the third class cities, but the Pennsylvania Bureau of Social Security for Public Employees is receiving communications from such municipal employees inquiring whether they can now elect social security coverage.

These single coverage members did not choose social security coverage for a number of reasons:

1. They had social security coverage through other employment than in the schools, State or municipality.

2. They would become eligible for social security benefits as dependent wives or widows through their husband's coverage.

3. They were not sure of the benefits of their being covered by social security because of their husband's membership in the Railroad Retirement System.

4. They could not acquire sufficient quarters of coverage at the time of establishment to be eligible for a benefit.

5. They resented the reduction of public employees retirement allowances because of the offset established in the joint coverage plan.

In fact, the offset reduction played a significant role in the decisions of many of those who did not elect social security coverage. Under the joint coverage plan when a public employe retired at an age when he could and did receive social security benefits, his retirement allowance is reduced by 40 percent of the social security benefits he receives. For example, if his retirement allowance were $300 and his social security benefit were $100, his retirement allowance would be reduced by $40 (40 percent of $100) and he would receive only $260 as his reduced retirement allowance together with his social security benefit of $100.

In many cases there was so little difference between the employees total retirement income from social security under joint coverage in the public employees retirement system plus his retirement allowance reduced by the offset and his total retirement income from social security under other coverage (or as a dependent of a covered spouse) plus his full retirement allowance without offset that it was not to his financial advantage to elect social security coverage in the public employees retirement system.

For example—a male employee with a retirement allowance of $300 per month and a social security benefit of $100 under joint coverage in the public employees retirement system would have a total retirement income of $360: Reduced retirement allowance—$260 ($300 minus 40 percent of $100) plus $100 social security benefit; $360.

If the same male employee had social security coverage through employment outside of his public employment which entitled him to a social security benefit of $50, his total retirement income would be $350. Unreduced retirement allowance of $300 plus his social security benefit of $50.

In the above example electing joint coverage would have meant only an additional $10 per month. It would take a number of years of retirement during which he would be receiving an additional $10 per month to recover the additional social security taxes he would have to pay if he elected social security coverage under the public employees retirement system.

Now legislation has been enacted in Pennsylvania which creates a new class of membership called dual coverage and joint coverage members may elect to eliminate the offset reduction in their retirement allowance. This legislation becomes effective on July 1, 1964, and those who so elect will, upon retirement, receive the full retirement allowance without offset reduction and the full social security benefit to which they are entitled.

It now becomes financially advantageous to virtually every single coverage member to elect social security coverage. Without the offset reduction the total retirement income from public employees retirement and social security will be increased so substantially that it will be to their advantage to elect coverage even though they will have to pay the social security taxes retroactive to January 1, 1956.

For example, in the case of the male employee in the example above—if he elects social security coverage under the public employees' retirement system his total retirement income would be $400—uninduced retirement allowance of $300 plus social security benefit of $100—rather than the $360 he would receive under the previous State legislation. This will be $50 per month more than the total retirement he would receive through his coverage outside his public employment of $350. At $50 a month in additional benefits he would recover the cost of the additional social security taxes in a very short period following retirement.

In addition every amendment to the Social Security Act since social security coverage became effective for public employees in Pennsylvania in 1956 has made it increasingly more advantageous for single coverage members to elect social security coverage under the public employees retirement system. All these are capped by the recent Pennsylvania legislation permitting the elimination of the offset reduction.

H.R. 9650 makes it possible for "single coverage" public employees in Pennsylvania (and perhaps other States) to greatly improve their total retirement income.

The Pennsylvania State Education Association supports passage of this legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the Book of Deuteronomy: *Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God.*

Almighty God, upon whom we lean for strength and unto whom we look for hope, may we earnestly devote ourselves to the task of bringing unto all mankind the blessing of the more abundant life. Grant that, living in an expanding universe, we may find our hearts enlarging with a greater concern for the welfare of humanity and helping man and nations cultivate a friendly and fraternal spirit.

May we hasten the day when human relations at the national and international levels shall be fraternally cooperative rather than fiercely competitive.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader if there has been any change in the legislative program for this week?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have been advised that a rule has been granted on the bill, H.R. 9022, to amend the International Development Association Act, to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. The gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. PATMAN], states that this is a matter of some urgency. Therefore we are adding this bill to the program tomorrow. It will follow the program already announced for tomorrow.

Further, responding to the gentleman, yesterday we obtained permission to have George Washington's Farewell Address read on Friday. This is also added to the legislative program for the week.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REINTRODUCTION OF FOOD STAMP BILL

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a new food stamp bill which is almost identical with the bill, H.R. 8107, which was recently tabled by the House Committee on Agriculture on a vote of 19 to 14. Several minor changes have been made in the legislation. These changes were suggested by several members of the Committee on Agriculture as perfecting amendments which would not in any way weaken or cripple the food stamp program. The Department of Agriculture, I am informed, is agreeable to these changes in the administration bill, and I have consequently agreed to reintroduce the measure as a "clean" bill.

One amendment makes it clear that nothing in the act shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to specify either the wholesale or retail prices of any food distributed under this

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

plan; another deals with the avenues of appeal open to retail food stores and wholesale food concerns which the Secretary may seek to disqualify from further participation in the program—for one thing, the store or concern may obtain judicial review of the Secretary's action in any court of record in the State having competent jurisdiction. Another amendment spells out a more precise definition of an emergency during which surplus commodities can also be distributed in an area where the food stamp plan is operating. It would have to be an emergency caused by natural disaster.

I believe that the reintroduction of this legislation in the form of a new bill will help to simplify the procedures in having the food stamp plan again considered in the Agriculture Committee. I hope this time the merits of the plan will be recognized by a clear majority of the committee. I have been hearing from all parts of the country about the tabling of H.R. 8107—from citizens who are deeply distressed that the bill might not pass.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF AIR FORCE'S ROME AIR MATERIEL AREA AT GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, on February 4 the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, by concurrent resolution, memorialized the Congress to investigate whether or not the proposed transfer of the Air Force's important Rome Air Materiel Area at Griffiss Air Force Base, would be in the best defense and economic interest of the United States.

Today I am introducing a resolution which would authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a complete investigation of the planned Defense Department action. The matter is not only of grave concern to the people of New York State, but to all who fear that the fragmentation and dispersal of personnel and functions of this vital ground electronics supply center will result in higher overall costs to the taxpayer and will impede the defense of the United States. Because of the disturbing implications of the proposal, both the Congress and the people are entitled to know all of the facts.

OVERTIME PAY

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor, which is discussing a bill to provide for double time over 40 hours, ostensibly to help the unemployment problem by discouraging overtime.

I do not think this is the answer. In talking to many people affected, I think the problem of unemployment involves what we commonly know as moonlighting. If you impose on management double time for overtime, they cannot stand it economically. If the affected employee will necessarily then be permitted to work only 40 hours, he will seek another type of employment in another company, because he has been used to the extra overtime pay and has obligations to meet.

If we are after a solution to the real problem having to do with the unemployed, the suggestion I make is that if a person is limited to 40 hours on one job and he then seeks further employment in a second company to supplement his income, when he goes to the second company he should not be employed at straight time. My suggestion is that if he works 40 hours for one company and goes to a second company on a moonlighting job, the second employer be required to pay this employee who has already worked 40 hours, time and a half. The second employer will probably not be anxious to pay time and a half to this moonlighter, so what will he do? He will turn to an unemployed person, and he will only be required to pay that unemployed person straight time. So this will hit at the crux of the problem. He will hire the unemployed person and not the moonlighter.

There may be some people downtown who may try to refute this. But human nature being what it is, I know that this suggestion will greatly improve the unemployment situation.

I think if we can stop the moonlighting through this suggestion we can really get down to the basic problem of unemployment, so in conclusion my suggestion is that if a man works 40 hours and then takes a second job, the second employer will have to pay him time and a half. If the employer hires an unemployed person he pays him straight time thus getting to the roots of the unemployment problem. I predict that the application of double time for over 40 hours will do nothing more than encourage persons already employed to take a second job and the unemployed will still be unemployed.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be permitted to sit today and tomorrow while the House is in session during general debate, for consideration of the military construction bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MacPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CAROLINE G. JUNGHANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8878) for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 33), with respect to the filing of claims and the institution of suits for the return of property or any interest therein pursuant to section 9 or 32 of such Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9 or 32), Caroline G. Junghans, a United States citizen residing in West Germany, may, within six months after the enactment of this Act, file a claim for the return of certain property, namely, her interest under item 7 of the will of Fritz Glogauer, deceased, the title to her interest having been acquired by the United States under the Trading With the Enemy Act by vesting order numbered 4907 of the Office of Alien Property; and that claim shall be considered on its merits in accordance with the remaining provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That if no such return is made within a period of sixty days after the filing of such claim, the said Caroline G. Junghans shall be entitled, within one year

of the expiration of such period, to institute suit pursuant to section 9 of such Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9) for the return of such property.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE I. ELLINGTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7757) for the relief of Jesse I. Ellington.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jesse I. Ellington is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,384.87, representing overpayment of compensation he received, through administrative error, as an employee of the Department of the Navy, United States Naval Observatory Time Service Substation, Richmond, Florida, in the period between December 29, 1961, and June 8, 1963.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Jesse I. Ellington, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayment referred to in the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike "$1,384.87" and insert "$1,385.10".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN A. PERALTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9615) for the relief of John A. Peralta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John A. Peralta, of Bay Shore, New York, the sum of $483.12, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for compensation for loss through theft on or about September 21, 1961, of personally owned hand tools required for official business and stored in Government quarters at New York International Airport: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agency or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER ROYAL FAY, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 573) for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Elmer Royal Fay, Senior, captain, United States Army, retired, of Hillcrest Heights, Maryland, the sum of $228.68, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for compensation for retired pay which was withheld from him by the United States during the period from July 1, 1947, through August 11, 1947, while the said Elmer Royal Fay, Senior, was an employee of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, at Washington, District of Columbia: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGIE LOU RADER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the barring of claims against the United States", approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Georgie Lou Rader, of Knoxville, Tennessee, the sum of $1,440, representing the amount of the six months' death gratuity payable to her upon the death of her son, Second Lieutenant Kenneth R. Rader, who died on March 27, 1945, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, the said Georgie Lou Rader having relied upon erroneous information from United States Army personnel that she might file application for such gratuity at any time: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARCHIE L. DICKSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1445) for the relief of Archie L. Dickson, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Represenatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized and directed to determine the amount and effective date of the retirement pay to which Archie L. Dickson, Junior, would have been entitled if (1) the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army in reviewing his case in 1945 and 1946 had found that the said Archie L. Dickson, Junior, was, at the time he was relieved from active duty in 1946, permanently incapacitated for active service and that his incapacity for active service was the result of an incident of service as a commissioned officer in the United States Air Force incurred in line of duty not due to his own misconduct and such a finding had been approved by the President or his delegate, and (2) the Department of the Air Force thereupon had certified Archie L. Dickson, Junior, in the grade of first lieutenant to the Veterans' Administration for the receipt of retired pay under the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557; 10 U.S.C. 2687).

(b) Upon such determination, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Archie L. Dickson, Junior, after deducting any disability compensation he has received from the Veterans' Administration, retired pay in such amount upon the conditions which would have been applicable if such certification had been made pursuant to the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557; 10 U.S.C. 3687).

(c) From the date of enactment of this Act it shall be held and considered that Archie L. Dickson, Junior, has been retired for physical disability and the Secretary of the Air Force is directed to pay him retired pay accordingly.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3: After the word "That" insert "in accordance with the findings of fact of the United States Court of Claims in the case of *Archie L. Dickson, Jr.* v. *The United States,* Congressional No. 4–60, decided November 7, 1962,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY G. EASTLAKE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1518) for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the service of Mary G. Eastlake, Nurse Director (retired), Public Health Service, performed while in the employ of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, before July 1, 1955, shall be deemed to be active service in the Public Health Service for the purpose of computing her retired pay from the Service as of the date of her retirement (December 1, 1962): *Provided,* That the increase in retired pay authorized by this Act shall not exceed the amount which would be payable as a Civil Service retirement annuity based on such service.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALESSANDRO A. R. CACACE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1488) for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alessandro A. R. Cacace shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. Hilton D. Hall, a United States citizen.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL JAMES BRANAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5306) for the relief of Paul James Branan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Paul James Branan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Thomas D. Branan, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Paul James Branan shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paul James Branan may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Thomas D. Branan, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTERINA RICUPERO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3264) for the relief of Esterina Ricupero.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Naturalization Act, Esterina Ricupero may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "section 212(a)" and substitute in lieu thereof "section 212(a)(1)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Adair	Dowdy	Mailliard
Ashbrook	Edmondson	Martin, Mass.
Ashmore	Finnegan	Meader
Bass	Flynt	Miller, N.Y.
Battin	Forrester	Montoya
Bennett, Mich.	Goodell	Moss
Berry	Gray	O'Brien, Ill.
Blatnik	Green, Oreg.	O'Konski
Bolton, Frances P.	Griffin	Pilcher
	Gubser	Powell
Broomfield	Halleck	Price
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Rains
Brown, Ohio	Harvey, Ind.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bruce	Hawkins	Riehlman
Buckley	Hoffman	Roberts, Tex.
Burkhalter	Holifield	Roosevelt
Burleson	Hosmer	Rostenkowski
Burton	Hull	Roybal
Casey	Hutchinson	St. Onge
Cederberg	Jones, Ala.	Short
Celler	Kastenmeier	Smith, Calif.
Chamberlain	Kee	Thomson, Wis.
Collier	Kelly	Tuck
Colmer	Kluczynski	Tupper
Corman	Latta	Udall
Cramer	Leggett	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Widnall
Dawson	Lindsay	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Lloyd	Younger
Dorn	Macdonald	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 340 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS ON FEBRUARY 21

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to a special order agreed to on February 17, 1964, the Chair designates the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately following the reading of the Journal on February 21, 1964.

SUSPENDING REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 315, COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, DURING CAMPAIGN OF 1964

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, disagree to the Senate amendments and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the meaning of the resolution?

Mr. HARRIS. This resolution was passed by the House some time ago suspending the requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for this presidential year. The Senate passed the resolution making some changes and we are asking to go to conference on the differences between the House and the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, ROGERS of Texas, MOSS, ROSTENKOWSKI, KORNEGAY, HULL, BENNETT of Michigan, YOUNGER, CUNNINGHAM, BROYHILL of North Carolina.

ACTION AGAINST CASTRO'S SUPPLIES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a good sign for those who believe in getting rid of Castro in this hemisphere that the Department of State has just advised that any aid given to the United Kingdom, France, Yugoslavia, Spain, and Morocco will be terminated under the provisions of the Fascell-Rogers amendment, section 620(a)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

This legislation provides that with certain exceptions no funds available under the act shall be used to furnish assistance to any country that has not taken appropriate steps by February 14 to prevent its ships and aircraft from carrying any equipment, materials, or commodities to and from Cuba.

That the intent of Congress in respect to these countries that they should receive no aid is a first step in showing that

we do mean business about isolating and getting rid of Castro. A second step should be to close our ports to ships of any nation which allows any of its ships to trade with Cuba. Thirdly, we need increased activity by the Organization of American States, with full U.S. backing, to take the necessary steps to isolate Cuba to eliminate communism's Castro.

I want to commend Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann, for firming up this Government's position against Castro's suppliers.

DUAL COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 624, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and pending that I yield myself such time as I shall require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 624 provides for consideration of H.R. 7381, a bill to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, making it in order to consider the substitute amendment now in the bill as an original bill.

The general purposes of H.R. 7381 are to aid the Federal Government in obtaining the best qualified people available for hard-to-fill civilian positions; to provide reasonably uniform and fair treatment for retired military personnel with respect to their employment in Federal civilian positions; to provide appropriate safeguards so that Federal civilian employment of retired military personnel will not grant such personnel unfair advantage over civilian employees or unduly hamper career opportunities for civilian employees; and to consolidate and simplify the present numerous and confusing statutes on dual compensation and dual employment in the Federal Government.

This legislation is the outcome of more than 8 years of intensive studies and discussion within the executive branch, appropriate committees of the Congress, and representatives of employee, veterans, and retired military personnel organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 624.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 7381 and, as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] said, this is to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think it can be safely said this is very necessary and corrective legislation.

The general purposes of this legislation are to aid the Federal Government in obtaining the best qualified people available to fill civilian positions; to provide reasonably uniform and fair treatment for retired military personnel with respect to their employment in Federal civilian positions; to provide appropriate safeguards so that Federal civilian employment of retired military personnel will not grant such personnel unfair advantage over civilian employees or unduly hamper career opportunities for civilian employees; and to consolidate and simplify the present numerous and confusing statutes on dual compensation and dual employment in the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, there are far too many laws. There has been a proliferation in this field. This is quite natural, because we go back to the original statute, which was written in 1894, and that is a long way back.

When this particular law was passed, $2,500 was a fairly considerable sum of money. Members of Congress then received $5,000 a year. This is a thing to be contemplated and digested. Assistant Secretaries of Cabinet departments were generally paid between $3,500 and $4,500 a year. Chief clerks of departments and chiefs of major divisions, most of whom would be in the higher grades of the Classification Act today, were paid $2,500 a year.

A retired major with 30 years of service in 1894 would have been retired at slightly over $2,500 a year, and, of course, a major in 1894 held a higher relative military rank than a major of today.

For these reasons, if for no others, this whole statute had to be gone over with care and revamped. H.R. 7381 does something that is long overdue. It passed the Rules Committee unanimously. I believe there was very slight objection to it in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, page 2 of the rule refers to the recommended committee amendment which may be considered as an original bill. I think this serves to point out that this whole problem was to a degree compromised in our committee. It was the result of many months of hard work; in fact, many years of consideration. We had several days of public hearings. I think it is a correct statement to make that this bill reflects areas that are somewhat complicated and confusing. Yet we hope that we will be able to simplify it sufficiently to where the measure will not be controversial, because I believe that this is highly important legislation. I think that we must act on this matter and solve this problem right now.

In an effort to arrive at this compromise, as found in this bill, after holding several days of hearings and after discussing the matter in executive session, we formed a subcommittee, an ad hoc group, to go back and meet with representatives of the executive branch to iron out some of the minor technical details and arrive at some solution that would be acceptable to everyone. This measure, regardless of how complicated and confusing it was, was approved by the committee by an overwhelming vote.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], the main purpose, the main objective of this legislation is to recodify many archaic statutes now on the lawbooks. There are approximately 40 acts of Congress involved with this same subject, and approximately 200 separate rulings of the Comptroller General. This is really a ridiculous situation as it exists right now. We do not know what the law is actually on this particular subject. The first law goes back to 1894. Obviously that should be revised and brought up to date. We had another act in 1916 and one in 1932. As I have said, there have been approximately 37 others. So it stands to reason that the time has come for us to rewrite this complicated group of laws so that the people downtown will know what the intentions of Congress are.

There are two other situations that need immediate correction. This bill points up the confusion that exists in the present situation. We have 475 retired military officers, retired Reserve officers, who have been told that they have been overpaid for the past few years. They are told that they would have to pay as high as $30,000 apiece as a refund to the Federal Government. That is the ruling of the Comptroller General of the United States. We have introduced legislation to clarify what the Congress originally intended in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General was holding up the enforcement of his ruling until the end of the next session. Now, that we are going to act on the measure at this session, he has given these people additional time by holding

up the enforcement of his ruling until April 30 in order to give the Congress an opportunity to act.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we have a group of around 870 warrant officers who will actually be dismissed. These are temporary or Reserve warrant officers who will actually be taken off the Federal payroll entirely if this corrective, clarifying legislation is not enacted. In fact, some of these warrant officers will be called upon, due to an error in interpreting the law of the past and by virtue of that error, to pay back to the U.S. Government amounts in some instances which range as high as $50,000 a year.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we do something now at the earliest possible date to clarify what Congress really intended in passing all of these previous dual compensation laws. Actually, about 90 percent of the retired military people who are on the civilian payroll will not be affected as a result of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of the legislation, as has been stated by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], is to streamline and to simplify these various laws which have been passed. We do plan, however, by this proposed legislation, to make it possible for the Federal Government to utilize more of the experienced and well-educated retired Regular officers.

Mr. Speaker, we do correct by this bill some inequities which I think will help to strengthen the law and eliminate some of the abuses which we now have. I refer to the buddy system of hiring and promoting retired military personnel.

Mr. Speaker, by and large, this is a good bill and is a sound bill.

As I said before, it is most essential that we act on it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is speaking of retired military personnel. I am a retired Reserve officer. Is the gentleman speaking of Regular officers and Reserve officers when he speaks of military personnel retiring or is he just speaking of the Regulars?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Primarily, the bill will only affect the retired Regular officers, insofar as permitting them to accept civilian Government jobs.

At the present time there are no restrictions on Reserve officers or retired enlisted men from the standpoint of accepting civilian Government positions and receiving their full retirement pay.

This bill makes no change in that respect, other than, let us say, eliminating some of the veterans' preference rights whereby retired Reserve officers with 20 years who can now go in and bump a civilian career employee who had only 4 years of active duty during wartime, is true at the present time.

Again, the only effect it has on the retired people is to make it a little more difficult for them to come in and obtain a civilian Government job.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, in your judgment is the bill adequate in its coverage when it only covers one part of the military retired personnel and not the other?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I should like to point out that the executive branch in originally recommending this legislation did recommend that Reserve officers and enlisted men also be covered by a similar restriction or limitation from the standpoint of receiving retired pay, which we are now providing for the Regular Army retired personnel.

However, 95 percent of the retired people are reservists, and there was a storm of opposition to that approach. There did not appear to be much of an opportunity of getting it approved.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman had started to touch on my next question, and that is this: When you speak of retired military personnel, you seem to be speaking only of officers and not of enlisted men. Does this cover both classes, or only officers?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The only people who are affected are retired Regular officers. The retired enlisted men are exempt as the result of previous legislation. We merely confirm that approach in this legislation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman recommends the passage of the bill anyway even though there is not contained in the bill that coverage?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I say to the gentleman that this is the best compromise we could come up with. Any bill of the far-reaching scope as this one cannot be perfect because there are too many people involved. However, I am proud of the job which the committee did in attacking this very complicated problem.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, there is another question in my own mind and that is this: There have been various comments by speakers here today with reference to the action of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in handling this legislation. They say that there has been some little opposition. What was the vote on the bill when it came out of the committee?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I believe the bill as finally compromised was approved by a vote of 12 to 1 with one member voting "present."

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. How many members are on the committee?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Twenty-five members on the committee.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. There were 12 members not voting?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I cannot answer for those. I say the committee seemed to be in harmony on a very complicated problem.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not think there is any discrimination as between classes and groups so that we might be rendering an injustice here by voting these extra rules on an already confusing situation?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. This bill does not create inequities. As a matter of fact, it eliminates some inequities which exist at the present time. This is a step forward. There will remain certain inequities if we consider retired officers and Reserve officers to be treated alike. Some of us feel that there is a distinction. The administration felt they all should be treated alike. They are not being treated alike now, and this bill does not treat them all alike.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7381, with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of H.R. 7381 is to establish, in a single statute, a firm policy with respect to dual compensation and dual employment in Federal civilian positions which will best serve the interests of the Government and the public and which will be fair, workable, and reasonably uniform in its application throughout the Government and among all categories of Federal personnel.

This is truly a committee bill, worked out with the greatest care and diligence by the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in order to implement an official administration proposal submitted by the U.S. Civil Service Commission. Enactment of H.R. 7381 will accomplish these five major objectives.

It will materially facilitate the recruitment and retention of personnel with unusual or unique qualifications for "hard-to-fill" civilian positions.

It will guarantee fair and reasonable uniform treatment for all classes of retired military personnel with respect to their employment in Federal civilian positions.

It will provide appropriate safeguards against any preferential treatment as

between retired military personnel and career civilian employees in respect to Federal civilian employment.

It will protect career advancement opportunities for civilian employees by preventing any unfair preference to retired military personnel.

And it will consolidate and simplify present numerous, confusing, and in many cases conflicting, statutes on dual compensation and dual employment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to grant favorable consideration of H.R. 7381 with the amendment recommended by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that when this bill was before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service we were deeply involved in the consideration of the foreign giveaway bill in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was not possible for me to be able to attend the hearings or the markup of the bill. Therefore, I pose as no expert on this legislation but I do have some definite ideas concerning it.

Mr. Chairman, the stated purpose of H.R. 7381 is to simplify, modernize, and consolidate laws relating to the employment of civilians working for the Federal Government who are also on retired pay from the military services. H.R. 7381 also opens the Government's employment doors, with certain restrictions, to allow nondisabled Regular officers, who are retired, to start a new civilian career.

It is estimated that approximately 450,000 officers and enlisted personnel will have retired from active duty between 1963–70. Of this 450,000, less than 10 percent, or about 42,000, will be nondisabled Regular officers. Nondisabled Regular officers are today restricted from drawing retired pay and holding a full-time Government job. The other 90 percent—disabled Regular officers, Reserve officers, and all enlisted men—may now retire and draw both their retired pay and full pay in Government jobs.

Chairman Macy, of the Civil Service Commission, advanced this legislation as necessary to provide the Government with much needed talent that he says is now being lost through legal restrictions. The statistics, as I have indicated, reveal that only about 10 percent of retired military personnel is restricted in the holding of Government civilian jobs.

If the losing of know-how is so great then we should question military retirement policies and laws. It is most difficult to understand why a 40-year-old, well-trained military electronic expert, representing an investment to the Government of tens of thousands of dollars, should be permitted to retire at the height of his ability. We are supposed to have a pushbutton war concept today, but some of our retirement policies reflect the era of the horse cavalry.

Given as another reason for this proposed legislation is the "buddy system" of employment. Some 3 years ago, the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee made a detailed analysis of the methods by which some military personnel were retired and immediately hired as career civilian employees.

Time and again our subcommittee found that a job was being especially written to fit a particular military person who was retiring. Time and again we found instances of jobs being held open pending the retirement of a particular friend. In the course of our investigation the term "quickie appointment" was coined by the members and the press. We found instances where jobs were conveniently changed from military to civilian. The serviceman retired one day and came back the next to the same desk as a civilian. Incidentally, the Government found itself paying considerably more for the same work.

Recent examples of the buddy system in operation in the military departments:

CASE (A)

A lieutenant colonel, specialized in chemistry, retired as a Reserve officer after 20 years service on December 21, 1963, from an Army activity in Maryland and then during the first week in January 1964, was hired by the Army to work at the Pentagon as a housing officer at grade GS–11. He was not hired from a register since the Civil Service Commission did not have a register for housing officers. The Army claims that they could not find housing officers and they had to resort to the hiring of this chemistry engineer. There must be hundreds of GS–9 career civilians in the Army, with the necessary background, that were ready and available for such a promotion.

CASE (B)

An Air Force major was retired on August 30, 1963, at the Minot Air Force Base and then accepted an assignment as a contracting officer on September 4, 1963, at Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak.

CASE (C)

A lieutenant colonel in the Air Force retired on March 31, 1963, with 24 years service as a Reserve officer and on July 5, 1963, became chief of an operations section at a GS–14 salary at another base in Ohio.

CASE (D)

An Army colonel on special assignment to NASA at Huntsville, Ala., retired from active duty on October 30, 1963, and on November 1, continued the job as a civilian for NASA.

As a result of the efforts of the subcommittee, the Defense Department issued what is known as the Gilpatric memo which supposedly put the brakes on "quickie appointments." The Gilpatric memo, still in effect, says that a person retiring from a particular activity cannot be appointed to a civilian job in that activity within 6 months. The trouble lies in the fact that the "buddy system" crosses geographic lines as well as service lines. Within the last few months the subcommittee has learned of many instances wherein servicemen retired at one activity and within a few weeks or days went to work as a civilian at another activity.

H.R. 7381 is designed to prohibit this practice and the "buddy system" within the Defense Department, but unless there is an extensive cooling off period throughout the entire Government—between the time a serviceman retires and he enters upon a civilian job in Government—the abuses that exist are not likely to be eliminated.

Veterans preference has often been raised by career civilians as a sore spot resulting from the hiring of retired military personnel. Under existing legislation a retired military man, with, for example, 20 years of service, can go to work for the Government as a civilian and at the end of 2 years will have 22 years of Government service which becomes invaluable in the case of a reduction in force. The subcommittee has found instances of veterans of World War II, with some 4 years of war service and 15 years of career civilian service in the Government, being bumped by a retired serviceman who actually has less than 4 years of career civilian service but 20 years as a professional in the military service. To the credit of the proposed bill, it would eliminate all military credits except those gained in time of war. I understand that the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other service organizations support this provision.

Again it is claimed that this legislation is necessary to correct what is described as unfairness and confusion arising from a situation involving 475 retired Reserve officers and an unknown number of warrant officers who have been found by the Comptroller General to have received illegal dual compensation as employees of the Federal Government.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul, testifying before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee last July, stated that the liability of some of these officers would be as much as $30,000 each.

Comptroller General Campbell has withheld action to force collection for these illegal collections pending action on dual compensation by Congress. Subsections (g) and (h) of section 202 of this bill would provide relief for these officers.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is sadly defective in many respects. No reduction in retirement pay is provided for enlisted men and Reserve officers who are given civilian employment in Government. It does reduce the retirement of a Regular officer to $2,000, plus one-half the remainder.

The question is: "Why continue to discriminate between Regular and Reserve officers?" One of the original purposes was to eliminate discrimination between these categories of service personnel but the bill continues to discriminate.

But the worst defect is that no ceiling is imposed upon approximately 90 percent of these retirees. Look at the ceilings imposed upon those who are trying to live under social security at an average of $76.81 per month, with a limitation of $1,200 a year upon earnings. If a beneficiary of social security earns between $1,200 and $1,700 a year there is a deduction of $250, and if the earning is more than $1,700 a year there is a dollar for dollar deduction. And what of the limitation upon the widow of a war veteran?

Congress wisely set up a retirement system for military personnel to which the servicemen makes no contribution whatever. The costs of that retirement system are now approximately $1.4 billion a year and steadily increasing. Who will pay the bills if civilians are to be denied employment in favor of dual compensation for retired members of the military?

I have no desire to work a hardship upon any retired military personnel but I predict the day will come when Congress will be called upon to take drastic action in this regard. This bill falls far short of meeting the situation that exists. It should be recommitted to the committee for further study and the preparation of a bill that will at least eliminate the abuses that exist rather than condone them as this legislation does.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, there has been no disagreement that existing laws controlling civilian employment of retired military personnel and the laws controlling dual employment of civilians are obsolete, unfair, confusing, and difficult to administer. The record is full of cases of inadvertent hardship and injustice resulting solely from the erroneous interpretation of the laws.

The unfairness is readily apparent because of the fact that there are now so many statutory and judicial exceptions to the dual employment prohibition of the act of July 31, 1894, that the prohibition now applies only to one category of retired military personnel—retired Regular officers. The prohibition no longer applies to enlisted men or to Reserve officers as it did when the law was enacted in 1894.

In the case of those retired military personnel who may be employed, some are subject to the $10,000 limitation on the receipt of combined civilian salary and retired pay imposed by section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932. Others can be employed and receive their full civilian pay and their full retired pay. This confusion arises by reason of the 40 or more statutory exceptions and amendments that have been enacted to the basic 1894 and 1932 acts.

As a further complication, it quite frequently is difficult to determine which military category a particular individual is in, thus leading to another Comptroller General decision. Each year numerous private bills are introduced to relieve employees of overpayments of military retired pay or civilian salary resulting from these understandable errors in interpretation and the dozens of judicial and Comptroller General decisions. There have been so many reversals of the decisions that no one is quite sure which decision represents the current interpretation of the law.

The obsolete nature of the dual employment and dual compensation laws is shown by the fact that one law enacted in 1894 was intended originally as a limitation on the combined pension and salary. It now serves to bar absolutely retired Regular officers from nearly all Government employment.

Mr. Chairman, the principal purpose of the reported bill is to consolidate and to simplify the present numerous and confusing statutes in dual compensation and dual employment in the Federal Government.

If I may, I would like to summarize the major features of H.R. 7381, as reported with a proposed amendment. The reported bill will repeal all of the confusing provisions on dual compensation and dual employment. The new provisions will provide two limitations on the receipt of dual compensation.

The first will be found in section 201 of the bill, which prescribes a limitation on the amount of retired pay that an officer of a Regular component of the uniformed services may receive while he is employed as a civilian employee.

The second will be found in section 301 and will limit civilian employees to compensation equivalent to compensation of one full-time job or, in the case of part-time civilian employees, to compensation for a combination of part-time positions equaling the compensation of one full-time position.

