when, for the first time, white-collar workers began to outnumber blue collars in America.

The revolution has brought the coinage of new terms to describe people who have no work. They are called "the unhired." These displaced or unplaced humans represent not only despair for themselves but, for organized labor, a painful and ironic loss of both manpower and revenue.

"It may sound cynical but a lot of these people probably are not ever going to be hired at all or hired again," says a veteran labor observer. "Practically speaking, as long as a man has no work and so is not a factor in the economy, how can you organize him? Marginal workers can never bring back in dues what it costs to organize them. Unions, too, must think about cost accounting."

In the superheated climate of public resentment, the unions are accused of being just too disgustingly rich. But until very recently few outsiders could even guess what any one union might be worth. The first opportunity for the public to take a worthwhile peek into the countinghouses of labor came with passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which required unions to file annual financial statements.

The first batch of reports for 1961 is still being digested by the Department of Labor, but the Department has recently disclosed that labor is far less affluent than supposed. The report fixed the total of wholly owned union wealth at about \$1.5 billion, which comes to something less than \$100 each for every union member in the country. The Department's list of the 10 wealthiest unions included: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, \$111 million; United Mine Workers, \$110 million; Ladies Garment Workers, \$44 million; Teamsters, \$38 million; Steel Workers, \$31.5 million; Auto Workers, \$30.7 million; Locomotive Firemen, \$29.3 million; Bricklayers, \$26.3 million; Machinists, \$22.9 million; Hod Carriers, \$21.3 million. But some were worse than broke—notably the International Longshoremen, which reported itself \$694,000 in the hole.

The richest list provoked indignant denial from the Electrical Workers' president, Gordon Freeman. He declared that the listed total included \$102 million which actually belonged to the union's pension and death benefit fund. He pointed out that even the entire reported total wealth of all unions, \$1.5 billion, would still be peanuts compared, say, to the \$24.6 billions assets at A.T. & T.

Calculation of labor's wealth has frequently been distorted by this confusion between union-held treasure and the very much larger capital accumulations in the Nation's pension and welfare funds. The Labor Department has disclosed that 120,510 such funds held assets of \$52.2 billion at the close of 1960 and were then growing at a rate of \$4.5 billion a year. Most such funds are trustee, however, and only 1 percent are exclusively controlled by union officers. Moreover, the workers who are designated as the eventual beneficiaries of the funds include far more nonunion than union employees, up to and including corporation presidents.

It is fortunate that such cushions for the jolt of economic dislocation do exist; it seems likely that something similar eventually will have to be devised to protect a lot more hu-

manity. Thus far the foremost victims of automation have been the most helpless to fight back. They are the very young looking for a first job, especially school dropouts who possess neither training, experience, nor seniority; the elderly, who are ill-equipped or temperamentally unwilling to have their lives uprooted; and the non-favored minorities, Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

The plight of the minorities, indeed, adds a powerful surge to this year's tides of racial strife. Hammering at the door for social and educational equality, the Negroes are ready to fight, and fight now, for equality in jobs and access to them. Here again the unions, particularly the building-trades unions which have long been all but closed to Negroes, stand accused.

But it is clear that automation is eliminating not only the unskilled or semiskilled production worker. Indeed, it already has penetrated beyond unions as such, is reaching deep into the white-collar class and, as it develops, seems unlikely to respect anybody. For example, the machines have taken much more than a bridgehead in the communications industry—as anyone knows who ever dialed a Los Angeles telephone number direct from New York or Chicago without the aid of a human operator.

It was once optimistically believed that the still-growing service industries might soak up the extra labor supply. But the army of mechanical hands ready to perform countless service functions is expanding too fast to be ignored. We are already accustomed to automatic elevators, cigarette machines, drink and candy vendors, laundromats, machines that collect tolls or make change. It does not often come to mind that each gets rid of one or more human beings.

Not long ago Macy's, New York, even tried out a machine that sold 36 different garments in 10 sizes and styles. Moreover, it would accept coins, or \$1 and \$5 bills and make change, and scornfully kick back counterfeit currency. The store gave up the experiment, deciding rather reluctantly that we had not yet quite reached the stage of shopping for soft goods in a slot machine. But if the thing is ever perfected, it raises the interesting possibility that a store could get everybody off the payroll except the complaint clerk. The machine did not surrender tamely; it is now set up in post offices in 10 cities, selling stamps, envelopes and post-cards, and spurning phony money.

President Joseph Beltrone of the Communications Workers predicted in his recent book "New Horizons for Labor" that the day will come when most U.S. workers will be "people in white coats baby sitting for push buttons." The prediction cannot be taken lightly. Machines which need very little help from humanity are well past the point of mere automation, which is to say, doing repetitive physical chores more accurately and rapidly than man and without such human fringe needs as vacations or hospital insurance. The electronic computer long since settled down comfortably as a day-to-day workhorse, taking over much of the routine and even the sophisticated clerical and statistical work of business and government.

The U.S. Veterans' Administration has installed computers to chop away all but 3,000 of 17,000 employees who once processed insurance claims. A city department store gives a computer the chore of checking 50,000 transactions in 30 minutes. An airline has tied all its ticket offices together in a computer system which keeps track of traffic, assigns passengers to seats, and even joggles moonstruck human clerks with a reminder to take down the customer's phone number.

The next step is called "cybernation." This is a fairly new term coined by dismayed man from the Greek *kybernetes*, which means "steersman." It describes a world controlled by electromechanics in which ma-

chines take over most of man's functions, mental as well as physical—excluding only eating, sleeping, dreaming, complaining, and making love.

Cybernation takes account of both automated doing machines and computerized analyzing and deciding machines. When the most sophisticated of the doers and thinkers are mated, they can reduce most of mankind to the wretched role of consumer, foreseen by Aldous Huxley in his grisly 1932 science fiction, "Brave New World."

Let no stubborn optimist hope that the robots will not be mated, for they already are. Photon, Inc. of Wilmington, Mass., which manufactures photoelectric typesetting machines, has come up with a new gadget named, with terrifying accuracy, "Zip." Zip links the old model-T, semiautomated photographic typesetting principle to computers capable, when so instructed of remembering, selecting and giving orders. The result is a device which can set type at the rate of 450 characters a second while, at the same time, revising and updating such rapidly changing material as telephone books. Zip is roughly 50 times faster than the best previous man-machine combinations for doing the same thing. Zip could reset the entire Manhattan telephone directory, all 1,804 pages of it, in just 29 hours and 43 minutes.

The Fund for the Republic recently financed a study of the outlook for cybernation which was conducted by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Commenting on the versatility of so-called "learning" and "decision-making" machines, the study remarked rather snottily that some now seem capable of only "a fair amateur game of chess." But it admitted that the same machines are whizzes at checkers. They get so good that, after 10 to 20 hours of instruction, they begin to devise original strategy and tactics and to beat the human who taught them the game.

"It is no fantasy, then, to be concerned with the implications of the thinking machines," the study observes. "There is every reason to believe that within the next two decades machines will be available outside the laboratory that will do a credible [a last-ditch human would have said "credible"] job of original thinking, certainly as good thinking as that expected of most middle-level people who are supposed to 'use their minds.'"

Finally, in the envisioned society which promises the elimination of most human effort, except for a tiny elite of bosses and technicians who build and teach and more or less understand the machines, the big question must be asked: what do we do with the people?

Many old-style human brains are worrying about the problem today. There are even a few people actually doing something about it. Unluckily the worriers outnumber the doers.

The head worrier is Secretary of Labor Wirtz. But the Secretary sounded none too confident in recent testimony before a House subcommittee. "We have been assuming that the developing technology—what we call automation—will provide as many new jobs as it replaces," he said. "I say we have been assuming that. I am not sure it is right. . . . I assume we shall find those jobs because we must find the jobs."

What appeared to worry the Secretary most is the paradox that while we are fast running out of use for people, we are at the same time ironically producing people faster than ever. In the decade of the fifties, he said, we added 8.3 million new people who needed jobs, but in the sixties we are producing 12.6 million brandnew job applicants. Naturally, since humans are somewhat disorderly in their habits anyhow, this piling up of surplus new humanity does not proceed in an entirely orderly fashion. Lately every crop-year of new 18-year-olds has been a bumper one—averaging in the neighborhood of 2.5 million;

but in this staggering decade the 1964-65 crop-year of 18-year-olds (babies born in 1946-47) figures to be the all-time humdinger with nearly 4 million.

Recently Secretary Wirtz took part in a day-long communal worry about the matter at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. He said he can foresee the development of a "human slag heap." The Waldorf session was unique because, for the first time, it brought together all three of vitally concerned forces—labor, management and government—in a common effort to tackle a monstrous human dilemma that no one or two can handle alone. However, there is little present evidence that all three together can handle it either.

Among those doing something about it, the Federal Government exhibits abundant concern but has not yet made much of a dent in the labor surplus. The administration's Manpower Development and Training Act became Federal law in 1962 but did not get moving until last September, when funds were appropriated. In the months since, 40,000 persons have been "approved" for training or retraining; 20,000 had actually begun training by last June 1 and 5,700 had completed training. By next year, if it gets the appropriations, the MDTA program hopes to have as many as 100,000 in training. After the third year, by law, the program's future will be at the mercy of State legislatures, which will have to put up half the cost—estimated at \$2,000 per trainee.

Not long ago, speaking on the "stark realities" of the technological revolution, John Snyder attacked "the myth that those who lose their jobs to automation can be retrained and put into other jobs requiring higher skills and paying more money. Not only are there fewer jobs available today, but many workers are not retrainable in the first place, due to the level of intelligence, age or aptitude. . . . You cannot force people into retraining, nor can you manufacture jobs out of thin air."

This proposition is not disproved by the occasional miracles which do occur. The all-time champion retrainee is, beyond doubt, a meatcutter who, displaced by layoff at the Cudahy packing plant in Omaha, went into retraining and ended up as a professor of languages at the University of Omaha.

Some of the biggest unions are trying hard to upgrade their people to the future. The 793,000-member Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has put 50,000 employees through courses in modern industrial electronics. These schools are financed, roughly, one-half by the union and the other half jointly by union and management through the joint apprenticeship committee. On its own, the IBEW conducts courses in the care and feeding of nuclear powerplants. Top-grade men, chosen by locals all over the country, are sent to Washington to take the course and thereafter are expected to instruct fellow members in this new atomic energy technique. Similar courses are planned in the Midwest and on the west coast.

But, for the most part, the actual things done have been isolated efforts to take a chewable mouthful. Some seem only remotely related to the looming crisis of automation but, in a larger sense, as the new technology evolves, each job saved or created is a human being rescued from the machines.

One of the more exciting efforts to meet the automation crisis is paradoxically one of the smallest. It is exciting because it is dramatic and successful, and because—although its primary purpose was a frank desire to create jobs and profits for the men who undertook it—the project also embraced a much larger and unselfish concept. It is most exciting of all because of who did it. The doers were, of all people, the 9,000 members of the Chicago Flat Janitors Union.

The janitors financed, built, own, and now also sweep the halls of the most spectacular new crag on the skyline of Chicago. This is

Marina City, two dazzling 60-story, cylindrical towers for housing people and autos, raised on the banks of the Chicago River and soaring over a commercial complex which includes everything from a bowling alley and a legitimate theater to a 700-yacht boat basin.

The janitors were prodded into this adventure by their 68-year-old president, William L. McFetridge, who had just retired from wearing his second hat as president of the parent union, the Building Service Employees International. McFetridge had been brooding for years because Chicago, like many cities, was decaying at the center while people fled from their apartments to houses in the suburbs where, naturally, they no longer needed a janitor. He wanted jobs for janitors and other crafts in the union. And he believed that his union people owed some mystic obligation to help rejuvenate their town.

At first McFetridge felt the union might risk a few hundred thousand dollars. But he got title to a unique piece of real estate—about 3 acres on the riverbank, just outside the famous Loop. It was "lot 1, block 1," in Chicago's original 1857 city plat. He then commissioned a 36-year-old real estate promoter, Charles R. Swibel, and a 49-year-old architect, Bertrand Goldberg, to do justice to this fancy acreage. "Justice" simply ran away with itself. Eventually the union men had \$3,100,000 of their own hard dollars on the line. Architect Goldberg's problem was to think big and imaginatively. Swibel's biggest problem was to mesmerize the Federal Housing Authority into a semantic rewriting of its rules in order to guarantee a \$17.8 million mortgage. The janitors' problem was to keep a collective stiff upper lip.

Today the janitors own a \$36 million ultra-modern city within a city. Land next door to that which they bought for \$18.50 a square foot now sells for \$45. Three other projects, inspired by Marina City and totaling investments of something over \$500 million, are underway nearby. The union could sell out for a profit of millions. Meanwhile, it has picked up 43 new jobs inside its own property and stands to pick up hundreds more in the neighboring new projects.

A more direct frontal assault on automation has been the highly controversial handwork of a New York labor leader, Harry Van Arsdale Jr., business manager of Local 3 of the Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. A year ago he forced New York's construction industry to accept a 25-hour week, plus 5 hours of mandatory overtime, for his 9,000 elite A-card members, the journeymen electrical construction workers.

Van Arsdale's pitch was that new fabricating and installation techniques have "engineered all the labor out of the job." This creates more electrical work but it doesn't create more jobs.

"They wanted to know why I was insisting on it right now when there's a lot of new building going up in the city. They thought I was just building a cushion for a lot of overtime and would kill off construction by pricing it out of the market," Van Arsdale says. "But I told them I had to do it now because if I tried it some other time, they wouldn't give it to me."

To ease the blow, Van Arsdale made certain concessions. He has agreed to take in 1,000 new apprentices in a union traditionally so closely held that about the only way to get in was to be the son of a member. He also declared there would be no abuse of overtime. "To get more, you've got to give more," he told his members.

Whether the 25-hour week will prove out to the eventual advantage of both union and employers, there is no doubt whatever that Van Arsdale believes in it as an article of faith. "America will be a much better place when everybody works 4 hours a day and attends some kind of classes 4 hours," he says.

Nor is he kidding about attending classes. The local has financed 345 scholarships for the children of members and is now conducting a campaign to prevent children of lower paid members from dropping out of school. Seeking out latent talent and hoping to develop the union's future leaders, the local created what it calls the futuran society, in which more than 50 college-trained members—mostly construction workers—have conducted citizenship courses for more than 2,000 other members. Because Van Arsdale believes that every man owes it to himself to learn to use his noodle, more than 5,000 members have passed through Bayberry Land, a Long Island estate where the union conducts intensive 1-week seminars in such unelectrical abstractions as literature and world politics.

Still another, different but just as controversial, attack took effect last March 1 at the Fontana, Calif., plant of the Kaiser Steel Co. The device is called the long range sharing plan. This is not a profit-sharing plan as such—and thus differs in principle from the American Motors Plan. Instead, this is an agreement that company and workers will share—approximately two-thirds to the company and one-third to the workers—whatever can be saved by automation, improvements in technique or greater efficiency in the use of time and materials.

To the union the company promises that no worker will lose his personal employment because of automated technology. Instead, if his job is eliminated, he will go into a "reserve labor pool" and will continue to draw his pay. Men in the reserve will be occupied by whatever chores can be found for them or, if none can be found, will be a force ready to fill in for absentees or possibly to fabricate items which the company would normally buy outside. From the company's point of view, the reserve pool is an asset; instead of being off somewhere fishing or looking for another job, men will be ready at hand whenever expanded production requires more human bodies. It has been calculated that the reserve pool should not grow unbearably burdensome since the normal 8 percent annual rate of personnel attrition by death or retirement should about equal the rate of elimination of jobs by automation.

The proposal was submitted to the 5,500-member Kaiser local last January and the members voted it in by a majority of 74 percent of the production and maintenance crews and 90 percent of the clerical staff. The vote amounted mainly to acceptance in principle; many steelworkers in the production end, by long tradition, enjoy certain bonus rights contractually described as incentive pay. Historically these have made for a chaotic mishmash of pay rates, but those entitled to such bonuses are understandably reluctant to give them up. The long range sharing plan entailed the surrender of all incentive pay for those electing to take part in it. Most of the crews with incentive pay contractual rights elected to wait and see how it worked out.

Meanwhile, a surprising thing happened. Employees and employee groups began coming in with suggestions on ways to speed things up or save materials. A work gang suggested ways to calculate estimates of needed material more closely in order to save waste. Another reported that some expensive tools had been stored out in the open and should be taken in under cover before rain, rust, and dust ruined them.

Early in May, Kaiser announced the result of the first full month's operation of the plan. The improved techniques had saved \$962,000 in March—a whopping windfall of \$312,000 for the 3,930 workers who had got all the way in—an average of \$79 per employee. By the third month the benefits had grown to \$1,083,000.

"This is a good agreement," says Marvin Miller, assistant to Steel Workers President

Dave McDonald and the union officer chiefly concerned in the long negotiations. "We took our time and worked out most of the bugs."

"Of course," he adds, "it's not the full answer to automation, but nothing else is either. What this does is slow down the process of eliminating people—but we know it doesn't stop the process."

Asking what the whole machine-instead-of-man process costs is like asking how high the sky is. Secretary Wirtz calculated that the Nation already loses about \$30 to \$40 billion a year in unused and unusable human resources. Harry Van Arsdale uses a longer yardstick: "The country cannot afford to throw away the \$90 billion in gross national product that goes unproduced because people who could work can't," he says.

John Snyder, who builds automatic machines and was introduced at the start of this article, is profoundly concerned by the human implications of what he does. He has arrived at his own unique partial answer. Every time he sells a machine to displace flesh and blood, he "taxes" it from \$25 to \$1,000. The money thus set aside supports an institution unique in American industry, the American Foundation on Automation and Employment. The foundation is now making depth studies into several facets of the problem: the short workweek, early retirement, the older worker, Western European legislation on the subject, retraining, the kinds of education which will be demanded by the age of cybernation.

"What the total answers are nobody knows, but we are trying to find some of them," Snyder says. "I think it possible that the day will come when the machines will do nearly all the work and produce nearly all of our goods and services—even decisions—and, since there'll be little work for humans, the machines will also have to pay our taxes."

"This implies a total reorientation of human society. Humans will become wards of the machines, supported by the machines. But the great unanswerable question is, what, then, will happen to the souls of people? We have to build things from the inside out. People—living, breathing, feeling and thinking people—somehow will have to learn how to do nothing in a constructive way."

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

SUPREME COURT JUSTICES ACTING IN OTHER CAPACITIES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, only a few moments ago I heard the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] comment on the proposed appointment of Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg to arbitrate the difficulties between the railroads and the railroad brotherhoods.

I highly approve the statement the Senator made. I have the highest regard for Mr. Justice Goldberg, as I am sure all other Senators have. We highly respect his great integrity, his ability, and his standing as a lawyer and as a judge. I am certain that, from the practical point of view, it would be difficult to find any other person in this country who could arbitrate the problem as well as could Mr. Justice Goldberg.

However, I think it is a bad precedent for the President of the United States to ask a Justice of the Supreme Court to undertake such a task; and it would be a bad precedent if a Justice should accept a President's proposal in this regard.

I say this for the reason that, from the most practical point of view, the Justice would be called upon to withdraw from any cases which might come before the Supreme Court which his decision had affected. To that extent it would limit the effective work of the Supreme Court.

It seems to me also that this could create difficult problems for the members of the Supreme Court. In some case a Justice of the Supreme Court might render a decision as an arbitrator or in some other capacity, and the Supreme Court might at a later time be called upon to pass upon the case. Quite a problem might arise for members of the Court, though I am sure all Justices would discharge their duty objectively. It might be difficult to take a position either for or against the member of the Court who had acted in such a capacity.

The most important point in this regard is that such an appointment would affect the separation of powers as among the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and the executive branch. The Executive in this case is the President, who suggested the appointment of a Justice of the Supreme Court.

I say all this merely because I think it is a bad precedent. I hope it will not be proposed in the future, and that, if proposed, it will not be accepted by a Justice of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I usually find myself in agreement with my friend from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], but in this instance I find myself in disagreement with him. In my judgment the suggestion made by the President of the United States—to appoint Mr. Justice Goldberg as an arbitrator in one of the most critical labor disputes of our time—was sagacious and sound. As the President himself pointed out at the time he made the announcement of the proposal, Mr. Justice Goldberg had already made it clear that he would disqualify himself from sitting in any case before the Supreme Court which involved any aspect arising from the railroad dispute. The dispute actually arose during the Eisenhower administration, at the time of Judge Rifkin's appointment to the special board, but the dispute was still pending when now Mr. Justice Goldberg became the Secretary of Labor.

So the President was involved in a situation in which undoubtedly one of the best qualified men, if not the best qualified man, in the field of labor relations, with respect to both mediation and arbitration, was available to the President, because on this particular subject matter he would not be functioning in a judicial capacity as a member of the U.S. Supreme Court.

The President himself made it very clear it was an exceptional situation at the time of the suggested appointment. He made it very clear that it was not to be considered a precedent. He pointed out, however, that in the opinions of other Presidents, there have been other great public issues which have justified the use of a Justice of the Supreme Court for special, public service—such as the appointment of Mr. Justice Jackson to represent our Government as an advocate, as a prosecutor, in behalf of the Government of the

United States in the war criminal trials known as the Nuremberg trials.

There have been other instances in which Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have performed special services.

The fact that a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court performed some extraordinary special service for his country upon appointment by the President of the United States could not have the slightest effect upon the judicial actions of other members of the U.S. Supreme Court. They sit as separate, independent minds under the great trust and obligation of their judicial duties, to pass judgment upon each juridical question that comes before them, irrespective of participation in the subject matter by anyone in the Court, including their own associates on the Supreme Court.

I repeat today what I said on this floor the other day: I deeply regret that the brotherhoods did not see fit to accept this great Justice as the arbitrator of the dispute, for I think the dispute ought to be settled by the application of the rule of reason and the preponderance of the evidence. It is a problem of automation that cannot be settled on the picket line. Complex economic issues, including a good many scientific issues involved—because automation includes scientific questions—cannot be settled on the picket line.

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

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for a few seconds more.

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

Mr. MORSE. Those questions are not settled on the picket line. So I arise not only to defend the President's decision, but to highly commend it, and again express my regret that the brotherhoods did not see fit to follow the wisdom of the course suggested by the President.

SAVINGS IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last week Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara made a most important report to the President in which he detailed actual savings of \$1 billion which he and his associates had made during the fiscal year which ended on July 1. This record of concrete achievement needs to be studied and appreciated by every American, and I am therefore asking unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 8, 1963.

Subject: Department of Defense cost reduction program—first annual progress report.

A year ago, in a memorandum dated July 5, 1962, I reported to you that, through improvements in operating efficiency, we could cut the Department's logistics costs by at least \$3 billion per year within 5 years, and that we would realize about 25 percent of this goal in fiscal year 1963. I have now completed a review of the results to date and the

opportunities that lie ahead, and I find that they are greater than estimated last year:

1. Savings in excess of \$1 billion were actually realized during fiscal year 1963, compared with our estimate of \$750 million last July.

2. The actions now planned for fiscal year 1964 and 1965 will bring the estimated annual savings, to be realized by fiscal year 1967, to almost \$4 billion, compared with the \$3 billion estimated last July.

I should like to review the highlights of our progress to date and some of the ways in which we hope to achieve the ultimate goal of \$4 billion in savings per year.

Let me note that these savings have not in any way been achieved at a sacrifice of national security. Indeed during the past 24 months we have achieved:

A 100-percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads in the strategic alert forces.

A 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

A 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions.

A 30-percent increase in the number of tactical air squadrons.

A 60-percent increase in airlift capability.

A 100-percent increase in ship construction and conversion to modernize the Fleet.

A 200-percent increase in the special forces, trained to deal with counterinsurgency threats.

The cost of these advances in our national security will begin to be balanced in future years by the very substantial savings we are assuring through this cost reduction program.

As you know, the savings are being achieved in three ways:

1. Buying only what we need to achieve balanced readiness.

2. Buying at the lowest sound price.

3. Reducing operating costs through integration and standardization.

I. BUYING ONLY WHAT WE NEED

(a) Refining requirements calculations: The best way to ensure that we buy only what we need is to start at the very beginning of the procurement process—the setting of requirements. Through a systematic and intensive review of requirements calculations, we have been able to cancel \$700 million of purchases which otherwise would have been made had our procurement programs still been based on planning factors and inventory levels considered necessary in past years. The largest part of this reduction occurred in spare parts for aircraft and missiles. We expect to increase these savings in fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Here are some of the ways in which these savings were achieved in fiscal year 1963:

1. The Army has introduced the new uniform issue priority system permitting reduction in order and shipping time by an average of 15 percent, thereby reducing on-hand inventory requirements. Fiscal year 1963 annual savings are estimated at \$36.2 million.

2. By closer management control, the Navy has been able to reduce stocks of high demand spare parts on aircraft carriers by 50 percent.

3. By a detailed analysis of repair operations time, the Air Force has been able to reduce repair cycle time on high cost items from 90 to 45 days and on low cost items from 120 to 60 days. In total, the Air Force has reduced requirements on some 400,000 items with annual savings of \$469 million.

(b) Increased use of excess inventories: During fiscal year 1963 almost \$1.2 billion in excess inventories held by the Department and its contractors has been redistributed to other military users for current consumption or mobilization reserves. This is an increase of better than \$200 million in the rate of reutilization, compared with fiscal year 1961. Our goal for the next 2 years is to increase this rate to more than \$400 million over the 1961 level.

Here are some examples of reutilization of excess inventories in fiscal year 1963:

1. More than 1 million 2.75-inch rockets excess to the Air Force were transferred to the Army for use on helicopters. By spending \$10 million to restore them to operational conditions, the Army is saving \$41 million over the cost of new procurement.

2. Twenty J-79 jet engines excess to the Air Force were transferred to the Navy for use in KD-20-1 flying targets, thereby saving \$4.4 million.

3. Five M-33 fire control systems excess to the Army were transferred to the Navy to be used as Government furnished equipment on a Navy contract, thereby saving \$2.3 million.

4. Thirty-one unserviceable aircraft engines excess to the Air Force were transferred to the Army for use on Army aircraft. By spending \$372,000 to put them in good condition, the Army was able to save \$806,000 over the cost of new procurement.

5. Sixty-seven and three-tenths million dollars worth of parts was reclaimed from excess Air Force aircraft engines during the first 11 months of fiscal year 1963.

With excess stocks now representing a \$12 billion investment, one of our most important logistics management problems is to ensure that we use every item having a further useful life. A central clearing house has recently been established at the Logistics Services Center in Battle Creek, Mich., where by the end of this calendar year a complete inventory of such items will be available. Requirements of the military departments are already being screened against this central inventory and available stocks transferred from one military department to another to meet valid needs.

(c) Eliminating "goldplating" in specifications: Last year I reported to you that we were undertaking a major effort to eliminate from our procurement specifications costly materials and fabrication processes not essential to the proper functioning of the item being bought. As a result, we are now averaging savings well over \$1 million per week in reduced costs, and we expect these savings to triple during the next 2 years.

The following are some recent examples which illustrate the wide range of opportunities for such value engineering savings:

	Unit cost		Savings on current procurement
	Before redesign	After redesign	
1. "Mule" for opening and closing Minuteman silo. Substituted a commercial hydraulic for a specially designed electronic mule.	\$555,000	\$80,800	\$1,200,000
2. Air vane for Pershing missile. Substituted an aluminum casting with simplified fittings for a foam-filled plastic skin with special fittings.	1,512	463	1,140,000
3. Lift truck for ASROC missile. Substituted mechanical lifting device with disk type brakes for hydraulic device with precision machined brakes.	2,480	385	245,000
4. Brake fluid reservoir for T-38 aircraft. Reduced capacity from 17 ounces to 4 ounces to eliminate unnecessary capacity.	178	52	50,400
5. Radiation hazard filter for airborne rocket launcher. Redesigned filter using available standard parts.	13.02	4.70	83,000

II. BUYING AT THE LOWEST SOUND PRICE

It is not enough to buy only what we need, we must also buy at the lowest sound price.

(a) Shifting from noncompetitive to competitive procurement: Maximizing competition in defense procurement is sound public policy. It is one of the most effective means of broadening the industrial base and insuring that we obtain the lowest sound price on what we buy. The purchase of specialized military items, however, involves unique problems which tend to limit our opportunities to buy competitively. We are attempting, nevertheless, to expand continually the opportunities for competitive bidding even on these specialized items, and in the process of doing so we have achieved savings in the first 10 months of fiscal year 1963 of \$195 million. We have found that when we are able to shift from a single source to a competitive procurement, we normally achieve a reduction in price of at least 25 percent. On 58 major procurements made competitively during the third quarter of fiscal year 1963, the average reduction was 30 percent of the price formerly paid to the sole source producer.

Here are some examples of shifts to competitive procurements in fiscal year 1963, including both end items and components:

Item	Previous noncompetitive price	First competitive price	Gross savings on fiscal year 1963 procurement
1. M-110 8-inch howitzer.	\$68,044	\$41,415	\$7,855,555
2. M-107 175-millimeter gun.	68,036	41,376	3,625,760
3. R-442 radio receiver.	1,519	1,034	908,890
4. RT-246 receiver/transmitter.	3,976	2,692	927,048
5. RT-524 receiver/transmitter.	3,074	2,036	7,338,660
6. AN/PRC-25 man pack radio.	2,278	843	10,494,312
7. GRC-50, radio sets.	34,478	17,411	4,300,940

To insure a concerted effort toward competitive buying whenever possible, we established specific goals to be achieved by each of the military departments and the Defense Supply Agency in terms of the percentage of awards to be made by price competition in each of the fiscal years 1963, 1964, 1965. As the following chart [not printed in RECORD] reveals, the Department of Defense as a whole in the first 10 months of this fiscal year has exceeded the full year 1963 goal; 37.6 percent of all awards were made to the lowest responsible bidder, compared with 32.9 percent in fiscal year 1961.

The estimated \$195 million saved during the first 10 months of fiscal year 1963 breaks down as follows:

Estimated price savings from competition	
Millions	
Aircraft components and parts	\$40
Missile components and parts	24
Electronic and communications equipment	40
Vehicles (combat and noncombat)	27
Ships and components	58
Weapons and ammunition	4
Supplies and services	2
Total	195

The full year savings may be somewhat greater when final results for May and June are known. Our goal in this area is to increase total price reductions through competition by an additional \$100 million each year for the next 3 years, thereby reaching an annual rate of savings by fiscal year 1966 of \$500 million over the fiscal year 1961 level.

(b) Shifting from cost-plus to fixed-price and incentive contracts: The increasingly complex weapon systems resulting from the

technological revolution of the 1950's led to a great expansion in the use of the cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. However, both Departments and industry officials agreed that cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts not only fail to provide incentives for economy, but actually deaden management efficiency by removing the need for either the Department or the contractor to estimate costs accurately, and to plan and control programs tightly.

Accordingly, last year we established specific goals for a reduction in the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts by each military department in each of the 3 fiscal years 1963-65. The goal for fiscal year 1963 was to reduce such contracts to 25.8 percent of total contract awards (compared with 38 percent in the first 9 months of fiscal year 1961) with an ultimate goal of not more than 12.3 percent by fiscal year 1965. This is a very ambitious goal but we are exerting every effort to meet it.

Improvements actually achieved by each of the military departments during fiscal year 1963 are:

	[In percent]		
	9 months of fiscal year 1961	10 months of fiscal year 1963	Change
Army	32.8	16.0	-16.8
Navy	24.3	18.0	-6.3
Air Force	50.6	30.2	-20.4
All Department of Defense	38.0	21.1	-16.9

As shown on the following chart [not printed in RECORD], cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts during the first 10 months of fiscal year 1963 dropped to 21.1 percent of the total—the lowest level since fiscal year 1955.

As a result of these efforts, the value of annual awards under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts has declined by \$3.2 billion on a basis comparable to fiscal year 1961. Our best estimate is that for each dollar shifted to firm fixed-priced and incentive contracts, we should be able to reduce final costs by at least 10 percent—a total saving of \$320 million.

III. REDUCING OPERATING COSTS

The third broad area for improving logistics management is the reduction of operating costs by:

1. Terminating unnecessary operations;
2. Standardizing and simplifying procedures; and
3. Consolidating and increasing the efficiency of major operating services: supply, communications, transportation, and maintenance.

(a) Terminating unnecessary operations: Retention of unneeded real estate and facilities constitutes one of the largest hidden costs in defense operations. In 1961 you instructed me to review thoroughly our utilization of real properties, and, wherever possible, to consolidate activities in order to eliminate unnecessary overhead costs, free personnel for higher priority duties, and release property which could be put to more productive use by the civilian economy. Accordingly, we have instituted a permanent program of inspection and review to achieve these objectives. During the past 2 years, actions have been initiated at over 400 locations in the United States and overseas which, when completed, will produce the following results:

Real estate returned to civilian use, 265,905 acres.

Industrial plants with commercial potential made available for sale, 54 plants.

Personnel being released or reassigned, 53,310 men.

Annual operating savings, \$316 million.

During the next 2 years we expect to take additional actions which will increase the annual savings to almost \$450 million, with further savings anticipated in later fiscal years.

The adverse impact of these actions on the local economies is being completely or substantially offset in many cases. The Administrator of GSA recently advised me that in calendar year 1962, 26 industrial plants released by Defense were sold at fair market value of \$49 million, and that these plants are now employing 27,000 workers. In addition, we have an active program to assist employees and communities adversely affected by reduction or termination of defense activities. This program has been successful in minimizing loss of employment as well as in turning the excess properties to productive nondefense uses.

(b) Standardizing and simplifying procedures: During fiscal year 1963, 16 different requisitioning systems were successfully consolidated into one standard system, eliminating extensive rewriting of information and wasted clerical effort. As a result, manpower reductions are beginning to occur, and over the next 2 years the value of clerical time saved should reach \$20 million per year.

On October 1 we plan to introduce a new single multipurpose shipping document which is designed to replace the 81 different bills of lading and shipping forms now in use. The value of the man-hours which the new improved system is expected to save when fully operational is estimated at more than \$30 million per year.

(c) Consolidating and increasing efficiency of operations: Actions taken during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963 to consolidate and increase the efficiency of other logistical operations of the Department of Defense should produce savings of almost \$220 million per year, somewhat more than our full year goal.

1. The Defense Supply Agency, in its first 18 months of operation, has produced results well beyond our estimates prior to its creation. DSA is now managing 1 million items of common supplies and has proved its ability to provide effective support to military users at substantially less cost than they previously incurred. Overhead savings of \$31 million in fiscal year 1963, and \$35 million in fiscal year 1964 are already assured. Inventories in fiscal year 1963 were reduced by 10 percent, or \$240 million, and a program was initiated to consolidate DSA stocks at 11 instead of 77 primary locations. Further improvements in DSA's operating efficiency are expected in future years.

2. Communications systems savings: During the past year the responsibilities of the Defense Communications Agency have been expanded and its effectiveness improved. Consolidated procurement of leased-line services and more effective utilization of existing defense and commercial services have produced savings of \$82 million.

3. Transportation and traffic management: Savings of \$13 million reported during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963 resulted from the increased use of economy class air travel, decreased cost of household goods shipments, and more economical use of airlift for cargo movements. Our goal for fiscal year 1963 was a saving of \$17 million. These economies are expected to increase during the next 2 fiscal years, reaching an annual rate of \$41 million by fiscal year 1965.

4. Maintenance management: Among other steps, we are installing detailed cost accounting and information systems to provide a basis for measuring and evaluating the performance of maintenance activities employing more than 1 million military and civilian personnel at some 2,000 locations. Savings from these and other reforms designed to provide more economical maintenance of equipment, family housing and other property exceeded \$90 million in the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963—approximately double those in all of 1962. Our fiscal year 1965 goal for savings in these areas is over \$400 million per year.

IV. SUMMARY

Last year I submitted a memorandum on the cost-reduction program reporting reforms which I estimated would produce annual savings of over \$750 million in fiscal year 1963 toward a fiscal year 1967 goal of \$3 billion per year. Today I can report savings of \$1 billion in fiscal year 1963, one-third more than planned. Largely because of the rapid progress we have been able to make, we have now raised our goal for fiscal 1967 by about one-third—from the \$3 billion proposed last year to the \$4 billion which is our current goal. As these savings materialize they are being reflected in the Department's annual budget, helping us to meet the heavy burden of national defense with the least possible demand on the Nation's resources.

ROBERT S. McNAMARA.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Illinois with respect to the savings reported to the President and to Congress by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator, who, while he was the Secretary for Air, brought about many economies, while at the same time increasing the efficiency of the Air Force. He knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. President, in view of the frequent downgrading of Congress and of congressional efforts to achieve economy, it may be appropriate to mention some of the congressional personalities and civic groups which have sought for these economies over the years.

In the House, Speaker McCORMACK, Congressmen T. B. CURTIS, F. E. HEBERT, and H. C. BONNER have worked for years to achieve greater economies in military procurement.

I hope I will not be considered immodest if I inquire if readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will also remember how, since 1951, I have urged the consolidation of supply functions, the greater use of competitive bidding to reduce the prices paid, and a better program of storage and utilization of stock and surplus, together with many other reforms.

The Hoover Commission, with such men as Perry Shoemaker and John Stuart and its representatives, Charles Hook and Frank Upman, have also given yeoman service in the cause, while that fine public servant, Ray Ward, has been the informed and determined spark plug for nearly all efforts at improvement.

But we were not able to make much, if any, headway with the successive Secretaries of Defense until Secretary McNamara took office. On December 30, 1960, a few days before he was sworn in, I addressed a detailed letter to him on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be inserted at this point in my remarks.

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

DEAR MR. McNAMARA: May I first congratulate you on your appointment as Secretary of Defense. I want to wish you well in this post which is of the highest responsibility and where the opportunity to serve the country is unsurpassed.

I am writing to draw your attention to my concern, and I think that of almost every Member of Congress and of private persons who have gone into it, over what is appalling and even scandalous waste in the Defense Department's procurement and supply system. I am enclosing a number of reports and other documents concerning this. May I mention only a few points.

1. Some 86 percent of all contracts—both in dollar and number—are now negotiated rather than let by competitive bidding. This is inexcusable and results in millions of dollars in excessive prices.¹ In fact, in the reports on the latest Defense Department appropriation bill both the House and Senate urged radical reform in this area. We have been met, however, by little more than a series of justifications of the existing system instead of action to carry out the congressional mandate.

2. In the last 2 years alone, the General Accounting Office has submitted over 50 reports going into detail concerning waste in procurement and supply. The testimony of the Comptroller General before my committee indicates that these are representative samples of a much larger universe. Almost every time they go into this question, malpractices and bad practices are found.

3. There is almost a complete lack of integration between and among the supply systems of the individual services and, equally important, within the services. There is vast duplication of personnel, inventories, warehousing, etc., which can only be solved by centralizing the supply systems. This should be done immediately at least with respect to those items which are common to all of the services.

4. The stock fund system has resulted in the accumulation of excess stocks and cash. Each service seems to operate them in a different way. There is no common practice concerning them. They often involve a double appropriation. In addition, the reimbursable requirements have had the effect of preventing other services and agencies from using stock fund materials which have subsequently been disposed of as surplus.

5. The amount and disposal of surplus property is also of scandalous proportions. We are now selling off some \$8 to \$10 billion of surplus supplies. The question arises, "What kind of a supply system do we have which could conceivably generate such amounts?" In addition, we are receiving only 2 to 3 cents on the dollar when they are disposed of.

Furthermore, there are literally hundreds of examples of concurrent buying and selling—where one agency of the Government buys new supplies which another agency is at the same time disposing of as surplus. A recent Budget Bureau study showed that this was true in two-thirds of the examples and in their study the equipment was new, available in the same geographic area, etc.

6. The Defense Department has at hand one agency which could radically help in solving some of these problems. That is the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. But it is not being properly used. Services have, in effect, a veto over its activities and its hands have been tied.

At the moment the Armed Forces Supply Support Center is attempting, under great difficulties, to match the excess or surplus supply inventory with requirements of the services. But much more is needed. There should be a complete inventory of all supplies so that new procurement or requirement can be matched, against existing stocks. This is not now true and calls for a central agency where all procurement requests can go and be matched against existing supplies before new purchases are made.

In this connection also, many of us believe that the services have excessive quantities in

¹ May be billions.

their various inventory categories, i. e., mobilization reserve, etc.

I believe that great savings can be made in procurement and supply in the Defense Department. To summarize—there must be more competitive bidding, greater centralization of purchase and supply, much more efficient handling of the surplus supply and disposal system, and the reform of the stock fund and reimbursable requirements.

Fortunately, these reforms can take place under existing law. The Defense Department does not need legislation to effect these reforms.

I think the motto of the Department should be to "use it up, wear it out, make it do," wherever possible. As a minimum, I believe that \$2 to \$3 billion per year could be saved by merely beginning on these reforms. These savings should then be translated into more missiles, tanks, and combat troops so that our country can be more adequately defended and our people protected.

With best wishes.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Secretary responded by setting up a quarterly conference with the congressional critics, and programs of action were jointly discussed and approved and reports made on progress. It is impossible to give Secretary McNamara and his associates, Roswell Gilpatric and Thomas Morris, adequate credit for the splendid way in which they have worked at this problem, while General McNamara has done an excellent job as head of the Consolidated Defense Supply Agency.

There still remains a great deal to be done, particularly in the field of obtaining more competition in the awarding of contracts, but since the reforms of Secretary McNamara and his associates are being vigorously opposed both within and without the armed services by those who are still attached to the old wasteful order, we need to appreciate the Secretary's qualities while he is here and under fire and not merely after he has gone.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 seconds more.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. The judgments of history may ultimately come, but they are seldom of much direct service in the concrete struggles of life.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, with the consent of the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may have 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I say, with great respect, that the senior Senator from Illinois is exceedingly modest. The work he has done in the years I have been in the Senate on consolidating procurement has been one of the primary reasons for the recent successes in this field, and the American people should be grateful to him for the work he has done over the years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I hoped I would not be considered egotistical if I spoke about this matter.

AMENDMENT OF LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3845) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the executive calendar, which was reported earlier today by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and which has been cleared by both the minority and majority leadership.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

U. S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Pat Mehaffy, of Arkansas, to be a U. S. circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES IN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly, without losing the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 316, Senate bill 793.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 793) to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific

flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 4, line 16, after "Sec. 4.", to strike out:

In carrying out the policy of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall retain full authority to lease for agricultural purposes the reserved public lands lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges. Leases for agricultural purposes shall provide for the growing of grains, forage, and soil-building crops, except that not more than 25 per centum of the leased lands may be planted to row crops.

And insert:

The Secretary shall, consistent with proper waterfowl management, continue the present pattern of leasing the reserved lands of the Klamath Straits unit, the Southwest Sump, the League of Nations unit, the Henzel lease, and the Frog Pond unit, all within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges and shown in plate 4 of the report entitled "Plan for Wildlife Use of Federal Lands in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon-California," dated April 1956. Leases for these lands shall be at a price or prices designed to obtain the maximum lease revenues. The leases shall provide for the growing of grain, forage, and soil-building crops, except that not more than 25 per centum of the total leased lands may be planted to row crops. All other reserved public lands included in section 2 of this Act shall continue to be managed by the Secretary for waterfowl purposes, including the growing of agricultural crops by direct planting and sharecrop agreements with local cooperators where necessary.

On page 6, line 4, after the word "by", to insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "contract", to insert "between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, or any amendment thereof,"; and after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to stabilize the ownership of the land in the Klamath Federal reclamation project, Oregon and California, as well as the administration and management of the Klamath Federal reclamation project and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuge, to preserve intact the necessary existing habitat for migratory waterfowl in this vital area of the Pacific flyway, and to prevent depredations of migratory waterfowl on agricultural crops in the Pacific Coast States.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, all lands owned by the United States lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, the Lower Klamath National

Wildlife Refuge, the Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and the Clear Lake Wildlife Refuge are hereby dedicated to wildlife conservation. Such lands shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the major purpose of waterfowl management, but with full consideration to optimum agricultural use that is consistent therewith. Such lands shall not be opened to homestead entry. The following public lands shall also be included within the boundaries of the area dedicated to wildlife conservation and they also shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the major purpose of waterfowl management, but with full consideration to optimum agricultural use that is consistent therewith. Such lands shall not be opened to homestead entry: Hanks Marsh, and first form withdrawal lands (approximately one thousand four hundred and forty acres) in Klamath County, Oregon, lying adjacent to Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge; White Lake in Klamath County, Oregon, and Siskiyou County, California; and thirteen tracts of land in Siskiyou County, California, lettered as tracts "A", "B", "C", "D", "E", "F", "G", "H", "I", "J", "K", "L" and "N" totaling approximately three thousand two hundred and ninety-two acres, and tract "P" in Modoc County, California, containing about ten acres, all as shown on plate 4 of the report entitled "Plan for Wildlife Use of Federal Lands in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon-California," dated April 1956, prepared by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. All the above lands shall remain permanently the property of the United States.

Sec. 3. Subject to conditions hereafter prescribed, and pursuant to such regulations as may be issued by the Secretary, 25 per centum of the net revenues collected during each fiscal year from the leasing of Klamath project reserved Federal lands within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge shall be paid annually by the Secretary, without further authorization, for each full fiscal year after the date of this Act to the counties in which such refuges are located, such payments to be made on a pro rata basis to each county based upon the refuge acreage in each county: *Provided*, That the total annual payment per acre to each county shall not exceed 50 per centum of the average per acre tax levied on similar lands in private ownership in each county, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no such payments shall be made which will reduce the credits or the payments to be made pursuant to contractual obligations of the United States with the Tulelake Irrigation District or the Klamath Drainage District, and the priority for the use of the net revenues shall be (1) to pay or credit to the Tulelake Irrigation District the amounts already committed to such payment or credit, and (2) to pay to the Klamath Drainage District the balance thereof until the sum of \$197,315 shall have been paid as full reimbursement for the construction of irrigation facilities to the lands involved.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall, consistent with proper waterfowl management, continue the present pattern of leasing the reserved lands of the Klamath Straits unit, the Southwest Sump, the League of Nations unit, the Henzel lease, and the Frog Pond unit, all within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges and shown in plate 4 of the report entitled "Plan for Wildlife Use of Federal Lands in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon-California," dated April 1956. Leases for these lands shall be at a price or prices designed to obtain the maximum lease revenues. The leases shall provide for the growing of grain, forage, and soil-building crops, except that not more than 25 per centum of the total leased lands may

be planted to row crops. All other reserved public lands included in section 2 of this Act shall continue to be managed by the Secretary for waterfowl purposes, including the growing of agricultural crops by direct planting and sharecrop agreements with local cooperators where necessary.

Sec. 5. The areas of sumps 1(a) and 1(b) in the Klamath project lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge shall not be reduced by diking or by any other construction to less than the existing thirteen thousand acres.

Sec. 6. In carrying out the obligations of the United States under any migratory bird treaty, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (40 Stat. 755), as amended, or the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1222), as amended, waters under the control of the Secretary of the Interior shall be regulated, subject to valid existing rights, to maintain sump levels in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge at levels established by the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, or any amendment thereof, and regulations pursuant thereto, which shall be levels that in the judgment of the Secretary are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes.

Sec. 7. The Secretary is hereby directed to complete studies that have been undertaken relating to the development of the water resources and waterfowl management potential of the Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuge. The results of such studies, when completed, and the recommendations of the Secretary shall be submitted to the Congress.

Sec. 8. The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I think it fair to say that the legislation now before the Senate represents one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation which the 88th Congress will consider. In the previous Congress the Senate approved essentially similar legislation to this which I had the honor of introducing. It has the recommendation of every conservation group in America. It has the recommendation of the Department of the Interior of the Federal Government. It likewise bears the stamp of approval of the Fish and Game Commission of California, the State government of California, the Governor of California, every California conservation group, and various farm groups as well. It is the only bill which carries these endorsements.

As I say, I offered that legislation 2 years ago and the Senate passed it. My regret is that the House of Representatives did not have time to complete consideration of it in the previous Congress after a subcommittee there had approved it. This year, in the early days of this session, with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] I introduced S. 793 which is essentially the same as the legislation which was approved by the Senate a year ago.

I am, therefore, most pleased to bring before the Senate, as its pending business, S. 793, a bill representing many years of diligent effort by people aware of the supreme importance of conserving and managing, for its highest and best use, in the interest of the people, an area of the public's lands at and near the Oregon-California border. These lands, with their water and marsh areas, have from earliest time served as the

sanctuary for millions upon millions of migratory waterfowl. S. 793 would preserve a portion of the original area for the purpose it has historically served.

On April 24, 1963, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs conducted a full hearing on my bill and on S. 784, a related bill introduced by Senator ENGLE. Because our bill, S. 793, is virtually the same bill as my previous bill, S. 1988, and because S. 793 dedicates four refuges while S. 784 dedicates but three refuges, the subcommittee and the full committee each concluded that the logical course is to enact S. 793 rather than S. 784 and thus S. 793 has been favorably reported to the Senate, with some clarifying amendments written into S. 793 by merging certain provisions from S. 784 to aid in achieving the primary purpose of the two bills, without, however, changing, in any respect, our basic purpose of sound conservation.

I am pleased that a number of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have joined as cosponsors of the proposed legislation, to demonstrate the widespread interest which the Senate has in this subject.

Mr. President, the purpose of this measure is to achieve an equitable solution to a public land utilization problem that has been before the Department of the Interior for over 20 years. This bill would dedicate for the major purpose of waterfowl management, but with full consideration to optimum agricultural use that is consistent therewith, the land and water areas of four existing wildlife refuges established by Executive order plus additional nearby public lands of some 6,891 acres for a total of some 133,000 acres so dedicated. Under all circumstances, the major purpose of conservation, sound waterfowl management, would remain supreme.

In deciding how to legislate in this regard, the basic question before the committee was whether to preserve the area primarily for conservation, or to authorize management techniques and disposition of lands to private ownership so as to limit the conservation purposes in certain respects. The committee resolved the issues in favor of conservation purposes—primarily waterfowl management—because it clearly appears that such is in the public interest, not only so as to conserve the important national and international natural resource of waterfowl, but also because the maintenance of an adequate habitat for these migratory fowl is in the best interests of the great majority of affected agriculturalists. A good habitat at this location holds the birds until after the harvesting of crops to the south throughout California. That is why our State farm organizations favor this bill.

In resolving the issues in a way consistent with best conservation practice, the committee rejected contentions made by two irrigation districts. First, it is believed that it is not necessarily so, as was claimed by the Tulelake Irrigation District, California, that harm to the local agricultural interests will follow from

the committee's decision that waters within the Tule Lake refuge, as elsewhere in the complex, should be at levels that are adequate and practicable for waterfowl rather than for agriculture, in the event of a conflict between the two purposes. Representatives of the district claimed that their contract with the United States forbids such a priority for conservation. However, they testified that operation of the water sumps within the Tule Lake refuge, since an unfortunate incident in 1959—and I remember that incident very well—has been under regulations of the Secretary in a manner which has not caused the district harm, such regulations being recognized by the contract itself. Yet it also appears that the interests of waterfowl have been adequately protected. This legislation merely assures that this will continue to be, and that the first consideration of the United States is sound conservation. It is hoped that an enlightened and mutually beneficial operation of the waters may continue. With performance of the district's obligation to maintain the dikes and sumps, as provided in its contract, no conflict in the priorities ought to arise. But if it did, the bill assures that waterfowl management purposes must prevail.

Second, the Klamath drainage district, Oregon, asked for some 6,365 acres of public land of the lower Klamath refuge to come under private ownership. That district suggested that the property in private ownership could carry easements favoring undisturbed perpetual public hunting rights. Nevertheless, the committee concluded that the property should remain in public ownership for the ultimate highest utilization in the refuge complex.

In doing so it was decided that it should be done in part on recommendations to that effect from the Secretary of the Interior.

In order that the legislative history may be abundantly clear, I now ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee, at pages 1, 2, 3, and the four lines at the top of page 4, be set forth in the RECORD at this point.

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

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 793) to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific Flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with amendments, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENTS

On page 4, strike all of section 4 and insert the following new section 4:

"Sec. 4. The Secretary shall, consistent with proper waterfowl management, continue the present pattern of leasing the reserved lands of the Klamath Straits unit, the Southwest Sump, the League of Nations unit, the Henzel lease, and the Frog Pond unit, all within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges and shown in plate 4 of the report entitled "Plan for Wildlife Use of Federal Lands in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon-California," dated April 1956.

Leases for these lands shall be at a price or prices designed to obtain the maximum lease revenues. The leases shall provide for the growing of grain, forage, and soil-building crops, except that not more than 25 per centum of the total leased lands may be planted to row crops. All other reserved public lands included in section 2 of this act shall continue to be managed by the Secretary for waterfowl purposes, including the growing of agricultural crops by direct planting and sharecrop agreements with local co-operators where necessary."

On page 5, line 11, after the word "by", insert the word "the".

On page 5, line 11, after the word "contract", insert the following: "between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, or any amendment thereof."

Add a new section 8 to read as follows: "Sec. 8. The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

On April 24, 1963, the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee conducted a full hearing on S. 784, introduced by Senator ENGLE, and S. 793, introduced by Senator KUCHEL for himself and Senator ROBERTSON. S. 793 is virtually the same bill as S. 1988, 87th Congress, which was approved by this committee and thereafter by the Senate on May 16, 1963.

Both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs gave careful consideration to those provisions of the two bills that indicated some differences. The committee believes that the amendments set out above have resulted in a merger which has improved S. 793. Section 5 of Senator ENGLE's bill, S. 784, replaces the original section 4 of S. 793. This section provides that the present pattern of leasing the reserved lands within the area shall continue.

The second amendment assures the settlers and the Tulelake Irrigation District that the operation of the sump levels in the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge will be in conformance with the contract between that district and the United States, dated September 10, 1956, which shall be levels that in the judgment of the Secretary are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes. The bill, as reported, reassures the farmers in the local area of the protection of their valid existing rights.

That section of the bill, thus amended, reads:

"Waters under the control of the Secretary of the Interior shall be regulated, subject to valid existing rights, to maintain sump levels in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge at levels established by the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, or any amendment thereof, and regulations pursuant thereto, which shall be levels that in the judgment of the Secretary are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes."

The third amendment, adding section 8, merely confirms the Secretary's power to issue regulations under this proposed act.

The action taken by the committee conforms to the recommendation of Governor Brown, of California, when he urged a single bill encompassing the interests of the various parties concerned. The committee has tried to do this subject to the basic objective of the legislation which is conservation of valuable public resources.

DISCUSSIONS

The purpose of this measure is to achieve an equitable solution to a public land utilization problem that has been before the Department of the Interior for over 20 years. This bill would dedicate for the major purpose of waterfowl management, but with full consideration to optimum agricultural use that is consistent therewith the land and

water areas of four existing wildlife refuges established by Executive order plus additional nearby public lands of some 6,891 acres for a total of some 133,000 acres so dedicated.

The basic question before the committee was whether to preserve the area primarily for conservation or to permit agricultural purposes and management techniques to limit the conservation purposes in certain respects. The committee resolved this issue in favor of conservation, primarily waterfowl management purposes, because it clearly appears that such a priority is in the public interest, not only for reasons of conservation of the important national and international resource of waterfowl but also because the maintenance of an assured safe habitat for these migratory fowl is in the best interests of the great majority of affected agriculturalists. A good habitat at this location holds the birds until after the harvesting of crops to the south throughout California.

In resolving the priority issue in favor of waterfowl, the committee believes that it is not necessarily so that harm to the local agricultural interests of the Tulelake Irrigation District will follow. Representatives of the district testified that operation of the water sumps within the Tule Lake Refuge since an unfortunate incident in 1959 has been under regulations of the Secretary in a manner which has not caused the district harm, and yet it also appears that the interests of waterfowl have been adequately protected as the bill provides that they shall be. It is hoped that such an enlightened and mutually beneficial operation of the waters can continue.

The bill also provides for—

"(1) Continuation of the present pattern of leasing, at prices designed to obtain maximum revenues, of certain lands in the Lower Klamath and Tule Lake Refuges.

"(2) The revenues from the leases (after deducting up to \$50,000 per year due the Tulelake Irrigation District and the sum of \$197,315 to the Klamath Drainage District) will be shared equitably with the local counties on the basis of payment of 25 percent of the net lease revenues but not to exceed 50 percent of the average per-acre tax levied on similar lands in private ownership."

The committee believes that S. 793, as amended, is a proper solution to the management of these important public lands lying at the waist of the three-nation Pacific Flyway. Further disposal of lands is prohibited, a financial contribution to local government, out of revenues from the lands, is provided for, financial obligations to two affected irrigation districts are assured out of revenues from the lands, and conservation is clearly established as the priority purpose of management in the area.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in summary, from Theodore Roosevelt's time, an area of public lands in northern California has been protected only by Executive order for the purpose of providing a habitat for millions of migratory waterfowl in their annual trek from Canada to Mexico. That is part of the Pacific coast flyway. The proposed bill would give legislative sanction to a whole series of protective Presidential executive decrees. It will do more than that. It would provide that the fundamental duty of the Department of the Interior, representing the people of the United States, would be so to conduct the operations there that conservation purposes will be given priority. This is an excellent piece of legislation. It ought to be enacted into law.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks of my senior colleague

that this is an important piece of legislation. In order that our legislative record may be complete, the bill was introduced not only by us, but also by Senators ROBERTSON, JACKSON, ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BIBLE, MOSS, BURDICK, METCALF, MCGOVERN, NELSON, MECHEM, and DOMINICK. I have joined in cosponsorship of the bill because, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it is a good bill. It will accomplish our basic objective of wildfowl conservation at Tule Lake and at the same time it will protect the rights and benefits of the 50-year-old Klamath reclamation project.

There was some controversy over this in California and Oregon. In February we had two bills—one, S. 784, which was prepared at my request by the Department of the Interior; the other, S. 793, introduced by my distinguished colleague, Senator KUCHEL. Essentially alike in providing for permanent establishment of the four wildlife refuges, they had one basic difference. My bill, S. 784—and an identical one, H.R. 3817, introduced by the Congressman from the area, Representative "Bizz" JOHNSON—required specific recognition of the existing reclamation contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District. S. 793, as introduced, did not recognize the Tule Lake contract.

Well, without relating the controversy—which I think was unfortunate and unnecessary—I want to say to the Senate that in my judgment it has been resolved. The committee report—(No. 341, page 2)—is forthright. It gives us a new bill, S. 793 by number, that is con-

sistent with S. 784 in substance. The five sections of the two original bills that were identical in language or alike in substance are left unchanged. These are sections 1, 2, 3, 5 and 7.

In section 4, pertaining to the leasing of reserved lands, the committee substituted a section verbatim from my bill S. 784. In section 6 the committee resolved the key issue by requiring operation of Tule Lake "at levels established by the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, or any amendment thereof, and regulations pursuant thereto, which shall be levels that in the judgment of the Secretary are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes."

Section 8 of the reported bill also is taken verbatim from S. 784.

I hope and believe that everybody is happy. The bill as reported meets our common objectives. If adopted by the Congress it will, at long last, provide permanent nesting grounds for ducks and geese in a vital section of the great Pacific Flyway. I urge Senate approval of S. 793, as reported.

In order that there may be a complete legislative record, I have prepared an analysis of the various sections of the bills, as they were changed and incorporated in the bill before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

THE KLAMATH-TULE LAKE BILLS

S. 784 (ENGLE)	S. 793 (KUCHEL)	S. 793 (as revised and reported by committee)
Sec. 1: Land management policy. Secs. 2 and 3: Designation of wildlife areas. Sec. 4: Payments to counties. Sec. 5: Leasing of reserved lands. Sec. 6: Sump areas. Sec. 7: Requiring adherence to existing irrigation contract. Sec. 8: Clear Lake studies. Sec. 9: Authority to issue regulations.	Sec. 1: Identical to Engle bill. Sec. 2: Same in substance. Sec. 3: Same in substance. Sec. 4: Similar in substance, but less definitive. Sec. 5: Identical. Sec. 6: "Valid existing rights"—no reference to irrigation project. Sec. 7: Identical. No provision.	Sec. 1: No change. Sec. 2: No change. Sec. 3: No change. Sec. 4: Substitutes verbatim sec. 5 of Engle bill. Sec. 5: No change. Sec. 6: Substitutes in substance sec. 7 of Engle bill. Sec. 7: No change. Sec. 8: Identical to sec. 9 of Engle bill.

NOTE.—The original Engle and Kuchel bills were either identical in language or the same in substance in all sections except the 3 marked above. The committee adopted verbatim or in substance the Engle provisions in all 3 instances, making it in practical effect the Engle bill. However, the committee used the Kuchel name and number

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe the most important section of our bill is section 6. The opposition to my bill would have subordinated the conservation purposes to the requirements of the irrigation district. The opposition did not prevail. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of section 6 of my bill, S. 793, and section 7 of the Engle bill, S. 784, be printed in the RECORD at this point. The difference of approach will be readily apparent, and will add to the legislative history.

I ask consent, also, to include sundry letters and articles and testimony appearing in the hearings on both S. 784 and S. 793.

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

SEC. 6. In carrying out the obligations of the United States under any migratory bird treaty, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (40

Stat. 755), as amended, or the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1222), as amended, waters under the control of the Secretary of the Interior shall be regulated, subject to valid existing rights, to maintain sump levels in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge at levels established by the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, or any amendment thereof, and regulations pursuant thereto, which shall be levels that in the judgment of the Secretary are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes.

S. 784

SEC. 7. In carrying out the obligations of the United States pursuant to treaties, international agreements, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), or the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 715 et seq.), waters under the control of the Secretary shall be regulated to maintain levels that in the judgment of the Secretary are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes; *Provided*, That to the ex-

tent the sumps within the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge are maintained, they shall be operated and maintained in accordance with the provisions of section 7 (b) and (d) of the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District, dated September 10, 1956, and the rules and regulations of the Secretary.

THE RESOURCES AGENCY OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME, Sacramento, April 19, 1963.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Member of the Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Thank you for sending us a copy of your bill S. 793, the Tule-Klamath legislation.

We are pleased that you have introduced this important conservation bill, and we are giving it our wholehearted support.

We hope that you will be successful in your endeavors to have this legislation adopted by Congress.

Sincerely,

W. T. SHANNON, Director.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Mar. 13, 1963]

TULE LAKE BATTLE IS NOT OVER (By Walt Radke)

Any sportsman who thinks that battle to preserve the Tule Lake-Lower Klamath waterfowl refuges is all over, should take a look at some of the small print in the Engle-Johnson bill, presently wending its way through committee in Washington, D.C.

Congressman HAROLD T. "BIZZ" JOHNSON, in whose constituency Tule Lake lies, and Senator CLAIR ENGLE, who previously represented the area in the House, have cosponsored a measure which is strikingly similar to the famed Kuchel bill * * * with one glaring exception.

If they have their way, water levels in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge would be operated and maintained in accordance with an irrigation contract.

It was under a similar contract, in 1959, that irrigators attempted to pump Tule Lake dry in an effort to force wildlife interests out, and to allow homesteading of sump areas.

The ensuing battle between the sportsmen and farmers went clear back to Washington, D.C., where the Interior Department finally had to step in and force the irrigation interests to maintain water levels compatible with waterfowl needs.

Should Congress pass the Engle-Johnson bill (S. 784), instead of the new Kuchel bill (S. 793), the farmers could still wind up in the driver's seat at Tule * * * and the ancient conflict between waterfowl conservation and agriculture would be perpetuated.

Fortunately for the sportsmen, the Kuchel bill is being supported by just about every interest other than agriculture.

The measure has the backing of the Interior Department, Governor Brown, the California Fish and Game Department, the Duck-hunters Association of California, the National and California Wildlife Federations and the Izaak Walton League, the Audubon Society, among others. It also has the backing of the average Pacific flyway shotgunner and blind buyer.

Truly, a formidable list. But let's not underestimate the opposition.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 21, 1963]

KUCHEL'S BILL GOOD FOR DUCKS, RICE (By J. P. Cuenin)

Every duck hunter in California should immediately write to his Senator and Congressman and ask them to not only vote for Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL's bill, S. 793, but to work for its passage.

KUCHEL's bill, if passed, will not only save ducks for the hunters, but it will help to prevent the destruction of rice by the birds that will pour into the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys before the rice is harvested.

Over the years a great deal of the original area of the famous Upper and Lower Klamath Lakes and Tule Lake has been taken over by homesteaders. They still are trying to grab more of this perfect waterfowl area which for centuries has been the main water station for millions of ducks migrating from Alaska and the vast Prairie Provinces of Canada to California.

TWO DEFINITE FLIGHTS

We have two definite flights of ducks that reach the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. One of these comes down the coast from Alaska and turns east at Point Reyes toward the Suisun Bay, and from that area spreads up the Sacramento Valley and down the San Joaquin Valley.

The second and largest flight comes to California from the Ducks Unlimited region in Canada on an overland flight, with an extended stopover at Upper and Lower Klamath Lake and Tule Lake refuges.

The waterfowl which come to us via the Klamath and Tule Lake refuges remain in that area and seldom come down to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys until most of the rice has been harvested. But if there is insufficient water on the refuges, they may swarm down to our rice growing districts and clean out a great deal of the rice.

In recent years there have been as many as 7 million ducks counted in 1 day on the Klamath-Tule refuges at a time when the harvesters were busy cutting rice on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley's 400,000 acres of rice. If at that time there happened to be a scarcity of water on the Klamath-Tule ponds, and that mass of ducks moved down to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley area, there would have been a tremendous loss of rice.

NEW REFUGES

However, the Federal Government and our State government have spent millions of dollars to create about 60,000 acres of refuges scattered about the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, and there was no sudden increase in the numbers of ducks, though there were some planes used to herd the birds from the ricefields to the refuges.

Senator KUCHEL's bill, if passed, will make it possible for the Federal Sport Fishing and Wildlife Service to get ample water to keep the ponds on the refuges filled to the correct height to prevent another outbreak of botulism. This killed more than 200,000 waterfowl in 1946 and 1947 in those refuges.

A couple of years ago when my sidekick, Walt Radke, went up to the Klamath-Tule district to hunt with a local guide, there was so little water in the pond they intended to hunt on, they had to push their boat over 200 yards of bare mud to reach the edge of the water. They bagged limits of ducks, but with that type feather edge water, and if the temperature that could prevail in August and September had been recorded then, there could have been a big outbreak of botulism.

During the last outbreak I went up to a meeting held in Klamath. After a long discussion it was decided that the dikes should be built so that the water depth could be kept up to 14 inches. That would prevent the mud on the bottom from building up enough heat to bring on a hatch of the dreaded botulism bugs.

At a meeting of Ducks Unlimited, Dr. Karl Meyer of the University of California, known throughout the world as the great botulism expert, told us that maintaining a depth of 14 inches on the ponds would prevent another outbreak.

SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES,
San Jose, Calif., April 20, 1963.

Hon. Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: This is regarding S. 793, Senator KUCHEL's bill on the Tule-Klamath Waterfowl Refuge Area.

I have been long familiar with this area and the problem. I was consulting biologist for the investigator hired by the Duck Hunters Association of California in 1959, to investigate the water management problem of Tule Lake refuge at that time.

The Tule-Klamath refuges are extremely important to the Pacific flyway and whatever affects these refuges will affect the flyway.

The important factor here is the proper management of the water level of the refuges. Full responsibility for all management factors must rest with the Fish and Wildlife Service personnel. This is not possible if the water is controlled by the irrigation district. In the investigation mentioned above it was clearly disclosed that the irrigation district was deliberately withholding water in order to embarrass the refuge personnel with the hunters. This was nothing but a "squeeze play" to eventually release refuge land for homesteading and private interests.

For this reason I cannot support S. 784 which puts the water control in the hands of the irrigation district. This will merely create the same old problem.

We do not need more potatoes and grain. We do need more permanent waterfowl areas. The waterfowl of the Pacific flyway are a \$20 million asset just in California alone.

I strongly urge the support of Senator KUCHEL's bill S. 793. The water must be controlled by the refuge personnel.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM GRAF,
Professor of Wildlife Management.

ASSOCIATED SPORTSMEN
OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, Calif., April 10, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This organization composed of 140 clubs and approximately 11,000 members are most concerned with the Tule-Klamath legislation.

It is difficult to realize that people, some in political circles can so easily dismiss the importance of this Pacific flyway which unless maintained can easily sound the death knell of migratory waterfowl in the Western United States. The adverse effect such a catastrophe would have on the economical and recreational stability of these Western States would be astounding and we sincerely trust the Congress of the United States will this year provide for this area the protection so vitally required.

The membership of this association is fully conscious of your efforts in our behalf in this matter, Mr. KUCHEL.

As a matter of sound principle and in appreciation of your efforts we are pledged to support S. 793 in any manner that may be helpful.

Please do not hesitate to call upon us for that assistance we may be able to render.

Sincerely,

JULIUS VON NOSTITZ,
President.

CONCORD SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.,
Concord, Calif., April 15, 1963.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We of the Concord Sportsmen's Club of Concord, Calif., wish to point out

that section 7 of the Senator Clair Engle bill (S. 784) is totally unacceptable to the sportsmen of California. We cannot accept the use of water for irrigation before it is used for the waterfowl area.

We urge you to act favorably on a bill that is to be presented April 24, 1963, by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL (S. 793). We believe this legislation to protect our wildlife is fair and just.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN YATES,
Secretary.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY
WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
San Diego, Calif., April 20, 1963.

Senator TOM KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This federation of sportsmen's clubs wishes to be recorded as supporting your Tule-Klamath waterfowl bill.

Very truly yours,

SAM WEISENBERG,
Secretary.

SPORTS COUNCIL, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 21, 1963.
Re S. 793 to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Sports Council, Inc., of Los Angeles and southern California, including its combined membership of over 200 representatives and manufacturers' representatives of recreational materials and equipment are 100 percent for your Senate bill 793.

This bill will protect for many years to come the Pacific flyway in preserving the area of the Tule Lake and the Klamath as far as the Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges, both the Oregon and California areas are in need of protection in the Pacific flyway.

Your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, No. 22, has been read in committee and found to be very accurate and gives full protection to all aspects of the problem, to the extent of satisfaction of those who have hunted the area for many years.

We request a "do pass" on Senate bill 793 in the meeting of the committee April 24, 1963.

Yours for conservation.

FRIEZ MANGOLD,
Executive Secretary.

ALTADENA, CALIF.,
April 21, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: We support your Tule-Klamath bill, S. 793. It is necessary that the water level be controlled in a manner which takes into consideration the needs of the waterfowl.

Thank you for your work on the wilderness bill.

Sincerely,

WALTER B. POWELL,
Legislative Committee,
Pasadena Roving Archers.

SANTA PAULA, CALIF.,
April 21, 1963.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Santa Paula Sportsmen's Club urges you and your committee to oppose bill S. 784. We find section 7 of said bill totally unacceptable. We feel it is inconsistent to dedicate land for waterfowl then chance cutting off the water.

The language in bill S. 793 is, in our opinion, more consistent with good practice and we further urge your support of same.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH V. BAIN,
Legislative Chairman,
Santa Paula Sportsmen's Club.

FRESNO COUNTY
SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, LTD.,
Fresno Calif., April 8, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Fresno County Sportsmen's Club urges your support for Senator KUCHEL'S S. 793 relative to the preservation of the Tule-Klamath waterfowl area. We strongly feel that the Tule-Klamath area must be preserved for the use of waterfowl.

We must also oppose Senator ENGLE'S bill, S. 784, for the reason that it will do no good to dedicate land for waterfowl and then have the water cut off. Adequate and practical water levels must be maintained for waterfowl management purposes.

We are depending on you to do all possible to protect the future of our Pacific flyway.

Sincerely,

H. DODDRIDGE,
President.

ARROYO GRANDE SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
Arroyo Grande, Calif., April 10, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUCHEL: Thank you for your efforts in behalf of the sportsmen and conservations.

The Arroyo Grande Sportsmen's Club wishes to assure you of the support of the members in obtaining the passage of Tule-Klamath waterfowl legislation represented by your Senate bill 793.

Sincerely,

R. E. "BOB" McDONALD,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

SANTA ANA CHAPTER,
ISAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Santa Ana, Calif., April 9, 1963.

Re Tule-Klamath legislation.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The California Division, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., urges strongest support for S. 793 (Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL) and H.R. 3016 (Hon. JAMES B. UTT). Other bills introduced are unsatisfactory, particularly S. 784 (Senator CLAIR ENGLE), and H.R. 3817 (Representative Harold T. "Bizz" Johnson). Waterfowl management interests in our wildlife refuges must take precedence over the interests of the irrigation districts.

We thank you for your consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

WARREN E. McCARTY,
Chairman, Wildlife Committee,
California Division.

LODI SPORTSMAN'S CLUB, INC.,
Lodi, Calif., April 7, 1963.

Re Tule-Klamath waterfowl area.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Senator THOMAS KUCHEL has a bill scheduled for hearing on April 24. We are particularly impressed with S. 793, as it provides that a water level be maintained, that are in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, adequate and practicable for a sound waterfowl management program.

Section 7, of Senator ENGLE'S bill, S. 784, is totally unacceptable by the members of this club.

The members therefore respectfully urge the enactment of KUCHEL'S bill, S. 793.

Yours truly,

GORDON L. NICHOLS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SUNNYVALE ROD & GUN CLUB,
Santa Clara, Calif., April 9, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to express opposition, in our club's name, to section 7 of Senator ENGLE'S S. 784. We would also like to express our support for Senator KUCHEL'S S. 793.

Respectfully,

AL LAURINEE,
Executive Officer.

FORESTER'S ROD & GUN CLUB,
Oakland, Calif., April 10, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON.

DEAR SIR: This is in reference to bill S. 793, Tule-Klamath waterfowl legislation introduced by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL asking for your support in this bill.

We of the Forester's Rod & Gun Club, associated with the Associated Sportsmen of California and its affiliates, wholeheartedly support Senator KUCHEL'S bill and are not in favor of Senator CLAIR ENGLE'S bill S. 784, section 7.

Hoping to get your support in this matter, we are,

Respectfully yours,

HERMAN O. FULLER,
President.

MILDRED C. FULLER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

WEST END FISH & GAME
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Ontario, Calif., April 11, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: I am writing you on behalf of the West End Fish & Game Association. We wish to express our support for Senator KUCHEL'S bill, S. 793, re Tule-Klamath waterfowl legislation.

We feel that Senator KUCHEL has a good understanding of the situation and in his bill is considering the overall good and the need for preserving this waterfowl habitat. Therefore, we request that you lend your support to this bill, S. 793.

Sincerely,

MRS. E. J. DAHLSTROM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

WEST END FISH & GAME
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Ontario, Calif., April 11, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: On behalf of the West End Fish & Game Association, I am writing expressing our opposition to Senate bill 784, author Senator ENGLE, re Tule-Klamath waterfowl legislation.

We are opposed to it because we feel that the water level should be maintained at a level conducive to a good waterfowl habitat. This is the only area suitable for this in many miles along the west coast. This water level cannot be maintained if the principal use of the water is for irrigation purposes.

We request your opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

MRS. E. J. DAHLSTROM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY
FISH & GAME ASSOCIATION,
San Diego, Calif., April 12, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: Sportsmen from California and all the Western States urgently request that your committee again endorse Senator KUCHEL'S Klamath-Tule Lake conservation bill, S. 793.

We must oppose Senator ENGLE'S bill, S. 784 because section 7 of the bill would allow depletion of the water supply.

Sportsmen are hopeful that Senator KUCHEL'S bill will not be held up in the House as it was last session. We ask you to actively support this fine conservation measure.

Very truly yours,

CHARLEY MARTIN,
President.

SAN BRUNO ROD & GUN CLUB,
San Francisco, Calif., April 12, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: We members of the San Bruno Rod & Gun Club urge passage of bill, S. 793.

RON ROVIGNO,
Secretary.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
April 15, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our entire club and many unattached hunters are in strong support of your S. 793. You are to be congratulated and be assured of our support.

RUSSELL F. CHAPIN,
President, Stockton Sportsmen's Club.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
April 17, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members of the Key Rod & Gun Club, wish to extend our support, as to the bill S. 793, Tule-Klamath waterfowl legislation.

We oppose the bill S. 784 brought up by Senator CLAIR ENGLE.

Sincerely yours,

A. MESEKE,
Secretary.

PACIFIC ROD & GUN CLUB, INC.,
San Bruno, Calif., April 15, 1963.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Pacific Rod & Gun Club, 267 members strong, wish to advise you of their solid support to the Tule Lake bill S. 793 of Senator TOM KUCHEL.

Very truly yours,

FRANK L. BURGESS,
Secretary.

MARIN ROD & GUN CLUB, INC.,
San Rafael, Calif., April 15, 1963.

Re S. 793, Tule-Klamath waterfowl legislation.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: As a conservation club dedicated to the preservation of fish, wildlife, and recreation, we have had occasion to examine the content of some measures now before your committee, and in particular S. 793 and S. 784.

We feel that the Tule-Klamath Waterfowl Refuge is perhaps the most important area in the Pacific flyway and must be preserved

if migratory waterfowl hunting is to be enjoyed in the Western States.

May we vigorously point out that section 7 of S. 784 is completely unacceptable, and we urge the enactment of S. 793.

Our 2,300 members are of a single mind in urging your favorable consideration of S. 793.

Respectfully,

PAUL S. WARE,
Secretary.

DIXON GAME CONSERVATION CLUB, INC.,
Dixon, Calif., April 15, 1963.

HON. SENATOR KUCHEL: Our regular meeting of the Dixon Game Conservation Club, Inc., held April 9, the members went on record to support your bill S. 793 Tule-Klamath waterfowl area and oppose Senator ENGLE's bill S. 784.

There are many duck hunters and duck clubs in the central California area that would be affected by the water supply kept at all times high level to keep the Western flyway available for this area.

Very sincerely,

L. E. FERGUSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

VALLEJO ROD & GUN CLUB, INC.,
Vallejo, Calif., April 13, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: S. 793 is scheduled to be heard by your committee on April 24 at 10 a.m. This bill concerns the Tule-Klamath Waterfowl Refuge, perhaps the most important area in the Pacific flyway. This refuge must be preserved if we are going to continue to enjoy migratory waterfowl hunting in the Western States.

Senator CLAIR ENGLE has introduced a similar bill, S. 784. Section 7 of this bill provides a prior use of water in Tule Lake for irrigation purposes. Obviously, it will do no good to dedicate the land for waterfowl and then have the water cut off.

The Vallejo Rod & Gun Club asks you to support Senator KUCHEL's bill, S. 793, for the reasons pointed out above.

Sincerely,

LAVERNE ROND,
President.
JOHN M. MOISEFF,
Secretary.

WESTERN CONSERVATION CLUB, INC.,
Los Angeles, Calif., April 13, 1963.

Subject: Tule-Klamath waterfowl area, Senate bill 793.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: On my behalf and on behalf of the members of Western Conservation Club of Los Angeles, Calif. (a group of ardent sportsmen dedicated to the conservation, protection, propagation, and perpetuation of fish, game, and forest) I urge enactment of Senate bill 793 by Senator KUCHEL, which would protect our Pacific flyway for waterfowl.

I personally feel that this bill will provide adequate and practical waterfowl management in the Tule-Klamath waterfowl area and assure us that water levels will be adequately maintained for good waterfowl-management purposes.

In reference to Senate bill 784, section 7, I feel that this section is not acceptable to the sportsmen of California and again recommend enactment of Senator KUCHEL's bill S. 793 which, I believe, is in the best interests for proper waterfowl management.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT B. ALLISON,
President, Western Conservation Club, Inc.

DISTRICT COUNCIL NO. 3 OF THE ASSOCIATED SPORTSMEN OF CALIFORNIA,
Oakland, Calif., April 18, 1963.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: The delegates to district council three of the Associated Sportsmen of California have instructed me to write you in support of Senator THOMAS KUCHEL's bill S. 793 for the preservation of the Klamath-Tule Lake Refuge.

We are opposed to section 7 of Senator ENGLE's bill S. 784, which would set aside the land for the refuge but allow prior use of the water for irrigation purposes.

The Pacific duck flight is dear to the hearts of California sportsmen and the Klamath-Tule Lake Refuge is one of the prime resting places for this flight.

Thank you for your consideration of our plea.

FRANK HILLEDAHL,
Recording Secretary.

TULANE FISH & GAME PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Tulane, Calif., April 17, 1963.

Senator HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR JACKSON: The members of the Tulane Fish & Game Protective Association have read bills S. 793 by Senator KUCHEL, and S. 784 by Senator ENGLE, concerning the Tule-Klamath legislation. We therefore would like to go on record to oppose Senator ENGLE's bill S. 784. The reasons are section 7 of the Engle bill is totally unacceptable to the California sportsmen. We would like to urge enactment of the Kuchel bill.

Sincerely,

VILMA SHEPPA,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SAN PABLO AVENUE SPORTSMEN, INC.,
Berkeley, Calif., April 16, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

DEAR SENATOR: We, a club of 350 sportsmen, are keenly interested in the passage of S. 793. We feel that parts of Senator ENGLE's bill, S. 784, would not be to the best interest in preserving this key Pacific flyway area for aquatic birds with which both of these bills are concerned. Section 7 in S. 784, we as sportsmen and conservationists, find particularly undesirable. We therefore ask you and members of your committee to approve favorably Senator KUCHEL's bill, S. 793.

Sincerely,

WALFRID SAARNI,
Secretary.

APRIL 15, 1963.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Hayward Sportsmen's Club, Inc., is vitally interested in the passage of S. 793—Tule-Klamath waterfowl legislation, and we urge your active support.

While Senator ENGLE has done much to aid the sportsmen in the West, his S. 784, section 7, is totally unacceptable to us in that it would nullify the effect and purpose of S. 793 by providing prior use of water in Tule Lake for irrigation purposes, making it possible to draw off water for irrigation just when it is vitally needed for ducks and geese when in that area.

May we urge the careful consideration of your committee on this vital subject to western sportsmen.

Gratefully yours,
HAYWARD SPORTSMEN'S CLUB, INC.,
C. E. WILSON, Secretary.

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,
Feb. 14, 1963]

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL UPON INTRODUCTION OF S. 793 IN THE U.S. SENATE

URGENT NECESSITY FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION PROTECTING VAST WILDLIFE REFUGES IN PACIFIC FLYWAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am honored to introduce today what I sincerely believe to be one of the major pieces of conservation legislation which will come before this Congress. In a word, this bill gives congressional recognition and protection to several wildlife refuges located in both California and Oregon, which have been established or expanded by various Executive orders of several Presidents during the first four decades of this century.

This proposed legislation is practically identical with S. 1988, 87th Congress, which passed the Senate without opposition a year ago. I regret that time did not permit the House of Representatives to conclude the consideration of this measure during the last session of the Congress. It is my hope that hearings by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs can be held shortly and that the Senate will favorably pass upon the matter at an early date so that it might be sent to the House where similar legislation has been introduced by two Members of the California delegation.

I am honored that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has placed his name on this measure as a co-author.

Mr. President, by this measure the Congress would dedicate for the major purpose of waterfowl management, but with full consideration to optimum agricultural use that is consistent therewith, the public lands presently designated as the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges, the latter being in addition to the others earlier included in Senate bill 1988 of last year. Our hearings last year revealed there was no reason to exclude Clear Lake from the congressional protection being afforded its neighboring refuges and conservation and wildlife groups support the inclusion of the Clear Lake Refuge in this bill.

This bill will also, as did the predecessor, S. 1988, afford similar protection to an additional public lands area of some 6,891 acres not presently within the Executive order designation but similarly best suited for wildlife refuge use.

It is thrilling to contemplate that by this legislation Congress can preserve, for the highest and best use of the many, for all time, this total of some 133,000 acres so that this area may continue to serve as nature ordained long before man's shadow fell upon it.

Though significant, even this is a minimum reservation. When one considers that around the year 1900 there were about 400,000 acres of marsh and water in the Upper Klamath Basin, it is apparent that what we propose is neither too much nor too soon.

Approximately 80 percent of all the waterfowl in the Pacific flyway use these refuges. As many as 7 million birds utilize this refuge complex in their semiannual migrations and it also serves annually as the nursery for the hatching of some 3,000 Canada geese and almost 112,000 ducks, many of the latter being the now dwindling redheads. Wildlife, other than waterfowl, also inhabit this complex as in the case of Clear Lake where sage grouse and pronghorn antelope occupy the rocky sagebrush uplands.

Lest one concludes that this legislation is of interest for wildlife benefits only, even though such conservation and much-used recreation aspects would alone indicate the wisdom of the action, I point out the im-

portance of these refuges to the economy of the immediate locality and of more southerly parts of California. This refuge complex permits the holding of these millions of fowl until the crucial harvest of crops, such as rice and lettuce, to the south, has been accomplished. Furthermore, in this feeding itself, the agricultural development of the area has been especially important. And the public hunting opportunities which are available in these refuges bring many people from all over the Pacific coast—from which the local economy is assisted.

This bill, which I introduce today, carries a provision for payment for local government services to the counties within the area. The contractual obligations of the United States with the Tulelake Irrigation District and the Klamath Drainage District are recognized. The Secretary of the Interior shall retain full authority to lease for agricultural purposes the reserved public lands lying within the Lower Klamath and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges.

Under the provisions of the bill, sumps 1(a) and 1(b) in the Tule Lake Refuge could not be reduced by diking or other construction to less than the existing 18,000 acres. The bill further provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall regulate water under his control in accord with applicable migratory bird treaties and our domestic Migratory Bird Conservation Act and subject to valid existing rights, so as to maintain sump levels in the Tule Lake Refuge at levels established by contract and regulation pursuant thereto and so that such levels are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes.

The Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget all reported favorably on my bill last year and I feel assured that the present bill will again receive their favorable response.

I am also proud to have had support in this matter by such as: the Izaak Walton League of America; the National Wildlife Federation; the Audubon Society; the Sierra Club; the North American Wildlife Foundation; the Sport Fishing Institute; the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners; the Wilderness Society; the Wildlife Management Institute; the Governor of California; the California Department of Fish and Game; and the California Fish and Game Commission; to mention only a few.

I am particularly pleased that several groups aware of my intention to introduce this legislation in this Congress have already written me of their support and I ask unanimous consent to have several of these communications, or pertinent parts thereof, and the bill which I have today introduced printed at this point in the Record.

I might add, Mr. President, that for further reprints of supporting letters, articles, editorials, statements, and so forth, I refer any interested persons to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1961, and to the printed transcript of the hearings on former S. 1988 before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, under date of February 23, 1962.

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

The communications presented by Mr. KUCHEL are as follows:

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1963.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Thank you for sending me a draft copy of your bill to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, Upper Klamath,

and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project.

This bill will be warmly received and vigorously supported by all the national, regional, State, and local conservation agencies and organizations that endorsed your earlier bill in the 87th Congress. I also expect that the Department of the Interior again will recommend its enactment. You clearly stated the urgent need for this bill in your floor statements last year and in your testimony before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Fully 80 percent of the waterfowl of the Pacific flyway use the Tule-Klamath refuges during the spring and fall migrations. For that reason alone, their permanent dedication for waterfowl restoration purposes should be supported by all Members of Congress from the Pacific flyway States.

Approval of this proposed bill would be a significant conservation action of the 88th Congress.

Sincerely,

IRA N. GABRIELSON,
President.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1963.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: Thank you for the invitation to comment upon your proposed draft of a bill to promote the conservation of wildlife resources in the Tule Lake-Klamath area of California and Oregon.

I have read your draft and note this proposal essentially is the same as your S. 1988 of the 87th Congress, with some few amendments recommended by the Irrigation Reclamation Subcommittee in the House last year. These amendments have improved the original version which was endorsed by the Interior Department and conservation organizations before passage by the Senate last year.

The National Wildlife Federation believes it is absolutely essential for the welfare of the entire Pacific flyway and our international migratory bird obligations that existing habitat at wildlife refuges in the Tule Lake-Klamath area be preserved and managed for the maximum numbers of waterfowl. This basic objective can be achieved only if the Tule Lake-Klamath area is dedicated for the major purpose of wildlife management. In short, the present refuge areas must be maintained without further loss of lands and water levels must be managed for maximum waterfowl benefits yet encouraging optimum agricultural production not in conflict therewith.

Your proposed bill accomplishes these objectives while continuing present agricultural arrangements, and we predict it will receive wide approval in States along the Pacific coast.

Sincerely,

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1963.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have your draft of the Tule Lake bill, and the measure is one that will have our full support.

We hope the bill will be introduced quickly in order that hearings can be arranged at the earliest possible date.

Cordially,

SPENCER M. SMITH, JR.,
Secretary.

IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Whittier, Calif.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

DEAR SIR: The Whittier chapter is very much concerned with the possible loss of the nesting and flyway area of the Klamath and Tule wildfowl refuge. Each of our members is writing their support for your bill for this protection.

If there is anyone else we can contact for support of this bill, we would like to write them, also.

Thank you.

WALLACE G. THOMPSON,
Secretary.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC ROD & GUN CLUB,
San Francisco, Calif., January 12, 1963.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This statewide organization composed of railroad workers is pleased to hear that you intend to reintroduce S. 1988, the Tule-Klamath legislation, which bill provisions proposes to preserve the Tule Lake-Klamath waterfowl area.

It is indeed gratifying to the many sportsmen of our organization to have you again supporting this bill which is so important to the sportsmen of our State.

You may rest assured that your action will be given full publicity to the entire membership.

We are certainly pleased that you were selected to fill the post that you have so capably filled during the years.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. VISALIA,
President.

CALIFORNIA WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Carmichael, Calif., February 7, 1963.

Senator KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Thanks for your letter of January 29 referring to former S. 1988 and enclosing your new draft of this proposal.

Our federation met in Sacramento on February 2-3 in an executive session on State legislation and the arrival of your new proposal on Tule-Klamath came just in time to be reviewed and enthusiastically endorsed. I have passed the draft on to our fish and game department for their information and you may hear from them direct.

We are happy in knowing you will be in Washington looking after our interests for another term. Please continue to keep us informed on outdoor recreation and wildlife legislation.

Best of personal regards.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. DIFANI,
Legislative Advocate.

HEARINGS TESTIMONY, STATEMENT BY BEN GLADING, APPEARING ON BEHALF OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Mr. GLADING. My name is Ben Glading, representing the California Department of Fish and Game.

This statement is being made on behalf of Dr. Walter Shannon, Director of the Department, and on behalf of the California Fish and Game Commission.

Both of these agencies have been supporting actively this much needed legislation for a number of years.

The purpose of this legislation—and now I am referring to both bills—is to preserve the necessary existing habitat for migratory waterfowl in the most vital single area of the Pacific flyway. It will also assure the continued control of depredations on agricultural crops, and the preservation of one of the largest and best waterfowl public hunting grounds in the United States.

The Tule-Klamath refuges are indispensable to the mains of the Pacific flyway and its waterfowl resources. Eighty percent of the waterfowl of this flyway uses this area during the spring and fall migrations. At times the daily concentration of waterfowl reaches over 7½ million birds. While the area is of primary value as resting and feeding habitat, it compares favorably, acre for acre, with some of the best Canadian breeding grounds. On the average, 100,000 to 125,000 waterfowl are produced here, with a large proportion being the endangered species of redheads, and ruddy ducks.

The need for stabilizing the existing refuges is indicated by the fact that during the past 60 years the marsh and water areas have dwindled from an original 187,000 acres to the present 25,000 acres. Each year additional encroachments are being made on the remaining habitat. The existing areas meet certain waterfowl requirements.

If their value for this use is seriously impaired or destroyed, replacements will be necessary if the waterfowl resource is to be preserved. On the basis of experience in California, the purchase of suitable replacement lands would be very expensive, and at this late date practically unobtainable.

It should be emphasized that in addition to being essential for the maintenance of the Pacific flyway's waterfowl, the Tule-Klamath refuges are absolutely essential to maximum agricultural production in the Central Valley of California.

During the fall migration, there is no stopping place for ducks between those refuges and the Central Valley that is capable of holding more than a small number of birds. Should the carrying capacity for the millions of ducks that stop over on the Tule-Klamath refuges each fall be jeopardized, the consequence to rice farmers and other agriculturists would be disastrous.

An earlier witness says whenever it snows the birds are going to move on, anyway. But these snows do not occur at the time of year that is critical to agriculture in the Central Valley.

In other words, this critical time is past by the time any snows of any consequence arrive at the Tule-Klamath area.

The proposed legislation will stop any further homesteading—and this is highly important—but it will not reduce agriculture income.

The practice of leasing 15,000 acres of farmland will be continued under various practices. This practice not only helps the local economy, but it also provides waterfowl with great quantities of waste grains, weed seeds, and, after the fall rains, green forage.

Thus, the agricultural economy will continue, but, even more important, the more valuable waterfowl resource will be provided. In summary, the main purpose of these bills is to stop any further encroachment on refuge lands for reclamation and homesteading purposes. Since these refuges are established only by Executive order, their status could change at any time.

These bills would establish the refuges on a permanent basis, perpetuate the esthetic and recreational values of the waterfowl resource, and assure protection to the Central Valley's established agricultural interests.

For these reasons, it is essential that the refuge areas covered by legislation of this type be permanently dedicated to the primary purpose of waterfowl management—and I would have to add, personally, as soon as possible.

Senator Moss. Thank you very much, Mr. Glading.

Senator KUCHEL?

Senator KUCHEL. We have two bills before us, S. 784 and S. 793. Which bill, if either, has your commission recommended?

Mr. GLADING. As I tried to indicate in my statement, Senator, the main purpose is served by each bill. However, we have made

a careful analysis, largely through the Attorney General's office, and as they are presently worded, there is a preference for your bill, S. 793, which has to do with the controversial sections that have been discussed.

Senator KUCHEL. Thank you, sir.
Senator Moss. Thank you, Mr. Glading. We appreciate your testimony.

Senator Moss. Mr. Leffler, the general counsel for the International Association of Fish & Game Directors.

STATEMENT OF C. R. GUTERMUTH, VICE PRESIDENT, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

Mr. GUTERMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to comment about a couple of things having to do with section 7 in the Engle bill, S. 784.

Conservationists are pleased that the committee has scheduled an early hearing on these bills that would permanently stabilize the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges, along the California-Oregon boundaries, for wildlife purposes. The circumstances favoring the need for congressional recognition of the refuges have not changed in the year that has passed since the committee last considered this subject and reported out a sound bill that was approved by the Senate and by the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. Formal dedication of the refuges to wildlife purposes is supported by the affected Federal and State agencies and by conservationists everywhere.

Because of their unique location in respect to available waters and marshlands in the Pacific flyway, the refuges are used by more than 80 percent of the flyways ducks during the spring and fall migrations. Large numbers of ducks, geese, and other birds also nest there, and thousands of young are reared each year. The refuges also help retard the southward migration of ducks into California's Central and Imperial Valleys thereby assisting materially in decreasing serious agricultural depletions that would be experienced if the birds arrived before most harvesting was completed. The refuges are open to public visitation and hunting, and provide many hours of outdoor recreation opportunity for thousands of people and enhance the local economy, in addition.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's records and printed documents contain a thorough discussion of the origin of the three refuges, their history of operation and development, and the factors that have forced the decision to seek congressional dedication of the areas for wildlife purposes. Much of that record already is known to the members of the committee and more of it undoubtedly will be reviewed before this hearing concludes. Rather than adding further to that testimony, I wish to discuss the principal differences of the two bills before the committee.

First, it should be recognized that conservationists are grateful to both of the California Senators for their interest in seeking to resolve a problem that has pestered successive administrations for more than 20 years. There is widespread support for the overriding objective of both bills; namely, to stabilize the boundaries of the three refuges and to assure their continued management in the interests of waterfowl and other wildlife and to aid in the administration of the contiguous project.

Two fundamental elements influence the management of any refuge for waterfowl purposes. The first of these is land—living space in a sense—and this is provided in the bills. Both would stabilize the boundaries of the refuges, exempt them from further homestead entry, and include limited additions of certain other public lands that are recognized as having primary value for the operation and management of the refuges.

We are pleased that the bills authorize continuance of the present pattern of agricultural leasing within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Refuges. There is no opposition to this. The present leasing agreements on about 15,000 acres enable local farmers to benefit from arable lands within the refuges, while at the same time, the crops that may be grown are carefully regulated so as to provide on-refuge waste grain for the ducks and geese. The Federal Government also farms about 2,500 acres to provide additional and necessary food for the birds.

Leasing revenues would be shared with local counties on the basis of not to exceed 25 percent of the net revenues collected annually, providing that the total annual payment per acre shall not exceed 50 percent of the average per-acre tax levied on similar lands. This scale of revenue sharing is consistent with the policy of the Federal Government as it applies throughout the country.

As I noted previously, the refuge operation depends for its success, or failure, on suitable elements of land and water. Both S. 784 and S. 793 would assure that the refuges have sufficient area of land in order to fulfill their primary purpose without loss of value for wildlife. Some persons with whom I have talked have expressed preference for section 5 of S. 784 over section 4 of S. 793 in that it is more precise in describing the areas of the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Refuges that would be open to agricultural leasing. Section 5 relates those lands to the official "Plan for Wildlife Use of Federal Lands in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon-California" dated April 1956.

The productive capacity and the overall usefulness of a waterfowl refuge depends upon an adequate supply of water, balanced both in quantity and in time with the needs of the birds. It is possible, in the case of a refuge like Tule Lake where the sump water levels can be controlled, to regulate the water supply so as to greatly facilitate waterfowl nesting, to minimize the occurrence of botulism, or western duck sickness, and to favor public access at times where such access is necessary or desirable. Reasonable control of the water levels is necessary in order to assure that the Tule Lake Refuge will be managed so as to produce maximum benefits for waterfowl consistent with other prominent, local considerations.

The acute relationship between water level control and refuge productivity is not idle speculation, Mr. Chairman. For example, operation and maintenance of the reclamation project whose waters pass into the Tule Lake Refuge sumps was taken over by the Tulelake Irrigation District in 1956 under a repayment contract to the United States. Contract regulations specified objective water levels in the sumps so as to be compatible with waterfowl nesting, to minimize the hazards of botulism to the birds, and to accommodate public hunting, when permitted. The district ignored the regulations, altered the water level schedule drastically, ruined a waterfowl nesting season, and made it impossible for hunters to reach shooting areas by boat. In 1960, the Interior Department charged the district with violating the contract and took steps to operate the project's water pumps. Only then did the district agree to comply with a new set of objective water levels and to operate the pumps so as not to interfere with the wildlife objectives of the refuges.

Conservationists wish to avoid any such misunderstanding in the future. It is not good for the waterfowl resource, for the Tule Lake Refuge, or for the local residents who are interested in the operation of the irrigation district. All parties should know exactly where they stand, the requirements that have to be met, and what is expected of

them. Preservation of the status quo is not enough.

The committee should know that the conservationists do not think that section 7 of S. 784 adequately takes care of the situation. Section 7 differs considerably from the corresponding section in S. 1988, which was reported by the committee and approved by the Senate last year, and from section 6 of S. 793, which is identical to the earlier bill. It also is at variance with the recommendations of the Department of the Interior on S. 1988 last year.

We are concerned about section 7 of S. 784 because it singles out two paragraphs of the contract between the United States and the Tulelake Irrigation District for inclusion in the proposed law. The first of these, paragraph b, stipulates that the sumps within the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge "shall be operated and maintained primarily for the protection of lands within the district for agricultural purposes, including flood protection and drainage and the use of said sumps for said purposes shall be prior to all other uses * * *."

Paragraph d of section 7 in the contract specifies that the Secretary of the Interior may make additional modifications of rules and regulations from time to time.

The reasoning for seeking to include only two paragraphs of the contract between the irrigation district and the United States in a law that would be enacted by the Congress is obscure. In fact, the reasoning for including any part of the contract in law is obscure. The two paragraphs that are singled out would, in our opinion, project into the future the same doubts and misapprehensions that have provoked difficulties in the past. Their inclusion would weaken, not strengthen, the overall objectivity of any law that may be enacted by the Congress.

Neither this committee, the Senate, nor the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation thought that any such reference was necessary last year; the language in section 6 of S. 793 was satisfactory then. If the Congress were to enact isolated parts of the contract into law, then perhaps the conservationists should insist that the last sentence of section 8 of the contract should be included, too. It reads: "Subject to the terms and provisions of this contract, the jurisdiction of the United States over Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge shall be unchanged and the continued use of refuge lands and waters for refuge purposes shall be as the Secretary may direct."

The net result of including section 7 of S. 784 would, in the conservationists' opinion, provide grounds for the continuance of unfortunate and unnecessary conflicts between the wildlife refuge and local farmers. We are opposed to section 7 as written. The apprehensions of the local farmers, if they may be termed apprehensions, are unjustified. We would much prefer section 6 of S. 793 in that it recognizes "valid existing rights." We believe that local interests have "valid existing rights" under the terms of the contract.

Conservationists are not trying to run the farmers in the Tule Lake area out of business. Any allegation of that kind is ridiculous. What we are striving to do is to protect the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge and to obtain necessary safeguards and assurances so that it can be operated efficiently and productively in future years. Tule Lake is not a local problem. It affects much more than local people. Because of the migratory nature of the waterfowl it accommodates, the influence of the Tule Lake Refuge ranges from Alaska to Mexico, directly affecting the interest of hundreds of thousands of people who reside in the several States of the Pacific flyway. This larger interest, it seems to conservationists, requires that Congress make sure that the

law that it enacts does not introduce any obstacles in the proper management of the refuge. The interests of sportsmen and outdoor enthusiasts of all kinds in the several Western States must also be taken into regard. For this reason, the committee is urged to adopt the language of section 6 of S. 793 as it pertains to this situation. It is hoped that the bill can be reported and acted upon early in this session.

The conservationists are quite disturbed about the specific references to those two sections in the contract in this bill. We think that it is uncalled for and unnecessary, and while the colloquy this morning here had to do with this other provision, and Mr. Kimball just mentioned this section 32 of the contract, I still think that it is a serious mistake to consider anything but the references to the contract itself in this legislation.

Mr. Edwards said this morning, or at least I understood him to say, that the conservationists had asked that we ignore the contract, if my understanding of his statement is correct, and I certainly do not want the record to show that.

The conservationists have never suggested that we ignore this contract. What we are trying to say is that there is no use or good in specifically referring to this contract in this legislation.

We have no desire to avoid or to abrogate or to disregard this contract. That is not our thought. We want this contract carried out, but while we don't want the contract ignored, we, at the same time, do not want it recognized in law by specific references in this legislation. We do not want inflexible parts of this contract referred to and made a part of the law. We don't think that that is good. If you want to refer to the contract, which we have no objection to, then we think that is perfectly adequate to refer to the valid and existing rights. While we are discussing obligations of the Federal Government under this contract, I would like to also refer you to the obligations, very severe ones, of the Federal Government under the Migratory Bird Treaty.

It is my understanding that treaties have an overriding effect in many respects, and we certainly have a real obligation under the Migratory Bird Treaty that certainly should be given very serious consideration when we are talking about the Federal Government's obligation under this contract.

Now, if it is very comforting for the Tulelake Irrigation District to have some references made to that, then I can say that it is very disconcerting to a lot of other people to think that treaty obligations are not being more specifically referred to in connection with the maintenance of these important refuges.

One other comment and then I have said about all I care to. The record is full of the importance of these refuges, need for them. When we talk about the obligations to the general public in maintenance of these refuges we are talking about the obligations to literally millions of people. We are talking about these treaty obligations and all of the other responsibilities that we have in the maintaining of these renewable natural resources in the broad public interest over a long haul.

If this legislation that was put through last year, which referred to valid and existing rights, was acceptable last year, and if it went through and was acceptable to the House subcommittee last year, as it was in S. 1988, then I say to you that in my humble opinion it will be acceptable to that House committee again this year, and I hope that this language is deemed adequate by this committee again this year and by the Senate again this year.

With that, I would like to say that we will take this legislation in its stride if the Senate will favor us with this legislation which we think is right and proper and have urgently needed.

The conservationists will go to work to get this legislation through the House.

Thanks very, very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there is no further discussion, I ask that the Senate adopt the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I believe that public interest in this subject has been amply demonstrated. If there is no further discussion, I ask for third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. ENGLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was especially happy to yield for the purpose of permitting the Senate to pass the proposed legislation, because it is a conservation measure in which I have long been interested. I think it will serve the interests of the country as a whole. I congratulate the Senators from California on having the bill passed.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION PIRATES TALENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, several weeks ago three scientists came into my office to complain about the policies of NASA in attempting to build scientific communities within that organization and to eliminate the opportunity for private industry or colleges to engage in basic scientific programs in the overall NASA program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated June 6, 1963, written to me by John H. Gardner, professor of physics at Brigham Young University, who was one of the three men. In his letter, Mr. Gardner details his fears with respect to this program.

The situation was highlighted recently in an article entitled "Agencies Say NASA Steals Talent by Pay and Promotion Promises," written by Joseph Young, for his column "The Federal Spotlight," and published in the Washington Evening Star. So apparently NASA is not only making it difficult for scientists in private industry to work in the field; it has actually attempted to recruit scientists who are already in the Federal Government. According to the headline of the article, NASA is actually stealing such talent.

The combination of the letter from Mr. Gardner and the newspaper article focuses our attention on the problems created by this fast-growing organization, whose budget is now under study by a Senate committee. I think it appropriate that I ask unanimous consent that

the article also be printed in the RECORD, so that it may be available to members of the committee.

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

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY,
Provo, Utah, June 6, 1963.

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: During my recent visit to your office with two of my scientific colleagues, we pointed out a number of difficulties with the present trend in Government policy as it relates to the support of science and expressed our concern as to the possible consequences of the continuation of this trend. I should like to reiterate some of the points we were attempting to make.

I have not mentioned here the names of my colleagues nor their professional connections since they are employed by a private company whose major customer is the Federal Government and one of the prime rules of business is to avoid offending the customer. This, of course, points up an obstacle in the way of appropriate feedback to Congress of information critical of Federal policies and procedures, particularly in those programs related to space where the Federal Government is the only customer.

The point of greatest concern to us, and I believe also to large numbers of the scientific community, is the trend in NASA and in the Department of Defense toward the development of inhouse capability for the performance of basic research and other scientific tasks which can and, under our private enterprise system, should be performed by the private sector of the economy with a secondary role being played by the university. The arguments for a strong in-house staff are of two kinds: (1) Considerable scientific competence within the Government is required for the effective deployment of the large sums of money currently being spent in scientific activity; (2) it is inappropriate to pay private, profitmaking industry for basic research. Both arguments are completely fallacious. The AEC provides a substantive counter example to the first argument and the second could apply equally well to military and space hardware.

As a matter of fact competent research scientists are not interested in evaluating proposals and administering contracts. Their prime interest is in engaging in research with as little involvement in paper work as possible. The real work of spending and procurement must be done by high caliber administrators with the help of scientists acting in an advisory capacity. These latter should come from outside the Federal Government because if they are working within the Government as researchers in the field in which they are called on for advice they are competitors for the funds being deployed and should properly be disqualified as interested parties. Many examples of unfair competition of this nature from NASA and from scientific organizations in the Department of Defense have been recited to me by scientists working in industry. Frequently these men are reluctant to submit proposals which have been requested because they do not wish to reveal their plans and ideas to these Government in-house competitors. The funneling of large sums of money for research through administrators who have the choice of spending it outside of Government or within their own organizations can hardly help but lead to empire building within the Government.

Again, with reference to the second argument for in-house work, basic research is a product which has long been competently produced by scientists working in private industry and in the university. If there is a national need for this type of product in

the defense and space fields it is just as natural to turn to the private sector of the economy for it as for military and space hardware. Since a considerable scientific competence is required by private industry in producing reliable hardware to do the job envisioned by the customer most industries have assembled competent scientific staffs. In order to maintain this high level of scientific capability they must carry on a certain amount of basic research. Government procurement of basic research needs from private industry, therefore, has the added advantage of enabling industry to retain the scientific talent necessary to achieve its hardware mission. It is, on the other hand, inefficient and artificial to place the basic scientific function in the Government laboratory and the hardware function in private industry.

NASA claims that a large fraction of the basic scientific work will actually be performed by private industry. This claim, however, seems to be contradicted by their actions. For example, a recent report of NASA program plans (Trans. of Am. Geol. Un., vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 228-235, Mar., 1963) describes a variety of space missions during the next 4 years. There are a total of 86 experiments aboard the payloads for the several missions described with 42 of these belonging to NASA, 12 to other Federal laboratories, 32 to universities, and none to private industry.

For a healthy science on a national scale, the national policy must encourage and expand rather than exclude or restrict basic research in profit-making industry. Science must be encouraged to flourish in a diversity of environments, not just in nonprofit organizations or in government. The industrial environment is quite different from civil service or the university; there are different needs, goals, and stimulations which are peculiar to the industry itself; there is a different balance between thought and action; each environment has its own novelty, its own kind of suggestiveness of problems and new research areas. Just as new technological development may stem from theoretical knowledge of an abstract kind, so pure science is often indebted to what is suggested by the technological requirements and practices of industry. Scientific research seeks answers to questions but the formulation of questions is perhaps even more difficult and creative. Important new questions and avenues of research are often distilled from an industrial environment and could not occur to the Government or university researcher, and, of course, vice versa.

Far from the cry that it is inappropriate to pay private, profitmaking industry for basic research is the solid fact that the Federal Government could hardly find a better way to stimulate economic growth and thus provide more jobs than to encourage and support this significant source of ideas and developments which lead to new industrial products.

Perhaps one of the most damaging consequences of the growth of the NASA organization and of the in-house philosophy in other agencies of the Federal Government is the exaggeration of our current shortage of scientific manpower. It has been observed by the President that federally financed activities in defense, space, and atomic energy absorb roughly two-thirds of our total supply of physical scientists and engineers. With rapidly increasing Federal budgets in space and in defense this figure is bound to increase in view of the limited scientific manpower pool. If the in-house trend continues it is evident that it will lead to an alarming percentage of scientists working for the Federal Government. The situation is rather clearly indicated by the growth of NASA where the in-house philosophy is most deeply entrenched. In taking over programs from the Department of Defense they are drying up funds formerly available to industry for basic sci-

ence in the space field with the result that many industrial scientists must go to work for NASA if they are to continue their research. NASA can exert additional pressure through the control of information on the results of space research. I was told by one scientist that his request to NASA for results on a particular flight was met with a refusal and an implied suggestion that if he wanted the information he should come to work for NASA.

The consequences of this manpower shortage are most severe in the university where it is difficult to compete with the salary and research inducements from outside. Large NASA grants to universities for training and research merely aggravate the problem for nonparticipating universities and for universities wishing to retain a traditional balance in the scientific training they offer. The race for space appears to be hurting our scientist-training capability and thereby working against one of our long-range national needs.

It is far from evident that the creation of new Government laboratories in competition with and at the expense of existing laboratories will help us to achieve our goals in space any faster. Appropriate utilization of the private scientific resources of the country would seem to be faster and more in keeping with our traditions. The statement that NASA has too much money is frequently heard among scientists and it is indicative of the widespread fears and misgivings scientists have about the ominous changes taking place in the kind of role they play in our society. These fears and misgivings may underlie much of the growing opposition to our lunar landing goal. Congress could do much to change the situation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. GARDNER,
Professor of Physics.

AGENCIES SAY NASA STEALS TALENT BY PAY AND PROMOTION PROMISES

(By Joseph Young)

Other Government agencies are complaining that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is luring away some of their best scientists and engineers.

The agencies contend that NASA—the Government's newest glamor agency as far as Congress and the public is concerned—is using higher salaries and promises of promotions to entice the employees.

As a result, some Federal agencies contend that their own vital programs are being hurt. Some of the defense agencies, for example, are unhappy about the situation. They assert that their programs are at least as vital to the national security as NASA's.

The Defense Department is not the only Government establishment unhappy about NASA recruitment of their engineers and scientists. Other Government research and scientific agencies are equally unhappy. There is a definite possibility that President Kennedy will be asked to order a halt on NASA's recruitment of other Government engineers and scientists.

NASA denies the raiding charges. The agency does acknowledge that of the 3,700 scientists and engineers it hired during the last 15 months, about one-third of these came from other Government agencies.

However, NASA officials say that about 60 percent of the engineers and scientists secured from other Federal agencies were not given higher salaries. The other 40 percent did get higher pay grades on joining NASA.

NASA officials acknowledge that many scientists and engineers switched over to their agency in the hope of eventually getting higher pay. This is only reasonable, say NASA officials, since the agency is the fastest growing one in Government and consequently more promotional opportunities will be available.

Officials of other Government agencies contend that NASA recruitment officers stress this fact in persuading engineers and scientists to switch to NASA. NASA is one of the few Government agencies that has no trouble getting all the money it wants from Congress to run its operations.

INTENSIFYING THE FREE WORLD'S ECONOMIC BOYCOTT OF CASTRO'S CUBA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, I have been interested and impressed as have many other Senators by the developing discussions of American policy on Cuba which were touched off by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] when he recently delivered a most informative speech on Cuba and called for a developing dialog on the subject. And since the executive branch has chosen to remain silent about Cuba and continues its failure to propose constructive Cuban policies I think it highly appropriate that Congress has become a forum for this discussion. I note that more and more Members of the House of Representatives are also devoting their talents to this serious and growing problem.

On the Senate side, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] have come forward with stimulating suggestions of their own. The Allott proposal to encourage the establishment of a free provisional government to be offered a home on Cuban soil on Guantanamo base and the Curtis suggestion that we establish a Pacific blockade of Cuba enforced by our Navy and Air Force have evoked spirited and informative discussions among important segments of our national press and each proposal has developed its own proponents and its opponents. In my opinion, Mr. President, this is all to the good. Challenging and constructive recommendations such as those emanating from the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nebraska may not be the final and accepted answer to our continuing do-nothing policy toward Cuba but from the discussions involving these and other proposals it is hoped that an all-American, positive, forward-moving program may be evolved toward Cuba which will force the Russian and Chinese Communists out of Cuba and hurry the downfall of Castro and the establishment of a free and representative democratic government in Cuba.

As I stated on the Senate floor during the colloquies which followed the proposals of Senators ALLOTT and CURTIS, I am not personally wholly satisfied in my own mind that either of them, or both together, provide us with the proper formula for action at this time. I believe we should, for example, fully explore the availability of other Cuban soil—some nearby islands, perhaps—or some other location, other than Guantanamo Bay, for a free provisional Cuban Government, representative of all responsible Cuban factions, and one which our own country could and should then recognize. And instead of the type of Pacific blockade envisioned by Senator CURTIS, I said at the time in the

discussion in the Senate—and I rise today to describe more fully what I had in mind—that there is an alternative first step which in my own opinion our country can and should take in the area of utilizing economic pressures to bring Castro to his knees. However, I again salute Senators ALLOTT and CURTIS and all others who are devoting their talents and their thoughts to the imperative need to “get America moving”—to quote an almost forgotten phrase from our recent past—in the direction of doing something more effective about Cuba than merely decrying the existence of the Communist Castro dictatorship on our doorstep and wringing our hands at the unwillingness of the Russians to go home or the reluctance of Castro voluntarily to abdicate. Our recent history with relationship to the Cuban peril is indeed most melancholy and discouraging.

One of the most inadequate and least satisfying aspects of present U.S. policy toward Cuba consists of the half-hearted measures that have been taken toward weakening the economic base of the Castro regime. Granted, there is a virtually complete embargo on United States-Cuba trade that has been in effect since February 1962 and that the countries of Latin America are for the most part imposing sharp curtailments on their own trade in Cuba. But let us take a look at the other measures announced by the administration and see just what effect they have had.

First, under the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1962, U.S. Congress provided that American aid will be denied to any country whose ships carry arms or strategic materials to Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the complete text of these congressional prohibitions.

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

Public Law 87-872 (76 Stat. 1165), October 23, 1962: Section 107(a). No assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry to Cuba, so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, any arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, or any articles, materials, or supplies, such as petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, contained on the list maintained by the Administrator pursuant to title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, as amended.

(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any country which sells, furnishes, or permits any ships under its registry to carry items of economic assistance to Cuba so long as it is governed by the Castro regime, under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven

days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, these provisions are not, however, enforced with regard to NATO-type aid to NATO countries. Hence, this is not as strong as it sounds, since Cuba has been receiving arms from the Communist bloc in Communist bottoms for 3 years now. None come directly from non-Communist countries.

Second, a series of measures was announced last October, just before the discovery of the Soviet missile-launch sites and nuclear weapons in Cuba. It consisted of the following:

First, U.S. ports will be closed to all ships of any nation that permits its vessels to carry military equipment to Cuba.

Second, U.S. ports will be closed to any ship that on a continuous run carries any nonmilitary Communist cargoes to Cuba.

Third, Foreign shipowners whose vessels are engaged in trade between Cuba and the Soviet bloc will be prohibited from carrying U.S. Government-financed cargoes on any of their ships.

Fourth, U.S. flagships of U.S.-owned ships are forbidden to carry goods to and from Cuba.

Mr. President, this series of measures sounded fairly strong, when first enunciated; but, I hasten to add, they were never put into effect. The administration attributed its inaction to the October missiles crisis, the subsequent negotiations over the release of the Bay of Pigs prisoners, and vigorous protests from some of our allies.

Finally, last February the administration issued an order barring U.S. Government-financed cargoes to foreign ships trading with Cuba. The President directed Federal departments and agencies to deny—“shipments of such cargoes on vessels that have called at a Cuban port since January 1, 1963, unless the owner of such a ship gives satisfactory assurances that no ship under his control will henceforth be employed in the Cuban trade.”

Thus, our present policy with respect to discouraging our allies from trading with Castro's Cuba consists of a provision of the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1962 that is virtually inapplicable and the order denying shipments of U.S. Government-financed cargoes on individual ships that have traded with Cuba since last January 1.

In this connection, I wish to refer to an editorial, published in the New York Times, which states:

The latest step was a request to Britain to prohibit Cuban planes from landing on Grand Cayman Island, which is regarded as a convenient transfer point for Cuban Communists traveling to South American countries.

The editorial also states:

The other measure was a freeze on an estimated \$33 million in deposits (\$20 million held by the Cuban government, and the remainder by Cuban nationals resident in Cuba) accompanied by a ban on U.S. dollar transactions with Cuba.

But neither one of these has any significant impact whatsoever on the economic situation in Cuba. I call to the

attention of the Senate this editorial, entitled "Controls on Castro," which was published in the New York Times; and I call to the attention of those who read the RECORD who may not be familiar with the editorial policies of the New York Times the fact that it is a newspaper which supported the election of President Kennedy, has supported his foreign policy, and has fairly consistently supported his attitude toward Cuba; but that was going a step too far in trying to bewilder and confuse the public, so the editorial concludes with the following paragraph:

The notion that Cuba is being subject to total economic isolation may be politically helpful to the administration. But the actual impact of its latest steps is minimal. In fact, they give Castro ammunition on the evils of dollar diplomacy for his agents to spread throughout South America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
July 12, 1963]

CONTROLS ON CASTRO

With considerable fanfare the Kennedy administration has announced two new measures advertised as curbing Cuba's ability to engage in subversive activities. But on examination they are mostly bark and little bite.

The latest step was a request to Britain to prohibit Cuban planes from landing on Grand Cayman Island, which is regarded as a convenient transfer point for Cuban Communists traveling to South American countries. Even if the British agree, Castro's agents would not be confined to Cuba.

This would require a similar ban by all countries bordering the Caribbean. Despite the resolution of the Council of the Organization of American States urging its members "to counter Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere," other nations are unlikely to follow the United States in curtailing Cuban flights.

The other measure was a freeze on an estimated \$33 million in deposits (\$20 million held by the Cuban Government and the remainder by Cuban nationals resident in Cuba) accompanied by a ban on United States dollar transactions with Cuba.

There is no way to stop Cuba from financing subversive activities in South America, where controls over currency movements are notoriously lax. Ever since trade relations with the United States were broken off 2 years ago, Cuba has conducted most of its commercial transactions with the West in Canadian dollars, Swiss francs and the British pound, which are fully convertible into dollars. Presumably, they can be equally useful to Cuba's agents.

Nor will Castro be pinched by the freezing of \$20 million in deposits. These funds have been tied up in litigation with American companies whose assets in Cuba have been expropriated, so that they could not be withdrawn in any event. As for the immobilization of deposits held by individuals, it is comparatively small change.

The notion that Cuba is being subject to total economic isolation may be politically helpful to the administration. But the actual impact of its latest steps is minimal. In fact, they give Castro ammunition on the evils of dollar diplomacy for his agents to spread throughout South America.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his splendid discussion of U.S. policy—or the lack of it—toward the Cuban Government. It is in keeping with the previous discussions in the Congress, which seems to be the only forum in the Government where this subject is being discussed and where constructive steps are being suggested. These are helpful suggestions which could well receive consideration from other quarters in the National Government, although apparently they are not.

In regard to the instance cited by the Senator from South Dakota—the impoundment, a week ago today, of Cuban funds—I ask if it is not true that there are at least three points in regard to the so-called freezing of those funds which render it virtually ineffective.

First, \$13 million of that \$33 million was in private funds which were tied up by litigation of American claimants against Cuban citizens or corporations. Therefore, the freeze order was without any effect whatsoever upon the \$13 million.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I understand it was freezing something which was already frozen.

Mr. HRUSKA. Second, part of the \$20 million of the funds for the Castro government itself was to be used to finance Cuba's United Nations activities in this country. When that was discovered, an order to unfreeze that particular portion of the funds was entered, thereby vitiating the order considerably. It is well known in banking circles that this order might be a petty annoyance or disturbance and may even have some small psychological value, but it has no practical effect or impact whatsoever upon the Cuban economic situation.

Is the Senator from South Dakota familiar with that view?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Nebraska is entirely correct.

I am sure it was that aspect of it, among others, which led this pro-Kennedy newspaper—the New York Times—to make the rather cynical remark that this announcement "may be politically helpful to the administration, but the actual impact of its latest steps is minimal," and that it is completely worthless insofar as bringing economic pressure to bear on Cuba is concerned.

Mr. HRUSKA. Similarly the administration's effort to enforce an order having to do with travel to and from Cuba of agents trained there for subversion in other Latin American countries is of little value.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. That order was discussed by the Organization of American States; but, although those discussions were approved by the Council of the OAS, four major nations within that association abstained in that vote; namely, Brazil, Haiti, Mexico, and Venezuela. So, for all practical purposes, though that move provides some window dressing and is the basis for a lot of administration publicity to the effect that we are dealing adequately with Cuba, even that resolution was a disappointment.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. Four nations abstained from voting; and one nation voted against us—by casting a negative vote.

Mr. HRUSKA. So this attitude in regard to travel by the agents of subversion and the guerrillas trained in Cuba and sent to the Latin American countries has no real deterrent effect; and those movements continue unimpeded, as heretofore, do they not?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. In connection with the Senator's statement, I call attention to an Associated Press dispatch dated July 11, and published in the Washington Post, under the heading "Red Agent Suspects Fan Out of Cuba." I shall read the first paragraph of the article, as follows:

The State Department reported yesterday that 15 to 20 persons described as "potential subversive agents" flew from Cuba to various Caribbean countries within the last several weeks.

The article relates how they, in turn, were conveyed from there to Latin American countries.

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

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

RED AGENT SUSPECTS FAN OUT OF CUBA

The State Department reported yesterday that 15 to 20 persons described as "potential subversive agents" flew from Cuba to various Caribbean countries within the last several weeks.

Press Officer Richard I. Phillips said the persons, presumably Cubans, were aboard three Russian-made Ilyushin airliners that landed at Grand Cayman Island, a British-owned Caribbean island. He said they then transferred to non-Cuban commercial flights for other points in the Caribbean, including San Jose, Costa Rica.

He said the State Department had drawn that to the attention of the British. Generally speaking, he said, Britain has joined with the United States in its policy of isolating the Red Castro regime and not allowing such flights.

No response has yet been received from the British Government, he added.

State Department authorities said that, although Costa Rica has broken off diplomatic relations with the Havana regime and has joined in the American Republics' effort to isolate Cuba, officials at the San Jose airport apparently were taken by surprise at the arrival of the passengers from Cuba and allowed their entry into Costa Rica in normal fashion for airline passengers.

What other Caribbean points the passengers went to was not stated.

In Havana, meanwhile, Cuban newspapers reported for the first time yesterday that Washington had frozen Cuban assets in the United States and taken other measures to clamp on a financial squeeze.

The newspaper El Mundo said:

"Of course this measure does not affect the Cuban Government's available dollar reserves for its dealings with other countries because in these transactions American banks or similar organizations are not involved. These reserves are not deposited in any of them."

[In another development, the Soviet Union ratified a loan agreement giving Cuba long-term credit on favorable terms to "cover the excess of Soviet goods deliveries over Cuban deliveries to the U.S.S.R.," the United Press reported from Moscow.

[A brief announcement Tuesday by Tass said the Soviet credit "will strengthen the Cuban economy, help the Cuban population with consumer goods." Tass said the arrangement was concluded last February, but gave no further details.]

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I appreciate the contributions the Senator from Nebraska has made.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Utah, who has made a great study of this entire Cuban problem, and heretofore has expressed himself very lucidly and effectively on it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been interested in this colloquy between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Nebraska.

It has developed that out of the \$30 million, which presumably has been frozen, probably only half of that amount was in fact frozen. \$13 million was already frozen. An unnamed amount was unfrozen—let us say half of it, or \$15 million.

Does the Senator from South Dakota remember how much good American merchandise we sent to Cuba as a ransom for the Bay of Pigs prisoners?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not carry the amount in my mind, but it was much larger than either the \$15 million or the \$30 million.

Mr. BENNETT. My memory is that it was approximately \$53 million.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe it was in that neighborhood.

Mr. BENNETT. Cannot Castro laugh up his sleeve at us when we are stupid enough to think that we are making progress by freezing \$15 million, and then hand him \$53 million of new wealth, new and usable merchandise in exchange for those prisoners—one of the most effective bits of international blackmail in history?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator makes a sound observation. While all of us are pleased at any little token step whatsoever against Castro, and agree it was perfectly proper for the administration to have taken those steps, but to balloon them up, to headline them, and to make a special announcement about them in order to deceive the people back home into believing we are doing something effective was too much for the New York Times to stomach. For that reason the editorial was written.

The whole program of the administration is at best a halfhearted and less than a halfway program. It is even more halfhearted than I said it was in my colloquy the other day with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLORT], when he was delivering his magnificent address. At that time I declared that we are telling a shipping company, in effect, "All we require of you is that your ships A, B, and C which trade with Cuban ports, shall not enter our ports; but you may bring into our ports any other ships you operate."

Actually, we are saying, "Ships A, B, and C may enter our ports and carry

cargo to Cuba so long as that cargo is not financed by the U.S. Government."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the most recent report of the Maritime Administration listing free world, Yugoslav, and Polish flag vessels arriving in Cuba since January 1, 1963.

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

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE MARITIME
ADMINISTRATION REPORT NO. 9

LIST OF FREE WORLD AND POLISH FLAG VESSELS
ARRIVING IN CUBA SINCE JANUARY 1, 1963

Section 1. Pursuant to the National Security Action Memorandum No. 220, dated February 5, 1963, addressed to the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce; the Administrator, Agency for International Development, and the Administrator, General Services Administration, concerning U.S. Government shipments by foreign-flag vessels in the Cuban trade, the Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate departments the following list of vessels which have arrived in Cuba since January 1, 1963, based on information received through May 31, 1963, exclusive of those vessels that called at Cuba on U.S. Government-approved noncommercial voyages and those listed in section 2:

Flag of registry, name of ship	Gross tonnage
Total—all flags (97) ships	807, 581
British (33 ships)	326, 443
Ardgem	6, 981
Ardmore	4, 664
Ardrowan	7, 300
Arlington Court	9, 662
Athelcrown (tanker)	11, 149
Athelduke (tanker)	9, 089
Athelmere (tanker)	7, 524
Athelmonarch (tanker)	11, 182
Athelsultan (tanker)	9, 149
Avisfaith	7, 868
Chipbee ¹	7, 271
Fir Hill	7, 119
Hazelmoor	7, 907
Ho Fung	7, 121
Ivy Fair ¹	7, 201
Linkmoor	8, 236
London Confidence (tanker)	21, 699
London Independence (tanker)	22, 643
London Majesty (tanker)	12, 132
London Pride (tanker)	10, 776
London Splendour (tanker)	16, 195
London Victory (tanker)	12, 132
Lord Gladstone	11, 299
Maratha Enterprise	1, 166
Overseas Explorer (tanker)	16, 267
Overseas Pioneer (tanker)	16, 267
Pampas	7, 589
Shienfoon	7, 127
Tulse Hill	7, 120
Vercharmian	7, 265
West Breeze ¹	8, 718
Yungfutary	5, 388
Zela M ¹	7, 237
Greek (23 ships)	191, 064
Alderbaran (tanker)	12, 897
Americana	7, 104
Apollon	9, 744
Capetan Petros	7, 291
Despoina ¹	5, 006
Embassy	8, 418
Galini	7, 266
Gloria	7, 128
Hydraios III ¹	5, 239
King Theseus	9, 153

Greek (23 ships) 191, 064

Alderbaran (tanker)	12, 897
Americana	7, 104
Apollon	9, 744
Capetan Petros	7, 291
Despoina ¹	5, 006
Embassy	8, 418
Galini	7, 266
Gloria	7, 128
Hydraios III ¹	5, 239
King Theseus	9, 153

Footnote at end of table.

Flag of registry, name of ship—Continued

	Gross tonnage
Greek—Continued	
Kyra Hariklia	6, 888
Maria Santa	7, 217
Mastro-Stellos II	7, 282
North Empress	10, 904
Pamit	3, 929
Pantanassa	7, 131
Penelope	6, 712
Perseus (tanker)	15, 852
Redestos	5, 911
Seirios	7, 239
Sirius (tanker)	16, 241
Styllianos N. Vlassopoulos	7, 244
Western Trader ¹	9, 268

Lebanese (14 ships) 96, 633

Akamas	7, 285
Aiolos II	7, 256
Carnation ¹	4, 884
Giorgos Tsakiroglou	7, 240
Ilena	5, 925
Malou	7, 145
Mantric	7, 255
Mousse	6, 984
Noelle	7, 251
Noemi	7, 070
Olga	7, 199
Parmarina	6, 721
Razani ¹	7, 253
St. Nicolas	7, 165

Italian (7 ships) 53, 415

Achille	6, 950
Annalisa ¹	2, 479
Arenella ¹	7, 183
Cannaregio	7, 184
Linda Giovanna (tanker)	9, 985
Nazarena ¹	7, 173
San Nicola (tanker)	12, 461

Norwegian (5 ships) 45, 595

Benny Viking	3, 857
Kongsgaard (tanker)	19, 999
Ole Bratt	5, 252
Polyclipper (tanker)	11, 737
Tine	4, 750

Polish (5 ships) 30, 274

Baltyk	6, 963
Bialystok	7, 173
Bytom	5, 967
Chopin ¹	6, 987
Piast	3, 184

Yugoslav (4 ships) 28, 641

Bar	7, 233
Cavtat	7, 266
Dugi Otok	6, 997
Trebinjica	7, 145

Spanish (2 ships) 4, 565

Castillo Ampudia	3, 566
Sierra Madre	999

West German (1 ship): Adolf Leonhardt ¹	7, 066
Japanese (1 ship): Meischun Maru	8, 647
Moroccan (1 ship): Toubkal	8, 748
Swedish (1 ship): Dagmar	6, 490

¹ Added to report No. 8 appearing in the Federal Register, issue of May 25, 1963.

Sec. 2. In accordance with the provisions of National Security Action Memorandum No. 220 of February 5, 1963, the following vessels which called at Cuba after January 1, 1963 have reacquired eligibility to carry United States Government-financed cargoes from the United States by virtue of the persons who control the vessels having given satisfactory certification and assurance that no ships under their control will, thenceforth, be employed in the Cuba trade so long

as it remains the policy of the United States Government to discourage such trade:
 a. Since last report.

	Gross tonnage
Danish (1 ship) <i>Himmerland</i>	8,774

b. Previous reports.

Flag of registry	Number of ships
British.....	1

SEC. 3. The ships listed in Sections 1 and 2 have made the following number of trips to Cuba in 1963, based on information received through May 31, 1963:

Flag of registry	Number of trips				
	Jan-uary	Feb-ruary	March	April	May
British (43).....	5	8	8	16	6
Greek (30).....	4	6	8	8	4
Lebanese (14).....	1	2	2	8	3
Norwegian (7).....	2	4	1	1	3
Italian (8).....	1	1	1	2	1
Yugoslav (4).....	2	1	1	1	1
Spanish (2).....	1	1	1	1	1
Danish (1).....	1	1	1	1	1
German (West) (1).....	1	1	1	1	1
Japanese (1).....	1	1	1	1	1
Moroccan (1).....	1	1	1	1	1
Swedish (1).....	1	1	1	1	1
Total (113).....	12	19	28	36	18
Polish (7).....	2	1	1	2	1

NOTE.—Trip totals in this section exceed ship totals in secs. 1 and 2 because some of the ships made more than 1 trip to Cuba.

DONALD W. ALEXANDER,
 Maritime Administrator.

Mr. MUNDT. It is about time for Senators and the country generally to know specifically what we are talking about in connection with the extensive trade now being conducted with Cuba. The reports list the names of the ships, the tonnage, the dates, and the entire factual material, so that the people will realize that we are practically doing nothing whatsoever at the moment even to make trade with Cuba difficult, to say nothing about trying to make it impos- sible.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy that the Senator is putting the entire table into the RECORD, but I believe it would be helpful at this time if he would mention the totals involved. My recollection of the figures is that they are most astounding. I shall have something to say about the Senator's remarks later. But some of the countries listed show a grand total amount which is beyond one's belief.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is entirely correct about the amounts. Actually I have not added the total number of gross tons. However, in the period covered by the report there has been a total of 97 ships carrying a gross tonnage of 807,581 tons. The names of the ships are listed. The countries are also listed. I am sure that many Senators, when they read the list of ships, will share with me disap- pointment when they find that the biggest offenders in this regard and the biggest traffickers in blood money are our good friends in the British Isles—Great Britain.

Mr. President, this indicates that the administration's half-hearted measure

has had no visible effect. The number of trips made by free world ships to Cuba actually was lower in January, 1 month before the administration's order went into effect, than in any month since then through May.

So, if the order did anything, it seemed to encourage people to trade with Cuba instead of to discourage them.

Other sources indicate that shipping from some of our European allies to Cuba may be even greater than U.S. Govern- ment reports show. I call the attention of Senators to a recent report issued by "Revolutionary Unity," a Cuban organi- zation in Miami claiming excellent sources of information from inside Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con- sent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a tabulation of free world shipping with Cuba prepared by this or- ganization, which also breaks it down by months, countries, and by offenders.