We provide relief in subsection (g) and (h) of section 201 for the 475 retired Reserve officers and at least 870 warrant officers who have received overpayments because of the erroneous application of these confusing statutes. A full explanation of these cases is contained in the hearings, starting at the bottom of page 78.

Appropriate safeguards are established under sections 204 and 205 to assure that consideration of retired military personnel for civilian positions is accomplished on an equitable competitive basis and to require a strict compliance in spirit and in procedure with the fundamental merit system principle of open job competition. These sections are intended to do away with the so-called "buddy" system under which a position is created or held open at a military installation for a buddy about to retire from the military service. This undesirable practice has been recognized by officials of the Department of Defense and procedures to safeguard the merit system were set forth in memorandums issued by the Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric. Section 204 includes provisions embodying the essence of the Gilpatric policy.

Section 202 of the reported bill provides a more equitable method for the career civilian employee to compete with the military retiree who holds a civilian position whenever an agency is forced to undergo a reduction in force. Under existing law, the military retiree generally has two advantages. He is entitled to top priority if he has veterans' preference and is entitled to count his military service for length of service retention points in connection with the reduction in force.

Under section 202, the military retiree will be placed in a top category position on the basis of his veterans' preference only if his retirement is based on certain types of disability, or if his military service does not include 20 or more years of full-time active service. There are included, of course, adequate savings provisions for those military retirees who are now employed in civilian positions.

The military retiree will be entitled to credit his military service for reduction-in-force purposes only for the length of time in active service during any war or in any campaign or expedition. If he has retired for certain types of disability, he will be authorized to count all of his military service. Here again, we also included adequate savings provisions for those who are now employed in a civilian position.

Section 203 contains one additional feature which will provide a more equitable method for military retirees who are employed in civilian positions to count their military service for leave accrual purposes. Here again, they will be permitted to count only military service performed in the Armed Forces during any war or in any campaign or, in the case of retirement for certain types of disability, they may count all of their military service. This benefit also has an appropriate savings clause. Under existing law all military service is counted.

Mr. Chairman, we recognize that these provisions still are not acceptable to everyone. The reported bill is a compromise. I believe it embodies the best of the recommendations and is the most fair and workable approach which most nearly meets the needs of the public interest and the interest of the veterans, the military retirees, and the career civilian employees.

H.R. 7381 was initiated on the basis of an official recommendation of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, following more than 8 years of intensive study and discussion within the executive branch, appropriate committees of the Congress, and the various organizations of civilian employees, veterans, and retired military personnel.

The Civil Service Commission recommended that military retirees, whether officers or enlisted men, Regular or Reserve, be treated uniformly in establishing eligibility for Federal civilian employment and in applying the compensation limitations.

The reported bill adopts this recommendation in part by repealing the 1894 statutory provision and the various amendments which together prohibited uniform treatment in eligibility for employment, so that hereafter there will be uniformity in eligibility for employment.

The committee did not agree with the recommendation of the administration to subject enlisted men and reservists who with few exceptions now are not subject to any dual compensation limitation, to a requirement for reduction in retirement pay when employed in a civilian position.

As I have stated, section 201 of the amendment requires a reduction in retirement pay only for Regular officers who for the first time will be able to compete for Federal civilian employment.

The committee rejected as unwarranted, at the present time, the Civil Service Commission recommendation to limit the veterans' preference status granted by section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, or to change the

method of crediting military service for civil service retirement purposes.

Sections 202 and 203 of the reported bill adopt the Commission recommendation, in a modified form, to restrict the use of veterans' preference and the counting of military service for reduction in force purposes, and the counting of military service for annual leave purposes.

Another major objective of this legislation is to provide a means to aid the Federal Government in obtaining the best qualified people available for hard-to-fill positions. The bill provides reasonably uniform and fair treatment for retired military personnel attempting to obtain employment in Federal civilian positions. It provides, in sections 204 and 205, appropriate safeguards so that Federal civilian employment of retired military personnel will not place the military retirees in an unfair advantage over career civilian employees or unduly hamper career opportunities for civilian employees.

Mr. Chairman, another reason the existing laws governing dual employment and dual compensation are harmful is that in prohibiting the employment of retired Regular officers, they deprive the Government of the services of certain highly trained retired military personnel whose technical skills, often acquired at Government expense, are in short supply and are needed in Federal agencies.

During our hearings we were advised that some 22 critically skilled categories are listed as hard-to-fill categories by the Department of Defense. The number of civilian employees in those categories is approximately 24,000. As of December 31, 1962, there were 1,055 vacancies in these hard-to-fill categories in the Department of Defense. It is estimated that unless there is a change in the present law to permit the utilization of retired officers of a Regular component, there will be approximately 4,000 to 6,000 Regular officers in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1970 who will be precluded from competing for Federal civilian employment. A considerable number of these officers have worked on programs and projects requiring skills and knowledge while on active duty that qualify them for the hard-to-fill positions. A complete discussion of this problem and a listing of the categories may be found on page 80 and page 90 of the hearings. An almost identical situation exists in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which is described starting on page 125 of the hearings. The reported bill will permit the Government to utilize the needed skills of this group of military retirees.

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, the reported bill is a compromise. I believe it represents a good compromise, reasonable and fair to all as compared with the difficult and confusing state of the existing law. The situation needs to be corrected now.

I urge your favorable consideration of the reported bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the time this bill was reported out of the committee I voted to report it out but I did so with a minimum of enthusiasm. At the same time, I stated that I reserved the right to oppose the bill on the floor if after further study it seemed to me that was justified.

I have two major observations to make about the bill. I do have definitely mixed feelings about it. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], has done a prodigious amount of work. I do not discount the job that has been done. I do think there are some important things in the bill that should be accomplished, that are desirable and needed.

My main objection, and the reason I shall support a motion to recommit, and the reason why I am going to be completely unenthusiastic if I do vote for the bill in the event the recommittal motion fails, goes to two points. In the first place, this bill does not cut the Gordian knot of the real problem of dual compensation. I am advised by the committee staff a survey shows there is no government other than the United States that provides for this sort of a situation, in which retirees drawing retirement pay from the Government can secure employment in the Government and draw full compensation simultaneously with the drawing of retirement pay.

I also understand a survey provides no evidence that this practice is carried out by private enterprise and industry in this country. With the kind of national debt we have, with the kind of deficit we are having, and with the kind of taxes the people will still have to pay, even if the $11 billion tax reduction bill passes, I know there are a great many American people who just do not see any sense, equity, or justice whatever in the ability of retirees of the military—and I am for the military—drawing full or a substantial portion of their retirement pay, then receiving full compensation on the job.

This particular problem has not been met. In fact, it is aggravated in the sense if we permit the $2,000 maximum income of a retiree and superimpose upon that the pay for Federal employment, we are liberalizing that so far as the retired Regular Army officers are concerned. This bill, of course, does nothing at all about the Reserve retired officers. The lid is off there. So, at best it is a liberalization and at its worst it is no effort at all to cut the Gordian knot.

On the other side of the picture this bill is rank in its discrimination. I recall a week before last and last week there were a great many tears shed and a great deal of blood shed on the floor over the evils of discrimination. Here, you have built-in discrimination within the military because you have one set of rules with regard to the retired Regular Army officers with a $2,000 limitation on retirement pay, if they are employed by the Government subsequent to retirement. You have no such restriction whatever on the retired Reserve officers who are employed. That is only a small part of the story of rank and inexcusable discrimination.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] pointed out the discrimination as between this procedure and that applied to very low retirement income of beneficiaries of the social security system.

I want to point out a further area of discrimination. I refer to the career civil service employee retiree. If he returns to work for the Federal Government after retirement his pay for this job is reduced by the amount of the pension. For example, a man retires from the Federal Government with a retired amount of $6,000. He then takes a job as a consultant for $13,000 a year. The $6,000 retirement is deducted from the $13,000, and he is paid in salary only the difference of $7,000. There is a major area of discrimination which this bill not only does not correct but in certain respects aggravates.

On this basis and because of these considerations I shall vote for recommittal and quite possibly against final passage.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there was an amendment adopted to this bill by our committee 10 to 5. A short time thereafter Mr. Macy appeared before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and said about the amendment that he would rather see no bill at all than to see the bill with the amendment.

What does this amendment do? According to the committee report on page 11, referring to sections 204 and 205, this is what the amendment does:

> These sections are intended to do away with the so-called buddy system under which a position is created or held open at a military installation for a buddy about to retire from the military service.

That is in the report. Then the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Honorable John Macy, says to the committee in the Senate that he had rather see no bill at all than see the bill with that amendment in it.

The amendment also states that 30 days' notice shall be given when a job is open and that an assembled examination, including written tests, oral interviews, and security investigation, where practicable, should be given.

I say again the Members of this body should be mighty cautious about the Civil Service Commission's taking a position against an amendment providing that there should be no buddy system in filling these jobs which become vacant.

I include a copy of a bill at this point which I introduced December 10, 1963. It is similar to the amendment to which I refer.

H.R. 9407

A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to notice and examinations in connection with appointments to positions in the competitive civil service

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person shall not be appointed to any civilian office in the competitive civil service unless (1) the United States Civil Service Commission shall have given prior public notice of the fact that a vacancy exists in such office

and of the fact that an assembled examination (including written tests, oral interviews, and security investigation), where practicable, or a combination of an assembled or nonassembled examination, where practicable, open to all persons, is to be given at a specific time and place, but not before the thirtieth day after the date such notice is first given, and (2) such office is filled only from among those qualified persons who successfully complete such examination.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, there is only one part of this bill that actually liberalizes the present dual compensation situation. We propose to repeal the 1894 act.

The 1894 act imposed a limitation of $2,500, which at that time was a rather liberal one. In fact, only those military retirees who retired with the rank of major and above were subject to the limitation at that time. Members of Congress then were receiving $3,500 a year and Cabinet members $4,000. In today's labor market the limitation is unrealistic. We are told that the Government is suffering. We are losing the experience, the skill, and power of the retired regular officer.

That is the reason we are permitting the retired regular officer to be employed. We are merely saying, he will receive his first $2,000 of retired pay and one-half of his retired pay in excess of that amount.

There are many ways in which we are strengthening existing law. These limitations have been pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. We are strengthening the veterans' preference situation for the veteran who fought for his country for a short period in wartime who is not receiving retired pay by protecting him from being bumped by another veteran who has served 20 years in the military and who is retired on full retirement pay. That is what can be done now. A retired Reserve officer or retired enlisted man under existing law can come to work for the Federal Government without any restrictions whatsoever and receive full-time pay and bump a civilian employee in a reduction in force. We are improving that situation. If the retired military person has 20 years of service and is receiving retirement pay, he cannot use his military service to bump the civilian employee. That is an improvement. We also are preventing the retired military person with more than 20 years of service from counting that service toward accumulated leave. That certainly is an improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to highlight just two of the many reasons why I am urging favorable consideration of H.R. 7381.

First, H.R. 7381, as proposed to be amended by our committee, will place into one simple and easily understood law all dual compensation restrictions and thus will overcome the many administrative problems and hardships which have been brought upon our employees as a result of the existing legislative confusion. This accomplishment by itself is ample justification for your favorable consideration of this legislation here today. We found little, if any, objection to this part of the proposal.

Everyone seems to agree that the existing laws governing civilian employment of retired military personnel and the existing laws governing dual employment of civilians are unfair, complex, and confusing to administer. The difficulty lies in finding a solution which is acceptable. Also, it is well recognized that the existing laws are continually causing inadvertent hardship and injustice.

The three major statutory limitations are contained in section 2 of the Dual Office Holding Act of July 31, 1894, section 6 of the act of May 10, 1916, relating to the prohibition against receiving compensation for more than one civilian position and section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, prescribing a combined $10,000 limitation on the receipt of retired pay and civilian compensation.

These three laws were fairly simple and affected relatively few people at the time of enactment. However, the amendments now make the restrictions so complicated as to confuse even lawyers in the Federal Government whose duty it is to administer them.

The General Accounting Office representatives testified before our committee that there was no single category of cases relating to officers and employees of the Federal Government that has been the subject of so many frequently reoccurring questions as has the disposition of cases under these laws. It was pointed out that few general statutory restrictions have been the subject of so many exemptions by statutory and judicial interpretation.

The Department of Defense witnesses confirmed this condition and stated that while the basic statutory restrictions contained in the original acts were not difficult to administer, the exemptions granted by statute, judicial interpretations, and decisions of the Comptroller General have created a situation which now is most confusing, complex, and almost impossible to administer.

This situation has resulted in many of our retired military personnel accepting Federal employment in good faith and with approval of the employing agencies, only to find at some later date that they were unemployable in the first place or, if employable, were subject to the compensation limitations. I need only cite two recent situations, each of which will be corrected by the provisions of this bill, to highlight the confusion surrounding the application of these laws to our retired military personnel.

This brings me to the second point I wish to discuss. It long had been held that Reserve officers were not subject to the dual compensation restrictions of the act of June 30, 1932. However, on July 9, 1962, the Comptroller General held that Reserve officers of the Army or the Air Force who were serving on active duty in temporary grades at which they were appointed under section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 equal to or higher than their Reserve grades at the time of retirement for physical disability may not be considered as having been retired under laws relating to Reserve officers, which would exempt them from the dual compensation restrictions.

It has been determined that there are approximately 475 Reserve officers who are affected by this decision, and nearly 225 had a combined retired pay and civilian income in excess of $10,000. Consequently, since October 1, 1962, the retired pay of these officers has been reduced to the $10,000 limitation.

The Comptroller General has ruled that retroactive collection action may be postponed until April 30, 1964. However, if legislation is not enacted and the collection becomes necessary, the liability to the Government by some of these officers will be over $30,000. Section 201(g) of the reported bill will correct this situation as of the date they were first employed after retirement.

The other group of officers are retired temporary warrant officers of the Army and the Air Force. These officers, also, were considered as not being subject to the 1894 Dual Office Holding Act. It has now been held that certain temporary warrant officers are subject to the limitations in the same manner as Regular warrant officers.

The Department of Defense has identified 872 temporary warrant officers whose employment will have to be terminated unless relief legislation is enacted. Some of these warrant officers have been employed since 1956, with overpayments totaling in some cases as much as $50,000. Section 201(h) of the reported bill will overcome this difficulty.

I believe the time is long since past for eliminating the legislative and judicial monstrosity that has grown up around the dual compensation and dual employment laws.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, there is no objection concerning the consolidation of the existing laws or for granting relief to the Reserve officers and the warrant officers. There was much objection, however, to the recommendations of the administration on the proposal to apply the reduction in retirement pay to all groups of military retirees, whether Regular or Reserve, or whether officers or enlisted men, including those groups which are not now subject to any employment restriction or compensation limitation. Also, there was tremendous objection to the proposal to exclude military retirees from veterans' preference benefits or to prohibit them from counting military service as a civilian employee for purposes of reduction in force, civil service retirement, or annual leave accumulation.

It became apparent to me that enactment of this very desirable legislation would be jeopardized unless these proposals were modified. I was pleased to join my colleagues on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in arriving at the compromise embodied in H.R. 7381, as reported by our committee. These compromise provisions have been explained by my colleagues. I believe they are in the best interests of the agencies which need the vital services of our experienced military retirees, as well as in the best interests of the civilian employees who have a right not to have their civilian careers jeopardized by recently employed military retirees. I am

convinced that the compromise is in the best interests of the military retirees who will be able to expect fair treatment in their attempts to obtain civilian employment.

This is very important legislation, Mr. Chairman, and as I said earlier during the debate on the rule, we have worked hard trying to come up with a compromise solution. I know the legislation tends to be confusing. But there are a few simple things that need to be done. We have had pointed out to us repeatedly here the situation with reference to all these confusing and complicated laws that the administration itself, the executive branch, finds extremely difficult to interpret. It shows poor housekeeping on the part of the Congress for us not to face up to the task to do something to simplify these laws and say what we mean and that is primarily what we are attempting to do in this legislation that we are considering today.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the reported bill is desirable legislation. It will afford the Government the opportunity to avail itself of the shortage category skills of retired regular officers which now is not available to the Government. I believe the legislative proposal contains adequate safeguards so that the careers of our civilian employees will not be jeopardized unnecessarily by the employment of military retirees.

While the proposal will eliminate some of the benefits now enjoyed by military retirees under the Veterans' Preference Act in connection with reductions in force, I feel that the compromise on this point is the best solution we could reach at the present time and still offer the protection that is necessary to the career employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Congress, I thank my colleague from Louisiana for yielding to me. I have just a very few brief remarks.

If this legislation is passed, it will extend to the military something that no other group in America has. For instance, let us say a man retired from the General Motors Corp. and then goes back to work. He has to give up his retirement. That is accepted in every industry in the land. A retired civil service employee anywhere in the Government, when he is called back into his particular category, gives up his retirement. To show you that this bill is an inequity in itself, a Reserve officer working side by side with a Regular officer is in this position: the Reserve officer is not restricted whatsoever in what he might draw, but the Regular officer is. That is one reason why this bill should be recommitted. We should make it so that men working side by side will be treated equally. This penalizes the regular civil service employee. We are making class legislation if we pass this bill today. I do not believe that Congress wants to do that, because as one distinguished gentleman says, this only affects 10 percent. I heard the distinguished gentleman, Mr. Webb, from NASA, say there was one gentleman whose services were desired by NASA who would not come to work for this Federal agency unless he got $27,000 a year. NASA could only pay $19,000. This gentleman said, "If I cannot keep my retirement pay at $7,000 a year, then I cannot work for NASA." Yet Mr. Webb himself and all his assistants do not draw anywhere near that amount of money. Mr. Webb draws $22,500 as the Administrator, and his assistant $21,000 and it goes on down the line to the deputy administrator, who draws about $21,000, and on down.

This bill is discriminatory in every sense of the word. I believe in most of it with the exception of this part dealing with Regular officers. If there is any equity at all, it should be recommitted and Regular officers be allowed to draw everything that the Reserve officer does. It is proposed to penalize the Regular officer in not allowing him to do what the Reserve officer does. I do not know the thinking that is involved here. I think this should be recommitted and reconsidered.

You are saying that under social security 75 million may draw only $1,524—and the average, according to the gentleman from Iowa, is only $912—and that if they draw $1,200 more in civilian life they start cutting off their retirement. What kind of legislation is this that Congress proposes to enact? They say that this is part of military pay, but they do not pay one penny toward their retirement. At the same time those under social security do pay, as do their employers. Contributions are deducted from their pay. Contributions are deducted from your pay and mine, as Members of Congress for retirement. Yet the military do not pay one single penny.

How can one say to the disabled veterans and the widows of veterans and the great masses of the working people of this country that we are going to give these privileges to one special segment and nobody else?

This legislation was approved in the first place because of the great evil that existed in 1894. The administration said that we must have some laws to keep the military from bringing in their own buddy system and that we should stop this now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] has expired.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 7381, a bill which will simplify the dual employment and dual compensation laws.

The present statutes which impose restrictions on the employment of retired members of the uniformed services are confusing, discriminating, and very complex. But even more important, they are undoubtedly denying to the Government the special skills of many persons that are needed in our defense effort.

In addition to consolidating, simplifying, and modernizing the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the military services, this bill also will provide relief to a group of non-Regular warrant officers and to a group of retired Reserve officers who were retired for disability in a temporary grade.

As you know, a recent decision by the Comptroller General held that non-Regular warrant officers who are now and have been employed by the Federal Government, are subject to the 1894 dual employment statute which prohibits their employment by the Federal Government. The result of this decision means that this group of non-Regular warrant officers are faced not only with dismissal from Federal civilian service but are also faced with claims for back pay.

In another 1962 decision, the Comptroller General held that the protection of the 1947 law which made inapplicable the restriction imposed by the Dual Compensation Act of 1932 on the employment of retired Reserve officers, did not apply to that group of retired Reserve officers who were retired for disability which serving in a temporary grade.

I am particularly concerned in securing relief for these two groups who have been adversely affected by the decision of the Comptroller General.

I am pleased that relief in these two instances has been provided in this bill, thus making it necessary to pass special legislation.

I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position of my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on this bill. I recognize that it may cause some dislocations. We never pass legislation that does not adversely affect some people. But I would rather get away from the fringes of the problem and look to the substance of what we are doing here today. It is very easy to make a fine speech about some man getting $30,000 a year, or some man who has certain unique qualifications that are very badly needed, say, by NASA, who can command that kind of money in the market place; and yet we are going to deny NASA the services of that man because of dual compensation.

He does not have to give up his retirement if he goes to work for a contractor who is being paid directly by the Government. When one goes to work for any of the great companies in this country who are supplying the Department of the Air Force and NASA with their products, one can receive $30,000 a year and still retain his retirement pay.

But, while we are talking of $30,000, remember there are very few in that category.

Mr. Chairman, we need these men because of the peculiar nature of their work, because one of the only training grounds and the best training ground for the people that we need in the science and astronautics fields are men who have had Department of Defense training.

We paid for that training. Then, for a pittance, we are going to throw it away. We have a hard enough time competing with the Government contractors, the people who are building airplanes and who are building missiles, in obtaining personnel, without putting this added burden on ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the position taken by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS]. But I, unfortunately, cannot support him. I know the price that we pay, the price we will pay, and if we do not do this, we drive the Government into a fiction of setting up a nonprofit organization into which these men can be hired without respect to their retirement and thus go through another layer, merely to give them the money that is necessary in order to keep them.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say let us be practical in this matter. Let us look at the substance of it. Let us see where the Government is best going to be served, and I am certain if others weigh it as carefully as I have, they will come to the conclusion that this legislation is necessary and will vote for it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as remains on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, it is true that some of the members of the committee worked very hard on this bill and they deserve credit for that work. However, the trouble is this: As they were stirring up what was pretty good soup, they came along and threw a lot of rotten tomatoes in it.

Mr. Chairman, there are many features of this bill which ought to be passed and which should become law. However, they have put into this bill many features that are bad. So, I am going to make what will be an honest motion to recommit the bill, hoping that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will take the bill back, will study it, and will change certain features and eliminate others, and then come back here to the floor of the House with something that we can support enthusiastically and unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, one situation that looks awfully bad here is this: It has been announced by the Department of Defense that as a followup of the military pay raise last year and the proposal this year, that in the future positions in the military shall be paid comparable rates to positions in private enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to keep military pay comparable with the pay of private industry, how in the world can we defend giving a large part of the pension along with the salary? Let us take, for example, a full colonel. He will secure a little less than $10,000 a year as a pension after 30 years. If we exempt the first $2,000 of his retirement pay and if we give him 50 percent of the remainder, this means he would receive $6,000 a year from his retirement, plus the full compensation for his job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the full effect of it. On the one hand we are raising salaries in order to keep men in the military. On the other hand we are proposing by this bill to encourage them to retire.

I think we ought to do one or the other. Why should we encourage with a bill of this kind a man to retire after the Government has trained them for 20 years of service, or 25 or 30? We should be trying to keep him in the service, not encouraging him to get out. Here we add more and more to the confusion with regard to retirement.

The widow of a veteran has a certain limitation, social security has another, the Reserve officers have another. Now we are putting in here a new limitation, and perhaps there will be another one that will come in the form of an amendment. That is, to treat civilian employees and workers as regards retirement pay the same as the military. Why not? You will have set this precedent. Why should you as a Member of Congress not be able to quit, get your retirement, and then go to a department downtown and get a job? There is no reason in the world why you should not. Warrant officers have been mentioned. That should have been and could have been brought in here as a special bill.

They talk about NASA. Believe me, the majority of the officers that will be reemployed will not be in NASA. We all remember a situation that we had just across the river here in Arlington. There were a group of retired officers over there teaching younger officers how to behave when they got to France, Germany, or some other foreign country. Every one of them was a retired officer doing their work under a contract with a private group and hired by the military. If it was that necessary, why not recall them to service? If these people at NASA are so important, why encourage them to retire? It just does not make sense.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope when the time comes we can recommit this bill to the committee in the hope that it may be cleaned up, that it can be ironed out, and the bad portions may be eliminated, and that we may bring some order out of the chaotic conditions that our retirement situation is in.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one point clear as to the situation we will find ourselves in, when we are presented with the motion to recommit.

As I stated in my earlier statements, this matter has been under study for 8 years by the Civil Service Commission and the committees of Congress. We have had full hearings. Every spokesman has said there are some provisions in this bill they agree with, and that are beneficial.

I want to make it crystal clear if you do not want to enact this legislation the way to do it is to vote for a motion to recommit. There is nothing else that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service can do, in my opinion, in the next 8 years to clean up what everybody admits is a bad situation. If after considering the legislation here and all the arguments that have been made, you are not convinced it is better legislation than we now have, you should vote for the motion to recommit, but a vote for a motion to recommit, in my opinion, will have the effect of killing the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If we do recommit the bill, and as the gentleman knows I am in favor of that, the key to any progress from there on is going to involve some very active cooperation by the Committee on Armed Services in the area of the whole retirement problem and cost.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes. That was the next point I wanted to make. The objections and arguments against this bill are all arguments that are pointed out in connection with legislation that is in the jurisdiction of other committees. I think very properly we should not get into that in this legislation. This bill ought to be passed. I would join with the gentlemen in many of these points that they have talked about in other legislation, but our committee and the Committee of the Whole today cannot get into that.

I point out to you that we should pass this bill by a majority of the Congress and then do something about the military retirement system.

The gentleman from Virginia, who has been very interested in this legislation, will agree with me a motion to recommit is a motion to kill the legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I want to reemphasize the point I made: I am not trying to kill the bill, I want it recommitted so we can correct our mistakes before we make them. The gentleman advises the House that we should pass this bill. If we find there are corrections to be made, the corrections should be made before the bill is passed.

Mr. HENDERSON. We debated this in committee. The gentleman correctly pointed out he voted to bring it out, but now he wants it sent back to the committee. We now get into an argument that cannot be resolved, in my opinion, any better than we have it in this legislation today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Dual Compensation Act".

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this Act and the amendments made by this Act—

(1) "uniformed services", "armed forces", "Secretary concerned", "officer", "warrant

officer", "grade", "active duty", "active service", and "member" have the definitions given them by section 101 of title 37, United States Code;

(2) "a retired member of any of the uniformed services" means a member or former member of any of the uniformed services who is entitled, under any provision of law, to retired, retirement, or retainer pay on account of his service as such a member;

(3) "civilian office" means a civilian office or position (including a temporary, part-time, or intermittent position), appointive or elective, in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States (including each corporation owned or controlled by such Government and including nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the jurisdiction of the armed forces) or in the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

TITLE II—EMPLOYMENT OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

SEC. 201. (a) Except as provided by subsections (b), (c), and (e) of this section, a retired officer of any regular component of the uniformed services shall receive the full salary of any civilian office which he holds, but during a period for which he receives salary, his retired or retirement pay shall be reduced to an annual rate equal to the first $2,000 of such pay plus one-half of the remainder, if any. In the operation of the formula for reduction of such pay under this subsection, such amount of $2,000 shall be increased, from time to time, by appropriate percentage, in direct proportion to each increase in such pay effected pursuant to the provisions of section 1401a(b) of title 10, United States Code, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index.

(b) The reduction in retired or retirement pay required by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to a retired officer of any regular component of the uniformed services whose retirement was based on disability (1) resulting from injury or disease received in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict or (2) caused by an instrumentality of war and incurred in line of duty during a period of war (as defined in sections 101 and 301 of title 38, United States Code).

(c) The reduction in retired or retirement pay required by subsection (a) of this section shall not apply to a retired officer of any regular component of the uniformed services employed on a temporary (full-time or part-time) basis, any other part-time basis, or any intermittent basis, for the first thirty-day period for which he receives salary. The exemption from reduction in retired or retirement pay provided by this subsection shall not apply to a period longer than—

(1) the first thirty-day period for which he receives salary under any one appointment from the civilian office in which he is employed, if he is serving under not more than one appointment, and

(2) the first period for which he receives salary under more than one appointment, in any fiscal year, which consists in the aggregate of thirty days, from all civilian offices in which he is employed, if he is serving under more than one appointment in such fiscal year.

(d) For the purposes of subsections (a) and (c) of this section, "period for which he receives salary" means the full calendar period for which he receives salary when employed on a full-time basis but only the days for which he actually receives salary when employed on a part-time or intermittent basis.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the United States Civil Service Commission, subject to the supervision and control of the President, is authorized to prescribe and issue regulations under which exceptions may be made to the restrictions in subsection (a) of this section whenever it is determined by appropriate authority that such exceptions are warranted on the basis of special or emergency employment needs which otherwise cannot be readily met. The President of the Senate with respect to the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the United States House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol with respect to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol each is authorized to provide for a means by which exceptions may be made to the restrictions in subsection (a) of this section whenever he determines that such exceptions are warranted on the basis of special or emergency employment needs which otherwise cannot be readily met. The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is authorized to except, at any time, any individual in a scientific, engineering, or administrative position appointed pursuant to clause (A) of section 203(b)(2) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(2)(A)), from the restrictions in subsection (a) of this section, whenever the Administrator determines that such exception is warranted on the basis of special or emergency employment needs which otherwise cannot be readily met; but not more than thirty such exceptions may exist at any one time under such authority.

(f) Notwithstanding subsection (a) of this section, a retired officer of any regular component of the uniformed services who was employed in a civilian office on the day immediately preceding the effective date of this subsection—

(1) if, on such immediately preceding day, he was exempt from limitations on compensation, may elect (A) to remain subject to and continue under such exemption or (B) to be subject to applicable limitations and exemptions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of this section; or

(2) if, on such immediately preceding day, he was subject to limitations on compensation, may elect (A) to remain subject to and continue under such limitations, or (B) to be subject to applicable limitations and exemptions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of this section.

Such election is irrevocable and shall be filed with the department concerned not later than the ninetieth day after the effective date of this subsection. Any such retired officer who does not file such election within the prescribed period shall be held and considered to have elected to remain in the status which he occupies, on such immediately preceding day, with respect to limitations on compensation, or exemptions therefrom, as the case may be. In the event of any appointment, reinstatement, or reemployment of such retired officer which is made after such effective date and follows a break in service of more than thirty days, such retired officer shall be subject to applicable limitations and exemptions of subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of this section.

(g) A member of any of the uniformed services, serving in the Army or Air Force of the United States without component, under an appointment made under section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, in a temporary grade higher than, or the same as, the reserve commission he then held, who, prior to the effective date prescribed by section 403(a) of this Act, was retired for physical disability in such temporary grade, shall not be considered as subject to the restriction on the concurrent receipt of civilian compensation and retired pay contained in section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), for any period following such retirement.

(h) A nonregular member of any of the armed forces, who served on active duty in a temporary warrant officer grade and who was retired in that status prior to the effective date prescribed by section 403(a) of this Act, shall not be considered as subject to the restriction in section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U.S.C. 62), for any period following such retirement.

SEC. 202. Section 12 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended (5 U.S.C. 861), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" immediately following "SEC. 12.";

(2) by inserting ", subject to subsection (c) of this section," immediately after the word "That" in the first proviso thereof;

(3) by inserting "(subject to subsection (b) of this section)" immediately after "military preference"; and

(4) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an employee who is a retired member of any of the uniformed services included under section 2 of this Act shall be considered a preference employee for the purposes of subsection (a) of this section only if—

"(1) his retirement was based on disability (A) resulting from injury or disease received in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict or (B) caused by an instrumentality of war and incurred in the line of duty during a period of war (as defined in sections 101 and 301 of title 38, United States Code); or

"(2) his service does not include twenty or more years of full-time active service (regardless of when performed but not including periods of active duty for training); or

"(3) immediately prior to the effective date of this subsection, he was employed in a civilian office to which this Act applies and, on and after such date, he continues to be employed in any such office without a break in service of more than thirty days.

"(c) In computing length of total service, an employee who is a retired member of any of the uniformed services shall be given credit for—

"(1) the length of time in active service in the armed forces during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized); or

"(2) if he is included under clause (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b) of this section, the total length of time in active service in the armed forces."

SEC. 203. The last two sentences of section 203(a) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (5 U.S.C. 2062(a)) are amended to read as follows: "Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in determining years of service for the purposes of this subsection, there shall be included all service creditable under the provisions of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act for the purposes of an annuity under such Act and the determination of the period of service rendered may be made upon the basis of an affidavit of the employee. Active military service of a retired member of any of the uniformed services is not creditable in determining years of service for the purpose of this subsection unless—

"(1) his retirement was based on disability (A) resulting from injury or disease received in line of duty as a direct result of armed conflict or (B) caused by an instrumentality of war and incurred in the line of duty during a period of war (as defined in sections 101 and 301 of title 38, United States Code); or

"(2) immediately prior to the effective date of this sentence, he was employed in a civilian office to which this Act applies and, on and after such date, he continued to be employed in any such office without a break in service of more than thirty days; or

"(3) such service was performed in the armed forces during any war, or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized).