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

Free world ships entering Cuban ports

	April 1963	March 1963	February 1963	January 1963	December 1962	November 1962	Total
United Kingdom.....	24	7	3	7	4	3	48
Lebanon.....	22	0	0	1	4	0	27
Greece.....	14	5	5	3	5	3	35
Panama.....	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
France.....	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Sweden.....	1	0	1	2	3	4	11
Italy.....	3	1	3	2	1	1	11
Morocco.....	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Denmark.....	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Norway.....	3	1	2	0	4	0	10
Holland.....	0	0	1	0	1	1	3
Spain.....	0	2	0	0	1	0	3
Turkey.....	0	0	0	0	3	2	5
West Germany.....	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total.....	70	16	16	18	27	16	163

Mr. MUNDT. Regardless of source, the available information suggests that the measure announced last Friday is not working effectively. In fact, I submit that it is doubtful whether it is working at all. Meanwhile, the volume of So- viet-bloc shipping to Cuba seems to be rising.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Presi- dent, to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a brief statement made in the House of Representatives on June 11 by the gentleman from Florida, Rep- resentative ROGERS, dealing with this spec- ific point.

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

RUSSIANS INCREASE SHIPS TO CUBA

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 11, 1963, pp. 10644-10645.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have received information from various U.S. Government sources which show that the Russians have increased the number of ships supplying Castro's island in recent weeks.

It may be too early to determine the sig- nificance of this increase, but stepped up shipping was an early sign of the Soviet military buildup of Cuba last summer. I strongly urge that U.S. surveillance of Cuba be intensified to insure that our intelligence community can provide reliable and accu- rate data for U.S. policymakers.

During the month of May, 37 Soviet ships, along with 9 Soviet-bloc ships, called in Cuba. April shipping figures show 27 Soviet vessels, along with 7 Soviet-bloc ships. Total Iron Curtain shipping to Cuba for the first 6 months of 1963 numbers 165 ships, 52 of which were tankers.

Detailed Russian shipping figures for 1963 are as follows:

Month	Total	Soviet- flag ships	Bloc- flag ships	Tankers
January.....	41	35	6	10
February.....	38	34	4	10
March.....	35	32	33	10
April.....	34	27	7	10
May.....	46	37	9	12
To date.....	194	165	29	52

However, the shocking fact is that one out of every three ships supplying Castro's island is from the free world.

Since January 1963, 89 allied ships have made trips to Cuba, and 20 of these vessels were tankers. This shipping would have been considerably reduced if the U.S. Gov- ernment had implemented my proposal to close U.S. ports to nations which allow their flags to be used in sea trade with Cuba. However, such action is warranted particu- larly now in view of this new development.

The British are the main offenders. Since January of this year there have been 33 Brit- ish ships which have called in Cuba. The British would think twice about shipping to Castro if we banned the *Queen Mary* from New York Harbor.

Mr. MUNDT. I also ask that the news stories on this subject appearing in the *Baltimore Sun* on June 21 and June 25, this year, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the *Baltimore Sun*, June 21, 1963]
 CUBA TRADE RISE ALARMING TO UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, June 20.—Administration officials privately expressed concern today about the increase in Western shipping to Cuba.

This was learned as the Maritime Ad- ministration released the names of 21 ships added to the U.S. blacklist for trading with Cuba.

Although the 21 compose the largest list yet released by the Government agency since the blacklist was put into effect as of Janu- ary 1, additional vessels bound for Cuba were noted in Lloyd's Shipping Index, which records ship movements all over the world.

BRITISH SHIPS BLAMED

State Department and White House of- ficials pinpointed British and Greek-owned ships as playing a major role among the vessels trading with the Communist domi- nated island.

A high official remarked:
 "The British and Greek Governments could certainly do more than they are doing about their ships going to Cuba. So far they have done nothing."

Although the Greek Government has made three major pronouncements since the Cuban crisis last fall about its ships not going to Cuba, a number of Greek-flag as well as Greek-owned vessels, show up on every list.

The newest group includes seven Greek and five Lebanese ships, most of which are owned by Greeks. Only 4 British ships were in this count, bringing the British total up to 37 ships making 47 trips since January 1.

Thirty Greek-flag ships have made 37 trips and 19 Lebanese ships have made 19 trips.

The blacklist now contains the names of 118 Western and Polish ships making 132 trips since January 1, the arbitrary cutoff date.

PLEDGE IS NEEDED

The vessels are not allowed to pick up U.S. Government cargoes in U.S. ports as their punishment for going to Cuba. However, any owner can remove his vessel from the blacklist by promising it will not call at Cuba again.

Many American shipping executives and maritime labor unions were critical when the single restriction against Cuban-trading ships was announced in February. They predicted then that it was not strong enough to deter Western shipowners from diverting their vessels from this trade which has become more profitable in recent months.

The International Longshoremen's Association (AFL-CIO) takes more credit than the Government for cutting off a large portion of Cuban-trading ships by refusing to work any cargoes on them or any ships of any shipowner going to Cuba.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 25, 1963]

MORE SHIPS GO TO CUBA

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, June 24.—Havana radio today confirmed what administration officials have been saying quietly with concern—that free world shipping to Cuba is on the increase.

The Communist radio broadcast quoted an editorial of the Havana newspaper Hoy saying, "Each new boat which is added to this list is a defeat for the imperialists since it signifies no more and no less than the addition of a boat and a company and a capitalistic country which has ignored the Yankee threats, has disobeyed the orders, has disregarded the persuasions, and the demands."

ADDITIONS TO BLACKLIST

Last Thursday the largest single group of free world ships calling at Cuba was announced by the U.S. Government and added to the blacklist.

That list now numbers 118 vessels which are not privileged to transport U.S. Government-financed cargoes out of U.S. ports. They can pick up such cargoes in foreign ports and carry them to another foreign port.

The blacklist contains the names of those ships which have called at Cuba since January 1.

PROOF OF STUPIDITY

"The fact that they already have had to inscribe 118 boats on the blacklist is a proof of the stupidity of this policy, of its weakness, of its inevitable failure," Hoy said.

The number of vessels visiting Cuba has been increased since Premier Fidel Castro visited Russia, the newspaper stated.

"The world sees that the world balance of forces and the unity of Cuba with the Socialist world augur the complete failure of the U.S. policy aggression," it added.

Early last week, administration officials had said in private circles that they were disturbed by the rise in free world shipping to Cuba.

NEW SUGAR CROP NOTED

They were inclined to attribute it to the present sugar crop, for which the Communists are willing to pay premium freight rates to get the crop moving.

U.S. shipping sources do not feel the single restriction which the Government has imposed upon free world ships calling at Cuba is sufficient to stop shipowners from use of their vessels in that trade.

The Government restriction covers only the ship involved.

DOUBTED WHEN IMPOSED

When it was announced February 6, retroactive to ships of January 1, there was

criticism in this country that it would not do the job. But Government officials said it would be sufficient, noting such trading to Cuba had dropped sharply from October when the initial warning was issued.

The International Longshoremen's Association (AFL-CIO) claims that its own ban against both ships and shipowners calling at Cuba since November 8 has done more to cut down the calls than the Government's restriction.

An ILA spokesman said the union still receives two or three calls daily from ship charterers and brokers clearing a vessel before it is chartered to a new operator.

Mr. MUNDT. Here, too, we get out of the realm of generalities and speculation and come down to the actual names of the offenders, the names of the ships, and the amounts of merchandise being transported.

Why should the present measure work, Mr. President? What incentive is there for some of our allies to curtail their trade with Cuba? Certainly none can be found in U.S. policy on Cuba.

The fact of the matter is that the United States has not demonstrated that it really means business when it says that Communist power in this hemisphere is intolerable, nonnegotiable, and must be eliminated.

Certainly the Bay of Pigs debacle was not such a demonstration. Surely, the aftermath of the missile crisis of last fall as well as the weeks preceding it convinced nobody that we really regard Cuba as an urgent threat to the security of this hemisphere that must be dealt with accordingly. And certainly diplomatic representations to our allies to curtail their trade with Cuba are meaningless in the face of this record and alongside the puny measure I described earlier.

Before we can expect other free nations to go along with our desire to intensify the boycott of Castro's Cuba, we must demonstrate that we really are serious and mean business.

Having displayed this intention clearly for all the world to see, we can then go to our allies in Europe and elsewhere and lay it on the line: We can make it clear that we will close U.S. ports to all vessels of any country permitting trade with Cuba—not just to those specific vessels engaged in the trade. And we can warn that unwillingness to heed our requests will result in the suspension or sharp curtailment of U.S. Government aid programs until a change of attitude is manifested.

I realize, Mr. President, that these are stringent measures not designed to enhance our popularity abroad, but stringent measures may be required to communicate the seriousness of our intent to other nations and to achieve our objectives with respect to the Castro-Communist threat in this hemisphere.

I do not claim original authorship of the proposals I am making for intensifying the economic boycott of Castro's Cuba. I am sure others have discussed them and advocated all or part of them at different times. However, I first advocated these proposals shortly after the President's speech of last October 22, and I have reiterated them on frequent occasions since. I think it is now time to bring them formally to the attention

of the Senate and the administration as I am doing here today.

Let me repeat, Mr. President: Our present economic sanctions against the Castro regime are halfhearted, they have had no visible effect, and consequently more stringent measures are required. A number of constructive suggestions for peaceful but positive actions have been made on the Senate floor these past few weeks.

These measures effectively refute and answer the oft-repeated question asked by the White House whenever it is urged to face up to the growing perils of communism in Cuba. The White House then seeks to allay or divert criticism of its "see no evil; hear no evil; speak no evil" policy of vacillation by asking, "Well, what do you propose—that we go to war to free Cuba?"

Mr. President, that Yankee habit of seeking to answer a question by merely asking another may have some merit elsewhere but it has neither merit nor validity in a discussion of our Cuban policy or lack of Cuban policy.

Certainly nobody in the Senate has remotely suggested that we go to war to free Cuba, but a growing chorus of unhappy Senators reflecting a growing number of impatient and disillusioned Americans, have suggested and are suggesting constructive steps far short of war which can hasten the downfall of Castro and speed the day when Cuba will again be liberated and administered by freedom-loving Cubans.

It becomes increasingly clear day by day, Mr. President, that to continue to do nothing is the most dangerous policy of all. We can neither wish away the problem of communism and Castroism in Cuba nor close our eyes in the expectation that when we open them the problem will have evaporated. Each passing day that we ignore its existence increases the dangers of its presence and the difficulties involved in its elimination.

Mr. President, the action program, the positive policies which I propose and strongly recommend here this afternoon have a number of attractive and appealing virtues. I enumerate some specifically:

First. Nobody can successfully argue that this program is an act of war. By our sovereign right to control our own trade, our own harbors, and our own foreign aid programs we simply reenforce our appeals to others that they join us in helping us to help them to stay free and to remain secure and at peace.

Second. To the degree that these economic pressures are applied to Cuba—and the degree of success and cooperation that is attained will depend upon the vigor with which our administration would implement this program—we shall be undermining Castro-communism in Cuba and weakening his capacity to do injury elsewhere.

Third. By urging all members of the Organization of American States and of NATO, together with the governments of free nations everywhere, to cooperate in this voluntary but comparatively universal withholding of all commercial transactions and all free shipping from Cuba, we shall make her dependent for outside aid upon the comparatively weak

and austere capacities of the Communist countries to provide such assistance. Cubans generally will then realize the meager degree to which they can be benefitted by the Communist cohorts of their own treacherous leader.

Fourth. By exercising the great prestige of our American leadership potential in winning free nations to the support of this organized program of economic pressures we shall gain experience with our friends and allies in "working in harness together" in the interests of the mutual security and advancement of all free peoples. From these experiences in effective teamwork and cooperation it would be hoped the same countries under American leadership and inspiration then might come to take other collective and cooperative actions together in the United Nations and elsewhere. Nothing succeeds like success, and successful experiences in working together should lead to a continuation and expansion of these experiences.

Fifth. Since it is too much to be hoped that all free nations and their respective Governments will cooperate in such a program of economic pressures and abstention from economic relations with Cuba, a final and important dividend for freedom would flow from an American-inspired effort of this type. We would, to put it colloquially, be "dividing the men from the boys." We would learn from our efforts exactly which countries and which governments really want to support collective security and human freedom and which are merely interested in procuring for themselves the maximum of American aid and free world support in a selfish attempt to aggrandize themselves, to keep themselves in power, and to practice a program of "global panhandling" by which they seek for themselves the largest possible handouts from both the Communist camp and the free world. In fact, if this effort did nothing else than to establish for all to see and understand a star-studded rollcall of the countries who really mean business in the global effort to preserve peace and freedom against Godless, aggressive communism it would produce a standout result well worth all the effort devoted to it.

Mr. President, let me repeat that what I propose requires nothing more than political leadership and moral courage. Specifically I propose four points:

First. Issue a Presidential statement—today, if possible; tomorrow, if necessary; but no later than this week—that henceforth commerce in American ports will be denied to the ships of any country which permits its merchant vessels to engage in trade of any kind—except only medical supplies—to Castro's Cuba.

Second. Present to the Organization of American States and to our NATO allies an official request that each of these friendly countries adopt a similar policy and that they, like we, abstain from shipping to or buying supplies of any kind from Castro's Cuba.

Third. That through appropriate diplomatic channels we present the same requests individually and separately to every country outside the domination of the Communists.

Fourth. That we announce as official American policy the determination to free the Western Hemisphere from Communist-dominated governments inasmuch as this violates at least the spirit and perhaps the letter of our hallowed Monroe Doctrine, and that in our desire to utilize all peaceful means at our control to attain this objective, our foreign aid and military assistance programs henceforth must be tailored and adjusted to provide maximum assistance to those who are willing to aid us with our own immediate problem of ridding the Western Hemisphere of Castro's Communist regime and any other Communist dictator who might succeed in grabbing power by means other than those of free, orderly, and honest elections.

Mr. President, in my opinion we need go no further in announcing an American policy of determination and positive action at this time. Perhaps we should move more precipitately and perhaps we should proceed with more direct action—undoubtedly we should take additional steps—but it is my conviction that a program developed along the general lines of my proposal will achieve the desired results and will, likewise, procure for us some highly important and significant collateral dividends and benefits.

Certainly, we should do no less than what I have today proposed. To do less will be to continue to do nothing. Unless we have no faith in our own capacity to lead; or unless we lack confidence in our American ability to sell an idea, which is basically sound and in the interest of freedom loving people everywhere; or unless we are in some way committed by agreements and exchanges of correspondence the contents of which are now unknown, to continue a program of appeasing Castro and doing nothing to help liberate Communist Cuba, I suggest this program as a bare minimum of what is required to recapture our self-respect, to recapture our posture of world leadership, and to recapture the security of the Western Hemisphere and perhaps the world from the growing menace of an unchecked Communist threat thumbing its Red nose at the greatest and the strongest power the world has ever seen.

Today Castro's associates in the drive to communize Latin America and to imperil freedom in the Western Hemisphere have succeeded in creating trouble which is breaking out all over. We witness it today in British Guiana. A few days ago it was in Venezuela. Tomorrow we may expect to see it evidenced in other places creating new provocations and dangers. Each news dispatch from Haiti is fearfully scanned lest it reveal that the Communists from Cuba and their Russian masters have established themselves in that unhappy country, whose dictator flouts the authority of all his neighbors and maintains himself illegally in power by military right.

I invite the attention of Senators and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a most significant full length article which appeared in the June 29–July 6 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. I quote from page 20 of an article entitled "How the Communists Plan To

Win Latin America." It is written by Richard Armstrong. I suggest that those who have available the issue of the Saturday Evening Post to which I have alluded, for June 29–July 6, turn to page 20 and read the article in full. I quote one significant statement:

Why has Latin America, so long ignored, become so important a battlefield in the cold war?

The most immediate reason, of course, is Cuba. "The Communists were amazed there", said a former Party member. "They had always assumed that you meant what you said and implied—in the Monroe Doctrine, in the Rio treaty of 1947, and in the Caracas treaty of 1954—that you would not permit an alien dictatorship in the Western Hemisphere. Then came Cuba?"

A prominent U.S. diplomat adds, "The Communists have been working in Latin America for 40 years, but they were always sabotaged by a certain lethargy, an inner disbelief in success. Cuba says every day that it can happen here. Encouraged by this success, the Communists have launched their first really comprehensive campaign to capture Latin America. Their spirits and their hopes are high.

While we spend billions of dollars abroad to oppose communism and while Americans are dying in far-off Asia to support the cause of freedom, we sit in chains and do nothing to protect our home base through moving to reduce the power and repel the programs of communism in Cuba, which is indeed the Achilles heel in our entire program of national defense and world cooperation.

Let us delay no longer in demonstrating the leadership expected of America. Let us evolve a pattern of action against this Communist cancer on our doorstep which will match our brave words about communism elsewhere and which will give meaning and significance to our pretty phrases about the protection and the promotion of freedom throughout the world.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I am most happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado, who has made so many constructive suggestions in this field and who has devoted so much careful study to this growing problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am extremely interested in the overall approach that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has made to this problem. Again and again he has pointed out facts which almost every American knows—what is going on in Venezuela, what is going on in other Latin American countries, and what is going on within Cuba. He has also pointed out—and this is a significant contribution—that there are many ways by which we could stop or throw a block into the development of communism out of Cuba and into Latin America—not only the blockade idea, or closing our ports. He has suggested that we might use our mutual aid for this purpose. I am glad to hear him bring that suggestion up, because I have long felt that aid to other countries should not be a gratuity that we throw around like a drunken man throws money around on Saturday night, but, rather, that our mutual aid should be utilized for one purpose

only, and that is for strengthening and bolstering the international foreign policies of this Government.

We know what is going on. In the few weeks since I made my proposal on the floor of the Senate, on June 17—a proposal, incidentally, which was not reported in one of the local newspapers, and which received only a brief notice in another, and then was withdrawn after the first edition—hundreds of letters have come into my office, and they continue to come in an ever increasing and strengthening volume, from South America, saying, "When is America going to wake up and do something about the situation in Cuba?"

The point the Senator has made is one of the strongest that can be made. How can we expect those who want free government in other Latin American countries to have their hand supported when we are absolutely ineffective in doing anything with Cuba? The fact is that every day we permit Cuba to exist as she does—and the Senator has pointed this out so well—we provide moral support to the Communist activities in South America.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; and we discourage our Latin American friends who might like to join us in a strong effort against communism, and particularly against communism in Cuba. We discourage them by our inertia.

Mr. ALLOTT. I intend to speak in greater detail on one of the points the Senator has made, as a result of some of the thoughts the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has provoked. It is time for Americans to shake their heads and say, "What did Khrushchev want in Cuba?"

It is almost 9 months after the 22d of October 1962. If any person in this world intended to establish a Communist base in Cuba for the subversion of Latin America, the one thing he would want would be manpower. Whether or not the Communists had large missiles in Cuba, I do not know. Two or three years ago, in 1960, we heard about the missile gap as between the United States and the Soviets. The United States was supposed to be hopelessly inferior. The administration told us, or at least the one who became the head in this country told us, that Russia had all the missiles she needed to destroy America.

Then we were told that the Soviets were putting missiles into Cuba. What purpose would that serve? The answer is, no purpose. Perhaps the whole missile story was a red herring. Perhaps they put blank cylindrical tubes on concrete platforms, to look like missile weapons. Whether or not they were real did not matter. The fact is that the biggest red herring was drawn across our path, and we followed it. When it was over, Khrushchev had at least 17,000 men there in October 1962. Therefore, while we were concerned with what we thought were missiles, he had established an entrenched Communist dictatorship government—not a Cuban Communist government, but a Russian Communist government in Cuba, which is one of the worst kinds of government that could be found anywhere in the world today—

and that includes Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Poland, and the rest of them.

Mr. MUNDT. And he exacted from our President a promise that he would not promote, and perhaps not permit, an attack against Communist Cuba.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct. That is where I think the red herring was. While he was doing that he was doing the things he always wanted to do, and it was necessary for the administration to take this step. That was the Communist red herring; and we completely lost our way.

I thank the Senator for his very great contribution. I hope we shall continue to discuss the subject, and I hope he will continue his contribution, because it will help in forcing a definite policy toward Cuba which will help kill communism in Latin America.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate what the Senator has said. We hear indirectly about secret correspondence, which we read about in the newspapers, including a letter a week being exchanged between President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev. I am afraid this is a sort of put-and-take correspondence, whereby President Kennedy puts and Mr. Khrushchev takes, so far as Cuba is concerned, because there has surely not been an inch of progress from our standpoint, in the strengthening of our position in Cuba, since the letters began. I hope the President will soon take America into his confidence and let us know what this correspondence is about, and whether we are getting any quid pro quo in any concessions that may be involved in the letters.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his speech today. The assembling of the material he used took a great deal of time and effort. The results are startling with respect to what is happening in the buildup and in the growth of the Communist camp on our doorstep in Cuba.

As one humble American citizen, I am deeply indebted to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for their remarks and their contributions with regard to the Cuban situation. These distinguished Members of the Senate have probed the subject. They have made suggestions. They have done what should be done by our entire Government.

I am greatly alarmed about our country. I fear that the Republic we love, the Republic with prestige and power and opportunity and tranquillity, is being eroded while the heads of our Government are chasing rainbows on foreign continents and making proposals in this country to buy the people's votes, and while other things upon which our permanent status and development depend are being neglected. I refer to our fight against communism, and I refer to the great necessity of preventing the financial collapse of our country.

The Cuban problem cannot be swept under the rug. The Cuban problem cannot be solved by bringing out the

flag and using it as a political instrument biennially just before election time.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, the Senator does not believe that it can be deferred until October 1964?

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. It cannot. The whole free world was heartened by what appeared to be the start of positive action in October 1962. It united the country. It united our allies. It united the freedom-loving people of the Western Hemisphere. It united the voters of the country.

Mr. MUNDT. And it united the two parties.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know of one Republican Representative or Senator who was against it. We all joined as Americans in an attempt to do something. We were all disillusioned shortly after the election, when nothing was done, except to retreat.

Mr. CURTIS. This great problem, involving human liberty, involving lives, involving people who are living in slavery, and involving the security of this country, cannot be brushed aside or held back as a "gimmick," to be used politically in October 1964. I hope the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and other Senators whom I have mentioned, and many other Senators, will speak again and again on this subject. After all, in the last analysis, the people will determine this question. It has been my observation that on most crucial issues the people are far ahead of Washington. The Senator has given all of us documented facts. I hope it will be but the beginning of his efforts along this line.

We are not suggesting that any particular individual's idea be adopted without question. We are suggesting that nothing be done which threatens to make us a fourth-rate nation, but that every fact be utilized and pursued in the way it should be utilized and pursued. I again congratulate the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I deeply appreciate the expression of my distinguished colleague from Nebraska. I realize the great amount of work and study he has devoted to this subject and his own fine contribution to the discussion of this subject. We do not dare delay making badly needed decisions on Cuba. After several weeks of study of this subject, with specific facts concerning the economic situation, and the list of ships that were serving Cuba providing grist for the mills, so that we could bring into focus some plans and programs, I have purposely reduced all these to what I consider to be the bare minimal effort to start something effective operating against Cuba without a chance of war, or the breaking of any international treaty, but merely by exercising our prerogative as a sovereign Nation to control our own ships and our own aid program, and to try to flex the muscles of American leadership; and also to discover where we have friends, who they are, who will stand up, who will crawl

away, and who stands like a great Shylock, trying to pluck as many shekels as he can, both from the Communists and from the United States.

It is about time to get some sense and rationale into our American foreign policy. A good place to start is 90 miles away, with communism in Cuba.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has been sitting here, listening to what the Senator from South Dakota has had to say, and to the comments which have been made by several of our colleagues in the Senate. There have come back into my mind some lines written by the English poet, Pope. I am wondering if we are not beginning to prove, in our relationship with Cuba, what Pope said. He was talking about vice, but what he said is true of any other evil thing. He said:

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

The longer we wait before we do anything about Cuba, the more American people there will be who will say, "Oh well, we have gotten along all these years and have not had any trouble. Perhaps we had better accept the situation and go on from there."

I am a little afraid that this is already happening. Articles dealing with Cuba are disappearing from the front pages of our newspapers. We have many more problems to consider, and these have pushed Cuba from the front pages of the newspapers. We are in danger of forgetting the Cuban problem.

When we raise it, as the Senator has raised it today, we are told by the administration, "Do not bother about it. The proposals you make are not practical. We are aware of the problem."

However, every week and every month that goes by customs are preparing us to assume that Cuba is going to be Communist forever.

We lapse into a kind of apathy. We say that this is the status quo. It becomes more and more difficult to develop either a program or the strength to support it. I am very much afraid that if the American people do not nudge the administration soon into beginning the necessary steps of action, we shall reach the point of pity and then embrace. We will say, "This is the way it has been done for so long; it is now the pattern of the future."

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Utah has made a most interesting observation, I hope not a prophetic one, but certainly within the realm of possibility. Even though Americans, firmly imbedded as we are in freedom, may never embrace voluntarily a situation such as exists in Cuba, there is certainly grave danger that the rest of the world may, as illustrated by the vote the other day, when there were four abstentions and one adverse vote on a vote from Latin American Republics on a perfectly puerile, innocuous, inconsequential resolution. I suspect that one reason why we lost was that any rational

man could say, "Why do this? Why antagonize Castro on this point? Why slap him in the face? This is a completely ineffective procedure."

The leaders of the Latin American Republics are conversant with the teaching that one never strikes the king until he can kill him. The leaders of Latin American Republics do not want to scratch Castro's face. But I am confident that they would join us in any forward-moving program, such as the first step, so that they could employ it effectively against communism.

I think there is a possibility that the longer this situation drags out the more it will be subject to suspicion. The people will begin to suspect that nothing serious will happen. Then once more, just 15 minutes before it is too late, we will try to unite them in a great program. But our timing next time may be wrong, and it may be 15 minutes after it is too late. The time to act is now, when we have earned the confidence and respect of the world.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add my voice of commendation to the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota. It seems to me that this is the most important immediate step we could take. But I know some of the problems which will be encountered.

In June 1961, Representative ROGERS of Florida and I introduced identical measures in the House, designed to cut off all trade between the United States and Communist Cuba. The interesting thing was that when hearings were held before the committee, representatives of the State Department appeared in August 1961 and testified in opposition to the bills. In any event, we were able to have a bill reported by the committee and passed by the House. But it never got anywhere in the Senate.

It was not until February 1962, that the administration finally took action under the Trading With the Enemy Act in order to cut off trade between the United States and Cuba, but months too late to be able to do any real good.

So the Senator will encounter problems in trying to secure any positive action which is not initiated under executive responsibility solely and completely.

Second, I have been interested in and have been advocating for a long time a NATO conference under section 2 of the NATO Agreement, so that we could have an agreed treaty policy among the NATO nations with respect to trading with Communist countries. One of the things that concerns me is the evidence, which was shown so clearly in the Senator's speech, of the number of British ships which are trading with Cuba. There is no doubt that more British ships are trading with Cuba than ships of any other country. The other day I placed in the RECORD, in connection with another discussion on Cuba, the fact that the British have had an imbalance of trade of 98 million pounds with Soviet bloc countries in the past year. That is a large sum of money. It provides

the Soviet bloc countries with the necessary sterling and dollar exchanges to enable them to proceed with Communist infiltration throughout the world.

It seems to me that we are doing exactly the same thing in permitting trade to continue with Cuba, a country only 90 miles away from our shore.

The Senator's statement that we can refuse our foreign aid and can prohibit the use of our ports to countries which are trading with Cuba is the first positive suggestion I have heard to bring home the reality of the problem to many countries which are solidly on our side in the overall effort to combat communism.

Mr. MUNDT. I deeply appreciate the historic documentation concerning the difficulties which confront Senators and Congressmen who are trying to pursue a minimum program of action against Cuba. I am quite certain that any suggestion from any source that promises to accomplish anything against Castroism in Cuba will meet with resistance, at least until the letter-writing campaign between the K-Boys is terminated and we can find out what it is all about.

Representative ROGERS of Florida, who joined in that grand effort with the Senator from Colorado when the Senator was a Member of the other body, is a distinguished Member of the House. The people of Florida are the direct sufferers from some of the difficulties which arise from the establishment of communism in Cuba. I credit Representative ROGERS with being one of the few administration followers who have had the courage to stand up and speak out against the craven do-nothing policy program toward Cuba.

I feel certain that we shall meet with further resistance; but I am sure that the kind of resistance we shall meet with can no longer hide behind the language screen which says, "What are we to do?—go to war against Cuba?"

The program I have recommended today is something which even the most imaginative writer in the White House cannot describe as an act of war. We could put together all the Sorensons, all the Schlesingers, all the Harvard men, and ask, "How are you going to describe as an act of war an American trade and aid policy operated under our authority as a sovereign nation?"

So the administration ought to consider the question: "Are you serious about communism when it is close to our shores? Or are you serious only about communism in Vietnam or Laos, 7,000 miles away?"

Unless the administration completely lacks confidence in its own ability to lead, I challenge it now to take the initiative in doing those things which are short of war, which can be done to start the beginning of the end of Communist Castroism in Cuba.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY LIGHT, CASCADE LOCKS, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I was in Oregon over the weekend, I made a major policy speech to the people of

my State, setting forth my views with respect to the sum of the electric power problems that confront the Pacific Northwest. I spoke with respect to such issues as intertie connection legislation and the Canadian Treaty negotiations. I made this speech at a banquet at Cascade Locks, Oreg. The banquet was in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the purchase by the city of a block of power from the Bonneville Administration. The city of Cascade Locks was the first of our municipalities to purchase a block of power and to establish a municipal public power administration making use of the power generated by the Bonneville Power Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the address I delivered at the Cascade Locks anniversary dinner on Saturday night be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF CITY LIGHT, CASCADE LOCKS, OREG., JULY 13, 1963

Mayor Miles, Judge Teunis Wyers, Bonneville Administrator Charles Luce, other distinguished guests and fellow Oregonians, it is a privilege and an appreciated compliment to be invited to deliver the principal address at this anniversary banquet. It was 25 years ago that Cascade Locks bought the first block of power sold by the Bonneville Administration. It was a historical event of great economic importance to Oregon, the Pacific Northwest and the entire Nation.

It is particularly fitting that the Honorable Charles Luce, the present Administrator of the Bonneville Administration should be one of our honored guests tonight. The Nation has been very fortunate in the appointment of Administrators of the Bonneville Administration ever since the passage of the Bonneville Act. However, we are particularly fortunate to have Charles Luce as the Administrator at this time when we see arising on the economic horizons new threatening storm clouds that may develop into a deluge of controversy over public versus private power policies.

I am confident that under Charles Luce's leadership the sunshine of reason will dissipate the gathering clouds of controversy. It is in the vital economic interest of all the people of our section of the country, including members of economic groups such as the stockholders of private utilities and their customers as well as members and customers of public preference groups, that gathering differences be resolved in a manner that will advance the legitimate joint economic interests of all.

However, now is the time to face up to these issues and try to settle them before advocates take irrefragable positions in respect to them. Charles Luce is particularly well qualified to help resolve any differences that may arise. His judicial temperament, his dedication to the public interest, his insistence upon fair play to the private utilities, the public utilities districts, the electric power consumer and the general public assure us of an industrial statesmanship so essential to a carrying out of the purposes and objectives of the Bonneville Act.

However, it is very important that we have open public discussion of these powerlines because they involve the economic business of all the people. Therefore I propose in this major policy speech tonight to deal with a few of the facts of our electric power problems and needs in the Pacific Northwest, to call upon the many friends, supporters and beneficiaries of the Bonneville Act to rededi-

cate themselves to its purposes and sound objectives. I would have this audience never forget that the Bonneville Act has been the most important stimulant in the development of private enterprise business and the expansion of our private economy in the Pacific Northwest that we have experienced within our economy during the past 25 years.

Businessman after businessman, operating his business within the economic environment of any one of Federal multipurpose dams in our section of the Nation, are the best possible witnesses in support of the public policy soundness of the Bonneville Act. These businessmen tell us that they never would have located their businesses where they did if it had not been for the low-rate electric power that the Bonneville Act in its administration has brought to Oregon and our neighboring States.

Thus it is a pleasure to be in Cascade Locks again. Your town has many features which make it a notable municipality. I came to speak about one of them: your role in initiation of the activities of the Bonneville Power Administration.

City Light in Cascade Locks has the distinction of being the first recipient of power marketed by BPA. You are still reaping the benefits of that decision a quarter of a century ago. Today, residential use of electricity in Cascade Locks is three times the national average and yet you pay only one-third as much as the national average for each kilowatt-hour.

What happened in Cascade Locks on July 9, 1938, was the beginning of a chain of events which reshaped the social and economic structure of the Pacific Northwest.

When Cascade Locks received its first power from Bonneville Dam, only about 30 percent of Oregon's farms were electrified; today 99 percent have electricity.

The year before BPA power came to Cascade Locks, homeowners in Siletz, Oreg., paid \$51.60 a month for 500 kilowatts of electricity. Twenty-five years later, Siletz residents could get the same amount of power for \$8.

In 1938 the economy of our State was almost entirely dependent on lumbering, farming, mining, and fishing. There was little industry. BPA power brought Oregon six electro-process industries with a plant investment in excess of \$190 million, estimated payrolls of \$12,500,000 and 6,600 new jobs. Low-cost power from Bonneville nurtured the unprecedented expansion of our quick-frozen food industry and electrified our sawmills, paper and plywood plants, and wood fabrication facilities which are one of Oregon's major sources of employment.

Here in Cascade Locks, City Light furnishes the power for the all-electric operation of one of the largest independent lumber mills in the Northwest, and I am advised City Light can accommodate almost any new industry with the same low-cost power at very little added investment.

Bonneville itself is a principal industry in Oregon with 1,000 employees, an annual payroll of nearly \$8 million, and an investment of \$166 million in power transmission equipment.

The Bonneville Power Administration did not introduce electricity to the Northwest. We had power before BPA. But it was expensive for all, prohibitively costly to many, and completely unavailable to some. What Bonneville brought to the Northwest was low-cost electricity distributed regionwide at a postage stamp rate—a rate which has remained unchanged for more than 25 years.

How did it do it? With 20 operating or authorized Federal multiple purpose water projects, 8,600 miles of Federal transmission line, an antimonopoly preference clause that give priority in sales to public agencies and co-ops, and a policy of making an abundance of cheap power available in even the most remote reaches of the Northwest.

It accomplished this feat in the face of the bitterest opposition from one to today's major beneficiaries—the Northwest's private power companies, who buy large quantities of BPA power and pay less for it than public agencies and co-ops.

Today, the limitation of its marketing area has put the Bonneville Power Administration into a financial problem. In the last 5 years, BPA has experienced deficits which have reduced its surplus by \$60 million. Although Bonneville is still ahead of the game, unless other solutions are successfully applied, it will be necessary to raise BPA rates to cover scheduled repayments.

During the same period that Bonneville's financial "cushion" decreased by \$60 million, some \$126 million worth of power went unsold—water wasted over the spillway. If a market had been found for only half this surplus secondary power, which is available on a nonfirm basis, there would have been no deficit.

A major electrical interconnection between the Northwest and California and the Southwest could be the means of marketing this power. An intertie would also permit sale of peaking capacity, allow firming up of substantial quantities of secondary power for use in the Northwest, and provide a means of taking advantage of diversity in peak loads between the two regions.

BPA has proposed two ties, one a 750-kilovolt direct current line to Hoover Dam in Nevada or Los Angeles, Calif., and the other a 500-kilovolt alternating current line extending to the Oregon-California border where it would link with facilities of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Average annual net revenues to Bonneville in the first 10 years alone would be \$24.6 million, and large additional benefits thereafter. Net benefits for the Northwest—including the non-Federal utilities of the region—are estimated to range up to \$872 million over the next 50 years.

This is an extremely lucrative proposal. These lines would pay for themselves in less than a decade. Benefit-cost ratio is about 3.5 to 1—a better economic justification than most recent hydroelectric projects in the Northwest. Because of the profitmaking potential of such an interconnection, seven non-Federal proposals to accomplish all or part of the job have been submitted to Bonneville. However, none can show equal benefits.

California private power companies are seeking to take over this interconnection plan. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. of California, which has absorbed 520 other firms to make it the biggest privately owned utility in the country, wants to control the flow of power between the Pacific Northwest and California. Southern California Edison Co. seeks to substitute a line from its service area to Phoenix, Ariz., for the Federal direct current line through Nevada. The California companies suggest that they become the sole channel for distribution of Northwest power in California. Under their plan, all BPA surplus power which is exported for sale outside the region would be sold to Pacific Gas & Electric. Other potential customers could gain access to this power only on terms and conditions laid down by Pacific Gas & Electric.

Last month the president of the Puget Sound Power & Light Company declared that "whoever controls transmission lines these days controls the works." The California companies would obtain control under their proposal.

This is no new attitude on the part of private power companies. These private utilities fought Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee. They opposed expansion of the BPA grid. They fought a high dam at Hells Canyon. They worked against the Hanford project.

These private utilities are obligated primarily to their stockholders and therefore they naturally are concerned about making good profits. There is nothing wrong in that from their standpoint. Since 1950 public and co-op systems in the Northwest have made rate reductions of \$30 million while private utilities of this region have increased rates by \$25 million.

Low cost power is a key to the Northwest's economic growth. We are thousands of miles from major markets, insulated from major centers of commerce by high freight rates. Our economy remains resource oriented, strongly sensitive to dips in the business cycle and seasonal unemployment. Low cost power has helped bring us industry and stable payrolls. Low cost power permits us to compete with other sections of the country. It is an equalizer which compensates for our isolated location. If BPA power rates go up, chances of attracting new industry—or even retaining full operation of existing plants—are proportionally decreased.

BPA's \$520 million transmission grid constitutes about 80 percent of all the high-voltage lines in the Pacific Northwest. Bonneville provides 60 percent of all our power. An increase in rates will have widespread impact on our State and region.

Somebody is going to build an interconnection between the Northwest and Southwest. It is too good a deal to pass up. Any intertie can help Bonneville's financial picture. But a Federal interconnection is the best bet for keeping our power rates down.

The Federal Government should build the needed tie lines. The Bonneville Act of 1937 directs the BPA to interconnect with other Federal systems and publicly owned power projects. Substantial economies are possible by linking such systems as the Central Valley project in northern California, the Hoover-Parker-Davis dams and the Colorado River storage project in the Southwest. Local public power groups, rural electric cooperatives and State agencies also stand to benefit.

The administration has asked for funds in the current appropriation bill to build to the Oregon-California border. What logic dictates that a Federal line must terminate at this point for the benefit of private parties? Some 75 percent of the surplus power available for export in the Northwest is at Federal dams. Why should BPA depend on private power companies for its marketing arrangements? Federal lines would be common carriers, available at cost to all—including private power companies. Why should a private monopoly be substituted?

Implementation of the treaty with Canada for cooperative development of the upper Columbia River will result in the equivalent of another Grand Coulee Dam for the Northwest, but conclusion of this arrangement swings on the ability of Canada to market its share of treaty power in the Southwest via an intertie. Are negotiations between the United States and Canada to be subject to the veto of a private power company?

Any intertie requires as a prelude passage of legislation to prohibit the drain of Federal power out of the Northwest to the detriment of the needs of our region. We have passed such a bill in the Senate, and it is pending in the House of Representatives. An amendment has been added there, requiring enactment of new authorizing legislation before the 750-kilovolt line may be built directly from the Columbia River to the southern California market. If the private utilities amendment remains part of the preference measure, the bill itself will certainly be vetoed.

But our concern with the progress of this measure should not blind us to the reason for its existence—the desirability of an intertie to better BPA's fiscal situation. Our aim is not to build a Chinese Wall around the

Northwest but to facilitate sale of surplus to protect our supply of low cost power.

In a recent speech on the floor of the Senate I reminded the Federal Power Commission of its independent jurisdiction—indeed its obligation—to decide the question of the authority of the Washington Public Power Supply System to go outside the State of Washington to construct a dam on the Middle Snake in Oregon and Idaho, notwithstanding a decision by the Oregon Federal District Court that Washington Public Power Supply System lacks such authority under Washington State law. Editorializing about that speech, the Oregonian said: "Senator Morse's position appears to be founded on ideological grounds rather than legal grounds." This, apparently because I also reminded FPC of its mandate to provide for maximum development in the public interest of the publicly owned rivers of this country.

Where the only resource concerned or affected is power generation at a low-head site, there is every reason for dams to be those of private utilities. I have always supported their construction of low-head dams at such sites.

But where there is the prospect for a multipurpose project, that is another matter.

The editors of the Oregonian know just as well as I do that the private power companies which comprise Pacific Northwest Power Company are not proposing maximum development of the Middle Snake, any more than Idaho Power Company did a decade ago. In its zeal to champion Pacific Northwest Power Company, the Oregonian camouflaged the substance of my legal position. It obviously did so because it could not refute that position.

The point I made is in fact irrefutable. The FPC, not having been a party to the litigation in the Oregon District Court, is free to deal independently with the issue decided by that court. Moreover, no prohibition in State law nor any lack of authority under State law can void an FPC license or bar the exercise of the FPC's paramount Federal licensing power. This has been the repeated holding of the U.S. Supreme Court. Irrespective of State law, then, the FPC can endow WPPSS—a public body competent under Washington State law to generate and sell power—with independent Federal authority under a Federal license to construct a dam on a navigable stream belonging to the United States located outside the State of Washington.

This is a far cry from the Oregonian's characterization of my legal position as being that a Federal court has no authority over the Federal Power Commission.

In a second editorial, the Oregonian again bleated the call of the Pacific Northwest Power Co. with respect to the fish problem on the Middle Snake. After one private utility has killed off what fish there were above the Salmon River, we are told that only another private utility can save the fish below the Salmon.

I think the people of this area have seen enough wreckage of Snake River resources at the hands of private utilities.

It is regrettable that the Oregonian seeks its legal advice from patently biased quarters. It is even more regrettable that the Oregonian falls so often to speak out on major power issues on behalf of the general public interest, in the great tradition of the press.

Interconnection of the Pacific Northwest and Southwest, and development of the Middle Snake River are issues which will help shape the future of the Northwest, just as did the arrival of BPA power in Cascade Locks. If we allow private parties to work out their own special solutions, outside the framework of the public interest, we have only ourselves to blame.

It will be most regrettable if controversies over the intertie issue and the maximum power development of the Middle Snake are not settled on a negotiated basis that places the long-time public interest ahead of all other issues.

For a good many years, great progress was being made in the maximum river basin development of the Pacific Northwest, based upon a program of joint venture between Government and private utilities that would result in the pooling of power and a fair distribution of that power to the private utilities for sale to their customers and to public power bodies for distribution to their customers. Such a program was aimed at providing people living in the great potential hydroelectric power areas of the West with low-cost power so vitally needed for an ever-expanding economy, new job opportunities, new business, and an ever better standard of living for our people.

I have always supported such a program, and I will continue to do so.

It gives assurance to private utilities of an adequate supply of power, fair and reasonable but not exorbitant profits and a maximum rather than an inadequate development of the hydroelectric power resources of the Pacific Northwest. Such a joint venture approach should be returned to by the Government and by the public utilities in the solution of existing intertie connection issues and Middle Snake development proposals. I intend to continue to work to that end.

I shall continue to insist that the fishery problems on the Middle Snake and the Salmon Rivers should be protected to the maximum extent possible consonant with any greater public interest that the facts may show exist. I am very much of the opinion that much more can and should be done to protect fishery interests before final decisions are made concerning which of several alternatives should be agreed to for the development of maximum power resources of these stretches of river water.

The public utilities are entitled to be in on this development, but they are not entitled to control it, for such a control could very well give them a stranglehold on the throat of maximum potential economic expansion throughout the West.

The future of our great natural resource area of this Nation calls for industry as well as Government to exercise the highest possible degree of industrial statesmanship in facing up to these tremendously complex economic issues.

If such a course of statesmanship is followed, those who follow us 25 years from tonight will be speaking at other Cascade Locks dinners, giving thanks to the fact that our generation kept faith with the economic and political statesmanship of Charles McNary, George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, Franklin Roosevelt, and the many other leaders of the generation just before ours who had the vision to develop the great Bonneville Administration, along with the Federal multiple-purpose dam system of which Cascade Locks is a good example of its beneficiaries.

We can best honor those leaders of the past tonight by rededicating ourselves to support in our time further programs aimed at the maximum development of the hydroelectric power potential of the West.

TONGUE POINT NAVAL FACILITY, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss two subjects this afternoon. The first involves a very important economic issue in my State which has become known as the Tongue Point issue. I have spoken about it before at this session of

Congress; I shall undoubtedly talk about it again on various occasions before Congress adjourns, unless at an early date the administration carries out what I believe is the very clear obligation it owes to the people of my State to see to it that the Tongue Point facility is put to suitable use.

As I have said before, the Tongue Point Naval Facility, at Astoria, Oreg., became obsolete to the then use of the U.S. Navy. Once the administration satisfied me that the installation was obsolete to the use of the Navy, I did not ask that the administration continue to operate the naval base for an obsolete purpose, for that would be an inexcusable waste of the taxpayers' money. But I did say to the administration, "However, there can be no excuse for junking a wonderful permanent facility, in connection with which the Government admits it paid at least \$14 million." But, Mr. President, this point is now under serious dispute; and I think that when I come forward with the final proof it will be found that the Government paid more than \$14 million for the development of this project. Be that as it may, one cannot justify wasting \$14 million.

I have stated in conference after conference with representatives of this administration, including, on several occasions, the President of the United States himself, that the deactivating of this naval base has created in Astoria, Oreg., in my judgment—and I do not think it is disputable—the most depressed economic municipality or metropolitan area in the entire country; and I am aware that there are some other seriously depressed areas, including area after area in West Virginia and elsewhere in the Appalachian region. The U.S. Government gave cause for the people of Astoria area to rely upon the economy created by this wonderful naval installation.

As I have said before, the buildings are permanent; and many of them are as fine as some of the fine Federal buildings in Washington, D.C., or elsewhere in the country. I say to the many who have discussed with me the possible conversion of these buildings into business uses or industrial uses, that it is difficult to convert them into such uses; but they provide a magnificent facility for any one of a good number of Federal uses. Although I am the spokesman, by assignment of my Democratic colleagues on the Oregon congressional delegation, for the presentation of Oregon's case in regard to this matter, I repeat that I speak for the united Democratic members of that delegation in urging that the administration do everything possible to find a Federal use for this property.

Through the majority leader and the senior Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee has been apprised of the continuing interest of the White House in its endeavor to find a Federal use for this property; and, therefore, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has been urged to keep the administration advised as to the requests of various departments of the Government for appropriations for new installations. The request is that when there comes from a department a recommendation for a new

installation, there first be made an analysis as to whether Tongue Point can be used for the purposes of the installation requested. Several weeks ago Mr. Boutin, the head of the General Services Administration, advised the Oregon delegation that there have been occasions when the General Services Administration has been advised by some agency of the Government that Congress had approved funds for a new installation of which the General Services Administration up to that time was not aware. His office was then called, and the suggestion was made that it have architects proceed with the planning of the new installation. When Mr. Boutin mentioned this, I said that if our Government really has become so large and so complex that we do not know until after congressional action has been taken that there are requests for new installations, and that funds for them have been appropriated despite the possibility that Tongue Point might be used to serve the same purposes, it is about time that we establish a watchdog committee to take jurisdiction over both the Congress and the departments of the administration, in order to see to it that the most economic use of existing surplus facilities is made.

I know there are those who would like to junk Tongue Point; and of course the junk price would be but a pittance compared to its true value. I know that in my own State there are those who would like to take advantage of that kind of economic benefit. I have no doubt, also, that in the Government there are those who would like to get this problem "off their backs" and would like to see the property disposed of on some basis. My responsibility is to make clear to both groups that this property should be used for a purpose which will give to the American taxpayers a maximum value as a result of its use.

The President has assured me—and has carried out his assurance—that this property would not be junked, at least until every possible effort had been made to find a suitable public use for it—either Federal or Federal-State use.

On another occasion I spoke about the controversy which developed between the Oregon congressional delegation and the General Services Administration when it was clear to me that the regional office of the General Services Administration apparently either did not know or, in spite of its knowledge, was following a course of action which could not be reconciled with the White House wishes, and published in Oregon newspapers certain advertisements which left the impression that bids would be taken on June 24 for the property and that the property would be sold on the basis of the bids. In fairness to the regional office and to the national office of the General Services Administration, I say there is no question that the bidders had at least constructive notice, if not actual notice, that they would be subject to the rules, regulations, and terms of the Surplus Property Disposal Act.

The fine print served notice on them that the General Services Administration was under no legal obligation to accept any bid, but that bids were being

sought in order to find out, at least, what private bidders might wish to bid for the property at that time. I shall have more to say about that subject in a formal statement that I shall make from manuscript in a moment. I repeat that we have stopped the junking of the property to date. We have the assurance of the administration that there will be no renewal of any attempt to dispose of the property under the Surplus Property Act until some time this fall. We have the assurance of the administration that it is exercising every effort to find a public use for Tongue Point. All I can say today is that I think it is extremely important that the administration intensify its efforts, because in fairness to my State, this most depressed municipal area in the country is entitled to better treatment from the present administration. It is entitled to a clear showing that there is no possible Federal use to which the property could be put which would result in an efficient and economic use of the property.

I say to the administration today, "You cannot make such a showing, for you have had submitted to you already a series of proposals that in my judgment would result in an efficient and economic use of the property; and it would redound to the great economic advantage not only of the Astoria area but of the Nation."

I sincerely hope that the administration will not only double, but quadruple, its efforts to find a Federal use for the property. I am sure the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], will understand if I smile at him as I discuss the subject today, because he presided the last time I spoke at length on Tongue Point, for about 3½ hours, as I remember. I shall never forget the Senator's graciousness. I shall never forget the kind things he said to me when the speech was over in respect to the merits of the prima facie case which in his judgment, at least, I made on that occasion.

I desire my friend from Hawaii to know that the case is now better than even a prima facie case. The administration has been unable to meet on its merits the case which the senior Senator from Oregon, speaking in behalf of the Democrats in the Oregon delegation, has made in regard to the Tongue Point issue. I think of the millions of dollars being asked for necessary facilities for other Federal functions elsewhere in our country and around the world. I repeat to my administration, "In my judgment you have no case for disposing of Tongue Point under the Federal Surplus Property Act."

Mr. President, a Senator cannot take the position I have taken and not find himself in conflict with certain forces in his own State. So I have been subjected to criticism from certain economic interests in my State that would like to get Tongue Point for a song. They have never yet made a case showing that even if it were given to them, the property would be used economically. I would fight giving it to them, because that would violate the Morse formula.

I shall fight to protect the Morse formula in its application to my State as well as to any other State. But to illustrate my point, even if the property were given to them, they have not yet come forward with a plan which would show a use of the Tongue Point facility that would be to the economic advantage of my State to the extent to which it is potentially capable of being put. So I intend to oppose, as long as there is any chance of getting a Federal use of Tongue Point, any attempt on the part of any group in my State to obtain Tongue Point for a song. But any time that any economic group in my State desires to come forward with a blueprint plan that will show that Tongue Point can be put to an economic use which would result in the jobs, in the economic expansion, and the creation of greater economic productive power in my State, they have an ally in their senior Senator.

I make these introductory remarks today because I think they are fitting in connection with a reply that I now make to an anti-Morse newspaper in my State. I probably should qualify that statement by referring to the newspaper as the most powerful anti-Morse newspaper in my State, because, except a couple of small newspapers, they are all anti-Morse newspapers. But I do not intend to let the criticisms of the Oregonian go unanswered officially. So I comment on that subject today from the floor of the Senate.

Certain newspapers such as the Oregonian, have criticized me in slanted editorials for what happened to the city of Astoria's \$920,000 bid for a proposed negotiated purchase of the Tongue Point property. That is \$920,000 for a facility in which the American people have a minimum of \$14 million invested, and, in my judgment, if it were put to proper use, it would be worth more than \$14 million.

These attacks are typical of some segments of the press that are doing their level best to make a bad deal look good.

What these newspapers do not tell the people of Oregon is this: In a report dated April 19, 1963, the Administrator of the General Services Administration said:

On several occasions subsequent to the April 26, 1962, meeting here in Washington with the city officials, our regional representatives held meetings with the local city officials, and on each occasion tried to make it abundantly clear that we could not accept an offer from the city if it constituted a paper proposal with the real intention being to immediately resell to a private entity.

We have now received, here in Washington, the city's offer to purchase the remaining portion of the property for \$920,000. Although as mentioned above, there is statutory authority to negotiate sales to local public bodies at fair value, we cannot abuse this negotiating authority by a negotiated sale to a public body which intends to immediately transfer its title to a private entity. We therefore propose to reject this negotiated sale proposal because it is apparent both from the offer received and earlier correspondence herein referred to that the city does not intend to retain ownership of the property.

Despite the crystal clear statement of the General Services Administration, the

Oregonian in an editorial last month stated:

Should Senator Morse fail to find a Federal agency to occupy Tongue Point, his last minute dynamiting of Astoria's proposal could well cost the taxpayers many thousands of dollars.

Thus, the Oregonian attempted to condone something the General Services Administration said it could not do without abusing its negotiating authority. In other words, had GSA accepted the \$920,000 bid, it would have violated the law, but apparently this would have pleased the Oregonian.

The Surplus Property Act makes perfectly clear that if property is to be sold to a public body, such as the city of Astoria, it must be on the basis of the understanding of a good-faith intent on the part of that public body to put it to a public use.

I say once again to some of the councilmen and the mayor of the city of Astoria, who have never missed an opportunity to seek to reflect upon the senior Senator from Oregon because he stood up and fought for the public interests against their attempt to raid the public interest, that their offer was not a good-faith offer under the Surplus Property Act. It was a subterfuge offer. It was a "gimmick." It was an offer which was designed to permit them to be used as the conduit, as the vehicle for transferring property which they were entitled to buy if they wanted to put it to a public use to a private group of businessmen, with whom they had entered into an agreement to sell the property for \$950,000.

I shall always be proud of the fact that the senior Senator from Oregon had something to do with the stopping of that raid on the Public Treasury.

Any time the city of Astoria wants to buy Tongue Point for the public use and shows that it will be a purchase in good faith and that the city intends to retain Tongue Point for a public use—and offers a fair price for it—the senior Senator from Oregon will do all he can to assist the council and the mayor of Astoria to obtain the property. But I do not intend to sit here and countenance a subterfuge being practiced upon all the taxpayers of the United States by any group in my State or in any other State.

As senior Senator from Oregon, it is my duty to the people of my State, as well as to the people of the United States, to make sure that disposals of property belonging to all the people of our country are handled in full compliance with the law. If the Oregonian—and similar newspapers suffering from moral myopia—object to my defense of the taxpayers' interest, I can only say that I am proud to have their opposition.

The fact that the bids on the portions of Tongue Point property give evidence of being inadequate makes it all the more important that the project be reviewed intensively at the White House level for a Federal use that will prove to be to the advantage of the United States and the economy of the Astoria area.

My work to attain this objective will continue despite any editorials that seek to propagandize their readers into be-

lieving that Tongue Point should be sold for \$920,000 or any such amounts as are represented by the bids of June 24.

The Oregonian and some other newspapers object to my earlier reference to the proposal that the City of Astoria buy the property for \$920,000 and then sell it immediately for \$950,000, as a steal. In view of the fact that the proposal of the City of Astoria to buy the property for \$920,000 and immediately sell it to private business interests for \$950,000 would have been in violation of the law if the General Services Administration had gone along with the deal, and in view of the fact that the amount of money involved was such a small amount in relation to the true economic potential of the Tongue Point installation, I repeat that the entire proposal was properly described as an attempted economic steal.

In fact, I think the low amount involved in the proposal probably helped create an impression in the Pacific Northwest that the Tongue Point property may be available eventually at an exceedingly low price such as was offered for it in the bids on June 24.

I wish to make clear to the people of Oregon that if it develops that the Federal Government finally decides that the property cannot be put to a Federal use, I shall then do everything I can to help business interests in Oregon obtain the property for private industrial development. However, I agree with many businessmen in Oregon who have written me on this subject that every effort should be made to try to find a Federal use for the property or a combined Federal-State use for the property. It is as clear to them as it is to me that a Government use of the property would undoubtedly provide the State with the greatest amount of economic return in the form of jobs and economic expansion in the Astoria area.

Only a few days ago the President assured me again that a most thorough survey of possible Federal uses of the Tongue Point property is being made by Federal officials.

I am doing everything I can in carrying out the obligation I owe the people of Oregon to convince the administration that Tongue Point should be reactivated for some Federal use. The Democratic members of the Oregon delegation are being of wonderful assistance to me. If we fail, it will not be because we did not try.

Also, may I point out that if it is finally decided that the property must be sold any business or group of businessmen in the State or anywhere in the country will then have a renewed opportunity to make their best offer for the property.

A few days ago I made a brief reference to this subject matter as I discussed on the floor of the Senate the testimony of the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Keppel, before my Subcommittee on Education, which was then holding hearings on the administration's omnibus education bill. Commissioner Keppel—as was done by many witnesses during the preceding weeks—called attention to the fact that we must do something quickly about training and retraining men and women who will find themselves unemployed soon because of automation.

The statistics have not been refuted, but have been agreed to by witness after witness. Those statistics indicate that if automation were stopped today and if there were no more, it would be necessary to provide 35,000 new jobs a week for some time to take care of the losses of jobs which will continue to accrue because of automation operating at its present level.

We all know that automation will continue for years. The employment disjuncture which will result almost defies the imagination. We must consider not only the loss of employment caused by automation but also the need for new jobs to be created for the increasing number who will go into the labor market week by week. The statistics show that it will be necessary to provide an additional 65,000 new jobs a week to take care of the population explosion. The total need already is for 90,000 new jobs a week.

Various witnesses discussed statistics of the nature I have just stated, but I think one of the very best discussions was the discussion of Commissioner Keppel. It was in the course of that discussion that he made his plea for the development of vocational training centers. It was in the course of the discussion in the hearing room that I said I thought it was important that the administration's attention be called to the need. I especially refer to the Tongue Point installation as a great training center. I had already notified the administration as to the information that had been supplied to me by one of the outstanding men in the field of vocational training in my State, in charge of vocational training in the Springfield (Oreg.) school system. He came to see me about Tongue Point. It was pointed out in that conference that it is made to order for a great vocational training center, where several thousand persons could be trained each year. There was a great facility there for an institution for vocational training.

There is a need for some in other parts of the country, too. That proposal had been made earlier to Mr. Ralph Dungan, whom the President had assigned to follow through on the Tongue Point matter and keep the White House informed as to the potentialities that might develop for the Federal use of Tongue Point.

After listening to Commissioner Keppel the other day, I wrote Mr. Dungan another letter, in which I called attention to various aspects of the Tongue Point problem, with especial reference to Commissioner Keppel's testimony; and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted at this point in the Record, and that excerpts of Commissioner Keppel's testimony that I sent to the White House also be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JULY 11, 1963.

MR. RALPH DUNGAN,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: Yes, it is Tongue Point again.

You probably have noted in the press recently several stories to the effect that the

Federal Government is concerned about the need for developing vocational training centers to help meet the loss of jobs caused by automation and the employment problems faced by school dropouts.

As I told you in a previous letter, Commissioner Francis Keppel discussed a phase of this problem in his testimony before my Subcommittee on Education. I am enclosing a copy of the hearing record, and I have marked the excerpts dealing with this part of Commissioner Keppel's testimony.

In my opinion, the administration should draw together all of the recommendations of its various spokesmen on the need for retraining centers and then give consideration to the possibility of making Tongue Point a vocational training center for various Federal programs that are in the incubation stage.

This spring, I had a conference with Mr. L. John Lipney who teaches in the vocational education department at Springfield Senior High School, Springfield, Oreg. Mr. Lipney advanced several excellent suggestions for possible uses of the Tongue Point facility. He feels that it could be used to train foreign service technicians and teacher trainees; as a manpower retraining program; and a vocation training school.

You may find the attached copy of my April 15 correspondence with Mr. Lipney of some interest in this connection, particularly the Senal brochure and the Sao Paulo photographs.

The thrust of Mr. Lipney's proposal is that training of foreign technicians in a residential center in this country could be accomplished more efficiently and expeditiously than in centers situated in their own country. An extremely useful byproduct of this approach would be the fact that the technicians who were trained in an area such as Astoria would carry back home with them excellent impressions of our democratic way of life.

Furthermore, I still think that the Peace Corps and the foreign aid organization should give more favorable consideration to the possibility of using Tongue Point as a vocational training center for young foreigners brought here from foreign lands along the lines of the proposal that Fritz Rarig made to us some months ago. I would rather spend some of our foreign aid money training young foreigners in our own country in various phases of vocational training than spending the money abroad.

I am enclosing a copy of a statement I am making in Oregon this weekend on Tongue Point, because with the passage of time, the demands for Federal action are becoming more intensified.

Incidentally, I think it would be very helpful if you had a talk with Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and assured him, as I have, that it would be very helpful if he would keep us advised as to requests that various Government departments and agencies are making for the construction of new installations that might not be needed if they gave consideration to a Federal use of Tongue Point for the same purpose.

Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXCERPTS FROM S. 580 HEARING RECORD, JUNE 25, 1963, SENATE EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Commissioner KEPPEL. * * * Three, to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to States for the establishment of experimental residential vocational schools. For this purpose, the sum of \$15 million is authorized for fiscal 1964.

Senator YARBOROUGH. What do you mean by "residence"?

Commissioner KEPPEL. It would mean that these schools would be particularly for young people, probably in the slum areas in the cities, who would be sent to schools where

they would live, board, and be trained for the period necessary, which might vary from 1 to 3 years, to be trained for job skills.

This is a proposal which I believe has been considered before by this committee and others, the notion, of course, being that, in some cases, perhaps tragically in many cases, it is desirable that the young man be put in a setting where the school can provide far more service than is available to him in the home or tragic imitation of a home that he comes from.

This is the proposal.

Senator MORSE. Will you permit an interruption for a commercial?

Commissioner KEPPEL. Yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Will you see if you can help me, for I have been impressing upon this administration the ideal location for one of these great vocational rehabilitation centers. West Virginia and Oregon are at the bottom of the totem pole of depressed areas. This administration, I feel, has done a great injustice to my State, and nothing yet to correct it. There is a great establishment at Astoria, Oreg., a naval base that was closed down some years ago. It is a perfect facility, and the President is very much interested in finding a use for that base, because he knows that Senator MORSE is a persistent fellow.

Get this into the White House, will you? I even suggested that they use Tongue Point as a vocational educational center for foreign students, from Latin America and east Asia, but as you know, in recent months, I have taken the position that I am not going to support taxpayers' funds for the development of underdeveloped areas elsewhere in the world, until we take care of some of our own needs first. You will want to be prepared not only on this point, but on every other point. They will say to you, "Keppel, where are you going to get the money?" That is what they will ask us.

So you might want to say to them, "Take some of it away from France and West Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal and Belgium, and Norway and Sweden, who are more prosperous now than we are, and let's do something about these people here in this country."

You have inspired me. I am speaking each day on the floor of the Senate about this giveaway program. I am going to use some of these figures this afternoon.

But, joking aside, because there was a certain amount of joking in my statement—I am dead serious now, when I tell you this is a sound proposal.

We must do something about vocational training in this country, and fast, with automation costing us 30,000 to 35,000 jobs a week. The population explosion creates the need for an additional 25,000 jobs a week, with a total of some 60,000 jobs a week that we have to find to take care of automation and the population explosion. We had better set up centers such as this.

Of course, if the administration will buy your bill of goods, and it better, I think there is only one place that it ought to go. Please continue.

Mr. MORSE. I also sent to Mr. Dungan yesterday a copy of a letter I sent to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN]; and I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] be printed at this point in the Record.

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

JULY 11, 1963.

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

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: You will recall that some time ago I spoke to you about the desire

of the White House to find an appropriate Federal use for the Tongue Point naval installation at Astoria, Oreg.

Tongue Point was an extremely active naval base during World War II. It was used originally as a naval air station and later by the Columbia River Group, Pacific Reserve Fleet. It was officially reported to the General Services Administration as excess property in October 1961. Since that time, it has been maintained in excellent condition by the General Services Administration and is available for almost immediate use by any Federal agency that might be interested.

The Tongue Point property consists of 882.54 acres of land, improved with 365 buildings and structures. According to GSA, the total acquisition cost was \$14,643,930. Included in the facilities are an administration building, warehouses, dwellings, three hangar-type buildings, offices, a hospital, a heating plant, several shops, eight well-constructed piers, a marginal wharf and three seaplane ramps, railroad trackage, storm and sanitary sewers.

Enclosed is a brochure describing Tongue Point in some detail. Photographs depicting portions of the installation are included in the brochure. I believe you will be impressed, as I am, by the excellent condition of the facilities at this base. They could be used for numerous purposes with very little alteration.

The closing of this installation has probably made Astoria, Oreg., the most economic depressed area in the entire country, even worse than some of the depressed areas in West Virginia and the rest of the Appalachian area.

For example, the population of Astoria for 1962 totaled slightly over 9,000. Since that time hundreds of people have moved away from the city and surrounding area. In 1956, the population was 12,331. One has only to walk along the main street of Astoria to appreciate the seriousness of the situation. Every block of the central business section of the city contains vacant store buildings, many of which are relatively new. Indications of economic depression are evident throughout the city; business firms in large numbers have left the city, compounding its economic distress.

President Kennedy has appointed Mr. Ralph Dungan of his staff to represent him in consultation with various departments and agencies in an endeavor to find a suitable Federal use for this fine installation.

The fact is that Tongue Point has become a cause celebre in Oregon and will rise to plague the Kennedy administration if it is finally junked or sold at a low price to some concern that will not make use of it for job-creating and economic expansion purposes.

Ralph Dungan has suggested, in behalf of the President, that Senator MANSFIELD and I seek your cooperation in keeping us advised as to the appropriations requests of various agencies appearing before your Committee asking for funds for new installations. Certain appropriations of this type might not be needed at all if one or more agencies were required to make use of Tongue Point.

After you have had an opportunity to review the material I am enclosing, Senator MANSFIELD and I will ask to confer with you about it.

With kindest personal regards.

Cordially,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. I close the discussion of this subject matter today by pleading again—and I use the term advisedly—that this administration give direct evidence that we have not permitted government to become so complex that our left hand does not know what our right hand is doing, or that we are not aware

of the many requests for additional appropriations for new services to be installed in new facilities, when at the same time we have such a wonderful and magnificent permanent facility being maintained by the Federal Government, in vacancy at the moment, which, with relatively small expenditures, could be very quickly rehabilitated into any one of a number of potential uses. But today I particularly emphasize the vocational training use.

It will be noted, when the letter I send to Mr. Dungan is read, that I renewed a request for the consideration of another phase of the vocational training program that I presented to the White House several weeks ago. I say most respectfully to the White House it is just as sound today as it was when I first proposed it. That is a proposal to combine into the vocational training program a program for people in our own country who need retraining, and training in vocational skills in the first instance, a program that will take care of a very ugly fact that exists in our society today, about which Commissioner Keppel testified eloquently—the problem of the many thousands of school dropouts. We are living in the midst of one of the most serious school dropout problems, in the District of Columbia.

There are tens of thousands of them each year across this Nation. Where are they going to get jobs? The testimony is that a very large percentage of school dropouts will become unemployable. They are not trained for skilled jobs in an automated age. All of us have an obligation to the dropouts. If we do not follow a course of action that will train them for employment, we shall be faced with a stupendous bill for our failure to stand up to this issue and take our heads out of the sand. We shall have to pay an increased bill in public welfare, in unemployment insurance, and in maintaining larger prisons, for we shall have to watch out for unemployed people for whom society does not make jobs available.

So I plead not merely for the development of Tongue Point. This is not the only facility we must develop to meet this need. In my judgment, we need several Tongue Points in the immediate future, developed as vocational training centers to meet the problem of automation in this country.

I urged weeks ago, and urge it upon my administration again this afternoon on the floor of the Senate, that we ought to bring into this country several thousand young men and women from the most underdeveloped areas of the world—Africa, Latin America, southeast Asia—for training in skills that will make it possible, when we send them back to their villages, to become teachers in the development of vocational skills. I have gone into villages in the underdeveloped areas of the world. One cannot go into them without coming away from them fully appreciative of the fact that there is little hope for the development of a system of economic freedom among them unless vocational skills are first developed. We ought to bring several thousand of them into this country a year, training some of them at Tongue

Point, some in the Middle West, and some in the East, in keeping with a well planned blueprint program, which I had the chairman of the board of directors of International House of Pennsylvania University, Mr. Frederick Rarig, submit to this administration months ago.

In my judgment, one cannot go over the recommendation of this dedicated man, who is counsel for one of the largest of the chemical corporations of America, Rohm and Haas, in Philadelphia, and not agree with the senior Senator from Oregon that here is a great opportunity for the administration. If we should bring thousands of young men and women into this country and train them in various skills, and give them the prestige and standing that would accrue from such training in the United States, and send them back to their homelands and villages in the underdeveloped areas of the world as teachers of vocational skills, we would do much more to strengthen a so-called foreign aid program than we could possibly do by many aspects of the foreign aid program, to which subject I shall direct my attention in a few moments.

As I have said to the White House "This proposal calls for some vision and imagination. It calls for some doing. Do not tell me it cannot be done." The word "cannot" should be stricken from the vocabulary of those in charge of the foreign policy of this country. On this subject I speak also as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. We are missing a great opportunity by not developing a training program which would help develop skills in human beings in our own country and send them back as economic ambassadors of our system of economic freedom.

I would much prefer, as Senators will note from reading my letter to Mr. Dungan, spending some of that money in this country in such vocational training schools as Mr. Rarig recommended several months ago, than pouring it into some of the underdeveloped areas of the world, knowing, as I do, that much of it does not go into effective training and in the end is wasted.

I hope the administration will take note of the remarks I have made on Tongue Point today, and fully appreciate the fact that the Senator from Oregon has not in the slightest degree ceased to be less than an advocate for this program than he was when he first started his advocacy. On the contrary, I want the administration to know that my degree of advocacy has intensified. I am perfectly convinced that those of us who are urging a Federal use of Tongue Point are right, and that the administration will be dead wrong if it does not proceed to see to it that this fine facility is saved from the junkyard.

FOREIGN AID SHOULD BE REVITALIZED WITH NEW GROUND RULES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now to my daily discussion, on every day that I am present, of foreign aid. The markup of the foreign aid bill was started this morning in the Foreign Relations Committee. I hope the Senate

will come forth with a better bill—a bill which meets the rising demand of the American people for some drastic renovation of the administration's foreign aid bill. I did not hear very much this morning which gives me any enthusiastic hope. However, I say good naturedly to my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee that they are not yet through the Senate with their bill. I also wish to add quickly that neither are they through the Foreign Relations Committee with their bill. As the debate within the committee continues, and amendment after amendment is presented, and the roll is called for the record, I have hopes that the bill will at least be substantially improved. It needs to be thoroughly renovated and ventilated. One of the reasons why I speak each day on the bill is that I aim at least to help along the process of ventilating the bill.

Mr. President, I am contemplating the introduction at the proper time of an amendment to the Act for International Development which would be a drastic but apparently necessary change in the AID program.

First, Mr. President, I contemplate proposing that, with the exception of a few existing irrevocable commitments, all U.S. military and economic aid be terminated as of July 1, 1965.

Second, thereafter, no aid shall be extended to any nation unless it meets the standards which the United States will thereafter require as a *sine qua non* of aid.

And third, I shall propose spelling out in considerable detail the conditions—the “strings,” if you will—under which aid would henceforth be extended.

It would be the purpose of this amendment to reorient drastically the totality of our aid programs.

At the present time, the United States is providing military and economic assistance to not less than 96 different countries. This fact in itself creates the impression that it is more in the interest of the United States to extend aid, than in the interest of the individual nations to seek and to receive aid. It creates the impression on the part of recipient nations that they are being discriminated against if they do not get United States aid, and that they have a right to receive assistance from the United States regardless of whether their own actions are consistent with the interests of the United States.

As a consequence of this attitude we have been extending aid in some most incongruous situations.

We have taxed our own people to aid nations not willing to require their own citizens to pay comparable taxes, based upon the principle of their ability to pay.

We have given assistance to countries not willing to undertake land reform essential to their own internal stability.

We have aided nations in which economic and political stability is so tenuous that the flight of their own capital exceeds the input of the American taxpayer's dollar.

We have supported totalitarian regimes threatened by internal revolt of

their own peoples seeking greater control over their own destinies.

We have given military aid to one country, and economic aid to another, when the actual effect of both types of aid has been to enable nations friendly to the United States to arm against each other.

It is amazing to me that aid programs under Republicans and Democrats have managed to dig us into this position. Partly responsible is the fact that we gradually slipped from postwar economic and military assistance to industrial nations of Europe, to similar types of aid to quite different types of nations, characterized by their nonindustrial character and their lack of political and military experience.

The key to success in any aid program is mutuality of interest as between the donor and the donee. If the donor thinks aid is extended solely to serve the interests of the donor the recipient nation has every right to be suspicious of the aid proffered.

By the same token, if the donee believes that aid is a matter of right and is extended solely to serve the interests of the donee, the nation extending aid has every right to question the desirability of extending assistance.

Members of the Senate have tried for many years now to amend and reshape our aid programs to develop a real mutuality of interest between the United States and nations receiving our assistance. With some few exceptions, these efforts have failed. We have managed to cultivate recrimination abroad, as well as at home. Since the end of the Marshall plan we can count on the fingers of one hand the number of nations we have helped boost into a reasonable degree of economic independence.

We have toyed with superficial ideas. We have tried to reorganize the agency administering aid; we have switched the men in charge of the program. Incidentally, Mr. Bell, the present administrator, is one of the best. There is no question about Mr. Bell's ability; it is a question of the inherent unsoundness of the aid program itself. We have tried to avoid the unsettling effects of annual congressional reviews by the creation of a long-range development loan concept; we have tried, without success, to force the administration to spell out plans for terminating aid in certain countries through the Mansfield amendment.

The result has been a circumvention of the Mansfield amendment. We have tried to see to it that military aid did not go to Latin America except in connection with hemispheric defense, which was the intent of the Morse amendment. But time and time again the administration has successfully circumvented the Morse amendment. I hope that this year the proposal can be tied down with even more specific restrictions than has heretofore been the case. I understand that an amendment will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in an attempt to put more blocks in the way of enlarged military aid to Latin America.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Having observed the frequent overthrow of governments in Latin America, and having had no evidence whatsoever that our increasing military aid strengthens hemispheric defense, I can see no reason—and I certainly appreciate the support of the senior Senator from Oregon—why we should continue with a useless, destructive procedure, which is not only a waste of the taxpayers' money, but is actually defeating the alleged purpose of the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I desire to make with respect to military aid to Latin America as proposed by the bill. I took the same position in regard to the bills of previous administrations. That is why I came forth with the Morse amendment, which was adopted by Congress and written into the law, but which has been successfully circumvented by two administrations. I have taken the position that the military aid program this year would weaken, not strengthen, the Alliance for Progress, because the great strength of the Alliance for Progress is its economic purpose of strengthening all of Latin America. To pass a military aid program would result in an injury to the economic program in Latin America and lead to the establishment of different types of military regimes, which frequently use democratic labels and slogans.

We have stated pious hopes of land and tax reforms; we have struggled to guarantee private investments and to secure them against expropriation; we have pushed hard to get other industrial nations to carry part of the load.

Some of these efforts have been successful; but a majority of these efforts have turned out to be superficial palliatives; not meeting the real problem which is a frank recognition that aid is useless and wasted unless both parties believe in the mutuality of the interests being served.

I believe the mutuality of interests between the United States and recipient countries can be simply stated.

What the United States seeks economically in its aid programs is to help to create as rapidly as possible independent states capable of earning their own economic way in the world. We think this can best be done by the route of private enterprise which has proved so phenomenally successful in our own country. But we are not absolutely against public enterprise, of which we have a goodly amount in our own country.

What the United States seeks politically in its aid programs is the promotion of the maximum amount of individual freedom—a freedom of people to choose freely their own public servants.

What the United States seeks militarily in its aid programs is to create military force adequate to prevent the internal overthrow of elected governments, and adequate to deter external attack.

I believe that every one of these interests coincides with the interests of countries in need of external aid.

If we are true to these basic aims of our aid programs, I believe we can promote public acceptance of aid programs

here, as well as abroad. It is when we begin to think of aid programs as political devices to be used to please everyone that we are in trouble.

I believe an amendment along the lines I have suggested would be of inestimable help in getting our aid programs on a firm footing, and I invite Senators to comment on this proposal.

I am perfecting it now. I shall submit it to the Committee on Foreign Relations before the week is over. If I fail to have the amendment adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations, I shall then formally offer it in the Senate and fight for it when the foreign aid bill is before the Senate for debate and consideration.

To the American people, I say, in closing: We are now entering one of the last stages of the foreign aid debate in Congress. We are now marking up the bill in the Committee on Foreign Relations. This means that the Committee on Foreign Relations, in executive session, day in and day out for the immediate future, will go through the administration's foreign aid bill line by line, paragraph by paragraph, and section by section.

I am satisfied that the overwhelming majority of the American people who have made any study of this subject believe that the administration's foreign aid bill should be drastically renovated and ventilated. I urge them to make their views known, for I would have them never forget that American foreign policy belongs to the people of the country, not to this or any other administration.

I am convinced that the foreign aid bill, if passed in its present form or anywhere near its present form, would do irreparable injury to the standing of the United States around the world.

I yield the floor.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on June 27, 1963, the Committee on Commerce reported favorably to the Senate a bill, S. 627, entitled the "Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1963." As a cosponsor of this measure, I take this opportunity to again express my support for it.

Faced with the fact that in the recent past this Nation has dropped from second place to fifth place among the fishing nations of the world, S. 627 is designed to provide much needed assistance to the States in carrying out programs of research and development to help lift one of our oldest industries from its present depressed state. The bill would allow a direct attack on this truly national problem.

In my own State of Rhode Island, the total value of fish and processed fish products amounts to more than \$6.6 million annually. With even the modest expenditures contemplated by this legislation, I am confident that this total can be increased in Rhode Island as well as in every State of the Union.

The bill as reported would provide coordinated aid to the several States in the development of their commercial fisheries by stimulating research and de-

velopment at the local level. In order to achieve this purpose, the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to appropriate among the States for 5 years an annual sum of \$5 million on the basis of a formula designed to give each State a share proportionate with its commercial fishery activity as compared with total commercial fishery activity in the United States. Under this formula, it is estimated that Rhode Island would receive approximately \$28,000.

In addition, the sum of \$500,000 for each of the first 2 years of the program and \$750,000 for each of the last 3 years of the program will be available to the Secretary for allocation to the States as he may determine, but giving preference to those States suffering a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural causes and to those States in which a new commercial fishery can be developed where none existed before. This provision will provide the administrative flexibility necessary to meet current State needs while strengthening the program as one for obtaining immediate beneficial results.

The bill also provides that no State shall receive less than one-half of 1 percent nor more than 10 percent of the total to be distributed under the formula written into the bill. Thus the minimum amount which would be available to a State would be sufficient to finance at least one project in that State.

Another factor which should be considered is that the Federal share of any project will not exceed 75 percent of the total cost; the State will pay the remaining 25 percent. Such a percentage is well within the means of the various States, and it helps to insure that only programs of substance which can reasonably be expected to produce results in the immediate future will be undertaken.

I believe these positive features of the bill plus the overwhelming support expressed for it during the hearings conducted by the Committee on Commerce are impressive evidence that this legislation is both worthy and urgently needed.

I sincerely urge Senators to give S. 627 most careful consideration.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to comment on S. 627, the bill to which the Senator from Rhode Island has made reference to provide aid to our fisheries. It is a bill sponsored by my colleague BOB BARTLETT, and I am a cosponsor. I am heartily in favor of this proposed legislation. It is one of the striking facts about this fisheries bill, to which sufficient attention has not been called, that this Congress and past Congresses have rendered very great aid to those who produce food from the land, but no corresponding effort has been undertaken to aid those who produce food from the sea. There has been a great disparity between the aid given our farmers and the aid not given our fishermen.

I believe it is time for Congress to give to those who produce food from the sea attention and solicitude equal to what has been given to those who produce food from the land.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Alaska, which is a seafaring State. His support is very greatly appreciated.

AMENDMENT OF LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS STABILIZATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3845) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is House bill 3845. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. GRUENING obtained the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his consideration of House bill 3845. It is a very deserving bill which will help to "zero in" on the purpose of the original legislation, which was to be of assistance to some of the very small lead and zinc mine operators, in order to help them remain alive and to help keep their mines in operation, so they can be useful and productive in the event of national emergency.

This program has been very economically operated.

A quirk of the original act which this bill would correct is that under the original program such aid could be extended to those who, from the mines they operate, produce only limited amounts of lead and zinc as a part of their other operations.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska and the other members of the committee for reporting the bill so promptly and for giving the Senate a chance to consider it, and perhaps to have the bill enacted into law.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

I believe this is a desirable piece of legislation. The purpose of the bill is to assure that payments under the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of the last Congress are received only by small producers of lead and zinc. The bill would limit the application of the subsidy—which would equate the difference between the market price and the stabilization price—to those who have not sold more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc, combined, in the last 7 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why do we need this lead and zinc subsidy program at all in view of the fact that we have in the national stockpile close to a billion dollars worth of lead and zinc or about five times as much as we could possibly use in any foreseeable emergency?

Mr. GRUENING. That question was passed on and was settled in the last Congress. This bill does not attempt to reopen that issue, but simply attempts to provide participation for the few small producers who might be excluded from participation in this program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But why should we expand an act which never should have been placed on the statute books in the first place?

Furthermore, I understand that those who are in charge of our defense now say we do not even need the existing supply of lead and zinc. The last report which I have seen shows that we now have on hand 1,302,000 short tons of lead. It cost a total of \$384 million; but the market value of that tonnage as of December 31, 1961, was only \$266,900,000. So the taxpayers were confronted with a loss of \$117 million, and since then the market has declined even further.

Furthermore, the maximum objective of lead, even for an all-out 3-year war, with all production stopped, was, so we were told, only 286,000 tons, whereas we have 1,302,000 tons—enough for 15 years; yet we are carrying on a program which has substantially increased the production of lead.

I wonder whether the Senator from Alaska will tell us why we should continue buying this lead and zinc and why it would not be more advisable to advance the termination date on all of this program and begin a liquidation of our inventories.

Mr. GRUENING. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that if our stockpile has increased to the extent he states—although we did not hear these objections before our subcommittee—the way to proceed is to establish quotas on imports. The lead and zinc industry is one of our domestic industries which has been sorely crippled by the competition of foreign imports, many of them coming from countries which have shared in our foreign-aid program. If the Senator from Delaware believes the imports of these commodities are excessive, I believe the way to deal with that problem is to establish quotas, rather than to cripple our domestic producers. Already we have given all kinds of aid to foreign industries, with resulting disadvantage to our domestic industries.

The lead and zinc industry certainly is in need of help. I know of no other industry, except possibly the gold mining industry, which is in greater need.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I do not understand that this bill has any connection with that argument. If the tariff laws need amendment they can be amended. If quotas are needed they can be established. It may be that a justification for such action can be shown. If so I may favor the imposition of an increased tariff on lead and zinc imports, but I am opposed to these subsidies. I would far prefer that course to a proposal to increase the subsidies. This subsidy is nothing more than a so-called Brannan plan for the mining industry. For example, under the program the producers of lead can sell the lead they produce at the market price—

which today is approximately 10 or 11 cents a pound—and then can bill the U.S. Government for the difference between that price and 14½ cents a pound; and 75 percent of that difference will be paid by the taxpayers.

No other industry receives such a favorable break.

So why not do away with all this program and meet the issue head on. If we have to increase the tariffs introduce legislation to do so; or, if it is necessary to establish quotas do that. But certainly let us not increase our already overloaded stockpile. About a year and a half ago, the President said that he was astonished to find that we had approximately \$8.5 billion tied up in inventories of so-called strategic materials. However, the most recent report issued by the committee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Virginia shows that the total for all such materials in our stockpile has actually increased by around \$136 million in the last 18 months.

We should be starting an orderly liquidation of this stockpile rather than an expansion of the program.

Mr. GRUENING. I say in all kindness, Mr. President, to the Senator from Delaware that that is not the issue in connection with this small bill. The Lead and Zinc Stabilization Act, which was enacted in the last Congress, is the one to which his argument should apply. This measure protects only the small producers, so as to enable them to get the benefit of this act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then why not amend the bill so as to see to it that the taxpayers receive their share of the protection? After all, we now have nearly \$1 billion tied up in the stockpiles of these two commodities.

Why keep on supporting a bankrupt idea?

The time is long past due when we can afford to keep these unnecessary programs going. Our inventories of zinc are just as bad. The most recent report I have seen shows that there are on hand 1,580,000 short tons of zinc. We are told that in the event of an all-out 3-year war the maximum needs would be 178,000 tons. Therefore, we have 1,402,000 tons of zinc more than we need. That is enough zinc to meet our needs for 15 to 18 years. Still there is before the Senate a bill which would result in piling up more and more production.

We shall never solve the problem of excess inventories by subsidizing increased production and adding to the inventories. The time is overdue when we should stop. I would support the bill as written if the Senator would merely add another section which would advance the termination date of all such subsidies from 1965 to the end of 1963. Under the law passed last year the subsidies would expire on December 31, 1965. We are committed to continue to subsidize their production of lead and zinc under the present law until December 31, 1965. Why not advance the termination date, repeal the act, and be done with it?

Let us give the taxpayers a break for once.

Mr. GRUENING. The taxpayers are not affected by this bill. I suggest to my friend from Delaware, who is a member of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Finance that he seek his objective limiting foreign lead and zinc imports. If he could get legislation which would limit foreign importation, he would achieve his objective without penalizing the domestic lead and zinc miners.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My suggestion would not penalize either the domestic or the foreign producers of lead and zinc. I am speaking of what we have already bought. Under these subsidy programs we have kept the domestic mines operating to the extent that we have built up a surplus now of 10 times as much as we need. We shall certainly not solve the problem by continuing to subsidize production on any such basis as that proposed. We have already rejected higher support prices for agricultural commodities.

As a government, we cannot afford to continue to subsidize and build up surpluses forever. What will we do with all the lead and zinc?

Mr. GRUENING. The bill would not increase surpluses. The bill would merely amend the Stabilization Act and provide that the small producers shall not be excluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would provide that the small producers would not be excluded, and therefore it would take care of them. There is a companion bill on the calendar which we should discuss together with the present bill. That bill would even carry benefits retroactively to one company.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. The bill we are now discussing would actually limit the language of the bill which was passed last year by reducing the number of companies that could apply for the differential pricing, which is the thrust of the original bill that we were discussing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct in respect to the pending bill—

Mr. MONRONEY. H.R. 3845.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct on H.R. 3845, but the companion bill which is on the calendar, H.R. 3120, and which I understand will be brought before the Senate immediately after consideration of the present bill, does expand the subsidy. That bill would expand the subsidy for companies which have heretofore not been able to qualify. They must be considered together.

Mr. MONRONEY. Very slightly, in relation to those that did not get their filings in on time due to the failure of the Department of the Interior to have the statistical data ready. But remaining with the bill before the Senate, which I think we are compelled to do in order to have an orderly discussion, that bill would actually limit the application of the bill to which the Senator is discussing by prohibiting anyone but those companies or mines having greater than

50 percent of their production in lead and zinc to participate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct as regards one of the bills.

Mr. MONRONEY. Through an accident of the language, mines of other types have been able, since they have produced a small amount of lead and zinc, to qualify for the special support pricing which we expected to be made available only to keep the small lead and zinc mines operative as against the terrific competition we have had through low tariffs on lead and zinc imports.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In a moment. I should like first to reply to the Senator from Oklahoma. I have talked with members of the committee. I have also talked with representatives of the Department of the Interior. They have confirmed what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. One bill would limit it and not extend the provisions to any additional producers, the other bill would expand the subsidy.

My point is this: While we are headed in that direction, why do we not include in the bill another section which would terminate the program at the end of the present year rather than carrying it forward for 2 more years? Its continuation cannot be justified anyway. Why carry the program for another 2½ years and make the taxpayers continue to subsidize the production of something we do not need? Why not do the job right while we are at it and terminate the program?

The next bill which will come before the Senate is H.R. 3120. I would oppose that bill in its entirety because it would expand the subsidy even beyond the existing law; it would expand it not only beyond the existing law in the future but would also give retroactive benefits to some companies that do not qualify under the existing law. I do not see any sense in passing a private bill such as that. So I most certainly would oppose that bill. At the proper time I shall make a motion to re-refer the bill to the committee, where it should have been kept in the first place.

But in relation to the particular bill now before the Senate, I should like to see the job done right. I should like to see an amendment terminating the program added to the bill. I am hoping that Senators will accept such an amendment. I do not see how there could be much controversy about it. The program could be terminated at the end of the present year.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Do I correctly understand that the bill to which the Senator objects is H.R. 3845?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. H.R. 3120, the one that is on the Calendar immediately below H.R. 3145, the one we are discussing now, H.R. 3120 would expand the subsidy program beyond that provided under existing law and it would even give retroactive benefits at least to one company.

Mr. GRUENING. In view of the fact that there is considerable controversy about that bill, I shall suggest that the bill be passed over for today and be brought up at a future date. The Senator can then make his motion. If it is agreeable to the Senator, let us proceed to the consideration of the particular bill which we are now discussing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am agreeable to that procedure.

I understand that the Senator from Arizona wishes to be present when that bill is discussed. But Senators cannot discuss these bills separately because they relate to the same problem. I do not see how the next bill could even be put in acceptable shape by amendment. The principle of the second bill is to expand the subsidy far beyond that provided in existing law and make it possible for companies that could not qualify under existing law to qualify. At the same time it would provide retroactive benefits. We shall discuss that feature when the second bill comes before the Senate.

As I said, I shall then move to refer the bill back to the committee unless the chairman of the committee will take it back without making necessary such a motion. But the bill now before the Senate, which is H.R. 3845, while it would somewhat restrict the operations of some companies which can now qualify, nevertheless I do not see that it would help very much as it is written. It would be a simple matter for those companies to arrange their sales of other products in certain periods and thereby qualify for the subsidy anyway. But I will grant that at least it has a semblance of being restrictive even though in actual application I doubt that it would have much valid effect.

Again I would like to ask if the Senator would accept an amendment which would advance the termination date of the act itself from its original scheduled expiration date of December 31, 1965, and let the program terminate at the end of the present year.

Mr. GRUENING. I am afraid I could not accept such an amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the tariff or the quotas need to be changed the appropriate committee could consider that problem. But that proposal is not before us. Under the present law it does not make too much difference to the sellers of lead and zinc whether they receive 10 cents a pound or 8 cents a pound. They bill the U.S. Government for 75 percent of the differential between what they get and 14½ cents. If the price went to 16 or 18 cents, they would put it all in their pockets. This is a one-way street. The taxpayer loses no matter how the program goes. As I have stated before, approximately \$8.5 billion is tied up in the defense stockpile now. The administration has said that it does not need half that much. The President has asked us to start an orderly liquidation. Instead of an orderly liquidation the bill would provide an orderly accumulation of more inventories by increasing production.

This subsidy program is diametrically opposed to what the President said he

wanted done. It is opposed to what the Symington committee as a result of its investigation recommended. About a quarter of a million dollars was spent by that committee to find out how we accumulated so much in excess inventories and how we could reduce the excess inventory. The way to reduce our excessive inventories is to stop buying and start selling. The amendment which I am proposing this afternoon will be a start in that direction. We should put a termination date on this program and stop encouraging the increased production of lead and zinc when we already have 5 or 10 times as much as we now need.

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

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the distinguished Senator from Delaware should realize that this would not go into the stockpile. It would go into the open market. This is to help the small miners, usually of mines which are owner operated, to prevent the mines from closing down, to permit them to sell on a commercial, going price. This is why it is important to pay the 3 or 4 cents per pound price differential to supply some of the lead and zinc which is needed domestically.

Since the Senator serves on the Finance Committee, the distinguished Senator from Delaware knows that we do not produce enough lead and zinc in this country to take care of our needs. Approximately two-thirds of the lead and zinc which we use is imported from abroad. If we should increase the tariff on the lead and zinc which is brought in, we would raise the price on two-thirds of these minerals for American industry.

If this were even an important amount of lead and zinc it would be more sensible, since it accounts for only one-third of what we use, to have a support price on it, rather than to force the users to pay higher prices on the two-thirds of production which comes in from abroad.

This program would apply only to the very smallest of the producers. Only 60 are eligible to receive payments. There were only 105 applications for payment. When those were checked out, there were only 60 who were producing in 1962.

The total cost of this program in 1962 was \$1,112,580.77. That did not have a very great impact on the subsidy, yet it did enable the small businesses which went into the market when the bill was passed, both with new machinery or with repairs for old machinery, to get into production.

That is the reason why I think we would be doing a grave injustice if we should shorten the period of time by one year, as the Senator suggests. These were people who in good faith invested in improving their mines, and reopened them. They would not have an opportunity to pay out the cost of hoists, trucks, and other materials which had to be bought, at the time the bill was up for passage or after it was passed, in order to reopen their mines.

I know the distinguished Senator would not wish to cause losses in this regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has made an excellent argument for the proposal which I made, which is that the subsidy be stopped. The Senator says that this production does not go into the stockpile but is sold for domestic consumption. That is true, but what is the difference? To the extent that we subsidize the production of more lead and zinc, it replaces the lead and zinc which we could use from the stockpile. We shall never get rid of any lead and zinc in the stockpile if we continue to subsidize the increased production of lead and zinc. Certainly it will add to the stockpile. We are adding to the stockpile now. The President made a speech in February of 1962 in which he said that he was astonished that we had about \$8½ billion tied up in the stockpiles of these minerals, and he said he was astonished to find out that we did not need but half that amount. He may also be astonished to learn that during the past 18 months his administration has put another \$130 million or more worth of material into that astonishing stockpile.

We shall never get rid of our surplus, if we keep adding to it. Everyone says, "This is only a little item," but all the "littles" add up into billions.

We do not need this lead and zinc. Why make the taxpayers buy it?

I do not see any sense in subsidizing the production of something when every one connected with the administration or any of its agencies says that we already have 5 or 10 times the amount that we need.

The only way to eliminate some of these surpluses is for somebody to stop producing. I do not care whether it is a mine in the State of the Senator from Oklahoma, a mine in my State, or a farmer in the Senator's State or in mine. We must stop encouraging production by subsidizing the production of every producer in America. That is the only way to bring the stockpile under control.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are not doing that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We must stop somewhere.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator knows we are not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Either that, or we shall have to stop imports. We will never get anywhere by increasing these subsidies. If we provide a subsidy for lead and zinc why not provide one for some other mineral? The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has just suggested that he would like to see a subsidy extended to gold and other minerals. Many would like to see it extended to some particular commodities in which they are interested. There is not sufficient money in the Federal Treasury to subsidize everybody and to make everybody a millionaire.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are not trying to subsidize everybody. This is a bill with the most limited application that I have ever seen. As I say, out of an original number of lead and zinc producers in 1956 of 574 there had been a

reduction by 1960 to only 273 who could be included under the terms of the act. Finally, when the act was passed, only 105 applications were received, and of those only 60 were able to prove that they mined in a sufficiently limited quantity, which was provided under the terms of the bill, to qualify for the 1962 payments.

This is a measure only to keep those very small mines alive. They would be very useful in the event of any war. The larger integrated companies do not require this subsidy, because they have great, highly mechanized mines.

They import a great deal of their basic ore or concentrates. Therefore, they do not require any help. They can survive at 10 cents or 11 cents as a ceiling, because they engage in the smelting operations and in production of other by-products.

This is merely for what are called, in my State, "gougers," those who mine the small workings themselves, or with other members of the family. It is important that we keep this basic supply, because once it is abandoned the water will come into the mines, and as a consequence the mines will cave in and the timbers will rot away. There will be a loss of that valuable asset for all time to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator claims that this production may be needed in the event of war and suggests that we should keep all the mines in a state of operation. I point out to the Senator that according to the Department of Defense if all production of lead and zinc were stopped and if war should start today there would be a sufficient amount of lead and zinc in this country to last us for 15 years. Certainly a nuclear war would not last 15 years. If it did there would be no miners left.

This subsidy cannot be justified from the standpoint of defense. It can be justified only from the standpoint of a desire to keep one group of operators on the taxpayers' back for another couple of years, producing something of which we already have too much. The producers are being paid to take lead and zinc out of the ground, move it over, and then store it in a hole in the ground somewhere else. That does not make sense.

It is past the time when we should face the problem and stop these unnecessary expenditures.

Either we should stop these subsidies or the administration should stop talking about how "astonished" it is to have \$8½ billion tied up in the stockpile. There is no need for being "astonished" when we continue to vote to keep adding to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are taking it off.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We have added \$130 million worth of minerals to the stockpiles since the President made his speech in February of 1962. We spent a quarter of a million dollars for a congressional committee so that we could find out what got us into this chaotic situation. The committee said that we were buying too much of that which we did not need.

Why should we have a congressional committee spend this money if we are

not going to listen to it? Let us stop this cockeyed program. I do not think anyone would say that he could ever picture any kind of a situation in which this country would ever need the lead and zinc which would be produced under the terms of the present subsidy program.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator realizes that the bill would reduce the claimants against the fund in a total amount of \$200,000. The bill would do what the Senator recommends; instead of adding, it would cut down. The time to protest is when something is being added, not when it is being cut down.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill only partly solves the problem. The amendment which I suggest would stop it entirely. It would cut out the need for the entire \$4 million or \$5 million a year. The amount was \$1½ million last year. But certainly it will be higher next year if we do not stop it now.

The producers are just finding out how to get on this "gravy train."

I think we might as well pull this gravy train into the station and take the locomotive off. That is all I want to do. I did not think there would be any objection to such a sound proposal. I merely suggest that we let the law expire at the end of this year; we do not need the minerals. That can be done by accepting this amendment.

It is very simple. It merely provides that instead of having a termination date of December 31, 1965, as provided in the original act, the program be terminated December 31, 1963. That is directly in line with what the President of the United States in February 1962 said he wanted to do. He said he did not want us to continue adding to the stockpile. I think we should support him in what he promised. Thus far he has done nothing to carry out that high sounding promise.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator knows that many of the mines have been reequipped. The small miners have invested a great deal of money, in good faith, knowing that Congress would provide this legislation. The distinguished Senator from Delaware put up a good fight when we passed this bill. We knew at that time the cost would be about \$4½ million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And it will be before it is over.

Mr. MONRONEY. The cost actually was \$1,012,000. So it is about one-fourth of the anticipated cost. Now, because it was carefully administered and limited only to those it was supposed to have served, and those not principally engaged in lead and zinc mining are to be cut out, the Senator wants to add a new termination date and give to the legislation only two-thirds of the life Congress anticipated it would have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I disagree with the statement that the mines have spent a great deal of money in re-equipping. The producers knew that Congress was under no obligation to keep this program going forever. The Senator knows that both the bills came out of the same committee. One bill even

permits some of the mines to file retroactively for benefits under a law passed 2 years ago but under which they were not then eligible. One bill would make the benefits retroactive and result in making a sizable payment to one particular company.

Let the administration stop talking about its concern for the taxpayers and the excessive stockpile unless it is willing to do something about it. I do not think the President ought to be speaking about his astonishment at having \$8½ billion worth of material in the stockpile and then not supporting Congress in stopping these subsidies.

If he meant what he said, I will support him.

Mr. MONRONEY. This legislation would not add to the stockpile.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Sure it will. There is no difference in the money the taxpayers pay into the Treasury which is then used for national defense or any other purpose. The money loses its identity. The Federal Treasury is paying for the production of lead and zinc. We have enough lead and zinc to last for 15 years. We cannot find any market for what we now have. To the extent that the taxpayers buy more lead and zinc, when we have enough, it adds to our stockpile.

Mr. MONRONEY. It does not go into the stockpile, but in the open market.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It may not be routed through St. Louis, Mo., but the cost is routed through Washington, D.C., and the taxpayers pay for it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill would not result in the purchase of more lead and zinc. If the Senator wants to make it clear that we could withdraw from the stockpile a certain tonnage of lead and zinc and sell it on the open market, that might be done. The stockpile was not created to cause unemployment; it was created to give us the materials we needed in the event of a longtime war.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Who expects a 15-year war? I would have supported the principle of stockpiling strategic materials in the amount the Defense Department felt might be needed in the event of a war. The Department should set the amounts. It did so. It stated that the major objective which it could foresee under circumstances of war was a need for 286,000 tons of lead. Instead of that amount, when we reached what was stated to be the maximum need, we bought 1,302,000 tons, or 1,016,000 tons more into the stockpile than was necessary. We have enough lead and zinc to last 14 years in the event of an all-out war.

We have turned what was a good program of stockpiling of strategic materials that might be needed in the event of war into a support program for the mining industry. I have opposed this unnecessary extension many times, and I am opposing it again. I think we should stop it today.

The administration should support the amendment which I am proposing to stop this program or else be frank and say that it is giving lipservice only to the principle and has no intention of curtailing the stockpile. We are not going

to cut down inventories unless we stop buying.

Under the present law, which I am asking to be changed, the lead and zinc producers can sell their product at 10 to 11 cents and then merely bill the United States for three-fourths of the differential between what they receive and 14½ cents. That was the same program Mr. Brannan suggested for all agriculture, and Congress repudiated it. I think we should repudiate it for the mining industry as well. I do not think there should be any such protection for that industry at the expense of the American taxpayers. The President should not be expressing his astonishment at the cost of the program unless he is willing to support its repeal. The program should be terminated at the end of this year.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest to the Senator that if he feels so strongly about lead and zinc, he, being a member of the two pertinent committees, the Finance Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, should introduce a bill to provide higher quotas for importations. We always seem to be concerned about the needs of foreign enterprises, but not to have the same sympathy for domestic producers. I think the place to take care of the problem is in connection with foreign imports.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The time to have stopped it was years ago when we were buying the million and a half tons which we did not need. Amendments were offered when these inventories were building up. We could not get enough support for the amendments in Congress to curtail the buying. This is not the first time I have criticized this program. It should have been stopped years ago when we reached our maximum needs. If we had done that we would not have the million tons of lead and the million tons of zinc hanging over the market today. That is what is the matter with the market today. The Congress insisted on a continuation of buying of commodities when it was known that we did not need them, when the Secretary of Defense and the heads of our stockpiling program sent letters urging the end of buying. Yet Congress kept buying because it was easier to vote for millions of dollars in subsidies than to vote against them. The result is that today we have \$8½ billion tied up in inventories of strategic materials when everyone connected with the program says we do not need half that much.

Mr. GRUENING. This bill would not add to the surpluses.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I disagree completely. It would add to our inventories. While production would not go into the inventories directly they would be increased to the extent that we increased the production of lead and zinc.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I send to the desk an amendment which I urge the chairman to accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, at the end of the bill, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 7 of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 768; 30 U.S.C. 687) is amended—

(1) by striking out "December 31, 1965" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1963"; and

(2) by striking out "March 31, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1964".

(b) Section 2(d) of such Act (75 Stat. 767; 30 U.S.C. 682(d)) is amended by striking out "the maximum amount of such payments which may be made on account of such sales made during the calendar year 1964 shall not exceed \$4,000,000; and the maximum amount of such payments which may be made on account of such sales made during the calendar year 1965 shall not exceed \$3,500,000".

(c) Section 3(a) of such Act (75 Stat. 767; 30 U.S.C. 683(a)) is amended by striking out "or in the twelve-month period ending December 31, 1964, in excess of nine hundred tons of zinc and nine hundred tons of lead; and in the twelve-month period ending December 31, 1965, in excess of six hundred tons of zinc and six hundred tons of lead."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the amendment would advance the termination date of the expiration for this program from July 31, 1965, to December 31, 1963. It would change the filing date for the last payments from March 1, 1966, to March 1, 1964. I hope the Senator will be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. I regret to say that I cannot accept it. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has pointed out, these people were acting in good faith based upon the bill we passed last year. They have bought new machinery, and this amendment would cut the time during which they could benefit.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would mean a cut of 2 years. Therefore it would amount to a double impact. They would be left with 2 years for amortization. They have acted on the basis of the ye-and-nay votes on the amendments and on the bill when it was before the Senate last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall request a ye-and-nay vote on my amendment. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is a strong possibility that a ye-and-nay vote will be requested on the pending amendment. Therefore, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, and the distinguished Senator from Delaware, I make the following unanimous-consent request; namely, that at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow, the Senate turn to the

consideration of the pending measure; that 30 minutes of debate be allowed on the amendment, 15 minutes to be controlled by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and 15 minutes to be controlled by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]; and that at the conclusion of the 30 minutes, a vote be taken on the amendment.

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

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, July 16, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3845) to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Mobilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), debate on the pending amendment (No. 124) by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], to be followed by a vote on the amendment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns this afternoon, it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I should like to say that at the conclusion of debate of H.R. 3845, the pending bill, it is the intention of the leadership to give consideration to taking up the following bills:

Calendar No. 222, H.R. 3120, a bill to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766).

Calendar No. 224, H.R. 2513, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of import articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes.

Calendar No. 273, S. 623, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945.

Calendar No. 312, S. 627, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, no further business will be conducted by the Senate today, except for speeches, requests, and matters of that kind.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION— PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the important discussion of the subject of civil rights, we have heard a great deal of reference made to public accommodations. Mr. President, before I entered politics, I was a merchant, a businessman, and I was a member of what is now the National Retail Merchants Association. I have been very proud of the progress the merchants of

our country have made in this field. I do not believe legislation is needed to achieve public accommodation.

The National Retail Merchants Association, at the request of the Attorney General, is conducting a survey among its members, and the report which was made to the Attorney General is based upon a request which would develop as much information as possible on the integration situation. The association circulated a bulletin to its membership, asking these four questions:

1. What steps have already been taken in your store to eliminate racial irritation? Washroom facilities, drinking fountains, lunchrooms, employee cafeterias, dining rooms.

2. What steps have been taken in your community along these same lines by hotels, motels, restaurants, and theaters?

3. Have you had meetings with other business leaders? Has a biracial committee been created?

4. What plans do you have for further action in this area? Do you plan to hire nonwhites in nonmenial capacities?

The results have been very revealing. Out of 835 stores located in 335 cities, only 2 have not integrated their facilities. This is a very revealing statistic. I am sure that the further results, as they come into the office of the association, will disclose the same trend.

For example, one of the largest stores in Virginia reported that its facilities had been integrated 3 years ago, and that of its 3,000 employees, 400 were Negroes.

So it goes, throughout the report. I wished to make this initial report to my colleagues in the Senate. As figures become available, I will submit them for the RECORD. I believe this report supports my contention that if the President will exert his moral persuasion with the businessmen of this country, he can point out the economic and moral stupidity of maintaining racial prejudice in the case of job acquisition. I hope that the President, with his ability to persuade people, will spend more time talking with business people, so that these results may be achieved without having to upset constitutional processes by resorting to enactment of law.

MARITIME POLICIES AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, according to the most recent statement by the Department of Commerce, the balance-of-payments deficit for the first quarter of 1963 was almost \$700 million. This was disappointing news, for it indicates that we may not be able to achieve any significant progress this year in reducing the deficit below last year's level of \$2.2 billion.

As a matter of fact, the deficit in the balance of payments this year will be greater than it was last year. There is no need for me to indicate the severity of this problem. It is well known in this Chamber, and it has become well known in the Nation at large. Last Wednesday, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I discussed this problem at length on the floor of the Senate.

It had been my belief and hope that every arm of the Government was really striving to help redress this adverse balance of payments. The Department of Commerce, for instance, under Secretary Hodges, has initiated programs to expand our exports and encourage foreign tourism in this country. I commend Secretary Hodges for his activities in this direction.

Much to my surprise, and dismay, I have found that the policies of two governmental agencies vital to U.S. trade—the Federal Maritime Commission and its sister agency, the Maritime Administration—have been in direct opposition to the purposes of the Trade Expansion Act and other economic programs initiated to redress our payments deficit. This is the only conclusion that can be drawn from recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee held on June 20 and 21. During these hearings, testimony was received from Thomas E. Stakem, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, and James W. Gulick, Deputy Administrator of the Maritime Administration. Before I characterize this testimony, I should point out why the Joint Economic Committee felt these hearings were necessary.

At the final day of the Joint Economic Committee's steel hearings, the Committee sought an explanation for the decline in steel sales abroad. The U.S. trade balance on steel has declined by almost \$800 million since 1955, our imports having quadrupled and our exports having fallen to one-half of what they formerly were. Mr. Walther Lederer, Chief of the Department of Commerce's Balance-of-Payments Division, testified that one of the reasons for this decline may well be the transportation advantage enjoyed by foreign steel producers due to ocean freight-rate differentials. Data which he submitted revealed that ocean freight rates are much higher from a given port in the United States to a Western European or Japanese port than are freight rates on identical products shipped inbound from the same port to the given American port—and, I may say, on the same vessels.

Moreover, freight rates on products carried from U.S. ports to South American countries are higher than the rates from European and Japanese ports to these areas, even though the distances from Europe and Japan to these third countries are much greater.

As a result of this testimony, the committee held an additional hearing on the afternoon of May 2 to hear an explanation from the agency which has jurisdiction over ocean freight rates, the Federal Maritime Commission.

On May 9, in a speech on the Senate floor, I summarized the testimony which had then been received from representatives of the Maritime Commission. The representatives testified: First, that this situation of differential rates has been "a matter of general knowledge" for at least 16 years; second, that the Commission had the right and authority, under sections 15 and 18 of the Shipping Act, to initiate studies and actions about these rates; third, that it had the power to disapprove conference rates, but it had

not done so; fourth, that it had undertaken no studies of international shipping conferences—the cartels—which establish these discriminatory rates.

I should like to point out that more than 15 months ago another congressional committee, the House Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, under the chairmanship of Representative CELLER, specifically recommended to the Federal Maritime Commission that it investigate ocean freight rate differentials and the shipping conferences which establish these rates.

There was no indication whatsoever that the Maritime Commission had paid the least attention to the recommendations of the House subcommittee.

In that same speech, I also accused the Federal Maritime Commission of gross negligence. I had anticipated that the Chairman of the Commission would respond to this public accusation, formally or informally, and justify the activity of the Commission by explaining these differential rates.

The Commission failed to respond. Consequently, I asked the staff of the Joint Economic Committee to look further into this matter and determine whether or not additional hearings should be held. The material prepared by the staff, notably by Mr. Thomas H. Boggs—I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Boggs for his work and his accuracy—revealed that the problem was much more extensive and far-reaching than I had originally believed. The salient features of the memorandums prepared by Mr. Boggs show that:

First. There is significant ocean freight-rate discrimination on heavily traded steel products, and this has significant effect on our balance of payments.

Second. In the case of steel, 17 percent of the difference in value between exported and imported steel products is due solely to higher freight rates paid by American exporters. The difference on many other products is approximately 11 percent.

Third. On 26 other commodities—that is, commodities other than steel—which the Department of Commerce selected on the basis of substantial export potential, the outbound freight rates were approximately 34 percent higher than the inbound freight rates. In the case of United States-Japanese trade, the inbound rates were approximately 70 percent lower than the corresponding outbound rates paid by U.S. exporters.

Fourth. Supply and demand apparently do not determine ocean freight rates. The outbound rate on electrical machinery going to Japan is \$56.75 a ton. The inbound rate is \$33 a ton. U.S. exports to Japan of these products amount to approximately \$30 million; imports from Japan exceed \$100 million. Hence, the tonnage rate is higher on American exports even though the demands in terms of tonnage are far less.

Fifth. Freight rates from the United States to third countries are far higher when compared with rates from Europe and Japan to these countries, even though the distances from the United States are shorter. For example, the ocean freight rate on a common plas-

ticizer or chemical softener from New York to Vera Cruz, Mexico, is \$54 a ton. The distance from New York to Vera Cruz is 1,973 nautical miles. The rate from Germany to Vera Cruz is \$43 a ton—\$11 a ton less—but the distance from Germany is 5,381 nautical miles. On a per mile basis, costs approximately 2 $\frac{7}{10}$ cents a ton if the plasticizer leaves a U.S. port, whereas the same plasticizer leaving a European port costs $\frac{8}{10}$ ths of a cent a ton per mile, or less than one-third of the rate from American ports.

Many more examples were brought out which indicated the same type of differential to other places in the world. All of them showed that U.S. exporters were at a serious competitive disadvantage because of freight rate differentials.

Sixth. The international shipping conferences—the rate-setting bodies—are composed mostly of foreign-flag lines. Of the 435 steamship lines operating in the commerce of the United States, only 35 are under the American flag. Moreover, foreign-flag lines in these conferences tend to vote as a bloc against the interests of the United States, thus keeping U.S. rates high, whereas rates from foreign shores are low.

Because this additional information was so startling and because the Federal Maritime Commission had failed to formally or informally reply to the accusations set forth in my speech of May 9, the Joint Economic Committee decided to call another hearing on this matter for June 20. Mr. Thomas E. Stakem, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, and his fellow commissioners were asked to appear.

The Commission's testimony on June 20 and 21 brought out the following:

First. The Federal Maritime Commission agreed that there are freight rate differentials on heavily traded steel products, and these may have significant effects on our balance of payments. Mind you, Mr. President, the Commission admitted this.

Second. The Commission agreed that rate differentials are not confined to steel and steel products but exist on many other items.

Third. The Commission admitted that it was aware of the triangular freight problem. It had knowledge of specific instances where freight rates from the United States to third countries are higher than rates from Europe and Japan to these countries, even though the distances from the U.S. ports are shorter.

Fourth. The Federal Maritime Commission—and its predecessor agencies—have been aware of these problems for many years, but until very recently had never called a formal hearing or taken any formal action. I am pleased to state that the Commission is currently preparing for a formal hearing on iron and steel products as a result of the Joint Economic Committee's investigations.

Fifth. The Commission agreed that it had sufficient statutory authority to disapprove rates set by these foreign-controlled conferences.

Sixth. The Commission has never disapproved a single rate or a series of rates set by conferences.

Seventh. The Commission has failed to promulgate guidelines for a U.S. complainant who is injured by freight rate discrimination.

Eighth. Conferences are foreign-controlled and there is evidence of bloc voting against U.S. interests, at least in the cases of Japanese, German, and Scandinavian lines.

Ninth. The Maritime Commission has not taken any steps to encourage Panamanian, Honduran, Liberian, or Greek lines to vote with U.S. lines in conferences, even though many of these foreign flag lines are in reality owned by U.S. corporations and are in fact mere fronts to evade or avoid the labor requirements prescribed for American steamship lines.

Tenth. The Federal Maritime Commission has failed to take any action on the Celler Subcommittee recommendations regarding the shipping conferences which establish ocean freight rates and the discriminatory rates themselves.

Instead of the situation improving it is actually growing worse. I hold in my hand a release of last Friday from the Federal Maritime Commission. It shows that the shipping conferences operating in North Atlantic trade have declared an intention to raise rates by 25 percent on exports alone; this does not apply to imports. The figures I cited, which show that the export rates are much higher than the import rates, were for the rates prevailing a few weeks ago. Now the export rates are to be increased 25 percent, with no increase whatsoever in the import rates. This is one of the most shameless performances that I have ever heard of.

The Maritime Commission says that reports which have reached it indicate that the Meyer Line, one of the important independent lines of the North Atlantic trade, which in the last year or so has been cutting ocean freight rates, has now reached an understanding with the North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference and has established a pooling arrangement between the independents and the conference lines. This is a most serious development. If it is allowed to go through, the situation, which was already very adverse to the interests of the United States will be made still worse by the further disparities between export and import freight rates. So I call upon the Commission to disapprove this pooling agreement, and, indeed, to disapprove the new rate schedules of the North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference, which would establish the new rates on the 1st of September of this year.

I ask that the release be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEYER LINE-CONFERENCE POOL REPORT FACES PROBE

The Federal Maritime Commission today launched an inquiry into reported plans of independent and conference shipping lines to enter into a pooling agreement in the North Atlantic trade and of plans, by the conference, to raise rates in that trade a reported 25 percent, it was announced today by Thomas E. Stakem, chairman.

Reports have reached the Commission indicating that Meyer Line, a leading foreign-flag independent in the North Atlantic trade,

had reached "an understanding" with the North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference which would establish a "pooling agreement" between the independent and the conference lines.

The Federal Maritime Commission learned that the conference had circularized the shipping export trade, stating that after a reconsideration of the tariff structure, the conference proposes to file a new tariff on August 1, 1963, effective September 1, 1963, which would reestablish freight rates in the North Atlantic/Continental trade at the level existing on September 1, 1962.

Reports which reached the Commission indicated an intention to file the proposed pooling agreement with the Commission for approval.

The purpose of the Federal Maritime Commission's inquiry is to determine whether the Meyer Line and the conference have effectuated any agreement or understanding prior to filing the agreement with the Federal Maritime Commission and awaiting Commission approval as required by law.

Meyer Line and the conference had been active competitors for North Atlantic cargoes and there had been a series of drastic rate reductions in this trade since late 1962. The situation at times had been referred to as a "rate war."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Chairman Stakem and his fellow Commissioners admitted to the Joint Economic Committee that discriminatory ocean freight rates were a matter of grave concern; and they assured the committee that the Commission would initiate a vigorous investigation. The Chairman of the Commission stated—and this was a manly statement—that: "any criticism to be presented to this Commission for not having moved sooner in this very critical area should fall on me as Chairman because it was my responsibility to set the priorities within the limits of our staff."

I commend the Chairman for that disarming statement; but I also wish to state that it does not absolve him from the responsibility which he properly ascribes to himself.

In light of the fact that the Federal Maritime Commission is aware of the severity of this problem, or at least says it is, and in light of the fact that the Commission failed to act on the Celler subcommittee's recommendations calling for an investigation of both discriminatory ocean freight rates and an extensive investigation of the shipping conferences, the Commission and its Chairman are to be severely criticized. In the hope that the Federal Maritime Commission would at last give top priority to an investigation of ocean freight rates and of the shipping conferences which establish these rates, the Joint Economic Committee unanimously—without regard to party—made four recommendations to the Commission. The committee requested a response from the Commission by July 9.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Committee's recommendations and the Commission's responses thereto, first listing each recommendation, and then listing the Commission's response to each.

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

Recommendation: (1) The Commission should establish guidelines for U.S. com-

plainants pointing out what the law requires as proof of discriminatory freight rates so that the Commission can act on their behalf.

Reply: Guidelines of the kind suggested in the Committee's recommendation have traditionally been set on a case-by-case basis, each case affording some precedent for future action. While it is the Commission's view that problems of the specific detailed elements and the quantum of proof necessary in adjudicating a claim of rate discrimination are not susceptible to formulation by agency rule, there are set forth in response to the Committee's recommendation some general guidelines which have been taken from precedents: Generally, it must be shown (1) that there is a difference in the inbound and the outbound rates, (2) that there is a similarity as to the weight, measurement, value, and kind of service required, (3) that the differential in rates complained of is not justified and is unduly discriminatory and unjust in that it acts to the disadvantage of the complainant, or restricts the flow of traffic and marketing of the commodity.

Recommendation: (2) The Commission should initiate steps under its existing authority to eliminate unjust discrimination in rates and should promptly inform the Congress if additional authority is needed to deal with any aspects of these discriminatory practices.

Reply: As we have previously informed the Committee, the Commission has instituted a formal investigation into the disparities between inbound and outbound rates on steel in the trades between the United States and Europe, Japan, and Australia. This investigation is being pursued on a priority basis.

The Commission's tariff examiners are continuing their analyses of all tariffs now on file with the Commission and will continue to give close scrutiny to new filings in order to promptly spot rates which would appear on their face to place U.S. manufacturers and exporters at a disadvantage vis-a-vis their foreign competitors. In this connection the Commission has established liaison with the Department of Commerce, Department of State, and the Tariff Commission in order that the Commission may be completely informed of the full effect of ocean freight rates on our foreign trade. (See also comments under recommendation No. 3).

Looking toward the future and the Commission's continuing concern with the extent to which ocean freight rates place U.S. manufacturers and exporters at a competitive disadvantage, the Commission will give prompt attention to both formal and informal complaints and inquiries from the shipping public and other interested persons. The Commission believes that greater efficiency in the final disposition of many complaints will be obtained if the Commission continues its practice of informally encouraging voluntary adjustment between shipper and carrier wherever possible. Where such informal attempts at resolution do not produce prompt adjustment formal proceedings are the alternative.

Where appropriate the Commission will make use of fact-finding investigations under its rules of practice and procedure and will make full use of its information gathering powers under section 21 of the Shipping Act, 1916, in order to preliminarily develop the information necessary for an informed judgment as to the proper course of action.

The current powers of the Commission to deal with rates which appear to discriminate against the commerce of the United States and against U.S. manufacturers and exporters are found primarily in sections 15, 17, and 18 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920. Under section 15 the Commission is empowered to disapprove conference agreements which are found to be unfair as between carriers, shippers, exporters, importers, or ports, or between exporters

from the United States and their foreign competitors, or to operate to the detriment of the commerce of the United States, or to be contrary to the public interest. Section 17 prohibits carriers from charging rates which are unjustly discriminatory between shippers or ports, or unjustly prejudicial to exporters of the United States as compared with their foreign competitors. Section 18 (b) (5) empowers the Commission to disapprove any rate which, after hearing, it finds to be so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States. Section 19 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 permits the Commission to make rules and regulations to meet conditions unfavorable to our foreign trade and which arise out of foreign rules or laws or the competitive practices of foreign-flag vessels.

It would appear that these statutory provisions are, on their face, sufficient tools for the correction of unlawfully discriminatory rates. The final answer to this, however, must await the completion of cases before the Commission. If, at any juncture in our disposition of cases concerning discriminatory rates, the Commission discovers that additional statutory authority is required we shall promptly make this matter known to Congress.

An additional power which the Commission believes would facilitate the disposition of a variety of cases including those involving discriminatory rates and which the Commission included in its last annual report to Congress is the power to enter interim cease and desist orders upon a prima facie showing of a violation of any provision of the Shipping Act.

Recommendation: (3) The Federal Maritime Commission should undertake a study of the extent and economic effects of disparities between inbound and outbound ocean freight rates. In selecting products for this study, the following guidelines should be used:

(a) Products which U.S. exporters have indicated are discriminated against in their complaints.

(b) Products which are presently substantially exported or for which there is export potential.

(c) Products which the Commission presently knows are discriminated against.

(d) Products for which freight rates are a high percentage of landed cost.

Reply: The Federal Maritime Commission on a priority basis is studying the extent and economic effect of disparities between inbound and outbound rates, utilizing the guidelines set forth above.

The Commission has already completed a study of the inbound and outbound conference tariffs in the North Atlantic trade between the United States and Northern and Western Europe and the United Kingdom. Using the results of this study, and taking into consideration commodities on which the Commission, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Department of Commerce have had rate complaints, we have compiled a list of 51 commodity groups, on which there is a disparity between outbound and inbound freight rates. The Commission by September 1 will complete an examination of the tariffs of all the outbound conferences and the corresponding inbound conferences to determine in each such trade if there are disparities between the inbound and outbound rates on similar or substantially similar commodities. When these rate compilations are completed a further report will be made to your Committee.

As indicated, the Commission has established liaison between the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, and the Tariff Commission, in order that it may be completely informed as to the products which are encompassed within the four categories listed in your recommendation No. 3.

Representatives of the Commission attend meetings which the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce holds with industry groups dealing with the problems that they face in connection with the export of products. The problem of freight rates is specifically discussed at these meetings. The Commission also consults with agencies of the Government in order to develop information as to the export potential of U.S. goods. Past and future complaints filed by shippers will also be used by the Commission in its all-out effort to determine the effect of freight rates on the exports from the United States.

The Commission has requested the National Archives to develop a feasibility study as to the possibility of machine tabulating the more than three million freight rates which are filed with it and to estimate the cost thereof. If it is found that such a system is feasible and if the necessary funds are obtained, it is believed that the Commission will be better able to take prompt action with respect to disparities in the import and export trades of the United States.

As disparities in the inbound and outbound rates are disclosed, action as set forth in 2 above will be promptly taken by the Commission.

Recommendations: (4). The Federal Maritime Commission should:

(a) Request information from the shipping conferences on rates between Europe, Japan and third market countries.

(b) Compare these rates to the rates on U.S. exports to these third market countries.

(c) Indicate the mileage from Western European and Japanese ports and U.S. ports to these third areas.

Reply: The Federal Maritime Commission is endeavoring to obtain information as to freight rates between Europe, Japan and third market countries. Assistance of the Department of State has been sought to endeavor to ascertain through its representatives abroad, freight rates on specified commodities from Hamburg, Rotterdam, Genoa, Liverpool and Yokohama to the third market countries of Brazil, Chile, Panama, Venezuela, Australia, South Africa and India. Advice has also been requested as to freight rates between the above-named European and United Kingdom ports and Japan. Messages asking for this information were cleared by the Department of State on June 28, 1963.

Letters are also being sent to all steamship conferences and all U.S.-flag carriers serving the export commerce of the United States requesting that they furnish the Commission such information as they have or can develop as to ocean freight rates from third countries to the foreign destinations which these conferences and carriers serve.

As soon as rates are received, comparisons will be made between these rates and the corresponding rates from the United States to common destinations together with a comparison of the mileage over the various routes. If the circumstances warrant, action as outlined in our response to recommendation 2 above will be taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I previously mentioned the fact that the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on June 20 and 21 revealed that the Maritime Administration, as well as the Maritime Commission, pursued policies contrary to the promotion of U.S. exports. We received from James W. Gulick, Deputy Maritime Administrator, testimony which indicated that the Administration's past and present policies require an American steamship line to be a member of a shipping conference or agree to its rates, rules, and regulations in order

to receive an operating subsidy. The only exception to this policy is that an American line can refuse to charge these conference-established rates if it is willing to bear the burden and cost of proving that such rates are not in the interest of the American merchant marine. But the full burden of proof and the full cost of proceedings are lodged upon the line.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of circular letter No. 3-62 which expresses this policy.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1962.
Subject: Basic policy with respect to rates. To all subsidized operators.

GENTLEMEN: The Maritime Subsidy Board on February 2, 1962, adopted the following policy with respect to rates: As a general principle, the Maritime Subsidy Board believes it to be in the interest of the American merchant marine, and of stability of trading conditions in the foreign commerce of the United States, for subsidized lines to comply with established applicable conference rates in any trade in which the subsidized lines engage. This general principle is applicable whether or not the subsidized line is a member of the conference. At the same time, it is recognized that in specific instances good reason may exist for departures from conference-established rates. Such specific departures should be based on sound business judgment of the subsidized line, and should be in furtherance of the best interest of the American merchant marine. The Maritime Subsidy Board will, where deemed appropriate, require subsidized carriers to justify any departure from applicable conference rates.

Your attention is directed to the provisions of section 7 of Department of Commerce Order No. 117 (revised) effective August 12, 1961.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES S. DAWSON, Jr.,
Secretary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is appalling to me that the Maritime Administration requires an American steamship line to be a member of a shipping conference or to charge conference rates, in view of the fact that these foreign-controlled conferences, by bloc voting, discriminate against U.S. exports. However, during the hearings, when I asked Mr. Gulick, "Do you still approve of this policy outlined in Circular Letter 3-62?" he responded, "Yes, sir; we do."

The effect of this policy on our balance of payments is obvious. It forces American steamship lines to charge rates detrimental to exports but beneficial to imports. Moreover, American taxpayers' money is used to force American ships to discriminate against American products. It amounts to using the subsidy as a club with which to force American lines to conform to the discriminatory rates established by international shipping cartels, in which we are underrepresented, and over which the Maritime Commission has chosen not to exercise any authority.

The policy also has detrimental effects on the U.S. merchant marine, as noted on page 60 of a recent report to the Sec-

retary of Commerce by the Maritime Evaluation Committee.

Incidentally, Mr. President, this report is interesting in connection with the behavior of administrative bodies. The report is dated January 1963; but it was issued only on July 1, or only 5 days after I directed to the Secretary of Commerce a letter urging the Department of Commerce to follow a policy which I shall now read. The report, entitled "Maritime Resources for Security and Trade," brought out that conference rates, as noted on page 60, "are not adhered to consistently by foreign carriers."

The Maritime (Administration's) Subsidy Board policy ties the hands of U.S.-flag operators; at the very least it hinders their freedom to respond quickly to trade developments. Foreign flag carriers who do not practice the same adherence to conference rates are at liberty to engage in irregular hit-and-run practices with little risk of reprisal from U.S. carriers. At the same time, the conferences (which are dominated by foreign carriers) can establish and maintain rates that are adverse to U.S. trade competing with another power's trade in the same commodity. The U.S.-flag members have little negotiating power to resist such actions since they are prevented by the Subsidy Board policy from any effective threat of independent rate action. A threat which must be contingent upon third party approval leaves the U.S. carrier vulnerable to countermeasures without notice. There is reason for concern that the development of our foreign commerce (one of the traditional objectives of Government support of the merchant marine) may be impeded by the policy of rigid adherence to the will of the conferences.

Withdrawal of the Subsidy Board policy in this respect is recommended as a protection to the U.S. subsidized carrier members of the conferences.

As I mentioned above, it is interesting to note that the recommendation of the Maritime Evaluation Committee to reverse this policy was released by the Secretary of Commerce on Monday, July 1. Just 5 days prior to this, I wrote to the Secretary requesting a change in this policy of the Maritime Administration. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Secretary be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
June 26, 1963.

HON. LUTHER HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of your vigorous efforts to expand and promote the foreign commerce of the United States, I would like to call to your attention information received during recent hearings of the Joint Economic Committee dealing with discriminatory ocean freight rates.

Both material submitted and testimony received revealed that past and present policies of the Maritime Administration require an American steamship line to be a member of a foreign-controlled shipping conference or agree to its rates, rules, and regulations in order to receive an operating subsidy. The only exception to this Maritime Administration policy is set forth in the enclosed circular letter No. 3-62, that is, an American

line can refuse to charge these conference-established rates only if it is willing to bear the burden and cost of proving that such rates are not in the interest of the American merchant marine.

Prior to the submission of this policy statement, testimony was received from the Maritime Commission which indicated that—

1. The Federal Maritime Commission is aware of the freight rate discrimination on heavily traded steel products, and many other American exports.

2. The Federal Maritime Commission agreed that this discrimination has significant effects on our balance of payments.

3. The Federal Maritime Commission—and its predecessor agencies—have been aware of this discrimination for many years but, until this month, have never held formal hearings or taken formal action to remedy this discrimination.

4. Shipping conferences which establish these discriminatory rates are predominately controlled by foreign lines. Of the 435 steamship lines operating in U.S. foreign commerce, 400 are under foreign flags.

In light of these facts, it seems inconceivable to me that the Federal Maritime Administration would require an American steamship line, as a condition for obtaining an operating subsidy, be a member of a conference or agree to charge conference-established rates.

There is a considerable difference of opinion between the Federal Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Commission.

In response to my question, "(do) you think this policy should be reversed?" Mr. Stakem, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, replied, "I certainly do." Mr. Stakem also stated with respect to the policy contained in the enclosed letter to Isbrandtsen Steamship Co., Inc., "that letter, I think, was a mistake. If I participated in the decision that led to that letter, I think that was a mistake."

On the other hand, in response to my question, "Do you still approve of the policy outlined in (circular letter) 3-62?" Mr. Gullick, Deputy Administrator of the Maritime Administration, stated, "Yes sir, we do. We find it has worked very well."

It is strongly urged that this policy be reviewed and updated. After your review of this policy, I am sure you will conclude that subsidies should not be used to promote conferences or cartels which pursue policies contrary to the Trade Expansion Act, the balance-of-payments position of the United States, and your vigorous efforts for export promotion.

I intend to make a speech on the floor of the Senate in the near future, setting forth our findings during the hearings, and suggesting changes in maritime policies. I would greatly appreciate any views and comments you would care to offer. You have been making a most sincere and able effort to revamp the work of your Department and to improve its performance in promoting our export trade. I am confident, therefore, that you can and will find ways of altering the Department's maritime policy so that subsidy programs tend to promote the elimination of freight rate discriminations against American exporters rather than promote their continuance, as does the present policy.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,

Chairman.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the Secretary's reply of July 12.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 12, 1963.

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of June 26, 1963, concerning certain information relating to policies of the Maritime Subsidy Board received by the Joint Economic Committee during the course of its recent hearings dealing with discriminatory ocean freight rates.

As you may know, the Commerce Department for some time has had underway a study of ocean freight rates and the balance of payments. This includes the testimony of Dr. Walther Lederer before the Joint Economic Committee in May relating to the effects of ocean freight rates on steel exports. The Department also provided much of the information on the basis of which your committee based its examination of Federal Maritime Commission officials in this matter last month. The Joint Economic Committee has been informed of some of our future plans in the same area.

Against this background, I have given careful study and consideration to the questions raised in your letter as they relate to present policy of the Board with respect to adherence of subsidized lines to conference-established steamship rates, and to the matter of conference rate policies and practices as they may adversely affect the development of our foreign trade generally. As a result, I have decided upon two immediate courses of action as initial steps looking toward an ultimate solution to the rate discrimination problem.

The first step: The Maritime Subsidy Board has been asked to undertake an immediate review of their policy (stated in circular letter No. 3-62 dated Feb. 2, 1962), which requires subsidized lines to adhere to conference rates. In this review, the Board has been asked to give careful consideration to whether this policy of the Subsidy Board should be rescinded. I anticipate that the Maritime Subsidy Board will make a decision within the near future.

The second step: I propose an investigation of international shipping conferences and the impact of their ratemaking policies and procedures upon the export and import commerce of the United States. In order to implement this action, I have requested the Federal Maritime Commission to initiate such an investigation. I am offering the full cooperation and assistance of this Department to the Commission in undertaking this important task. In fact, we already have underway discussion with the Federal Maritime Commission on a number of questions relating to their projected studies of ocean freight rates. We are anxious to see this work go forward as rapidly as possible. We believe that phase of the inquiry should focus on the level and structure of export and import rates with the emphasis on their economic effects. In addition, however, we believe that the almost complete lack of reliability and detailed knowledge of the ratemaking activities of international shipping conferences requires a comprehensive investigation on the basis of which sound remedial action can be developed for overcoming any discriminatory ocean freight rates which may exist.

Your calling to my attention such information respecting Department of Commerce policies which may have a bearing on the question of discriminatory rates is appreciated. The seriousness of this problem which has been brought into focus by the

work of your committee merits the full attention and cooperation of all interested parties in seeking an adequate and permanent solution.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Secretary stated:

I have decided upon two immediate courses of action as initial steps looking toward an ultimate solution to the rate discrimination problem.

The first step: The Maritime Subsidy Board has been asked to undertake an immediate review of their policy (stated in Circular Letter No. 3-62 dated Feb. 2, 1962) which requires subsidized lines to adhere to conference rates. In this review, the Board has been asked to give careful consideration to whether this policy of the Subsidy Board should be rescinded. I anticipate that the Maritime Subsidy Board will make a decision within the near future.