In the case of an officer or employee who is not paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods,

the leave provided by this title shall accrue on the same basis as it would accrue if such officer or employee were paid on the basis of biweekly pay periods.".

SEC. 204. (a) A retired member of any of the armed forces may be appointed to serve in a civilian office in or under the Department of Defense during the period of one hundred and eighty days immediately following his retirement only if—

(1) the proposed appointment is authorized by the Secretary concerned (or his designee for the purpose), and, if such civilian office is in the competitive civil service, after approval by the United States Civil Service Commission; or

(2) the minimum rates of basic compensation for such civilian office have been increased under authority of section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 (5 U.S.C. 1173); or

(3) a state of national emergency exists.

(b) A request by appropriate authority for the authorization, or the authorization and approval, as the case may be, required by subsection (a) (1) of this section shall be accompanied by a statement which shows the actions taken to assure that—

(1) full consideration, in accordance with placement and promotion procedures of the department concerned, was given to eligible career employees; and

(2) when selection is by other than certification from an established civil service register, the vacancy has been publicized to give all interested candidates an opportunity to apply; and

(3) qualification requirements for the position have not been written in a manner designed to give advantage to such retired member; and

(4) the position has not been held open pending the retirement of such retired member.

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a retired member of any of the uniformed services shall not be appointed to any civilian office in the competitive civil service unless (1) the United States Civil Service Commission shall have given prior public notice of the fact that a vacancy exists in such office and of the fact that an assembled examination (including written tests, oral interviews, and security investigation), where practicable, or a combination of an assembled or nonassembled examination, where practicable, open to all persons, is to be given at a specific time and place, but not before the thirtieth day after the date such notice is first given, and (2) such office is filled only from among those qualified persons who successfully complete such examination. This section shall not affect the authority of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration contained in section 201(e) of this title.

SEC. 206. The President shall transmit to the Congress on or before January 1, 1966, a comprehensive report of the operations under this title of the departments and agencies in the executive branch.

TITLE III—LIMITATION ON DUAL COMPENSATION FROM MORE THAN ONE CIVILIAN OFFICE

SEC. 301. (a) Except as provided by subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section, civilian personnel shall not be entitled to receive basic compensation from more than one civilian office for more than an aggregate of forty hours of work in any one calendar week (Sunday through Saturday).

(b) Except as otherwise provided by subsection (c) of this section, the United States Civil Service Commission, subject to the supervision and control of the President, is authorized to prescribe and issue regulations under which exceptions may be made to the restrictions in subsection (a) of this section whenever it is determined by appropriate authority that such exceptions are warranted on the ground that personal services otherwise cannot be readily obtained.

(c) The President of the Senate with respect to the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to the United States House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol with respect to the Office of the Architect of the Capitol each is authorized to provide for a means by which exceptions may be made to the restrictions in subsection (a) of this section whenever he determines that such exceptions are warranted on the ground that personal services otherwise cannot be readily obtained.

(d) Subsection (a) of this section does not apply to—

(1) compensation on a when-actually-employed basis received from more than one consultant or expert position if such compensation is not received for the same hours of the same day;

(2) compensation consisting of fees paid on other than a time basis;

(3) compensation received by teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia for employment in a civilian office during the summer vacation period;

(4) compensation paid by the Tennessee Valley Authority to employees performing part-time or intermittent work in addition to their normal duties when the Authority deems it to be in the interest of efficiency and economy;

(5) compensation paid by the United States Coast Guard to employees occupying part-time positions of lamplighters; and

(6) compensation within the purview of any of the following provisions of law:

(A) section 9 of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 384; D.C. Code, sec. 31–631), relating to teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia who also are employed in night schools and vacation schools;

(B) section 6 of the Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1108), as amended by the Act of January 27, 1926 (44 Stat. 2), relating to employees of the Library of Congress (2 U.S.C. 162; 5 U.S.C. 60);

(C) the Act of July 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 467; D.C. Code, sec. 31–631a), relating to custodial employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

(D) section 2 of the Act of July 22, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 400, 74 Stat. 11; 33 U.S.C. 873), relating to extra compensation paid in connection with instrument observation or recording, the observation of tides or currents, or the tending of seismographs or magnetographs;

(E) section 3 of the Act of June 2, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 286, 74 Stat. 11; 15 U.S.C. 327), relating to extra compensation paid in connection with the taking and transmitting of meteorological observations;

(F) section 10(b) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (73 Stat. 217; 5 U.S.C. 2358(b)), relating to the compensation of certain teachers employed in another position in recess periods;

(G) section 102 of chapter 7 of title 2, Canal Zone Code (76A Stat. 15), relating to teachers in the public schools of the Canal Zone who also are employed in night schools or in vacation schools or programs;

(H) section 23(b) of title 13, United States Code, relating to the payment of compensation to employees for the field work of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; or

(I) subsection (a) or (c) of section 3335 of title 39, United States Code, relating to dual employment and extra duties in the postal field service.

(e) With respect to the compensation of persons serving on the effective date of this section in more than one position under properly authorized appointments, subsection (a) of this section shall not apply for the duration of the appointment or appointments concerned.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. (a) Section 18 of the Act of December 20, 1944, as added by section 2 of the Act of August 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 466; D.C. Code, sec. 2–1226), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(b) The second paragraph of section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1950 (64 Stat. 438; D.C. Code, sec. 6–1202), is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the limitation of any law, there may be employed in such Office of Civil Defense any person who has been retired from any of the uniformed services of the United States or any office or position in the Federal or District governments, and except as hereinafter provided, while so employed in such Office of Civil Defense any such retired person may receive the compensation authorized for such employment or the retirement compensation or annuity, whichever he may elect, and upon the termination of such employment, he shall be restored to the same status as a retired officer or employee with the same retirement compensation or annuity to which he was entitled before having been employed in such Office of Civil Defense. While any person who has been retired from any of the uniformed services of the United States is so employed in such Office of Civil Defense, he may receive the compensation authorized for such employment and his retired or retirement pay, subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act."

(c) Section 13(b) of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 619; 22 U.S.C. 2512(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a),"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(d) Section 44 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 636; 22 U.S.C. 2584) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a),"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(e) Section 626(b) of part III of the Act entitled "An Act to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic development and internal and external security, and for other purposes", approved September 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 451; 22 U.S.C. 2386(b)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 212 of Public Law 72–212, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a),"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(f) Section 28 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 926; 42 U.S.C. 2038) is amended by striking out "Any such officer serving as Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee shall receive, in addition to his pay and allowances, including special and incentive pays, or in addition to his retired pay, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and allowances, including special and incentive pays, or between his retired pay, and the compensation prescribed for the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any such active officer serving as Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee shall receive, in addition to his pay and allowances, including special and

incentive pays, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and allowances, including special and incentive pays, and the compensation fixed for such Chairman. Any such retired officer serving as Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee shall receive the compensation fixed for such Chairman and his retired pay, subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act."

(g) Section 204(d) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 432; 42 U.S.C. 2474(d)) is amended by striking out "The compensation received by any such officer for his service as Chairman of the Liaison Committee shall be equal to the amount (if any) by which the compensation fixed by subsection (a)(1) for such Chairman exceeds his pay and allowances (including special and incentive pays) as an active officer, or his retired pay." and inserting in lieu thereof "Any such active officer serving as Chairman of the Liaison Committee shall receive, in addition to his pay and allowances, including special and incentive pays, an amount equal to the difference between such pay and allowances, including special and incentive pays, and the compensation fixed by subsection (a)(1) for such Chairman. Any such retired officer serving as Chairman of the Liaison Committee shall receive the compensation fixed by subsection (a)(1) for such Chairman and his retired pay, subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act."

(h) Section 3(b)(1) of the Act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 1091; Public Law 85–850), is amended to read as follows:

"(1) One member, who shall serve as Chairman, and who shall be a resident from the area comprising the Savannah, Altamaha, Saint Marys, Apalachicola-Chattahoochee, and Perdido-Escambia River Basins (and intervening areas) embraced within the States referred to in the first section of this Act and who shall not, during the period of his service on the Commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except that a retired military officer or a retired Federal civilian officer or employee may be appointed under this Act without prejudice to his retired status. A retired Federal civilian officer or employee appointed under this Act shall receive compensation as authorized herein in addition to his annuity, but the sum of his annuity and such compensation as may be payable hereunder shall not exceed $12,000 in any one calendar year. A retired military officer appointed under this Act shall receive compensation as authorized herein and his retired pay, subject to section 201 of the Dual Compensation Act;".

(i) Section 9 of the Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 384; D.C. Code, sec. 31–631), is amended by striking out "That section six of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation Act, approved May tenth, nineteen hundred and sixteen, as amended by the naval appropriation Act, approved August twenty-ninth, nineteen hundred and sixteen," and inserting in lieu thereof "Section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(j) Section 6 of the Act of March 3, 1925, as amended by the Act of January 27, 1926 (43 Stat. 1108, 44 Stat. 2; 2 U.S.C. 162, 5 U.S.C. 60), is amended by striking out "nor shall any additional compensation so paid to such employees be construed as a double salary under the provisions of section 6 of the Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, as amended (Thirty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 582)." and inserting in lieu thereof "and section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act shall not apply to any additional compensation so paid to such employees."

(k) The Act of July 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 467; D.C. Code, sec. 31–631a), is amended by striking out "That section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917', approved May 10, 1916 (39th Stat. 120), and Acts amendatory thereto," and inserting in lieu thereof "That section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(l) Section 2 of the Act of July 22, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 400, 74 Stat. 11; 33 U.S.C. 873), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and without regard to section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act."

(m) Section 3 of the Act of June 2, 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 286, 74 Stat. 11; 15 U.S.C. 327), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "without regard to section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(n) Section 10(b) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (73 Stat. 217; 5 U.S.C. 2358(b)) is amended by striking out "section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), relative to the holding of more than one office, section 6 of the Act of May 10, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 58 and 59), relative to double salaries, and any other law relating to the receipt of more than one salary or the holding of more than one office" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(o) Section 102 of chapter 7 of title 2, Canal Zone Code (76A Stat. 15), is amended by striking out "Section 2 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved July 31, 1894, as amended (28 Stat. 205; 5 U.S.C., sec. 62), and section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 120; 5 U.S.C., sec. 58), do" and inserting in lieu thereof "Section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act does".

(p) Section 23(b) of title 13, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "without regard to section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act".

(q) Subsections (a) and (c) of section 3335 of title 39, United States Code, each are amended by striking out "sections 58, 62, 69, and 70 of title 5" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 69 and 70 of title 5 and section 301 of the Dual Compensation Act".

SEC. 402 (a) The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) Section 1763 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 58), relating to the receipt of compensation from more than one office.

(2) Section 2074 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 50), prohibiting the holding of more than one office at the same time under title XXVIII of the Revised Statutes.

(3) Section 4395 of the Revised Statutes as amended by the Act of January 20, 1888 (25 Stat. 1), providing for the appointment of a Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries who shall not hold any other office.

(4) The Act of July 2, 1882 (22 Stat. 176), authorizing additional pay or compensation for Government employees engaged in cataloging Government publications at the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(5) The sentence in the Act of February 25, 1885 (23 Stat. 329), which reads as follows: "And hereafter no consul or consul-general shall be entitled to or allowed any part of any salary appropriated for payment of a secretary or second secretary of legation or an interpreter."

(6) Joint Resolution Numbered 3 of February 5, 1889 (25 Stat. 1019), authorizing the President to appoint an officer of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey as a delegate to the International Geodetic Association to serve without extra salary or additional compensation.

(7) Section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended by the Act of May 31, 1924 (43 Stat. 245), by section 6 of the Act of July 30, 1937 (50 Stat. 549), and by the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1194), relating to the holding of two offices (5 U.S.C. 62).

(8) The paragraph in the Act of February 20, 1895 (28 Stat. 676), providing for the compensation of members of a commission established to recommend the location of a certain building, which reads as follows:

"The compensation of said commissioners shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the same shall not exceed six dollars per day and actual traveling expenses: *Provided, however,* That the member of said commission appointed from the Treasury Department shall be paid only his actual traveling expenses."

(9) Section 7 of the Act of June 3, 1896 (29 Stat. 235; 5 U.S.C. 63), relating to the employment of retired officers of the Army and Navy in connection with river and harbor improvements.

(10) Section 7 of the Act of June 28, 1902 (32 Stat. 483), relating to the appointment and compensation of certain officers employed under such Act.

(11) The paragraph of the Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 931), relating to the pay of retired Army and Navy officers and enlisted men then in the employ of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which reads as follows:

"Authority is hereby granted for the payment of salaries and wages accrued or hereafter earned of retired army and navy officers and enlisted men now in the employment of the Isthmian Canal Commission, in addition to their retired pay, where their compensation under such employment does not exceed two thousand five hundred dollars per annum."

(12) The second paragraph under the center heading "THE ISTHMIAN CANAL" with the side heading "National Waterways Commission:" in the Act of August 5, 1909 (36 Stat. 130), authorizing the National Waterways Commission to pay not to exceed three officers or employees of the Government without regard to the Act of July 31, 1894, and other laws.

(13) Section 12 of the Act of August 20, 1912 (37 Stat. 319; 7 U.S.C. 165), relating to the appointment of members of a Federal Horticultural Board from among employees of the Department of Agriculture.

(14) Section 6 of the Act of May 10, 1916 (39 Stat. 120; 5 U.S.C. 58), as amended by the Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 582; 5 U.S.C. 59), relating to double salaries.

(15) Section 8 of the Act of March 21, 1918 (40 Stat. 455–456), authorizing the President to avail himself of the assistance of Government employees in the operation of transportation facilities taken over by the President.

(16) Sections 3 and 4 of the War Finance Corporation Act (40 Stat. 507; 15 U.S.C. 333, 334), authorizing the appointment of Government employees to membership on the Board of Directors of the War Finance Corporation and providing for their compensation.

(17) The last paragraph under the heading "DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA" and under the subheading "PUBLIC SCHOOLS" contained in the first section of the Act of July 8, 1918 (40 Stat. 823; D.C. Code, sec. 31–631), relating to the application of section 6 of the Act of May 10, 1916, to employees of the community center department of the public schools of the District of Columbia.

(18) The ninth paragraph under the heading "DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA" and under the subheading "PUBLIC SCHOOLS" contained in the first section of the Third Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1920 (41 Stat. 1017; D.C. Code, sec. 31–631), relating to the application of section 6 of the Act of May 10, 1916, to employees of the school garden department of the public schools of the District of Columbia.

(19) That part of the proviso contained in the paragraph under the heading "BUREAU OF THE BUDGET" in the Act of February 17,

1922 (42 Stat. 373; 5 U.S.C. 64), relating to the application of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894, to retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard appointed to certain offices in the Bureau of the Budget, which reads as follows: "*Provided*, That section 2 of the Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes, approved July 31, 1894, shall not be construed as having application to retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who may be appointed to the offices created by section 207 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, approved June 10, 1921, within the meaning of precluding payment to such officers of the difference in pay prescribed for such offices and their retired pay;".

(20) Section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 406), as amended by section 3 of the Act of July 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 761), by the Act of February 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 18), by section 2 of the Act of August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 498), by section 2201(11) of the Act of June 17, 1957 (71 Stat. 158), and by section 13(d) of the Act of September 2, 1958 (72 Stat. 1264), relating to the limitation on the amount of retired pay received for commissioned officer service when combined with Government civilian salary (5 U.S.C. 59a).

(21) The Act of September 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 885), authorizing Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, to exercise the duties of the Office of Secretary of Commerce.

(22) The Act of March 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 38), authorizing the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives during the Seventy-ninth Congress to employ Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets.

(23) The Act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 978), as amended by the Act of October 29, 1951 (65 Stat. 662), providing authority for the employment of certain retired officers in the Veterans' Administration (formerly contained in 5 U.S.C. 64a), which authority has expired.

(24) The fifth sentence of section 3 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as in effect on June 30, 1947 (47 Stat. 6), and as continued by section 3(a) of such Act, as amended (61 Stat. 203, 62 Stat. 262; 15 U.S.C. 603(a)), relating to employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which reads: "Nothing contained in this or in any other Act shall be construed to prevent the appointment and compensation as an employee of the corporation of any officer or employee of the United States in any board, commission, independent establishment, or executive department thereof."

(25) Section 2 of the Act of July 11, 1947 (61 Stat. 311; D.C. Code, sec. 4–183), relating to the position of director of the band in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

(26) Section 3 of the Act of April 21, 1948, as amended (7 U.S.C. 438), relating to the Remount Service in the Department of Agriculture.

(27) That part of section 9 of the Act of June 4, 1948 (62 Stat. 342; D.C. Code, sec. 2–1709), relating to personnel of the Armory Board of the District of Columbia, which reads: ", and without regard to any prohibition against double salaries contained in any other law".

(28) Section 5(f) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended (65 Stat. 89, 72 Stat. 337; 50 U.S.C. 403f(f)), authorizing employment of not more than fifteen retired officers who must elect between civilian salary and retired pay.

(29) That part of the second sentence of section 103 of the American-Mexican Treaty Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 847), relating to the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, which reads: ", and who shall be entitled to receive, as compensation for such temporary service, the difference between the rates of pay established therefor and their retired pay during the period or periods of such temporary employment".

(30) That part of section 401(a) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 1254; 50 U.S.C. App. 2253(a)), which reads: "and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, except those imposing restrictions upon dual compensation, employ, in a civilian capacity, with the approval of the President, not to exceed twenty-five retired personnel of the armed services on a full- or part-time basis without loss or reduction of or prejudice to their retired status;".

(31) Subparagraph (g) of the third paragraph of the Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366), as amended by the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 590), and by the Act of August 28, 1957 (71 Stat. 457), relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission (36 U.S.C. 426(g)).

(32) Section 12 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 529; D.C. Code, sec. 31–1541), authorizing employment of retired members of the armed services of the United States as teachers of military science and tactics in public high schools of the District of Columbia.

(33) Section 8 of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 628; 36 U.S.C. 748), relating to appointment and pay of certain retired officers by the Civil War Centennial Commission.

(34) Section 203(b)(11) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 431; 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(11)), authorizing the employment of retired commissioned officers subject only to the limitations in pay set forth in section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a).

(35) Section 626(c) of the Act of September 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 451; 22 U.S.C. 2386(c)), authorizing employment of retired officers under the Act for International Development of 1961 or the International Peace and Security Act of 1961.

(36) Section 201(d) of chapter 7 of title 2, Canal Zone Code (76A Stat. 21), relating to retired members of a regular component of the Armed Forces or the Public Health Service of the United States employed in the Canal Zone Government or the Panama Canal Company.

(37) The matter contained in section 507 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1964 (77 Stat. 264; Public Law 88–149), relating to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home, which reads: ": *Provided*, That section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (5 U.S.C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home", and provisions to the same effect contained in other appropriation Acts enacted prior to the effective date of this section relative to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home (5 U.S.C. 59b).

(38) The next to the last sentence of section 4103(b) of title 38, United States Code, relating to the application of certain provisions of law to the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, which reads: "Section 62 of title 5 of the United States Code shall not apply to any individual appointed Chief Medical Director before January 1, 1964; however, section 59a of title 5 shall apply, in accordance with its terms, to any such individual.".

(b) All other provisions of law, general or specific, inconsistent with this Act and the amendments made by this Act, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 403. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which begins later than the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) This section and sections 201(g) and 201(h) shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 404. If any provision of this Act shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. MORRISON (interrupting the reading of the substitute amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of what those who are pushing for this bill have to say, I think there are many good factors in this bill, but that is no reason why we should take the bad. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the bill should be recommitted and the bad features eliminated from the bill.

The gentleman from California made the statement we are trying to penalize NASA and some other agencies. I made the statement in committee that if NASA or any other department of this Government needed those men, they should be allowed to have them and get their full pay. That could be done very easily. There could be no question about it. I do not believe there is any man here who would deny that to any Federal department.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman said it can be done very easily.

Mr. STAGGERS. I said it could be done if it were included in this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman can tell me how it could be done, I would like to know how.

Mr. STAGGERS. Put it into law. Send the measure back to the committee. There is no question about that. The bill can be revised.

This bill discriminates between the Reserve officer and the Regular officer. It is evident the Reserve officer can take all of his retirement pay under this bill. He may be sitting side by side with the Regular officer, and that Regular officer is penalized because his retirement pay is reduced. What kind of legislation is that?

Here might be a retired officer sitting side by side with a civil service employee, and the retired officer may be getting $5,000 or $6,000 more than the civilian employee. What kind of legislation is that for the morale of our Government? I do not believe any Member of Congress wants to do such a thing. It is not equal, and is not fair. I do not believe that there is a person in the Congress who wants to discriminate against 75 million social security people who are on the rolls today.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Is it not possible that a Regular retired officer could be sitting beside a retired enlistee and be discriminated against as well?

Mr. STAGGERS. Just as well.

Mr. Chairman, the other day President Johnson spoke about this fight on poverty. Are we going to give a man two jobs and put another man out of a job and tell him to stay out of a job because this Congress is going to pass class legislation? Under the bill this Congress is going to tell a man he cannot have a job because we are going to give that job to a man who is receiving his retirement pay drawing up to $6,000 or $8,000 a year or more besides his current salary. Is this the kind of legislation we want to pass when we are faced with a situation of unemployment going up and up and up?

One of the most convincing arguments against dual compensation was uttered in 1857 by the then Attorney General Jeremiah Black.

His words should be well heeded today. He said:

> Plurality of offices and extra allowances to those who hold them are the vice of a bad government and have always prevailed to the greatest extent in the worst times.

Do we want to record this as one of the worst times in our history and bring about the inequities proposed in this bill?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that so many members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service are advocating a recommittal of this legislation. As was pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON], we have worked on this problem for approximately 8 years. We have put in many hundreds of man-hours on this problem trying to work out a solution. The committee did work its will. Every member of the committee who had something to offer insofar as the solution of this problem is concerned was heard by the committee and his suggestions were thoroughly considered.

As I pointed out before, this is a compromise. We had to make some sacrifices and concessions along the line to come up with a bill that the vast majority of the Members would agree to. This is an excellent piece of work on the part of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina that if this bill is recommitted, it is a dead bill for this year and possibly for many years to come. I think the main argument that the opponents of this bill have, so far as I have been able to understand these arguments today, is that the bill does not go far enough. I think nine-tenths of the things that we are trying to do by this bill meets with the wholehearted approval of the vast majority of the members of the committee. We are arguing mostly about the word "discrimination" and that we are not treating all groups alike. That is just where we do not go far enough in this legislation. If there is any discrimination, this bill does not cause the discrimination. We have the discrimination existing now. We do absolutely nothing insofar as cutting back the retired pay of 90 percent of the retired military personnel, both officers and enlisted men.

As I said before, the administration did recommend that we cut back the retired Reserve and enlisted personnel. That is the way that we could make it uniform and in that way we could eliminate all of this alleged discrimination. Actually, how can you cut back the retired pay or place more restrictions on the retired pay of 90 percent of our retired military officers and enlisted men, men to whom we made a contract when they went into the armed services. Now when they have served their Nation and they come back, we, by act of Congress, say that we are going to cut back some of their retired pay and we are going to renege on our obligation. This is an impossible thing to do and it is the wrong thing to do. The only other way to make it uniform is to liberalize the retired pay or liberalize the restrictions on retired pay of the Regular Army officers further. That also would be difficult to do.

The gentleman asked why discriminate against 10 percent of our retired military personnel?

If the gentleman will offer an amendment to release all restrictions whatsoever on retired Regular officers, I will support that amendment, but I maintain that they are not exactly alike. They are a different group of people. The Regular officers do receive more advancement in their term of service and are allowed to go on for 30 years and receive 75 percent of their base pay when the vast majority of Reserve officers must retire at the end of 20 years and receive 50 percent of their base pay and do this at an earlier stage of life when they still have children in school or college to educate. It is an entirely different situation. However, if the gentleman wants to make it completely uniform and remove all of the alleged discriminations, let him offer an amendment. I will be glad to support it. But let us not recommit this measure, because there are many good features in this bill that we have to act on this year. We would be guilty of an act of irresponsibility unless we act on this legislation right now and correct some of the defects that exist at this time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. You talk about discriminating. Cannot the Army officer go into any phase of private industry anywhere in this land and get all his retirement and get all the money he wants to?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct, but let me respond further to the gentleman's question. I said earlier in the debate the reason why we are liberalizing this for the Regular retired officers is not for their benefit. He can go out into private industry and earn a great deal more, and he does. We are providing this liberalization in order for the Government to have the benefit of his service.

Mr. STAGGERS. He can still get it. I want to ask you one more thing. You talk about inequity in offering an amendment for the Reserve officer. I have an amendment, but I think it should go back to the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I said offer an amendment to liberalize the retired Regular officer's pay. I do not believe it is fair to cut back on a contract we made years ago with the Reserve officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman speaks of a contract on the part of the public to provide retirement for military personnel. I do not recall any contract on the part of the taxpayers of this country to provide the military with full retirement pay and also provide a guarantee—no, not a guarantee, but the opportunity of a Government civilian job so that they can draw full job pay as well as full retirement pay. I do not recall any such contract.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. There is nothing in this bill or any legislation I know of that guarantees any officer anything in the way of a civilian job.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw the word "guarantee."

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Or even a promise of a civilian retirement. They have earned their military retirement. What we are talking about here is after his retirement does he have an opportunity to go to work for the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. You mean to retain full retirement pay and all the money he can make in addition on a Government civilian job?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. He is entitled to it. He earned it.

Mr. GROSS. He earned his retirement compensation but he has no right to dual compensation on a basis not permitted any other civilian employee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would not agree with me if this proposition is fair, why should it not be applied to the widows of veterans and why should it not be applied to the whole civil service retirement list?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Let me say in a very pleasant and light frame of mind of the gentleman in the well, that he has just been assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means and has not had a chance to get into that question yet.

Mr. CORBETT. I might make it a little easier then. Here the civil service

employee pays into the fund every month for every year he works. The Army officer or enlisted man does not. Why should this law not apply to the civil servant?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Virginia for just a moment, he knows how delighted I am on his advancement to the Committee on Ways and Means. I do suggest that other than this matter of social security legislation in his new assignment he may have a greater familiarity with the problems of raising requisite revenues for the Government to pay the bills for some of the luxuries we are tolerating. I wish him well in his assignment and I do not want to contribute to his problems today by perpetuating a folly in connection with this bill.

When I spoke during general debate, I was attempting to underscore this factor of discrimination, but I did not have the time to mention a little further detail with respect to the widow of the deceased veteran on a non-service-connected pension.

Take the case of such a person with no children. If her total income per year, other than from this non-service-connected pension, is less than $600, the Government pays her $60 a month. If it is between $600 and $1,200 the Government reduces its pension to $45 a month. If it is from $1,200 to $1,800 it cuts it to $25. If it is above $1,800 she gets nothing. She is eligible for nothing. And I call the attention of the members of this committee to the paltry figures we are talking about compared to some of the preferential benefits both pensionwise and salarywise for some of the brass for whom we are dealing in this legislation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding because as a member of our committee he has always been very fair, and I am sure that at this point he would agree with me that the inequity he is talking about is not by virtue of the bill we are considering; I certainly agree with the gentleman that there is a great differential here.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the gentleman by saying that the fault with which this bill is charged is that it perpetuates a situation from the standpoint of the retired Reserve officer that is completely inequitable and discriminatory. Of course, what is done under the pension legislation is not our responsibility, but the perpetuation of this disparity is our concern.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, a vote against the bill or a vote to recommit the bill is not going to solve the problem that the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. JOHANSEN. A vote for the passage of the bill is going to perpetuate this condition and make it almost certain that there will be no prospect of corrective action; whereas, because of the virtues and benefits of other sections of this bill, to which the gentleman has contributed so much, recommittal would provide an incentive and an opportunity to do some correcting. I want to say a word to the gentleman from Virginia on this point. He has expressed himself as surprised at the action of some of the committee members today, and I am sure the gentleman who was present does not include me as an object of his surprise because I served notice at the time that we voted it out that I might go off the reservation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Certainly.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Certainly it is not the purpose of the gentleman from Virginia to criticize any individual member of the committee on his action in the committee. What I meant to say is that we had ample opportunity to eliminate all of the defects and take care of all of the objections while we were in committee. I tried to emphasize that this bill was a reasonable compromise. If we recommit the bill it would mean, perhaps, 8 more years of work.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I never suspected the gentleman from Virginia of any unkindness toward any colleague in the House or on the committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that if we pass this bill with these discriminations in it will we not then reemphasize and reaffirm our belief that these discriminations are wholesome?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think we have again applied our imprimatur of approval, and as a result of this debate I am not only going to vote for recommittal, but if this fails, I intend to vote against the bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on December 10, 1963, I introduced a bill to establish certain requirements with respect to notice and examination in connection with appointments to positions in the competitive civil service. I want to underline that word "notice."

The bill reads, very briefly, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a person shall not be appointed to any civilian office in the competitive civil service unless (1) the United States Civil Service Commission shall have given prior public notice of the fact that a vacancy exists in such office and of the fact that an assembled examination (including written tests, oral interviews, and security investigation), where practicable, or a combination of an assembled or nonassembled examination, where practicable, open to all persons, is to be given at a specific time and place, but not before the thirtieth day after the date such notice is first given, and (2) such office is filled only from among those qualified persons who successfully complete such examination.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my contention all along that the trouble with a good many competitive civil service examinations is that too few people know about the examinations until the position is filled. Having that in mind, I introduced an amendment to this very legislation at the time it was being considered. This amendment was adopted by a vote of 10 to 5 by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. Chairman, what was the purpose of the amendment? The purpose was to make sure that notice about a vacancy would be given 30 days in advance of the filling of the job and that then a truly competitive examination, where practicable, might be given; the phrase "where practicable" is in the amendment twice. I underscore this.

Mr. Chairman, what is taking place with reference to many of the jobs in the Federal Government? As I view it, they are filled by what is known as unassembled examinations. That is an examination, generally speaking, where questions are asked of the applicant and then if the person who is asking the questions wishes to hire the person, he does so. If the board which does the questioning wishes to recommend the person, it does so. I think we could have in many instances more thorough examinations.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize that that kind of amendment was offered to this very bill, and it passed by a vote of 10 to 5. There were only 15 members of the committee present at the time.

Now, the interesting part about it is this: the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission goes over to the Senate not long thereafter and says that he would rather have no bill at all than to have the bill with that amendment. I quote his words before the Senate committee on December 12, 1963, about the amendment:

REQUIREMENT FOR EXAMINATIONS

Section 205 is the one new provision I mentioned earlier as the one which we would have to oppose most strongly. This section was added to H.R. 7381 by the House committee on the day it voted to report favorably on the bill. Let me read this section to you:

"SEC. 205. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a retired member of any of the uniformed services shall not be appointed to any civilian office in the competitive civil service unless (1) the United States Civil Service Commission shall have given prior public notice of the fact that a vacancy exists in such office and of the fact that an assembled examination (including written tests, oral interviews, and security investigation), where practicable, or a combination of an assembled or nonassembled examination, where practicable, open to all persons, is to be given at a specific time and place, but not before the thirtieth day after the date such notice is first given, and (2) such office is filled only from among those qualified persons who successfully complete such examination. This section shall not affect the authority of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration contained in section 201(e) of this title."

We do not know why this section was added to the bill nor exactly what it was intended to accomplish. However, our own

analysis leads us to the conclusion that we might well be better off under the existing dual compensation laws, as obsolete and inequitable as they are, than under this bill if enacted with this particular provision.

The Commission is clear here as to its position on the amendment.

What does our committee report state? It was written by very able, dedicated and conscientious employees and Members of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. OLSEN of Montana) Mr. BECKWORTH was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BECKWORTH. Here is what the report says:

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT PROCEDURES—RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

Sections 204 and 205 establish safeguards which will assure that consideration of retired military personnel for civil service positions is accomplished on an equitable competitive basis and that there is strict compliance in spirit and in procedure with the fundamental merit system principle of open public competition. These sections are intended to do away with the so-called buddy system under which a position is created or held open at a military installation for a buddy about to retire from the military service. This undesirable practice has been recognized by officials of the Department of Defense and procedures to safeguard the merit system were set forth in memorandums issued by Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell L. Gilpatric under dates of July 5, 1961, and October 30, 1962.

Section 204 of the bill writes into law the essence of the Gilpatric policy referred to above.

The provisions of subsection (a) of section 204 are intended to prohibit most appointments of retired military personnel to civilian positions in the Department of Defense during a period of 180 days immediately following their retirement. However, exceptions to the prohibition are permissible if (1) the proposed appointment is authorized by the Secretary concerned or his designee for the purpose and, if the civilian office is in the competitive civil service, after approved by the U.S. Civil Service Commission; or (2) higher minimum rates have been established for the civilian office under section 504 of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962; or (3) a state of national emergency exists.

That is what the report says, that these sections are designed to do away with the so-called buddy system where a position is created or held open at a military installation for a buddy about to retire from military service. I think all, I say all qualified military people and all veterans, if qualified, should be given a fair chance to compete for these jobs, yes, all qualified people. But, naturally at all times veterans preference would be observed and recognized.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, it is strange indeed that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission would oppose the very section that undertakes emphatically to do away with the buddy system. I think that the House of Representatives would desire to have a real understanding with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission along that line because part of the purpose of this legislation is to do away with the hiring of people based on friendship rather than based on true qualifications.

We have a bill coming before the House very soon that will cost millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, the Government pay raise legislation, and one of the reasons it is offered, it is contended, is because it is necessary to get more competent people in the Government. Yet the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, when we have a provision in there that says "give 30 days' notice about a vacancy" says he would rather have no bill at all than to have that specific section 205 in the bill.

I hope that we as a body will let that gentleman know we do want real competition in connection with the filling of Federal positions including all vacancies.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. What is an unassembled examination under Civil Service?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It, generally speaking, is definitely not a written examination as I understand the term. It is one where a person presents his credentials, he is asked questions, too frequently by a friendly questioner, and given the job, and the folks in Montana do not know anything about the job being open.

I might say three-fourths of the civil service jobs filled annually are filled by nonassembled examinations rather than by assembled examinations according to the best statistics I have had considerable difficulty in obtaining.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The definition the gentleman has given is of a nonassembled examination?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is right.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. An assembled examination is when it is written?

Mr. BECKWORTH. When one has to go in there like he does when he takes a bar examination and has to pass the examination, he gets quite a thorough test. He then can be asked questions and be interviewed.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The gentleman's amendment would require that there be a written examination for these vacancies that are called for?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Yes. Mr. Macy forgot my words "where practicable." I gave him a getting out place, by the words "where practicable," and those words are in the amendment twice.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. You would require 30 days' notice that there will be such an examination, and the gentleman says the Civil Service Commission opposes that provision?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It opposes it, yes. Section 205 is the one new provision I mentioned earlier as the one which "we would have to oppose most strongly," he says. That is the Civil Service Commission chairman speaking.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Is the gentleman aware of any particular empty chairs over in the Defense Department or anywhere else, from the testimony that we received in the committee?

Mr. BECKWORTH. There are very few empty chairs in any division of any department of this Federal Government. My mail indicates to me they want the jobs even at the present amount that is paid, and I think the gentleman knows that is the case.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Would the gentleman give the same answer even with respect to NASA?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Possibly. I recall that Mr. MORRISON discussed this issue carefully. Possibly because of the very high degree of skill it is claimed is required in NASA, exceptions would have to be made. I supported Mr. MORRISON's position in the committee. My amendment says "where practicable."

Mr. JOHANSEN. And that exception could be made?

Mr. BECKWORTH. You bet your life.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, the question now is on the committee substitute amendment to the bill.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PEPPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7381) to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 624, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] rise?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CORBETT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CORBETT moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 7381, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes had it.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 83, nays 262, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—83

Abbitt	Fulton, Pa.	Moore
Abernethy	Goodling	Olsen Mont.
Alger	Grant	Olson, Minn.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Griffin	Passman
	Gross	Philbin
Ashbrook	Hall	Pillion
Baring	Hays	Pucinski
Barry	Hechler	Rogers, Tex.
Beckworth	Hemphill	Roush
Beermann	Hoeven	Rumsfeld
Bolling	Holifield	Saylor
Bray	Holland	Selden
Bromwell	Hutchinson	Slack
Brooks	Jennings	Smith, Iowa
Burke	Jensen	Smith, Va.
Chelf	Johansen	Snyder
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Calif.	Staggers
Conte	Johnson, Pa.	Sullivan
Corbett	Johnson, Wis.	Tuck
Cunningham	Jones, Mo.	Ullman
Dague	Keith	Vanik
Devine	Knox	Van Pelt
Dingell	Kunkel	Weaver
Donohue	Kyl	Whalley
Dulski	McClory	White
Duncan	McDade	Whitten
Feighan	Marsh	Williams
Fino	Michel	Winstead

NAYS—262

Abele	Dorn	Jarman
Addabbo	Downing	Joelson
Albert	Dwyer	Jonas
Anderson	Edwards	Karsten
Andrews, Ala.	Elliott	Karth
Arends	Ellsworth	Keogh
Ashley	Everett	Kilburn
Aspinall	Evins	Kilgore
Auchincloss	Fallon	King, Calif.
Avery	Farbstein	King, N.Y.
Ayres	Fascell	Kirwan
Baldwin	Findley	Kornegay
Bates	Fisher	Laird
Becker	Flood	Landrum
Belcher	Flynt	Langen
Bell	Fogarty	Lennon
Bennett, Fla.	Ford	Libonati
Betts	Foreman	Lipscomb
Blatnik	Fountain	Long, La.
Boggs	Fraser	Long, Md.
Bolland	Frelinghuysen	McCulloch
Bolton, Oliver P.	Friedel	McDowell
	Fulton, Tenn.	McFall
Bonner	Fuqua	McIntire
Bow	Gallagher	McLoskey
Brademas	Garmatz	McMillan
Brock	Gary	MacGregor
Brotzman	Gathings	Mahon
Broyhill, N.C.	Giaimo	Martin, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Gibbons	Martin, Nebr.
Byrne, Pa.	Gilbert	Mathias
Byrnes, Wis.	Gill	Matsunaga
Cahill	Glenn	Matthews
Cameron	Gonzalez	May
Cannon	Grabowski	Miller, Calif.
Carey	Griffiths	Milliken
Celler	Grover	Mills
Chenoweth	Gurney	Minish
Clancy	Hagan, Ga.	Monagan
Clark	Hagen, Calif.	Moorhead
Clausen, Don H.	Haley	Morgan
	Halleck	Morris
Cleveland	Halpern	Morrison
Cohelan	Hansen	Morse
Cooley	Harding	Morton
Curtin	Hardy	Mosher
Curtis	Harris	Moss
Daddario	Harrison	Multer
Daniels	Harsha	Murphy, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Harvey, Mich.	Murphy, N.Y.
Dawson	Healey	Murray
Delaney	Hébert	Natcher
Dent	Henderson	Nedzi
Denton	Herlong	Nelsen
Derounian	Horan	Nix
Derwinski	Horton	Norblad
Dole	Huddleston	O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.	Stubblefield
O'Hara, Mich.	Rooney, N.Y.	Taft
O'Neill	Rooney, Pa.	Talcott
Osmers	Rosenthal	Taylor
Ostertag	Roudebush	Teague, Calif.
Patman	Ryan, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Patten	Ryan, N.Y.	Thomas
Pelly	St. George	Thompson, La.
Pepper	St Germain	Thompson, N.J.
Perkins	Schenck	Thompson, Tex.
Pickle	Schneebeli	Toll
Pike	Schweiker	Tollefson
Pirnie	Schwengel	Trimble
Poage	Scott	Tuten
Poff	Secrest	Utt
Pool	Senner	Van Deerlin
Purcell	Shipley	Vinson
Quie	Shriver	Waggonner
Quillen	Sibal	Wallhauser
Randall	Sickles	Watson
Reid, Ill.	Sikes	Watts
Reid, N.Y.	Siler	Weltner
Reifel	Sisk	Wharton
Reuss	Skubitz	Whitener
Rhodes, Pa.	Springer	Wilson, Bob
Rich	Staebler	Wilson, Ind.
Rivers, Alaska	Stafford	Wright
Rivers, S.C.	Steed	Wydler
Robison	Stephens	Wyman
Rodino	Stinson	Young
Rogers Colo.	Stratton	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—86

Adair	Goodell	O'Brien, Ill.
Ashmore	Gray	O'Konski
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Pilcher
Bass	Gubser	Powell
Battin	Hanna	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey, Ind.	Rains
Berry	Hawkins	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman	Riehlman
	Hosmer	Roberts, Ala.
Broomfield	Hull	Roberts, Tex.
Brown, Calif.	Ichord	Roosevelt
Brown, Ohio	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Bruce	Kastenmeier	Roybal
Buckley	Kee	St. Onge
Burkhalter	Kelly	Schadeberg
Burleson	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Burton	Lankford	Short
Casey	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Leggett	Thomson, Wis.
Chamberlain	Lesinski	Tupper
Collier	Lindsay	Udall
Colmer	Lloyd	Westland
Corman	Macdonald	Wickersham
Cramer	Madden	Widnall
Davis, Tenn.	Mailliard	Willis
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Charles H.
Dowdy	Meader	
Edmondson	Miller, N.Y.	Younger
Finnegan	Minshall	
Forrester	Montoya	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Macdonald with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Short.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Price with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Roberts of Texas with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Chamberlain.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Mailliard.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Berry.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Burkhalter with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bruce.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Dowdy with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. BURKE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. DOWNING changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE THIRD PAN AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following resolutions were passed at the Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference held in Washington, D.C. on February 5–7.

As president of the U.S. National Group, and President of the Conference, it is my duty to inform the U.S. Congress of what resolutions were adopted and I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, that these documents be placed at this time in the body of the RECORD.

RESOLUTION ON LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SERVICES

(Adopted at the fourth plenary session, held on February 6, 1964)

The Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference recommends: That the Secretariat of the Pan American Interparliamentary Regional Group urge the national groups in the respective congresses to establish an information service on the laws of each American country, so that this information may be disseminated and the exchange of legislative documents kept up to date.

APPENDIX TO THE RESOLUTION ON LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION

(Adopted at the fifth plenary session, held on February 7, 1964)

WASHINGTON, D.C., *February 4, 1964.*

CHAIRMAN, THIRD PAN AMERICAN INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, *Washington, D.C.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We have pleasure in placing in your hands, for the purposes indicated, a draft recommendation for the creation of the "American Legislative Section" in each one of the Parliaments comprising the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union.

This proposal is included in the agenda adopted for our fourth plenary session, to be held on February 6, since one of the most

important functional aspects for "strengthening parliamentary institutions in the Americas" is their closer and permanent mutual understanding through the exchange of copies of the laws in force in each nation, which will serve as quite valuable sources of information, and will be useful for comparative legislation when necessary.

The development of our civilization, with its ever-increasing trend toward universality, demands the constant exchange of ideas and experiences between the various countries and their governments. This exchange is more fundamentally necessary when the said countries are motivated by common democratic ideals and have common cultural and religious traditions.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that in the social structure of our Americas processes of change have operated that demand prudent and wise legislation. If those historic demands are, generally speaking, common to us, the same nevertheless is not true with respect to the experiences themselves, precisely because of the lack of a proper medium. To supply that lack is the purpose of our proposal, which recommends obtaining the corresponding resolution in each member Parliament of the American Interparliamentary Group for the creation of the "American Legislative Section."

Very truly yours,

Dr. J. AUGUSTO SALDÍVAR,
Dr. FERNANDO LEVI RUFFINELLI,
MANUEL FRUTOS PANE.

WORK METHODS IN AMERICAN PARLIAMENTS

(Resolution adopted at the fifth plenary Session, held on February 7, 1964)

Whereas there is a need to increase the authority and prestige of Parliaments through efficient, orderly, and technical work serving their peoples,

The Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference recommends: That the Parliaments of the Americas establish technical and scientific work methods that will expedite and shorten the discussions.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DECLARATION OF WASHINGTON

(Resolution adopted at the fifth plenary session, held on February 7, 1964)

Whereas the Parliament, as depository of the sovereignty of the peoples and interpreter of public opinion, in all its shades, in free countries, identifies itself with the founding and authentic exercise of democracy;

The parliamentary institution is the object of many defamatory campaigns by totalitarian forces as a method for promoting dictatorial regimes or forces that repudiate, distort or mutilate the institution;

The parliaments of the Americas cannot remain indifferent in the face of attacks against the institution, and it is their duty to consolidate its existence, ensuring the fulfillment of its high responsibilities,

The Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference, declares

1. That the effective exercise of representative democracy, basis for inter-American solidarity, demands, as an essential requisite, the existence and free functioning of parliaments and full dissemination of their activities.

2. That the Parliament, as the leading power of a democratic state, resulting from free and periodic elections that ensure the representation of all sectors of public opinion, should be supported by all the guarantees and legitimate immunities necessary for the fulfillment of its high legislative mission.

3. That the parliaments of the Americas are dutybound to and shall give one another fraternal and democratic solidarity, considering that attack against one affects all and undermines the bases of hemispheric cooperation and of the inter-American regional system.

4. That this declaration shall be known as the "Interparliamentary Declaration of Washington."

CREATION OF AN AMERICAN PARLIAMENT

(Resolution adopted at the fifth plenary session, held on February 7, 1964)

The Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference:

Resolves:

1. To recommend to the Executive Committee that it study the possibility of organizing an American Parliament.

2. To declare that this Parliament is needed to furnish the political bases that will make possible a more rapid solution of the social and political problems of the peoples of the Americas.

REFORMULATION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Resolution adopted by the plenary meeting of February 7, 1964)

The Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference considers:

1. The fundamental problem of Latin America is its struggle against underdevelopment. All solutions aimed in the direction of this problem boil down to increasing resources to finance economic and social development, in such a way as to accelerate the rate of growth and at the same time to promote a more just and equitable redistribution of the fruits of development.

2. The Charter of Punta del Este recognized the need for a concentrated multilateral effort, with a maximum mobilization of the resources of each Latin American country, supplemented from the United States, to attack the problems arising from the lack of resources of the Latin American countries themselves, a lack that is explained by the low level of per capita income in the majority of these countries.

3. These resources should be mobilized on a priority basis, according to national plans, in which the basic sectors of economic development are defined, and these plans, in turn, should include essential structural reforms, to allow for an efficient utilization of available internal and external resources.

4. The Charter of Punta del Este recognizes that one source of the external resources required by Latin America for its development is the income derived from the exportation of its basic products to the developed countries of the world. With that purpose, the charter recognizes that the economic development of Latin America depends upon "expansion of its trade, a simultaneous and corresponding increase in foreign exchange incomes received from exports, a lessening of cyclical * * * fluctuations in the incomes * * * and the correction of the secular deterioration in their terms of trade."

5. The Alliance for Progress has been publicized primarily as a mechanism whereby the United States will furnish additional resources for the economic and social development of Latin America, overlooking the other declarations and commitments of Punta del Este. The administration of the U.S. resources, their utilization through bilateral machinery and, in certain cases, even their channeling through international organizations, has been subject to the influence of restrictive provisions adopted by the U.S. Congress and interpreted in an even more restrictive manner by the other organs of its Government.

6. For these reasons, it is felt that a reformulation of the Alliance for Progress is essential, in order to reestablish—in all their effectiveness and validity—the basic principles and commitments of Punta del Este. As a decisive contribution toward reaffirming the spirit of the Alliance for Progress,

Resolves:

To suggest to the national participating groups that they urge their parliaments to accept the following recommendations:

(a) To strengthen the inter-American bases of the Alliance for Progress through the adoption of an executive multilateral system for making decisions with regard to the utilization of the resources of the Alliance, eliminating, insofar as possible, organs that have no power to make decisions.

(b) To expand and strengthen all machinery designed to insure a fair price for basic products and to prevent fluctuations in accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Charter of Punta del Este (international agreements and the like), and to adopt compensatory systems of financing that are flexible and automatic, to compensate the countries producing raw materials for the losses sustained in their export trade.

(c) To alleviate the financial burden so that the credit worthiness of the Latin American countries may be reestablished, and massive financing may be granted by the financial organizations for projects of high economic priority. This can be achieved by means of a realistic rescheduling of their external debts in order that the yearly amortization commitments and interest payments will represent only a reasonable portion of the current export receipts.

(d) To use Alliance for Progress resources according to national priorities and regional projects, and make the beneficiary governments responsible for determining the organs and sectors to which the resources will be applied and the projects that will be financed.

(e) To give high priority to multinational projects.

(f) To give priority in the parliaments to the discussion and voting of projects related to the commitments adopted in the Punta del Este chapter.

PARTICIPATION OF TRADE UNIONS

(Resolution adopted at the fifth plenary session, held on February 7, 1964)

The Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference recommends:

That equal participation be accorded to organized trade unions, in the plans for the Alliance for Progress, in the economic and social development of their countries.

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTATION

(Recommendation adopted by the plenary meeting on February 7, 1964)

The Third Pan American Interparliamentary Conference:

Convinced that a thorough study of the manifold problems now facing representative institutions in the various parts of the world would serve the cause of democracy;

Having been informed that the Interparliamentary Union had decided to create in the near future, in Geneva, an international center for parliamentary documentation and research;

Appeals to national groups of the Interparliamentary Union, as well as to nonmember parliaments in Latin America, to extend their full cooperation for the implementation of this project, thus assisting in the development of this center as an instrument for building up knowledge of the functioning and procedure of parliament.

TELEVISION RATINGS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently the Los Angeles Times, in connection with the Times Reader Panel, conducted a survey of TV viewing habits in the Los Angeles area. The metropolitan area of Los Angeles encompasses some 6 million people and the circulation of the Los Angeles Times is 1.2 million on Sundays and over 770,000 daily. In light of the recent investigations by the House into the TV rating industry, the results of this survey are of great interest and deserve mention.

The questionnaires were mailed to some 711 readers and of these 451 or 64 percent were returned.

While we realize the sample was taken from the Times reader list, nevertheless, it showed a great discrepancy with the results of the A. C. Nielsen Co. survey. Nielsen is the industry leader, far and above American Research Bureau—ARB, Pulse, Sindlinger & Co., C. E. Hooper, and others of even lesser magnitude and has been criticized for its rating practices.

The Times listed the "Beverly Hillbillies" as the program receiving the most votes in the "least liked category." A. C. Nielsen Co. listed that program as the most popular in the Nation for the same period of time. Nielsen purports to use a random sample which he says represents the viewing habits of the entire Nation. The fact that according to the 1960 census 69.9 percent of the total U.S. population live in urban areas, seems to indicate that Nielsen's sample homes may be disproportionately in favor of the rural areas. While not advocating that the Los Angeles survey is completely accurate, the striking differences of fact that it draws with Nielsen can only emphasize the question of the accuracy and reliability of the present systems of TV ratings.

The advertising industry, which pays for the great bulk of the surveys, might take notice of the discrepancy, particularly in regard to the desires and tastes of the urban viewing population of America. The fact that roughly 70 percent of all Americans live in urban communities and that a poll taken in such a community completely contradicted a supposed "national" poll, calls for increased scrutiny of national rating techniques.

Millions of dollars are being spent for programs based on ratings compiled in actual practice from shocking techniques as brought out in congressional hearings on this subject. Certainly the National Association of Broadcasters, which is attempting to set industry standards for the ratings firms, will want to take notice of this survey of one of the Nation's great metropolitan areas. This survey stands in complete contradiction to what TV rating services are plying the advertisers and TV trade with for rather substantial sums of money.

It might be of service to the TV industry to have similar polls run in the large metropolitan markets to see if the TV ratings are as poor as they turned out to be in Los Angeles, according to the Los Angeles Times poll.

LIFETIME FRANKING PRIVILEGE TO FORMER MEMBERS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would extend a lifetime franking privilege to former Members of the Congress who have served for 50 years. One beneficiary of this bill would be our great and distinguished colleague from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON.

Georgians, and others throughout the Nation, expressed their deep regret over his decision to retire at the conclusion of his present term. He will thus conclude a career in this House spanning half a century. Passage of this bill would be small, though appropriate recognition of his life of service. I ask your support.

TED SORENSEN: MASTER CRAFTSMAN

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one measure of the greatness of President John F. Kennedy was the wide number of people he inspired to achieve greatness. One of the most important of these was Ted Sorensen. Tomorrow, Theodore C. Sorensen's many friends in high places will honor this young Nebraskan, as he leaves his Government post.

A dozen or so years ago, I recall him as a brilliant young staff member for a newly elected U.S. Senator. Then I remember the tense Democratic National Convention of 1956, when Jim Finnegan, Adlai Stevenson's sage campaign manager, asked me to get the pros and cons on every potential vice-presidential candidate. Naturally, I turned to Ted Sorensen to brief me on U.S. Senator John F. Kennedy. I marveled at this brilliant young analyst, objective, articulate, sensitive, and astutely convincing in his argument for the man who was only beaten by an eyelash on the floor of the Chicago convention in 1956.

Then I remember the great drama of 1960, the presidential primary in West Virginia, the primary which made a President. One Sunday evening on the edge of the State capital in Charleston, W. Va., the Unitarian Fellowship had as its guests John F. Kennedy and Ted Sorensen. The audience was alert, critically interested, and highly intelligent. They groaned when they discovered that the presidential candidate had lost his voice in the rigors of campaigning in the hills and hollows. Ted Sorensen arose in this difficult situation, with Senator Kennedy sitting mute on the front row, and he gave a modest yet highly polished performance in articulating Senator Kennedy's philosophy. He had so well immersed himself in the thoughts and ideals of his chief that he handled the difficult audience questions with ease. The chief interrupted only twice, in a hoarse and husky whisper, not to contradict but to confirm absolutely and personally what the master craftsman was saying.

Under unanimous consent, I ask to include a tribute to Ted Sorensen written by Max Freedman in the February 17, 1964, Washington Evening Star:

A TRIBUTE TO A KENNEDY AID: THEODORE SORENSEN'S ROLE SEEN MORE THAN JUST THAT OF SPEECHWRITER

(By Max Freedman)

On Wednesday, a few days before his departure from Washington, Theodore C. Sorensen, the special counsel for President Kennedy, will be honored at a public ceremony sponsored by the present and former members of the Cabinet and by his closest associates in the Government. It is difficult to recall any other public servant who has received such a tribute, and impossible to think of anyone with an equal claim to public recognition.

It is a strange misconception of Mr. Sorensen's role to think of him primarily or essentially as Mr. Kennedy's most trusted speechwriter. He is the last man to minimize the power of eloquence as the champion of great causes. But he knows that the art of politics consists in turning ideas into achievements; and he towered into greatness as an architect of policy and a master of strategy. He was so valuable to Mr. Kennedy in the drafting of state papers precisely because he was so familiar with the ideals and hopes of the leader whom he delighted to serve.

This surely is the central point, the one which means the most to Mr. Sorensen. He saw in Mr. Kennedy the leader who embodied and fulfilled his own highest principles of government. It was never necessary for Mr. Sorensen to attribute to Mr. Kennedy any spacious ideals of his own. His task was rather to draw out and express the ideals which glowed with quiet passion in Mr. Kennedy's mind and heart.

One tiny story will illustrate the almost unique gift which Mr. Sorensen and Mr. Kennedy both had in being able to laugh at themselves without ever laughing at their principles. Within a few days of its delivery, President Kennedy's inaugural address, with its soaring eloquence and majestic idealism, was universally recognized as a noble affirmation of the faith which has often glorified America in times of challenge. The overflowing praise rather embarrassed the President, and one day Mr. Sorensen drew gusts of laughter from Mr. Kennedy by bringing him a hilarious parody—never published to this day—of the inaugural address.

Now Mr. Sorensen would have put his hand in the fire to protect the principles of that speech, and Mr. Kennedy served those ideals with gay courage to the moment of his death. For both of them what mattered above everything else was the victory of principles, not the glory of words; and they shrank with wise reserve from turning the tributes to the speech into the exaltation of the speaker.

We are fortunate beyond the usual measure of men in knowing that before many months have passed we will be able to look at President Kennedy and the record of his administration through the eyes of Mr. Sorensen and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Their two books

will not be competitive, for they will approach their subject from different points of view, and will throw accumulated light on a gallant and unforgettable figure.

Mr. Schlesinger came to the White House with an established reputation as a historian, a biographer, and an interpreter and defender of democratic values. His years in the White House add another notable chapter to his record of public service. But with Mr. Sorensen it is rather different. He will not only be rearing a monument to Mr. Kennedy; he will also be going on a pilgrimage into his own past. He has it within his power to write a book about President Kennedy that will be at once unique, invulnerable, and immortal, if it is no exaggeration to use Augustine Birrell's words in tribute to Gibbon.

Then, his task completed, Mr. Sorensen will be on his own. That may well be the beginning of a new career of great significance for the American people. Mr. Sorensen will not seek elected office for himself; but in the world of ideas and in the clash of debate his influence will often count decisively, and it will be an influence with which scrambling politicians will have to reckon. Countless people, especially young people with an adventurous faith in the destiny of America, look to Mr. Sorensen as a spokesman for their hopes. Not even the cruel changes of a democracy can dim our memory of his valiant services, nor extinguish our conviction that in service to President Johnson and other Presidents he will many times place the whole country again under obligation to him.

OBSERVANCE OF PAN AMERICAN DAY ON APRIL 14, 1964

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 627.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 627

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Tuesday, April 14, 1964, for the celebration of Pan American Day, on which day, after the reading of the Journal, remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GROUP REPORT ON SAC AND AIR ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

I. ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, we arrived at Andrews AFB at 8:50 a.m., February 13, with our escort officers—Col. John M. Chapman and Maj. Harry M. Funk. The following Congressman—Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas; Representative HARLAN F. HAGEN, Democrat, of California; Representative ROLAND V. LIBONATI, Democrat, of Illinois; Representative J. EDWARD ROUSH, Democrat, of Indiana; Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey; Representative HAROLD M. RYAN, Democrat, of Michigan; Representative LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan; Representative COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., Democrat, of Indiana; Representative EVERETT G. BURKHALTER, Democrat, of California; Representative CHARLES H. WILSON, Democrat, of California; Representative EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat, of California; Col. John M. Chapman, SAF–LL, escort officer; Maj. Harry M. Funk, SAF–LL, escort officer—attended the briefings starting at 8:52 a.m. with an introduction to the subject matter by Lt. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., who discussed the research and development of the programs supported at enormous cost, the future consolidation of range activity, and the naval range unification with Vandenberg's program.

Gen. B. A. Schriever, U.S. Air Force, in command, was away on Government business. The biographies of these two distinguished military leaders are in order at this time for study, and I include them at this point:

BIOGRAPHY OF GEN. B. A. SCHRIEVER, U.S. AIR FORCE

German-born, Texas-reared Gen. A. B. Schriever immigrated to the United States in 1917. He was born in Bremen, Germany, on September 14, 1910.

Graduating from Texas A. & M. in 1931 with a bachelor of science degree, he started his military career that same year when he accepted a Reserve appointment in the field artillery.

Entering flight training at Randolph Field, Tex., in July 1932, the future general earned his wings and commission as a second lieutenant in the Army Air Corps Reserve in June 1933 at Kelly Field, Tex.

After assignments to March Field, Calif., and Albrook Field, Canal Zone, the then lieutenant reverted to inactive Reserve status. Meanwhile, he accepted a position as a pilot with Northwest Airlines.

Reentering the service as a second lieutenant in the Regular Army Air Corps in October 1938, General Schriever performed duty at Hamilton Field, Calif., and Wright Field, Ohio. In 1941, he entered Stanford University and in June 1942 was awarded a master's degree in mechanical engineering (aeronautical).

In June 1942, Major Schriever joined the 19th Bomb Group in the southwest Pacific. While in that theater he participated in seven campaigns.

From 1946 to 1949, General Schriever was assigned as Chief, Scientific Liaison Section, Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force. Entering the National War College in 1949, he was graduated in June 1950. He then returned to U.S. Air Force headquarters where he served as assistant for development planning. In June 1954 he became assistant to the commander, ARDC. One month later, although retained as assistant to the commander, ARDC, he assumed command of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

As commander of AFBMD, General Schriever directed the Nation's highest priority project—the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. He was responsible for telescoping time in the research and development on all missiles and for Air Force space systems. He also directed the management program for concurrently providing launching sites and equipment, tracking facilities, and ground support equipment necessary to these programs.

In April 1959, General Schriever assumed command of the Air Research and Development Command with headquarters at Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

On April 1, 1961, he became commander for the newly created and expanded Air Force Systems Command. AFSC is responsible for research, development, procurement, and production actions required to place a complete aerospace system in operational use.

General Schriever has management responsibility for Air Force contracts with more than 5,000 major contractors who are engaged in work on Air Force systems.

General Schriever was promoted to four-star rank effectively July 1, 1961.

General Schriever has been awarded the following honorary degrees: Doctor of science degrees from Creighton University, Rider College, Adelphi College, and Rollins College; doctor of aeronautical science from the University of Michigan; doctorate of engineering from Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute; doctor of laws from Loyola University of Los Angeles.

General Schriever is married to the former Dora Brett. The couple have three children—Brett Arnold, Dodie Elizabeth (married to Capt. T. G. Moeller), and Barbara Alice.

BIOGRAPHY OF LT. GEN. HOWELL M. ESTES, JR., U.S. AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., was born at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., on September 18, 1914, and was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy on June 12, 1936.

Assigned to the 2d Cavalry at Fort Bliss, Tex., in September 1937, General Estes was appointed acting aide-de-camp to the commander of the 2d Cavalry Brigade. In July 1939, he began flight training. Upon graduation the following March, he was rated a pilot and transferred to the Army Air Corps. Assigned as a flight instructor in August 1940, he became commandant of cadets at Advanced Flying School, Brooks Field, Tex. He assumed the duties of director of flying for the school in July 1942 and a year later was designated director of training.

General Estes assumed command of Blackland Airbase, Waco, Tex., in February 1944, and upon deactivation of the base in June assumed command of Lubbock Army Air Field, Tex.

In January 1946, General Estes became assistant to the assistant chief of staff for plans, U.S. Air Forces in Europe, stationed in Wiesbaden, Germany. Three months later, he was named chief of the plans section, operations division, USAFE, and in July as deputy assistant chief of staff for operations. In November 1947, he was named assistant chief of staff, plans, headquarters USAFE.

At Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., General Estes entered the Army War College in July 1948. Graduating the following year, he was assigned to the 22d Bomb Wing, March Air Force Base, Calif., and in September assumed command of the 1st Air Base Group at March Air Force Base. On temporary duty from November 1949 to January 1950, he served with the 22d Bomb Group in the United Kingdom. He became deputy commander and chief of staff of the 22d Bomb Group, and in January 1951, activated and assumed command of the 44th Bomb Wing at March Air Force Base.

In March 1951, General Estes was assigned to temporary duty overseas as vice commander, Far East Air Forces Bomber Command, where he served until July 1951. During that time he flew 25 combat missions over Korea totaling 328 hours in B–29's. Returning to March Air Force Base, he assumed command of the 106th Bomb Wing in August 1951, and the following March was appointed commander of the 12th Air Division. In October he was designated commander, Air Task Force Group 7.4, Joint Task Force 7, for the oversea atomic operation known as Castle as additional duty.

General Estes relinquished command of the 12th Air Division in July 1953 and took active command of the Air Task Group 7.4. After activating and forming the task group, he spent 4 months at the Pacific Proving

Ground at Eniwetok in 1954 during the operational phase of Operation Castle.

General Estes was assigned as director of weapon systems operations, Wright Air Development Center, Air Research and Development Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, in August 1954. This directorate was transferred to the office of the deputy commander for weapon systems of ARDC in August 1955 and became known as detachment No. 1, Headquarters, ARDC, with station at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. He was named assistant deputy commander for weapon systems with additional duty as commander, detachment No. 1, and director of systems management.

Transferred to Washington, D.C., in August 1957, General Estes became assistant chief of staff for air defense systems, headquarters U.S. Air Force. In May 1958 he became assistant deputy chief of staff, operations, headquarters, U.S. Air Force. On April 1, 1961, he was named deputy commander, Air Force systems command for aerospace systems, with duty assignment in Los Angeles, Calif. On October 10, 1962, he assumed duties as vice commander, headquarters AFSC, Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

General Estes' promotion to lieutenant general was effective May 19, 1961. His decorations include the Legion of Merit with two oak leag clusters, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal with one oak leaf cluster, and the Czechoslovakian War Cross.

General Estes and his wife, Annah V., have three sons. They are Howell III, attending the Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo.; Charles D., a student at Governor Dummer, South Byfield, Mass.; and Michael S., a student at Pennsylvania University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Speaker, at 9:30 a.m. Colonel Merritt briefed us on facts concerning the Air Force System, Command, its organization and operational units and systems.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

The Air Force Systems Command, established April 1, 1961, is responsible for the rapid advancement of aerospace technology and its adaptation into operational aerospace systems. It is organized to provide the most up to date and effective management of Air Force scientific and technical resources. The Air Force Systems Command—AFSC—is the single manager of all phases of acquisition of new aerospace systems.