The second step: I propose an investigation of international shipping conferences and the impact of their ratemaking policies and procedures upon the export and import commerce of the United States.

Mr. President, in light of the facts brought out at the committee's recent hearings, this policy should be reversed so that U.S. subsidized carriers will lose their subsidies if they abide by conference rates and regulations which are detrimental to the commerce of the United States.

We should use subsidies as a weapon to break down the system of differential rates, rather than as a weapon to force the American shippers to conform to a system of differential rates.

The Maritime Administration has been derelict in another area for nearly 40 years. Section 28 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 permits railroads and other overland carriers to charge special rates, reduced by as much as 50 percent, for transportation of products designated for export or import. For example, it costs \$1,058 per carload to send automobiles from Detroit to San Francisco, if the automobiles are for domestic sales. However, if the cars are to be exported the rail rate is \$783 per carload, or \$275 less.

Although section 28 permits reduced rail rates for exported and imported commodities, it restricts these reduced rates to the exports and the imports transported in American-flag vessels unless the Maritime Administration rules that American-flag service is inadequate. If such a ruling is handed down, the restrictive provisions of section 28 are suspended until the administration rules that American-flag service has become adequate.

The last ruling handed down by the Shipping Board—predecessor of the Federal Maritime Administration—was in 1924, or 39 years ago. This ruling suspended the operation of the restrictive provisions of section 28 and permits reduced rail rates to apply to shipments on flag vessels of all kind; on vessels carrying foreign flags as well as American flags.

In section 28 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, Congress has given the governmental agencies concerned with the

movement of export-import traffic a powerful and effective means of inducing exporters and importers to give preference to vessels of U.S. registry by restricting the application of export and import rates to traffic which is to move or has moved on American-flag vessels. The Maritime Administration, the agency charged with the duty to promote the U.S. merchant marine, has failed to enforce or to even review the restrictive provisions of section 28 for 39 long years. Conditions have certainly changed since 1924. It is long past time for a review of the administration's suspension of this act.

I am not certain that section 28 of the act is wise, because obviously it gives to producers of goods abroad who ship on American lines an internal freight advantage over American producers who ship by rail or truck. In this respect, it discriminates in favor of the foreign producer at the expense of the American producer. So I do not wish to be understood as necessarily endorsing section 28. But the Maritime Administration has neglected to consider the question in any objective fashion a ruling of 1924 which extends these advantages to foreign shipping lines as well as to American lines.

The recommendations made by the Joint Economic Committee to the Maritime Commission and to the Secretary of Commerce were made within the framework of the existing laws governing our maritime activities. The responses indicate that these recommendations can be carried out without additional legislation.

I wish to underscore that last statement, because it is always a defense of derelict administration agencies to say, "We are only operating under the laws of Congress. Give us new legislation, and we will change." The point is that the Maritime Administration has already all the statutory powers which it needs, and we should not allow our attention to be diverted by any claims which they may make that they need additional legislation.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the Federal Maritime Commission and the Federal Maritime Administration have failed to enforce existing laws and to use their statutory authority to protect American exporters and to promote the foreign commerce of the United States. Moreover, they have failed to recognize the export promotion goals of the Trade Expansion Act. Finally, it is my belief that these two agencies, which are vital to our U.S. trade, have failed to join the other departments and agencies of our Government working toward, I hope, a solution of our balance-of-payments problem. It is the hope of this Senator and, I am sure, of the American taxpayers that this dereliction of duty may be corrected. Mere promises to investigate are not enough. The continuous stalling tactics of derelict administrative officials are not enough.

It has been 47 years since the Jones Act was passed and during most of this time these nefarious practices have gone on with the knowledge of the governmental agencies with jurisdiction. We need a cleanup and we need it rapidly. The case is clear. The time for action is now.

While I do not wish to imitate Madam Defarge of Dickens' Tale of Two Cities in any connection, I would say that in my judgment some heads should roll.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend highly and unqualifiedly the fine presentation which the Senator from Illinois has made on the subject of the Federal Maritime Commission. He charges it with gross negligence. He charges it with dereliction of duty. He charges it with repeated failures. If there was any way in which I could emphasize that those vigorous allegations were understatements, in view of the malfeasance, nonfeasance, and misfeasance of the Maritime Commission, I would do so.

I agree with the Senator that we need a cleanup and need it rapidly. As, he says, correctly, the time for action is now. It is for that reason that I appeared before the Commerce Committee last week to oppose the reappointment to the Federal Maritime Commission of the first member of the Commission who comes up for reconfirmation after the present administration has appointed him. It is the Senate's first opportunity to "advise and consent" after this member has demonstrated the character of his service. I refer to the renomination of Mr. Ashton C. Barrett, who serves as Vice Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

The Senator from Illinois has referred to one of the recent actions of the Commission as the most shameless performance of which he has ever heard. I would equal that statement by saying that the performance of the Maritime Commission in the recent Alaska freight rate case was one of the most shameless performances of which I have ever heard. The Commission completely ignored the evidence. They swept it aside. They disregarded the gross abuses and practices of the Alaska Steamship Co., whitewashing them, and giving the company a rate increase beyond all justification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Committee on Commerce last Friday against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Ashton C. Barrett be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE ON THE NOMINATION OF ASHTON C. BARRETT TO THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, FRIDAY, JULY 12, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify on the nomina-

tion of Mr. Ashton C. Barrett to the Federal Maritime Commission.

I am opposed to this appointment.

I am sure Mr. Barrett is an able and distinguished individual within the field of his own competence and that he may very well have outstanding qualifications for public service.

However, for reasons I shall set forth I think Mr. Barrett has demonstrated that he is not qualified for another term as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission.

On May 6, 1963, the Federal Maritime Commission, of which Mr. Barrett is Vice Chairman, handed down a decision in another of the seemingly unending series of rate increase cases of which the Alaska Steamship Co. is the inevitable beneficiary. In my opinion, this decision constitutes such a flagrant corruption of the regulatory responsibility of the agency that I do not believe any member of the present Commission should be reappointed.

Despite the critical need for reduction of water freight rates to Alaska which has been repeatedly pointed out by the State, by the Territory before statehood, and by agencies of the Federal Government; despite the fact the rate increase awarded May 6 brought the total of rate increases in the Alaska trade since 1950 to a startling 56.4 percent; in the face of an adverse finding of the hearing examiner in the case (who died before it was decided by the Commission); and without any regard for facts presented by the State and the General Services Administration showing the increase to be unwarranted, the Federal Maritime Commission arbitrarily and capriciously decided the Alaska Steamship Co. needed some more money—and awarded the increase.

During the presentation of evidence in the case, which was concluded in December 1960—nearly 2½ years before the decision was rendered—the State of Alaska demonstrated that profits of the Alaska Steamship Co. were, even before the 10-percent hike now allowed, higher than could be justified. The State estimated that on the basis of rates in effect prior to the 10-percent increase now approved, the Alaska Steamship Co. earned a return on its investment in 1958 of not less than 19.74 percent; a return in 1959 of not less than 8.35 percent; and a return for the combined 2-year period of not less than 13.246 percent. It was further estimated that, with the application of more realistic depreciation periods than had been allowed, the profits of Alaska Steam actually ranged between 21.931 and 22.737 percent for 1958; between 9.697 and 10.528 percent for 1959 and 14.659 and 15.484 percent for the 2-year period.

The State presented, in addition, startling evidence of highhanded use of assets of the Alaska Steamship Co. by its owners, the Skinner family, which resulted in personal profits to the Skinners and constantly increasing costs to the beleaguered citizens of Alaska who pay the freight.

The State protested the allowance as an expense to the company of charitable contributions made on behalf of the Skinner family, but paid for by the people of Alaska. It argued that the company should not be allowed to charge to the trade the sum of \$39,620 paid in 1958 and \$10,500 paid in 1959 to the Skinner Foundation Trust, established to provide funds for contributions to charitable causes, and subsequently allowed by the Commission in the May 6 decision.

There was also presented evidence of inefficient management of the company reflected by abnormal layup costs when ships were inactive in 1958 and 1959. Such expenses, when combined with preinaugural costs of outfitting vessels for the Alaska trade, resulted in charges of nearly \$200,000 in the

years 1958 and 1959—expenditures the State held should not be borne by the ratepayers of Alaska.

Among other reasons for disallowing the increase, it was further shown that, despite extremely generous depreciation allowances permitted by the predecessor agency of the Commission and rate base computations which allowed the company, among other benefits, to earn a return on property it did not even own, the Alaska Steamship Co. has built no ships for its own account for a quarter of a century. The profits resulting from these beneficent policies of the so-called regulatory agency have simply been pocketed by its stockholders. Meanwhile, Alaska Steam has relied on Uncle Sam to supply it with Liberty ships and reserve fleet vessels at considerable savings of cost. Although Alaska Steam has earned substantial profit from the trade in which it engages, it has consistently failed to invest in public services any amounts commensurate with public needs.

The evidence was overwhelming this was no poor struggling company in need of public sympathy. Quite the contrary. This is a highly profitable business.

The reasoning of the State and the General Services Administration was persuasive to the hearing examiner, who came forth with a decision on April 3, 1962 (a year and 4 months after the case began), finding that the increase for which the company had applied was not justifiable for the future—although, curiously, allowable for the past months in which the higher rates had already been allowed to go into effect. The hearing examiner found, on the basis of the record, that the increased rates under consideration would produce projected earnings for 1960 bringing a return on investment of 19.35 percent—"far in excess of that found reasonable"—in the words of the examiner's decision. The examiner further agreed with the State of Alaska that the trade should not be forced to carry the burden of expenses in the form of charitable contributions from the Skinner trust fund and that the company could not claim, as a part of its rate base, the value of a pier and equipment belonging to the port of Seattle, Wash.

And now this poor excuse for a regulatory agency which presides over the good fortunes of the Alaska Steamship Co. to the detriment of the offshore areas of the United States has come along and found this deplorable rate increase to be just, reasonable, and lawful.

I confess my astonishment at the brazen disregard of fact and reason displayed by the Federal Maritime Commission in coming to the decision in the Alaska Steamship case it made on May 6.

The decision can be read straight through, backward, sideways, or upside down and there is nothing to disclose the reasoning by which the result was reached. Unless one comes to the unhappy conclusion, as I have, that the Federal Maritime Commission simply took the same course as its predecessor agencies and decided to benefit the carrier for the sake of benefiting the carrier there is no other possible explanation of the decision.

The decision admits the accuracy of the finding of the examiner as to forecasts of tonnage carried by the company in 1960 but proceeds to disregard this blithely by stating, without any supporting documentation, that 1960 was a better year than average. It must be kept in mind the record in this case was closed in December 1960. Whatever may have happened to the company after that was not at issue—or should not have been—in this case. Whatever the circumstances of the Alaska trade between December 1960 and May 1963, or, for that matter, in the years

ahead from now to the end of time should not have been considered by the Commission in coming to a decision on this case. It was bound to decide on the basis of the evidence before it when the case was closed in December 1960.

Thus, if there is any rationale for the decision of May 3, it can only be found in material not part of the record and not, under any fair rules of play, before the Commission at the time it made its decision.

This irresponsible action of an agency sworn to protect the public welfare is my reason for recommending that no member of it having taken part in this case should be reappointed.

I believe that, in this case, a conscientious Commissioner, concerned with the public welfare, would have reached a different decision. But there was not one dissent. There was not one member of the Federal Maritime Commission who voted in the interest of the public and on the basis of the record. The decision for Alaska Steam and against the people of Alaska was unanimous.

I believe the submission of this nomination by the President represents a serious matter of national concern that goes beyond the question of Mr. Barrett's qualifications for membership on the Federal Maritime Commission, vital as this is to all who are concerned with maritime matters, either as carriers or members of the public dependent on our domestic water transportation facilities, as are the people who live in Alaska.

For more than 30 years, since the New Deal emphasis on protection by the Government of interests of the people, as demonstrated by the development in those years of the concept of independent regulatory agencies, scholars of government have been working at perfections of our administrative system that will assure impartial action on matters for decision, protect rights of individuals, and safeguard the interests of the public.

While there are many avenues which may lead to establishment of an ideal system of regulating those industrial concerns of our Nation subject to Federal surveillance, and while there may be room for disagreement about differing proposals for improvement of administrative procedures, there can be no quarrel with the proposition that no system of administrative review, no matter how well designed, can operate properly without competent, qualified individuals in control of it.

This has been recognized by this administration.

Before President Kennedy took office, we who are concerned with effective action by regulatory agencies were heartened by one of the first actions of the President-elect in preparation for his assumption of office. This was the appointment of the Honorable James M. Landis, long recognized as an authority in the field of administrative law, as a special adviser, with the responsibility of preparing a searching study of deficiencies in the operation of Federal regulatory agencies, and recommendations for improvement. Dean Landis' study was presented in December 1960, and there was hope the recommendations he made would be put into operation and result in a renaissance of the enthusiasm for public service and Government dedicated to the public interest which was evident in the regulatory agencies in the years preceding World War II.

In his proposals for improvement of regulatory functions of Government, Dean Landis placed major emphasis on the importance of appointing well qualified individuals to agencies having regulatory functions. In his letter of transmittal of the report to the President-elect, Mr. Landis said:

"I have also dwelt quite heavily in a section entitled 'Personnel' on the matter of the

qualifications that should be required of the men called upon to man these agencies. No better service could be rendered to the administrative agencies as a whole than by gradually restaffing them with men who, because of their competence and their desire to fulfill the legislative mandates described in the basic statutes establishing these agencies, will inspire a sense of devotion to and pride in the public service by their many employees."

Again, in the introduction to the report, it was stated:

"Finally, it must be remembered that we cannot regard our Government as simply a government of laws and not of men, but rather a government of laws by men. Although the mechanisms we create for administration may be more or less well adapted to a particular task, the individuals that operate them singly or as a group have the ultimate responsibility of guidance and control.

"The results of their operations will thus reflect not only efficiency or inefficiency but more importantly the ideals and goals that within the framework of the basic law can fairly be achieved."

Finally, in recommendations for action needed, Dean Landis' report had the following to say about the need for careful attention to appointments to the regulatory agencies:

"The prime key to the improvement of the administrative process is the selection of qualified personnel. Good men can make poor laws workable; poor men will wreak havoc with good laws.

"As long as the selection of men for key administrative posts is based upon political reward rather than competency, little else that is done will really matter * * *."

"Basic challenges have been missing in the last decade. Good men cannot be attracted to agencies if they see that the colleagues with whom they are called upon to work, the staffs that they must utilize, are not measurable by standards they believe to be appropriate. Such a condition implies a lack of concern or a lack of understanding of the regulatory process by the President, either or both of which are destructive of the very thing that could hold an appeal. The appeal of a job can also be destroyed if the President, through design or neglect, permits his prejudices in behalf of political associates or friends to dictate the disposition of individual items of business. No truly good man can submit to such interference. Finally, the job's relationship to the general program of the administration must be clear and that clarity of relationship with the help of the President constantly maintained. These are the essential ingredients of the concept of challenge. They are also essential lures for the enlistment of talent."

As for the maritime regulatory agency, then the Federal Maritime Board, the Landis report referred to the anomaly then existing in its organizational structure in which administrative functions dedicated to promoting the interests of the maritime industry were combined with the regulatory responsibilities required to be exercised by the same agency. Those of us who are particularly concerned with the actions of this agency were, again, encouraged by the administration's position with respect to operation of regulatory agencies when, on June 12, 1961, President Kennedy submitted Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, establishing a five-member Maritime Commission and separating the Office of Maritime Administrator from any regulatory responsibility, as had formerly been the case. At that time I viewed this action with hope and faith that a new day had dawned which would finally bring Alaskans some relief from the unbearably high

shipping costs that have plagued our State from territorial days and have made it impossible for Alaska to develop as it should.

I testified before this committee in support of Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961, as follows:

"The new Maritime Commission, replacing the present Maritime Board, would have five members instead of three—a change which should bring new ideas and a fresh approach to the regulation of water carriers subject to its jurisdiction and also a desirable greater diversity of representation. I believe this change, in itself, ought to be productive of a hitherto untried vigorous regulatory policy which is so badly needed.

"It is of particular importance that the plan of the President would relieve the Chairman of the regulatory body of responsibility for promotional efforts on behalf of the maritime industry. This important duty would be lodged in a Maritime Administrator responsible to the Secretary of Commerce where it appropriately belongs. The anomalous situation now existing in which one individual is both the Chairman of the Maritime Board, in which role he exercises regulatory responsibilities, and also Maritime Administrator, a position charged with responsibility for promoting and encouraging the development of the American Merchant Marine is, I believe, at the root of many of the freight cost difficulties faced by the offshore areas.

"I believe the adoption of this reorganization plan is essential not only to the interests of the public dependent on water transportation but that it will also greatly benefit the water carriers."

Unhappily, my high hopes of 1961 have not been realized. Sadly, I have called the attention of the President and the Senate to the meaning of the Alaska Steamship Co. case decision of May 6, which I regard as a demonstration that the Commission the President appointed has betrayed his purpose and the trust he put in a revitalized organization. Certainly, the action of the Commission in the Alaska Steamship case cannot reflect the evident intent of the President to improve the regulatory agencies of the Government, and, particularly, the maritime regulatory agency.

I believe the occasion of this appointment is a good time to review the previous efforts of the administration toward improvement of Federal regulatory agencies which I have recounted above and raise the question whether this appointment is truly in the interest of the present administration.

At the time Mr. Barrett's original nomination came before this committee, in February 1962, I think most of us felt the President should have been given the benefit of Executive prerogative in the selection of his appointees. The Senate must always keep in mind its responsibilities for confirmation of Presidential appointments; however, except where there is substantial reason to question a Presidential nomination, Senators are traditionally reluctant to raise objections.

In 1962 we had reason, based on the expressed attitudes of the President toward improvement of the maritime regulatory agency, to feel he should be given his choice of nominees for the new Federal Maritime Commission. We felt the President and the new agency should be given a chance to demonstrate, by performance, the quality of nominees to the Commission.

Now that the Commission has, by its action in the Alaska Steamship case, showed its attitude and method of operation I think we have sufficient grounds for opposing reappointments of individuals who, in my judgment, have failed to serve the public interest.

I think the time has come, with this request for reappointment, that the Senate has good reason to criticize a Presidential nomination and exercise its constitutional responsibility to reject nominees not believed fitted for the service for which they are chosen.

In the case of Mr. Barrett, I have, on a previous occasion questioned his qualifications for membership on the Federal Maritime Commission. In a statement I made on the floor of the Senate on May 21 I referred facetiously to Mr. Barrett's experience in the drycleaning field as having led him to clean out the pockets of Alaskans by his action on the May 6 decision. That the Alaskans have, once again, been taken to the cleaners by the maritime regulatory agency is no laughing matter. The State of Alaska cannot survive further, uninhibited rate increases for water shipping to the State. Our entire economy is almost totally dependent on water transportation. It is perilously threatened by unrelieved increases in the cost of living which are the direct result of increases in water freight rates.

Alaska cannot risk any longer the supervision of the water carriers which are its lifeline by individuals whose philosophy of service on the regulatory agency they serve are characterized by the statement in Mr. Barrett's biography, presented to this committee at the time of his original appointment. At that time, it was stated to the committee that Mr. Barrett "views the regulatory role as one in which the Government has the opportunity to assure, in cooperation with those to be regulated, a free interchange of products in world trade that will mutually enhance the vigor and prosperity of American and free world shipping."

I find nothing in this statement to indicate that Mr. Barrett conceives of the regulatory function of this agency as one which will operate in the interests of the public dependent upon it. I find nothing to show a willingness to take account of the importance of this agency in enhancing the vigor and prosperity of the offshore areas of the United States to which domestic shipping is of vital importance. I find, only, a view of the agency which describes its role as that of enhancing the vigor and prosperity of the carriers, without regard to what the application of this philosophy may mean to those who are dependent upon the services of these carriers.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge this committee to reject the nomination of Ashton C. Barrett to the Federal Maritime Commission.

Thank you again for giving me this opportunity to testify on this appointment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for the campaign which he is conducting to lower ocean freight rates. I think the blame is not so much Mr. Barrett's as it is that of the Chairman of the Commission, but I suppose there is sufficient blame for everybody.

Mr. GRUENING. All are equally responsible. The Chairman no doubt led the way. He is the only person on the Commission with appreciable previous experience in maritime matters. Other members are completely unqualified by lack of pertinent experience. But they might have learned, which they did not. They merely followed the Chairman, who is an old hand at following the practices which have been followed through the years by predecessor agencies which the Senator from Illinois properly characterizes as nefarious practices. These ne-

furious practices have been going on much too long.

As the Senator from Illinois says, the time to act is now. Mere promises will not do. We have lived with these promises in Alaska for two generations or more. What has happened and what is happening is shameful. The Maritime Commission is not in Alaska protecting the public interest; in the instances the Senator from Illinois cites the Maritime Commission is not protecting the private interest or the national interest. I do not know what interest it does serve, except that of its members to continue to draw their salaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Alaska. I also have been discouraged by the failure of the parties supposedly interested in this matter to make any effective showing.

The Treasury Department is much concerned over the unfavorable balance of payments. Virtually the only remedy the Treasury Department has proposed is for us to increase interest rates, which would of course directly hobble American economic expansion—this is a procedure which, in my judgment, would be relatively ineffective even if foreign countries did not increase their rates, because already there are higher interest rates here than in most European countries. Furthermore, if we should increase our interest rates there is every prospect that the European countries would increase theirs, and hence there would be no differential advantage to us.

The Treasury Department does not mention differential freight rates.

I do not know what the Council of Economic Advisers has done. They have advised the President, but I have not noticed any public statements on this subject.

I think Secretary Hodges is trying, but he seems to be almost alone.

I have been very disappointed by the fact that we have received little response from the injured parties. I have been trying to stir up interest on the part of the steel industry, and I must say that with the exception of the Kaiser Co. and one or two other companies there has been a very discouraging response.

I have not found any other appreciable group of exporters who are interested, with the exception of the chemical industry, and I do wish to pay tribute to them.

There seems to be a sort of tacit acceptance of these discriminatory provisions and an acquiescence in economic totalitarianism. The apostles of free enterprise seem not to object, although this is a direct violation of all the principles for which they supposedly stand.

I have not noticed any objection to these practices on the part of the economic columnists, many of whom are very anxious to have interest rates increased.

I have not noticed any action by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce or by the National Association of Manufacturers.

I have been trying to interest the unions in this problem, because they suffer so far as employment is concerned.

It is extraordinary how people pacifically accept this, though it hurts their interests—hurts production, hurts sales, and hurts the national interest. I have been surprised to see how they all acquiesce in these rates, which are directly contrary to our every legitimate interest.

As the Senator from Alaska knows, I have always tried to adopt a rather broad international point of view. The Senator has reproved me on many occasions for supporting foreign aid as zealously as I have supported it. But I do not believe in a cowardly subservience to any such practices as these against the interests of the United States. I think this is especially reprehensible on the part of Government officials who are supposedly charged with the duty of protecting legitimate American interests.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I would say that this whole question of regulatory agencies is one of the most vital issues which confronts the American people. I believe that the test of an administration can be found in the character of its appointees to the regulatory agencies. Are they vigilant? Are they alert? Are they knowledgeable? Are they dedicated? Do they protect the public interest? Do they protect the national interest?

In the case of the Federal Maritime Commission I think the proof is very clear. It so happens that the Senator from Illinois and I have approached this problem from entirely different standpoints, from two entirely different aspects of the Maritime Commission's duties and responsibility. In each case, we have found negligence, indifference to the public interest, and shameful performance.

Perhaps we should not dilute this indictment of the Federal Maritime Commission by referring to other regulatory agencies, but we who live in Alaska have suffered greatly from regulatory agencies and this came close often to being a matter of survival. We are now exposed to a threat hanging over us from the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Alaska has suffered from the fact that while it was a Territory—a stepchild in the national family, really a colony—it had only one form of transportation. That was maritime transportation. Alaska until 1940 could be reached only by sea. The shortcoming of maritime transportation date back to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, to which the distinguished Senator from Illinois referred, into which act was written a specific discrimination against Alaska. That act provided that shippers, across the country, of freight destined over the oceans could use interchangeably foreign and domestic carriers, and "foreign" in that case meant Canadian. A shipper from New York who wished to ship goods to China could ship across the country either by American railroads or by Ca-

nadian railroads, or partly by either, and when the goods arrived at the Pacific coast port he could ship across the Pacific Ocean either in American bottoms or in foreign bottoms. The same was true of the reverse shipments, west to east across the Atlantic.

But in the heart of that section the author of the bill, the late Senator Wesley Jones, of Seattle, inserted two lethal words. Those words were "excluding Alaska."

So, of all areas, foreign and domestic, sought to be benefited by the legislation, Alaska alone was excluded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He did that to help the shipping lines which sailed out of Seattle to go to Alaska, which then had a monopoly on the trade with that territory.

Mr. GRUENING. Precisely. That situation has been haunting us ever since, to this day. The stranglehold of the Seattle shipping monopoly is the very thing against which we are struggling now, and its excessive rates ever increasing have always had the support of the various Federal maritime bureaus—the U.S. Shipping Board, the Federal Maritime Board, and now the present Federal Maritime Commission.

We were hopeful that when this administration came in, and President Kennedy separated the two functions—the promoters function and the regulatory function—we would have a new approach, a validation of the New Frontier. Unfortunately, that has not happened.

At the same time that we were subjected to the steamship monopoly, with ever-increasing rates—which abolished passenger service 9 years ago—we were likewise excluded from all Federal-aid highway legislation. So while roads were being built with Federal aid in 48 States, while a magnificent network of highways was constructed, with Federal matching funds in lower 48 States, Alaska was totally excluded from the legislation until 1956, with the result that today Alaska, after having been in the Union for 4 years, is in the unique position—which is unthinkable in the lower 48 States—of having not merely a few, but indeed a majority, of its communities inaccessible by highway or railway.

It would be unthinkable in the State of Illinois or in any of the other mainland 48 States to have a situation where one could not go into or leave by highway or by rail from even the smallest village. But that is true of Alaska in the majority of its communities, including the capital.

Having thus been deprived by Federal action and discrimination of adequate transportation by sea and land, Alaskans, being pioneer in spirit, turned to air, and through their efforts, have developed a fine system of intra-Alaska aviation and connecting aviation with the other 48 States.

This, the only functioning, effective system of transportation Alaskans have, the Civil Aeronautics Board now wants to wreck. There are now four carriers that carry passengers and air freight be-

tween Alaska and the lower 48 States: Pan American, which was the pioneer in developing air transportation in Alaska, and is an unsubsidized air carrier; Northwest Air Lines, likewise unsubsidized, and two others, Pacific Northern Air Lines and Alaska Air Lines, which developed from bush pilot pioneering. CAB wants to push Pan American out of Alaska entirely. It wishes to limit Northwest to merely letting off and on passengers incidental to its Orient service; wishes to abolish its daily excellent service between Anchorage and Seattle. It wishes to consolidate the two remaining airlines, Pacific Northern and Alaska Air Lines, reducing four airlines to one and creating an air monopoly. That is the announced purpose of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It would be utterly destructive. It would ruin the one form of transportation to and from Alaska that is adequate, effective, and satisfactory. As for the intra-Alaska airlines, the Board would cut down on subsidies which are absolutely essential if communities which are now roadless, and which one must go to or leave from by air, are not to be left without service. In short, the Civil Aeronautics Board, in flagrant disregard of Alaska's needs, is strangling Alaska. The policies of these two regulatory agencies, both dealing with transportation, the Federal Maritime Board and the Civil Aeronautics Board, have shown no concept of the New Frontier. Quite the contrary.

So the problem we face with the Federal regulatory agencies is one to which we must direct our attention. I intend to keep focusing on it until we get some rectification, some relief, some justice, and some regard for the public interest, which we do not now have. It remains to be seen whether this indictment does not apply to all the regulatory agencies. I hope not. I think they are on trial before the people of the United States, and I feel that that trial should be conducted by those who are deeply concerned with the welfare of their constituencies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I think there is a general tendency for the regulatory agencies, over the passage of time, to become regulated and controlled by the very interests which they were set up to regulate and control, because the institutions whose rates and services they control have great economic interests involved. These interests are brought to bear upon the regulatory bodies, and as the members of the public are uninformed, their interests are diffused and relatively neglected. This is the common tendency, I am afraid, of all such regulatory bodies.

I am glad the Senator from Alaska is sounding the alarm. It is not merely Alaska which is involved, but the entire United States. Casting our eyes upon the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], we remember that he had a magnificent war record, and, while a Senator occupying the chair cannot speak, I ask if it is not true that Hawaii

also suffers from discriminatory shipping rates and that the rates from the United States to Hawaii are extremely high and that the rates between and among the Hawaiian Islands are extremely high.

Mr. GRUENING. I am not prepared to say whether that is true. Hawaii was long a stepchild with Alaska and may have suffered some of the same discriminations as Alaska, although not to the same extent. However, it is time, now that the 49th and 50th States are a part of the Union, that they make known their demands for equality of opportunity, rates, and services.

Hawaii, too, has no land bridge. It depends on either maritime or air transportation for its continued existence, and the character of these services is very much more important there than it is in any one of the other 48 States, which have bus, auto, and rail transportation, as well as air.

Alaska is essentially an island, although it is geographically a part of the continent, and, of course, Hawaii is all islands and dependent upon these two forms of transportation, air and maritime, and, therefore, particularly concerned over the actions of the agencies that are presumed to act to protect the interest of the people in those areas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that at one time—and if I am wrong, I hope to be corrected—the shipping lines which plied between the United States and Hawaii were controlled by about five families, which controlled the land of Hawaii and controlled the politics of Hawaii as well? Is that not true? It may be that changes have been made in the last year or two but when I last looked into the matter what I have said was true.

Mr. GRUENING. I am not prepared to enter into that aspect of the problem. I think there has never been quite the same intensity of the problem there that we have in Alaska. Certainly my experience with Hawaii indicates that the abuse, if there has been one, has not been of the same character and extent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I am in error, I am very willing to assume the role of the Presiding Officer so the Senator from Hawaii may come to the floor and refute the statement which I have made.

Mr. GRUENING. It is my impression that the Matson Line does not hold the same position in the eyes of the people of Hawaii that the Alaska Line holds in the eyes of the people of Alaska.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandums prepared by Mr. Boggs be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandums were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 13, 1963.

To: Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman.
From: Thomas Boggs.
Subject: Ocean freight rates and steel products.

The U.S. trade balance has increased by \$2.7 billion since 1955. This increase ac-

counts for one of the few plusses in the U.S. balance of payments. In contrast to this improvement is the U.S. trade balance on steel. Since 1955, this balance has declined in constant dollars by almost \$800 million. The value of steel exports declined by 48 percent, whereas imports increased more than threefold.

Some explanations for this decline are well known, such as the postwar reconstruction of European and Japanese steel plants and the loss of foreign markets during prolonged steel strikes. The validity of these explanations will not be debated in this memorandum; its purpose is to point out that one of the important, yet unpublicized reasons for this decline in trade may well be the advantage enjoyed by foreign producers of steel due to ocean freight rate differentials.

Ocean freight rates for the most part are established by shipping conferences. There are more than 100 active steamship conferences which operate over trade routes involving U.S. commerce. In 13 of these, there are no American-flag lines. In another 30, only 1 American-flag line is an active participant. In 93 of these conferences, Americans are outnumbered. The lack of U.S. representation in these conferences may be the primary reason for the freight rate discrimination against American exports.

While the Maritime Commission does not set rates, it can regulate rates. All rates set by conferences whose ships operate in U.S. commerce must be filed with the Maritime Commission 30 days prior to their effectiveness. The Maritime Commission has the authority to "disapprove, cancel or modify any agreement that it finds to be unjustly discriminatory or unfair, to operate to the detriment of the commerce of the United States, to be contrary to the public interest, or to be in violation of the act" (Jones Act, 1916). Thus, the Maritime Commission has knowledge of rate discrimination and has the authority to disapprove the rates established by the conferences.

Freight differentials can be grouped in two classes. First, differentials exist between the outbound and inbound freight rates charged by carriers traveling to and from the United States on the same trade routes and carrying identical products. In the case of steel, the ocean freight rates established by the shipping conferences are much higher from a given port in the United States to a Western European or Japanese port than are the freight rates on identical products shipped inbound from the same ports to a given American port. Second, differentials exist between freight rates charged by carriers from U.S. ports to third market areas and the rates charged from European and Japanese ports to these areas. It would seem logical that these differences would be based on mileage and time. It should cost more to send steel products from Western Europe to the north coast of South America than it costs to send them from the United States. But such is not the case—it costs less to send the products from Europe, even though the distance is far greater.

The effects of freight rate discrimination on U.S. exports and imports is illustrated by the following example. The price of a German wire rod, f.o.b. West Germany, is approximately \$116 a short ton. The freight rate from Germany to a North Atlantic port is \$18.25. The U.S. price of similar wire rod is \$132.60 per short ton. With the freight rate of \$18.25, therefore, the German import can effectively compete with the price of wire rods in the United States. However, the outbound rate paid by American exporters of wire rod is \$29.50. If this rate were applied

to the German inbound product, it could not compete for the price would be at least \$145—\$12.90 more than the American price. In this case, the freight differential permits goods to come into the United States and compete with our goods, whereas if the American rate were to be applied, German wire rods could not effectively compete.

The Federal Maritime Commission lacks information regarding the freight rates of our major competitors to third market countries. Thus, this memorandum is not able to document the transportation disadvantage of American exporters to these areas. There is, however, evidence that American exporters are not able to penetrate third markets solely because of freight rate discrimination. Mr. Walther Lederer of the Department of Commerce testified before the Joint Economic Committee that "the rates from the United States, for instance, to the north coast of South America, an area relatively close to our shores, are considerably higher than the rates from Europe to the same place in the same ships." Thus, freight rate differentials force exporters to reduce profit margins or to abandon sales altogether.

Despite the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States and the decline of American steel exports and the increase in steel imports, the Federal Maritime Commission has not previously undertaken steps to remedy existing freight rate differentials on steel. The Maritime Commission has, as its representatives testified before the Joint Economic Committee, known of this problem for many years. In the words of its representatives, "it is a matter of general knowledge." Moreover, another committee of the Congress, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the House Judiciary Committee, informed the Commission of this discrimination over a year ago. The Commission testified that it has the responsibility and authority to initiate studies and actions about these matters, and that it has the power to disapprove freight rates set by shipping conferences. Nevertheless, it failed to take any action until this month.

The attached tables indicate that (a) ocean freight rates on U.S. exports of steel products traveling the major U.S. trade routes are significantly higher than the rates on identical imports traveling the same routes in the same ships; (b) the value of trade is significant in commodities where freight rate discrimination prevails; (c) freight rates account for more than 12 percent of the value of steel products on the average; (d) on the average, 17 percent of the difference in value between exports and imports is due to the higher freight rates paid by American exporters of steel products.

Tables 1 and 2, applicable to the three major U.S. foreign trade routes, indicate that the freight rates on U.S. exports to Japan of all major iron and steel products, and on many manufactured and fabricated products with a high steel content, are in every case higher than the freight rates on imports of identical items.

Tables 1 and 2 also indicate that outbound freight rates applicable to European trade routes are higher than inbound rates on most steel products and on many fabricated and manufactured products with a high steel content. In the few instances where the inbound rate is higher, it is just a fraction above the outbound rate; when the outbound rate is higher, it is substantially higher.

Table 3 seems to contradict statements made by representatives of the Maritime Commission that these rates are only paper rates and do not affect actual U.S. exports. Table 3 compares the original figures sub-

mitted to the Joint Economic Committee by Mr. Lederer, showing freight rates effective March 1962, with a set of figures submitted by the Maritime Commission showing freight rates in May 1963.

Freight rates on the products listed have changed levels in almost every case during the past year, but the disparity in favor of our competitors remains at an almost constant level. The changes imply that these rates are under continuing security by the shipping conferences. They are not merely paper rates which have been on the books for a number of years and have not changed simply because U.S. exporters do not sell any of these products abroad.

Table 4 indicates that the balance of U.S. steel trade has declined by more than \$760

million since 1955, and that widespread discrimination in freight rates exists on products which are heavily traded. For example, on pipe and tubing, the value of U.S. exports has declined from \$157 million in 1955 to \$86 million in 1962—a decrease of 45 percent. At the same time, imports have risen from \$11 million to \$96 million—an increase of 751 percent. The average out-bound freight rates of the three major trade routes on pipe and tubing is \$42.40 per ton. The average inbound rate is \$22.65.

Table 5 indicates the percentage of freight rates to the total value of exported and imported steel products. Using a simple average, approximately 13 percent of the total value of steel products is accounted for by freight rates. The table also indi-

cates the percentage of the differences in values between exports and imports due to differences in freight rates. In the case of ingots, billets, blooms, and slabs, the average value of a U.S. export of one of these products is \$102.25 per ton. The average value of a like import is \$93.40 per ton. Sixty-six percent of the difference in value between these exports and imports is due to the difference between outbound and inbound freight rates. In every case shown in the table, some part of the value difference between exports and imports is directly attributable to a higher freight rate paid by the American exporter. On the average for all of the products shown, 17 percent of the value differences are due to higher freight rates.

TABLE 1.—Comparison of Conference ocean freight rates on iron and steel products for the 3 United States-foreign trade routes, May 1963

Commodity	United States Pacific and Japanese ports ¹		United States gulf and North Atlantic French ports ²		United States North Atlantic and West German ports ²	
	Outbound ⁴	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound
Plates.....	\$27.10	\$15.50	\$15.55	\$13.50	\$15.25	\$20.00
Bars.....	31.10	15.50	32.35	31.00	13.25	17.75
Wire.....	33.35	22.75	29.40	15.00	27.50	15.75
Plates, iron and steel.....	22.15	15.50	15.55	13.50	14.50	20.00
Sheet.....	(⁵)	15.50	15.55	13.50	13.25	20.00
Strip.....	33.35	(⁵)	(⁵)	(⁵)	13.25	24.25
Structural shape, fabricated.....	(⁵)	22.75	33.50	13.50	28.50	(⁵)
Wire rope.....	38.85	25.25	52.90	42.00	45.00	20.25
Wire strand.....	38.85	25.25	(⁵)	(⁵)	49.50	20.25
Grinding balls.....	35.00	(⁵)	(⁵)	29.75	38.00	21.50
Pig iron.....	Open	Open	29.40	13.50	25.00	(⁵)
Sponge iron.....	43.00	(⁵)	(⁵)	(⁵)	(⁵)	(⁵)
Iron and steel scrap.....	41.60	21.00	37.90	25.75	24.25	24.75
Angles, beams, and girders.....	31.10	15.50	33.50	13.50	28.50	17.75
Bolts and nuts.....	33.35	25.25	33.50	17.00	28.50	16.25
Castings and forgings.....	58.50	(⁵)	47.35	34.00	40.25	26.25
Billets and blooms.....	33.35	15.50	15.55	13.50	Open	17.25
Rails.....	39.35	15.50	39.40	13.50	33.50	17.75
Rods, wire, plain.....	33.35	15.50	31.45	13.50	23.25	16.50
Screws.....	33.35	23.75	49.10	17.00	41.75	21.50
Pipes, iron and steel.....	33.35	18.00	60.25	14.50	51.25	18.75
Wire, barbed.....	36.60	18.75	33.50	17.00	28.50	16.25
Bars, reinforcing, up to 30 feet.....	31.10	15.50	38.80	(⁵)	(⁵)	(⁵)
Oil-well castings.....	36.60	18.00	(⁵)	(⁵)	(⁵)	(⁵)

¹ Pacific Westbound Conference and Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan.
² Gulf-French Atlantic Hamburg Range Conference—Continental-U.S.A. Gulf Westbound Conference.
³ North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference tariffs.
⁴ Outbound rate is the noncontract rate set by the conferences. The contract rates are 5 to 10 percent lower.

⁵ Not available.
⁶ Open.

NOTE.—Freight on exports on ton basis, 2,240 pounds; freight on imports on ton basis, 1,000 kilos=2,204.6 pounds. (except Japan where import freight is on the long-ton basis, 2,240 pounds).

TABLE 2.—Freight rates on products with high steel content

Commodity	United States Pacific and Japanese ports ¹		United States gulf and North Atlantic French ports ²		United States North Atlantic and West German ports ²	
	Outbound ⁴	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound	Outbound	Inbound
Autos, new, boxed.....	\$40.75	\$23.00	\$23.20	\$14.50	(⁵)	(⁵)
Autos, new, unboxed.....	50.75	23.00	28.75	33.80	(⁵)	(⁵)
Bulldozer.....	59.50	50.25	32.05	(⁵)	\$22.25	(⁵)
Generators.....	59.75	33.25	(⁵)	(⁵)	36.75	\$42.50
Electric motors.....	59.75	33.25	(⁵)	(⁵)	65.50	24.00
Hardware, general.....	(⁵)	24.00	(⁵)	28.00	42.50	21.00
Machine tools, excluding electric.....	76.50	45.50	40.65	44.50	36.75	42.50
Machines and machinery, agricultural and parts.....	(⁵)	33.00	23.80	34.50	22.25	23.25
Roadbuilding machinery.....	59.50	50.25	32.05	(⁵)	22.25	(⁵)
Tractors, boxed.....	48.00	(⁵)	32.05	27.75	22.25	20.00
Tractors, unboxed.....	59.75	(⁵)	22.35	27.75	16.75	20.00
Trucks, boxed.....	40.75	23.00	23.20	14.50	15.00	27.50
Trucks, unboxed.....	50.75	23.00	33.40	14.50	20.00	24.00
Auto parts.....	40.75	24.75	23.20	18.75	15.00	14.00

¹ Pacific Westbound Conference and Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan.
² Gulf-French Atlantic Hamburg Range Conference—Continental-U.S.A. Gulf Westbound Conference.
³ North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference tariffs.
⁴ Outbound rate is the noncontract rate set by the Conferences. The contract rates are 5 to 10 percent lower.

⁵ Not available.

NOTE.—Freight on exports on ton basis, 2,240 pounds; freight on imports on ton basis, 1,000 kilos=2,204.6 pounds (except Japan where import freight is on the long-ton basis, 2,240 pounds).

TABLE 3-A.—Comparison of Conference ocean freight rates effective May 1963 on iron and steel products for 3 U.S.-foreign trade routes

Commodity	United States North Atlantic ports and West Germany ¹		United States gulf ports and North Atlantic French ports ²		United States Pacific ports and Japan ³	
	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports
Angles, beams, girders (structurals).....	\$31.25	\$17.75	\$33.50	\$13.50	\$31.10	\$15.50
Bolts.....	31.25	16.25	33.50	17.00	33.35	25.25
Castings and forgings.....	44.75	26.25	47.35	34.00	58.50	(⁴)
Billets and blooms.....	13.25	17.25	15.55	13.50	33.35	15.50
Rails.....	37.00	17.75	39.40	13.50	39.35	15.50
Rods, wire, plain.....	25.50	16.50	31.45	13.50	33.35	15.50
Screws.....	45.75	21.50	49.10	17.00	33.35	23.75
Pipes, iron and steel, 6-inch diameter.....	56.75	18.75	60.25	14.50	33.35	18.00
Wire, barbed.....	31.25	16.25	33.50	17.00	36.60	18.75
Bars, reinforcing up to 40 feet.....	13.25	(⁴)	38.80	(⁴)	31.10	15.50
Oil-well casings.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	36.60	18.00
Shapes, plain, not fabricated.....	13.25	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	31.10	(⁴)
Rods.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	45.85	15.50

¹ North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference Tariffs.² Gulf-French Atlantic Hamburg Range Conference—Continental-U.S.A. Gulf Westbound Conference.³ Pacific Westbound Conference and Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan.⁴ Freight rate is either not available or the commodities are included in another class.⁴ Not available.

NOTE.—Freight on exports on ton basis, 2,240 pounds; freight on imports on ton basis, 1,000 kilos equals 2,204.6 pounds (except Japan where import freight is on the long-ton basis, 2,240 pounds).

Source: U.S. Federal Maritime Commission, Division of Foreign Tariffs.

TABLE 3-B.—Comparison of Conference ocean freight rates effective March 1962 on iron and steel products for 3 U.S.-foreign trade routes

Commodity	United States North Atlantic ports and West Germany ¹		United States gulf ports and North Atlantic French ports ²		United States Pacific ports and Japan ³	
	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports
Angles, beams, girders (structurals).....	\$31.25	\$19.75	\$28.50	\$17.00	\$28.10	\$15.50
Bolts.....	31.25	24.00	28.50	20.50	(⁴)	(⁴)
Castings and forgings.....	44.25	29.25	40.25	34.00	(⁴)	(⁴)
Billets and blooms.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	13.25	17.00	30.35	15.50
Rails.....	36.75	19.75	33.50	17.00	(⁴)	(⁴)
Rods, wire, plain.....	29.50	18.25	(⁴)	(⁴)	28.25	15.50
Screws.....	46.00	24.00	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)
Pipes, iron and steel, 6-inch diameter.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	30.35	21.00
Wire, barbed.....	28.50	23.00	28.50	19.00	(⁴)	(⁴)
Bars, reinforcing up to 40 feet.....	(⁴)	19.75	(⁴)	(⁴)	28.10	(⁴)
Oil-well casings.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	33.60	21.00
Shapes, plain, not fabricated.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	28.10	(⁴)
Rods.....	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	(⁴)	28.25	15.50

¹ North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference tariffs.² Gulf-French Atlantic Hamburg Range Conference—Continental-U.S.A. Gulf Westbound Conference.³ Pacific Westbound Conference and Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan.⁴ Freight rate is either not available or the commodities are included in another class.⁴ Not available.

NOTE.—Freight on exports on ton basis, 2,240 pounds; freight on imports on ton basis, 1,000 kilos=2,204.6 pounds (except Japan where import freight is on the long-ton basis, 2,240 pounds).

Source: U.S. Federal Maritime Commission, Division of Foreign Tariffs.

TABLE 4.—Average freight rates for the 3 major trade routes, and value of trade, 1955 and 1962

Product grouping	Exports				Freight rate (per ton)		Imports			
	1955 value ¹	1962 value ¹	Percent change	Absolute change	Export	Import	1955 value ¹	1962 value ¹	Percent change	Absolute change
Ingot, blooms, billets, slabs, etc.....	Thousands \$48,762	Thousands \$20,493	Thousands -\$58.0	Thousands -\$28,269	\$21.25	\$15.40	Thousands \$11,888	Thousands \$13,338	Thousands +\$17.1	Thousands +\$1,950
Skelp.....	8,272	1,128	-86.4	-7,144			356	356		-356
Wire rods.....	7,006	3,842	-45.2	-3,164	27.50	14.90	4,608	61,920	+1,243.8	+57,312
Structural shapes and piling.....	41,905	23,005	-45.0	-18,850	29.00	15.50	10,780	36,652	+340.0	+25,872
Plates.....	47,088	26,160	-44.5	-20,928	20.30	16.15	186	13,950	+7,400.0	+13,764
Rails and accessories.....	11,248	17,784	+58.1	+6,536	35.80	15.00	655	1,140	+71.4	+475
Concrete reinforcing bars.....	9,916	2,948	-70.3	-6,968	26.00	15.00	11,607	44,311	+281.8	+32,704
Other bars and tool steel.....	35,904	21,760	-39.4	-14,144	27.90	20.00	14,560	43,456	+198.5	+28,896
Pipe and tubing.....	156,800	86,016	-45.2	-70,784	42.40	19.75	11,396	96,940	+750.6	+84,544
Wire nails.....	2,292	3,056	+33.3	+764	30.00	21.00	18,209	37,669	+106.9	+19,460
Barbed wire, wire fencing, and other wire and wire products.....	12,785	13,222	+3.8	+437	32.30	17.60	14,464	63,407	+338.4	+48,943
Sheet and strip.....	286,560	144,000	-49.8	-142,560	26.90	13.50	7,661	62,429	+714.9	+54,768
Tin mill products.....	118,269	60,282	-49.1	-57,987			8,960	8,960		-8,960
Total.....	816,781	424,743	-48.0	-392,038			114,460	483,800	+322.68	+368,340
Change in balance of trade, \$760,378										

¹ Value excludes freight rate.

TABLE 5.—Influence of ocean freight rates on steel price differentials, 1962

Commodity	Freight rates (per ton)		Value (per ton)		Percent of rates to value ¹		Percent of value difference due to rates ¹
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	
Ingots, blooms, billets, slabs, etc.	\$21.25	\$15.40	\$102.25	\$93.40	21	17	66
Skelp	27.50	14.90	253.50	110.90	11	13	9
Wire rods	29.00	15.50	174.00	113.50	17	14	22
Structural shapes and piling	20.30	16.15	238.30	109.15	9	15	3
Plates	35.80	15.60	187.80	110.60	19	14	26
Rails and accessories	26.60	15.00	166.00	98.00	17	17	15
Concrete reinforcing bars	27.90	20.00	299.90	132.00	9	15	5
Other bars and tool steel	42.40	19.75	490.40	167.75	9	12	7
Pipe and tubing	30.60	21.00	194.60	170.00	4	13	2
Wire nails	32.30	17.60	315.30	180.60	10	11	10
Barbed wire, wire fencing, other wire and wire products	26.90	13.50	266.90	193.50	10	8	15
Sheet and strip							
Tin mill products							
Average					12	14	17

¹ Rounded to nearest percentage.

NOTE.—Value includes average freight rates. Average freight rates of the 3 major trade routes

TABLE I-A.—U.S. oceanborne foreign trade in selected commodities and ocean freight rates, North Atlantic-Germany (trade route 7, Hamburg-Bremen-Bremerhaven: Continental Freight Conference), 1961

Commodity	Exports					Imports				
	Freight rate	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)	Freight rate	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)
Meat, canned	\$37.25	\$161,722	328	\$493	8	\$21.50				
Vegetables, canned	38.00	129,276	660	196	19	44.00				
Fruits and preparations, canned	38.00	4,887	8	635	6	37.50				
Fruit juices, canned or frozen	38.00	6,726	10	679	6	18.50	\$98,651	195	\$506	4
Rubber tires and inner tubes	38.75	186,114	132	1,412	3	30.50	872,491	649	1,345	2
Cotton, semimanufactures	34.00	1,462,435	4,886	299	11	27.50	215,321	1,017	212	13
Standard newsprint paper	25.00	57,462	401	143	17	58.00	33,231	204	163	36
Lubricating oils and greases	26.75	1,234,863	9,050	136	20	24.75	159		795	3
Sulfur	28.50	8,340	27	306	9	27.50	1,398	6	215	13
Iron and steel castings and forgings	40.00	174,521	136	1,281	3	32.50	195,665	376	520	6
Tools and basic hardware	36.25	1,240,532	304	4,079	1	21.00	5,578,538	5,988	932	2
Iron and steel pipe	51.00	1,062,520	1,439	738	7	18.25	1,029,855	4,832	213	9
Rolled and finished steel	63.00	13,420,986	55,708	241	26	24.25	6,457,942	18,819	343	7
Electrical machinery	22.50	16,710,889	5,688	2,938	1	67.00	38,418,516	13,812	2,781	2
Construction machinery	16.50	9,479,051	5,355	1,770	1	20.00				
Metalworking machinery	33.00	19,972,599	6,381	3,130	1	21.00	9,690,012	3,990	2,429	1
Textile sewing and shoe machines	21.75	8,870,167	1,976	4,489	1	21.00	14,423,955	5,418	2,662	1
Agricultural machinery	16.50	5,742,074	3,901	1,472	1	20.75	1,307,769	772	1,694	1
Automobiles, trucks, etc.	16.50	2,446,131	1,819	1,345	1	21.75	63,658,795	44,060	1,445	2
Railway locomotive cars and parts	63.00	79,850	48	1,660	4		396		1,980	
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations	56.75	2,270,678	205	11,082	1	61.50	3,915,660	996	3,932	2
Sulfuric acid	63.00	166		830	8	95.00	3,214	7	480	20
Alcohols	22.00	129,411	212	612	4	62.00				
Pigments, paints, and varnish	20.00	670,666	702	956	2	48.50	473,148	1,937	244	20
Nitrogen, fertilizer materials, excluding ammonium sulfate	24.50	28,821	170	170	14	21.25	7,524	94	80	27
Potash fertilizer materials	48.75					21.25	441,812	11,651	38	56

NOTE.—Tonnage data are in long tons. Freight rates for U.S. exports are expressed in terms of long tons (2,240 pounds); freight rates for U.S. imports are expressed in terms of metric tons (2,204 pounds). Freight rate data refer to 1963.

Source: Value and volume data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration. Freight rate data supplied by the Federal Maritime Commission.

TABLE I-B.—U.S. oceanborne foreign trade in selected commodities and ocean freight rates, North Atlantic/Belgium/Netherlands (trade route 8, Antwerp-Rotterdam: Continental Freight Conference), 1961

Commodity	Exports					Imports				
	Freight rate	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)	Freight rate	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)
Meat, canned	\$37.25	\$275,808	394	\$701	5	\$21.50				
Vegetables, canned	34.50	75,581	282	268	13	44.00				
Fruits and preparations, canned	34.50	24,901	98	253	14	37.50				
Fruit juices, canned or frozen	34.50	137,902	270	510	7	18.50	\$543,772	918	\$592	3
Rubber tires and inner tubes	35.25	2,555,352	2,035	1,256	3	30.50	392,444	420	934	3
Cotton semimanufactures	32.00	1,642,005	5,587	294	11	27.50	949,575	3,492	272	10
Standard newsprint paper	22.75	3,010	20	151	15	58.00				
Lubricating oils and greases	24.25	3,463,276	20,444	169	14	24.75	186,889	921	203	12
Sulfur	26.00	116,571	307	380	7	27.50	3,793	18	214	13
Iron and steel castings and forgings	36.25	614,826	205	3,006	1	32.50	24,583	26	957	3
Tools and basic hardware	33.00	5,770,552	2,225	2,504	1	21.00	3,696,190	14,413	256	8
Iron and steel pipe	46.25	1,000,482	1,760	569	1	18.25	2,638,115	16,700	158	12
Rolled and finished steel	57.25	16,001,589	45,211	354	16	24.25	32,410,057	259,001	125	19
Electrical machinery	20.50	36,613,086	11,059	3,311	1	67.00	15,688,992	3,326	4,717	1
Construction machinery	15.00	37,127,396	22,225	1,670	1	20.00				
Metalworking machinery	33.00	34,953,205	17,115	2,042	2	21.00	2,595,635	666	3,898	1
Textile, sewing, and shoe machines	19.75	19,013,937	3,238	5,871	1	21.00	5,127,885	2,290	2,240	1
Agricultural machinery	15.00	17,342,453	12,258	1,415	1	20.75	518,543	666	779	3
Automobiles, trucks, etc.	15.00	29,552,090	24,803	1,191	1	21.75	4,859,828	3,061	1,588	1
Railway locomotive cars and parts	57.25	1,115,491	288	3,869	1		2,302	5	490	
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations	51.50	21,343,529	3,752	5,688	1	61.50	3,069,766	756	4,061	2
Sulfuric acid	57.25					95.00				
Alcohols	20.00	1,425,636	2,829	504	4	62.00				
Pigments, paints, and varnish	19.00	2,571,101	3,711	693	3	48.50	1,158,144	9,219	126	38
Nitrogen fertilizer materials, excluding ammonium sulfate	22.25	86,049	637	135	16	21.25	73,951	879	84	25
Potash fertilizer materials	44.25					21.25	266,740	6,414	42	51

NOTE: Tonnage data are in long tons. Freight rates for U.S. exports are expressed in terms of long tons (2,240 pounds); freight rates for U.S. imports are expressed in terms of metric tons (2,204 pounds). Freight rate data refer to 1963.

Source: Value and volume data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration. Freight rate data supplied by the Federal Maritime Commission.

TABLE I-C.—U.S. oceanborne foreign trade in selected commodities and ocean freight rates, Pacific/Japan (trade route 29, Pacific Westbound Conference and Transpacific Freight Conference of Japan), 1961

Commodity	Exports					Imports				
	Freight rate	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)	Freight rate	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)
Meat, canned		\$219,157	282	\$778		\$25.75				
Vegetables, canned		1,697,590	4,518	376		25.75				
Fruits and preparations, canned		547,727	2,492	303		25.75				
Fruit juices, canned or frozen	\$73.00	826,164	1,670	495	15	120.25	\$957,081	8,041	\$119	101
Rubber tires and inner tubes	110.75	720,770	489	1,473	8	24.75	108,960	184	592	4
Cotton, semimanufacturers	61.00	138,093	570	242	25	33.50	14,617	108	136	25
Standard newsprint paper	27.00	2,324,008	16,802	138	20	35.75	183,877	1,494	123	29
Lubricating oils and greases	¹ 32.65	5,538,395	48,317	115	28	29.25	200		1,500	2
Sulfur	¹ 30.40					32.50				
Iron and steel castings and forgings	¹ 55.50	313,866	809	387	14	24.00	167,113	951	176	14
Tools and basic hardware	73.50	1,753,545	596	2,942	2	19.50	10,864,619	55,427	195	10
Iron and steel pipes, tube and tubing	¹ 30.35	638,518	1,106	577	5	¹ 17.00	8,868,226	53,594	165	10
Rolled and finished steel	¹ 24.10	4,357,587	26,856	162	15	¹ 15.50	18,096,041	127,896	141	11
Electrical machinery	56.75	17,136,674	4,894	3,501	2	33.00	59,195,030	11,993	4,986	1
Construction machinery	55.50	11,602,448	6,075	1,909	3	50.25				
Metalworking machinery	56.75	8,706,461	2,709	3,213	2	33.00	208,631	134	1,550	2
Textile, sewing and shoe machines	56.75	1,249,643	308	4,069	1	33.00	7,253,679	4,173	1,738	2
Agricultural machinery	47.25	9,064,228	7,076	1,281	4	24.00	153,136	242	633	4
Automobiles, trucks, etc.	37.75	2,340,678	1,425	1,642	2	23.00	1,399,770	1,430	979	2
Railway locomotive cars and parts	¹ 46.25	5,504,521	2,377	2,316	2					
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations	73.50	904,978	190	4,776	2	59.50	6,059,897	1,330	4,556	1
Sulfuric acid	93.25					85.75	8,111	42	194	44
Alcohols	75.00					35.00	363,593	1,502	242	14
Pigments, paints and varnish	57.75	1,622,075	2,798	580	10	38.25	66,519	31	2,132	2
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate	¹ 17.65	63,904	492	130	14	14.50	509,859	8,318	61	24
Potash fertilizer materials	¹ 17.65	13,784,368	9,328	1,478	1	14.50				

¹ Freight rate per long ton (2,240 pounds).

Source: Value and volume data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration. Freight rate data supplied by the Federal Maritime Commission.

NOTE.—Tonnage data are in long tons. Freight rate data refer to 1963 and are expressed in terms of short tons (2,000 pounds) unless otherwise indicated.

TABLE II-A.—U.S. oceanborne foreign trade in selected commodities and ocean freight rates, North Atlantic/Germany (trade route 7, Hamburg-Bremen-Bremerhaven: Continental Freight Conference), 1958

Commodity	Exports					Imports				
	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)
Meat, canned		\$275,681	423	\$651						
Vegetables, canned		60,746	242	251						
Fruits and preparations, canned		110,103	389	283						
Fruit juices, canned or frozen		165,529	286	623			\$55,671	77	\$722	
Rubber tires and inner tubes		232,542	164	1,422			684,262	534	1,283	
Cotton, semimanufacturers		1,134,511	3,971	286			204,342	987	207	
Standard newsprint paper		1,092,591	6,110	179						
Lubricating oils and greases		95,420	225	425			1,966	6	351	
Sulfur		22,003	13	1,693			74,812	180	415	
Iron and steel castings and forgings		412,663	182	2,269			7,014,324	12,397	566	
Tools and basic hardware		77,493	122	636			616,095	1,784	345	
Iron and steel pipes, tube and tubing		9,299,983	42,634	218			3,655,680	8,439	433	
Rolled and finished steel mill products		6,611,549	1,900	3,480			32,675,474	11,985	2,726	
Electrical machinery		5,411,214	3,413	1,585						
Construction machinery		9,133,757	2,989	3,056			8,385,632	3,687	2,274	
Metalworking machinery		4,949,068	1,221	4,053			8,250,088	3,232	2,553	
Textile, sewing and shoe machines		3,297,437	2,334	1,413			621,194	313	1,987	
Agricultural machinery		683,369	477	1,432			45,586,104	30,022	1,518	
Automobiles, trucks, etc.		199,615	112	1,785			20,308	30	679	
Railway locomotive cars and parts		1,669,881	241	6,920			3,004,014	695	4,323	
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations										
Sulfuric acid										
Alcohols										
Pigments, paints and varnish		661,932	509	1,164			438,048	2,055	213	
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate										
Potash fertilizer material							293,854	8,255	36	

¹ 1958 freight rate data not available.

Source: Based on data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration.

NOTE.—Tonnage data are in long tons.

TABLE II-B.—U.S. oceanborne foreign trade in selected commodities and ocean freight rates, North Atlantic/Belgium/Netherlands (trade route 8, Antwerp-Rotterdam: Continental Freight Conference), 1958

Commodity	Exports					Imports				
	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)
Meat, canned		\$485,322	408	\$1,189						
Vegetables, canned		37,347	99	378						
Fruits and Preparations, canned		10,978	35	313						
Fruit Juices, canned or frozen		209,319	590	355			\$364,580	374	\$975	
Rubber tires and inner tubes		1,250,347	981	1,275			395,259	539	734	
Cotton, semimanufacturers		609,738	1,966	310			764,073	5,266	145	
Standard newsprint paper		47,728	208	233						

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE II-B.—U.S. oceanborne foreign trade in selected commodities and ocean freight rates, North Atlantic/Belgium/Netherlands (trade route 8, Antwerp-Rotterdam: Continental Freight Conference), 1958—Continued

Commodity	Exports					Imports				
	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)
Lubricating oils and greases.....		\$2,531,176	15,179	\$167						
Sulfur.....		18,468	45	414		\$568		3	\$210	
Iron and steel castings and forgings.....		154,405	172	896		11,018		37	295	
Tools and basic hardware.....		2,317,954	1,634	2,241		5,042,880		25,469	198	
Iron and steel pipes.....		530,646	731	726		1,079,210		5,025	215	
Rolled and finished steel.....		28,308,300	124,081	228		25,599,055		198,091	129	
Electrical machinery.....		18,493,781	6,253	2,958		15,013,087		3,824	3,926	
Construction machinery.....		16,434,743	10,280	1,599						
Metalworking machinery.....		14,267,235	6,562	2,174		2,923,409		994	2,943	
Textile, sewing, and shoe machines.....		6,850,449	1,362	5,030		3,560,746		1,249	2,851	
Agricultural machinery.....		6,003,430	4,162	1,442		92,960		76	1,217	
Automobiles, trucks, etc.....		19,858,217	19,527	1,017		11,717,251		8,070	1,452	
Railway locomotive cars and parts.....		654,253	241	2,714		3,578		2	1,988	
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations.....		15,607,881	2,056	7,593		1,533,555		277	5,528	
Sulfuric acid.....										
Alcohols.....										
Pigments, paints, and varnish.....		4,087,366	7,320	558		885,709		7,791	114	
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate.....										
Potash fertilizer material.....						221,861		6,038	37	

¹ 1958 freight rate data not available.

Source: Based on data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration.

NOTE.—Tonnage data are in long tons.

TABLE II-C.—U.S. oceanborne foreign trade in selected commodities and ocean freight rates, Pacific/Japan (trade route 29, Pacific West-bound Conference and Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan), 1958

Commodity	Exports					Imports				
	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)	Freight rate ¹	Value	Tons	Value per ton	Ratio of freight to unit value (percent)
Meat, canned.....		\$611,359	882	\$693						
Vegetables, canned.....		1,027,752	3,530	291						
Fruits and preparations, canned.....		191,589	583	329						
Fruit juices, canned or frozen.....		132,765	286	465		\$301,547		2,404	\$125	
Rubber tires and inner tubes.....		897,689	629	1,427		24,535		29	835	
Cotton, semimanufactures.....		1,000	1	1,000		79,361		672	118	
Standard newsprint paper.....										
Lubricating oils and greases.....		4,083,415	39,353	104						
Sulfur.....		5,132	13	404						
Iron and steel castings and forgings.....		497,344	1,887	264		36,201		106	342	
Tools and basic hardware.....		999,659	496	2,015		6,002,388		33,193	181	
Iron and steel pipes, tube, and tubing.....		524,728	1,806	290		637,064		3,901	163	
Rolled and finished steel mill products.....		2,794,722	19,687	142		5,106,772		48,250	106	
Electrical machinery.....		9,692,918	3,235	2,996		9,632,770		2,291	4,206	
Construction machinery.....		8,851,450	5,230	1,693						
Metalworking machinery.....		2,600,899	736	3,532						
Textile, sewing, and shoe machines.....		227,435	78	2,916		2,284		1	2,538	
Agricultural machinery.....		3,576,753	2,570	1,392		6,164,250		4,055	1,520	
Automobiles, trucks, etc.....		1,852,237	1,270	1,459		36,517		62	594	
Railway, locomotive cars and parts.....		2,744,286	1,525	1,800		823,410		828	994	
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations.....		4,197,665	1,000	4,199		353,063		43	8,307	
Sulfuric acid.....		25,649	134	191						
Alcohols.....										
Pigments, paints and varnish.....		1,905,466	3,692	516		4,379		6	768	
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate.....										
Potash fertilizer material.....		5,146,792	142,365	36						

¹ 1958 freight rate data not available.

Source: Based on data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration.

NOTE.—Tonnage data are in long tons.