AFSC has the task of meeting major space responsibilities of the Department of Defense, providing research, development, test, and engineering of satellites, boosters, space probes, and associated systems needed to support specific National Aeronautics and Space Administration projects and programs arising under basic agreements between DOD and NASA.

From headquarters at Andrews Air Force Base, Md., AFSC directs the operations of seven divisions, seven development and test centers, three contract management regions, and administers the Defense Documentation Center. Command personnel strength numbers approximately 26,650 officers and airmen and 37,500 civilian employees.

In coordinating the military and civilian scientific and industrial efforts of the United States toward the development of aerospace weapon systems, AFSC directs the expenditure of about 40 percent of the Air Force budget, or approximately 10 cents of each Federal tax dollar. For fiscal year 1963 the budget to support AFSC programs and installations totaled more than $8.5 billion. The command administers approximately 70,000 contracts having a face value of about $60 billion.

AFSC manages and controls approximately 300 installations or separate activities in the United States and overseas, including England, South Africa, Greenland, Alaska, Hawaii, Eniwetok, and Singapore. These facilities are valued at about $2 billion.

Currently, AFSC supervises more than 80 weapon and support systems in varying stages of development or acquisition. Of this total, some 16 are designated systems programs of high priority.

AFSC's deputy to the commander for manned space flight plans, programs, and coordinates allocation of the AFSC resources necessary to support specific NASA projects and programs for manned flight under basic agreements between NASA and the DOD.

Of the 2,519 scientific and technical officers, 52 percent hold bachelor of science degrees; 33 percent hold masters, and 7 percent Ph. D's. Of the scientific and technical civilian employees, 80 percent hold bachelor of science degrees or equivalent, 13 percent masters, and 7 percent Ph. D.'s.

AFSC DIVISIONS

Space Systems Division—SSD—Los Angeles, Calif., plans, programs and manages space systems and related equipment. This includes the responsibility for the research, development, engineering, test, on-orbit tracking, telemetry control, recovery, evaluation, procurement, production, quality assurance, and installation and checkout of space systems. As a corollary responsibility, it manages the acquisition of related items such as space boosters and aerospace ground equipment necessary to provide launching, control, and recovery of space equipment and the support of space programs.

Units assigned to SSD are the 6595th Aerospace Test Wing, Vandenberg AFB, Calif.; the 6594th Aerospace Test Wing, Sunnyvale, Calif.; and the 6555th Aerospace Test Wing, Patrick AFB, Fla.

Ballistic Systems Division—BSD—Norton AFB, Calif., plans, programs, and manages acquisition of a ballistic missile program and related equipment that cost $18 billion through fiscal year 1963. BSD provides for activation of selected missile sites for the Atlas, Titan and Minuteman programs under the most gigantic construction effort in the history of this country. There are Atlas missile launch sites already in operation at nine Air Force bases in States west of the Mississippi, with one in New York. Atlas models D—horizontal on top of the ground—E—horizontal underground—and F—stored in a silo-type encasement below ground—are all operational. Titan I, II and Minuteman missile sites are now located in 7 States.

In all 17 States, covering more than 100,000 miles is involved, to date, with more construction planned. The mobile mid-range ballistic missile—MMRBM—program is under BSD's supervision.

Aeronautical Systems Division—ASD—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, plans and manages the development and acquisition of aeronautical and associated systems. Aerospace systems under the ASD mission include the X–20 Dyna-Soar—the piloted space glider; C–141 transport; F–111—TFX fighter; F4C fighter; XB–70 Valkyrie bomber; AGM–28A, air-to-ground—Hound Dog—missile; MIM–10B—Bomarc—intercept air defense weapon; and the X–19 and XC–142, both vertical takeoff and landing—VTOL—aircraft. ASD is the lead division for AFSC activities to increase the Air Force's worldwide air combat capability for special air warfare which includes limited war and COIN operations.

Electronic Systems Division—ESD—L. G. Hanscom Field, Mass., plans and manages information and communication programs and projects for accomplishment of command, control, warning, surveillance, and support—weather, intelligence—functions. Responsibilities include electronic systems acquisition, test, and support for the Air Force and other U.S. Government departments as requested or directed.

ESD-developed systems or those under development include the semiautomatic ground environment—SAGE—system for directing the air defense of North America; the ballistic missile early warning system—BMEWS—which provides warning against attack by ballistic missiles; the nuclear detonation detection system—nudets—and the space detection and tracking system—spadats—used to detect, track, and compute orbits of satellites.

Aerospace Medical Division—AMD—Brooks AFB, Tex., manages bioastronautics research and development programs in support of the Air Force personnel system, clinical and aerospace medicine requirements. AMD supervises specialized educational programs in aerospace medical subjects. AMD-assigned units include the USAF School of Aerospace Medicine, Brooks AFB, Tex.; Arctic Aeromedical Laboratory, Fort J. M. Wainwright, Alaska; 6570th Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio; 6571st Aeromedical Research Laboratory, Holloman AFB, N. Mex.; 6570th Personnel Research Laboratory; the Wilford Hall USAF Hospital; and the USAF Epidemiological Laboratory. The last three units are located at Lackland AFB, Tex.

Foreign Technology Division—FTD—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, to prevent possible technological surprise by a potential enemy, the FTD acquires, evaluates, analyzes, and disseminates foreign aerospace technology, in concert with other AFSC divisions and centers. Information collected from a wide variety of sources undergoes screening, then is processed in unique electronic data handling and laboratory processing equipment. Screened and processed information is analyzed by scientific and technical specialists for providing reports, studies, and technical findings and assessments of potential hostile technological or operational environs with

which the Air Force weapon systems must cope.

Research and Technology Division—RTD—Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C., responsible through its assigned laboratories for planning and managing the AFSC exploratory and advanced development programs aimed at creating a broad base of research and technology for timely application in the development of superior, advanced aerospace weapons and support systems and equipment.

Laboratories under RTD supervision and their respective functional areas are listed as follows: The Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Kirtland, AFB, N. Mex., conducts research in nuclear weapon applications, effects, ballistics, delivery techniques, and safety.

Programs at the Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory, Edwards AFB, Calif., encompass rocket propulsion components, propellants, and associated ground equipment.

The Rome Air Development Center, Griffiss AFB, N.Y., conducts research in electromagnetic energy conversion, signal detection and processing, computation and display, command and control, test and evaluation. The center furnishes research and development and engineering support of intelligence devices, ground communications hardware, the ground environment for surveillance, approach and landing, navigation, and electromagnetic radiation warfare.

There are four laboratories at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, under program direction of the RTD. The Air Force Aero-Propulsion Laboratory works in the areas of airbreathing, electric and advanced propulsion, fuels and lubricants, flight vehicle power, and site support.

The Air Force Materials Laboratory handles research programs in material sciences, metals and ceramics, nonmetallic materials, manufacturing technology, and materials application.

The Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory is concerned with flight vehicle dynamics, performance, control, launching, alighting and structures, crew station, environmental control and escape and aerodynamic decelerators.

The Air Force Avionics Laboratory conducts research and technology in electronic components, optics and photo materials, navigation and guidance, vehicle defense, electronic warfare, communications and reconnaissance.

AFSC CENTERS

Air Force Missile Test Center—AFMTC—Patrick AFB, Fla., develops, maintains and operates the Atlantic Missile Range (including Cape Kennedy Missile Test Annex) in support of U.S. missile and space programs; provides facilities for collecting data for the U.S. Air Force's major ballistic missiles, aerospace systems, the national space program, and includes facilities for the Army, Navy, and NASA.

In recent years AFMTC has compiled a spectacular record of "firsts" in the U.S. military missile and space program. Included among them are the first firing of a U.S. satellite, the first full-range Atlas ICBM launching, and the first firing of the Bomarc in conjunction with the Air Force SAGE systems.

The AFSC's 6555th Aerospace Test Wing located at the AFMTC and assigned to SSD, prepared the boosters, conducted the countdowns, launched, and put into orbit the capsule carrying the Mercury astronauts.

Against this backdrop of accomplishments, even more important satellite and space programs are underway at Cape Kennedy.

Air Force Flight Test Center—AFFTC—Edwards AFB, Calif., conducts aircraft category II testing. Provides facilities for category I contractor tests and the final functional test and military demonstration intended to determine the capability and suitability of a complete system in meeting established USAF requirements and design objectives. AFFTC is the home of the X–15 research rocket plane which has flown faster and higher than any manned aircraft in the history of world aviation. Also at Edwards is the USAF Aerospace Research Pilot School, the only school in the free world that offers a formal course in space research pilot training. The USAF Parachute Test Group, assigned to AFFTC, is located at El Centro, Calif.

Air Force Special Weapons Center—AFSWC—Kirtland AFB, N. Mex., provides engineering support and testing of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, their components, associated equipment, and related phenomena and environment.

AFSWC also provides support to the Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies in conducting continental and oversea nuclear tests.

Air Proving Ground Center—APGC—Eglin AFB, Fla., develops, operates, and maintains the Gulf Test Range for aircraft and missile system tests and an electromagnetic test environment for electronic countermeasure and electronic countermeasure tests; conducts development engineering tests of missile and aircraft systems, subsystems and equipment appropriate to the capabilities and facilities of the Center; and carries out combat effectiveness tests and operates the USAF Climatic Laboratory. In addition, APGC working closely with the Special Warfare Center of the Tactical Air Command, tests munitions and other equipment used in special air warfare, including counterinsurgency—Coin—operations.

Air Force Missile Development Center—AFMDC—Holloman AFB, N. Mex., conducts category II research and development testing of air-to-air missiles and drones. It maintains and operates an inertial guidance test facility and performs rocket firings in support of reentry technology. The Aeromedical Research Laboratory at Holloman conducts research and development in human factors relating to biodynamics and space biology, and was primate manager on Project Mercury.

Since its construction in mid-1950, the high-speed captive missile test track at AFMDC has played an ever-increasing role in missile development and human factors research. The 35,000-foot track is used to test full-scale missile subsystems and some of the complete weapon systems. Nose cones and other missile components requiring impact or other destructive experiments also are tested on the track.

Arnold Engineering Development Center—AEDC—Arnold AFS, Tenn.: The wind tunnel center of the U.S. Air Force and the largest in the free world, Arnold provides test support in the fields of gas dynamics and propulsion for all the Armed Forces, industrial contractors, NASA, and educational or research institutions.

The AEDC mission is to plan, construct, and operate a series of wind tunnels, high-altitude test cells and aerospace simulation chambers for the development, testing, and evaluation of aircraft, guided missiles, aerospace systems, and rocket and air-breathing propulsion systems.

AEDC is grouped into four major laboratories: the Von Karman Gas Dynamics Facility, which performs aerodynamic testing of scale models of aircraft, missiles, and space weapons under extreme flight conditions; the rocket test facility, which tests aircraft, missile, and spacecraft propulsion systems including ramjets, turbojets, turboprops, and liquid and solid propellant rockets; scale aircraft and missile propulsion systems to investigate combined aerodynamic propulsion characteristics; the propulsion wind tunnel, for testing scale and full model aircraft, missiles, satellites, and the propulsion systems; and the aerospace environmental facility, a series of high vacuum chambers in which space environments up to 300 miles altitude may be simulated.

Defense Documentation Center—DDC—Cameron Station, Alexandria, Va., provides a central service for the Department of Defense for efficient interchange of scientific and technical information. Under one roof are technical and scientific reports available to all the armed services, U.S. Government agencies, and qualified contractors.

Three contract management regions—CMR's—manage the administration of billions of dollars in contracts executed by the AFSC divisions and centers, Air Force Logistics Command field procurement activities, major air commands, DSA, NASA, and other U.S. Government purchasing agencies when required, in addition to those Army and Navy contracts for which the DOD has plant jurisdiction. Each CMR has administrative responsibility for these contracts and contractor surveillance within designated geographical areas. The CMR's assure that specified quantities and qualities of end items are delivered, provide technical direction in the management of the quality control of materiel and services provided, manage the Air Force industrial security program in facilities under contract, give transportation management surveillance, in addition to providing development engineering capability in support of Air Force system program offices and procuring activities designated by AFSC.

The three are, eastern contract management region—ECMR—Olmsted AFB,

Pa.; central contract management region—CCMR—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio; and the western contract management region—WSMR—Mira Loma, Calif.

Air Force Systems Command's 1963 report follows. In addition to the overall release highlighting the command's major activities during the calendar year of 1963, the report consists of six sections of sidebars. These are: First, aviation, aerospace, astronautics; second, missiles, rockets, and space; third, electronics; fourth, aerospace and general medicine, science, bionics; fifth, management, finance, contracts, personnel; and sixth, plastics, materials, chemistry, allied subjects.

For further information on items of specific interest write to: Office of Information, Attention: SCEP, Air Force Systems Command, Andrews Air Force Base, Washington, D.C.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND REPORTS ON 1963 ACHIEVEMENTS

Andrews Air Force Base, Md.: During 1963, the Air Force Systems Command—AFSC—headed by Gen. B. A. Schriever, passed important milestones in the advancement of aerospace technology and its adaption into operational aerospace systems for national security.

The highlight in delivery of missile systems to the operational inventory by the Ballistics Systems Division—BSD—Norton AFB, Calif., was the turnover of six squadrons of Titan II missiles to the using command in 1963. The first squadron was delivered on June 13, 1963, at Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz., and the last two squadrons were turned over on December 30, 1963, at Little Rock AFB, Ark. The turnover completed the Titan II program and gives the Nation an inventory of 54 of the powerful weapons.

During the year the BSD also delivered two Minuteman wings to the Strategic Air Command, making an average of one ICBM delivered per day in 1963. AFSC delivery of missile systems during the year raised the total in the SAC inventory to more than 500 ICBM's including Atlas and Titan I squadrons.

Highlighting aircraft development, directed by the Aeronautical Systems Division—ASD—was the rollout on August 22 and first flight of the all-jet C–141 StarLifter cargo transport on December 17, 1963, at Dobbins Air Force Base, Ga.

During the year, also, the X–19—the first of a new triservice family of vertical takeoff and landing—VTOL—aircraft flew for the first time.

In July the Space Systems Division—SSD—Los Angeles, Calif., recorded its 100th Agena satellite launch from Vandenberg AFB, Calif. An Atlas boosted the satellite engine into a polar orbit.

During the same month the world's largest solid propellant motor was successfully fired by SSD. In a static test, the 250-ton, five-segment, 120-inch-diameter motor produced more than 1 million pounds of thrust. The motor will be used on the Air Force Titan III.

AFSC, during the year, continued to provide a large measure of support to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—in terms of facilities, technically trained personnel, test and launch assistance.

In the area of contract administration, for example, support of NASA by the western contract management region—WCMR—Mira Loma AFS, Calif., showed a marked increase. Face value of contracts administered increased from about $450 million in July 1961 to about $1.5 billion in June 1963.

The ballistic missile early warning system—BMEWS—developed by the Electronic Systems Division, became fully operational on September 17 with turnover of the third station at Flyingdales, England. The other two are located at Clear, Alaska, and Thule, Greenland. BMEWS was built to provide the North American Continent with warning of enemy attack.

On November 21, the Aerospace Medical Division—AMD—Brooks AFB, Tex., formally dedicated the new six-building complex of the School of Aerospace Medicine at Brooks AFB, Tex. The dedicatory address was delivered by the President of the United States.

Assignment to the Research and Technology Division—RTD—Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C., of seven laboratories and the Air Force Systems Engineering Group increased the command's "in house" research capability. RTD, through its laboratories, plans and manages the AFSC exploratory and advanced development programs. The division creates a broad base of research and technology for application in the development of aerospace weapon and support systems.

More than 150 major test launches from Cape Kennedy, Fla., by the Air Force Missile Test Center—AFMTC—advanced the proficiency of America's missile systems and recorded important inroads into space.

On May 24, a Titan ICBM became the 1,400th missile launched from the cape.

Missile range instrumentation capabilities were increased with the assignment of two advanced range instrumentation ships. The ships, the *General H. H. Arnold* and the *General Hoyt S. Vandenberg*, were formally dedicated and delivered to the Atlantic Missile Range in 1963.

Development testing of the supersonic 500-mile-range Hound Dog at low altitudes was successfully concluded with an October 31 launch over the Eglin Test Range which is administered by the Air Proving Ground Center—APGC—Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.

Throughout the year the AFSC continued to emphasize management efficiency in delivering the maximum in qualitatively superior weapon and support systems to the U.S. Air Force at a minimum in cost. As a result, substantial cost reductions for the command during the first quarter of fiscal year 1964 amounted to $137 million.

In coordinating the military and civilian scientific and industrial efforts of the United States toward the development of aerospace weapon systems, AFSC had managerial responsibility for some 40 percent of the Air Force budget, or approximately 10 cents of each Federal dollar.

For fiscal year 1964 the budget to support AFSC programs and installations totaled more than $10 billion. The command administers approximately 68,000 contracts having a face value of about $58 billion.

AVIATION, AEROSPACE, ASTRONAUTICS

The School of Aerospace Medicine—SAM—Brooks AFB, Tex., in July installed a large-scale digital computer for recording, maintaining, and analyzing biomedical data relevant to Air Force man-in-space problems. The system includes an analog-to-digital converter. The system is the first of its kind and size to be used in aerospace physiology and medicine.

SAM uses two of the most heavily instrumented—medical—aircraft in the free world. The two F–100 two-seater jets carry equipment for recording on board and telemetering the following medical measurements: Heart rate; systolic and diastolic blood pressure; rate and depth of respiration; electroencephalogram; and galvanic skin response, to name a few.

With a specially designed seat mounted at various positions on a test sled, Air Force aeromedical personnel fired 48 manned sleds along the laboratory's 240-foot Daisy Decelerator, a compressed-air driven, dual-rail track with a water braking system. Maximum force recorded on a subject was 60 g.'s. Purpose of the tests was to record a human's reaction to various deceleration forces which might be experienced by Apollo pilots during the recovery. During the tests, 40 different subjects were subjected to deceleration forces in various seat positions determined according to simulated Apollo landing profiles. In July, Airman D. N. Aragon was the subject of the 1,500th ride on the Daisy sled track. The ride was in support of Project Apollo. Present for the run were Col. John Paul Stapp, known as the fastest man on earth since his world famous rocket-sled run in 1954 on the Holloman high-speed test track, and Capt. Eli Beeding, who once endured 83 g.'s in a deceleration run on the Daisy Decelerator.

The Air Force Missile Development Center—AFMDC—Holloman AFB, N. Mex., was designated as the location for the Ballistic Missile Reentry System Data Center—BMRSDC.

AFMDC completed a test program of the advanced version of the air-to-air Falcon designated the air-launched interceptor missile—AIM 4D. During the yearlong test program, the Falcon hit both ground targets and aerial drones at subsonic and supersonic speeds successfully.

AFMDC was assigned a portion of the testing phase category II of the RF–4C, the reconnaissance version of the F–4C. The plane is considered to be a frontline aircraft until at least 1975. The reconnaissance version features special radar antennas and other devices to enable it to "see" objects on the ground with greater clarity.

Last October AFMDC fired its 2,000th high-speed test sled down its 35,700-foot test track.

Nearing completion at the Center is a 260-inch radius centrifuge. It will provide the free world with an unequaled instrument for the calibration, testing, and evaluation of inertial guidance systems and their components.

As 1963 drew to a close, the Air Force Special Weapons Center—AFSWC—Kirtland AFB, N. Mex., neared completion of a 32-pound miniature space "laboratory" designed to measure strengths of the earth's magnetic field. The 8-inch-high by 20-inch-in-diameter package is the smallest instrument compartment of its kind ever used at AFSWC.

An "atomic heat engine," consisting of a small nuclear reactor without moving parts, was developed for AFSWC. The "engine" also has a system of thermionic converters to change the reactor's heat directly into electricity.

Scientists at AFSWC and those from the contractor seek to determine how efficient and reliable the concept would be as an auxiliary power source for future spacecraft. Thermionic systems promise important reductions in payload weights, increases in power output, and greater reliability for power needs of space vehicles of the coming decade.

On October 1 the first Lockheed NF-104A areospace trainer was delivered to the Air Force Flight Test Center—AFFTC—Edwards AFB, Calif. The craft is equipped with a 6,000-pound thrust rocket that will enable the plane to reach altitudes of 125,000 feet.

AFFTC test pilot Maj. Robert W. Smith climbed to 118,860 feet on November 15 in the rocket-assisted NF-104 for an unofficial world altitude record.

Construction began September 14 on a $3.5 million simulator for use by the Aerospace Research Pilot School at AFFTC to train crews in full mission space flight profiles, in addition to rendezvous and docking maneuvers.

The ASSET aeroelastic vehicle underwent hypersonic mach 8 and mach 10 wind tunnel testing at the Arnold Engineering Development Center—AEDC—Arnold AFS, Tenn., to help scientists obtain information on structural integrity, static stability, and other aerodynamic characteristics. ASSET is an acronym for aerothermodynamic/elastic structural systems environmental tests. It was launched on September 18 from the cape to explore the guidance of reentry into the atmosphere from space.

A space helmet radio transceiver aimed at providing unrestricted mobility for crewmen was developed at the Air Force Avionics Laboratory—AFAL—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio. AFAL is under the Research and Technology Division—RTD—Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C. A sometimes hazardous "tied in place" situation was eliminated when a radio link replaced headset cords. Such a device can be used in aircraft, space vehicles, or for communication by ground crews.

First flight tests were underway at the Aeronautical Systems Division—ASD—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, of a new communication system designed to penetrate the plasma sheath surrounding an aerospace vehicle reentering the earth's atmosphere. Plasma results when air in front of a vehicle heats up to 20,000 degrees and more—about twice the temperature on the surface of the sun.

A completely air-transportable hydrant refueling system gives added punch to the free world's ability to cope with limited and brush wars. ASD developed a system that can handle 200,000 gallons of fuel stored in four buna "N" coated, nylon tanks.

An escape and survival system—called the most advanced yet developed—will protect the crew of the F-111—TFX—tactical fighter. The system for the two-man crew is a complete compartment, including their craft seats. ASD developed the system.

A portable aircraft-arresting barrier was developed by ASD for use in support of limited war operations. The system is designed for forward airfields where permanent installations are not practical. Under test, 60 engagements were made of aircraft equipped with hooks, including a rapid cycle test of 12 arrestments in an hour.

Flight testing began in October of the first production model F-5A military tactical fighter. The craft—capable of supersonic speed up to altitudes of 50,000 feet—is the first of those being built for use in the military assistance program—MAP.

A vertical takeoff and landing craft—VTOL—an X-19—was rolled out in ceremonies on July 23 at the Curtiss-Wright Corp., Caldwell, N.J. ASD manages the VTOL program.

The laminar flow control X-21 aircraft made its first flight from Hawthorne, Calif., to Edwards AFB on April 18.

Air Force aircraft, some of World War II vintage, are being equipped to play new roles in remote areas of the world as counterinsurgency—coin—aircraft. The wide spectrum of coin operations offers use for a variety of off-the-shelf or out of inventory aircraft and helicopters—from a modified B-26 World War II bomber to present-day light liaison aircraft.

The first of several hundred F-4C mach 2 tactical fighters was accepted by the Air Force more than 2 months ahead of schedule in May 1963. The two-place all-weather fighter carries a variety of weapons, including more than twice the conventional bomb load of the World War II B-17 heavy bomber.

First Air Force flight of the two-place F-105F fighter aircraft was made on June 21, 1963. Six days later, the Air Force accepted the initial production F-105F, approximately 9 months after contractual go-ahead was received.

MISSILES, ROCKETS, AND SPACE

The first full-scale advanced ballistic reentry systems—ABRES—underwent successful test on March 1 by an all-Air Force crew of the 6555th Aerospace Test Wing from Patrick AFB, Fla.

The 6511th Test Group—Parachute—of the Air Force Flight Test Center—AFFTC—Edwards AFB, Calif., made the first space capsule recovery on land when on May 2 it recovered the "boiler-plate" full-scale Apollo capsule at El Centro, Calif.

Since March 1959, more than 460 space probes have been conducted from Air Proving Ground Center's—APGC—Eglin AFB, Fla., aerospace launch facility on Santa Rosa Island. The probes included at least 87 in the Project Firefly program. The project actually is the intense investigation of the earth's atmosphere and an assault on the secrets of "near space."

The shock test facility at the Air Force Special Weapons Center—AFSWC—Kirtland AFB, N. Mex., simulated nuclear shock tests during the year on the shock-insulation system for the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile's underground launch control center.

Growth of a complex of nuclear research and development facilities at AFSWC continued through the year.

For more than a decade, AFSWC has tested nuclear weapon and space probe systems; provided Air Force support for underground nuclear tests; and operated weapons effects simulation facilities.

During 1963, it fabricated and tested space probe instrument packages and provided flight planning and documentation services for space programs.

AFSWC test aircraft carried out about 500 missions during the year in support of nuclear weapon and space systems development.

The first launch from the Atlantic Missile Range of a Titan II intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM—was accomplished on February 6 by an all-Air Force crew from Ballistic Systems Division—BSD—Norton AFB, Calif. The ICBM carried the heaviest payload ever fired a distance of 6,500 miles by a ballistic missile.

On June 30, Space Systems Division—SSD—recorded its 200th Thor launch. The figure includes the use of the Thor as a space booster—Thor/Agena, Thor/Delta, Thor/Able, and Thor/Ablestar—and as an intermediate range ballistic missile—IRBM.

A tetrahedral research satellite—TRS—was launched in September by SSD from a spacecraft in orbit. It communicated essential data regarding the effects of radiation damage encountered in space.

SSD accepted the first Titan III engines on November 27 from the Aerojet-General Corporation of Sacramento, Calif. The engines were the first- and second-stage liquid fuel engines for the Titan IIIA—core of the Titan IIIC. Combined, they produce a total thrust of 530,000 pounds.

On October 25, the SSD accepted the first Gemini launch vehicle from the Martin Company. The booster—a modified Titan II—will be used in support of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's—NASA—Gemini program.

Launch of the first Titan II from an operationally configured silo took place on February 15 from Vandenberg AFB, Calif.

Construction began February 15 of the integrate-transfer-launch — ITL — facility for the USAF Titan III standard launch system on the Banana River at Cape Kennedy, Fla. The facility will be

built on soil dredged from the bottom of the river.

USAF Maj. L. Gordon Cooper captured the imagination of people everywhere on May 16 when he completed 22 orbits of the earth in 34 hours, 20 minutes, and 30 seconds after being boosted into orbit from Cape Kennedy—then Cape Canaveral—Fla., by an Atlas.

ELECTRONICS

A room literally without echoes was installed last March at the Air Proving Ground Center—APGC—Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. The room, an anechoic chamber, and a centrifuge test new electronic equipment.

The Avionics Laboratory and the Air Force Materials Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, contributed extensively to the operation of lasers in a space environment.

The laser—light amplification by the stimulation of emissive radiation—is a narrow beam of coherent light which does not spread like a conventional or incoherent light source.

A continuous wave laser system, pumped only by a tungsten bulb, has been developed.

An air-to-air infrared communications system, difficult to jam, intercept, or detect was developed by the Air Force Avionics Laboratory.

The Aeronautical Systems Division—ASD—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, developed a unique plating process—leading the way for possible applications in molecular electronics and aerospace research. Technicians extended the process to include vapor plating the interior surfaces of teflon tubing, and the interior surfaces of ceramic nozzles with films of tungsten for tests in solid fuel missiles. Devices proposed as a result of the study are thin film coaxial cables, flexible wave guides, resistors, diodes, capacitors, and storage units.

It was announced on November 20 that a $616,499 electronic brain was being built for Air Force Flight Test Center—AFFTC—researchers at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif. The computing system will enable researchers to make precise calculations required for manned space vehicle operations anywhere from the earth to the moon.

On January 1, 1963, Rome Air Development Center—RADC—Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y., was assigned to the Research and Technology Division, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D.C. In August the Passive Satellite Research Terminal at Floyd, N.Y., was dedicated. The center's new 60-foot-in-diameter parabolic steerable antenna will be used to track passive satellites and for other space communications research.

Early in January, the Electronic Systems Division—ESD—Hanscom Field, Mass., demonstrated a new all-weather multipurpose landing system. The design calls for a system capable of landing all types of aircraft in adverse weather and visibility conditions. It controls the aircraft on landing approach through instant computer data fed to the aircraft by radar and electronics.

Instructions are relayed to the aircraft's automatic pilot system which then adjusts direction, speed, angle, elevation, and glide path to touchdown. Manual operation returns may be used at any time during the approach or landing.

The ESD-developed Semi-Automatic Ground Environment—SAGE—Center at North Bay, Ontario, Canada, was declared operational September 26. The center is the headquarters for the Northern Norad—North American Air Defense Command—region. Northern Norad provides air defense coverage for the New England States, the Canadian Northwest Territories, Maritime Provinces, Quebec, and most of Ontario.

ESD completed on January 15 testing of a high-quality tropospheric scatter communications system. The system went into operation in South Vietnam and Thailand less than 18 months after development got underway.

Development of a highly reliable, transportable, tactical air navigation—tacan—guidance system was announced on March 8, by ESD. The system provides instantaneous bearing and range information to aircraft within a 200-nautical-mile range. The system can be used in tactical situations and at installations both in this country and overseas. It weighs one-fourth that of the present tacan, and can be placed into operation in 2 hours after arrival at a site.

AEROSPACE AND GENERAL MEDICINE, SCIENCE

The 6570th Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories—AMRL—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, completed plans to provide the Air Force with an inhalation toxicology facility to help scientists study effects of gases, vapor, aerosol, and dust exposure on humans and animals. Results are expected to give researchers a definition of human tolerance limits to toxic stresses they will encounter in closed atmospheres or orbital systems.

The initial phase of the Centralized Space Training Facility study by the 6570th Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, ended. The study determined the personnel and training requirements of future military space systems. Mission spectrums of 10 systems studied included reconnaissance, scientific tests, support, logistics, strategic and lunar.

AMRL initiated the first lunar gravity research in 1963. Using a zero-gravity parabola aircraft tests were conducted under actual lunar—one-sixth earth gravity—conditions.

Man's normal walking gait turned out to be equivalent to a fast walk in slow motion. The stride was longer in distance and time. Low frictional forces caused the "astronauts" to stumble backward when trying to turn while running forward. One man could easily pick up two men, walk with them and toss them 10 feet away.

AMRL found the solution to the problem of aircrew eye protection from nuclear flashes during daylight operations. A 1-percent neutral density gold-coated fixed filter offered protection to the eyes against the thermal effects of a nuclear fireball.

The U.S. Air Force Hospital, Lackland, became known officially as the Wilford Hall U.S. Air Force Hospital. The hospital, under the Aerospace Medical Division—AMD—and located at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., is the largest such installation in the Air Force. It was named in memory of Maj. Gen. Wilford Hall, commanding surgeon of several major Air Force commands and one of the leading proponents of military clinical medicine. In July, a cobalt 60 radiotherapeutic clinic was completed and went into operation at the Wilford Hall U.S. Air Force Hospital. The clinic uses the most powerful cobalt 6,700-curie source now used in the continental United States.

A new surgical technique to correct sound distortion which often accompanies nerve deafness was studied and developed at the Wilford Hall U.S. Air Force Hospital, Aerospace Medical Division—AMD. U.S. Air Force Capt. Robert Clubb designed the microscopic surgical procedure to release a normal pressure on the eardrum which, to date, has cured symptoms of dizziness and imbalance.

A centrifuge that can subject a 500-pound package to a force of 100 g.'s went into operation, enhancing the laboratory facilities of the 3208th Test Group, Air Proving Ground Center—APGC—Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. The centrifuge may attain speeds up to 225 revolutions per minute.

Radio Corp. of America designed a functional, electronic model of a frog's retina for the Aeronautical Systems Division—ASD—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio. The model is applied to the study of information handling techniques in the area of property filtering, parallel processing, and optoelectronic logic.

A frog's retina filters what the frog sees and only that information essential to its survival is transmitted to the frog's brain. The model duplicates four of these filtering functions of the frog. They are detection of edges, moving convexities, time-changing contrast, and dimming. The model contains about 33,000 electronic components.

The Rome Air Development Center—RADC—Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y., made marked progress during the year in language translation techniques. Russian, for example, can be translated into English at the rate of 1,800 words a minute. The translator is in operation at the Foreign Technology Division—FTD—Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

MANAGEMENT, FINANCE, CONTRACTS, PERSONNEL

Each month, from 40 to 50 percent of subcontracts issued by large companies under the jurisdiction of the central contract management region—CCMR—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, goes to small business. The dollar value of these contracts ranges from $40 to $50 million.

More than $1 million was saved in 1963 by using Air Force-owned machinery for new production. Another—audited—savings of more than $800,000

was recorded by eliminating unnecessary production steps or parts of equipment. A savings of nearly one-half million dollars was effected by using modern methods of preservation and packaging of shipments from contractors.

By the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1964, CCMR saved more than $4 million of an annual goal of $9,264,000 for the year. The savings represents 74 percent of the goal.

More than 50 large companies in the CCMR area agreed to place varying amounts of their subcontracts with small businesses, with the result that 1,000 to 1,300 region contracts have been with small business firms.

Research is underway at the Aerospace Medical Research Laboratories—AMRL—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, to develop methods that can be used by Government agencies and their contractors to build a "bank" of task-skill information useful for improving the design and development of advanced systems. Thus far, preliminary in-house research has developed computer methods that will store, retrieve, and update information on concepts. Methodology included the following: A category system; task analysis formats; analysis of task-skill information in system requirement—SR—studies; computer storage of analyzed information; and development and use of request programs. Results to date are encouraging. Future work will modify present programs to accommodate data appearing throughout system development and operation.

Research conducted since 1959 at the 6570th Personnel Research Laboratory—PRL—Lackland AFB, Tex., on the problem of nonadaptive Air Force personnel has demonstrated the relatively high discharge rate for unsuitability occurring for high school dropouts who enter service. Findings by the PRL, transmitted to the President's Committee on High School Dropouts, contributed to the national emphasis on increasing the retention efforts of high schools.

The first Ballistic Systems Division "purse strings" cost savings validation on September 3 resulted in a $5.5 million savings. An idea by Capt. Peter E. Rawlings resulted in the retrofitting of research and development guidance sets for Titan II training launches. BSD is located at Norton AFB, Calif.

On February 19 the Electronic Systems Division—ESD—Hanscom Field, Mass., was assigned the responsibility for selecting all of the Air Force's business and scientific-type computers.

PLASTICS, MATERIALS, CHEMISTRY, ALLIED SUBJECTS

The Aeronautical Systems Division—ASD—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, recorded progress in the development of elastomeric material compatible with liquid propellants. New materials and processes are being developed that possess greater resistance to the injurious properties of certain liquid fuels. The elastomers are used for components such as seals, gaskets, flexible connectors, diaphrams, and expulsion bladders required for advanced aerospace vehicles.

For the first time single crystals of cuprous chloride were grown by ASD. Future use of the crystals will be in optical communication systems designs and radar systems.

New fabrics woven from multifilament yarns and an experimental weaving loom acquired by ASD offer potential advances in development of parachutes and other decelerators, and expandable aerospace structures.

Using multifilament yarns, fabrics have been produced which possess up to 100 times greater folding endurance, five times higher tear strength, and 20 percent higher tensile strength than single filament fabrics. The new materials also have a wrinkle recovery of as much as 33 percent, compared with none for single filament fabrics.

The laboratory-scale loom acquired by ASD can be used to weave research samples from 2 inches to 20 inches in width from small quantities of new fibers. The weave can be varied geometrically without any loss in yarn or need for changing yarn alinement.

Common gelatin is under research by ASD. ASD scientists anticipate using gelatin in materials for shelters, solar collectors, passive communication satellites and other cloth structures to be reinforced with the rigidizing product.

Many dangerous gases and dust particles can be safely monitored by a device in use by the Air Force Rocket Propulsion Laboratory, Edwards AFB, Calif. Designed to detect harmful boron compounds used in rocket propulsion research, the device also can be adapted to measure minute quantities of other toxic or flammable vapors.

Scientists at the Research and Technology Division's—RTD—Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, established strength criteria for the design of supersonic textile canopies for high dynamic pressure operations. Thus far, 24 tests have deployed surface pressures between 1,500 and 2,800 per square foot, and canopy surface temperatures up to 200° F. were measured. Later it is planned to continue dynamic pressures as high as 10,000 per square foot.

AFSC OPERATIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

During its 13 years of operation, the Air Force Systems Command has recorded significant achievements in research, development, test, procurement, and production in fulfilling its mission of advancing aerospace systems for the U.S. Air Force. Activated on January 23, 1950, as the Air Research and Development Command, the organization was redesignated the Air Force Systems Command on April 1, 1961.

Some of the command's highlights follow:

January 23, 1950: Air Research and Development Command—ARDC—established.

July 24, 1950: The first missile launch was made from Cape Canaveral, Fla. The Bumper No. 8, a German V–2, with a 700-pound Army WAC Corporal mounted, climbed 10 miles, separated from the second stage Corporal, then traveled 15 more miles.

June 25, 1951: Arnold Engineering Development Center—AEDC—Arnold Air Force System, Tenn., was dedicated by President Harry S. Truman. The Center's wind tunnels are the largest in the free world.

September 20, 1951: The Air Force made its first successful recovery of animals from a rocket flight. A monkey and 11 mice were launched from the Air Force Missile Development Center—AFMDC—Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex., in an Aerobee rocket and survived an altitude of 236,000 feet.

December 12, 1953: USAF Maj. Charles E. Yeager flew a Bell X–1A, launched from a B–29, 1,612 miles per hour—mach 2.5—at the Air Force Flight Test Center—AFFTC—Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

July 1, 1954: Western Development Division of ARDC at Inglewood, Calif., was established under Brig. Gen. B. A. Schriever, with authority to direct the ballistic missile development program authorized by USAF's May 1954 directives.

December 10, 1954: Col. John Paul Stapp, USAF, MC, attained a speed of 632 miles per hour on a rocket-propelled sled run at the AFMDC, Holloman AFB. He sustained the greatest g-force—40 g.'s—ever endured by man in recorded deceleration tests. It was the equivalent of mach 1.7 at 35,000 feet. Mach 1—or the speed of sound—clocks at 762 miles per hour at sea level.

September 7, 1956: USAF Capt. Iven C. Kincheloe set an altitude record for manned flight by piloting a rocket-propelled Bell X–2 to a height of 126,200 feet at AFFTC, Edwards AFB.

September 27, 1956: USAF Capt. Milburn G. Apt flew an X-2 rocket-powered aircraft to a record 2,094 miles per hour—mach 3.196—at AFFTC, Edwards AFB. He was killed when the craft crashed.

August 19, 1957: USAF Maj. David G. Simons of the AFMDC, Holloman AFB, made a 32-hour balloon flight to a record altitude of 101,516 feet. He ascended from Crosby, Minn., and landed the following day—August 20—at Elm Lake, S. Dak.

December 17, 1957: The Atlas was fired successfully for the first time by the USAF from the Atlantic Missile Range—AMR—Cape Canaveral. The intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM—targeted 500 miles downrange.

October 11, 1958: A USAF Thor-Able-I boosted Pioneer I, an International Geophysical Year—IGY—space probe vehicle, from Cape Canaveral, Pioneer I traveled 70,700 miles before returning to earth 2 days later. It determined the radial extent of the great radiation belt, first observations of the earth's and interplanetary magnetic field, and first measurements of micrometeorite density in interplanetary space.

December 18, 1958: The USAF, using a 4-ton Atlas, boosted Score—the "Talking Atlas" into orbit from the AMR. The following day the satellite broadcast a tape-recorded Christmas message from President Eisenhower back to earth, marking the first such feat from space.

February 6, 1959: The USAF made its first successful launch of a Titan ICBM from Cape Canaveral.

February 28, 1959: Discoverer I, a satellite weighing 1,450 pounds, was suc-

cessfully boosted into a polar orbit by the USAF Thor from the Pacific Missile Range—PMR.

April 23, 1959: First successful test firing of GAM–77 Hound Dog supersonic, air-launched missile, from a B–52 at Air Proving Ground Center—APGC—Eglin AFB, Fla.

September 15, 1959: A full-sized model of the Minuteman ICBM was fired in a tethered test from an underground silo at AFFTC, Edwards AFB.

September 17, 1959: A. Scott Crossfield piloted the X–15 research craft in its first powered flight. The craft, using interim Thiokol-RMD XLR–11 engines, was released by B–52 mother ship approximately 36 minutes after taking off from AFFTC, Edwards AFB.

December 14, 1959: USAF Capt. Joe B. Jordan flew the F–104 Starfighter to a world altitude record of 103,395.9 feet for launched aircraft at AFFTC, Edwards AFB.

December 15, 1959: USAF Capt. Joseph W. Rogers, flying an F–106 Delta Dart, set a world speed record of 1,520.9 m.p.h. on an 11-mile straightaway course at AFFTC, Edwards AFB.

April 1, 1960: The USAF Thor-Able launched the 270-pound Tiros I, the first known weather satellite, from the AMR. Tiros—television infrared observation satellite—photographed and transmitted 22,952 cloud covers of the earth from 450 miles high until June 29. Tiros I was hailed as ushering in a new era of meteorological observation.

April 13, 1960: A Thor-Able-Star launched Transit I–B, a U.S. Navy navigational satellite, from Cape Canaveral. The flight demonstrated the first engine restart in space.

May 20, 1960: The USAF fired an Atlas carrying a 1.5-ton payload off the Cape Canaveral launch pad to a target area 9,040 miles away in the Indian Ocean.

June 22, 1960: The USAF Thor-Able-Star launched the Navy Transit II–A carrying navigation and radiation instruments from Cape Canaveral. A Greb—Galactic Radiation and Beta—"piggyback" also was carried aloft, marking the first twin satellite launching to date.

August 11, 1960: A 300-pound capsule ejected by the USAF Discoverer XIII was recovered in the Pacific, marking the first recovery of an object ejected from an orbiting satellite.

August 16, 1960: USAF Capt. Joseph W. Kittinger, Jr., testing equipment and free-fall technique, parachuted from an open gondola 102,800 feet above the AFMDC, Holloman AFB. He free-fell for 4.5 minutes before opening his chute at 17,500 feet. The entire jump required 13 minutes and 8 seconds.

August 19, 1960: A capsule ejected by the USAF Discoverer XIV became the first object recovered in midair from an orbiting satellite. USAF Capt. Harold F. Mitchell piloted a C–119 to a successful catch above the Pacific. Discoverer XIV had been launched from Vandenberg AFB, Calif., the previous day.

October 4, 1960: The USAF Thor-Able-Star successfully launched the Courier I–B communications satellite from Cape Canaveral. After completing one orbit, it received a recorded message from President Eisenhower beamed from Fort Monmouth, N.J., which was retransmitted to a station in Puerto Rico. This marked the 100th launch of a Thor—military and scientific combined.

November 12, 1960: Discoverer XVII was launched by a Thor-Agena-B from Cape Canaveral, marking the first time a restartable Agena-B second stage was flown successfully.

January 24, 1961: The first Atlas E was fired successfully from Cape Canaveral.

January 31, 1961: Ham, a chimpanzee trained at the Aeromedical Field Laboratory, Holloman AFB, rode a Redstone rocket in a 115-mile high, suborbital flight 420 miles down the AMR.

February 1, 1961: The first Minuteman was launched by an all-Air Force crew 4,600 miles down the AMR, impacting in the target area. The Minuteman is the first solid-fuel ICBM.

February 22, 1961: The USAF Thor-Able-Star launched the Navy's Transit III–B vehicle into orbit from the AMR. The satellite, like its predecessors, was designed to be of worldwide military and commercial navigational aid.

March 8, 1961: The Department of Defense assigned responsibility for military space development activities to the Air Force.

April 1, 1961: The Air Force Systems Command—AFSC—was formed from elements of two former commands—the Air Research and Development Command—ARDC—and the Air Materiel Command—AMC. The latter became the Air Force Logistics Command—AFLC.

May 3, 1961: The first successful launch of a Titan ICBM from an underground silo was made from Vandenberg AFB.

May 5, 1961: Comdr. Alan B. Shepard made the first manned, sub-orbital flight under Project Mercury 5,100 miles down the AMR.

June 5, 1961: The first aerospace research pilot course began at the AFFTC, Edwards AFB. The first graduates formed the faculty for the new course of the Air Force Experimental Flight Test Pilot School.

June 16, 1961: A rocket test stand designed to support tests of rockets producing 1.5 million pounds of thrust was completed at the AFFTC, Edwards AFB.

June 20, 1961: The Arcas-Robin series—probes of upper atmosphere—was concluded at the APGC, Eglin AFB.

June 23, 1961: USAF Maj. Robert M. White set a new speed record for manned aircraft when he flew the X–15 at 3,603 miles per hour over the AFFTC, Edwards AFB range. Major White attained the record with a full-throttle operation of the XLR–99 engine for 75 seconds.

June 29, 1961: Transit IV–A, the navigational satellite, was launched from Cape Canaveral by a Thor–Able–Star booster. The satellite was the first such vehicle equipped with nuclear power. Its power source was a radioisotope-powered battery of the SNAP—systems for nuclear auxiliary power—series.

July 1, 1961: Three contract management regions were reassigned to AFSC in keeping with the single manager responsibility for aerospace systems acquisition. The three are eastern contract management region—ECMR—Olmsted AFB, Pa.; the central contract management region—CCMR—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio; and the western contract management region—WCMR—Mira Loma AFB, Calif.

July 6, 1961: An Atlas E ICBM launched from Cape Canaveral established a record for a U.S. military missile by rocketing to target 9,050 miles before impacting its 1.5-ton nosecone 1,000 miles southeast of Capetown, South Africa.

July 12, 1961: Tiros III was launched by a Thor-Delta booster from Cape Canaveral. The satellite, 42 inches in circumference, weighing between 280 and 300 pounds, carried television cameras and infrared sensors to photograph cloud covers of the earth from a maximum altitude of 400 miles.

July 14, 1961: The first free flight of a GAM–72B Quail—diversionary—missile was launched from the Eglin (Fla.) Gulf Test Range.

July 21, 1961: USAF Capt. Virgil I. Grissom made the second manned sub-orbital flight in the Liberty Bell 7 capsule when he rode a Redstone rocket 303 miles down the AMR at 5,310 mph.

August 8, 1961: An Atlas F ICBM was launched for the first time from Cape Kennedy. The "F" missile, designed for long-term storage of liquid fuels and for a shortened countdown, was the only Atlas model scheduled for emplacement in hardened, underground silos.

August 15, 1961: An Air Force Thor-Delta booster placed Explorer XII into orbit from Cape Canaveral. The satellite carried instruments to measure the Van Allen radiation belt. The highly eccentric orbit of the satellite permitted the study of phenomena at altitudes between 170 and 50,000 miles.

September 13, 1961: The worldwide Mercury tracking network was used for the first time in observing the orbit of an unmanned vehicle launched by an Atlas booster. The test demonstrated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—that the Air Force Atlas was capable of launching a man into orbit.

October 5, 1961: USAF Lieutenants Melvin E. Pollard and Craig V. Miller completed a 17-day experiment in an 8-by 12-foot steel cabin—breathing almost 100 percent oxygen—in a bioastronautic study of mental and physical reflexes and processes. For 20 hours daily the officers alternated in the operation of the control panel of a behavior simulator. Vice President Lyndon Johnson congratulated the officers and entered the cabin after the test was completed. The experiment was conducted at the Aerospace Medical Center, Brooks AFB, Tex.

October 10, 1961: The APGC, Eglin AFB, conducted its 200th high-altitude launch of probe vehicles for making meteorological and other investigations.

October 12, 1961: The Air Force Experimental Flight Test Pilot School was designated the USAF Aerospace Research Pilot School, Edwards AFB.

November 1, 1961: Air Force aerospace research resources were incorporated into the newly established Aerospace Medical Division—AMD—of the AFSC.

November 9, 1961: USAF Maj. Robert M. White piloted the X–15 aircraft to a top speed of 4,093 m.p.h. (mach 6.04) while flying at full throttle at an altitude of 101,600 feet above the test range at Edwards AFB.

November 15, 1961: A Thor-Able-Star boosted the U.S. Navy's Transit IV–B carrying the TRAAC satellite—transit research and attitude control—into orbit from Cape Canaveral to test gravity system for satellite attitude control.

November 17, 1961: A Minuteman was fired from Cape Canaveral in the first fully successful launch of the ICBM from an underground silo.

November 21, 1961: A USAF crew test-fired its first Titan when members of the 6555th Aerospace Test Wing launched a test missile on a 5,000-mile flight from Cape Canaveral.

November 23, 1961: The entire Atlas E force was activated and deployed with the acceptance from AFSC of the ICBM by a SAC squadron at Warren AFB, Wyo.

December 12, 1961: A Thor-Agena–B boosted Discoverer XXXVI from Vandenberg AFB. It carried a "piggyback" satellite, the first such satellite built by private citizens. It transmitted Morse code messages to ham operators throughout the world.

December 15, 1961: Students of class no. 1 of the military space pilots course were graduated from the Aerospace Research Pilot School, Edwards AFB.

January 26, 1962: An Atlas boosted a Ranger III from Cape Canaveral that bypassed the moon and went into solar orbit.

January 29, 1962: The 47th and last Titan I ICBM was test-fired successfully from Cape Canaveral. In all, 34 of the shots were successful, with 9 partially successful, and 4 unsuccessful.

February 15, 1962: In the fifth consecutive silo launch, a Minuteman ICBM set a new record by rocketing 3,900 miles from its pad at Cape Canaveral.

February 19, 1962: A USAF T–38 Talon—a twin engine, supersonic trainer made by Northrop—set four time-to-climb records: 1.86 miles in 35.62 seconds; 3.72 miles in 51.429 seconds; 5.58 miles in 64.76 seconds, and 7.44 miles in 95.74 seconds. Records were made at Edwards AFB.

February 20, 1962: An Air Force Atlas D booster launched Lt. Col. John H. Glenn from Cape Canaveral on the first American manned orbital trip. AFSC units shared in both the recording and tracking functions during the three-orbit flight, in addition to research and development preliminaries of the specially built booster.

Feburary 28, 1962: CWO Edward Murray was ejected from a B–58 traveling 565 m.p.h. at an altitude of 20,000 feet, ending 20 months of successful testing of an escape capsule for B–58 crews at the AFFTC, Edwards AFB. His work qualified the former paratrooper for the AFSC Aerospace Primus Club, an organization restricted to persons who have contributed significant aerospace "firsts."

March 16, 1962: The first successful launch of a Titan II ICBM was made from Cape Canaveral.

March 23, 1962: An all-Air Force crew launched an Atlas D from Vandenberg AFB during a visit by President Kennedy.

April 18, 1962: The first Titan I squadron complex at Lowry AFB, Colo., was transferred formally by AFSC to the Strategic Air Command—SAC—operational inventory.

April 23, 1962: An Air Force Atlas boosted Ranger IV from Cape Canaveral its payload presumably landing on the moon.

May 1, 1962: The office of Deputy to the Commander for Manned Space Flight was established at Headquarters AFSC as the AFSC focal point for all Air Force actions pertaining to the national manned space flight effort.

May 2–5, 1962: AFSC Management Conference was held in Monterey, Calif. It was attended by 130 prominent leaders in industry, science, finance, and education, along with senior government officials for a frank exchange of views under the subject, "Systems Acquisition and Management in Today's Environment." Addresses, papers, and seminars to the conference resulted in numerous, valuable recommendations for follow-up action.

May 4, 1962: A Titan ICBM was launched from the PMR, marking the 100th successful firing from Vandenberg AFB.

June 1, 1962: A Thor-Agena-B rocket launched Oscar II, a 10-pound piggyback payload, from Vandenberg AFB for the American Radio Relay League (ARRL). The device broadcast "Hi" to worldwide amateur radio operators.

June 19, 1962: A Thor-Delta booster placed Tiros V in orbit from Cape Canaveral. The satellite, 42 inches in circumference, weighing from 280 to 300 pounds, was launched to photograph cloud covers of the earth from 400 miles high.

July 1, 1962: AFSC consolidated all its track testing under its AFMDC, Holloman AFB. All surplus tracks were inactivated or put on standby status.

July 10, 1962: The world's first international communications satellite, Telstar I, was rocketed into an earth orbit from Cape Canaveral by a Thor-Delta missile. The 170-pound satellite made possible the relay of live television and radio programs between the United States and Europe.

July 16, 1962: An escape capsule for the crew of the XB–70 supersonic bomber was tested successfully at the AFFTC, Edwards AFB.

July 17, 1962: Maj. Robert White flew the X–15 experimental aircraft 314,500 feet—59.6 miles—above the California coast for a new altitude record and became the first pilot to receive Astronaut Wings for man-controlled flight above 50 miles.

July 26, 1962: The Research and Technology Division—RTD—Bolling AFB, Washington, D.C., was established under AFSC, thus enhancing the in-house research and exploratory development capabilities of the command.

August 1, 1962: U.S. Air Force launched the first Atlas F from an underground silo. The ICBM targeted to the vicinity of the Marshall Islands, 5,000 miles from its Vandenberg AFB launching site.

August 9, 1962: A single Air Force crew launched two Atlas missiles from Vandenberg AFB with only 13 minutes elapsing between launches. The feat ended the Atlas D category III test program supported by AFSC.

August 10, 1962: The Clinical Sciences Division of the School of Aerospace Medicine, AMD, Brooks AFB, completed evaluation of 32 astronaut candidates for NASA and a group of applicants for the USAF aerospace research pilot course, Edwards AFB.

August 13, 1962: An all-Air Force crew conducted its first launch of an Atlas F ICBM from Cape Kennedy.

August 27, 1962: Mariner II, a Venus probe, was launched from Cape Canaveral by an Atlas ICBM. The probe passed within 20,000 miles of Venus on December 14, 1962.

August 28, 1962: The APGC, Elgin AFB, completed its 300th high-altitude space probe 42 months after the program went into operation. A Nike-Cajun was launched 90 miles to measure electronic propagation of the ionosphere.

September 20, 1962: Maj. H. C. Gordon, R. L. Rogers, and J. W. Wood; Capts. A. H. Crews, Jr., and W. J. Knight—all USAF officers—and Milton Thompson, NASA, were named to participate in the X–20 Dyna-Soar spacecraft operational program.

October 31, 1962: ANNA, a geodetic research satellite, was placed into orbit from Cape Canaveral by the USAF's Thor-Able-Star. The satellite contained instruments designed to mark position on the earth, locate the center of its mass and measure its strength and determine the direction of the gravitational field.

November 13, 1962: The Air Force announced that the world's smallest satellite was boosted into orbit by an Atlas-Agena at the PMR. The tetrahedral radiation satellite—TRS—a 1.5 pound, pyramid-shaped satellite, was designed to send back data on the Van Allen radiation belt.

December 5, 1962: The last test flight of an Atlas ICBM—an all "Blue Suit" launch—landed 5,000 miles from its Cape Canaveral launch site.

December 11, 1962: Malmstrom AFB, Mont., became the first Minuteman ICBM operational base with the turnover of the first two flights to SAC by AFSC.

December 13, 1962: Relay, a communications satellite, was launched into earth orbit from Cape Canaveral by Thor-Delta missile.

December 18, 1962: The 6595th Aerospace Test Wing, using a Scout booster, launched the U.S. Navy's Transit 5–A satellite from Point Arguello, Calif. The test wing is assigned to the Space Systems Division—SSD—Los Angeles, Calif.

January 1, 1963: The Rome Air Development Center—RADC—Griffiss AFB, N.Y., was assigned to the RTD, Bolling AFB.

January 25, 1963: The first counter-insurgency—COIN—aircraft, a modified B–26, was rolled out in ceremonies at Van Nuys, Calif. The program is the responsibility of the Aeronautical Systems

Division—ASD—Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio.

February 6, 1963: The first launch of a Titan II ICBM by an all-Air Force crew was accomplished. The missile carried the heaviest payload ever filed a distance of 6,500 miles by a ballistic missile.

February 15, 1963: A thermoelectric converter that absorbs solar energy and converts it into electrical energy underwent an orbital test flight from Vandenberg AFB.

March 1, 1963: A pool of 16 officer and civilian pilots from the Air Force, Navy, Marines, and NASA was assigned to the Gemini-Apollo project. The pilots: NASA Pilot Neil A. Armstrong; USAF Maj. Frank Borman; Navy Lt. Comdr. M. Scott Carpenter; Navy Lt. Charles Conrad, Jr.; USAF Maj. L. Gordon Cooper; Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr.; USAF Maj. Virgil I. Grissom; Navy Lt. Comdr. James Lovell, Jr.; USAF Capt. James McDivitt; Navy Comdr. Walter M. Schirra; Navy Comdr. Alan B. Shepard; NASA Pilot Elliot See, Jr.; USAF Maj. Donald K. Slayton; USAF Capt. Thomas P. Stafford; USAF Capt. Edward H. White, II; and Navy Lt. Comdr. John W. Young.

March 22, 1963: The Department of Defense announced the appointment of Maj. Gen. L. I. Davis, AFMTC Commander, as the DOD representative for Project Gemini support operations.

May 1, 1963: The Air Force Weapons Laboratory at Kirtland AFB, N. Mex., was assigned to RTD, Bolling AFB.

May 1, 1963: Mrs. H. H. Arnold christened the first Advanced Range Instrumentation Ship—ARIS—the *General H. H. Arnold*, named in honor of the late general, at Port Canaveral, Fla.

May 16, 1963: U.S. Air Force Maj. L. Gordon Cooper completed 22 orbits of the earth in 34 hours, 20 minutes and 30 seconds, following the MA–9 launch the previous day from Cape Canaveral.

June 27, 1963: U.S. Air Force Maj. Robert A. Rushworth earned Astronaut's Wings by piloting an X–15 aircraft 3,545 m.p.h. at the 286,000-foot altitude level—approximately 54 miles—above the range at Edwards AFB.

July 1, 1963: Restructuring placed the Air Force Materials Laboratory, the Air Force Avionics Laboratory, the Air Force Aero-Propulsion Laboratory, and the Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory at Wright-Patterson AFB, under the operational control of RTD, Bolling AFB.

July 18, 1963: Mrs. Hoyt S. Vandenberg christened the second of two Advanced Range Instrumentation Ships—ARIS—the *General Hoyt S. Vandenberg*, named in memory of her late husband, at Baltimore, Md.

July 20, 1963: The world's largest solid-propellant rocket motor was fired at the United Technology Center southeast of San Francisco, Calif. The two motors produced more than 2 million pounds of thrust—more than 2.5 times the amount of thrust produced by the Atlas booster which placed U.S. Air Force Maj. L. Gordon Cooper in orbit almost 3 months earlier.

July 23, 1963: The X–19 vertical take-off and landing craft—VTOL—was rolled out in ceremonies at the Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Caldwell, N.J. The program is under the management responsibility of the ASD, Wright-Patterson AFB.

August 17, 1963: The cooperative, tri-service program conducted to build a new family of VTOL was announced by AFSC. The three services are sharing equally in funding, support, and evaluation of the X–19, XC–142A, and the X–22A experimental aircraft.

August 22, 1963: President Kennedy pressed a button at the White House to open the hangar doors at Lockheed-Marietta, Ga., to begin the C–141A transport rollout ceremony. The giant cargo transport, known as the Starlifter, has the largest wings of any jet in the world. Speaking over closed-circuit television to the audience, President Kennedy said, "This aircraft will soon give us the means to quickly transport significant numbers of men and substantial quantities of equipment to any point in the world where our national interest may be endangered. By increasing our effectiveness, it is a real contribution to world peace." The program is part of the management responsibility of the ASD, Wright-Patterson AFB.

September 11, 1963: A $3.5 million spaceship simulator to train crews for space flight, space intercepts and orbital rendezvous at the AFFTC, Edwards AFB, has been ordered by AFSC, the command revealed at the Air Force Association meeting, Washington, D.C.

September 18, 1963: ASSET—Aerothermodynamic/elastic structural systems environmental tests—was launched from Cape Canaveral to an altitude of 40 miles by a Thor booster. This was the first in a series of such vehicles designed to explore the guidance of reentry into the atmosphere from space.

September 30, 1963: The development of a new pressure suit by ASD, Wright-Patterson AFB, for X–20 Dyna-Soar pilots was announced by AFSC. The suit permits more freedom of movement than its predecessors and may be worn for 36 hours without discomfort.

November 21, 1963: President Kennedy dedicated the new building complex of the U.S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine at the AMD, Brooks AFB.

November 28, 1963: President Lyndon B. Johnson told a nationwide television and radio audience that Cape Canaveral would henceforth be known as Cape Kennedy in memory of the late President of the United States.

December 17, 1963: The first successful flight of the C–141 Starlifter took place at Dobbins AFB, Ga. Featuring four fan-jet engines, the plane can cross any ocean nonstop at speeds of more than 500 miles per hour.

II. FROM ANDREWS FIELD

We departed from Andrews Field at 11:25 a.m., arriving at Langley Field at 11:58 noon. We met Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, Commander TAC; Lt. Gen. Charles B. Westover, Vice Commander TAC; Maj. Gen. Walter Arnold, Chief of Staff; Maj. Gen. D. O. Darrow, Deputy for Plans; and Brig. Gen. J. N. Ewbank, Assistant Deputy for Operations.

After the welcoming remarks by Commander of TAC Gen. Walter C. Sweeney we were briefed on command post orientation by Major Spence.

Also combat status briefing, Lt. Col. Swanson and Captain Tucker. TAC classified command briefing, Major Spence and Captain Goodman, OI command post.

Then we viewed aircraft in base operations hangar, and aircraft static display.

Departure 4:25 p.m. for Offutt AFB. Arrived Offutt 6:20 p.m. mountain standard time.

The biography of TAC Commander Gen. Walter C. Sweeney is as follows:

Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., was born in Wheeling, W. Va., July 23, 1909. He was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy and commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry on June 12, 1930.

In October 1934 he entered primary flying school at Randolph Field, Tex., with subsequent graduation from the advanced flying school in October 1935 at Kelly Field, Tex. His first assignment was with the 3d Attack Group at Barksdale Field, La.

In June 1939 General Sweeney joined the 5th Bomb Group in Hawaii and the following February transferred to the 11th Bomb Group in Hawaii as commanding officer of the 432d Bomb Squadron. He commanded the Army Air Force Task Group which participated in the Battle of Midway in June 1942. In July 1942, he became Air Officer for the Theater Group, Operations Division of the War Department General Staff.

With the coming of the B–29, he was assigned to the 73d Bomb Wing, a new unit being equipped with this new weapon. Activated at Salina, Kans., this unit was later to bring its crushing striking power to bear on the Japanese homeland from its Saipan base in the Pacific. General Sweeney served this unit as its chief of staff and deputy commander. While with the wing in the Marianas, he participated in the first unprecedented low-level attack with B–29's against the Japanese, and was on a later mission to lose his aircraft, paddle ashore in a liferaft, and return to his island base. In July 1945 he became Director of Plans of the Strategic Air Force, Pacific Ocean Area, in Guam.

After the war he served as a member of the Joint War Plans Committee for the Air Force in Washington, D.C., in August 1946.

In October 1947 General Sweeney was assigned to the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, and the following year was named Director of Plans for the Strategic Air Command with headquarters in Omaha, Nebr.

In April 1953 he was selected to command the 15th Air Force at March Air Force Base, Calif. In June 1954 while commander of this strategic bombing air force, he led a trio of stratojets in history's first nonstop flight for jet bombers across the Pacific.

For 6 years, from August 1955 until September 1961, General Sweeney commanded the 8th Air Force at Westover Air Force Base, Mass.

September 30, 1961, General Sweeney assumed command of the Tactical Air Command with headquarters at Langley Air Force Base, Va.

General Sweeney has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, Legion of Merit with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal.

He is rated a command pilot, aircraft observer, and technical observer.

General Sweeney is married to the former Midge Murray of Fort Myers, Fla. They have two children, Walter III, and Anne.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

TAC's mission—to provide fast-reacting, combat-ready tactical air power to employment anywhere in the world.

TAC's functions—to develop and perfect tactical air power doctrine and weapon systems designed to produce maximum combat capabilities;

To develop and test new techniques in special air warfare operations and train United States and Allied aircrews in the application of tactics, to cope with all forms of unconventional warfare;

To train and equip tactical air personnel and units in support of oversea tactical air forces and TAC wings in the United States. To insure the same capabilities for assigned Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units;

To develop and maintain troop carrier and close support tactical fighter forces in support of U.S. Strike Command Airborne and ground operations; and

To provide flexible composite air strike forces for quick deployment to oversea theaters to operate independently or in conjunction with deployed United States and Allied forces.

TAC's mobility—with refined inflight refueling, TAC forces have unlimited range and global mobility. Crews are trained and equipped to deploy in desired strength on short notice. Mission support kits, with spare parts and equipment for 30-day operation, are packed and ready to go.

Emergency procedures and packaging for immediate deployment to unprepared, bare-base operating areas.

The 12th Air Force is located at Waco, Tex. It is responsible for all TAC and assigned Reserve units west of a line described by the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and western border of the State of Ohio.