TABLE III-A.—Value of U.S. oceanborne exports and imports of selected commodities, North Atlantic-Germany (trade route 7), 1958 and 1961

Commodity	Exports				Imports			
	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change
Meat, canned.....	\$275,681	\$161,722	-\$113,959	-41.3				
Vegetables, canned.....	60,746	129,276	+6,530	+112.8				
Fruits and preparations, canned.....	110,103	4,887	-105,216	-95.6				
Fruit juices, canned or frozen.....	165,529	6,726	-158,803	-95.9	\$55,671	\$98,651	+\$42,980	+77.2
Rubber tires and inner tubes.....	232,542	186,114	-46,428	-20.0	684,262	872,491	+188,229	+27.5
Cotton, semimanufactures.....	1,134,511	1,462,435	+327,924	+28.9	204,342	215,321	+10,979	+5.4
Standard newsprint paper.....		57,462	+57,462			33,231	+33,231	
Lubricating oils and greases.....	1,092,591	1,234,863	+142,272	+13.0	1,066	159	-1,807	-91.9
Sulfur.....	95,430	8,340	-87,090	-91.3		1,398	+1,398	
Iron and steel castings and forgings.....	22,003	174,621	+152,618	+693.6	74,812	195,655	+120,843	+161.5
Tools and basic hardware.....	412,663	1,240,552	+827,889	+200.6	7,014,324	5,578,538	-1,435,786	-20.5
Iron and steel pipes, tubes and tubing.....	77,493	1,062,520	+985,027	+1,271.1	616,095	1,029,855	+413,760	+67.2
Rolled and finished steel mill products.....	9,299,983	13,420,986	+4,121,003	+44.3	3,655,680	6,457,942	+2,802,262	+76.7
Electrical machinery.....	6,611,549	16,710,889	+10,099,340	+152.8	32,675,474	39,418,516	+6,743,042	+17.6
Construction machinery.....	5,411,214	9,479,051	+4,067,837	+75.2				
Metalworking machinery.....	9,133,757	19,972,599	+10,838,842	+118.7	8,385,632	9,600,012	+1,214,380	+15.6
Textile sewing and shoe machinery.....	4,949,068	8,870,167	+3,921,099	+79.2	8,250,088	14,423,965	+6,173,877	+74.8

TABLE III-A.—Value of U.S. oceanborne exports and imports of selected commodities, North Atlantic-Germany (trade route 7), 1958 and 1961—Continued

Commodity	Exports				Imports			
	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change
Agricultural machinery.....	\$3,297,437	5,742,074	\$+2,444,637	+74.1	\$621,194	\$1,307,769	+\$686,575	+110.5
Automobiles, trucks, etc.....	683,369	2,446,131	+1,762,762	+258.0	45,586,104	63,658,795	+18,072,691	+39.6
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations.....	1,669,881	2,270,678	+600,797	+36.0	3,004,014	3,915,660	+911,646	+30.3
Sulfuric acid.....		166	+166			3,214	+3,214	
Alcohols.....		129,411	+129,411					
Pigments, paints, and varnish.....	661,932	670,666	+8,734	+1.3	438,048	473,148	+35,100	+8.0
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate.....		28,821	+28,821			7,524	+7,524	
Potash fertilizer material.....					293,854	441,812	+147,958	+50.4
Railway locomotive car parts.....	199,615	79,850	-119,765	-60.0	20,308	396	-19,912	-98.1
Sum of above commodities.....	45,597,087	85,551,007	+39,953,920	+87.6	111,581,868	146,824,042	+35,242,174	+31.6
Total North Atlantic-Germany.....	225,071,830	295,295,533	+70,223,703	+31.2	360,216,183	452,520,185	+92,304,002	+25.6
Total liner, all routes.....	8,733,944,000	10,665,697,000	+1,931,753,000	+22.1	6,648,182,000	7,668,564,000	+1,020,382,000	+15.3

Source: Based on data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration.

TABLE III-B.—Value of U.S. oceanborne exports and imports of selected commodities, North Atlantic-Belgium-Netherlands (trade route 8), 1958 and 1961

Commodity	Exports				Imports			
	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change
Meat, canned.....	\$485,322	\$275,808	-\$209,514	-43.2				
Vegetables, canned.....	37,347	75,581	+38,234	+102.4				
Fruits and preparations, canned.....	10,978	24,901	+13,923	+126.8				
Fruit juices, canned or frozen.....	209,319	137,902	-71,417	-34.1	\$364,680	\$543,772	+\$179,192	+49.2
Rubber tires and inner tubes.....	1,250,347	2,555,352	+1,305,005	+104.4	395,259	392,444	-2,815	-7
Cotton semimanufactures.....	609,738	1,642,005	+1,032,267	+169.3	764,073	940,575	+186,502	+24.3
Standard newsprint paper.....	47,728	3,010	-44,718	-3.7				
Lubricating oils and greases.....	2,531,176	3,463,276	+932,100	+36.8		186,889	+186,889	
Sulfur.....	18,468	116,571	+98,103	+531.2	568	3,793	+3,225	+567.8
Iron and steel, cast and forgings.....	154,405	614,826	+460,421	+298.2	11,018	24,583	+13,565	+123.1
Tools and basic hardware.....	2,317,954	5,770,552	+3,452,598	+149.0	5,042,880	3,696,190	-1,346,690	-26.7
Iron and steel pipe.....	530,646	1,000,482	+469,836	+88.5	1,079,210	2,638,115	+1,558,905	+144.4
Rolled and finished steel.....	28,308,300	16,001,580	-12,306,720	-43.5	25,599,055	32,410,057	+6,811,002	+26.6
Electrical machinery.....	18,493,781	36,613,086	+18,119,305	+98.0	15,013,087	15,688,992	+675,905	+4.5
Construction machinery.....	16,434,743	37,127,396	+20,692,653	+125.9				
Metalworking machinery.....	14,267,235	34,963,205	+20,695,970	+145.0	2,923,409	2,595,635	-327,774	-11.1
Textile sewing and shoe machinery.....	6,850,449	19,013,937	+12,163,488	+177.6	3,560,746	5,127,885	+1,567,139	+44.0
Agricultural machinery, implements and tractors.....	6,003,430	17,342,483	+11,339,053	+188.9	92,960	518,543	+425,583	+457.8
Automobiles, trucks, etc.....		29,552,090	+29,552,090		11,717,251	4,859,828	-6,857,423	-58.5
Railway locomotive cars and parts.....	654,253	1,115,491	+461,238	+70.5	3,578	2,302	-1,276	-35.7
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations.....	15,607,881	21,343,529	+5,735,648	+36.7	1,533,555	3,069,766	+1,536,211	+100.2
Sulfuric acid.....								
Alcohols.....								
Pigments, paints and varnish.....	4,087,366	2,571,101	-1,516,265	-37.1	885,709	1,158,144	+272,435	+30.8
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate.....		86,041	+86,049			73,951	+73,951	
Potash fertilizer materials.....					221,861	266,740	+44,879	+20.2
Sum of above commodities.....	118,910,866	231,580,213	+112,669,347	+94.8	69,208,799	74,207,204	+4,998,405	+7.2
Total, North Atlantic, Belgium, Netherlands.....	471,114,229	736,103,574	+264,989,345	+56.2	374,194,424	420,978,157	+46,783,733	+12.5
Total, liners, all routes.....	8,733,944,000	10,665,697,000	+1,931,753,000	+22.1	6,648,182,000	7,668,564,000	+1,020,382,000	+15.3

Source: Based on data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration.

TABLE III-C.—Value of U.S. oceanborne exports and imports of selected commodities, Pacific-Far East (trade route 29), 1958 and 1961

Commodity	Exports				Imports			
	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change	1958	1961	Change 1958-61	Percentage change
Meat, canned.....	\$611,359	\$219,157	-\$392,202	-64.2				
Vegetables, canned.....	1,027,752	1,697,590	+669,838	+65.2				
Fruits and preparations, canned.....	191,589	754,727	+563,138	+293.9				
Fruit juices, canned or frozen.....	132,765	826,164	+693,399	+522.3	\$301,547	\$957,081	+\$655,534	+217.4
Rubber tires and inner tubes.....	897,689	720,770	-176,919	-19.7	24,535	108,960	+84,425	+344.1
Cotton, semimanufactures.....	1,000	138,093	+137,093	+13,709.3	79,361	14,617	-64,744	-81.6
Standard newsprint paper.....		2,324,008	+2,324,008			182,877	+182,877	
Lubricating oils and greases.....	4,083,415	5,538,395	+1,454,980	+35.6		300	-300	
Sulfur.....	5,132	5,132						
Iron and steel cast and forgings.....	497,344	313,366	-183,978	-37.0	36,201	167,113	+130,912	+361.6
Tools and basic hardware.....	999,659	1,753,545	+753,886	+75.4	6,002,388	10,864,619	+4,862,231	+81.0
Iron and steel pipe.....	524,728	638,618	+113,790	+21.7	637,064	8,868,226	+8,231,162	+1,292.0
Rolled and finished steel.....	2,794,722	4,357,587	+1,562,865	+55.9	5,106,772	18,096,041	+12,989,269	+254.4
Electrical machinery.....	9,692,918	17,136,674	+7,443,756	+76.8	9,632,770	59,195,030	+49,562,260	+514.5
Construction machinery.....	8,851,450	11,602,448	+2,750,998	+31.1				
Metalworking machinery.....	2,600,809	8,706,461	+6,105,652	+234.8	2,284	208,631	+206,347	+9,034.5
Textile sewing and shoe machinery.....	227,435	1,249,643	+1,022,208	+449.5	6,164,250	7,253,679	+1,089,429	+17.7
Agricultural machinery, implements and tractors.....	3,576,753	9,064,228	+5,487,475	+153.4	36,517	153,136	+116,619	+319.4
Automobiles, trucks, etc.....	1,852,297	2,340,678	+488,381	+26.4	823,410	1,399,770	+576,360	+70.0
Railway locomotive cars and parts.....	2,744,286	5,504,521	+2,760,235	+100.6	744		-744	
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations.....	4,197,665	904,978	-3,292,687	-78.5	353,063	6,059,897	+5,706,834	+1,616.4
Sulfuric acid.....	25,649		-25,649			8,111	+8,111	
Alcohols.....						363,593	+363,593	
Pigments, paints and varnish.....	1,905,466	1,622,075	-283,391	-14.9	4,379	66,519	+62,140	+1,419.0
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate.....		63,904	+63,904					
Potash fertilizer materials.....	5,146,792	13,784,368	+8,637,576	+167.8		509,859	+509,859	
Sum of above commodities.....	52,588,674	91,261,898	+38,673,224	+73.5	29,205,285	114,479,059	+85,273,774	+292.0
Total, Pacific-Far East.....	289,262,923	637,533,395	+348,270,472	+120.4	248,375,584	458,671,115	+210,295,531	+84.7
Total liner, all routes.....	8,733,944,000	10,665,697,000	+1,931,753,000	+22.1	6,648,182,000	7,668,564,000	+1,020,382,000	+15.3

Source: Based on data supplied by the Federal Maritime Administration.

SUMMARY OF TABLES ON OTHER COMMODITIES

Table I-A points out outbound and inbound freight rates on 26 commodities between Germany and United States Atlantic ports. These commodities were selected because it was felt substantial export potential existed. The table also points out the value of exports and imports on these commodities.

The table reveals, for example, that the outbound freight rate on fruit juices is \$38, and the inbound rate is \$18.50. The outbound rate is 105 percent higher than the inbound rate. On rubber tires and innertubes the outbound rate is \$38.75; the inbound rate, \$30.50—a difference of 27 percent. On all 26 commodities, the outbound rates are approximately 21 percent higher than the inbound rates.

Table I-B indicates similar statistics for commodities moving between the United States Atlantic-Belgium-Netherlands. Outbound rates in this case are approximately 11 percent higher than corresponding inbound rates.

Table I-C indicates the rates for the United States Pacific Coast-Japan trade route. This is a phenomenal table. On the 26 commodities listed, outbound freight rates are 70 percent higher than corresponding inbound rates. Using rubber tires and innertubes, the outbound rate is \$110.75. The inbound rate is \$24.75—a difference of 337 percent. Or on electrical machinery, a \$17 million export, the freight rate is \$56.75. The inbound rate is only \$33. This may be one reason for the fact that our imports total \$60 million on this item alone.

Table II-A, B, and C, point out the value of our exports and imports on these commodities in 1958.

Tables III-A, B, and C show the percentage change of exports and imports on these 26 commodities during 1958 and 1961. While there has been an overall increase in our trade balance on these commodities of 6.8 percent, this increase might have been far greater had freight rates been competitive. On some of the cases of widespread discrimination, like fruit juice, our exports have decreased 95.9 percent. Imports of these same commodities have increased by 77.2 percent.

Tables IV-A, B, and C indicate the influence of ocean freight rates on price differentials for the 26 selected commodities on the three trade routes involved. Averaging the three tables, freight rate differentials account for 11 percent of the value difference between the export and import price. The example of cotton semimanufacturers shown on table IV-B shows the outbound freight rate is \$32, and the inbound rate is \$27.50—a difference of \$4.50. The landed value of U.S. exports in Belgium is \$294, and the landed value of the U.S. imports from Belgium is \$272—a difference of \$22. Had freight rates been the same, this difference would have been reduced by 20 percent.

STATEMENT ON THIRD MARKET PROBLEM

The memorandum which you have before you contains a summary of complaints received by the U.S. Department of Commerce regarding discriminatory freight rates. Some of these complaints point out the problem of uncompetitive rates charged U.S. shippers to third market areas when compared to the rates charged by our foreign competitors to these areas.

For example, the freight rate on a common plasticizer from New York to Veracruz, Mexico, a distance of 1,973 nautical miles, is

\$54 per ton. The rate from Germany, a distance of 5,381 nautical miles, is \$43 per ton. From England to São Paulo, Brazil, on the same product, a distance of 5,472 nautical miles, the rate is \$35, per ton. From New York to São Paulo, a distance of 4,957 nautical miles, the rate is over \$80 per ton.

To show the effects of this rate discrimination on the competitiveness of an American product selling in third market areas, a specific example is pertinent. A vacuum

cleaner retails in the United States for \$49.95. The same model manufactured in England sells for \$99.95. The landed value difference between the \$49.95 machine shipped to Australia from the United States and the machine shipped from England worked out to be only \$1. The distance from Los Angeles to Sydney, Australia, is 6,511 nautical miles. The distance from New York to Sydney is 9,692 nautical miles. The distance from London to Sydney is 12,475 nautical miles.

TABLE IV-A.—Influence of ocean freight rates on price differentials for selected commodities, North Atlantic/Germany (trade route 7), 1961

Commodity	Freight rates (dollars per ton)		Value ¹ (dollars per ton)		Percent of rates to value		Percent of value differential due to rates
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	
Meat, canned.....	37.25	21.50	493	---	8	---	---
Vegetables, canned.....	38.00	44.00	196	---	19	---	---
Fruits and preparations, canned.....	38.00	37.50	635	---	6	---	---
Fruit juices, canned or frozen.....	38.00	18.50	679	506	6	4	11
Rubber tires and inner tubes.....	38.75	30.50	1,412	1,345	3	2	12
Cotton, semimanufactures.....	34.00	27.50	299	212	11	13	7
Standard newsprint paper.....	25.00	58.00	143	163	17	36	165
Lubricating oils and greases.....	26.75	24.75	136	795	20	3	0
Sulfur.....	28.50	27.50	307	215	9	13	1
Iron and steel castings and forgings.....	40.00	32.50	1,281	520	3	6	1
Tools and basic hardware.....	36.25	21.00	4,079	932	1	2	0
Iron and steel pipe, tube and tubing.....	51.00	18.25	738	213	7	9	6
Rolled and finished steel.....	63.00	24.25	241	343	26	7	38
Electrical machinery.....	22.50	67.00	2,938	2,781	1	2	28
Construction machinery.....	16.50	20.00	1,770	---	1	---	---
Metalworking machinery.....	33.00	21.00	3,130	2,429	1	1	2
Textile, sewing and shoe machines.....	21.75	21.00	4,489	2,662	0	1	0
Agricultural machinery.....	16.50	20.75	1,472	1,694	1	1	2
Automobiles, trucks, etc.....	16.50	21.75	1,345	1,445	1	2	5
Railway locomotive cars and parts.....	63.00	---	1,680	1,980	4	---	---
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations.....	54.75	61.50	11,032	3,932	1	2	0
Sulfuric acid.....	63.00	95.00	830	480	8	---	9
Alcohols.....	22.00	62.00	612	---	4	---	---
Pigments, paints, and varnish.....	22.00	48.50	956	244	2	20	4
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate.....	24.50	21.25	170	80	14	27	4
Potash fertilizer materials.....	48.75	21.25	---	38	---	56	---
Average.....	---	---	---	---	7	11	16

¹ Includes average freight rates.

Source: Based on data in table I-A.

TABLE IV-B.—Influence of ocean freight rates on price differentials for selected commodities North Atlantic/Belgium/Netherlands (trade route 8), 1961

Commodity	Freight rates (dollars per ton)		Value ¹ (dollars per ton)		Percent of rates to value		Percent of value differential due to rates
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	
Meat, canned.....	37.25	21.50	701	---	5	---	---
Vegetables, canned.....	34.50	44.00	268	---	13	---	---
Fruits and preparations, canned.....	34.50	37.50	253	---	14	---	---
Fruit juices, canned or frozen.....	34.50	18.50	510	592	7	3	20
Rubber tires and inner tubes.....	35.25	30.50	1,256	934	3	3	1
Cotton, semimanufactures.....	32.00	27.50	294	272	11	10	20
Standard newsprint paper.....	22.75	58.00	151	---	15	---	---
Lubricating oils and greases.....	24.25	24.75	169	203	14	12	1
Sulfur.....	26.00	27.50	380	214	7	13	1
Iron and steel castings and forgings.....	36.25	32.50	3,066	957	1	3	0
Tools and basic hardware.....	33.00	21.00	2,504	256	1	8	1
Iron and steel pipe, tube and tubing.....	46.25	18.25	569	158	1	12	7
Rolled and finished steel.....	57.25	24.25	354	125	16	19	14
Electrical machinery.....	20.50	67.00	3,311	4,717	1	1	3
Construction machinery.....	15.00	20.00	1,670	---	1	---	---
Metalworking machinery.....	33.00	21.00	2,042	3,898	2	1	1
Textile, sewing and shoe machines.....	19.75	21.00	5,871	2,240	0	1	0
Agricultural machinery.....	15.00	20.75	1,415	779	1	3	1
Automobiles, trucks, etc.....	15.00	21.75	1,191	1,588	1	1	2
Railway locomotive cars, parts.....	57.25	---	3,809	490	1	---	---
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations.....	51.50	61.50	5,688	4,061	1	2	1
Sulfuric acid.....	57.25	95.00	---	---	---	---	---
Alcohols.....	20.00	62.00	504	---	4	---	---
Pigments, paints, and varnish.....	19.00	48.50	693	126	3	38	5
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate.....	22.25	21.25	135	84	16	25	2
Potash fertilizer materials.....	44.25	21.25	---	42	---	51	---
Average.....	---	---	---	---	6	11	5

¹ Includes average freight rates.

Source: Based on data in table I-B.

TABLE IV-C.—Influence of ocean freight rates on price differentials for selected commodities, Pacific/Far East (trade route 29), 1961

Commodity	Freight rates (dollars per ton)		Value ¹ (dollars per ton)		Percent of rates to value		Percent of value differential due to rates
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import	
Meat, canned		25.75	778				
Vegetables, canned		25.75	376				
Fruits and preparations, canned		25.75	303				
Fruit juices, canned or frozen	73.00	120.25	495	119	15	101	13
Rubber tires and inner tubes	110.75	24.75	1,473	592	8	4	10
Cotton, semimanufactures	61.00	33.50	242	136	25	25	26
Standard newsprint paper	27.00	35.75	138	123	20	29	58
Lubricating oils and greases	32.65	29.25	115	1,500	28	2	0
Sulfur	30.40	32.50					
Iron and steel castings and forgings	55.50	24.00	387	176	14	14	15
Tools and basic hardware	73.50	19.50	2,942	196	2	10	2
Iron and steel pipe	30.35	17.00	577	165	5	10	3
Rolled and finished pipe	24.10	15.50	162	141	15	11	41
Electrical	56.75	33.00	3,502	4,936	2	1	2
Construction machinery	56.50	30.25	1,909		3		
Metalworking machinery	56.75	33.00	3,213	1,559	2	2	1
Textile, sewing and shoe machines	56.75	33.00	4,059	1,738	1	2	1
Agricultural machinery	47.25	24.00	1,281	633	4	4	4
Automobiles, trucks, etc.	37.75	23.00	1,642	979	2	2	2
Railway locomotive, cars, and parts	46.25		2,316		2		
Medical and pharmaceutical preparations	73.50	59.50	4,776	4,556	2	1	6
Sulfuric acid	93.25	85.75		194		44	
Alcohols	75.00	35.00		242		14	
Pigments, paints and varnish	57.75	38.25	580	2,132	10	2	1
Nitrogen fertilizer materials excluding ammonium sulfate	17.65	14.50	130	61	14	24	5
Potash fertilizer materials	17.65	14.50	1,478		1		
Average					9	16	11

¹ Includes average freight rates.

Source: Based on data in table I-C.

THE FIFTH ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in 1959 I introduced a resolution in the Senate to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week. This week, on the fourth anniversary of the enactment of that resolution by the Congress, Americans across the Nation are joining hands in the observance of Captive Nations Week. In Eastern Europe, southeast Asia, and most recently in Cuba, men, women, and children once free like ourselves are denied the free exercise of constitutional and civil rights, the right to labor productively for themselves and their children, and the right to rejoice in a unique national heritage. The people of the captive nations have not however lost their inner dedication to the ideals cherished by free thinking people everywhere. I believe that we as Americans should reaffirm in our turn the objective of the eventual liberation of the people of the captive nations.

FREEDOM OF COLONIAL PEOPLES

The world has witnessed startling historical reversals in recent years. Throughout the former colonial world, captive peoples have felt the fresh winds of freedom. Under bold leadership, they have thrown off their shackles and taken their rightful place in the community of nations. But at the same time that new nations were thus emerging to lay the ghost of colonialism in its grave, there arose an even greater challenge to the dignity of mankind—the aggressive policies of the Soviet Union and its allies.

All over the world the Communists struck at free nations that had allowed their vigilance to relax. Using well practiced techniques of direct military action and personal intimidation, the Soviet Union extended its control over the once

free nations of Eastern Europe. Poles, Hungarians, Lithuanians, Czechoslovaks, Ukrainians, and other historic peoples in Eastern Europe, and the Chinese and the North Koreans in Asia, fell under the sway of the new colonialism—Communist slavery.

The free nations of the world which look to the United States for leadership in the struggle against communism should know that our country stands firmly behind all autonomous nations that cherish freedom. If we slacken our stand against the Communist usurpation of power or recognize the present Communist domination as either permanent or right, we really deny both our heritage and our ideals. If we abandon the fight against tyranny, we also unwillingly betray the newly free and developing nations in Africa and Asia which will themselves have to stand firm against the encroachments of the Communist empire.

RESISTANCE TO COMMUNIST OPPRESSION

We must also remember the physical presence of millions of people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains who are willing to sacrifice themselves for a democratic way of life. We need only turn on the television to understand the desire of the East Berliners to be free. By car and bus, tunnel and truck, in every way conceivable to the human imagination, thousands of individuals in search of freedom have overcome obstacles placed in their path.

The presence of determined people inside the Communist bloc, hostile to a way of life dictated by Moscow and Peiping, is of prime strategic importance to the United States. Communist plans for aggression must always take into account that the frustrations of the captive peoples may at any moment break into an armed uprising. Premier Khrushchev's awareness of this vulnerability

within the captive nations has led him to decry Captive Nations Week and to accuse us of duplicity in our dealings with other nations. Captive Nations Week, however, proclaims to the whole world that Soviet Russia and not the United States threatens the sovereignty of free nations.

BACKGROUND OF AMERICAN PEOPLE

Lastly, let us remember that the greatness of the United States is founded upon the talents of people of the most diverse racial, religious, and national backgrounds. American citizens who have come from the now captive nations have contributed their labor, their skills, and their respective cultures to our country throughout our growth. The combined heritages of the captive nations are part of our heritage. Thus, Captive Nations Week renews our blood and spiritual ties to the peoples of Eastern and Central Europe.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

For these reasons, I was proud to initiate in the Senate the Captive Nations Week resolution 4 years ago. I believe that the observance of Captive Nations Week by growing numbers of citizens demonstrates beyond any doubt that Americans do appreciate the symbolic and practical importance of this week both to ourselves and to the rest of the world.

I strongly believe that the interests of the nations now overrun or threatened by communism are identical with our own. Given this essential truth, I believe that this annual rededication to the eventual victory of freedom over communism strengthens the U.S. position in the world.

In keeping with their importance in the worldwide struggle, Congress has given additional attention to the captive nations. We have a bill presently before the Foreign Relations Committee to establish a Freedom Academy to educate and train government and civilian personnel to achieve greater efficiency in the global struggle against communism. This bill, which I cosponsored, constitutes another episode in the continuing struggle against the present and future enslavement of free and independent nations. To provide more effective and flexible support for our friends in the captive nations, I again advocate, as I have for several years, the creation of a special congressional committee on the Captive Nations.

ASSISTANCE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Our system of personal freedom and private initiative has made the United States the greatest nation on earth. The same powerful human aspirations that built our country are at work in the minds and hearts of the people of the captive nations. That is why we must remember that it is not the people of the captive nations who have chosen slavery. It is their leaders who have thrust slavery upon them.

We know very well the intentions of the Communist leaders of the captive nations. Under no circumstances must we offer assistance or encouragement to governments that unjustly deny their

people rights. We ought to do all we can, subject to responsible direction, to ease the sufferings of the unfortunate peoples of the captive nations and assist them in their just aspirations toward a better life. Our service can be invaluable also in providing food, clothing, and medical care, education, and eventually refuge and citizenship to the refugees from tyrannous Communist governments.

FREEDOM FOR THE CAPTIVE PEOPLES

Our goal of freedom for the captive nations has at times seemed remote. Yet if other free countries join with the United States in pressing for action to aid the captive peoples, freedom for the captive peoples may not be so far distant a goal.

To the end of gaining freedom and self-determination for all peoples under constitutional government and a life of liberty and self-fulfillment for all the citizens of the world, I am proud to join in the fifth annual observation of Captive Nations Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 16, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 15, 1963:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Navy, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

Claude G. Ross, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Central African Republic.

Howard Rex Cottam, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. William Jonas Ely, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Franklin A. Hart, Jr.	James T. Smith
Louis B. Myers	Eddie C. Paige, Jr.
Charles O. Pitts, Jr.	Thomas J. Ortman
Harrison W. Kimbrell	John K. Cochran
Jerry E. Kehrle	Charles W. Schreiner, Jr.
Adelbert L. Suwalsky, Jr.	William C. Frank
Robert P. Green	Stanley P. Lewis
Willard T. Layton III	Vincent J. Guinee, Jr.
Charles E. Thompson	Willis E. Wilson, Jr.
George P. Slade	Homer L. P. King
Paul M. Ryan	Robert F. Gore
Richard E. Haislip	Daniel E. Wight, Jr.

Charles A. McCluskey	Edgar R. Stoddard, Jr.
Robert E. Gibson	James B. Talley
William R. Fails	John W. Brown
Arthur E. Jensen	Richard G. Vass
Robert L. Modjeski	Theodore T. Hogan, Jr.
James R. Heffin	Orville R. Edmondson
Stephen S. Eisenhauer	Stanley J. Michael, Jr.
David A. Lerps	Norman E. Ryder
Ernest E. Evans, Jr.	Fitz W. M. Woodrow, Jr.
Ronald A. Clark	William Scullion, Jr.
Kent A. McFerren	Jerome W. Brown
Jimmie G. Morgan	Edward G. Milone
Russel H. Stolfi	James C. Hitz
William F. Kendig	Vincent P. Hart, Jr.
William H. Parker III	James B. Isbill, Jr.
Bruce M. MacLaren	Curtis G. Lawson
Walter C. Service III	George F. Ebbitt, Jr.
John J. Keenan	Jimmy L. Pappas
Gordon H. Buckner II	Hugh L. Dougherty, Jr.
Clarence E. Kaufman, Jr.	Joseph L. Felter
James C. Greene, Jr.	Jay G. Sellers
James L. Biegler	Willard L. Mattmiller
Raymond R. Powell	Walter J. Decota
Sterling W. Carter	William G. Soden
Donald J. Norris	Charles W. Montgomery
Robert P. Rose	Robert H. Southgate
David V. Holles	Edmund G. Garbee, Jr.
Dale C. Hawkins	Samuel J. Marfia
Charles L. Zangas	Leo A. Gildersleeve
Robert W. Topping	Harold H. Hill
Phil E. Brookshire	Donald P. Bowen
John C. Gillman	Joseph A. Siler
Daryl E. Benstead	Russell Lloyd, Jr.
George H. Dunn II	George J. Ertlmeier
James J. Delaney II	Thomas W. Nelson, Jr.
Odilio M. Diaz	James F. Moriarty, Jr.
Arthur B. Thompson, Jr.	Bryce A. Mutch, Jr.
Arthur A. Dittmeier, Jr.	William C. Bryson, Jr.
William G. Swigert	Barry N. Bittner
Peter Yadlowsky	Jacob W. Moore
William S. Morgan, Jr.	John D. Ingraham
Edwin J. Godfrey	Marvin E. Peacock
Daniel Prudhomme	John R. Carr, Jr.
Edward C. Tipshus	Paul F. Melcher
John R. Kostelecky	Stephen Bosbonis
Eugene R. Tirk	Allan W. Lamb
Daniel C. Escalera	Walter E. Grayum
Leroy E. Johnson	Karlton L. Batt
Jerry L. Sizelove	Terrance P. Baker
Richard L. Dennis	Stanley J. Czubai
Charles C. Seabrook	Russell I. Kramer
James L. Owens	Charles Ward
William Drebuschenko	Melvin W. McCoury, Jr.
James R. Ziemann	Jack L. Maxwell
James C. Page	Tommy I. Polks
Thomas L. Edwards	Albert G. Borlan
Bobby F. Long	Keith L. Christensen
Robert R. Thomley	Arthur S. Loughry
Eddie R. Maag	William I. Morgan, Jr.
Frederick E. Pyeatt III	Walter R. Brown
Lloyd E. Goodwine	Jesse R. Greer
Roland E. Smith	Richard W. Hanneman
Norman E. Canfield	Willie L. Lowe, Jr.
Kenneth G. Patterson	John W. Terwilliger
Carl B. Olsen, Jr.	Robert D. Flint
Jack P. Smith	Lester D. Widick, Jr.
Robert B. Eldridge	Willard I. Crumback
Thomas M. Stokes, Jr.	John L. Driefer
Jack A. Brandon	Robert M. Sweeney
William D. Stephani	Arthur R. Hickle
Louis H. Buehl III	Pasquale L. Cacace
Richard J. Alger	Joseph F. Golden
Earl F. Whipple, Jr.	Arthur L. Graves
Pat S. Galligan	Donald E. Dilley
Martin V. Young, Jr.	Edward J. Heise
John R. Yates, Jr.	James R. Parsons
Ray L. Baker	Manuel H. L. Hedges
John W. Everett	Leonard T. Preston, Jr.
Robert L. Moon	Erik Larsen
Burr T. Chambless	James D. Moody
Davis Sayes	Thomas E. Dotson
Clarence W. Dilworth	Charles E. Griggs
Charles L. Phillips	Charles S. Popok
Richard D. Buttolph	Phillip M. Jacobs
William E. Morgan	Peter R. Worden
George M. Shiffler, Jr.	William R. Smith

James E. Miller	Richard C. Conway
Thomas D. Cooney	Wilbur E. Skinner
Edward P. Janz	Neo L. Derickson
Richard P. Spreier	

IN THE NAVY

Charles C. McClement (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Roy L. Agle	Terry W. Fooshee
Gerald A. Brearton	Robert L. Himbarger
Bryan T. Conner	Leo E. McGonagle
Charles R. Crawford	Roy L. Ray, Jr.

Leon E. Drouin, Jr. (Navy enlisted scientific education program), to be a permanent ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Emile S. Sayegh (civilian college graduate) to be a captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Leslie Wiener (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Paul C. Gregg
Richard H. Tabor

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Raymond D. LaChance
Robert D. Roe

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Wilbur A. Heinz, Jr.
William F. Hook
Michael R. Stapleton

Clyde D. Henderson, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edward J. McLaughlin
Glyn M. Spearman, Jr.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abel, William H.	Aldrich, William L.
Abercrombie, Frank E.	Alexander, Dale E.
Ablowich, Dean A.	Alexander, Willis H., Jr.
Adams, Robert W.	
Adams, Max L.	Allain, Charles J.
Adams, Chester A.	Allen, Robert J.
Adams, Raymond A.	Allen, Bert L.
Adams, James W.	Allen, Larry D.
Adcock, Thomas W.	Allen, George R.
Adler, Alan B.	Allen, Julian A.
Affourtit, Daniel J., Jr.	Allen, Temple L.
Ahern, James W.	Allen, Stanley E.
Akers, Bruce	Allen, James W.
Akerson, Arthur C., Jr.	Allison, Charles P., Jr.
Albaugh, Cleve W.	Allison, Robert E.
Albers, Robert J.	Allwine, Robert A.
Albert, William A.	Alrick, Richard D.

- Alston, Vernon D.
Amend, Robert J.
Ames, Albert M.
Anderson, Robert E.
Anderson, Gordon R.
Anderson, Ira B.
Anderson, Varro D.
Anderson, Gordon W.
Anderson, Lewis G.
Anderson, James W.
Anderson, James L.
Anderson, Charles E.
Anderson, Earl N. J.
Anderson, Thomas M.
Anderson, Roger A.
Andrasko, Michael B.
Andrew, Kenneth C.
Anglin, Hubert L.
Anselmi, Ernest A., Jr.
Ansley, James H.
Anthony, John P., Jr.
Anthony, John A., III
Antonio, Robert J.
Aragona, Francis J.
Arbogast, James B.
Arkin, William E.
Arnbruster, Robert E.
Armes, Donald S.
Arms, Fay H.
Arms, Philip B., Jr.
Armstrong, Charles E., Jr.
Arnaud, Antoine J. A.
Arnett, Verlin M.
Arrasmith, Thomas M., III
Arsenault, Oscar W.
Ashbaugh, Charles I.
Ashley, Roger T.
Askren, Merlin G.
Aspas, Paul T.
Aurell, Donald L.
Ausley, Paul C., Jr.
Austin, Leon
Austin, Gene M.
Averna, Vincent S.
Avery, Charles G.
Avore, Malcolm A.
Ayre, Donald
Aycock, Charles B.
Ayers, John P.
Babb, Dewey E.
Babbitt, Thomas R.
Babcock, William L.
Babiash, William E.
Bable, Samuel S.
Bacon, Daniel K.
Bacon, William S.
Baer, Robert D.
Baesman, Richard F.
Bahre, George L.
Bailer, Donald W., Jr.
Bailey, Roy, Jr.
Bailey, Grover C., III
Bailey, Howard L.
Bailey, James H.
Bailey, Charles E., Jr.
Bailey, Stanley J., Jr.
Baimbridge, Horace H.
Baird, Dean D.
Baird, James D.
Baker, Curtis L.
Baker, Willard D.
Baker, Robert F.
Baker, Maurice R.
Baker, Hugh B.
Baker, Wayne E.
Baker, Robert P.
Baker, Arthur J., III
Bakun, William D.
Baldwin, William E.
Bales, Edward W.
Ball, Richard A.
Ball, Willie H., Jr.
Ballard, William C.
Ballard, James O., Jr.
Ballard, Gary D.
Ballinger, Roy G.
Ballou, Charles L.
Bancroft, William P.
Banes, Robert E.
Bangert, William R.
Banister, Richard M.
Banks, Richard
Bannach, Leroy R.
Banner, David F.
Barber, Robert F.
Barber, Stephen W.
Barbre, George W.
Barclay, William A.
Barcus, Charles C.
Bard, Stephen A.
Bareilles, John L.
Barell, John F.
Barkley, Eppa B.
Barlow, Johnnie T.
Barnes, Vernon T.
Barnes, Harlan L.
Barnes, Harley H., Jr.
Barnes, James R.
Barney, Thomas McM.
Barnicle, Paul E.
Barns, David W.
Barnum, Daniel B.
Baron, Theodore L.
Baron, Michael
Barr, Charles T.
Barrett, Robert W.
Barrett, Hoyt S.
Barringer, Larry E.
Barry, Kenneth R.
Barry, Richard D.
Barteis, Albert L.
Bartholomew, Joseph
Arnett, Verlin M.
W.
Bartolett, Frank S., III
Barton, Glenn L.
Bartsch, Thomas J.
Bartusek, Marion E.
Basham, Darell C.
Bashaw, Lloyd W.
Bass, William F.
Bassett, James R.
Batchellor, John K., Jr.
Bates, George E., Jr.
Bates, Barry T.
Bates, Henry W.
Battaglia, William F.
Batterton, George B.
Batti, Donald E.
Baublitz, John E.
Bauer, Roger A.
Bauer, Jerry F.
Baumann, Arthur C.
Baumer, Donald G.
Baxley, Jarman G.
Baxter, James B., Jr.
Bay, Warren H.
Bayley, Christopher T.
Bazzell, Roderic C.
Beach, Venton E.
Beam, Henry H.
Beam, James C.
Beardshall, Elmer W., Jr.
Beatty, Thomas J.
Bechtold, Joseph M.
Becker, Robert E.
Bee, Fred A.
Beebe, Bruce A.
Beech, Henry D.
Beguin, Stephen D.
Belford, Ralph W.
Bell, Charles F.
Bell, Gary E.
Bell, Ned D.
Bell, Nolie L.
Bell, Robert W., Jr.
Bellows, Lester E.
Benge, Albert H.
Benites, Robert D.
Bennett, Henry M.
Bennett, Hugh M.
Bennett, Roger L.
Bennigson, Lawrence A.
Benoit, Felix
Bensinger, Darrell L.
Benson, Leo, III
Benson, James H.
Benson, Jerome E.
Benson, Perry S.
Benson, Peter H.
Bentzley, Harold J.
Berberich, William D.
Berg, George W., Jr.
Berger, Walter E., III
Bergert, James W.
Bergmann, Leland D.
Berigan, Francis M.
Berkey, Lloyd A.
Berklite, Ronald B.
Berkowitz, Ross
Berreman, Robert C.
Berry, Kenton C.
Berry, James T.
Berry, Niles W.
Berube, Raymond E., Jr.
Berterton, Don M.
Betz, Dale S.
Beumer, Theodore H.
Beveridge, Jerry D.
Beyers, Stephen J.
Beyrle, Robert F.
Bicknell, James N.
Bickum, Gilbert W.
Biggerstaff, Paul O.
Billings, Robert A.
Billings, David J.
Binaghi, Joanne T.
Binder, Donald
Birchett, John A. K., III
Birtwistle, Richard, III
Bisbing, Raymond H.
Bishop, John A.
Bishop, Arles R.
Bissell, Allen M.
Bissing, Walter W.
Bittenbender, Karl C.
Bittner, Francis E.
Bixby, Joseph A.
Black, Phillip R.
Black, Rudolph E.
Black, Herbert E.
Blackburn, William J.
Blackier, Richard W.
Blackford, Peter B.
Blackstock, Fletcher L.
Blair, Nelson A.
Blair, Joseph H., Jr.
Blair, Charles E.
Blakeley, James H.
Blanchard, Everiste J.
Blanding, Richard L.
Blankenship, Thomas C.
Blick, Ernest C.
Bliss, Robert B., II
Blockinger, Alvin F., Jr.
Blome, Dennis J.
Blood, David H.
Bloodworth, George E.
Bloodworth, William T.
Bloom, Norman C.
Bloore, John L.
Blum, Ervin R.
Blunden, Alec R.
Boarman, John T.
Bobay, Gary J.
Bodenner, George E.
Bodie, Michael W.
Boecker, Donald V.
Boesenberg, John J.
Boggs, Dallas B.
Bogle, Robert J.
Bohn, Charles J., Jr.
Bolczak, Wallace L.
Bolden, David R.
Bolinger, Charles W.
Bond, Duane A.
Bond, Lawson G.
Bone, Charles R.
Boney, David B.
Bonnell, Gordon A.
Bonneville, Joseph E., Jr.
Bonsall, Donald E.
Bonsky, William F.
Booher, David M.
Boomgaarden, Marvin E.
Boose, Donald E.
Booth, Ronald J.
Boreen, Allen R.
Bornemann, Alfred
Borris, Charles M.
Bos, Peter G.
Bost, Donald W.
Boswell, Freddie L., Jr.
Botzum, Diane
Bouchillon, Milton D.
Bourke, Robert H.
Bouscaren, William J.
Bowden, Marilyn F.
Bowdoin, Bernard M.
Bowen, Alfred G.
Bowley, Frederick C.
Bowling, Weldon J.
Bowman, Peter B.
Bowman, Robert J.
Bowman, Lloyd
Bowser, John V.
Boyd, Thomas M.
Boyer, Larry A.
Boylan, James D.
Boyle, Robert H.
Boyle, Francis J.
Bozarth, Jack E.
Bracken, Robert T.
Braden, Morse S.
Bradford, Alfred E.
Bradford, Erby D.
Bradley, Ronnie A.
Bradt, Donald E.
Brady, John B.
Brandel, Roland E.
Brandon, John R.
Brandquist, Roland
Branham, Powers E., Jr.
Branson, Harry W., Jr.
Bratton, James E.
Braun, Frank B.
Breckenridge, Donald R.
Breeding, Donald C.
Bregenzler, Karl E.
Brehm, James H.
Brenton, Robert J.
Brewer, Shelby T.
Brewer, Eddie R.
Brewer, Vincent E.
Briesemeister, Norman E.
Bright, Calvin F.
Brimmage, Kirby L.
Bringham, William, Jr.
Briselden, Don J.
Bristol, William W.
Broach, John C.
Broadfield, Donald E.
Broadwell, William R.
Broadwell, Ronald E.
Brocken, John F., Jr.
Brockman, John L., Jr.
Broemser, Gary M.
Broerman, Neal J.
Broglie, John D.
Brooks, Robert H.
Brooks, Edward W.
Brooks, James S.
Brower, Robert L.
Brown, Charles K.
Brown, Harold E.
Brown, Edward E.
Brown, Clyde E.
Brown, Floyd W.
Brown, James M.
Brown, Marion L.
Brown, Elbert L., Jr.
Brown, Donald H.
Brown, Baldwin B.
Brown, Lester M.
Brown, Chester A.
Brown, Thomas L.
Brown, Nancy A.
Browning, Robert E.
Bruce, Estel E.
Bruce, James W., Jr.
Bruen, Richard J.
Brundridge, Harry L.
Bruntlett, Carl E.
Brust, Philip J.
Bryan, John W.
Bryan, Timothy E.
Bryant, Donald W.
Bryant, Cordis C.
Bryant, Raymond, Jr.
Bryant, William H.
Bryant, Ernest W.
Bryant, William J.
Bubeck, Robert C.
Buchans, James C.
Buchart, John E.
Buck, Duane E.
Buehler, Roy R.
Buenz, Peter R.
Bullock, James P.
Bundt, Jerry L.
Burdett, Lawrence P.
Burdett, Hubert W., Jr.
Burdge, Ronald E.
Burger, Joseph J.
Burgess, Kenneth L.
Burhoe, John T.
Burke, Robert D.
Burkhard, Charles D.
Burnett, William C.
Burnham, Robert C.
Burnham, William T.
Burns, Daniel R.
Burns, David F.
Burns, Walter W., Jr.
Burroughs, Eugene S., III
Burrows, Melvin M.
Burton, Robert E.
Bush, Thomas O.
Bush, William J.
Busher, Ronald F.
Butler, David E.
Butler, Harry P.
Bybee, Raymond A.
Byrne, Barry J.
Byrne, Robert A.
Byrnes, Henry F., Jr.
Byrnes, Albert M.
Cadwell, George M., Jr.
Cain, Douglas M., III
Callahan, Thomas J.
Callahan, James F.
Callaway, William E., Jr.
Callaway, Linnaeus T.
Calvert, Jack D.
Calvert, William R.
Cameron, Allan W.
Cameron, Thomas A.
Cameron, James J.
Cameron, Robert F.
Camp, William P.
Campbell, James B.
Campbell, Albert M.
Campbell, Theodore R.
Cannon, William T.
Canup, Theodore, Jr.
Capito, George R.
Carbajal, Ruben
Carey, William F.
Carl, Walter M.
Carleton, Gerald B.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carlson, John A.
Carlson, Frederick P.
Carlson, William R.
Carlson, Patrick J.
Carman, Jesse L.
Carnathan, Fred H.
Caron, Francis O.
Carpenter, John D., Jr.
Carper, Teddy G.
Carr, Robert E.
Carroll, Francis L.
Carruthers, David G.
Carson, Harold R.
Carson, Richard L.
Carter, Charles W. P.
Carter, Frederick T.
Carwin, Paul L.
Case, Calvin W.
Casey, Stephen H.
Cassaday, Charles R.
Castle, Willis R.
Caswell, Gordon C.
Cate, Diana J.
Cater, Charles E.
Cates, Donald E.
Catlin, June M.
Catron, Delbert F.
Cavey, Morris N.
Cawthon, Alon E.
Caylor, Daniel R.
Cecil, John P.
Cerul, John P., Jr.
Cesario, Richard A.
Chabot, Peter G.
Chain, David A.
Chalfour, Clark L.
Chambers, Thomas D.
Chancy, Eugene J.
Chandler, Harold, Jr.
Chanel, Clyde L.
Chapman, Charles A.
Chapman, Jay W.
Charters, Michael F.
Chase, Leroy O.
Chelton, Edward E.
Chenard, John H.
Chenoweth, Eldred E.
Cherry, William G., Jr.
Chesnutt, Billy
Chevalier, Paul E.
Chew, David G.
Chiacchio, Joseph
Childers, John V.
Chiles, Henry G., Jr.
Chrisman, Rex C.
Christensen, Merle L.
Christian, John T.
Christian, Howard B.
Christopher, Charles E.
Cima, Frank J.
Ciocca, Michael A.
Ciotti, Anthony
Cislo, Walter J.
Claman, John S.
Clark, Theodore L.
Clark, Alfred L.
Clark, Donald D.
Clark, Menzo T.
Clark, Joseph A.
Clark, George N.
Clark, Billy E.
Clark, William M.
Clark, William T.
Clark, William E.
Clark, Kenneth G.
Clark, Daniel B.
Clark, Vernon
Clark, Warren H.
Claunch, James I.
Clawson, Carl H., Jr.
Claxton, Irvin O.
Clay, Theodore A.
Clements, William J.
Canup, Theodore, Jr.
Clemmons, Melvin B.
Cler, Alfred J., Jr.
Cleveland, Spencer
Clexton, Edward W., Jr.
Click, Raymond D.
Clift, Jesse C.
Clifton, William E.
Clinton, John J.
Cloutier, Adore H.
Clover, Glen E.
Coates, Thomas A.
Cockram, John C.
Cofer, Horace G.
Coffelt, Robert O.
Coffey, Willey E., Jr.
Coffey, John A.
Cogdell, Gary B.
Cogdill, Thomas J.
Colburn, Richard E.

- Colby, Kenneth R.
Cole, Joseph D.
Cole, Kennard E.
Cole, William F.
Colegrove, Robert J.
Coleman, Glenn W.
Coleman, Jessie V.
Coleman, Thomas M.
Coleman, William E.
Coles, George E., Jr.
Colkitt, George R., Jr.
Colley, Michael C.
Collicott, Charles R.
Collier, Wilmer G., Jr.
Collins, William T.
Collins, Ed N.
Collins, Dan E.
Collins, Richard B., Jr.
Collins, Michael L.
Collins, Paul L., Jr.
Collins, Bernice W.
Colonna, Michael A.
Combemale, Jeanloup R.
Comeau, Charles R.
Condit, Norman E.
Confer, William A., Jr.
Conner, Willis D.
Conner, William T., Jr.
Conner, Lewis W.
Cook, Charles I.
Cook, James J.
Coolican, Donald J.
Cooper, Paul W., Jr.
Cooper, Jerry A.
Corbelle, Reginald C.
Cordell, Glen D.
Corkill, James L.
Cornwell, Alton E.
Correll, Robert D.
Correll, Robert A.
Cote, Arthur J.
Cotterman, Andrew G.
Cottom, Robert V.
Coughlen, Thomas D.
Coughlin, Daniel T., Jr.
Coulapides, Anthony C.
Coulter, Glenn R.
Council, William G.
Court, Charles W.
Courtney, James R.
Cover, Donald L.
Cowan, Herbert W.
Cowan, William L.
Cowles, David E.
Cox, Charles J.
Cox, Donald J.
Cox, Joseph W.
Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Lynn O.
Cox, Paul L.
Cox, Thaddeus C.
Coye, Beth F.
Craig, Charles E., Jr.
Crane, Jay V.
Cranford, Leon B.
Craver, William D.
Crawford, John W.
Crawford, John C.
Crawford, Denis H.
Crayton, Johnny L.
Craze, James W.
Creed, William K.
Creter, Arthur P., Jr.
Creutz, Charles
Crigler, Charles H.
Crisman, John C.
Criste, David M.
Crockett, Richard L.
Cromack, Dan
Cronfel, Ramsey L.
Crossland, Clifford T.
Crow, Hugh E.
Crow, Robert L.
Crowder, Thomas E.
Crowder, Kenneth L.
Crowley, Daniel H., Jr.
Crowley, Lawrence F.
Cullen, Donald C.
- Cumella, Walter S.
Cumm, Homer J., Jr.
Cummings, Vincent P., Jr.
Cummins, Glen S.
Cunningham, Glenn J.
Cunningham, Donald E.
Curling, Fred B.
Curtis, Jon E.
Curtiss, Daniel J.
Curtis, Grant R.
Curtis, Thomas G.
Dahlem, Francis E.
Dahlgren, Charles E.
Dahlgren, Arthur W.
Dally, Donald E.
Dally, Roger M.
Dale, Henry
Dalesio, Robert M.
Damon, David W.
Danforth, William L.
Dankievitch, John A.
Danser, Richard G.
Darling, Frank R.
Darwin, John C.
Daschbach, Joseph F.
Dascombe, Ronald E.
Davidson, Dennis M.
Davidson, Richard E.
Davidson, William G., III
Davies, William E., Jr.
Davies, Robert
Llewellyn
Davies, Robert
Leston
Davis, Jack A.
Davis, John H.
Davis, Leonard G.
Davis, Francis J.
Davis, Vibert H.
Davis, Doyle L.
Davis, George W.
Davis, Richard B.
Davis, Russell A.
Dawson, David L.
Day, Robert O.
Deaton, John H.
Decker, John P.
Decker, Cecil E.
Deehan, Paul K.
Dehaemer, Michael J.
Dehler, Richard F.
Dehn, William S., Jr.
Delamorton, Howard F. B.
Delaroi, Anna M.
Deloach, Jesse H.
Deloury, Edward M., Jr.
Delp, George D.
Delpaine, Nick, Jr.
Delude, Howard D.
Demitropoulos, Alexander
Dempsey, Richard E.
Dempster, Duncan F.
Denberger, Jerome N.
Denn, George E., Jr.
Dennis, Merrill L.
Denson, James K.
Deore, Donald A.
Depperschmidt, Robert F.
Deptula, Joseph
Derouin, Norman E.
Derr, Thomas A.
Derrough, Lois A.
Dettloff, Edward D.
Devenny, John P., Jr.
Devine, Ralph R.
Devine, Thomas W.
Dewerff, Duane L.
Dewinn, Donald A.
Dexter, Dillon C.
Diamond, Glenn B.
Diaz, David M., Jr.
Dibble, John P.
- Dickinson, Norman R.
Dickson, Paul B.
Diefenderfer, John P.
Dietrich, Lawrence H.
Dietsch, Karl F.
Digiovanni, Armand F., Jr.
Dillingham, Donald R.
Dillon, John P.
Dimartino, Joseph D.
Dimitry, Theodore G.
Dimsdale, William
Dinger, Harlan E.
Dinning, Donald McM.
Dirksen, John V.
Divers, Harry C.
Dix, Donald W.
Dobbie, Donald W.
Dobes, Joseph C.
Dobrosky, John
Dodd, James H., Jr.
Dodge, Elmer L., Jr.
Dodson, Richard E.
Doeg, Arthur G.
Dolan, Peter B.
Dole, Burton A., Jr.
Donahue, James R.
Donahue, Thomas M.
Donlan, Michael F.
Donnelly, John J.
Donofrio, Anthony L.
Donovan, Larry C.
Dooley, John J.
Doose, John C.
Dorman, Leroy M.
Dorrrough, Vernon R.
Dostal, Ronald J.
Dothard, Joseph R.
Dotterer, Kenneth R.
Douger, James B.
Dougherty, Thomas G.
Doughty, Robert
Douglass, Willie B.
Dovalgo, Richard R.
Dowell, George W., III
Downey, Edward V.
Downey, Harry J.
Draper, Lilbourne E.
Draughton, Harry C., Jr.
Dreher, Robert H.
Dressor, Robert F.
Drummond, William K.
Drury, Bruce R.
Drury, Melvin R.
Duchnick, Stanley M.
Dudley, James I., Jr.
Duff, Robert D.
Duffy, James F.
Duffy, Francis K.
Dufore, Maurice C.
Duggan, Edward H., Jr.
Dulling, Martin L.
Dunbar, Bartlett S.
Duncan, John W.
Duncan, Lawrence D.
Duncan, Angus F.
Dunham, Alfred B.
Dunlap, Howard D.
Dunlop, Herbert J.
Dunn, Gilliam S.
Dunn, James M.
Dunn, Stephen
Dunne, Lawrence E.
Dupont, Robert A.
Durkin, Wallace M.
Durocher, Joseph W.
Dutton, Bruce M.
Dvorak, Allan R.
Dye, Jessie D.
Dyer, Harold D.
Dyke, Conrad S.
Dzema, John
Earl, Frank S.
Earle, Ronald L., Jr.
Eaton, Allan L.
Eayre, Dean C.
Eberlein, Bernard E.
Eckerman, Orvin E.
Eddins, William R.
- Edgar, Peter D.
Edgerton, Justin R.
Edwards, Ronald
Eighme, Dean W.
Eilertsen, James T.
Einspruch, Henry, Jr.
Ekberg, Elden A.
Elkins, Paul W.
Ellett, Frank T.
Elliott, Robert O.
Ellis, Martin A.
Ellis, Willie C.
Ellis, Russell D.
Ellis, Elwood G.
Ells, Marvin R.
Elmore, Cleo A.
Elmquist, Robert J.
Elster, Robert E.
Elwood, William J.
Embry, Hugh C.
Emmett, Virginia A.
Emrick, Grover O.
Enslley, James E.
Enriquez, Jose
Erdel, Elmer A.
Ericson, James A.
Ernest, Charles L.
Ervin, James C., Jr.
Eshom, Roy L.
Esslinger, Jon H.
Estep, Fred R.
Etchells, Edward J.
Evans, Homer D.
Evans, William L.
Evans, William E.
Evans, Oliver K.
Evans, Neal C.
Evans, William R.
Evans, James R.
Everding, George A.
Everman, Leon E.
Everson, Richard W.
Ewart, Frederick M.
Ewing, Keith R.
Eychaner, Robert L.
Fadden, Byron M.
Fahsbender, Thomas F.
Falk, Dennis J.
Faller, Arthur R.
Fallin, Thomas B.
Fallon, Margaret A.
Fang, George W.
Fant, Iley W.
Farley, Robert T.
Farnan, George F.
Farnham, Robert
Farrell, Norman L.
Fay, Frederick O., Jr.
Fay, Vincent P.
Febel, Joel W.
Fee, Jerome J.
Feiguth, Ernest G.
Felix, Dennis F.
Fell, David B., Jr.
Fellis, Richard T.
Fellows, John A.
Fenn, Michael R.
Ferguson, Harry R.
Ferguson, Norman C.
Fernandez, Harvey M.
Ferranti, Nicholas A.
Ferrell, John C.
Ferris, Raymond B.
Fethke, Walter P., Jr.
Fetterman, Leroy W.
Fiedelmay, Joseph W., Jr.
Field, Alan R.
Field, Royal R., Jr.
Fields, George W.
Fields, Floyd H., Jr.
Finkelstein, Milton M.
Finn, Harold B., III
Finucan, Thomas E.
Firebaugh, Charles D.
Fischer, Charles F., II
Fisher, Cornelius W.
Fisher, Ben H.
Fisher, George D.
- Fisher, Robert A.
Fisher, Thomas J.
Fitzgerald, Raymond N.
Fitzgerald, James F.
Flanigan, Alan H.
Fleitz, William V., Jr.
Fleming, Michael J.
Fleming, Charles H., Jr.
Flesch, Robert W.
Fletcher, Thomas E.
Flinn, John E.
Flint, James C.
Florance, Earle S.
Flores, Arthur J.
Fluke, John W.
Flynn, Henry M., Jr.
Flynn, Gerrish C.
Flynn, William J.
Flynn, Edward J., Jr.
Foery, Donald G.
Fogel, Edwin L.
Foley, James A.
Foley, William H., Jr.
Follett, John R.
Folta, Kenneth D.
Folts, Roger H.
Ford, Marvin J.
Foreman, Earl L.
Forsman, Jalmar F., Jr.
Forstner, Gerald
Fortenberry, William S.
Fortney, Doyle W.
Foster, William L.
Foster, Ralph V.
Foster, William L., Jr.
Foster, George S.
Foster, Hiram A.
Foster, Kenneth M.
Fournier, Leo R.
Fowler, Richard C.
Fox, Henry W.
Fox, Joe E.
Fox, Robert E.
Foy, Frederick D.
Frailey, Julius R.
France, Donald J.
France, Donald F.
Frank, Robert A.
Franklin, David C.
Fraser, Dale H.
Frazier, Kendall L.
Fred, Robert H.
Freedman, Leonard A.
Freehill, Robert L.
Freeman, Michael H.
Freeman, Joseph H., Jr.
Freiberg, Harold M.
Fresco, Nace E.
Friedlander, Robert L.
Friedmann, Alfred R.
Friend, Leslie E.
Frasher, John A.
Frost, Norman C., Jr.
Fuller, Richard E.
Fuller, Donald S.
Funston, Walter H., Jr.
Furlong, Joseph W.
Furnholm, William G.
Furr, Jack C.
Fuss, Donald D.
Fussell, William R., Jr.
Gadsby, Donald F.
Gage, Robert W.
Gagliardo, James E.
Galley, Lonnie D., Jr.
Gaines, Andrew L.
Galbreath, Christopher W.
Gale, Earl L.
Gallagher, Thomas J.
Gallagher, James T.
Gallagher, Kathleen O.
Gallagher, Michael T.
Gallegos, Joe R.
- Galletti, Francis P.
Galloway, Earl W.
Gamba, Robert V.
Gandy, Asa J.
Gans, Thomas G.
Gardner, Glenn D.
Gardner, Heisey E.
Garduno, John F.
Garfield, Peter J.
Garman, Clair E.
Garner, Richard E.
Garrett, Loren E.
Garrison, Joe R.
Garver, Bruce M.
Gasser, Robert E.
Gassett, Will H.
Gast, Ronald E.
Gaut, Joseph W.
Gauthier, Charles C.
Gauthier, David P.
Gavlak, Michael W.
Gaydos, Cyril M.
Geer, David W.
Gehman, Thomas E.
Gehrlich, Richard E.
Geiger, William A.
Gelling, Terry L.
Gellinas, Norman H.
Geller, John B.
Gephart, Ernest B.
Gerasimoff, Philip J.
Gerber, Eugene D.
Gerity, Robert S.
Germain, Russell F.
Germany, Holmes B.
Gershon, Jon J.
Gertz, William J.
Gessner, Lynn E.
Gibson, Edward T.
Gibson, Harvey D.
Gibson, James W.
Gieseke, William D.
Gieseke, Neal D.
Gilbreath, David S.
Gilchrist, Orville L.
Gill, Donald L.
Gill, Raymond W.
Gillen, Robert F.
Gillespie, William M.
Gillett, Lewis C., Jr.
Gillis, John W.
Gilstrap, James R. L.
Gingles, William G.
Gingold, Joel E.
Gipson, Jack D.
Glasier, John M.
Glaspell, Grayson M.
Glotfelty, Robert L.
Glockow, Gerald E.
Gniffke, Bruce A.
Godbold, Wilford D.
Godwin, Gordon T.
Goff, Franklin L.
Goforth, James E., Jr.
Gohara, Roy S.
Golden, George H., Jr.
Golden, Mark M.
Gonsalves, David
Goode, Sanchez
Goodrich, Walker R., Jr.
Goodwin, Willis M.
Gordon, Max H.
Gordon, Bradley W.
Gordon, Frank
Gorecki, Walter
Gosselin, Henry E., Jr.
Gost, William J.
Goubeaux, Richard F.
Gould, George W.
Gould, Daniel H.
Grafel, Lynn H.
Grafton, Jay T.
Grafton, Donald L.
Graham, Ernest A.
Graham, William B.
Graham, Frank
Graham, William W.
Graham, James R.
Grant, Carroll D.

- Grant, Dale P.
 Grantham, Frank H.
 Graves, Bibb L.
 Gray, Gordon L.
 Gray, Peter H.
 Green, Conrad G.
 Green, Lorin D.
 Green, Albert W., Jr.
 Green, Richard M.
 Greenberg, Samuel J.
 Greenberg, Abe
 Greene, Cecil M.
 Gregg, William G.
 Gregory, James W.
 Greninger, John J.
 Gretter, Gary J.
 Gridley, Robert H.
 Griffin, Clyde W.
 Griffin, Robert N.
 Grimes, Fred H.
 Grimes, Elmer R.
 Grisemer, Alan N.
 Grochowski, Edward F.
 Groggett, Richard W., Jr.
 Grose, Herbert T.
 Groth, John F.
 Growe, Robert G.
 Grunstra, James
 Grzech, Leon W.
 Guess, Robert E.
 Guglielmo, Salvatore F.
 Guice, Louis K.
 Gulick, Roger K.
 Gustavson, Roy S.
 Hagen, Richard H.
 Haas, Phillip E.
 Hadley, Richard J.
 Hafer, Otto D.
 Hagelbarger, Ralph S.
 Haugs, John M.
 Hagerty, Cornelius J., Jr.
 Haggerty, John F.
 Haines, Floyd C.
 Haisten, John, Jr.
 Haker, Carl L.
 Haldiman, Martin F.
 Hale, Frederick G.
 Hall, Benjamin S.
 Hall, Harry M., Jr.
 Hallman, Lee A.
 Halloran, Stephen M.
 Hallowell, Benjamin H., Jr.
 Hamby, Thomas, Jr.
 Hames, William J.
 Hamilton, Plez
 Hamilton, Richard T.
 Hamilton, William C., Jr.
 Hamm, Roger G.
 Hamm, William D.
 Hammer, Karl L.
 Hammond, Charles M., Jr.
 Hamon, Richard W.
 Hampson, Harry W.
 Hanberry, Royce S.
 Hancock, Eugene W.
 Hancock, James E.
 Hand, David R.
 Hanes, Quanah C.
 Haney, Raymond E.
 Hankins, Jack T.
 Hansen, Kirby W., Jr.
 Hansen, Roy E.
 Hansen, Eigil L., Jr.
 Hanson, Ronald D.
 Hanson, Ralph E., Jr.
 Hanvey, James W.
 Harden, Jon D.
 Hardesty, Michael A.
 Hardgrave, James L.
 Hardin, Billie R.
 Hardin, Bruce H.
 Hardister, Rex J.
 Hardman, Herbert F.
 Hardt, William A.
 Hardy, Ralph H.
 Hargrave, Paul E.
 Hargrove, James C.
 Harker, Donald A.
 Harkey, Erskine L., Jr.
 Harkness, Melvin D.
 Harlett, John C.
 Harmer, William H.
 Harmon, Edward K.
 Harmon, Elmer L., Jr.
 Harnadek, Joseph J.
 Harper, Richard T.
 Harris, Carl E., Jr.
 Harris, Henry F., Jr.
 Harris, J. M.
 Harris, Jack D.
 Harris, William J.
 Harrison, Gravel L.
 Harrison, Joe P.
 Harrison, Marion C.
 Harrison, William D.
 Harrison, William L.
 Hart, Clifford A.
 Hart, Edward M.
 Hart, Irving H., III
 Hartman, Clarence P.
 Hartman, Herbert C.
 Hartsell, Clyde W.
 Hartz, Edward E.
 Haskell, Richard D.
 Haskell, Edward G.
 Hassel, William G., Jr.
 Hastie, William J.
 Hatfield, Everette
 Hatley, Carmon W.
 Hatton, William C.
 Haubold, Samuel A.
 Hauck, Kenneth H., Jr.
 Haughton, David E.
 Haungs, Richard E.
 Hauser, Gene W.
 Havery, John W.
 Hawkey, Robert J.
 Hawkins, Robert I.
 Hawkins, Victor L.
 Hayes, Raymond R.
 Hayes, James W.
 Hayes, Charles W.
 Hayles, Robert W., Jr.
 Hays, Jimmie D.
 Hays, John B.
 Hays, Leonard C.
 Hays, Russell O.
 Hazard, Edward P., Jr.
 Hazard, Roberta L.
 Hazelwood, Ernest R.
 Hazucha, Paul G.
 Heacock, Louis W.
 Head, Thomas A.
 Healy, Patrick R.
 Heasley, Allen D.
 Heath, Stuart R.
 Heath, John L.
 Heath, David M.
 Heckman, Robert J.
 Heckman, Ronald W.
 Heffernan, Charles F.
 Heger, Wayne P.
 Hegg, Daniel R.
 Heilpern, Roger F.
 Hellyer, James A.
 Helmann, Jack E.
 Helmick, Edwin B.
 Helms, David F.
 Helms, Lawrence S.
 Helsley, Jack
 Hemmer, John K.
 Henry, Jack M.
 Henderson, Thomas S.
 Hendrix, Marlon
 Hendry, John A.
 Henley, Willie D.
 Hennessey, John T.
 Henning, Harold E.
 Henrizi, John T.
 Henry, James C., Jr.
 Hensley, Hershaw W.
 Hepburn, Raymond G.
 Herbein, John G.
 Herbert, Robert W.
 Herkert, Richard H.
 Herring, "J" Michael
 Hersley, Janet L.
 Hervey, John C., Jr.
 Hess, Aubrie D.
 Hettich, Bobby S.
 Heuberger, Nathan A.
 Heuser, Herman F.
 Heustis, Rita J.
 Heying, Ernest H.
 Heyneman, Russel E.
 Hickey, Edward F.
 Hickey, Dennis J., IV
 Hickman, Joseph C.
 Hickman, Junior D.
 Hicks, Horace R.
 Hight, Bernice B., Jr.
 Hightower, Roger W.
 Hilder, Lewis E.
 Hill, Arthur S., Jr.
 Hill, Charles W., Jr.
 Hill, Frederick W., Jr.
 Hill, James D.
 Himmelein, Norman T.
 Hindal, Marvin O.
 Hinely, Elliott P.
 Hinkel, Ronald W.
 Hinkel, Jay E.
 Hinton, Aloneous S., Jr.
 Hite, Thomas H.
 Hixson, John D.
 Hixson, Harry F., Jr.
 Hoag, Jean W.
 Hoagland, William W.
 Hoch, Robert G., Jr.
 Hodges, Myron W.
 Hoecker, Richard G.
 Hoernlein, Russell P.
 Hoffman, Joseph F., Jr.
 Hoffman, Drake A.
 Hoffman, Richard P.
 Hoffman, Carl K.
 Hoffman, Hubert L.
 Hogan, Robert T.
 Hoke, John R., II
 Holcomb, Edward L.
 Holden, Durward B.
 Holeman, Charles W.
 Holland, Donald M.
 Holloway, Richard E.
 Holmes, John A.
 Holmes, Walter M., Jr.
 Holmes, Roland E.
 Holtz, Robert S.
 Hood, "J" "V"
 Hood, William J.
 Hood, William S., Jr.
 Hoppin, Thomas B.
 Horn, Floyd E., Jr.
 Horn, Frank G.
 Hornaday, Gregg W.
 Hornsby, Michael D.
 Horsch, Arthur R.
 Hort, John A.
 Horton, Jack O., Jr.
 Horton, Norman L.
 Horton, Ethel L.
 Horton, Andrew S.
 Horve, Leslie A.
 Houghtlin, Robert G., Jr.
 Houk, Donald R.
 Hover, Fred B.
 Howard, Lee F.
 Howard, Albert O., Jr.
 Howard, James R.
 Howe, Donald L.
 Howell, Norman B.
 Howell, Swebston S., Jr.
 Howell, Frederick J.
 Hower, William E.
 Howerton, Norman J.
 Hubbard, Orrin E.
 Hubbard, Charles W., Jr.
 Hubbard, Terrence C.
 Huber, Peter J.
 Huber, Katherine B.
 Huber, Dan E.
 Huberman, Benjamin
 Hudson, Jack D.
 Hughes, Roy J.
 Hughes, Emerson J., Jr.
 Hughes, Royston C.
 Huhn, John H.
 Hull, Charles E.
 Hulvershorn, Frederick W.
 Hungate, Joseph W.
 Hunnell, William R.
 Hunt, Frank M., Jr.
 Hunt, George W., Jr.
 Hunter, Raymond B.
 Hunter, Raymond A.
 Huntley, Donald E.
 Huntzinger, Kent S.
 Hurlburt, Joseph S.
 Huribut, Bonny A.
 Husta, William
 Hutchins, James R.
 Hutchinson, Aubry B.
 Hutchinson, Bruce R.
 Hutt, Thomas E., Jr.
 Hyde, Thomas A.
 Hyde, Walter J.
 Ianucci, Robert J.
 Ide, Charles H.
 Ide, Henry C.
 Ieuter, Fredric E.
 Iig, Raymond P.
 Inderlied, William T., III
 Ingram, David L.
 Ireland, Delbert H.
 Irons, Gary S.
 Irving, Verne H.
 Isaksen, George A.
 Isenburt, William, Jr.
 Ivy, Richard G.
 Iwatsu, David K.
 Jaap, Joseph D.
 Jacobs, Lawrence R.
 Jacobson, Gerald
 Jacobson, Clyde A.
 James, John D.
 James, Stephen R.
 James, Aaron C.
 James, Mary C.
 Janes, Cornell M.
 Janke, Roger A.
 Jaye, James M., Jr.
 Jeffries, Robert E.
 Jeffries, Henry C., Jr.
 Jenkins, Dale A.
 Jenkins, Wendal L.
 Jenkins, Clifton W.
 Jennings, William T.
 Jennings, Lawrence F.
 Jensen, Robert W.
 Jensen, Robert E.
 Jensen, Melvin H.
 Jensen, James L., Jr.
 Jerding, Frederick N.
 Jerrell, Donald G.
 Jeske, Donald C.
 Jochem, Raymond D.
 Joerres, Donald C.
 Johannesen, Robert E.
 Johniken, Teddy A.
 Johns, James E.
 Johns, Homer C., Jr.
 Johnson, Donald C.
 Johnson, Stephen, Jr.
 Johnson, James E.
 Johnson, Larry D.
 Johnson, Iver R.
 Johnson, Joseph H.
 Johnson, Clayton A.
 Johnson, Alfred E.
 Johnson, Ronald E.
 Johnson, Eugene H., Jr.
 Johnson, Donn R.
 Johnson, Ronald B.
 Johnson, James W.
 Johnson, Herbert W.
 Johnson, Kenneth S.
 Johnson, Melvin E.
 Johnson, Clinton B.
 Johnson, Albert P., Jr.
 Johnson, Frederick B.
 Johnson, Kenneth
 Johnston, James R.
 Johnston, Lawrence H., Jr.
 Johnston, Robert A.
 Johnston, Douglas M., Jr.
 Jones, Gordon S.
 Jones, David H.
 Jones, Robert E.
 Jones, Wallace E.
 Jones, Calvin L.
 Jones, Carroll E.
 Jones, Ronald L.
 Jones, Neil W.
 Jones, William H.
 Jones, Hugh S.
 Jones, John R.
 Jones, Charles D.
 Jones, Keith S.
 Jones, Walter R.
 Jones, Raymond G., Jr.
 Jones, Patricia
 Jones, Jerry S.
 Jones, David L.
 Jones, Thomas P., Jr.
 Jones, Joseph J.
 Jones, Robert J.
 Joost, Rodney E.
 Jordan, Aubrey H.
 Jordan, Alexander J., Jr.
 Jordan, John L., Jr.
 Jorgensen, Einar O.
 Jortner, Marvin W.
 Joy, Joseph E.
 Juergens, Kenneth C.
 Junker, Howard R.
 Justice, Billy D.
 Kaelin, James N.
 Kaeser, Harold G.
 Kagy, Virgil C.
 Kahler, Robert C.
 Kalb, David G.
 Kalenowsky, John E.
 Kanady, Garland H., Jr.
 Karamelas, Angelo N.
 Karl, Daniel D.
 Karsten, Peter J.
 Kau, Melvin E. M. K.
 Kauffman, Lawrence B.
 Kaullen, Fred P.
 Kay, Francis D.
 Kazebee, Raymond G.
 Kear, Patrick V.
 Kearney, Lawrence J., Jr.
 Keating, Arthur L.
 Keenum, Guy
 Keepin, Robert H.
 Kehm, William C.
 Keister, Jameson C.
 Keith, Joseph
 Keithline, William W.
 Keliikoa, Edward N.
 Kelleher, Dermot
 Kelley, Thomas G.
 Kelly, Michael J., Jr.
 Kelsay, Leslie E.
 Keltner, Jackie L.
 Kennedy, Joseph A.
 Kennedy, Eugene M.
 Kennedy, Jerry F.
 Kenney, John M.
 Kephart, Robert M.
 Kephart, Robert V.
 Kerlin, Roger L.
 Kerner, Leon W.
 Kerns, Lyle K.
 Kerns, Ernest C.
 Kerns, Alexander H.
 Kesler, Gene P.
 Kessel, Glenn R.
 Key, Paul L., II
 Khoury, Charles R., Jr.
 Kilgallon, James R.
 Killen, Kenneth B.
 Killinger, Edwin E.
 Kincheoloe, Lawrence R.
 King, Jerry C.
 King, James W.
 King, Kenneth P.
 Kingsbury, Karl C.
 Kingsley, Frederic T.
 Kinney, James R.
 Kinnie, Phillip B., Jr.
 Kirklen, Jack L.
 Kiser, William R.
 Kiser, Hoyt, Jr.
 Kishel, Gene F.
 Kistler, Michael W., Jr.
 Kitch, Dale
 Kitzmiller, Oscar V.
 Klausegger, Robert B.
 Kling, Thomas C., Jr.
 Klingebiel, Alfred C.
 Knapp, Carl A.
 Knauer, Fredric S.
 Knight, Vaughn L.
 Knippa, Larry D.
 Knoll, John R.
 Knopf, Peter W.
 Knorr, David J.
 Knouse, Phillip K.
 Knowles, Charles E.
 Knutz, James E.
 Koberg, John A.
 Kobylarczyk, Clarence E.
 Koch, Charles E., II
 Koh, Barry
 Kohl, Orlin A.
 Kohlmeier, Charles F.
 Kohut, Joseph J.
 Konetchy, George J.
 Konewko, Everett L.
 Koon, Norman C.
 Koontz, Ronald L.
 Kopp, Elmer M., Jr.
 Korbs, Donald E.
 Korcheck, Charles S.
 Korte, Joseph N.
 Kortge, Bernard W.
 Korzensky, George J., Jr.
 Kowall, Robert J.
 Kramer, Harvey F.
 Krause, Eugene S.
 Kreassig, Richard M.
 Kreiner, Edward T.
 Kreps, Oren A.
 Krese, Robert A.
 Kretschmar, Karl H.
 Kristensen, Gall A.
 Kromer, Ronald C.
 Kropac, John R.
 Kroyer, George P.
 Krulisch, Alan H.
 Kubishen, Michael A.
 Kuhlman, William
 Kuhnrt, Edward C.
 Kujawa, Gail S.
 Kundrat, Reginald
 Kunkle, Robert E.
 Kurz, Robert
 Laber, George E.
 Labiane, Harold S.
 Lacette, Robert L.
 Lachnicht, John F.
 Lafferty, Patrick J.
 Lafrance, Gerald
 Lain, Calvin E.
 Laipply, Charles T.
 Lairson, Don D.
 Lake, John T.
 Lamb, Donald K.
 Lamb, Jay W.
 Lamb, Rufus N., Jr.