The 19th Air Force, located at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, N.C., is a unique organization. With a normal complement of about 60 officers and airmen, and commanded by a general officer, the 19th is TAC's mobile command element for the control of tactical air units during oversea deployments, training exercises, and in joint operations as the air component of a Stricom force.

In April 1961, TAC's 4400th Combat Crew Training Squadron was activated at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., for the purpose of developing and training U.S. and allied aircrews in special airborne techniques and tactics for counterinsurgency operations. A year later, the expanded facility was designated the USAF Special Air Warfare Center, comprising the 1st Air Command Group and the 1st Combat Applications Group. Detachments of Air Commando Groups, flying World War II type aircraft—C–46, C–47, B–26, T–28, et cetera—are deployed and attached to U.S. air missions in Allied countries for the purpose of training aircrews of host nations in air counterinsurgency operations. Under the impetus of expansion, the 1st Air Commando Group attained wing status in June 1963.

Because of increasing importance of Tactical Aerial Reconnaissance which played a key role in the Cuban crisis of 1962—TAC was directed to establish the USAF Tactical Air Reconnaissance Center at Shaw Air Force Base, S.C., early in 1963. It has been, and will continue to be, the focal point for the development, testing, and application of improved aerial surveillance capabilities.

The TAC organization is distributed over a network of 14 U.S. bases controlled by TAC, with several "tenant units" located on bases of other major commands. Included among the latter are the 4504th Missile Training Wing at Orlando Air Force Base, Fla., the 516th Troop Carrier Wing at Dyess Air Force Base, Tex., the 31st Tactical Fighter Wing at Homestead Air Force Base, Fla., and the 366th Tactical Fighter Wing at Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.

In addition, TAC maintains four tactical fighter squadrons and one airlift squadron at oversea bases at all times. These are rotational units which operate under command and control of U.S. Air Forces in Europe during periods of deployment. Also, TAC maintains a provisional airlift squadron at Howard AFB, Canal Zone, in support of the commander in chief, Southern Command.

Under the influence of a continuing buildup in U.S. limited war forces since 1962, TAC has added 5 new tactical fighter wings, for a total of 12. TAC also began procuring the F–4C—Air Force version of the Navy F–4H Phantom II—as a means of quickly augmenting TAC Command's striking power and increasing flexibility. In addition to the 12 tactical fighter wings, the command has 4 airlift wings, 1 air refueling wing and the Tactical Air Reconnaissance Center composed of 4 reconnaissance squadrons. In addition, TAC is responsible for training and maintaining in combat-ready status certain Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard Tactical Fighter, Reconnaissance, Air Refueling and Troop Carrier Wings.

These Reserve Forces are maintained at a high degree of combat readiness for immediate recall to active duty. In October and November of 1961 a number of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve wings, squadrons and support units were recalled to active duty. Some were deployed overseas and others remained in the United States under TAC control.

The basic concept of TAC's operation is quick-reacting global mobility. The backbone of the operation is inflight refueling and the Composite Air Strike Force concept.

The Composite Air Strike Force, more commonly known as "CASF," is TAC's initial response element designed to meet any contingency anywhere in the world at a moment's notice. CASF is essentially a packaged Air Force, tailored specifically for a given mission with a built-in capacity for follow-on expansion.

TAC's entire organization of operational forces is adaptable to the CASF profile, which may require as few as 50 aircraft or as many as 300. Its mission concept covers the full range from a show of the flag to waging war in any remote corner of the world.

The CASF command element is the 19th Air Force, complete with jet-powered air command post which enables the commander to maintain communication with TAC Headquarters, the Pentagon Command Post and any major command overseas. The Airborne Command Post is an integral part of the TAC Command Control at Langley Air Force Base, which ties the entire command together as an integrated fast-reacting and highly mobile force.

Because of its versatility and flexibility, the CASF is equally suited to operate independently or to reinforce oversea tactical air forces. TAC also is ready to dispatch CASF units to widely separated areas for the same or different missions.

This was clearly demonstrated in 1958 when CASF units were deployed to the Middle East to meet the Lebanon crisis in July and the Far East in response to the Formosan emergency a month later. With these two forces deployed, TAC still had the ability to deploy a third, or to reinforce the two CASF's already in place. And in August of 1961 six tactical fighter squadrons were sent to Europe to augment Allied forces during a critical period. During the Cuban crisis in 1962, TAC had a powerful fighting force in Florida ready for any eventuality, while TAC reconnaissance planes provided the intelligence photographs on which vital Presidential decisions were based.

The same quality of flexible mobility that has characterized TAC's CASF configuration is a key factor in the command's responsibilities to the U.S. Strike Command. TAC also contributes extensively to the development, testing and refinement of air-ground joint operations techniques and tactics in concert with Stricom and the Continental Army Command.

AGENDA—FEBRUARY 13, 1964

1158: Arrive base operations, Langley Air Force Base.

1200: Proceed to officers' open mess.

1215–1315: Luncheon, Hampton Room, officers' open mess.

1315: Depart officers' open mess for Headquarters TAC, Building No. 1. Proceed to the command post.

1320–1335: Welcoming remarks by the Commander, TAC or representative.

1335–1340: Command post orientation briefing, Major Spence, OI, command post.

1340–1350: Combat status briefing, lieutenant Colonel Swanson and Captain Tucker, command post.

1350–1440: TAC classified command briefing, Major Spence and Captain Goodman, OI, command post.

1440–1505: "Full Scope" film, command post.

1505–1520: Coffee break.

1520–1540: Discussion, Conference Room No. 1.

1540: Depart Headquarters TAC, Building No. 1 for base operations hangar.

1555–1625: View aircraft static display.

1645: Departure to Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr.

LANGLEY AIR FORCE BASE

Langley Air Force Base was conceived at the 1916 meeting of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—NACA—when it was agreed that a need existed for a joint experimental airfield and proving ground for aircraft to be used by the Army, Navy, and NACA.

A year later—June 28, 1917—the base, then known as Langley Field, was authorized and construction began under the supervision of the Air Service Section of the Signal Corps.

The base is located on the lower peninsula of Virginia, adjacent to Hampton, the oldest continuous English-speaking community in the United States.

From its inception, Langley has been a vital part of the growth of military aviation in the United States. During its first 10 years it operated under the Air Service Section of the Signal Corps and in the final months of World War I total strength was about 475 officers and 4,700 troops.

Assigned units included several aero squadrons, a photo school detachment, a camouflage detachment, an aerial observer school, a balloon detachment, an air service flying school, and several engineer construction companies.

With the Armistice in 1918 a majority of military personnel were discharged, including all labor units, and until 1935 the field's strength averaged no more than 1,500 personnel.

During this period Langley Field continued to serve as the principle experimental agency for the NACA, providing the test facilities which were necessary to promote and accommodate the gradual evolution of aviation.

The first air service field officers' school, later to be known as the Air Corps Tactical School, opened at Langley in 1920. It was responsible for training student officers to commend and direct air units, to emphasize close cooperation with other branches of the Army, and to give students sufficient technical training to enable them to teach technical staff officers. This was the beginning of the development of a sound tactical doctrine for the Air Corps.

In 1921 the Provisional Air Brigade was formed. It was to become the focal point for the saga of Gen. Billy Mitchell, father of modern bombardment. The PAB was formed for the purpose of conducting bombing experiments against former German warships. General Mitchell personally supervised the training of the organization and the maneuvers off the eastern shore of Virginia near Cape Charles.

The first target was the German destroyer G–102. Moored 60 miles off Cape Charles, the G–102 was attacked by some 50 Army planes, 3 blimps and 7 Navy planes. Two direct hits sank the destroyer. This led to further experiments, designed to prove the vulnerability of shipping and naval vessels to aerial bombardment.

Despite post-World War I demobilization and delays in construction, by 1935 Langley was one of the finest airbases in the country and the stage was set for the transfer of general headquarters staff of the Air Corps to Langley on March 1, 1935. At that point, Langley Field became the center of tactical air power for the U.S. Army.

In 1941, when general headquarters of the Army Air Force moved to Bolling Air Force Base at Washington, D.C., Langley was transferred to the 1st Air Force. In this capacity, it was responsible for training of bombardment groups and their supporting observation and reconnaissance units.

With the declaration of war in December 1941, Langley's units were ready for action. The 22d Bombardment Group was deployed to California while the 2d Bombardment Group and the 3d Observation Squadron remained at Langley to participate in the battle for control of Atlantic coastal waters.

During the first year of World War II various sea search groups were formed and trained in the operation and maintenance of search radar. Thus Langley became the focal point for development of a new military technique; radar for search, navigation, and bombardment. The influence of this activity was felt in both the Pacific and European theaters throughout the war.

In 1946 Langley entered a new phase when the Tactical Air Command, established at Drew Field, Fla., was moved to the base. This action was predicated on the proximity to Fort Monroe, home of the then Army Field Forces, and Norfolk, home of the Atlantic Fleet. Later, Fort Monroe became headquarters for the Continental Army Command, and Norfolk became home base for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Atlantic Command as well as fleet headquarters.

From December 1948 until December 1950, TAC was an operational headquarters under the control of ConAC. At this time, Langley AFB was also assigned to ConAC. During the period from February 1949 to August 1950, Langley was the home of the 9th. Air Force. This was the only period in the history of Langley Field that a numbered air force was located on the base.

Since that time, Tactical Air Command has become a versatile air force with global mobility and worldwide commitments. And Langley's activities in space increased significantly in 1958 with establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to replace and expand upon the concept of the old NACA.

TAC, through its CASF deployments and responsiveness to contingencies, and NASA, as the home of the original seven astronauts, have achieved worldwide prominence.

TIDEWATER, VA., AND HAMPTON ROADS

Tidewater, Va., extending from Yorktown in the north to the North Carolina border, is an area steeped in American history and tradition. It is also unique in that it contains the greatest concentration of military commands in the world.

Major elements of the Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are located within the area, which also embraces Hampton Roads, the largest natural deepwater harbor in the world.

Major military commands and organizations include:

Tactical Air Command, Langley Air Force Base; Continental Army Command, Fort Monroe; Atlantic Fleet Headquarters, Allied Command Atlantic and other major Fleet Commands, Norfolk; Army Transportation Training Command, Fort Eustis and Fort Story; Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth.

There are additional subordinate commands located within the complex, giving credence to the claim that more generals and admirals are assigned to the Tidewater area than there are in Washington.

Besides its vital present-day role in national defense, Tidewater, Va., holds a distinguished position in American history. The first English-speaking colony was established at nearby Jamestown. And Williamsburg not only is the State's colonial capital, but was the scene of what many historians consider the birth of the Declaration of Independence, conceived and written by Thomas Jefferson.

Yorktown, the northern pivot of the Tidewater area, was the site of Lord Cornwallis' surrender and the final victory of the American Revolution. Thus the area is the cradle of the Nation's founding in 1607 and its birth in freedom in 1783.

Although regarded for many years as a nonindustrial area, noted principally for its military installations and seaport activities, Hampton Roads has a strong commercial-industrial base that is rapidly expanding.

The Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., with 17,000 employees, is the largest single manufacturing establishment in the southeast. The yard has built some of the world's largest passenger liners and many of the great American warships, including the atomic-powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the largest warship ever built.

Another large shipbuilding facility is the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. The Ford Co. also operates a large assembly plant in Norfolk, employing an average of 1,700 workers.

In recent years industrial expansion throughout the area has been accelerated under impetus of the Tidewater, Va., Economic Council, combining the efforts of political subdivisions in the Hampton Roads area seeking new industries.

Since World War II, the entire Tidewater area has experienced a tremendous population explosion, with more than 1 million people now living in the communities bordering Hampton Roads. And expansion is expected to continue at a rapid rate with the linking of communities separated by water with a network of bridge-tunnel systems.

In 1952 the first bridge-tunnel across the Elizabeth River was opened, connecting Norfolk and Portsmouth. In 1958 the Hampton Roads bridge-tunnel formed a physical link between the lower peninsula and the Norfolk side of the roads. In 1961 construction began on a $200 million, 17.5-mile bridge-tunnel complex that will connect the Virginia eastern shore and Norfolk across Chesapeake Bay.

This is the first link of what is expected to become a direct highway system between New England and Florida. Tidewater planners confidently predict an accelerated expansion of the entire area over the next decade.

In addition to its military-maritime-industrial character, Tidewater, Va., is an important resort area, boasting a wide assortment of recreational facilities, including major ocean and bay beaches and amusement parks.

In recent years the major cities have undertaken extensive urban renewal programs in an effort to eliminate decay and

rehabilitate downtown areas. These programs have been stimulated by a steady flow of city dwellers to newly developed suburban sections, which has caused homebuilding booms.

The tremendous growth of the Tidewater area is reflected in Norfolk, whose population has jumped from 140,000 in 1941 to 320,000 today. More than 30,000 private homes have been built in Norfolk and Princess Anne County since 1952.

Much the same applies to other Tidewater communities, and serves to depict the dynamic growth of the entire area. It is a pattern that observers predict will continue over the next 10 years.

III. OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, NEBR.

Ten Members of the U.S. House of Representatives visited Strategic Air Command headquarters, Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., February 13 for an orientation on the command's activities.

The Congressmen met with Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC commander in chief, received briefings on the command's mission and toured the headquarters facilities, including the underground command post.

The lawmakers orientation visits began at Air Force headquarters in the Pentagon, Washington, D.C., with escort officers Col. John M. Chapman and Maj. Harry M. Punk. Other stops included in the group's itinerary were Air Force Systems Command, Andrews Air Force Base, Md., and the Tactical Air Command, Langley Air Force Base, Va.

Following their SAC stop the Congressmen visited the Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo., and SAC's 1st Strategic Aerospace Division at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

Members of the visiting party were: Representatives E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas; HARLAN F. HAGEN, Democrat, of California; ROLAND V. LIBONATI, Democrat, of Illinois; J. EDWARD ROUSH, Democrat, of Indiana; DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey; HAROLD M. RYAN, Democrat, of Michigan; and CHARLES H. WILSON, Democrat, of California.

Also, Representatives LUCIEN N. NEDZI, Democrat, of Michigan; COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., Democrat, of Idaho; EVERETT G. BURKHALTER, Democrat, of California, and EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat, of California.

Offutt AFB, formerly known at Fort Crook, was, for many years, the home of the 22d U.S. infantry. Construction of the original fort was completed in 1896. During World War I the first air unit, the 61st Balloon Company, was assigned to the post. In 1924 Fort Crook was renamed "Offutt Field" in honor of 1st Lt. Jarvis J. Offutt, who lost his life in 1918 while flying with the Royal Air Force, in France. He was Omaha's first air casualty of World War I. During World War II, principal activities on the base were the construction of a Martin bomber plant and a prisoner-of-war camp for captured Italians. In March 1946, Strategic Air Command chose Offutt for its new headquarters. Two years later, in January 1948, the field was redesignated Offutt AFB and officially transferred to the Air Force.

STATISTICS

As of the end of October 1963, the total population of the base was 12,371 officers, airmen, and civilians.

The total area of the base is 1,887 acres, exclusive of the Capehart housing area, which adds 464 acres.

Over 75 training, liaison, transport, and tanker-type aircraft are assigned to the base. They are operated by the 3902d Air Base Wing and the 34th Air Refueling Squadron, which is equipped with KC–135 jet tankers.

Base housing consists of 1,516 Capehart units, 545 Wherry housing units and 35 individual brick homes.

The net worth of the base is more than $270 million. This figure includes the base's real estate, equipment, administrative aircraft and several remote sites.

Offutt's total military-civilian payroll averages over $5 million a month.

Offutt is also the home of several other units, including: Headquarters Strategic Air Command, 1st Aerospace Communications Group, 385th Strategic Aerospace Wing, 3d Weather Wing, 544th Aerospace Reconnaissance Technical Wing, 1911th Communications Squadron, the 549th Strategic Missile Squadron with Atlas ICBM launch complexes in eastern Nebraska and western Iowa, and numerous other small units.

SAC FACTS

The Strategic Air Command: U.S. Air Force's global strike force—for 17 years the world's most powerful military force established and operating on a global basis. Operator of global communications and support systems needed to operate intercontinental weapon systems including manned bombers and intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The mission: Peacetime—Maintain a force capable of deterring Communist aggression. Wartime—Destroy the enemy's warmaking capability.

The organization: Headquarters is at Offutt AFB, near Omaha, Nebr. The SAC force is located at more than 80 bases worldwide.

The capability: The jet bomber force, through aerial refueling, has global range. Day and night at least 50 percent of the force is on ground alert in the United States and overseas, armed and positioned to take off within the warning time of an ICBM attack as provided by the ballistic missile early warning system—BMEWS. The concept of airborne alert has been tested, and found feasible, and all SAC heavy bomber units are engaged in regular airborne alert training. ICBM's are constantly on alert, supplementing SAC's manned bomber force. The bomber force is composed of approximately 600 B–47's; 600 B–52's; 500 KC–135's; 400 KC–97's and 80 B–58's. The missile force consists of 126 Atlas, 54 Titan I and a rapidly increasing force of Minuteman, of which a total of 950 are now programed. In addition, six squadrons of advanced Titan II missiles will be operational prior to the end of 1963. SAC's total missile force will be increasing at the rate of more than one a day throughout 1963.

The operation: Continuous combat training. More than 17.5 million flying hours completed. Reflex crews are on temporary alert duty overseas at all times. At least 50 percent of SAC's bomber-tanker force on alert at all times. All SAC's operational ICBM squadrons on alert at all times.

The men: More than 280,000 officers, airmen and civilian employees assigned. SAC's combat crew members have a wealth of experience. Aircraft commanders on senior and select crews, for example, average 34 years of age, the oldest being 46 and the youngest 21. Forty-one percent have flown in combat in World War II or the Korean conflict and have participated in an average of 19.5 combat missions. Each has been an Air Force officer an average of 12 years, 9 months. SAC's growing missile force includes personnel whose ages range from 18 to 56 years; the eldest officer born in 1906, the youngest airman born in 1944. Fifty percent of the officers working in the missile force are between the ages of 22 and 32, with the average officer age as 32 years. The average missile combat crew member—officer and airman—is 28 years old. Fifty-six percent of SAC's enlisted personnel are between 20 and 29 years of age, and 78 percent of them have been in the Air Force 12 years or less. Sixty percent of SAC's officers have been in service 9 years or longer, and 77 percent have attended and 44 percent have graduated from accredited colleges, universities or graduate schools.

The aircraft: B–47 Stratojet, six-jet medium bomber. Near sonic speed. B–52 Stratofortress, eight-jet heavy bomber. Near sonic speed. B–58 Hustler, supersonic bomber. Flies more than twice the speed of sound. KC–97 Stratotanker, four piston-engine tanker. KC–135 Jet Stratotanker: Four-jet tanker. Near sonic speed.

The missiles: ADM–20A Quail, decoy giving a bomberlike return on radar; designed for inflight launching to confuse enemy radar and further improve bomber penetration ability. AGM–28A Hound Dog, supersonic guided missile; nuclear warhead; carried by a B–52 and launched hundreds of miles from target. Blasts way in for B–52 and can strike widely separated targets. PGM–16D and E and HGM–16F Atlas, ICBM; liquid fuel; operational; 6,300-mile range. HGM–25A and LGM–25C Titan, ICBM; liquid fuel; operational; 6,300-mile range. LGM–30A Minuteman: ICBM; solid fuel; operational; 6,300-mile range.

The introduction of intercontinental ballistic missiles into the arsenals of the world's great powers has made it mandatory that Strategic Air Command's commander in chief be able to exercise nearly instantaneous command and control of the SAC forces.

The time available to SAC in which to respond to any enemy attack against the United States has been drastically reduced by the speed and destructiveness of these modern weapons, requiring highly improved command and control procedures.

Project 465L, the Strategic Air Command Control System—SACCS—a high-speed automated information gathering,

processing, and display system is designed to meet the compressed time demands of the missile and space era.

Professional airmen at SAC bases will utilize 465L to feed data to the headquarters as well as receive information essential to their missions. At SAC and numbered air force headquarters the data received on SACCS will be viewed by the command battle staff to aid them in making decisions in the control of the SAC force.

When fully operational, sometime in 1965, SACCS will utilize approximately 250,000 miles of specially conditioned telephone circuits. Transmission of up to 3,000 words per minute will be possible. Information on the status of the force, war plans, damage reports, refueling schedules, missile availability, weather conditions—all the necessary data to aid rapid decisionmaking—will travel over the network at heretofore unheard of speeds.

In general, the system will be organized along the lines of an electronic pyramid. Each SAC base and every base at which a SAC tenant unit is located will be equipped with a "remote communications complex—RCC."

It is from this network of outlying consoles, including missile sites, that the bulk of the system's input will originate.

At missile launch control centers smaller versions of the remote complexes, "simplex remote communications complexes" tailored to fit in limited space will be provided, with installation scheduled to start on these units in 1963. In addition to the missile launch control centers, every missile unit command post will have 465L equipment which will enable it to receive fast reaction messages from the SAC commander in seconds.

From the remote complexes, operational and control data will be channeled through an electronic data transmission communication central—EDTCC—one of which will be located at each of SAC's numbered Air Force headquarters, as well as in the headquarters SAC underground command post itself. Construction and installation of this portion of the system is presently underway.

The EDTCC is an electronic computer-controlled message switching center. It will automatically receive, process, and transmit messages within the system in a matter of seconds. The system is expected to become operational in increments. As existing SAC units and new missile units programed for the future receive equipment, they will be tied into the data transmission, data processing, and data display subsystems.

The flow of information will then be fed into the system's three central computers, or "data processing centrals—DPC's." One DPC will be located at 15th Air Force headquarters on the west coast, the other two will be installed in the SAC underground command post.

The data processing centrals will process incoming traffic, update files, compare actual events with previously prepared plans, determine deviations, and automatically, or upon request, provide this information for display in the command post.

SAC's busy battle staff will view the information on large 8- by 8-foot, or 16- by 16-foot screens that are part of the "data display central—DDC." Capable of projecting seven different colors, the DDC can also supply written information at the prescribed rate of 10,000 words per minute on high speed printers.

To meet the constantly changing demands of modern warfare, 465L will boast the built-in flexibility to handle missile forces of the future, as well as the present mixed-force of bombers and missiles.

Specific facts: The "data display" subsystem of 465L includes high-speed impact printers to reproduce information for permanent and more detailed records. Request panels permit interrogations of the computer for specific data. The "data processing" subsystem employs one of the world's most modern solid-state computers. Automatic problem detection and correction techniques result in minimum of downtime and maintenance. Computers accept data, perform computation on a priority basis, and provide outputs under the control of a master executive program, which insures the machine is being used as efficiently as possible. The "stored program element," heart of the EDTCC, will automatically route information requests from other subsystems. Currently, available voice-quality land lines which have been specially conditioned, cables, and radio systems provide the interconnecting transmission links for 465L.

GEN. THOMAS S. POWER

Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command and Director of the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff, has been an active military flier for more than 30 years and has a wide background of command in the U.S. Air Force.

He was born in New York City, June 18, 1905, the son of Thomas S. and Mary Rice Power. Following graduation from New York's Barnard Prep, he entered the Air Corps Flying School, February 17, 1928, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in February 1929.

General Power's early service included assignments at most of the famed Air Corps fields of the day. At Chanute Field, Ill., for example, he served as a student officer. Later, he commanded the 2d Wing Headquarters Detachment at Langley Field, Va.

Other early assignments: Army air mail operations pilot, Bolling Field, Washington, D.C.; flying instructor, Randolph Field, Tex.; student at the Air Tactical School, Maxwell Field, Ala. Finally, to round out his early career, he served as engineering and armament officer at Nichols Field, in the Philippines.

During World War II, General Power first saw combat as a B–24 pilot with the 304th Bomb Wing, in North Africa and Italy.

Upon return to the United States in August 1944, he was named commander of the B–29-equipped 314th Bomb Wing—very heavy. Later he moved his B–29's to Guam as part of the 21st Bomber Command, and directed the first large-scale fire bomb raids on Tokyo, March 9, 1945.

On August 1, 1945, Gen. Carl Spaatz, then commanding general of the U.S. Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, named General Power as his deputy chief of operations. He served in this capacity during the atomic bomb attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

During the "Crossroads" atomic bomb tests at Bikini Atoll, in 1946, General Power functioned as assistant deputy task force commander for air.

Next came assignments as Deputy Assistant Chief of Air Staff for Operations in Washington, followed by a period of air attaché duty in London. He was named vice commander of the Strategic Air Command in 1948.

In the ensuing 6 years, General Power assisted Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, then SAC commander in chief, in making the command the world's greatest deterrent force.

Then came an appointment as commander of the Air Research and Development Command. General Power held the position from 1954 to 1957.

When General LeMay was named Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Power became commander in chief of SAC and was promoted to four-star rank.

In September 1959, he received the Air Force Association's H. H. Arnold Award as "Aviation's Man of the Year."

In August 1960, General Power, in addition to his duties as CINCSAC, was named Director of the Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff by the Secretary of Defense. The staff, composed of more than 100 highly experienced officers from all branches of service, maintains a single, integrated operational plan for initial U.S. retaliatory strikes in case of global war.

General Power has been awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, Silver Star, Legion of Merit with one cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross, Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Commendation Ribbon with one cluster, and the French Croix de Guerre, with palm.

He is a rated command pilot and aircraft observer.

PEACE IS OUR PROFESSION

Strategic Air Command personnel are conceded to be among the most highly motivated and dedicated military group in the world. This high purpose stems from a firm belief in the command's deterrent mission and its symbolic motto, "Peace Is Our Profession."

For while SAC is unquestionably the most powerful striking force in the world's history, the command's primary mission is to preserve the peace. SAC's strength is such that an enemy would not dare attack the free world because of the risk of destruction from SAC's bombers and missiles.

But deterrence is many things. Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC commander in chief, puts it this way:

Deterrence is more than bombs and missiles and tanks and armies. Deterrence is a sound economy and prosperous industry. Deterrence is scientific progress and good

schools. Deterrence is adequate civil defense and a stable professional military force. Most of all, deterrence is the determination of the American people to prevent and, if necessary, fight and win any kind of war, whether hot or cold, big or small.

Two world wars have taught freedom-loving peoples a bitter lesson: for the foreseeable future peace can only be maintained through strength that deters aggression.

When SAC men say, "Peace Is Our Profession," they do so with conviction and pride.

SAC ORGANIZATION

SAC regards simple, direct organization as one of its most vital elements.

The nucleus of the command, SAC headquarters, is at Offutt AFB, near Omaha, Nebr.

Major subordinate commands within the continental United States consist of three numbered air forces and a missile division. They are: 2d Air Force at Barksdale AFB, Shreveport, La.; 8th Air Force at Westover AFB, Chicopee Falls, Mass.; 15th Air Force at March AFB, Riverside, Calif., and 1st Strategic Aerospace Division, Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc, Calif.

Each of the numbered air forces controls approximately equal numbers of SAC's mixed force of operational bombers and intercontinental ballistic missile units.

Overseas, two air divisions and a numbered air force direct SAC activity; 16th Air Force at Torrejon Air Base, Madrid, Spain, is responsible for SAC's operations in Spain and north Africa. The 7th Air Division, located at High Wycombe Air Station, near London, England, controls SAC bases in the United Kingdom. The 3d Air Division on Guam in the Marianas is concerned with SAC activity in the Far East. In addition, there are several other units outside the continental United States responsible to the stateside numbered air forces.

Goose Air Base, Labrador; Ernest Harmon AFB, Newfoundland, and Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico, are operated by 8th Air Force. SAC is a tenant at Hickam AFB, Hawaii, and Elelson and Elmendorf AFB, Alaska. These units are under the jurisdiction of 15th Air Force.

The command does not base tactical aircraft or missiles permanently in any foreign country. It does, however, have bombers and tankers in Puerto Rico.

SAC COMMAND POST—THE NERVE CENTER

From one room in an underground command post, the Strategic Air Command aerospace force of aircraft and missiles would be launched and directed against an enemy in time of war. The command post, located beneath the command's headquarters building at Offutt AFB, near Omaha, Nebr., is the nerve center of SAC's global communications network.

By picking up a red telephone, the senior SAC controller can speak directly to more than 80 subordinate command posts spread across the Northern Hemisphere. Through this system, each SAC base receives notice of alerts—practice or real—from coded messages.

Another telephone, gold in color, gives the controller a direct line to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington and to other major command headquarters.

Through a radio network called "Short Order," the command post can contact SAC tactical aircraft in flight over any part of the world. A principal purpose of this system is to pass the execution order—"Go Code"—to the bomber force, if specifically ordered by the President of the United States.

The control room, one of the most impressive facilities in the underground command post, is 140 feet long, 39 feet wide and 21 feet high. Within 30 seconds, vital operational data can be taken from an original printed source and flashed on screen before the entire SAC battle staff.

Each of the six screens is 18 by 18 feet and six different displays of information can be projected simultaneously to provide a wide range of vital operational information to the staff.

Operational data pertaining to weather, force deployment, aircraft, missiles, and so forth, is transferred from the original source to plastic transparencies and projected on the screen.

Using transparency film and a dry-process copying machine, film and original documents can be reproduced in 4 seconds. Critical data from electronic computer printouts is also reproduced on a transparency for immediate screening, and battle staff evaluation.

Since SAC's emergency war plan can change frequently as new data becomes available, the data display is continually kept up to date with information fed from computers.

Source of most of the information flashed to the controller is a battery of International Business Machine—IBM—computers located nearby which stores information pertaining to the SAC force, including status of aircraft and missiles, crews, bases, war plans and supplies. In time of war, the machines would record the progress of the strike force, serving as an invaluable aid to the SAC commander in chief in making command and operational decisions. Strike information would be processed automatically in minimum time, giving SAC immediate and continuous knowledge of its strike force.

Through an electronic device known as the "situation display system"—SDS—in the command post, the controller would receive early warning of missiles or aircraft approaching the United States from over the polar regions. The SDS, which provides a visual display of any such activity, is connected with the ballistic missile early warning system — BMEWS — and Headquarters North American Air Defense Command.

An additional function of the SAC underground occurs in the trajectory center where intelligence specialists, using electronic computers, establish trajectory and space data for the command's ICBM's. This information, compiled well in advance and changed to meet revisions in the war plan, is fed into the missiles' guidance systems which direct the payloads to their targets.

To meet the constantly changing demands of modern warfare, Project 465L equipment is now being installed at SAC headquarters and at SAC units. Project 465L is a high speed automated information gathering, processing, and display system designed for use by SAC's commander in chief and his battle staff to assist them in exercising instantaneous, precise, secure, and complete operational control over the SAC force.

The SAC underground would be sealed off in time of war. Food stored there would support persons working in the command post independent of the rest of the base or headquarters. In case the command post was knocked out—which would require a near direct hit by a nuclear weapon—control of the SAC force would be passed to an alternate command post or to an airborne command post that is maintained in the air 24 hours daily.

POSITIVE CONTROL

A tested system of codes and communications procedures insures "positive control" of the Strategic Air Command retaliatory force.

The SAC bomber and tanker force can be launched in minutes by the SAC Commander in Chief, Gen. Thomas S. Power, if warning of an attack is received from the North American Air Defense Command.

Getting the bombers airborne does not send SAC to war. It does insure survival of SAC's ground alert aircraft should the warning prove valid.

Positive control means just that. After reaching a certain point on their routes, well outside enemy territory, the bombers automatically return to their bases unless they receive positive coded voice instructions to proceed to their targets. Authority from the President is the only means whereby the SAC force would proceed to target, beyond the "positive control" point. If the "go code" is not received, they turn back.

The "go code," transmitted only upon orders of the President, would be authenticated at several levels of command and ultimately by more than one member of the bomber crew. It would be transmitted to the airborne force by a variety of means from widely dispersed sites.

Use of dispersed transmitters and different methods of communications reduce the possibility that the "go code" might not be received by the aircraft.

In case of inoperative aircraft radio receivers, failure to receive the "go code" would, under conditions of actual enemy attack, cause some of our bombers to return to their bases; thus leaving their targets uncovered. However, this chance must be taken to prevent inadvertent action.

Thus, positive control guards against the possibility of inadvertent hostile action by the SAC force but guarantees that the bomber force will receive the attack order, if issued by the President.

Positive control procedures are tested repeatedly and have been proved effective under all circumstances.

In addition to the communications procedures of "positive control," the weapons in the aircraft are not armed until the bomber is ordered to attack. Coordinated effort by several crew mem-

bers under the "go code" authority is required to arm nuclear weapons.

Since missiles cannot be recalled once launched, our missile force is being deployed in protected and dispersed underground sites to allow it to ride out an initial enemy attack. Therefore, multiple safeguards are employed to prevent firing without Presidential direction.

B–47 STRATOJET

The six-jet B–47 Stratojet has been a principal part of the Strategic Air Command for more than 12 years, starting in 1951 with the replacement of obsolete prop-driven B–29's.