- Lambach, Carl E.
Lambertson, Roy F., Jr.
Lambertson, Wayne R.
Lammers, Lennis L.
Lamontagne, Richard R.
Land, Walter R.
Lane, Clinton R.
Lane, J. D.
Lane, John W.
Lane, Samuel D.
Lang, Joseph McM., Jr.
Lang, James R.
Lang, Peter T.
Langdon, Stewart D.
Langen, Joseph H.
Langston, James D.
Lanham, Michael S.
Lanker, Charles E.
Lanning, Bruce E.
Lanouette, Raymond F.
Lansdowne, Alan E.
Lantz, Phillip E.
Large, Elwyn F.
Larkin, Eugene F., Jr.
Larsen, Lawrence M.
Larsen, Tom B.
Larsen, Richard M.
Larson, Stanley M.
Larson, Frank C.
Larson, Richard H.
Lasch, Charles A.
Latimer, Peyton R.
Laufer, William H.
Laukaitis, Edward F.
Laurvick, Richard E.
Laux, William J.
Lavelle, John M.
Lavery, Richard J., III
Leahy, John F., III
Lawinski, Henry A.
Lawlor, Francis J.
Lawrence, Henry L. H., Jr.
Lawrence, Richard W.
Lawson, Fred W.
Leader, John C.
Leathem, Douglas B.
Leblanc, Henry R.
Leblanc, Arsene, Jr.
Lebrecht, Clifford W.
Leduc, Ernest R.
Lee, Jerald K.
Lee, Lawrence L.
Lee, Robert C.
Lee, Tommy H.
Lees, Michael J.
Legare, Thomas C. R., Jr.
Leggett, Melvin E.
Lehane, Jeremiah J., Jr.
Lehn, Richard M.
Leimonas, Sigitas
Leipold, Frederick J.
Lemaster, James L.
Lemaster, Morris
Lemond, William T.
Leonard, William J.
Leszczynski, Edward J. L., III
Letourneau, Joseph R. L.
Lettington, Thomas F.
Levasseur, Marshall J., Jr.
Levasseur, Rudolph G.
Levesque, Raymond D.
Levin, Victor
Levine, Emil H.
Levine, Jules I.
Levy, Edwin, Jr.
Lew, Girard T.
Lewis, Ralph M.
Lewis, Roy T., Jr.
Lewis, William E., Jr.
Lewis, Harry C.
Lewis, Porter, Jr.
Lickfold, F. R., III
- Lightner, Robert B.
Lilly, Joseph W.
Lind, Eugene E.
Lindsay, George W.
Lindsey, James A.
Lindstrom, Gordon E.
Linendoll, John A.
Linn, Joe E.
Lippold, Walter J.
Littell, Gerald L.
Litten, Robert A.
Little, Robert R.
Littlefield, James W.
Livingston, Gerald W.
Livingston, James M.
Lloyd, William B., Jr.
Lloyd, Roger M.
Lloyd, Roger W.
Locher, William W.
Locher, James R.
Lokke, William E., Jr.
Loden, Richard L.
Loebel, Leonard F.
Logan, Billy B.
Logan, Alexander S.
Logue, Richard J.
Logue, John F.
Lomax, Norman
Long, Gaeton A., Jr.
Long, Joseph
Long, William C.
Longaker, Harold L.
Longdon, Robert S.
Longmeier, Norman H.
Longmire, Thomas W.
Longton, Edward B.
Looman, Bernard J.
Lopresti, Frank P.
Love, Bonnie E.
Loveland, Lynn S.
Loveland, Kenneth W.
Lowe, Robert W.
Lowery, Fred H., Jr.
Lowman, Raymond D.
Lowrey, Donald F.
Lowsley, Iyon H., Jr.
Loy, Donald L.
Lucas, Edward
Lucas, James E.
Luce, George B.
Ludwigsen, Charles M.
Luke, John C.
Lund, Frederick M.
Lunny, Robert M.
Lusby, John F.
Lusignan, John M.
Lynch, James B., Jr.
Lynch, John F., Jr.
Lyons, Daniel B.
Mabry, James D.
Mabry, Fred W., Jr.
MacDonald, Walter F.
Mace, James A.
MacFadden, Robin C.
Machholz, Donald E.
MacKay, George W.
Macke, Richard C.
Mackey, Phillip E.
Mackie, David L.
MacKinnon, William B.
MacLeod, Kenneth
Leszczynski, Edward J. L., III
Madigan, William P.
Magee, Herman
Magnussen, Norman
Mahany, Walter H.
Mahathay, Clague O.
Mahoney, Danno F.
Main, Christopher A.
Maines, Robert L.
Makela, Toivo W.
Maki, Weldon E.
Makovic, George S.
Makowski, Walter F.
Mallari, William A.
Malmberg, Norman R.
Malone, John P.
Malone, Claude H.
Malone, Elmer D.
- Mamer, Edwin J.
Manlove, James C.
Manlove, William W., Jr.
Mann, Harry P.
Mann, Robert
Manning, William S.
Mansell, Waymond
Manser, Robert J.
Mansi, Leon
Manuel, John F.
Marburger, George G., Jr.
Mares, David L.
Mariano, Gilbert T., Jr.
Marinelli, Leonard F., Jr.
Markee, Neil D.
Marker, William J.
Markley, James L.
Marlin, Richard E.
Marquis, David R.
Marr, George M.
Marsh, Frank J., Jr.
Marsh, Lawrence E.
Marshall, James
Marshall, James S.
Marshall, John R.
Marshall, Ronald P.
Martel, Norman L.
Marti, Thomas J.
Martin, Joseph R. R.
Martin, Thomas D.
Martin, Glynn
Martin, Robert E.
Martin, Gay, G., Jr.
Martin, Frank
Martin, Clifford I.
Mashburn, Charles A.
Maskell, Charles M.
Mason, Charles C.
Mason, Ronald R.
Mathews, James E., Jr.
Matouk, George F.
Matthew, Gail E.
Matthews, Robert S.
Mattson, Karl R.
Matulka, Robert D.
Mauro, Peter J.
Maxfield, Jack M.
May, Walter A.
Maynard, Theodore W.
Maynard, Mark J.
Mayo, John B., Jr.
Mazzan, Carl A., Jr.
McAfee, Robert E.
McAfee, Ronald J.
McAfee, Robert S.
McCabe, Michael J.
McCall, James R.
McCallum, Carl P.
McCarthy, Robert J.
McCarter, Roy S., Jr.
McCartkill, Charles E., Jr.
McCausland, John E.
McClanahan, Ashby A.
McClanahan, Ted
McClarren, Ralph G.
McCloskey, Terry J.
McClure, Melvin M.
McClure, Thomas W.
McClure, Nathan F.
McConnell, James M.
McConnell, James T.
McCormick, Walter S., Jr.
McCormack, Harry A.
McCormack, Elmer L.
McCormack, Ollie B.
McCourtney, Theo H., Jr.
McCoy, Jimmy H.
McCoy, Walter L.
McCracken, William P.
McCracken, Robert F.
McCracken, Max D.
McCork, John C., Jr.
- McCullough, Michael S.
McCullough, Larry D.
McCune, George B.
McDole, James E.
McDonald, Lee R.
McDonald, William M.
McDonnell, Lawrence J.
McDonough, Thomas F.
McDougall, Donald J.
McDowell, Thomas N.
McDowell, Brian J.
McEwan, Donald P.
McFadden, Donald O.
McFarlane, Robert D.
McGargill, Mark
McGaughey, James P.
McGaw, Robert
McGilbery, Ira O.
McGinn, John P., Jr.
McGlasson, Ross
McGlathery, Monte N.
McGonegal, William F.
McGovern, John P.
McGrath, Milton A.
McGregor, James R.
McGregor, Joe W.
McHenry, Milton R.
McKean, Robert A., III
McKenney, George G., Jr.
McKeon, Guy R.
McKeon, Edward J., Jr.
McKimens, Paul K.
McKinley, Robert N.
McKinley, Douglas E.
McKinney, Kenneth W.
McKinna, Michael D.
McKinney, James B.
McKinney, John W.
McKnight, Franklin D.
McClellan, John H.
McLean, James R., Jr.
McLeod, Samuel D., Jr.
McManus, Arthur T.
McMurray, Marquis E.
McNabb, John M.
McNaughton, William E.
McNee, Malcolm R.
McNeill, James B.
McNew, Clyde E., Jr.
McPherson, Willard W.
McQuaig, Clarence M.
McSurely, Hugh B.
Meadows, Jackie W.
Meagher, Maurice F., Jr.
Means, Michael G.
Meardy, Ronald R.
Medaris, William W.
Meek, William A. J.
Meeker, Harold L.
Meeks, Joseph R.
Megill, Thomas L.
Mehelich, Jacob R.
Mehl, Henry T.
Mehl, Wayne J.
Mehldau, Alan P.
Meier, George E.
Meinicke, Thomas A.
Meislahn, Harry P.
Mellott, Harlan B.
Melton, Jack L.
Mendels, John C.
Mendenhall, Nathan J., Jr.
Mendenhall, Robert L.
Meng, William F.
Mengason, James
Menikheim, Douglas K.
Menshouse, Jack R.
Mercer, Benjamin F., III
- Meredith, Richard B.
Merikangas, James R.
Meritt, Donald L.
Merrick, Martin P.
Merrill, Michael H.
Mervine, Lowrie R.
Meyer, Robert A.
Michael, Glen R.
Michaels, Albert McM.
Michalski, Louis, Jr.
Michel, Alan E.
Midas, Michael T., Jr.
Miles, Samuel A., II
Millar, Robert L.
Miller, William E., Jr.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, George E.
Miller, Phil A.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Robert B.
Milligan, Frank T.
Million, Edwin F., Jr.
Mills, Richard B.
Millsaps, Richard Z.
Milne, Douglas S.
Mims, Norman W., Jr.
Mims, William J.
Mishler, Douglas L.
Mitchell, William A.
Mitchell, William T.
Mitchell, Frederick G.
Mitchell, Paul J.
Moerdyk, Bernard N.
Moerschel, David C.
Mohorich, Helen M.
Moller, Arthur E., Jr.
Moller, Herman W.
Mongan, Thomas R.
Montague, Gerald F.
Montanaro, Joseph A.
Montgomery, David R.
Moon, Charlie M.
Moore, Durward E., Jr.
Moore, William R.
Moore, Lawrence B.
Moore, James O., III
Moore, Theodore C., Jr.
Moore, Richard M., Jr.
Moore, William F.
Moore, James L., Jr.
Moore, John A.
Moore, James E.
Moore, Walter B.
Moore, David K.
Moore, Dennis A.
Moorehead, William S.
Moot, Zane A.
Morales, Alfonso H.
Moran, John P.
Moran, Maurice J.
Morey, Richard S.
Morgan, Harold R.
Morgan, Morris
Moroney, Charles C.
Morrison, Richard
Morrison, Robert, III
Morrison, Robert H.
Morris, Thomas V.
Morris, Clarence A., Jr.
Morris, Lewis L.
Morris, Robert C.
Morris, Carl M.
Morrisset, Jon E.
Morrow, Frederic I.
Moscoe, Loren J.
Mosher, Andrew C.
Mosher, Francis E.
Moss, Ambler H., Jr.
Mott, Carleton E.
Mrazik, Albert
Mucha, Marvin F.
Mudd, Richard L.
Mulhearn, Raymond R.
Mullin, William S.
Mullins, William E.
Mumford, Stanley E.
Munger, Francis X.
Munroe, Frank A., III
Murdock, Charles D.
Murphy, Michael L.
- Murphy, Howard L.
Murphy, Edward R., Jr.
Murray, Francis H.
Murray, Arthur P.
Murray, Allan W.
Murray, John J.
Murray, Joseph A., Jr.
Musser, Benjamin C.
Mussman, Edward J.
Mustard, James D.
Myers, George C., Jr.
Myers, Cecil E., Jr.
Naab, Geoffrey
Nagle, David J.
Nagle, Charles L.
Nale, James F.
Nanney, Robert G.
Nantau, Norman E.
Neal, James J.
Neapolitan, Richard C.
Neary, Joseph P., Jr.
Neblett, Robert E.
Neef, James V.
Neher, John D.
Neifert, Donald L.
Neill, William S.
Neiman, Howard A.
Nelson, James R.
Nelson, Francis E.
Nelson, Stuart N. M.
Nelson, Roger E.
Nelson, Roger W.
Nelson, George A.
Nelson, Norman R.
Nelson, Victor L.
Nelson, Gerald A.
Nemcosky, Martin J., Jr.
Nesbitt, Robert C., Jr.
Nesmith, Raymond C.
Nester, Irvin C.
Neumann, Joseph J.
Newhouse, Alan R.
Newman, Donald W.
Newman, Jack G.
Newsom, Elmer D.
Newton, Winston P.
Niccum, Leonard G.
Nichols, Herschel C.
Nichols, Keith A.
Nickerson, Charles A.
Niederer, Robert A.
Nieschke, Richard N.
Nixon, Murray C.
Noland, Robert F.
Norbeck, Carl S.
Nordwall, Curtis C.
Norman, Sheldon
Norman, Robert A.
Norris, Kay L.
Northrup, Russell L.
Norton, Paul S.
Novak, Harlan W.
Novak, Michael J.
Novotney, Clayton L.
Noyes, Arthur L.
Nuernberger, Herbert C.
Nugent, Leonard J.
Nunee, Samuel
Nunn, James L.
Nystrom, Robert E.
Oaks, Eugene W.
Oates, Kenneth L.
Oberlander, Clifford C.
O'Brien, James E.
O'Brien, Thomas
O'Brien, Thomas P.
O'Brien, Ward J.
O'Brien, George D., Jr.
O'Brien, Frederick
O'Connell, Robert T.
O'Connell, Patrick G.
O'Dell, Ralph V.
Odum, "J" "W"
O'Farrell, James T.
Ogles, Homer C.
Oldfather, Daniel O.

- Olds, David D.
Olds, Ernest E.
Oliver, Chester F.
Olsen, William P.
Olson, Leray
Olson, Donald L.
O'Malley, John P.
Oney, James B.
Oney, Warren W.
Onken, Gene A.
Orbish, Vincent A.
Ortengren, Ralph W., Jr.
Ortman, John C.
Oshell, Walter E.
Osborne, John B.
Ostrom, Kenneth R.
O'Sullivan, Paul K.
Otis, Howard L.
Otis, John W.
Otness, Phillip C.
Ott, Keith M.
Otte, Walter H.
Otto, Albert C., Jr.
Ouellette, Thomas A.
Overly, Thomas L.
Overstreet, Macy E.
Overstrom, Ronald G.
Owen, Tommie J.
Owens, Bruce H.
Owens, David C.
Owens, Edward L.
Owenson, Alfred T.
Owby, James F.
Pace, Joseph L.
Padgett, James A.
Padilla, Nicholas S.
Paleologos, Nicholas C.
Paletta, Joseph, Jr.
Palmer, Walla R., Jr.
Pane, Marietta A.
Pankratz, John M.
Panshin, Daniel A.
Papa, Henry W.
Parcells, Paul W.
Paris, Robert L.
Pariseau, Richard R.
Park, Earl P.
Parker, William H.
Parker, Allen H.
Parker, Joseph W., Jr.
Parker, Carl K.
Parker, Charles S.
Parkinson, David L.
Pardette, William T.
Parr, Clayton J.
Parrish, Hubert N.
Parry, Ira E., Jr.
Parsons, Edwin F., Jr.
Partlow, Joseph A.
Paskowitz, Selwyn S.
Pastre, Robert L.
Pateas, Theodore N.
Paterson, Robert W.
Patterson, Bradford H.
Patterson, Donald D.
Patterson, John W.
Patton, Edward J.
Patton, James H., Jr.
Paul, Martin A.
Paul, Michael F.
Paul, Raymond H.
Paules, Granville E., III
Paulsen, Thomas D.
Pauole, Alvin H.
Payne, William C.
Peace, William H., III
Pearce, Robert G.
Pearce, Patrick H.
Pearl, Vincent J.
Pearsall, Nelson H.
Pecor, Glenn O.
Peden, Joe D.
Peden, George B.
Peebles, Robert H.
Peek, Joseph H.
Peeples, Marshall A.
Peigh, Carl
Pekala, Carl J.
Pellegrini, Charles A.
Peltier, George A., Jr.
Pendleton, Reid, Jr.
Penley, Dennis R.
Penman, James A.
Penner, Vernon D.
Pepper, John E., Jr.
Pereira, Ronald M.
Perkins, Richard A.
Perrinello, Louis F.
Perron, Joseph H.
Perry, Lyman S. A.
Perry, Eugene E.
Petersen, Peter M.
Petersen, Ted M.
Peters, Donald L.
Peterson, Richard N.
Peters, James F., Jr.
Peters, Thomas J.
Peterson, Ernest K.
Peterson, Donald L.
Peterson, Harold A.
Peterson, Charles H.
Pethick, John A., II
Petrie, Arthur B.
Petrilla, John A.
Petrovitz, George, Jr.
Petty, Benny M.
Pezet, Walter A., III
Pflecki, Louis W.
Pfouts, John P.
Phelan, James E.
Phelps, Harold R., Jr.
Pheimister, Larry L.
Philbrick, James W., Jr.
Phillower, Peter P.
Phillips, Robert W.
Phillips, Stephen L.
Phillips, Grady H.
Phillips, Peter M.
Phillips, Henry L., Jr.
Phillippi, Frederick E., Jr.
Phillips, Glen R.
Phillips, George B.
Phipps, Rodney G.
Picard, Joseph C. E.
Pich, Leo
Piech, Henry J.
Pike, Robert P., Jr.
Pilcher, Charles R.
Pilkenton, Hester R.
Pimm, Russell S.
Pingenot, Edward R.
Pippen, Merrill D.
Pirtz, Ronald B.
Pitt, William M.
Pittell, Robert J.
Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
Ploeger, Paul H., III
Plummer, Grant W.
Pochordo, Stanley
Poindexter, Chris H.
Polaski, Harold E., Jr.
Polk, Jack O., II
Polzin, William F.
Pomrehn, Hugo P.
Ponton, Melvin V.
Pool, Herman M.
Pope, David K.
Porter, Ethan O., Jr.
Porter, William M.
Porter, Donald J.
Porter, William J.
Potter, Robert A.
Pottersveld, Jan P.
Potter, Rodrick H.
Powell, George A.
Powell, William L., Jr.
Powers, Harvey R.
Powers, Charles W.
Powers, Byron L., Jr.
Powers, Robert C.
Powers, Robert J.
Prater, Donald C.
Prather, James T.
Pratt, Michael W.
Pratt, Joel S.
Pratt, George W.
Prebola, George J.
Presley, Thomas M.
Previte, Francis I., Jr.
Price, Gary J.
Price, Harold R.
Prince, Robert V.
Pringle, Vernon E., Jr.
Proffitt, Norman A., Jr.
Prohaska, Frank B.
Proulx, Francis E.
Provaznik, Clarence E.
Provine, John C.
Prueske, Elmer W.
Przyblyski, Raymond M.
Puckett, Nathan L.
Pugh, John S.
Pullen, Leonard A.
Purcell, William C.
Pursel, John J.
Purtee, Jack W.
Pyatte, Devere, Jr.
Qualls, Fred H.
Quarterman, Joseph L.
Quastus, Robert F.
Queen, William E.
Quinn, Jack C.
Quinn, Joseph S.
Rader, Keith E.
Raftis, Paul E.
Ragan, Mary E.
Ragozzine, Carolyn M.
Ragsdale, George L.
Raines, Paul E.
Rains, Donald R.
Rakiewicz, Theodore W., Jr.
Ramsey, James B.
Ramsey, William F.
Ransom, Edward A.
Raph, Merlyn F.
Rathbun, Dennis K.
Raup, Thomas C.
Ravetta, Richard C.
Ray, Harry, Jr.
Rayburn, Clarence W.
Raymond, Henry A.
Raymond, William J.
Raymond, David A.
Raymond, Robert W.
Read, Bonnie J.
Read, Gustavus C., Jr.
Rechterman, Merlin E.
Redman, Charles D.
Reed, Joseph W.
Reed, Richard D.
Reed, Ross M.
Reeder, Hugh A.
Rees, Richard J.
Rees, Ruth E.
Reese, Evan P.
Reese, Ronald M.
Regan, James J., Jr.
Regner, Clarence H., Jr.
Reich, Harry B.
Reichle, Philip S.
Reid, William G.
Reightler, Kenneth S.
Reinert, Herbert W.
Reinholtz, Theodore L.
Reinstra, Llewellyn R.
Reisenleiter, Vernon A., Jr.
Remakis, John, Jr.
Remenak, Leo N., Jr.
Renner, Robert R.
Renning, Richard A.
Reno, Andrew F.
Rentfro, Russell, Jr.
Repine, Marlin D.
Repp, John T.
Ressler, Paul M.
Reutelhuber, Jack C.
Reuter, Stewart E.
Reynolds, James C.
Reynolds, Dexter H., Jr.
Rhinebeck, George C.
Rhinebolt, Henry J.
Rhoades, William W.
Rhodes, William A.
Rhodes, Robert M.
Rhodes, Melton E., Jr.
Rhodes, Forrest T.
Ricci, Nick C.
Rice, Robert P.
Rice, William R.
Rich, William M.
Richardson, John M., Jr.
Richards, Frank M.
Richardson, Thomas J.
Richardson, Bruce R.
Richartz, Arthur O.
Richley, Howard L.
Richno, Carl E.
Rickelman, John H.
Ricketts, David L.
Ridder, Wendell C.
Riddle, Peter E.
Riedel, Richard
Riehm, Charles E., Jr.
Riggs, William D.
Riggs, Harold S.
Riiff, Francis J.
Riley, Harold P.
Riley, John T.
Riley, Roy G.
Rimelen, Harry J.
Rindlaub, Beverly M.
Riner, Robert E.
Ringer, Warren C.
Rinnert, Henry J.
Ritchie, Lloyd T.
Ritchie, James D.
Roark, William M.
Robbins, Albert H.
Roberson, Franklin P.
Roberts, Lawrence W.
Roberts, Donald A.
Roberts, Ernest P.
Roberts, Richard R.
Roberts, Charles K.
Robertson, Delmaine A.
Robertson, Teddie E.
Robins, Thomas D.
Robinson, Marion B.
Robinson, Richard H.
Robinson, William B.
Roche, James G.
Rodgers, William E. L.
Rodriguez, Antonio B.
Roeder, Bernard F., Jr.
Roemish, Eric M.
Rogers, Raymond H.
Rogers, George R.
Rogers, John L.
Rogers, Roy L.
Rognlien, Robert P.
Rogus, Edward F.
Rohr, Edwin M.
Rohr, Robert C.
Roller, Donald G.
Rollins, David J.
Rolph, Kenneth E.
Romanelli, John N.
Romig, Phillip R., Jr.
Ronneberg, Earl F., Jr.
Rooney, Henry F.
Roop, Charles W.
Roper, Lidge B.
Rorem, John A., Jr.
Roselle, Curtis C.
Rosenburg, Herman E.
Rosengren, Joseph R.
Ross, Robert W.
Ross, William M., Jr.
Ross, William W.
Roth, Daniel McK.
Rothschild, Robert E.
Rothschild, Stephen G.
Roton, Cyrus W.
Roudebush, Jackie L.
Rouse, William A.
Rouse, Kay E.
Routt, William, Jr.
Rowan, Charles L.
Rowland, Robert C.
Rowley, James E.
Ruckersfeldt, George E.
Rudy, George H., III
Ruhsenberger, John F.
Rullman, Donald H.
Rundle, Lynne E.
Runnels, James M.
Rupert, Clarence W.
Russell, James H.
Russell, Clifford S.
Russell, William R.
Russick, John A.
Rutherford, Robert R.
Ryan, Kevin T.
Ryan, Lester E.
Ryan, Larry E.
Rybarczyk, Anthony M.
Ryder, Albert
Saari, Colin H.
Salesky, Theodore E.
Sanders, Loren L.
Sanders, Ralph G.
Sanders, William E.
Sanders, Gilbert E.
Sanders, Donald W.
Sanderlin, Francis R.
Sandlin, John P.
Sanford, Harold W.
Sangster, Robert P.
Sargent, Elbert W.
Sarno, Lawrence F.
Sarnowski, Thomas J.
Sasser, Sidney J.
Saunders, Franklin H.
Savage, Kenneth D.
Sawyer, John L.
Sawyer, Harmon W.
Scalf, Fred R., Jr.
Scarborough, John R., Jr.
Schaaf, Ronald L.
Schaefer, Joseph F., Jr.
Schappaugh, Earl L.
Schardein, Edgar A.
Scheffer, Stephen J.
Schisler, Billy W.
Schlicht, Donald L.
Schmeltz, Victor C., Jr.
Schmer, Conrad J., Jr.
Schmidt, John A.
Schnabel, Walter F.
Schneeberger, Donald G.
Schneider, George T.
Schneider, Joseph D.
Schneider, George F.
Schneider, Robert P.
Schoonover, Ray R.
Schriefer, Luther F.
Schroeder, William A., III
Schroeder, Raymond C., Jr.
Schuette, Richard W.
Schult, Richard W.
Schultz, Earl W. H.
Schultz, William V.
Schultz, Thomas L.
Schultz, James F.
Schultz, Willard E.
Schulz, Robert J.
Schuman, Stanley D.
Schuette, Frank A.
Schweizer, Earle G., Jr.
Schwer, Frederick A., Jr.
Scott, Charles T.
Scott, John R.
Scott, Peter D.
Scott, Thomas W.
Scott, James H.
Scott, Gordon E.
Scoville, Frederick W.
Scruggs, Sidney L., III
Scully, Vincent F., Jr.
Seabring, Robert C.
Seale, Eugene B.
Seaman, Stewart R.
Seaver, George A.
Seebirt, James E.
Seekell, Warren W.
Seelen, Charles
Seeley, Howard G.
Seiden, Paul E.
Seitz, Roger M.
Sellers, William E.
Senhen, Linus A.
Senterfitt, John E.
Serfass, Robert E.
Sessions, Thomas F., II
Sestric, Joseph L.
Seufert, Robert J.
Sevario, Byron W.
Seyler, Lloyd E., Jr.
Shade, Walter R., III
Shaffer, John G.
Shaffer, Phillip H.
Shanley, Peter A.
Shanok, Michael E.
Sharp, John B., Jr.
Sharp, Grant A.
Sharp, Perry C.
Shattuck, Oliver P.
Shaw, Joe L.
Shaw, John F.
Shawkey, Richard S.
Shawver, John R.
Shea, Brian M.
Sheehan, Robert P.
Sheler, James A.
Shepard, Charles E.
Shepard, Alfred D.
Sheppard, Albert W., Jr.
Sherman, John M.
Sherman, Linda K.
Sherman, Howard E.
Sherron, Cole A.
Sherrwood, Raymond W.
Shilling, Gordon L.
Shindledecker, John B.
Shipp, Jimmie S.
Shirk, Robert L., Jr.
Shiveley, Murle W.
Shoemaker, Hugh L.
Shoop, Robin D., Jr.
Short, Richard H.
Shovlin, Daniel M.
Shreckengast, James A.
Shuell, Thomas J.
Shufelt, William J., Jr.
Shuford, Robert E.
Shuler, Curtis R.
Shumake, George E.
Shumway, Louis A.
Shy, Julius T.
Siebecke, Alfred G.
Siebers, Karl J.
Sievors, Arthur W.
Sigafoos, William E.
Silcox, Gordon B.
Silliman, Edwin L., Jr.
Simms, Gordon H.
Simms, George E.
Simon, Henry J.
Simonelli, Norman W.
Simons, Charles F., Jr.
Simpson, Harold L., Jr.

- Simpson, Frank T.
Singer, Arnold
Singleton, "J" Arthur
Siple, Terrence E.
Sipple, Howard L., Jr.
Sisk, Ralph D.
Skidgel, Gerald T.
Skillin, Kenneth W.
Skillman, John W.
Slack, Charles E. III
Slagg, Lyle L., Jr.
Sleeper, Joseph E.
Slezak, Norman L.
Slick, Charles O.
Slobodny, Joseph J.
Smiley, Robert W.
Smith, Donald A.
Smith, Norman H.
Smith, Thomas D.
Smith, Lawrence J.
Smith, Peter H.
Smith, "J" "B"
Smith, Fairo J.
Smith, Billie J.
Smith, Kenneth L.
Smith, John N.
Smith, Karol A.
Smith, Regis R.
Smith, Peter D.
Smith, Robert W.
Smith, John F.
Smith, Vance G.
Smith, Edward H., Jr.
Smith, Larry L.
Smith, Frank R.
Smith, Jackson E. M.
Smith, Clyde W.
Smith, George E., Jr.
Smith, George R.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Ronald C.
Smith, Hugh J., Jr.
Smith, Roy C., IV
Smith, Lowell E.
Smith, James A. D.
Smith, David W.
Smith, Edgar N.
Smith, Ray W.
Smithson, Alva P.
Smits, Walter I.
Snell, Wendell D.
Snodgrass, Roger R.
Snow, Charles H., Jr.
Snow, Richard M.
Snyder, Gene L.
Snyder, Robert W.
Snyder, Stanley G.
Soderholm, Loren F. G.
Sokolowski, Steven
Sollberger, Melvin H.
Sollenberger, Robert N.
Soper, Edward E.
Sordelet, James R.
Sorenson, Loren O.
Sortor, James B.
Soval, Paul T.
Sovey, Paul L.
Sowell, Harley A., Jr.
Space, Theodore M.
Spang, Norman W.
Spann, Alton B.
Sparks, Ernest E.
Sparks, Paul W.
Speerman, William R.
Speegle, Arthur R.
Spencer, Edmund B.
Spencer, Dan T., Jr.
Sperling, Harris
Sperry, Seifert D.
Spidell, Everett D.
Spiker, Donald C.
Spinelli, Domenick A., Jr.
Spinks, Alfred H.
Spriggs, Harold B.
Spurr, Gilbert C.
Stabler, David R., Jr.
Stack, James F.
Staehlin, Marlene J.
Staes, James P.
Staggers, Howard E.
Staley, Wayne E.
Stalnaker, Frank
Stamer, Leonard P.
Stampfle, Richard A., Jr.
Standard, Louis F.
Standley, John R.
Stanley, William M.
Stanley, Howard C.
Stanley, Joe M., Jr.
Stanley, Vito
Stansell, John A.
Starling, Frank E.
Stasko, Nicholas J.
Stauch, Eugene A.
Steedley, Duncan McM.
Steele, Robert L.
Steelhead, Wesley L.
Stefencavage, George
Steffens, Marcellus P.
Steffner, Barbara A.
Stenson, Henry B.
Stephens, Manuel C.
Stephens, Laurence A.
Stephens, Darrel L.
Stevens, Rowland S., II
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stevens, Stanley L.
Stewart, William J.
Stewart, Glendale P.
Stewart, Kelsey S.
Stewart, Harvey T., Jr.
Stewart, Richard L.
Stiles, Willis O.
Stine, Clarence E.
St. Jean, Russell J.
Stoakley, Richard H.
Stoehr, Robert E.
Stokes, Thomas M.
Stoltz, Charles L.
Storms, James J.
Story, Hardin C.
Stott, Joe M.
Strangertorsen, Rolf
Stratton, Bobbie E.
Stratton, Russell E.
Straughn, Wyatt F.
Straus, Melville
Strawbridge, David A.
Striedel, Henry C.
Stromberg, David P.
Strother, James F.
Stroup, Harold D.
Struck, Gerald L. V.
Strunk, Alvin A.
Stryker, Lylal M.
Stumbo, Stanley C.
Sturm, Edward J.
Sturm, Harold F., Jr.
Suddath, Jewel J., Jr.
Suggs, Robert F.
Sullivan, John F.
Sullivan, Francis E.
Sullivan, Patrick H.
Sullivan, James E., Jr.
Super, Richard N.
Sur, Richard R.
Surber, John S., Jr.
Surlis, Elzie R.
Surprenant, John P.
Surratt, Jon E.
Sutcliffe, William G.
Sutliff, Robert C., Jr.
Sutor, John K.
Svatek, Joseph F.
Swalis, Carl U.
Swap, John E.
Swearengin, David E.
Swilley, Aaron E.
Syck, James M.
Szczepanski, Kazimierz J.
Szeyler, Edward P.
Taber, Alton E., Jr.
Tabor, Don C.
Tackney, Peter McM.
Tadlock, James D.
Taff, Dennis V.
Tague, James R., Jr.
Taipale, Denis G.
Tait, David N.
Tait, John H.
Tait, Thomas M.
Talarico, Frank
Talbot, Bruce R.
Talken, George F.
Talley, Kirby L.
Talley, James C., Jr.
Tallman, James R.
Taulbee, William H.
Taylor, Lloyd P.
Taylor, William E.
Taylor, Thomas W.
Taylor, Lowell S.
Taylor, Clarence R.
Taylor, Nelson D.
Taylor, Paul D.
Taylor, Donald E.
Taylor, Jerry I.
Taylor, John F.
Taylor, Robert G.
Taylor, Turner W.
Taylor, Raynor A. K.
Taylor, Mary E.
Taylor, Frank L.
Taylor, Herbert W., Jr.
Teal, Thomas H., III
Teemley, Ronald P.
Teeter, Richard E.
Teigland, Stanley M.
Temple, Nicholas B.
Tereo, Michael
Terry, Dennis H.
Terry, Donald L.
Terry, John R.
Terry, Thomas J., Jr.
Terry, Charles L.
Tew, Jasper L.
Thames, Lewis H., Jr.
Thibeault, Frederick L.
Thomas, John B.
Thomas, Grove N.
Thomas, Glenn E.
Thomas, Christopher R.
Thomas, William E.
Thomas, Frank A.
Thomas, Larry D.
Thomas, Donald K.
Thompson, Phillip S.
Thompson, Thomas N.
Thompson, Clifford K., Jr.
Thompson, Salvia, Jr.
Thompson, Alton K.
Thompson, Robert E.
Thorderson, John R.
Thorgerson, Eric J.
Thornburgh, Eldon L.
Thorner, Michael G.
Thumser, William D.
Tickle, Tommy R.
Tilton, Donald A.
Timm, Leroy A.
Tipton, Douglas B.
Tisdale, Jesse W.
Toben, Joseph L.
Tobin, Kiefer A.
Tobin, Daniel J.
Todd, William D.
Tolderlund, Douglas S.
Tollaksen, Duane M.
Tomkins, Harold L.
Tomkins, Norman E.
Toms, Macolm E.
Tool, Stephen R.
Toomer, Garland W.
Topp, David P.
Torkelson, Thomas G.
Torrance, Harold S.
Tourney, Keith M.
Towle, Robert L.
Townsend, William J.
Trainor, Walter C.
Traister, Robert E.
Tranchini, Joseph
Trandahl, Orlin E.
Trapp, Nathan L.
Travis, Bevan E.
Treacy, Michael F.
Trefry, Edwin V.
Treseder, Richard M.
Trimble, David C.
Triptow, Earl L., II
Tritz, Lawrence J.
Troyer, Thomas L.
Trudeau, Frank F.
Truesdell, William M.
Truitt, Richard D.
Trulli, Harry B.
Tucker, Robert E., Jr.
Tullis, Robert D.
Tully, Vernon C., Jr.
Tully, Neal C.
Tumminelli, Joseph P.
Tupaz, Terencio
Tupaz, Jesus B.
Turk, Eugene J.
Turner, Rolland R.
Turner, Ellis L.
Tuttobene, Anthony T.
Twig, David W.
Tyler, Donald K.
Tyson, James P.
Ugoretz, Richard J.
Uhrhane, Francis J.
Underwood, Arlof V.
Valk, Jerome W.
Vanauken, Ivan E., Jr.
Vance, Benjamin L.
Vandenbroeck, Thomas A.
Vandervort, Harry E., Jr.
Vandiver, William C.
Van Houten, Otis E.
VanHyning, Carl W.
VanNess, Peter R.
Varady, Paul D.
Varley, Edwin R., Jr.
Varner, Dale N.
Vaughn, William E.
Vaught, Clarence T.
Vawter, Vernon J.
Veazey, Richard F., Jr.
Veazey, Luther T.
Verona, Francis M.
Verwers, Robert A.
Vest, Calvin L.
Vied, Dennis H.
Vincent, James M.
Violette, Jerome C.
Virden, Charles S.
Vivian, Jack A.
Vogels, Richard H.
Vonfischer, Eduard L., III
Vonkleeck, John S., Jr.
Vonkolnitz, Henry Jr.
Voss, George P.
Vrtar, Marko
Waddell, Robert M.
Wade, Joseph W., Jr.
Wagenbrenner, Blase F.
Wagner, Alfred H., Jr.
Wagner, Fred D.
Wagner, Theodore
Wagner, Edward F.
Walker, Arthur J.
Walker, Wilburn O.
Walker, Charles E.
Walker, Horace G.
Walker, Richard L.
Walker, George R., Jr.
Walker, William H.
Walker, Edward T., Jr.
Wall, Edward J.
Wall, Thomas E.
Wallace, Richard W.
Wallace, George L.
Walls, James M.
Walsh, George A., Jr.
Walsh, Patrick A.
Walsh, Anthony L., Jr.
Walter, Everett R.
Walters, Robert M.
Wangeman, Charles E., Jr.
Wangler, John H.
Ward, Gordon L.
Ward, Sibley L., III
Wardle, Norval L.
Ware, Paul N.
Warren, Robert S.
Warren, Roger C.
Warren, Robert R.
Waterman, Larry W.
Watilo, Kenneth E.
Watkins, James
Watkins, Donald E.
Watlington, Sarah J.
Watrous, David
Watson, John W.
Watson, Louis H.
Watt, Robert H.
Watts, John H., III
Watts, Donald W.
Wax, Gary N.
Way, Thomas C.
Weatherspoon, Joseph R.
Weaver, Milton W.
Webb, Lowell E.
Webb, Paul H.
Weber, Daniel D.
Weeks, George R., Jr.
Wegele, Edward
Wegner, Arthur E.
Wehner, James R.
Weichman, Bruce E.
Weinhardt, William J.
Weir, Glendon H.
Weisenberger, Frederic P.
Welch, Walter E.
Weldon, Robert B., Jr.
Welenc, Joseph
Wells, Rodney G.
Weltner, Frank V.
Wemette, Richard O.
Wendholt, Gregory W.
Wentzel, Richard D.
Wenyon, Leonard J.
Wert, Peter K. W.
Wertman, Franklin, Jr.
Westbrook, John F.
Westerman, John P.
Westman, John A., Jr.
Westover, Richard L.
Weymouth, Charles R.
Whalen, Thomas E.
Whalen, Joseph M., II
Wheeler, Donald C.
Wheeler, Raymond M.
Wheeler, William W., Jr.
Wheeler, Donald R.
Whelan, John F., Jr.
White, Richard J.
White, Marshall N.
White, Thomas O., Jr.
White, Thomas L., Jr.
White, Charles E.
White, Stuart C.
White, Lawrence W.
White, Robert D.
White, George E.
Whitehead, Charles T.
Whitely, John E., Jr.
Whiteman, William E.
Whittington, William, J.
Whittle, Delma H., Jr.
Wichman, James H.
Wichmann, Jay E.
Widergren, Robert D.
Wiegley, James R.
Wiennandt, Melvin W.
Wier, Ward W.
Wigfall, George H., Jr.
Wiggins, Jack
Wightman, James E. R.
Wilbur, Paul J.
Wilcox, Loran A.
Wilcox, Wayland E.
Wilcox, Emory E.
Wiley, Talmadge K.
Wiley, Edwin H.
Wilgenbusch, Ronald C.
Wilkowski, Edward A., Jr.
Willenbacher, Marshall R.
Willey, Marshall L.
Willey, Percy W., Jr.
Williams, Hugh T.
Williams, Bryce W.
Williamson, Charles B.
Williams, Zane G.
Williams, Dallas K.
Williams, Walter L.
Williams, John R.
Williams, Peter L.
Williamson, James V., Jr.
Williams, Albert L.
Williams, Clarence R.
Williams, Morris B.
Williams, Douglas A.
Williams, John D.
Williams, James W.
Williams, Johnny L.
Willsey, John M.
Wilson, William A.
Wilson, Waldo W.
Wilson, Richard E.
Wilson, Ashley V.
Wilson, Edward A.
Wilson, Robert A.
Wilson, John O.
Wilson, Richard V.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, Donald M.
Wilson, Seth T., Jr.
Wilson, Thomas E., Jr.
Wilson, William O.
Wilson, James R.
Wiltgen, Robert M.
Wimberly, William R.
Wing, Thomas E.
Winingar, Marvin W.
Winkle, Arthur D., Jr.
Winston, Richard J.
Winter, Lloyd H., II
Winters, Colin G.
Wise, Donald R.
Wishart, Thomas T.
Witcher, Murray H., Jr.
Witt, James D., Jr.
Witten, John W.
Witzke, Arnold E.
Wolfe, James B.
Wolgram, James K.
Wolod, William A.
Wolverton, Donnie R.
Wombold, Arthur D.
Wonnell, Stanley E.
Wood, Leslie E.
Wood, Richard E.
Woodall, Jere W.
Woodard, John S.
Woodbury, David E.
Woodruff, Frank C.
Woodruff, Harold H.
Woods, Leonard W.
Woods, Phillip J.
Woodward, Albert J.
Woodward, Frank, Jr.
Woodward, John D.
Woolley, Dan A.
Worden, Douglas W.
Worley, Edmond V., Jr.
Worley, William F.
Worley, Loren

Cassell, George L.	Loomis, David F.	Kennedy, Austin J., Jr.	Skipper, Henry J.	Chappell, John R.	DuVall, Richard A.
Champlin, Norman D.	Lumpkin, Pickett	Jr.	Waters, George C., Jr.	Charles, John M.	Dzikowski, Richard J.
Charles, Nelson R.	Marshall, Walter L.	MacDonald, Albert M.	Whitcher, Lamar D.	Chesler, Daniel E., III	Eaton, John D.
Clarke, Jared E., III	Maxwell, George T.	Nicks, Paul B.	Wolfe, John P.	Chester, Raymond M.	Eaton, William G., Jr.
Clarke, Robert A.	McClendon, William R.			Chester, William R.	Ecker, William B.
Conner, Andrew B., Jr.				Childress, Howard W.	Edelman, Sidney
Coonan, John J.	McMahon, John L., Jr.			Christofferson, Edward	Edge, Donald B.
Craig, Russell F.	Meacher, Leo			A., Jr.	Edmonds, LeRoy S.
Creedy, Richard B. L.	Meier, Louis L., Jr.	Craven, John H.	Markley, John H.	Clancey, Robert J.	Ellenbrand, Ralph E.
Creed, Donald L.	Miller, Frank E.	Ingvaldstad, Orlando, Jr.	McManus, Hugh T.	Clarke, Robert L.	Ellis, George F., Jr.
Dalley, Elmer W., Jr.	Mitchell, John J.	Linguist, Loren M.	Menges, Harold F.	Clements, Daniel C.	Ennis, Wilbur J.
Deitchman, Vincent	Moore, Michael U.	MacNeill, Harold A.	Noce, William S.	Cleveland, Jesse S.	Eppes, George P.
des Granges, Maino	Morin, George F.		Tubbs, Joseph J.	Clifford, Frank F., Jr.	Eriksen, George A.
Dowd, Robert A.	Morrow, William B.			Close, Robert A.	Esmiol, Morris A., Jr.
Doyle, Judson C.	Murph, John W.	Bamberg, Edward C.	Gorman, Joseph W.	Cobb, Jesse B.	Evans, Kenneth J.
Dozier, William C., Jr.	Neff, John L.	Brown, Woodrow M.	Underhill, Edward G.	Cochrane, Edward L., Jr.	Evans, Simpson, Jr.
Drew, John G., II	Obey, Roland J.	Frate, Lawrence P.	Wright, James A., Jr.		Everhart, Charles D.
Drewelow, Robert W.	O'Brien, Frank H.			Cockrill, James T.	Ewald, Frank W.
Dubyk, William	Olsen, Leslie R.			Coffey, Claude C., Jr.	Ewing, Robert H.
Farrell, Eugene H.	O'Neil, Justin A.	Blackwell, Richard T.	Staples, William R.	Cogswell, George W.	Faddis, James M.
Fernandez, Caesar, Jr.	Peterson, Robert F.	Pablos, Tomas C.	Traeger, Kimble A.	Cole, George	Fahey, John A.
Fichman, Herbert T.	Porter, Rufus C., Jr.			Colegrove, Warren R.	Fannin, William E.
Flynn, Russell F.	Potter, Edward H., Jr.			Coleman, Edward P.	Farnsworth, William D.
Folta, George W., Jr.				Collins, John D.	
Ford, George E.	Poynter, Drexel E.			Collins, Ralph W.	Farrell, Charles S.
Franger, Marvin J.	Price, Walter W., Jr.			Colton, Joseph	Farrell, Crumpton
Frazier, Claude R.	Rapp, Jerome A., Jr.			Condor, Bernard	Farrell, Rollo L., Jr.
Fretwell, Uncas L.	Rawson, Arthur F., Jr.			Condren, John F.	Faulkner, Stuart T.
Froude, Robert S.				Conger, Elton V.	Fay, Richard C.
Gass, Shelby C., Jr.	Reck, Floyd F.	Burk, Alberta		Connelley, Ernest C., Jr.	Felchner, William E. H.
Gates, Robert L.	Reed, Dale C.			Converse, Paul V.	Ferguson, William P.
Gaw, Benjamin D.	Reed, Roy E.	Acton, William D.	Boldt, Charles H., Jr.	Cook, Herbert B.	Ferrin, Robert W.
Gebert, Wesley R., Jr.	Rees, Joseph ReV.	Adams, Allan M., Jr.	Bolger, Joseph F., Jr.	Cooke, Richard J.	Fick, Theodore R.
Gibson, Freal J.	Relly, Robert F.	Adams, Paul A.	Bollenbacher, Robert M.	Cooley, Homer K., Jr.	Fielding, Teddy R.
Gift, Ronald P.	Reinhardt, William C.	Adams, Robert E.	Bonds, Joseph E.	Cooley, Samuel M., Jr.	Findly, Lee B.
Glaes, James G.	Rich, Francis E.	Adams, Will M., Jr.	Boney, Bobby E.	Cooper, Lloyd F.	Fisher, Dale W.
Gockel, Bernard N.	Richards, John M.	Adriane, Homer R.	Bono, Vernon C.	Corner, Sheldon L.	Fisher, Lowell E.
Gordon, Donald	Riley, Richard	Agles, James H.	Bordelon, Guy P., Jr.	Cornwell, Roy S.	Fisher, Robert D.
Greeley, George R.	Rizza, Joseph P.	Alderton, Dickson W.	Boriotti, Joseph	Correia, Frank B.	Fisher, Willis M.
Green, David H.	Rowell, Ira M., Jr.	Alexander, Richard G.	Boston, Leadore G.	Coset, Albert W.	Fitch, Lowell F.
Grothjahn, Harry C.	Ruffin, Chester E.	Alford, Ralph M.	Boutte, Lester H.	Cosgrove, Thomas A.	Flynn, William J.
Haffey, John J., Jr.	Sands, Pierre N.	Allison, John K.	Bowcock, Charles S., Jr.	Coulthard, Robert O.	Fogg, Reginald S.
Hart, Ralph W., Jr.	Sheppard, Charles P.	Ambler, Joseph B.		Cox, John W.	Forbes, Bernard B., Jr.
Helme, Charles F., Jr.	Shirley, James A.	Anania, Vincent J.	Bowes, William A.	Cox, Lyle A.	Forbis, Roy E.
Hazlett, William R.	Smith, Paul B.	Anderson, Paul A.	Bowler, Roland T., Jr.	Cranney, "W" Loron, Jr.	Ford, John E.
Hoepfner, Frederick R.	Stough, Ben H., Jr.	Anderson, Vernon F.	Boyd, Edward A.		Fortson, Robert M., Jr.
Holley, Edward B., Jr.	Sult, George H.	Andrews, Lyman L., Jr.	Bradbury, Albert W.		Fowler, William E.
Holloway, James L., III	Taylor, Robert E.	Ansion, Henry O., Jr.	Brady, Donald B.	Cranton, Jack H.	Freeman, DeWitt L.
	Tilden, Charles E.	Armstrong, Sam "T", Jr.	Brandenburg, John H.	Crayton, Louis B., Jr.	Floyd, George R.
Hoof, Wayne	Tolleson, Robert T.	Arthur, Russel L.	Bratten, Toria J., Jr.	Cross, Richard E.	Gale, Philroy C., Jr.
Howell, Wiley B.	Toran, William P.	Atkins, Waldo A.	Brauer, Walter J.	Cullen, John P.	Gallemore, James G.
Howerton, Wilfred M.	Tully, Joseph M., Jr.	Atkinson, Aubrey E.	Braun, James F.	Cummins, David E., III	Gambrill, Nelson J.
Hunt, William T.	Wall, Charles B., Jr.	Atkinson, Wilton L.	Brekke, Trond G.	Cunningham, Patrick F.	Garofalo, Paul C.
Jernigan, William A., Jr.	Walton, Donald F.	Aulich, Julian	Brent, Sherman E.		Gates, James L.
	Warner, Arthur H., Jr.	Austin, Kenneth B.	Britt, Harvey R.	Curran, Donald C.	Gatlin, William A.
Johnston, Juel D.	Welsh, John R.	Axene, Dean L.	Brogolitti, Bobby C.	Curtis, Donald P.	Gawthrop, Wilson R.
Kelley, Hugh A.	Werthmuller, Roy W. F.	Bagby, Henry L.	Brown, Fred W., Jr.	Custer, Prentice J.	Geiger, Anson D.
Kinne, Francis E.	Williams, Thomas H.	Bain, Edwin C., Jr.	Brown, LaVern W., Jr.	Custer, Robert E.	Gensert, John R.
Kolakowski, Roman	Yarnell, Lawrence R.	Baldwin, Robert B.	Brown, Willis I.	Dalland, Carl A.	Gilbert, John R.
Lacy, Paul L., Jr.	Young, William H.	Ball, James L.	Bryan, Clarence R.	Dame, Allen M.	Gillcrist, John A.
Ladley, Herbert V.	Zalewski, Chester V.	Barkley, Paul H.	Bryan, Leonard G.	Daniel, Royal T., Jr.	Gillooly, John F.
Lanier, Samuel L.	Zumwalt, Elmo R., Jr.	Barnes, John W.	Bryant, Olney J.	Dauer, Frank H.	Gilmore, Allen J.
Law, John T.		Barnes, Willis C.	Buchanan, Charles S.	Davidson, Hubbell Y.	Giorgis, Albert S.
		Barnett, Gordon R.	Buck, Clarence C., Jr.	Davis, Charles R.	Godfrey, Earl F.
		Barnhart, Robert C., Jr.	Bucknell, Howard, III	Davis, Jack E.	Godshall, Walter H.
			Buerger, Robert P.	Dean, Benjamin H.	Gohr, Robert B.
			Bush, Thomas A., Jr.	Deasy, Charles J.	Gore, Frederick S.
			Bussey, Samuel T.	Dedrick, Walter	Gorsline, Samuel G., Jr.
			Butler, William S.	Deems, Eugene F.	
			Cadenas, Ernest M.	DeGroot, Douglas F.	Gossman, Thomas J.
			Caldwell, Jack	Delaney, Charles E.	Goulet, Lionel J.
			Callahan, Robert J.	DeLany, Walter S., Jr.	Graham, Frank W.
			Callaway, Steven W., Jr.	Delaware, Joseph L.	Graham, Ralph E.
				Delgado, Robert	Gray, Robert J.
				Demmler, Charles F.	Greenwood, Thomas E.
				Denkler, William A.	
				Derr, Phaon B., Jr.	Grey, Valentine
				Dietzen, Walter N., Jr.	Griffin, Shade W.
				Dinwiddie, John M.	Griffin, Thomas H.
				Doak, Joseph J., Jr.	Grill, Robert W.
				Donavan, Robert D.	Gronemann, Carl W., Jr.
				Donovan, Gerard M.	
				Doolin, Edward H., Jr.	Gumb, Irving T., Jr.
				Doyle, James T.	Hadaway, Donald L.
				Driscoll, John R.	Hale, Robert R.
				Duckett, Edmund	Hallman, Robert E.
				DuVal, Jr.	Halwachs, Alois W.
				Dunlap, Billy F.	Hamilton, Billie C.
				Dunning, Bruce B.	Hannifin, Patrick "J"
				Durtche, Carl, Jr.	Hansen, Jens B.

- Hansen, Theodore W.
Hanson, Donald M.
Hanson, Donald J.
Harper, Wyatt E., Jr.
Harris, Jack
Harrison, Leo W.
Harvey, James H., Jr.
Hastings, Edward E., II
Haugh, Edward McK.
Hayes, Robert S.
Hayes, Robert V.
Hayler, William B.
Heagerty, Harold R.
Heath, Leroy A.
Hecker, George M.
Heffernan, William J. J.
Heid, Robert S.
Heinze, Arthur D.
Hensley, Nathaniel T.
Henson, John H.
Henson, Josiah
Herman, John S.
Hermann, Edward P.
Herrick, Robert W.
Hertzog, Richard D.
Hicks, Richard J.
Hill, John F.
Hill, Robert D.
Hilson, Ralph A.
Hinkelman, John W., Jr.
Hinman, Charles R.
Hoblitzell, Charles M.
Hodge, Ervin "F"
Hogsed, Robert A.
Holmes, Francis M.
Holmes, Robert A., III
Holmgaard, Evald
Holschuh, Howard W.
Hooper, James A., Jr.
Hoover, William H.
Hopwood, Gordon R.
Hosier, Ray S., Jr.
Houck, Richard
Hubbelling, Johan D. W., Jr.
Hubert, William E.
Huddleston, Woodrow
Hudson, William H., Jr.
Huff, Ralph E.
Hunter, Clifford E.
Hurd, Ernest L., Jr.
Jester, Jack A.
Jobe, James K.
Johnson, Gerald M.
Johnson, Gerald
Johnson, John R.
Johnson, Theodore L.
Johnston, Harry D.
Johnston, Philip D., Jr.
Jones, Edward D.
Jones, Robert S.
Jones, Roy K., II
Jortberg, Richard E.
Juarez, Robert
Julian, Alexander, Jr.
Kallina, John F.
Karnes, Austin G.
Kasten, Robert I.
Kauth, John L., Jr.
Kays, Robert L.
Keating, James H.
Keeler, William E.
Keevil, Arthur K.
Kelley, Frederick J.
Kelly, Merrill E., Jr.
Kempf, Lawrence A.
Kennedy, Donald W.
Kerr, Alex A.
Kerstein, George E.
Kidd, John D.
King, Ernest J., Jr.
King, Evans P. K.
King, Patrick J.
- Kirk, Robert
Kirkemo, Leland E.
Kistler, William C.
Klaessy, Dale S.
Klaus, Edward L.
Kleber, Francis T.
Klein, Harry J.
Klemawesch, James
Klindworth, Carl H.
Klockenkemper, Joseph B.
Knick, Victor R.
Knudsen, John T.
Knudson, Irving H., Jr.
Koch, Robert A.
Konzen, Joseph J.
Kopps, Richard L.
Kribs, David A., Jr.
Kroczynk, Stanley P.
Kube, George F.
Kurfess, John F.
Kushman, Howard B.
Lake, Kenneth "B"
LaMar, Burriss D.
Lamarlin, Frederick H., Jr.
Lamb, Harold M.
Lang, Ralph R.
Laubach, Luther W. S.
Laughlin, George W.
Laighton, Robert J.
Lawrence, Edward J.
Laws, Walter T.
Leavitt, Eben, Jr.
LeBourgeois, Julien J.
Lee, Richard H.
LeFevre, Adolphe C.
Legare, Rupert W., Jr.
Leib, Frederick L.
Leland, Harley G.
Lemert, Russell C.
Leonard, Warren E.
Leslie, Jene L.
LeTourneau, Joseph R. E.
Lewis, David D.
Lewis, William C.
Licko, Richard J.
Lindler, Charles R., Jr.
Lipfert, Ralph G.
Lippincott, Lincoln H., Jr.
Loftin, Edward H., Jr.
Longfield, John N.
Longley, Thomas B.
Longton, David M.
Longwill, Albert E.
Lorenz, Samuel, Jr.
Loveday, John C.
Lowery, Hugh H.
Luedtke, Wilbert C.
Luka, Earl
Lulu, Michael T.
Lyons, Thomas W.
Mackay, Douglas S.
Maddock, Edmund J.
Madson, Rae P.
Mallon, Richard J.
Malnerich, Joseph N.
Manger, Arthur J.
Manger, Martin M., Jr.
Manhart, Raymond J.
Manherz, Jack M.
Mansfield, Samuel K.
Marr, Robert I.
Marshall, Daniel V., Jr.
Masica, Eugene M.
Mason, Hugh C.
Massey, Joseph P.
Masters, James C., Jr.
Masuen, Francis N.
Matheson, James C.
Mathwick, Leon E. L.
Matthes, Harold K.
May, Robert E.
McAdams, John K.
McAndrew, Richard J.
- McCaskill, James M.
McCool, Richard M., Jr.
McCord, Stanley R.
McCormick, Gordon H.
McCullough, William F.
McDade, Nolan H.
McDaniel, Hector S.
McGarry, William J., Jr.
McHugh, Richard P.
McKee, John C.
McLaughlin, William H., Jr.
McLean, William O.
McVicker, Robert J.
Mead, Robert W.
Melnts, Alvin L.
Melin, Kenneth L.
Mercer, Ellsworth O.
Merrick, John L.
Merrick, Robert H., Jr.
Middleton, Charles H.
Midgett, Joe L.
Miles, Warren H.
Milhan, Harry L.
Miller, John W.
Miller, Lawrence L.
Miller, Orville H.
Miller, Robertson L.
Miller, William W. K., Jr.
Mills, Terry
Mitchell, Cleo N., Jr.
Montgomery, James W.
Moore, Charles K.
Moore, Jack LaV.
Moore, Joseph E., III
Moore, Robert A.
Moorer, Joe P.
Morgan, Henry S., Jr.
Moul, Cornelius F.
Murphey, Samuel B.
Murphree, Hugh D.
Nance, James W.
Nearman, Leonard M.
Neilson, Thomas L.
Nelson, Robert R.
Nelson, Wayne S.
Newman, Augustus, Jr.
Nicholls, Benjamin F.
Nichols, Ramon B., Jr.
North, John R.
Norton, Hassel L.
Novak, Jerome C.
Nuschke, Paul L.
Nutt, Thomas A., Jr.
O'Day, Henry J.
Ogier, Herbert L., Jr.
Olsen, Alfred R., Jr.
Olson, Frederick G.
O'Neil, Warren H.
O'Neill, John L.
O'Rourke, Gerald G.
O'Shea, George A., Jr.
Osterholm, Robert E.
Overman, Dana C., Jr.
Packer, Francis A., Jr.
Padbury, Harry E.
Padgett, John B., Jr.
Padis, Alexander A.
Page, William P.
Parke, Everett A.
Parker, George A.
Pate, Jack A.
Peed, George P.
Perkins, Peter E.
Peters, John V.
Petersen, Forrest S.
Peyton, Henry A. R.
Phillips, Donald M.
Phillips, Richard B.
Pitts, Charles R.
Poe, Donald T.
Poenicke, Charles F., Jr.
- Polk, Mavis X.
Polk, Thomas H.
Poorman, Herbert
"R"
Potter, John "R"
Price, Arthur W., Jr.
Priest, Charles, Jr.
Prothro, Randell H.
Prouhet, Clement R.
Purinton, David F.
Purkrabek, Paul V.
Quanstrom, Carl R., Jr.
Quarton, Thomas J.
Quiel, Norwald R.
Quinn, George D., Jr.
Quinn, Harry T., Jr.
Racette, Henry J., Jr.
Radcliffe, Robert J.
Ragon, George T.
Rankowski, Charles A.
Raposa, William C.
Rasmussen, Ralph R.
Rawlings, Frank T., Jr.
Rayburn, Lawrence M.
Reeve, Robert W.
Reinhart, Leonard J.
Renaldi, Richard R.
Rentschler, Alexander K.
Richards, Donald R.
Richards, Harold O.
Richardson, Guy D.
Richison, Warren C.
Richinak, Michael D.
Riley, Horace, Jr.
Riley, John F.
Riley, Ralph R.
Risch, Harry, Jr.
Robb, Earl J.
Roberts, Gerald M.
Robertson, Charles R.
Robinson, Rembrandt C.
Rockoff, Herbert R.
Roemer, Robert F.
Rogers, Benjamin C., Jr.
Roll, Walter D.
Rooney, George M.
Rorex, Sam, Jr.
Rossi, Edward C.
Roth, Edward F.
Rumble, Richard E.
Rush, Max R.
Rymal, George R.
Saroch, Emil, Jr.
Saunders, David M.
Scambos, Thomas T.
Scherrer, Robert A.
Schulz, Quinley R.
Schwager, Joseph E.
Schwartz, Matthew J.
Schwartz, Walter W., Jr.
Sciliris, Louis G.
Scott, Julian F.
Searles, Philip N.
Seay, Samuel D.
Selfridge, Samuel W., Jr.
Sepper, Frank
Sette, Lyle H.
Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
Seymour, Earl P.
Shaffer, James B.
Shelton, Doniphon B.
Shepard, Alan B., Jr.
Sheppard, Cedric W.
Sheppard, William L.
Sherman, Robert O.
Sherwood, Charles
Silliman, Henderson G.
Simpson, William H., Jr.
Sims, Wilbur N.
Skipper, James C., Jr.
- Slaff, Allan P.
Sledge, Jack B.
Smiley, Robert W.
Smith, George H.
Smith, John E.
Smith, Lawrence N.
Smith, Lewis O.
Smith, Russell L.
Smithey, Thurman E.
Smyer, Theodore M.
Snyder, Joseph E., Jr.
Snyder, Joseph M., Jr.
Sodke, Henry E., Jr.
Soltyz, Leo S., Jr.
Sommer, Charles A.
Spargo, James
Sperberg, Franklynn R.
Squire, Wade R.
Stansell, Herman J., Jr.
Stanton, Robert F.
Stauffer, Howard C.
St. Clair, Robert H., Jr.
Steele, George P., II
Steele, Robert D.
Steere, Lucius E., III
Stell, Ralph W., Jr.
Stepanian, George
Stephens, William E., Jr.
Stewart, Clifford L.
Stewart, Hal B.
Stewart, William S., III
Stirnweiss, Andrew P., Jr.
Stout, Graydon T.
Strong, William W.
Stull, John O.
Sulick, Tom E.
Sutton, Ralph N.
Swallow, Chandler E., Jr.
Swank, John A.
Swensen, Robert A.
Swigart, Robert E.
Tarbox, William
Tartre, Robert J.
Taylor, Arnett B.
Taylor, Thaddeus M.
Taylor, Warren
Teevan, Charles L.
Temple, Walter N.
Thomas, Homer B., Jr.
Thomas, Warren J.
Thompson, Arthur E.
Thompson, Max E.
Tierney, Glenn A.
Tollefson, Leif
Trautman, Wilbur C., Jr.
Traynor, William J.
Tremaine, Mark G.
Trueblood, Harold J.
Ufer, Alfred L.
Uncles, John F.
Ursettle, Howard J.
Uttegaard, Thomas F.
Van Orden, Merton D.
Van Oss, Willis B.
Vaughan, Vie J.
Vierregger, William T.
- Vining, Pierre H.
Viscardi, Peter W.
Vissering, Victor M., Jr.
Voiler, Sherman L.
Volk, Ralph L., Jr.
Wade, Kenneth W.
Wadleigh, George C.
Wagner, Adrian DeW.
Wagner, Theodore A., Jr.
Walery, Kenneth F.
Walker, Robert G.
Walker, William F.
Wallace, Luther B.
Warner, Robert L.
Waters, David E.
Waters, Robert M.
Waters, Willard H.
Watson, Fred C.
Watson, Robert H., Jr.
Wear, LaVern G.
Webb, Charles W.
Webb, Howard "T", Jr.
Weidig, Donald H.
Weinbeck, Eugene J.
Wells, Lionel E.
Werdelman, Egon H.
West, Raymond W.
Westcott, Malvern P., Jr.
Wheless, John C.
Whilden, Adolphus DeV., Jr.
White, Edward C.
White, Garrett "A", Jr.
White, Robert E.
Wiesendanger, Carl F.
Wiggins, James R.
Wikenheiser, Frank J.
Wilder, Lawrence A.
Wilder, Tracy H., Jr.
Williams, "D" Hunt
Williams, Henry J.
Williams, Harlan D.
Williams, Joe, Jr.
Willis, Avery L.
Willson, Lawrence E., Jr.
Wilmarth, Eugene M.
Wilson, Dick G.
Wilson, Jennings B., Jr.
Wilson, Ronald O.
Winter, Homer A.
Winton, Matthew J.
Wise, John P.
Wise, John H.
Wongergem, John M.
Wood, Robert C.
Wootton, William T.
Work, David D.
Working, John D.
Worley, Carson R.
Worrall, Alton H., Jr.
Worrall, David J.
Yeagle, Carl H.
Young, Thomas C.
Zech, Lando W., Jr.
Zeigler, William T.
Zelbor, Joseph L.
Zenner, Harold J.
Zeltvay, Robert R.
- Commander, Medical Corps*
Adams, William C., Jr.
Austin, Frank H., Jr.
Bass, Robert E.
Beer, David C.
Bernard, Donald P.
Bernstine, Richard L.
Blair, Donald F.
Blakey, Ernest A.
Browne, Howard S., Jr.
Cales, Robert J.
Chandler, Deck E.
Critz, George T.
Cummings, Ronald A.
Delaney, Thomas B.
- Dempsey, John J.
Dinsmore, Harry H.
Downey, John J.
Dykhuizen, Robert F.
Ebersole, John H.
Fox, Lay M.
Guida, Anthony J.
Hines, Larry J.
Humes, James J.
Ireland, Roger G.
Klein, Chester L., Jr.
Klein, Martin H.
Kramer, Scott G.
Laning, Robert C.

- Linehan, Francis J., Jr.
 Lonergan, Walter M.
 Long, James A.
 Martin, Stuart H.
 Milnes, Roger F.
 Pascoe, Delmer J.
 Sigel, Carter B.
- Commander, Supply Corps*
 Anderson, Clayton L.
 Aull, Herbert H.
 Austin, Charles B.
 Balcom, Vaughn O.
 Barger, Conrad A.
 Barton, Alton W.
 Bates, Raymond H.
 Batterson, Robert E.
 Baumann, Wesley O.
 Beckham, John J.
 Bennett, Keith
 Benson, David W.
 Bland, Herbert L.
 Blandin, Sherman W., Jr.
 Blank, Arthur E.
 Boswell, Harold
 Boylan, Walter J.
 Bryson, William L.
 Burns, Hugh F. J.
 Burrus, Elgie L.
 Caldwell, William F.
 Cohn, Murry
 Creel, Clarence A.
 Crosby, Philip
 Dale, Oscar N.
 Daniel, Charles, Jr.
 Duncan, Henry C.
 Dunlap, Glen LaM.
 Dunn, George G.
 Ericson, James B.
 Fink, William W., Jr.
 Fitchett, George L.
 Gardner, Charles A., Jr.
 Geneste, Elmon A., Jr.
 Griffin, Cecil L., Jr.
 Grinstead, Eugene A., Jr.
 Hackenson, Bernard J.
 Haddock, William N.
 Henn, Carl L., Jr.
 Herb, James W.
 Hightower, James I., Jr.
 Hoffman, George P.
- Commander, Chaplain Corps*
 Capers, Keene H.
 Emerson, James E.
 Hutcheson, Richard G., Jr.
 Keeley, John A.
 Metzger, Ernest W.
- Commander, Civil Engineer Corps*
 Bannister, John M., Jr.
 Cunning, David P.
 Daggett, Robert E.
 Diberto, Edward T.
 Eding, Lawrence H.
 Graff, Charles W.
 Grah, Ralph B., Jr.
 Jones, Richard O.
 Krickenberg, Custer F., Jr.
 Lalor, Foster M., Jr.
- Commander, Dental Corps*
 Beall, Frank P., Jr.
 Black, Edwin "R"
 Chap, Bernard
 Counsell, Lee A.
 DeLaurentis, Carlo A.
 Didion, Robert W.
- Commander, Medical Service Corps*
 Abernathy, Odell S.
 Baker, David H.
 Bennett, Paul B.
 Bing, John H.
 Bodenlos, Leonard J.
- Snyder, William A.
 Sparks, Henry A.
 Speaker, Richard B.
 Sweeney, Francis J.
 Trummer, Max J.
 Watten, Raymond H.
 Webb, Martin G., Jr.
 White, Neil V.
- Howell, Jesse E.
 Jones, Russell A.
 Kelleher, John C.
 Kost, George J.
 Larson, Phillip D.
 Lewis, William L.
 Lipscomb, John W., Jr.
 Longnecker, Kenneth W.
 Luebbe, Harry R.
 Martin, James R.
 Maxwell, Lester G.
 McClaren, Wesley J.
 McCormick, Robert J.
 McDonough, Edward M.
 McPike, Howard D.
 Miller, Edward J.
 Mills, Herbert F., Jr.
 Noga, Edward L. S.
 O'Keefe, Paul "D"
 O'Loughlin, Richard C.
 Paolantonio, John F.
 Patton, Gerald J.
 Rawls, Elbert S., Jr.
 Rivers, Vernon G.
 Robinson, William J.
 Roche, Francis
 Ruetz, Edward S.
 Schaufetter, Robert A.
 Sigman, William E.
 Simpson, Samuel R., Jr.
 Smith, James A.
 Spillman, Frank L., Jr.
 Stafford, Dean C., Jr.
 Stewart, Robert W.
 Stringer, Carl J., Jr.
 Swart, Phillip
 Walther, Frederick W.
 Whiteside, Charles E.
 Williams, William C.
 Wilson, Wilbur A. G.
 Woodfin, Kenneth L.
 Yearick, William A.
 Zielinski, William E.
- Parham, Thomas D., Jr.
 Ray, Milton U.
 Schutz, Adam J., Jr.
 Snelbaker, James K.
- Marschall, Albert R.
 Patrick, Jason M.
 Pollard, Andrew M.
 Reese, William R., Jr.
 Rogers, William R.
 Stephens, Henry E.
 Stephenson, William B.
 Waters, Allen S.
 Williams, John P.
 Wilson, Joe R.
 Wynne, Sydney J., Jr.
- Green, George H.
 Scribner, James H.
 Silberstein, Victor H.
 Sobieski, Edward F.
 Swanson, Carl J.
- Bonnell, Theodore V.
 Bowman, Clarence W.
 Boyd, Thomas A., Jr.
 Carson, Ralph
 Curtis, Ned B.
- Donovan, Harold G.
 Eastman, Robert W.
 Edge, Cary O.
 Essman, Frederick B.
 Goldenrath, Walter L.
 Hollis, Thomas L.
 Johnson, Woodbury
 Keener, Mary F.
 Kinder, James W.
 King, Arthur N.
 Longest, Nova
 Martorano, Joseph J.
- Commander, Nurse Corps*
 Carlson, Eloise M.
 Daughtry, Edna M.
 Duwe, Elizabeth M.
 Jacobs, Grace E.
- Abele, André N.
 Abernathy, Kenneth L.
 Adams, Ben L.
 Adams, Billy J.
 Adams, Frederick G.
 Adams, Jerome B.
 Adams, Thomas C.
 Albright, William E., Jr.
 Alexander, Sherman G.
 Allard, Frank A.
 Allemand, John D.
 Allen, John E.
 Allen, Richard O., Jr.
 Allen, Robert L., Jr.
 Allen, Scott
 Allison, William R., Jr.
 Almand, Willie G.
 Alton, Homer W.
 Ames, David E.
 Ames, Laverne W.
 Amos, Robert H.
 Anderson, Charles R.
 Anderson, Charles L.
 Anderson, George B.
 Anderson, Jerry P.
 Anderson, James B.
 Anderson, John A.
 Anderson, Richard W.
 Anderson, Robert G.
 Andrews, Bobie
 Androski, Frank N.
 Angell, Richard O.
 Angus, Marvin S.
 Anthony, Phillip D.
 Anton, Leonard G.
 Apple, John D., Jr.
 Aquilino, Salvatore P.
 Arnold James G.
 Arnold, Thomas F.
 Arrighi, George J., Jr.
 Artuso, Michael A.
 Arvay, John F.
 Atkins, Allan L.
 Audilet, Garland O.
 Ausley, Joe H., Jr.
 Avery, Paul R.
 Ayers, Harry P., Jr.
 Baals, John R.
 Bachman, Robert A.
 Bailey, Donald C., Jr.
 Bailey, George M.
 Bair, LaVon H.
 Baker, Robert E.
 Baker, Robert C.
 Ball, George B., Jr.
 Bandy, Clifford W.
 Banks, Peter A.
 Banks, William K.
 Barbour, William J., Jr.
 Baril, Robert F.
 Barnes, James A.
 Barnett, Charles E.
 Barney, Charles R.
 Barnhart, Harold D.
 Barr, John F.
 Barriger, Donald B.
- Mayberry, Frank L.
 McLellan, David J.
 Mibeck, Albert E.
 Morgan, Guy H.
 Ottie, Frederick O.
 Pedersen, Arthur S.
 Pflag, Solomon C.
 Phillippi, Fred E.
 Richardson, Richard C.
 Shepherd, William H.
 Teller, Leslie W., Jr.
- Commander, Nurse Corps*
 Mentzer, Romaine M.
 Smith, Hattie B.
 Smoker, Sue E.
 Williams, Kathryn E.
- Lieutenant, Line*
 Barringer, Robert A.
 Barrish, Paul D.
 Bartholomew, James H.
 Bartley, Robert H.
 Bass, William H., III
 Bassett, Charles G.
 Bassett, James S.
 Bate, Ronald D.
 Bauer, Donald R.
 Bauman, John M.
 Baumgartner, James A.
 Beach, Milton D.
 Beach, Robert R.
 Beall, Thomas J.
 Beck, Liston C., Jr.
 Beck, Richard E.
 Bedow, Robert J.
 Beecher, Ronald R.
 Beegle, Earl A.
 Bellisle, Phillip M.
 Bellinger, John R.
 Benediktsson, Philip W.
 Bennett, Charles F.
 Bennett, Edward I. H., Jr.
 Bennett, Peter C.
 Bennington, Thomas P.
 Bergman, Walter R.
 Bergstrom, Kenneth I.
 Bernal, Richard E.
 Bess, George D.
 Best, Albert H., III
 Bethel, Robert G.
 Betts, Roger S.
 Beversdorf, Donald W.
 Beving, Duane U.
 Beyl, David D.
 Biggs, Robert R.
 Bigler, William W.
 Biles, George E.
 Billicki, Daniel R.
 Bird, Ralph G.
 Bird, Thomas C.
 Bishop, Jack D.
 Blanchard, Ralph W., Jr.
 Blanchard, James W., Jr.
 Blankenship, James M., II
 Bledsoe, Paul I.
 Bley, John E., Jr.
 Bloom, Donald D.
 Blumie, John A.
 Boebert, Frank L., Jr.
 Boelter, Dan A.
 Boensch, Arthur C.
 Bolte, William S.
 Bonadies, Louis
 Booth, Peter B.
 Borcik, Andrew J., Jr.
 Borgardt, Elmer G.
 Bossert, John L.
 Bovey, Paul E.
 Box, Roger E.
- Boyd, Jack W.
 Boyd, Richard M.
 Bredderman, Rudolf T.
 Breeding, Leslie E.
 Breland, Edgar A.
 Brennan, John F., Jr.
 Brennan, Richard J.
 Brenneman, Harold R.
 Brennen, William L.
 Brestle, Charles A.
 Briegel, Charles V.
 Briggs, Braden R.
 Briggs, Stanley
 Bright, Richard A.
 Bright, Thomas B.
 Brisbois, Marshall B.
 Bronson, Hiram S., III
 Brooks, Bernard A.
 Brooks, Charles G. W.
 Broton, Chester F.
 Brown, Daniell M.
 Brown, Donald B.
 Brown, Donald L.
 Brown, Nicholas
 Brown, Ora D., III
 Brown, Robert H., III
 Brown, William M.
 Browning, Elmer L.
 Brusio, James W.
 Bruyere, Thomas E.
 Bryan, John E., Jr.
 Bryant, "H" Donald
 Buchsieb, Louis D.
 Buehler, William S.
 Buggy, Joseph S., Jr.
 Burdick, Howard F., Jr.
 Burke, Francis J.
 Burke, Joseph S.
 Burkel, John F.
 Burnham, Paul
 Burns, Kenneth F.
 Burris, William L., Jr.
 Burt, Russell H.
 Bush, Ronald J.
 Bush, Vernon R.
 Butler, Francis M., Jr.
 Button, Ralph L.
 Butts, Richard F.
 Byng, Weston H.
 Caccivio, John D.
 Caldwell, John M.
 Callahan, David F., Jr.
 Callaway, Jack M.
 Camacho, Richard G.
 Campbell, Carl E.
 Campbell, Donald G.
 Campbell, Ronald K.
 Campbell, Thomas G.
 Canada, Donald E.
 Cannon, James R.
 Carlson, Walter G.
 Carmichael, Eddie I.
 Carre, David M., Jr.
 Carrigan, Richard C.
 Carroll, John T.
 Carson, James T.
 Carswell, Michael S.
 Casey, Richard F.
 Casey, Ronald C.
 Castner, Willis H., III
 Cates, Gus V.
 Catoe, Ralph D.
 Catola, Stanley G.
 Cecelski, Arthur R.
 Cellar, Charles J., Jr.
 Cernan, Eugene A.
 Chancellor, Dean H.
 Chaney, Marvin L.
 Chang, Ming E.
 Charneco, Carlos M., Jr.
 Chase, Henri B., III
 Chase, Warren T., Jr.
 Chatham, Walter L.
 Chester, Scott A.
 Chitty, Charles M., Jr.
 Chrans, Ronald L.
 Christensen, Charles C.
- Christensen, Cyrus R.
 Christopher, Richard V.
 Chumley, Sylvester G.
 Cichowitz, Edward J., Jr.
 Clampitt, Robert M.
 Clark, Arthur R., Jr.
 Clark, Bruce A.
 Clark, George G.
 Clark, George E.
 Clark, James M.
 Clark, William E., Jr.
 Class, William H.
 Clay, Jack D.
 Cleveland, Richard R.
 Cloc', Richard V.
 Cloud, Bruce L.
 Clower, Claude D.
 Clynnes, Charles E.
 Cobb, Roy L.
 Cole, Charles W., Jr.
 Coleman, Douglas C.
 Coll, William A.
 Collier, Lacey A.
 Collins, Charles R.
 Collins, Erwin A.
 Collins, LeRoy, Jr.
 Collins, William B.
 Colville, Robert E.
 Combs, Robert L.
 Connell, Earl W.
 Connell, Laurence M.
 Connell, Philip J.
 Connelly, James H., Jr.
 Connolly, Leo J.
 Conti, Francis A.
 Cook, Richard D.
 Cook, Wilmer P.
 Cooke, Vincent E.
 Cooley, David L.
 Coolidge, Julian L., II
 Coons, Henry A.
 Cooper, Ross E.
 Cooper, Scott E.
 Corica, Kenneth J.
 Corkins, Charles W., Jr.
 Corkrum, Richard C.
 Cosgrove, Robert R.
 Costello, Donald H.
 Costilow, Kenneth L.
 Cotsonas, John P.
 Courtney, Hugh J.
 Covey, Edward J.
 Cox, George E.
 Cox, Henry
 Coyle, Charles A.
 Crafton, Robert W.
 Craig, John E., Jr.
 Crain, Carroll O., Jr.
 Cramer, Dean E.
 Cramer, Edward A., Jr.
 Crandall, Douglas R.
 Cranwell, George E.
 Crater, George H., Jr.
 Craven, Robert P.
 Crawford, Paul G.
 Credland, Earl D.
 Cremona, John, Jr.
 Criley, David M.
 Crim, Billy R.
 Crissman, Daniel McM.
 Crouse, James U., Jr.
 Crowell, George T., Jr.
 Crowson, Christopher G.
 Crudup, Everett H., Jr.
 Cruse, Reese E.
 Crutchfield, Claud C.
 Cumming, Richard S., III
 Cunningham, Donald E.
 Curry, Keith R. W.
 Curtis, Joe C., Jr.
 Cushing, Earl H.
 Cust, Harlan R.

Cutter, Alan "B"	Ellis, Hal R., III	Fudala, Ernest M.	Hanson, Edwin E.	Jauss, Charles W.	Lambright, Harold R., Jr.
Cutting, Curtis E.	Elpers, William W.	Fuld, Charles L.	Hanson, Morton H.	Jellison, Harry E.	Jr.
Cyr, Byron A.	Emmerson, Milo E.	Fulk, Gerald A.	Hardt, Hugo A.	Jenista, George B.	La Motte, Francis J.
Czar, Raymond J.	Emsley, Albert P., Jr.	Fullerton, Frank E.	Harmon, Jack E.	Jenkins, Jerry V.	Langenheim, John P.
Dage, Jerry D.	Erdei, Edward J.	Furlong, George M., Jr.	Harriott, Robert K.	Jennings, Mark J.	Langley, Thomas R., Jr.
Dahill, Edward E., III	Erie, Carl E.	Gaffrey, Leo J.	Harris, Robert H.	Jensen, Richard S.	Jr.
D'Angelico, Donato	Erner, Eugene J.	Galinsky, Jerome J.	Harris, William R.	Johannessen, Allen C.	Lanning, Richard J.
Daniels, Hal B.	Eskew, Perry R., Jr.	Gallo, Henry A., Jr.	Harscheid, David G.	Johe, Richard E.	Lapham, Joseph G.
Danin, Victor	Estes, Edward D.	Garber, Cecil E.	Hartley, Donald H.	Johns, Alan D.	Lapp, Charles B.
Dankel, Kenneth M.	Etheredge, Teddy B.	Garman, Glen E.	Hasch, Ralph H.	Johns, Clifford M.	Larison, John D., Jr.
Darling, David D.	Evans, Alton R.	Garretson, Arthur S.	Haskell, Hugh B.	Johnson, David E.	Larsen, James L.
Darnell, Jack	Evans, Frederic H.	Garrison, Charles H., Jr.	Hastings, Ralph H.	Johnson, James E.	Larsen, Victor D.
Daugherty, Donald N.	Evans, Gene O.	Garvin, John K.	Haswell, Fremont G., Jr.	Johnson, Jerome L.	Larson, Lawrence H.
Daulton, James T.	Evans, James A.	Gates, Richard L.	Hatch, Philip B., Jr.	Johnston, Donald H., Jr.	Lassetter, Keith M.
Daus, Rudolph H.	Evans, Ronald E.	Gay, Donald M.	Hatch, Ross R.	Johnston, Donald W.	Lattig, Edward C.
Davis, Norman E.	Everett, William A.	Gaylor, Elvin L.	Hatcher, James L.	Jones, Clyde W.	Laub, Burton R., Jr.
Davis, Robert G.	Eyler, Frederick P.	Gerhart, Guy L.	Hayes, Newton G.	Jones, Jerry E.	Laurance, James D.
Dean, Robert V.	Eyler, Armand T., Jr.	Gero, Richard L.	Hayman, Douglass F., Jr.	Jones, Stanley W.	Laux, Arno H.
Dean, Ronald I.	Fair, Thomas W.	Gesling, Marion L.	Hayward, Stearns L.	Jones, Wilbur D., Jr.	Lavelle, Thomas J.
Deering, Robert M.	Fairbanks, Wayne K.	Giachino, Louie F.	Hedstrom, Carl W.	Jordan, Henry W.	Lawrence, Donald W.
Denison, William F.	Faircloth, Gerald F.	Gibson, Clifford W.	Heiland, Charles E.	Jordan, Henry M.	Lawson, Ramsay
Dennis, Don J.	Fallon, Thomas F., Jr.	Gibson, Donald	Heinz, Paul R.	Jourden, Bud A., Jr.	Leblanc, James B.
Dennison, James R.	Faris, William E.	Gibson, James C., Jr.	Heisinger, Duane L.	Juif, Robert J.	Lee, Dennis B.
Denton, Douglas J.	Farnsworth, John F.	Giffin, John L.	Hennessey, John P.	Jumper, Vernon L.	Lees, Forrest A., Jr.
De Nunzio, Nicholas J.	Farr, Sterling J.	Gifford, Robert M.	Hennick, Raymond J.	Kalinyak, Paul P.	Lefevre, Robert J.
Deuter, David W.	Farris, John H.	Gilbert, Donald B.	Henry, Albert L., Jr.	Karn, Alvin R., Jr.	Leird, William A.
De Vane, Richard W., Jr.	Fasnaro, Michael F., Jr.	Gilbert, James C.	Henry, William F.	Karnakis, Nicholas	Lenhardt, Harry F., Jr.
DeWeese, Everette D.	Featherston, Rex W.	Gilbert, Robert L.	Heppburn, Richard F.	Katz, Robert E.	Levendoski, Richard J.
Di Bona, Charles J.	Feeney, Edward J.	Gilchrist, Edwin B., Jr.	Herring, Hubert E.	Katzmann, Gerard H.	Levy, Norman S.
Dickerson, Kenneth A.	Felkins, Charles G.	Gillette, Nelson M.	Herring, Paul E.	Kavanaugh, Michael W.	Lewedag, Loren M.
Diloreto, Lucio	Fellows, John H.	Gilreath, James E.	Hess, Ronald K.	Kawalkowski, Leonard P.	Lewey, Ira D.
Dixon, Jewel L., Jr.	Fenzl, George J., Jr.	Giuliani, Leonard E.	Hesse, Gerald H.	Kearl, Grant W.	Lewin, Theodore E.
Doebbler, Gordon "B"	Ferrari, Richard L.	Glasgow, Billy R.	Hickerson, James M.	Keast, Paul H.	Lewis, Harold S.
Doerr, Peter J.	Ferry, James M.	Glason, William A., Jr.	Hickman, Darrell D.	Keegan, Arthur E.	Lewis, John L.
Doherty, Richard S.	Fesler, Robert J.	Glenn, Eugene R.	Hickman, Jimmie E.	Keene, Charles R.	Lewis, Norman H.
Domville, Compton N., Jr.	Fieser, Arnold K.	Gluse, Michael R.	Hill, Kenneth E.	Keller, William E., Jr.	Lightsey, James L.
Donahue, John F.	Findley, Anderson H., Jr.	Goewey, Lee E.	Hill, Raymond W.	Kelly, Francis P.	Linch, Donald T.
Donahue, Thomas E., Jr.	Fink, George E.	Golden, Edward E.	Hill, Richard L.	Kelso, Frank B., II	Lincoln, John R.
Donlan, William J.	Fink, Siegfried A.	Goodale, Charles N.	Hill, Rollin L.	Kemper, Robert D.	Lindquist, Donald E.
Donohue, Douglas J.	Finley, Dean M.	Goss, Richard M.	Hindorf, Donald M.	Kenaston, George W.	Linehan, Timothy J., Jr.
Donovan, Neil	Piore, Adolph A.	Graham, Frank M.	Hoak, James F.	Kennedy, Dennis E.	Lloyd, David B.
Dorow, William R.	Fischer, Robert J.	Grandjean, Charles A.	Hobbs, Fermor W., III	Kennedy, Raymond J.	Locke, Jerry L.
Dorsey, James F., Jr.	Fischer, Theodore A., Jr.	Grant, Freeman A., Jr.	Hodge, William R.	Kenney, Richard A.	Logan, David E.
Dougherty, Charles E.	Fisher, Benjamin L., Jr.	Grant, Richard L.	Hodgkinson, John T.	Keough, Robert J.	Loos, Donald G.
Dowd, Gregory P.	Fisher, Walter L., Jr.	Graves, William S.	Hodgskiss, William L.	Kerslake, Ronald W.	Loscavo, John M.
Downs, Eugene H.	Fitch, Edward S.	Gray, Anthony W., Jr.	Hoerner, Frederick C.	Kersting, William H.	Loudon, Richard S.
Drake, Donald L.	Fitzgerald, Maurice D.	Gray, Robert K.	Hoffman, Chauncey F.	Ketchum, William H.	Lovdal, Rodney H.
Dresser, Roderick A.	Fitzpatrick, Paul M.	Green, Gerald E.	Hogg, James R.	Kilgore, William H.	Lowe, William L.
Drewry, Dean T.	Fitzsimmons, Eugene W.	Green, William E.	Hogue, Robert L.	Kilpatrick, Paul G., Jr.	Loynes, Louis A.
Driskell, Robert E.	Fitzwilliam, Peter K.	Green, William H.	Hohenstein, Clyde G.	Kinert, John H.	Lumbert, Albert W.
Druquer, Cedric W.	Flanary, Thomas N., II	Greene, Richard O.	Holland, John O.	King, Charles C.	Lund, John R.
Duffie, Charles L.	Flannery, Gerard J., Jr.	Greenwood, Richard L.	Hollandsworth, Paul F., Jr.	King, Ural W.	Lundquist, Donald R.
Duffield, Frederick H., Jr.	Flather, Charles R.	Greer, Albert E.	Holliday, James R.	King, William W.	Lybrand, Joe D.
Dunbar, Fredric A.	Flatley, James H., III	Gregory, Kenneth A.	Holm, John P.	Kinney, Ben J.	Lynch, Robert B., Jr.
Duncan, John G.	Fleming, William J.	Grewe, Webster	Holmes, Harry M.	Kinney, Charles H.	Lyons, James E.
Dungan, David A.	Fleshman, Samuel A., II	Grier, Thomas C., Jr.	Honsinger, Vernon C.	Kirkpatrick, John H.	Macan, John J.
Dunmire, Rance D.	Flight, John W., Jr.	Griffin, William H.	Hood, Joseph W., Jr.	Kirkwood, Robert L.	Macaskill, Everett, Jr.
Dunnam, William L.	Flower, John R.	Grimmes, William H.	Hootman, John J.	Kitzelman, Glenn E.	MacCabe, Van L.
Durckel, Ronald E.	Flynn, John J., Jr.	Grimmell, Robert L.	Horne, Roger B., Jr.	Klein, Harry L.	MacDougall, Ronald R.
Duval, Thomas J.	Flynn, William J.	Griswold, Gale M.	House, Wayne, Jr.	Klugh, Robert P., Jr.	MacIntyre, Daniel G.
Dyer, Nathaniel B., Jr.	Fontanesi, Francis D.	Groepler, Neil F.	Howard, Charles B.	Knaus, Vincent L.	MacKay, Gerald W.
Dyro, Stanislaus G.	Foote, Everett W.	Groff, Peter J.	Howell, William J.	Knef, Andrew L.	Mackin, Louis B., Jr.
Eagye, Vernon A.	Ford, Alvis S.	Gross, Sidney L.	Hoyes, Donald J.	Knott, Howard E., Jr.	MacLaren, John H.
Earnest, Charles "M"	Ford, John W.	Grossoehme, Clyde	Hueber, Fred P.	Komisarek, Adam	MacQuarrie, Gary L.
Eason, William G.	Ford, Omar R.	Grove, Ronald R.	Huhn, Samuel P.	Kordec, Walter A.	Magness, Eddie R.
Easterbrook, Charles W., Jr.	Forster, Robert M.	Gyder, Charles E.	Hull, William S.	Kraemer, Kenton K.	Mahler, George B.
Eaton, Robert H.	Fortenberry, Thomas N.	Haberma, Robert	Hullander, Robert A.	Kralk, Simon C.	Majors, Frances D.
Eck, Billy C.	Foster, Charles R.	Hahne, Dayton R.	Humphreys, David W.	Kramer, James E., Jr.	Majors, William T.
Eckert, John D.	Foster, John A.	Hale, Frederick W.	Hunter, Wallace R.	Kramer, Rex W., Jr.	Malloy, Malcolm A.
Edmunds, Donald C.	Fournier, Paul R.	Haley, George K.	Hurd, Devon "H"	Kristof, John J.	Malone, Donald W.
Edwards, Claude E., Jr.	Frank, Thomas P.	Hall, Don L.	Hussey, Harold W.	Krogh, David E.	Maloney, John J.
Edwards, James C.	Frank, Vernon E.	Hall, Robert A.	Husted, Murl E., Jr.	Kronnagel, Julius	Manes, William C.
Edwards, Joe D.	Franzen, Richard D.	Hall, Thomas J.	Huston, William G.	Krueger, Richard G.	Mansell, Richard T.
Edwards, Leslie R.	Fredrick, Russell E.	Hamilton, Arthur	Hutton, James L.	Kruger, Allen L.	Mansfield, John W.
Edwards, William F.	Freeman, Thomas L.	Hamilton, Edward A.	Hyatt, Robert G.	Kuhn, Wendel S., Jr.	Marks, Ernest
Egerton, James W.	Friedrich, Thomas E.	Hamilton, Verlie M.	Ingram, William A.	Kulo, Thomas S.	Martin, Frank P.
Ehret, James D.	Fries, Charles L.	Hamman, Kenneth A.	Ion, Dalton L.	Kuykendall, Herbert B.	Masterson, Leo S.
Ehrman, Robert G.	Friichtenicht, Richard D.	Hannaford, William H.	Irons, Robert P., Jr.	Kvederis, James P.	Maston, Joseph H., III
Elie, Gayle O.	Froehlich, Kenneth R.	Hansen, Herbert L.	Isaacs, Charles R.	Lacy, William A.	Mater, Bernard E.
Elinski, Michael, Jr.	Fromm, Ernest B., Jr.	Hanson, David F.	Ishol, Lyle M.	La Fave, Maurice G.	Matson, Bruce W.
Ellingwood, Arthur R., Jr.		Hanson, DeRoy L.	Ivy, Travis E.	Lakey, Jimmie D.	Matt, George E., Jr.
Ellis, Frank K.		Hanson, Donald C.	Jaeger, Robert H.	Lakin, Bill	Matthews, John B.
			James, Ernest W.	Lamberth, Billy C.	
			Jarratt, Guy C., III		
			Jarwin, Raymond J.		

- Mattson, John A.
Mautino, Richard L.
Mayer, Robert R.
Mayfield, Albert L.
Mayfield, Douglas S.
Mays, Samuel E., Jr.
Maytham, Peter
McAllister, Richard C.
McBride, Michael A.
McBurnett, Kenneth S.
McCabe, George J.
McCaffery, Robert A.
McCain, James R.
McCarter, Kenneth W.
McCarthy, John D.
McCauley, George A.
McClenahan, Tom P.
McClure, Dale R.
McCConnell, Edward W., II
McCoy, James C., Jr.
McCoy, Thomas H.
McCracken, David J.
McCune, Terrance O.
McDaniel, Eugene B.
McDermott, John G.
McDivitt, Ronald M.
McDonald, Ray M.
McEachen, Angus D., III
McFadden, John H., Jr.
McGahan, John P.
McGarry, John G.
McGhinnis, Richard O.
McGrath, James J.
McGuire, Marvin "E"
McIntire, Wilton H.
McKenna, Charles E.
McKenzie, John H., Jr.
McKinney, Gale A.
McKinney, Mercer L., Jr.
McKinstry, Thomas W.
McKissock, Donald J.
McLean, Charles R.
McClellan, Charles A.
McMillan, Edward W.
McMillan, Lee Q.
McNeill, Charles H.
McNeill, Richard J.
McPherson, Albert A.
McRae, James F.
Mecaughy, Robert W.
Medwedeff, Channing W.
Meier, Leonard M.
Meintzer, William C., Jr.
Melcher, Roland O.
Melvin, Edmund W.
Melvin, Virgil B.
Mencini, Anthony J.
Mercer, William C.
Merrill, Grant C.
Metzler, Charles D.
Meyers, Roger A.
Michaels, Danny J.
Mikitarian, Samson
Miller, Forrest R., Jr.
Miller, Herbert A.
Miller, James T.
Miller, John A.
Miller, John M., Jr.
Miller, Merle E.
Miller, Robert H.
Miller, Walter W.
Miller, Wayne W.
Miller, Wendell E.
Miller, William H.
Milligan, Wayne L.
Minton, David C., III
Mirise, Kerry W.
Mitchell, Kenneth
Molloy, Ronald J.
Monk, Samuel W.
- Moore, Harold A., Jr.
Moore, Nelson E.
Moore, Paul M.
Moore, Robert W.
Moran, Thomas J.
Moravec, Henry J., Jr.
Morgan, Kenneth A.
Morris, Charles S.
Morris, Hal B., Jr.
Morris, Jesse B., Jr.
Morris, John D.
Morrison, Jon K.
Mortimer, Edmund C.
Moyers, Gilbert E.
Mozier, Richard A.
Mulholland, Howard E.
Mullen, John T.
Mulloy, Charles S.
Mulvihill, James H.
Munn, Robert J., Jr.
Munsey, William D.
Murray, Frank S.
Murrell, Charles J.
Musgrove, William M.
Muschler, Wayne O.
Myers, Charles E.
Myers, William K., Jr.
Nagel, "L" "D"
Neale, George L.
Nelson, Carl A.
Nelson, Glen T.
Nelson, Paul J., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Nelson, Sven D.
Neuhard, Henry H.
Newbury, Alfred C.
Newman, Alvin S.
Newsom, Joe R.
Nicholson, Herbert H. J.
Nicholson, Robert C.
Nicholson, Harry E.
Nicholson, Murray M. J., Jr.
Niles, Wilmer J.
Nofziger, Larry B.
Norrington, Charles G.
Norris, Richard J.
Northam, Thomas A., Jr.
Notargiacomo, Joseph M.
Novratil, Robert V.
Oberle, Ronald J.
O'Brien, Donald W.
O'Connell, Jerome A.
O'Connor, Edwin A.
O'Connor, William J. M.
O'Donnell, Daniel T.
O'Dwyer, Kyran M.
Ohmen, Douglass J.
O'Keefe, Martin P.
O'Keefe, William J.
O'Kelly, James R.
Oliver, Richard C.
Oliverio, Theodore E.
Olson, Albert W., Jr.
Olson, Carroll A.
Olson, Darryl D.
Omondson, Jerrold W.
Onhaizer, Jerry E.
Onstott, Donald D.
Ord, Donald C.
Ordk, David N.
Orton, Cloyd G.
Orzech, Bernard P.
Osborn, Oakley E.
Osgood, Wayne R.
Overstreet, George H.
Owen, James L.
Owens, John G.
Owings, Dwight C.
Oyler, Donald R.
Oyler, Jimmie D.
Palmer, Jerry J.
Palmer, William R.
Parks, Jack "J," Jr.
- Parsons, Charles E.
Pasquinelli, Francis C.
Pattin, Stephen M.
Patton, James M.
Peabody, James P.
Pearson, John E.
Peek, Robert F.
Peeples, John M., Jr.
Penders, Joseph W.
Pendleton, Benjamin L.
Pennock, Murray F.
Perolat, John J.
Perry, Albert J.
Person, Herbert F.
Peters, Vernon W.
Peterson, Bob L.
Peterson, John R.
Peterson, James F.
Peterson, Karl L.
Peterson, Peter C., Jr.
Petree, Noel H., Jr.
Petrich, Horst A.
Pfister, William J.
Phillip, Frederick C.
Phillips, George L., Jr.
Phillips, Ronald M.
Phillips, Richard W.
Picciuolo, Stephen A. D.
Pickel, Theodore C., Jr.
Pinion, David E.
Pitzen, John R.
Plummer, Lynn B.
Poe, Benjamin L., Jr.
Polfer, Clarence R.
Poole, Thomas E.
Poore, Thomas W.
Porter, Robert W.
Potenti, John P., Jr.
Potter, Clare E.
Powell, Stewart G.
Powell, Wendell W.
Powell, William C.
Poyet, Elmer F.
Presley, Jack C.
Previ, Wallace M.
Proper, Vance D.
Propper, Ronald M.
Purdy, Dale C.
Pursley, John E.
Pyle, Roger G.
Quinn, James E., Jr.
Quinn, Robert N., Jr.
Raab, Charles F.
Raab, George E.
Rabuck, Leo V.
Ransom, James P., II
Ray, Willard D.
Rayome, Francis L.
Read, Benton M.
Redhage, James L.
Redington, Jerome J.
Reed, Jesse L.
Reese, Russell R.
Reid, Ralph G., Jr.
Reinhardt, Ellwood B., Jr.
Reis, Joseph J., Jr.
Rennaker, Charles L.
Renner, Joe D.
Renner, Lorraine E.
Rettig, Godfrey A.
Revak, Paul A.
Rice, Robert P.
Rich, Willis S.
Richards, Richard L.
Richardson, Fred D., Jr.
Richmond, Bruce R.
Riefner, George B.
Rinkel, Richard A.
Rinn, John R.
Roberts, Charles R.
Roberts, Gerald R.
Roberts, Ned C.
Roberts, Tommie W.
Robertson, Hollis E.
- Robins, John R.
Robinson, Robert E.
Roderick, John T.
Rodgers, Joseph L.
Rodgers, Robert D.
Roper, Vincent W.
Rosendale, George W., Jr.
Rothe, Jack F.
Rowell, George W.
Rowsey, James M., Jr.
Ruhle, Robert C.
Rush, Claude E.
Russ, William M., Jr.
Russell, Kay
Ruthrauff, Clifford B.
Ryan, Gerald F.
Ryan, Thomas M.
Rypel, Ronald J.
Saavedra, Robert
Sabin, James F.
Sabine, Frederick R.
Sackett, Dean R., Jr.
Sage, Robert A.
Saleh, Richard E.
Salo, Lennart F.
Salo, Willard H.
Saltz, Newell J., Jr.
Sandler, Charles A.
Sandman, Richard S.
Sargent, Stephen E.
Sarphe, Jack E., Jr.
Saunders, Richard E.
Savage, Jimmy R.
Saville, Robert E.
Saville, Terry D.
Sayers, Samuel L.
Scarborough, John R. L.
Schade, Eric H., Jr.
Schaeffel, Joseph A.
Schafer, Alfred E.
Schaffert, Richard W.
Schabile, David L.
Schafer, John D.
Schatz, Robert G.
Scherer, Francis H.
Scheyder, Ernest J.
Schick, Herbert A.
Schilling, George F.
Schleicher, Carl
Schmidt, Robert H.
Schmitt, Arthur F., Jr.
Schmitt, Robert W.
Schneider, Walter L., III
Schnitzer, Lawrence E.
Schoessel, William M., Jr.
Schreadley, Richard L.
Schreiner, Raymond J.
Schroeder, John H.
Schulze, John M., Jr.
Schutt, Harold J.
Schutte, John J.
Schwartz, Ralph C.
Scott, Philip J.
Scott, Thomas P.
Scovel, Frank D.
Scovish, Edward, Jr.
Scruggs, Richard M.
Seacat, Ralph L.
Sechrest, Edward A.
Seesholtz, John R.
Seiler, Melvin E.
Selberg, John W.
Senden, Paul W.
Sesma, Ramon A.
Shafer, Richard W.
Shannon, Philip M.
Shaw, Charles I.
Sheehan, John P.
Sheets, James R.
Shelso, David A.
Sheppard, Donald E.
Shinn, Robert A.
Shiple, Carl N.
Short, Benjamin F.
Short, LeRoy A., Jr.
Shultz, Theodore B.
Shumaker, Robert H.
- Sibley, David N.
Sigmond, Arle C. A.
Sikes, James H.
Simonie, Robert J.
Simpson, George T. K.
Simpson, Jon D.
Sinclair, Leonard A.
Sinnott, Brooks W.
Sirch, Richard W. F.
Skelly, Arthur R.
Slack, Stephen R.
Slaughter, William T.
Sleeman, Charles F.
Slingerland, Raymond D.
Sloan, John H.
Sloan, William D.
Slough, John H.
Smetheram, Herbert E.
Smiley, Robert R., III
Smith, Bobby E.
Smith, Carl C.
Smith, Donald W.
Smith, Frederick H., Jr.
Smith, Gene A.
Smith, James W.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Joseph C.
Smith, Leo B.
Smith, Norman M.
Smith, Ronald E.
Smith, Thomas F.
Smith, Vernon C.
Smith, William C.
Smith, William L.
Snell, Robert L., Jr.
Snider, Donald M.
Snyder, Richard C.
Sones, William C.
Soriano, Joseph R.
Spellman, Fred G.
Spencer, Barry W.
Spencer, Charles H.
Spencer, Lane L.
Spink, Peter J.
Spoto, Victor S.
Spotts, James L.
Squires, Howard J.
Stalcup, Jimmie M.
Stallings, Arthur C., Jr.
Stammer, Walter H., Jr.
Stanley, John N.
Stark, Walter W.
Statham, Raymond B.
Stefanou, Christopher McM.
Stelly, John M.
Stennett, William A.
Stephenson, Paul D.
Sterling, John C.
Stevenson, Barr S.
Stevenson, Connolly D.
Stewart, Charles C.
Stewart, Dennis J.
Stewart, Edwin McM., Jr.
Stocking, Sigurd I.
Stone, Elmer M.
Stone, Lowell P.
Stophel, Joseph E.
Storey, William D.
Stratford, Robert H.
Stratton, Richard A.
Streuli, Joseph W.
Strong, Henry H., Jr.
Strong, Paul L.
Stroup, Wayne B.
Stuart, Charles J., Jr.
Stutz, James D.
Sullivan, Arthur H.
Sullivan, Eugene J., Jr.
Sullivan, Gene F.
Sullivan, Gerald T.
Sullivan, Robert G.
Sullivan, Thomas J., Jr.
- Sullivan, William K.
Sumner, Donald M.
Sumrall, William H.
Swagart, Allan M.
Swan, Robert S.
Swan, William R.
Swanson, Harlan D., Jr.
Swinerton, Ronald H.
Taff, Clarence O., Jr.
Tager, Bruce A.
Talbert, Joseph T., Jr.
Talbott, Merrill L.
Tapp, John B.
Tarback, Richard R.
Taylor, Hugh E.
Taylor, James M.
Taylor, John D.
Taylor, Larry J.
Taylor, Lawrence H., Jr.
Taylor, Lewis H.
Taylor, Robert C., Jr.
Teachout, David S.
Terrell, Jerry L.
Tettelbach, Frederick M.
Thearle, William J.
Theodorelos, Pete "J"
Thibault, George E., Jr.
Thoma, John C.
Thomas, James G.
Thomas, Richard L.
Thompson, Jack D.
Thompson, Tommy L.
Thompson, William J.
Thomte, William J.
Thurber, John D.
Thurneysen, Jon S.
Tibbitts, Barrick F.
Tibbs, John C.
Tideman, John M.
Tierney, James S.
Tietgen, Charles A., Jr.
Timberlake, David W.
Tinker, Charles L.
Toehke, Walter A.
Toms, James E.
Toohy, Edward L., Jr.
Tracy, Theodore R.
Tralla, Wade A.
Traylor, Harold K.
Trent, Richard W.
Tretthewey, John O., Jr.
Tubbs, Kenneth A.
Tucker, Edwin B.
Tucker, James E.
Tucker, Roy E.
Tullis, James V.
Turner, Robert C.
Turner, Warren D.
Turner, Wilson C.
Tuttle, Jerry O.
Tyers, Robert D.
Tyler, Maurice F., Jr.
Ustick, Richard C.
Vallera, Rocco D.
Vance, Walter N., III
Vanderwagen, Edward A.
Van Horne, Alfred L.
Van Metre, James M.
Vanoy, William E.
Van Pool, Logan E.
Vanslyke, Gary L.
Varney, Gale N.
Villalobos, Julian
Villenave, Robert A.
Von Hendy, Richard D.
Vowell, Joe L.
Wachob, James R.
Wagner, John A.
Walden, Edward F., Jr.
Waldron, Michael J.
Wales, George E.
Walker, William E.
Wallace, Richard J.
Wallace, Turner P., Jr.
Wallis, Wayne H.

- Watler, Dale J.
 Waltzer, Jacob
 Ward, Compton E.
 Ward, James A.
 Wardell, William L., Jr.
 Watkins, Robert L.
 Watts, Henry A.
 Watts, Jasper B.
 Way, Edward R.
 Weeks, William G.
 Weber, Burtland B.
 Weber, Gustave A., Jr.
 Webster, John A., Jr.
 Wehner, George D.
 Weidman, Russell H.
 Weinfield, Richard M.
 Weir, Richard W.
 Welch, Richard D.
 Wells, Walton E.
 Welsh, George T.
 Werner, Marshall D.
 West, Charles T.
 Westall, Kenneth W.
 Westbrock, Donald H.
 Wheeler, James R.
 White, Charles A.
 White, Clarence A.
 White, Laurence A., Jr.
 White, Richard F.
 Whiteside, James D.
 Whittaker, Robert L.
 Wichmann, William H.
 Wicke, James O.
 Widen, Richard D.
 Wier, Ronald L.
 Wiggins, Larry C.
 Wilbern, Jack M.
 Wilde, John H., Jr.
 Wilkins, George H.
 Wilkinson, Thomas A. R.
 Wilkinson, Wilfrid P., III
 Will, Robert A.
 Williams, Forrest R.
 Williams, Richard E.
- Lieutenant, Medical Corps*
- Albanese, Robert
 Anderson, Edgar J.
 Anderson, Richard A.
 Aubrey, Royal G.
 Bailey, Albert G.
 Balding, Thomas L.
 Baringer, George R.
 Bassham, Harold L.
 Baute, Peter B.
 Benoit, Richard P.
 Bergeron, Lester L.
 Bernocco, Stephen J.
 Bertuch, Albert W.
 Biehl, Robert F.
 Billings, David E.
 Bistrong, Herbert W.
 Bland, James W., Jr.
 Blodgett, George S.
 Blount, Harry M.
 Boodish, Wesley
 Boorstin, James B.
 Bowlds, Joseph H.
 Boye, Donald E.
 Boyer, Garry O.
 Bradford, William M.
 Briant, Thomas P.
 Briere, Joseph T., Jr.
 Britton, Melvin C., Jr.
 Brodmerkel, George J., Jr.
 Brophy, James J.
 Brumback, George F.
 Bryan, Richard W. D.
 Budd, Frank W., Jr.
 Bull, John C., Jr.
 Burkett, Patrick R.
 Cantrell, Robert W.
- Wilson, Donald C.
 Wilson, John S.
 Windsor, Nelson E.
 Winslow, Myron S., Jr.
 Winter, Richard A.
 Wise, Anthony J., III
 Wise, Stephen A.
 Witherspoon, Beverly W.
 Witt, Robert F.
 Wolfe, Robert E.
 Wolfe, William F.
 Womack, David R., Jr.
 Wood, Clarence W.
 Wood, Forrest H.
 Wood, Joseph V.
 Wood, Rex S.
 Wood, Walter S.
 Woodbury, Orpheus L., III
 Woodlief, Frank L.
 Woods, Herbert P.
 Woodside, Harold R.
 Woolam, John E.
 Wootten, Carl B., Jr.
 Word, Millard L.
 Works, William W.
 Wright, Frederick E.
 Wright, Harry W.
 Wright, Joseph M. P., Jr.
 Wright, Marsh E.
 Wright, Orville, Jr.
 Wuthrich, Richard E.
 Wyly, James R., Jr.
 Yarnell, James L.
 York, David A.
 Young, Howard I.
 Young, Kenneth G.
 Young, Philip McC.
 Zagortz, Leonard "A", Jr.
 Zechlin, Frank F.
 Zeitler, William W.
 Zerwas, Richard L.
 Zipperer, William R.
 Zipse, Robert L.
 Zirbel, William D.
 Zwick, Stephen L.
- Lieutenant, Supply Corps*
- Allen, Robert A., Jr.
 Ault, William U.
 Barnett, Andrew F., Jr.
 Bedenbaugh, Jack R.
 Billicke, Eric W. H.
 Boike, Robert J.
 Booth, Stanley L.
 Bosco, Clement, Jr.
 Boyd, John S.
 Brandenburg, Wallace M.
- Fussell, Fitzhugh L., Jr.
 Gelber, Philip J.
 Godwin, James S.
 Greene, Reginald E.
 Griffin, William V., III
 Gross, Thomas A.
 Gruber, John W.
 Guttuso, Thomas J.
 Hagele, Herbert C., Jr.
 Hagg, Doyle D.
 Head, William C.
 Heller, Warren
 Hiehle, John F.
 Hix, William R.
 Hogan, Bartholomew T.
 Holdener, Paul A.
 Irick, Robert M.
 Jewett, Paul W.
 Johnson, David W.
 Johnson, William F.
 Jones, Daniel "M"
 Jones, Dwaine L.
 Julian, Sydney R., Jr.
 Kanel, Robert F., Jr.
 Kelley, David L.
 Koonce, Lacy A.
 Kurtz, Donald M.
 Lanning, John A.
 Lehfeldt, Darwin C.
 Lehwalder, Laurus W.
 Leisse, Fred C.
 Lopez, Domingo A.
 Lowe, Rodney S.
 Luehrs, James G.
 Lummus, Floyd L.
 Lynch, John I., Jr.
 Madden, Patrick J.
 Manning, Daniel A.
 Marshall, Charles E.
 Martin, Robert L.
 May, George F., Jr.
 McClain, Garvin H.
 McClintock, Richard P., Jr.
 McConnell, James F.
 McCormick, Byron H.
 McDonald, Robert L.
 McGath, James D.
 McKnight, Glen D., Jr.
 McClean, Walter L.
 Messina, John J.
 Metcalf, Harry L.
 Milton, John L.
 Mockus, Victor F.
 Motel, Richard H.
 Moloney, Charles J.
 Monell, William C.
 Morley, Kenneth C., Jr.
 Muehlberger, James J.
 Mullen, John C.
 Muller, Walter J., III
 Murdock, Kenneth A., Jr.
 Murphy, Eugene L.
 Mutt, Lawrence B.
 Myers, Lafe H., Jr.
 Nevara, John B.
 Newsom, Samuel R., III
 Norton, John W.
 Nottingham, Maurice, Jr.
- Lieutenant, Chaplain Corps*
- Bedingfield, Robert W.
 Fallon, Edward F.
 Gauthan, Geoffrey E.
 Jerauld, Philip E.
 Kase, Mark
 Kelly, Henry T.
- Lieutenant, Civil Engineer Corps*
- Ahrens, William N.
 Anderson, Walter I.
 Ayers, Charles D.
 Baggs, Charles C.
 Bauerels, Ellis G.
 Bradtmiller, Paul H.
 Brockwell, Sterling M., Jr.
 Burton, Joseph T., Jr.
 Collins, Allan W.
 Dickpeddie, John I.
 Flack, Frederick P.
 Ford, James E.
 Gillam, Harold R.
- O'Loughlin, John M.
 Pedersen, Carl M.
 Pellecchia, Joseph A.
 Peterson, Carl R.
 Pickens, Myron A., Jr.
 Pierson, William E.
 Pirrung, David E.
 Plant, Richard F.
 Folglase, Van N., Jr.
 Pope, Herbert L.
 Printup, Carter A., Jr.
 Ramlo, John H.
 Ramsey, Charles H.
 Reed, Jerome McD.
 Rhoades, Vade "G"
 Rivers, Leslie D.
 Robitaille, George A.
 Rogers, Charles C.
 Rohan, Neil J.
 Roling, Gerald T.
 Roy, Donald E.
 Rundlett, Fred A.
 Rutland, Eugene D., Jr.
 Ryan, Jerome R.
 Schneider, Paul J.
 Schwartz, Ronald A.
 Schwertley, Frederick W.
 Seal, Robert B.
 Sechler, Leslie I.
 Sever, Raymond J.
 Sewell, Sidney R.
 Shea, David W., Jr.
 Shiraki, Iwao
 Shumaker, James L.
 Smalley, Jennings B., Jr.
 Smith, Donald D.
 Smith, Franklin A.
 Smith, Laurie N.
 Smith, William W.
 Spaur, William H.
 Spencer, Edward M.
 Sprague, Arthur Y.
 Steimel, Herbert A.
 Strickland, George T., Jr.
 Teeter, Stanley D.
 Tenney, James B.
 Tobin, John J., Jr.
 Torpey, David J., Jr.
 Trimber, Connell J.
 Turner, Leonidas M., Jr.
 Urbanc, Andrew N.
 Urschel, William P.
 Wandewyngaerde, George A.
 Ventzek, Albert T.
 Volcjak, Charles B.
 Wall, Norman R.
 Weber, David M.
 Wengert, James W.
 White, Headley S., Jr.
 White, Paul C., Jr.
 Whitis, Peter R.
 Willis, Calvin J.
 Winslow, Homer L.
 Winston, Hamilton M.
 Wolfe, Wayne H.
 Wood, Philip K.
 Woodall, Martin A.
 Wright, Nathan L.
 Yanko, Robert P.
- Crutchfield, Frank D.
 Daddona, John M.
 Damm, John A.
 Daughtridge, Gerald R.
 Dickey, James A.
 Dolenga, Harold E.
 Dunning, William J.
 Eaton, Thomas E., Jr.
 Erickson, Douglas L.
 Estes, Arthur, Jr.
 Evans, Lloyd R.
 Fidd, Joseph A.
 Flach, Lynn R.
 Frampton, Robert T.
 Fries, Paul A., Jr.
 Gaddis, Carl K.
 Gagner, Francis X.
 Gerstenberger, Wayne W.
 Gorenflo, Louis W.
 Goulette, James D.
 Griffin, Edward J.
 Guss, Bernard L.
 Harmon, Robert G.
 Hawkey, William C.
 Higgins, Ernest C. M.
 Hinds, Duane E.
 Hopkins, Richard B.
 Hummel, Don F.
 Hurst, Harvey R.
 Jantz, Jack L.
 Jones, Channing E.
 Krueger, Lloyd W.
 Kruithof, Raymond A.
 Kruse, William E.
 Langer, Gerald D.
 Larsen, Henry O.
 Leblanc, Joseph F., Jr.
 Lemay, Jerome S.
 Locke, Olive C.
 Loveday, William G., Jr.
 Lubben, Vernon L.
 Luther, James R., Jr.
 Martin, William J.
 Mason, Kinner C.
 Maxwell, Kenneth H.
 McCullers, Lawrence E.
 McFarland, Wayne B.
 McGarvey, John J.
 McKinnon, Daniel W., Jr.
 McMullen, Franklin D., Jr.
 Merrifield, Richard L.
 Mitts, Joseph P.
 Monaghan, William T.
 Moran, Lloyd D.
 Morgan, Richard E.
 Morse, Seavey D., Jr.
 Moss, Stephen A.
 Munkres, Glenn R.
 Murphy, John E.
 Murphy, Joseph J.
 Newcomb, James W., Jr.
- Niles, Donald R.
 Oaks, Jacob G., Jr.
 Olivier, Denny R.
 Olson, Gene P.
 Osgood, Douglas C.
 Peck, Joe D.
 Peters, William A.
 Pistolessi, Vincent J.
 Prokop, Jan S.
 Raffels, John F.
 Randall, Harold N., Jr.
 Ranieri, Richard A. J.
 Raymond, James A.
 Reed, Dale H.
 Rice, Henry L., Jr.
 Roethe, Edward A.
 Rounds, Richard N.
 Ruehlin, John H.
 Rusch, Donald R.
 Ryan, John R.
 Scanlon, Robert J.
 Schaaf, Alvin D., Jr.
 Scott, William W.
 Shaugnessy, John M.
 Smith, Franklin D.
 Smith, John A., Jr.
 Stanton, James M.
 Starrett, William I., Jr.
 Stone, Donald R.
 Sullivan, Raymond V.
 Szwed, James A.
 Tannone, Rocco J.
 Tobin, Isidore L., III
 Trawick, George L.
 Tudor, Clyde E.
 Underhill, Edward B.
 Van Houten, Richard E.
 Van Naman, Thomas L.
 Walker, Richard C., Jr.
 Walsh, Richard S.
 Walters, Robert A.
 Warren, Raymond
 Webb, James R.
 Webster, John C.
 Westmoreland, Perry L.
 Westphal, Harold S., Jr.
 White, Donald B.
 White, James A.
 Whitman, Earl K.
 Williams, Robert L.
 Willis, John J.
 Wilson, Roger C.
 Woodard, James C.
 Wrobel, Eugene A.
 Young, Benjamin L.
 Young, Ronald A.
 Youngblood, Norbert V.
 Zabrycki, Edward A.

Mosher, Thomas F.
Nash, Archie R.
Newcomb, Frank M.
Newcomb, Kenneth R.
Petersen, Norman W.
Popowich, Clyde V. W.
Quinn, Robert E., Jr.

Lieutenant, Dental Corps

Annis, Robert B.
Ballard, Gerald T.
Baumgarten, Richard S.
Besley, Keith W.
Chlareza, Angelo R.
Crawford, John D.
Cushing, John R., Jr.
Davis, Thomas C.
DiClementi, Ralph J.
Dunston, Walter T.
Eden, George T.
Eklind, Ronald R.
Esposito, Richard A.
Farish, Robert W.
Fishel, David L.
Fitzgerald, Donald E.
Hamilton, Sherry M., Jr.
Howarth, Hugh C.
Hube, Albert R.
Hudson, Elmer R., Jr.
Keller, Jack H.
Kimball, Kenneth R.
Klug, Richard G.

Schade, Robert A., Jr.
Schumann, James F.
Shanley, John J., Jr.
Shirley, Ronald G.
Uber, Charles B.
Whelan, James E.
Wilson, Robert B.

Kravets, Thomas F.
Krzeminski, Arthur E.
Lehman, Ralph N.
Lekas, James S.
Linkenbach, Charles R.
Loizeaux, Alfred D.
Lowe, Cameron A.
Luke, Alan B.
Lynch, Paul D.
Mason, Billie M.
Maw, Ralph B.
McCall, Frank J., Jr.
McShera, Thomas J.
McWalter, George M.
Monasky, George E.
Morrissey, William J., Jr.
Mosby, Edward L.
Murphy, John D.
Murray, Richard A.
Pallasch, Thomas J.
Parker, Irwin J.
Pike, Robert E.

Proteau, Thomas J.
Reese, Kay T.
Rochford, Philip
Schaffer, Allen W.
Scholl, Jerome T.
Scott, Gale L.
Shaffer, Richard G.
Shattuck, John A.

Lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Barboo, Samuel H., Jr.
Boone, Harry M., Jr.
Boudreau, Harold J.
Breidenstein, Frederick W.
Clark, James L.
Cooper, Thomas G.
Davis, William P.
Devans, James J.
Fletcher, William E.
Fowler, Ephraim E., Jr.
Fultyn, Robert V.
Gallagher, Thomas J.
Gillenwaters, John D.
Hawkins, Kenneth L.
Hunt, James A.
Jones, George D.
Karr, Joseph T.

Lieutenants, Nurse Corps

Altenhofel, Dorothy A.
Barker, Elizabeth A.
Bates, Barbara A.
Bellinger, Edith V.

Shellin, Ronald A.
Short, George A.
Stevens, Mark M.
Terhune, Raymond C.
Toth, Wayne J.
Uveges, Alfred C.
Williams, Robert E., Jr.
Yacabucci, James E.

Lachapelle, Norman C.
Mobbs, Philip H.
Moody, John R., Jr.
Myers, James I.
Nichols, Lloyd B.
Palmer, Jack J.
Pittington, Francis C.
Roberts, Billy D.
Ryan, William A.
Shuler, Donald E.
Sickels, Forman J.
Sollman, John R.
Tuttle, Richard G.
Van Hooser, Russel P.
Wilcox, James G.
Ziegler, Harry F., Jr.
Zselvay, Andrew J., Jr.

Decicco, Virginia A.
Dennis, Joan T.
Dillon, Joanne M.
Elliott, Ruth L.
Elsass, Phyllis J.
Fitzgerald, Helen M.
Furuya, Cherril S.
Gammer, Marry E.
Garlutz, Kathryn R.
Gaughan, Rose A.
Gendron, Marie M. T.
Green, Barbara J.
Hinckley, Colleen
James, Loren J.
Joyce, Jane F.
Krisanda, Sylvia M.
Liberatore, Bertha M.
Lindsay, Magdalene A.
Long, Rose M.
Mack, Beverly T.
Marble, Ella E.

Martin, Ruth S.
Mason, Ruth A.
McGuckin, Dorothy E.
McIntyre, Lora J.
Melcer, Marjorie I.
Millard, Ariys M.
Morton, Jo A.
Nelson, Marlyn Von F.
Nickerson, Lois E.
Olson, Marilyn F.
Patmore, Nancy M.
Pollard, Joann L.
Reistroffer, Patricia R.
Shaw, Joan S.
Smith, Janet D.
Snook, Virginia M.
Steinocher, Anne M.
Thomas, Barbara J.
Trudgeon, Joyce A.
Walker, Marilyn J.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 15, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas.

Pat Mehaffy, of Arkansas, to be U.S. circuit judge for the eighth circuit.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Interior Committee Review of Coal Research Program

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 15, 1963

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, because I support the program of coal research which is authorized by Congress and is now being conducted in the Department of the Interior, I was gratified to see that the conference committee in reporting the adjustments of its differences on the Interior Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1964—H.R. 5279—has provided the funds necessary to permit the coal research program to proceed without interruption. But, because I support the program I rise at this time to provide assurances to the Members concerning the direction and supervision of coal research.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am proud to be chairman, reported favorably the legislation which established the Office of Coal Research. The committee, however, was very much concerned—just as I know most Members are concerned—as to how the money appropriated for research projects is spent. Accordingly, we have maintained close surveillance over the Secretary of the Interior and his staff.

Earlier this year, when we learned that the Secretary of the Interior had definitive proposals for multimillion-dollar contracts, the Mines and Mining Subcommittee under the able chairmanship

of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], immediately scheduled hearings to examine and review the direction in which the program was oriented. The review that was conducted was, I think, truly comprehensive and exhaustive with bipartisan support for which I thank both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] who, as we all know, represents one of the great coal producing areas of the country.

The subcommittee heard testimony from the Department of the Interior and also from the President's science adviser, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, and leading representatives of industry and labor including Mr. Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association and Mr. W. A. Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America. In addition, we had one phase examined in detail by the Comptroller General and received comments from one of the prospective contractors.

When Members vote on the Interior Department Appropriation Act this week, they may feel assured that the committee having legislative jurisdiction will maintain its scrutiny over the program. This was guaranteed when the Managers on the part of the House at the conference included in the statement on the conference report the proviso that, in connection with the money appropriated for coal research, "The projects shall be subject to the provisions of the resolution of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, dated June 10, 1963." Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate at this time to make public that resolution of

the Mines and Mining Subcommittee so that all Members, as well as the public, may know precisely the basis on which the conferees have acted.

As part of the background of this resolution the House is advised that the one thing that the committee found to give it concern in connection with a coal research program as a lack of standardization for consultation with the technical advisory committee or committees which were to be established pursuant to the Act of July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 336) which established the Office of Coal Research. We recognize that ultimate responsibility is vested in the Secretary of the Interior; it should not and cannot be placed elsewhere. However, the subcommittee is unanimously united on the proposition that there must be close and continuing consultation with the advisory committee and this is provided for in the resolution referred to by the conferees on the Appropriation Act.

Under permission previously granted, I include as part of my remarks the full text of the resolution adopted by the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, June 10, 1963:

RESOLUTION BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Whereas the act of July 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 336) established in the Department of the Interior an Office of Coal Research for the encouragement and stimulation of production and conservation of coal in the United States through contract research and development; and

Whereas said act established a Technical Advisory Committee of recognized experts from various aspects of coal research to assist the examination and evaluation of research proposals and contracts; and

Whereas certain proposals under consideration by the Office of Coal Research will