A workhorse aircraft, which is being replaced in part by the supersonic B–58 bomber, one B–47 can carry the nuclear equivalent to all the bombs dropped in World War II. With in-flight refueling, it can fly nonstop as long as its three-man crew can perform safely and efficiently.

Its drooping swept-back wings give the B–47 the appearance of a grounded gull until the plane is airborne. Then it is a thing of sleek beauty, humming through the air at speeds of 600 miles per hour and at altitudes above 40,000 feet. With electronic eyes the B–47 can find a target in daylight or darkness, good weather or bad.

B–52 STRATOFORTRESS

The current "heavyweight" among SAC's bombers is the B–52 Stratofortress. It travels faster than 650 miles per hour at altitudes above 50,000 feet.

Newer versions, the B–52G and B–52H, are America's first missile-carrying bombers. They carry two Hound Dog missiles plus a nuclear payload in their bomb bays. Earlier models of the Stratofortress are being modified to carry Hound Dog missiles.

The B–52's eight jet engines each develops more than 10,000 pounds of thrust or a total of 80,000 pounds of thrust—as much power as 30 diesel locomotives.

The Stratofortress replaced SAC's famous B–36 Peacemaker. With the replacement of B–36's, SAC became an all-jet bomber force.

An advanced Stratofortress, the B–52H, joined the SAC force in May 1961. This model uses turbofan engines to increase each plane's power by several thousand pounds of thrust. Turbofans enable the bomber to stretch its unrefueled range.

A B–52 carries more fuel than three railroad tank cars. Early models had an unrefueled range of 6,000 miles. Later models have stretched that to more than 12,000 miles.

With aerial refueling, the B–52 has a range limited only by the endurance of its six-man crew.

In the B–52G and H, the gunner's post has been moved from the tail to the forward section of the aircraft, and a television camera is mounted in the tail section to be used for fire control.

The additional fuel load in the wing cells pushes the B–52G and B–52H gross weight in flight to more than 450,000 pounds—225 tons—50,000 pounds more than previous models. The B–52's have electronic countermeasures equipment which helps confuse enemy ground or air radar and thus increases chances for a successful mission.

B–58 HUSTLER

The B–58 Hustler flies at altitudes and speeds far beyond any other free world bomber now in existence. It is the world's first supersonic bomber with intercontinental capabilities.

The Hustler can carry nuclear weapons at twice the speed of sound—mach 2.

A nuclear bomb and part of the aircraft's fuel is carried in a slim disposable "pod" mounted beneath the B–58 fuselage. In addition, up to four weapons can be carried externally under the wing.

The struts of the Hustler's main landing gear each carries eight wheels. The struts are exceptionally long to provide clearance for the disposable "pod," tail and outboard engines during takeoff.

The B–58's pinched-in fuselage is designed to gain the smoothest passage through the sound barrier at extremely high altitudes.

SAC has two B–58 wings—the 43d Bomb Wing, Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., and 305th Bomb Wing, Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Ind.

THE B–58 HUSTLER

Among pilots it is known as "the bomber that flies like a fighter."

The B–58 Hustler can penetrate to targets while flying above 60,000 feet at speeds of more than 1,300 miles per hour—twice the speed of sound.

Its triangular wing and slender wasp-waisted fuselage distinguish the B–58 in the air. On the ground, the long-legged landing gear that provides clearance for the underslung detachable armament pod is the eye-catching design feature.

The slender, bomb-shaped pod can be armed with conventional or nuclear weapons, reconnaissance gear or electronic countermeasures equipment, thus assuring a high degree of mission flexibility.

The B–58 is powered by four General Electric J–79 jet engines, carried on forward mounted pylons, each of which produces 15,600 pounds of thrust on takeoff with afterburner. Each engine has a "spike" or variable air inlet duct for best performance throughout the wide speed ranges flown by the aircraft.

At twice the speed of sound, the leading edges of the B–58's wing heat up to approximately 260 degrees Fahrenheit, too hot for conventional aluminum aircraft skin. Engineers solved this temperature problem by building a "sandwich" with a tough cellular honeycomb core, bonded to outer coverings of stainless steel. It offers high strength-to-weight ratios, provides aerodynamic smoothness, and is resistant to sonic fatigue failure.

The bomber's fuselage is 97 feet long and the delta wing, 57 feet across, comprises a total area of 1,542 square feet.

SAC TANKERS: EXTENDING THE PUNCH

The global capability of SAC's giant jet bombers depends on air refueling support given by the command's tanker force. Unrefueled ranges of SAC's bomber aircraft—the B–47, B–52, and B–58—vary from more than 3,000 miles for the B–47 to more than 12,000 miles for the B–52H. With aerial refueling, any of these bombers become intercontinental and can circle the earth.

Aerial refueling has progressed considerably since the initial refueling in 1923. The Strategic Air Command in 1948 developed on air refueling capability using converted B–29 bombers as tankers.

With the delivery of B–47 Stratojets to SAC's medium bomb wings, intensive aerial refueling training began. By 1953 the jet bombers and KC–97 Stratotankers were completing an aerial hookup every 15 minutes.

In June 1957, SAC received its first KC–135 Jet Stratotanker, thus providing the command with a combination of jet bombers and tankers.

With the KC–135, jet-to-jet refueling means SAC bombers can take on a full load of fuel without slowing down, changing course, or descending to altitudes at which they must burn more fuel.

SAC's goal is to eventually match its all-jet bomber force with an all-jet tanker force of KC–135's.

STANDARDIZATION CONCEPT

Among the many management innovations introduced by the Strategic Air Command, none is more significant or holds greater potential for increasing the reliability and safety of strategic operations than the concept of standardization. By standardizing aircraft and missile crew procedures, SAC has given the commander at all levels a system for insuring that critical procedures are being performed identically and safely in all similar units, regardless of their global location or operational experience.

First conceived by SAC in 1948, crew standardization has been so successful in improving air combat crew quality and, more recently, missile reliability, that this concept is now being applied to SAC aircraft and missile maintenance including nuclear weapons support.

Because of the basic differences between aircrew and missile crew operations and environment, standardization is applied to these two fields in slightly different ways. Principles of application are the same for both air and missile combat crews, however.

Essentially, combat aircrew standardization works this way: Each operational aircraft unit—including tanker and reconnaissance—selects its best crew members and assigns them as a standardization team. This team frequently examines and flight checks all other crews in the unit, using standard procedures received from the SAC Combat Evaluation Group—CEG—based at Barksdale Air Force Base, La. The CEG is attached directly to SAC Headquarters and is comprised of standardization teams of highly qualified combat crewmen from all SAC aircraft.

A CEG standardization team visits each SAC combat unit at least once a year. Upon arriving at a base, the standardization team schedules flights with the unit team and several random selected crews. During the flight check, team members sit in the aircraft near their counterpart crew members and observe their every move. Crew actions are rated by the observers on standard rating scales. After the flight checks are

complete, unit crews are given extensive written examinations, covering their weapon system, emergency procedures, and emergency war orders.

When checks and examinations are complete the results are given in the form of a critique to the unit commander and later forwarded to SAC Headquarters. Any discrepancies that were found will be given particular attention on the next standardization visit.

Discrepancies are passed on to the commander who must take immediate action to correct them.

Missile combat crew standardization is administered by the 3901st Strategic Missile Evaluation Squadron at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. This unit has a corps of top missile combat crews, maintenance teams and recently, reentry vehicle specialists who visit missile units for regular evaluations either once each quarter or once each 6 months depending on the unit's experience and level of training. As with bomber and tanker units, each missile unit has its own standardization team which gets most of the attention on evaluation visits. Teams visiting missile units, however, check all unit crews periodically including maintenance and reentry vehicle teams.

Missile units are also visited by standardization teams before they become combat ready to monitor training and assist in developing unit standardization procedures. Once operational the unit is checked quarterly and later semiannually as unit crews become more proficient. Similar to an aircrew check, the missile crew standardization "ride" consists of careful observation and rating of unit crews simulating procedures at their launch consoles and extensive written examinations.

This kind of "independent audit" given unit commanders by standardization teams assures the commanders that their unit training is adequate and that their crews can perform the same and as well as any crews in SAC. After being checked by a standardization team, both missile and aircraft combat crews can be validly certified—as they must before being allowed to go on alert—"combat ready."

At SAC Headquarters, the commander in chief and his staff can, with standardization, be absolutely sure of the ability of critical combat crews to carry out their emergency war orders.

Ample evidence of the success of SAC standardization can be found in the steady improvement in flying safety within SAC since standardization began. Standardization has paid off both in lives and combat effectiveness. Because of the success of SAC's program, standardization in some form or other is being practiced by the entire Air Force and by Navy aviation.

MINIMUM INTERVAL TAKEOFF (MITO) TRAINING PROGRAM

In the event of war, America's future and victory itself might well depend upon how quickly SAC's fleet of retaliatory bombers and their refueling tankers can get off the ground. When warning of an attack has been received, quick takeoffs will help insure that a major portion of the force will survive. This, despite the severity of an enemy's initial assault.

Likewise, with its retaliatory fleet airborne, a series of fast and devastating counterblows will be possible.

To qualify all combat crews in procedures necessary to launch the maximum number of aircraft in a minimum amount of time, SAC planners designed the minimum interval takeoff—MITO—training program. No crew is considered combat ready until it has demonstrated its proficiency in this furious art.

Minimum interval takeoffs are exciting to watch. Thundering down the runway barely 15 seconds apart, bombers and tankers leave behind them clouds of churning exhaust smoke that reduce visibility sharply for aircraft in the rear. It is a situation that demands maximum alertness on the part of crew members.

Generally, aircraft are lined up 150 to 200 feet apart on taxiways leading toward the takeoff strips. When the exercise begins, pilots follow a curved lead-in line that is an extension of the runway's centerline. By maintaining a precise distance interval—depending upon the takeoff speed of the aircraft just ahead—a proper time interval can also be maintained.

Despite the spectacular nature of a MITO exercise, flying safety precautions are never relaxed. A tight system of communications is in effect, and all participating aircraft must be functioning perfectly.

Effects of turbulence and jet wash increase as the takeoff roll progresses, reaching maximum at about the "unstick" point or point of takeoff. Pilots compare the experience to taking off under gusty wind conditions. Thus, they look for fluctuations in airspeed and some abnormal control reactions. Usually, the effects of turbulence can be reduced by turning slightly left or right, away from the preceding aircraft.

Only when a crew in training has satisfield its examiners that it is combat ready in all other respects is it allowed to participate in MITO exercises.

Few maneuvers in military aviation call for as much exacting professionalism on the part of participants. But it is a technique that all combat-ready crews must master. For, getting the SAC force airborne quickly may one day mean survival—for America and the free world.

SIGNIFICANT SAC FLIGHTS

A Strategic Air Command B–58 Hustler set a new flight record from New York to Paris May 26, 1961, flying 3,669 miles in 3 hours, 20 minutes. The flight, which commemorated Lindbergh's historic flight 34 years ago, was flown at supersonic speeds for an average speed of 1,105 miles per hour by a crew of the 43d Bomb Wing at Carswell AFB, Tex. The bomber departed from Carswell AFB and flew nonstop to Paris via Washington and New York with the aid of aerial refueling from SAC KC–135 tankers. The Carswell to Paris distance is 5,198 miles. For this the crew received the Mackay Trophy.

Sustained speed of 1,302 miles per hour by a SAC B–58 Hustler over a closed course of 669.4 miles for 30 minutes, 45 seconds, May 10, 1961, resulted in the pilot receiving the Bleriot Cup. The flight, by a SAC crew of the 43d Bomb Wing, Carswell AFB, Tex., was approved by the Federation Aeronautique Internationale of France. Pilot of the B–58 was Maj. Elmer E. Murphy. The course was rectangular with the corners near Needles, Calif.; Kingman, Ariz.; Norman Mesa, Nev., and Lone Pine, Calif.

Six official world speed and payload records were shattered by SAC's newest and fastest bomber, the B–58 Hustler, January 12–14, 1961. Flying over a closed circuit course, two B–58's set three records each in runs of 1,000 and 2,000 kilometers. The records were: First, speed without payload, 1,000 kilometers—1,284.73 miles per hour. Second, speed with 1,000 kilogram payload, 1,000 kilometers—1,284.73 miles per hour. Third, Speed with 2,000 kilogram payload, 1,000 kilometers—1,284.73 miles per hour. Fourth, speed without payload, 2,000 kilometers—1,061.80 miles per hour. Fifth, speed 2,000 kilometers, with 1,000 kilogram payload—1,061.80 miles per hour. Sixth, speed with 2,000 kilogram payload, 2,000 kilometers—1,061.80 miles per hour.

On March 5, 1962, a Strategic Air Command B–58 Hustler flew from Los Angeles to New York at 1,214.71 miles per hour in 2 hours, 56.8 seconds. On the same flight the B–58 set a New York to Los Angeles record in 2 hours, 15 minutes, 48.6 seconds—beating the sun by over 41 minutes—and averaging 1,081.77 miles per hour. A round trip record of 4 hours, 41 minutes, 11.3 seconds, averaging 1,044.96 miles per hour was also established. For these record flights the B–58 crew from the 43d Bomb Wing, Carswell AFB, Tex., received the Bendix Trophy and the Mackay Trophy.

A SAC B–52H from Minot AFB, N. Dak., set two world's distance records without refueling and nine course speed records January 10–11, 1962, flying 12,519 miles from Kadena AB, Okinawa, to Torrejon AB, near Madrid, Spain. The world distance records were: First, for all types of aircraft without refueling. Second, class C distance for jet aircraft without refueling. The nine Federation Aeronautique Internationale course speed records claimed were: First, Tokyo to Seattle; second, Tokyo to Fort Worth; third, Tokyo to Washington, D.C.; fourth, Tokyo to Madrid; fifth, Seattle to Fort Worth; sixth, Seattle to Madrid; seventh, Fort Worth to Washington, D.C.; eighth, Fort Worth to Madrid, and ninth, Washington, D.C. to Madrid.

The world distance records were established by a Strategic Air Command B–52H Stratofortress from Homestead AFB, Fla., June 6–7, 1962, during an 11,400-statute-mile flight without refueling. Commanded by Capt. William M. Stevenson, the eight-jet bomber claimed world closed circuit records during 22 hours, 38 minutes of flying. The B–52H traveled farther than any other aircraft without refueling over a circuitous route and exceeded the closed circuit distance for heavyweight aircraft. The flight began and ended at Seymour Johnson AFB, N.C., and passed over Greenland, Alaska, California and Florida before landing.

An SAC B–52G jet bomber manned by a crew from the 5th Bomb Wing, Travis AFB, Calif., completed a recordbreaking 10,000 mile nonstop flight without refueling on December 14, 1960. The bomber took off from Edwards AFB, Calif. at 7:07 a.m., December 13, and touched down at the same base the following day, after a flight of 19 hours, 45 minutes, breaking two world long distance flight records.

The fastest around the world flight on record was achieved Jan. 16–18, 1957, when three B–52 Stratofortresses from the 93d Bomb Wing, Castle AFB, Calif., flew 24,325 miles nonstop in 45 hours, 19 minutes. The eight-jet bombers departed from and returned to bases in California and utilized multiple in-flight refuelings. Distinguished Flying Crosses were awarded each crew member. Flight commander was Lt. Gen. Archie J. Old, Jr., commander of SAC's 15th Air Force.

The first important demonstration of B–52 capabilities came in November 1956, when eight B–52's from bases in California and Marine completed a nonstop operational mission which carried them around the North American Continent and across the North Pole. The Stratofortresses, from the 93d Bomb Wing, Castle AFB, Calif., and the 42d Bomb Wing, Loring AFB, Maine, were airborne as long as 32 hours and covered distances up to 17,000 miles.

Operation powerhouse, involving 1,000 combat aircraft from 21 B–47 wings and 18 tanker squadrons, was carried out during a 2-week period ending December 11, 1956. Simulated combat missions averaging 8,000 miles were flown over the North American Continent and Arctic regions. The mass flights marked SAC's first attempt to exercise a major portion of its strike force during such a short time period and successfully demonstrated the ability of the bomber command to launch its force on short notice.

The first B–47 bomb wing to deploy overseas for operational training was the 306th Bomb Wing. Taking off from its home station at MacDill Air Force Base, Fla., June 5, 1953, the wing stopped at Loring Air Force Base, Maine. From there it flew nonstop across the Atlantic to England. Taking off at spaced intervals from MacDill, the B–47's landed in England 8½ hours later after covering a distance of some 4,500 miles.

SAC's longest B–47 flight on record was made by a Stratojet of the 43d Bomb Wing between November 17 to 19, 1954. The B–47 took off from Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco, for RAF Station Fairford, England. Because of bad weather, it could not land and returned to Morocco. Encountering bad weather over Africa, the B–47 again set out for England. Before finally landing the bomber had remained in the air 47 hours, 35 minutes, through aerial refueling. It covered a distance of 21,163 miles.

The longest point-to-point nonstop flight for B–47 aircraft was made by an aircraft of the 321st Bomb Wing on August 10–11, 1957. The Stratojet took off from Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, and landed 11,450 miles away and 22 hours, 50 minutes, later at Sidi Slimane Air Base, Morocco.

A new jet tanker-transport record of 10,228 miles was set April 7–8, 1958, when a KC–135 from the 93d Bomb Wing at Castle Air Force Base, Calif., flew nonstop and nonrefueled from Tokyo, Japan, to the Azores Islands. The flight also set a speed record of 13 hours, 35 minutes, between Tokyo and Washington, D.C., a distance of 7,662 miles.

The first combat aircraft to fly nonstop around the world was the *Lucky Lady II*, a B–50 propeller-driven medium bomber. Between February 26 and March 2, 1949, the bomber, from the 43d Bomb Wing, covered a distance of 23,452 miles in 94 hours, 1 minute. The *Lucky Lady* was refueled in flight over the Azores, Arabia, the Philippines, and Hawaii. Carswell Air Force Base, Tex., was the site of departure and return. The 43d Bomb Wing won the Mackay Trophy in 1949 for the flight and the Distinguished Flying Cross was awarded to each member of the *Lucky Lady's* crew.

SAC ALERT FORCE

In today's aerospace age, when intercontinental ballistic missiles are able to strike half-way around the world within a half hour, the Strategic Air Command must be able to launch its strike force within minutes.

Plans for the fastest possible launch capability have always been part of SAC's procedures. On October 1, 1957, a number of SAC aircraft went on a 24-hour-a-day alert at U.S. and oversea bases. Today, at the direction of the President of the United States the command has 50 percent of its total bomber and tanker force on ground alert, ready to react well within the warning time provided by the ballistic missile early warning system—BMEWS.

Operation of the ground alert force requires a tremendous amount of hard, never-ending work. Aircraft on alert are parked near the end of the runway. Maintenance crews constantly check and recheck each item of equipment, each part of the aircraft, so that it is ready to start its takeoff roll at a moment's notice. Bomber and tanker crews pull alert duty around the clock, and average a 74-hour duty week. They sleep and eat near their aircraft and their duty uniform is their flying clothes. They know their targets and the mission routes they must fly to reach them. Crews and aircraft, both in a constant state of readiness, are never more than a few minutes from being airborne at any time.

Once airborne, SAC's "positive control" procedures guarantee that the bombers, should they be launched on an actual alert, will not touch off a war under false-alarm warning. Under "positive control," SAC's bombers fly to certain points—all well short of enemy territory—and turn back to their bases unless instructed otherwise by coded message.

The oversea portion of this worldwide alert operation, termed "Reflex," sends crews and aircraft from SAC's stateside bases to oversea areas for a short time, during which they remain on an alert similar to that in the United States.

All bomber and tanker crews participating in "Reflex" are accompanied by their crew chiefs. A few more permanent support personnel are required at advance bases since the wing's logistical personnel in most cases do not accompany aircraft.

As a further step in gearing the U.S. retaliatory striking force to meet the threat, SAC has trained its B–52 crews in airborne alert procedures. Under this concept, a percentage of the command's heavy bombers remains aloft, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

This concept is based upon a military premise older than the broadsword. If the enemy does not know where you are, he cannot hit you. Should the Strategic Air Command be forced to react under the worst possible conditions—namely an all-out enemy missile attack executed in total surprise—it is this timeless axiom that will assure the survival of a large portion of the command's retaliatory striking power.

To date, the command has tested and proved the concept with several thousand successful airborne alert training sorties; each lasting approximately 24 hours. SAC's B–52's remain airborne until their replacements have taken off and start a designated flight pattern. They are refueled in the air by KC–135 tankers as often as necessary to insure needed range and endurance.

During the Cuban quarantine—October 1962—the Strategic Air Command launched the first airborne alert in the history of airpower.

The incorporation of intercontinental ballistic missiles into SAC does not cancel the need for the alert force. The command's rapidly increasing missile force is also on continuous alert. But missiles must ride out an enemy attack before they are fired as they—unlike the bombers—cannot be recalled once they are launched.

As far into the future as SAC planners can see, manned aircraft will be needed along with missiles to give the command a flexibility of operations impossible to obtain by relying solely on one weapon system.

SAC MISSILE FACILITIES

Six types of missiles, ranging in size from the 103-foot Titan II intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM—to the less than 15-foot Quail decoy missile, are operational at Strategic Air Command stateside bases.

Atlas was the first ICBM assigned to SAC, and an initial combat capability was announced on September 9, 1959, when an early Atlas was launched by a combat-trained SAC crew at Vandenberg AFB, Calif. Since that time, 13 squadrons at 11 bases—the entire Atlas program—have become operational in the command.

All six Titan I bases became operational in SAC during 1962, and a third ICBM system was added to the command inventory in December 1962 when two flights of the solid fuel Minuteman were declared operational at Malmstrom AFB, Mont. The 341st Strategic Missile Wing there became completely operational in July 1963.

The first Titan II squadron became operational at Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz.,

in June 1963. Three Titan II squadrons are programed in SAC.

The Strategic Air Command is adding operational missiles at the rate of one a day during 1963.

Early models of the Atlas ICBM are in semihardened complexes while the F model is silo-stored and raised to the surface for launching. Titan I ICBM's are also silo-stored and fired from the surface. Titan II and Minuteman missiles are silo-stored and launched.

Missile sites are located near the following bases—the SAC numbered air force having operational control follows State:

ATLAS ICBM (PGM–16D AND E AND HGM–16E) (GENERAL DYNAMICS ASTRONAUTICS)

Altus AFB, Altus, Okla., 2d Air Force.
Dyess AFB, Abilene, Tex., 15th Air Force.
Fairchild AFB, Spokane, Wash., 15th Air Force.
Francis E. Warren AFB, Cheyenne, Wyo., 8th Air Force.
Forbes AFB, Topeka, Kans., 2d Air Force.
Lincoln AFB, Lincoln, Nebr., 2d Air Force.
Offutt AFB, Omaha, Nebr., 2d Air Force.
Plattsburgh AFB, Plattsburgh, N.Y., 8th Air Force.
Schilling AFB, Salina, Kans., 15th Air Force.
Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc, Calif., 1st Strategic Aerospace Division.
Walker AFB, Roswell, N. Mex., 15th Air Force.

TITAN I ICBM (HGM–25A)—(MARTIN CO.)

Beale AFB, Marysville, Calif., 15th Air Force.
Ellsworth AFB, Rapid City, S. Dak., 15th Air Force.
Larson AFB, Moses Lake, Wash., 15th Air Force.
Lowry AFB, Denver, Colo., 8th Air Force.
Mountain Home AFB, Mountain Home, Idaho, 15th Air Force.
Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc, Calif, 1st Strategic Aerospace Division.

TITAN II ICBM (LGM–25C)—(MARTIN CO.)

Davis-Monthan AFB, Tucson, Ariz., 15th Air Force.
McConnel AFB, Wichita, Kans., 8th Air Force.
Little Rock AFB, Little Rock, Ark., 2d Air Force.

MINUTEMAN ICBM (LGM–30A)—(BOEING CO.)

Malmstrom AFB, Great Falls, Mont., 15th Air Force.
Vandenberg AFB, Lompoc, Calif., 1st Strategic Aerospace Division.
Ellsworth AFB, Rapid City, S. Dak., 15th Air Force.
Minot AFB, Minot, N. Dak., 2d Air Force.
Whiteman AFB, Knob Noster, Mo., 8th Air Force.
Francis E. Warren AFB, Cheyenne, Wyo., 8th Air Force.
Grand Forks AFB, Mekinock, N. Dak., 2d Air Force.

ATLAS (PGM AND E AND HGM–16F)

The U.S. first operation intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM—was the Atlas D, designed to deliver a nuclear warhead to targets 6,300 miles distant.

On September 9, 1959, a Strategic Air Command crew launched the first operational Atlas D from Vandenberg AFB, Calif. Since that time, not only the Atlas D, but also Atlas models E and F have been integrated into SAC's emergency war order. All are able to launch within the warning time provided by the ballistics missile early warning system—BMEWS.

Atlas is a stage-and-a-half missile, powered by burning liquid oxygen and RP–1, a kerosenelike hydrocarbon fuel.

Height of the missile is approximately 83 feet, with a body diameter of 10 feet. Launching weight is more than 250,000 pounds.

Atlas has a powerplant consisting of two large booster engines and one large sustainer engine, plus a pair of small vernier rockets.

D-series missiles are ignited by the firing of a pyrotechnic squib into each thrust chamber. E and F models are fired by forcing a hypergolic mixture into the thrust chambers, along with the propellants. The former burns violently upon exposure to oxygen and starts subsequent burning in the engines.

On the Atlas D, all five engines are ignited prior to launching, and after a few minutes of flight, with the missile well into its trajectory, the booster section is jettisoned. Acceleration is accomplished from that point on by the sustainer engine. At a velocity of more than 15,000 miles per hour, the engine shuts off. The small vernier rockets are then employed to "trim" velocity to the exact amount required.

Following vernier shutdown, the reentry vehicle separates from the tank section. The reentry vehicle is then following a true ballistic course.

During power portions of flight, a guidance system governs course and speed of the missile. Atlas D uses a radio-inertial guidance system that incorporates a ground radar facility to monitor the missile's flight and issue appropriate engine shutoff commands to establish the desired trajectory of the reentry vehicle.

Atlas E and F operate independently of ground guidance facilities. An inertial guidance package senses accelerations along with three axes, utilizing these "inputs" to determine the missile's position at any given instant of flight. An airborne computer generates steering and engine cutoff commands to place the reentry vehicle in proper trajectory at the desired speed.

Early D-series missiles were erected by above-ground launchers—gantries—and were exposed to weather at all times. Operational D-series models are stored in horizontal position and housed in bays covered by sliding roofs.

The E series are stored horizontally in a concrete "coffin"—the top mounted flush with the earth, affording some blast protection.

F-series missiles are stored vertically in undeground silos. Elevators lift them to the surface for launch. Such emplacements are considered "hard" and afford maximum blast protection.

Thin-gage stainless steel makes up the tank structure of the Atlas missile which houses over 40,000 parts—not including the nose cone, guidance, and engine assemblies.

General Dynamics-Astronautics Corp., San Diego, Calif., makes the airframe and, as prime Atlas contractor, is responsible for assembly and test of the missile.

HGM–25A AND LGM–25C TITAN I, TITAN II

Titan I is the second ICBM to become operational in the Strategic Air Command's arsenal of aerospace weapons. In September 1961, the first Titan was launched from the combined operational and training facilities at Vandenberg AFB, Calif.

Six operational Titan I squadrons are located at five bases. The first Titan unit was at Lowry AFB, Colo., where two squadrons are located. The other bases are Beale AFB, Calif.; Larson AFB, Wash.; Mountain Home AFB, Idaho, and Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak.

The missile weighs 110 tons when fully fueled. Its first stage is powered by an engine which develops 300,000 pounds of thrust at sea level. Titan I's second stage develops 80,000 pounds of thrust at altitude. The Titan I is 98 feet tall.

Titan II, a more advanced version of the Titan I, became operational at Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz., in June 1963. Other Titan II bases are at McConnell AFB, Kans., and Little Rock AFB, Ark.

This advanced Titan incorporates such advantages as inertial guidance system, more powerful engines, in-silo launch, more reliability, greater payload, reduced launch time and storable propellants.

Titan II is 102 feet tall including the reentry vehicle. The first stage is 70 feet long; the second stage is 32 feet. Both stages are 10 feet in diameter and the total missile weight, with fuel, is about 150 tons. The first-stage engine develops 430,000 pounds thrust at sea level and the second-stage generates 100,000 pounds at altitude.

Where Titan I uses a radio-inertial guidance system and must be raised from its underground silo to be fired, the Titan II will be directed by a completely airborne inertial guidance system and is capable of being launched from its silo.

Because Titan II has a greater load-carrying ability than any other American missile, it is designed for an important role in space activities.

It will furnish the booster system for the X–20—formerly the Dyna-Soar. This manned boost-glide spacecraft will be launched into orbit around the earth and will be able to return under pilot control to selected airfields in the United States.

Titan II will supply lift for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Project Gemini, the undertaking that will see two astronauts hoisted into orbit in a single capsule.

Both Titan models are fitted with nose cones whose surface material disperses the heat generated during the reentry through the earth's atmosphere:

Titans are produced by the Martin Co., in association with 12 other contractors.

LGM-30A MINUTEMAN

Hardening, quicker firing, lighter weight, smaller size, and lower cost make the Minuteman as different from the Atlas and Titan intercontinental ballistic missiles as night is from day.

The Strategic Air Command added the third ICBM system to its mixed aerospace force in December 1962 when two

flights—20 Minuteman ICBM's—were declared operational at Malmstrom AFB, Mont. By mid-summer 1963, the entire Malmstrom wing was declared operational and the first flights of the Minuteman wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak., achieved operational status.

Construction is underway or planned near four bases other than Malmstrom and Ellsworth: Minot Air Force Base, N. Dak.; Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo.; Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., and Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak.

Because it is propelled by solid fuel—instead of by liquid fuel as are the Atlas and Titan—the Minuteman is smaller, lighter, and easier to handle.

In the first launch attempt from the Air Force Missile Test Center, Cape Kennedy, Fla., the Minuteman achieved a range of 4,600 miles, its reentry vehicle impacting in the target area.

The test also established two other missile flight records: First time all stages of a multi-stage ICBM performed their assigned functions on the initial flight; first time an operating guidance system placed reentry vehicle on target in the initial attempt.

Minuteman was first launched from an underground silo at Cape Kennedy on November 17, 1961. Since then an unprecedented number of successful flights have been achieved.

The Minuteman's solid fuel also permits it to be ready to go in seconds, if necessary, since the countdown can be completed in advance, leaving only the actual firing to be accomplished should this Nation be attacked.

Hardened and dispersed sites make the Minuteman virtually immune from enemy attack since they can only be knocked out by a direct nuclear hit.

Produced in quantity, the Minuteman costs considerably less per unit than the Atlas and Titan.

The Air Training Command at Chanute Air Force Base, Ill., trains SAC Minuteman crews in individual specialties, followed by training in operational procedures by SAC at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif.

Production and assembling of the Minuteman missile is being done near Ogden, Utah.

Associate contractors for the missile include the Boeing Co.; the Autonetics Division of North American Aviation, Inc.; Thiokol Chemical Corp.; Aerojet-General Corp.; Hercules Powder Co.; Avco Manufacturing Co., and Space Technology Laboratories.

ADM–20A QUAIL

A decoy to confuse an enemy while Strategic Air Command bombers are en route to a target is the ADM–20A Quail, now in use by the combat force.

Only 13 feet long, the Quail guided-air-missile is powered by a General Electric J–85 turbojet engine, and is designed for inflight launching.

Mounted on special racks in the bomb bay of the eight-jet B–52, each Quail, when in flight, produces a "blip" on enemy radar screens similar to that produced by the B–52 Stratofortress. By confusing enemy radar, it aids the penetration of bombers on target missions.

The Quail flies faster than 600 miles per hour, as does the B–52.

HOUND DOG (AGM–28A)

First combination of the missile and bomber as part of the Strategic Air Command's aerospace force was achieved on December 21, 1959, when the command accepted the AGM–28A—Hound Dog—a supersonic air-to-ground guided missile capable of carrying a nuclear warhead.

Two AGM–28A missiles are carried by the intercontinental B–52 missile platform bombers. The missile extends the operational reach of the eight-jet B–52 bombers by more than 500 miles.

The Hound Dog is directed to its target by a self-contained inertial guidance system. It is considered nonjammable, and has been described as "a super-elusive miniature supersonic airplane."

After the Hound Dog-carrying bomber is airborne, it is possible for the navigator to select cruise altitude to targets or to change targets.

Equipped with the AGM–28A, each B–52 bomber on a single mission could destroy several targets literally thousands of miles apart.

Hound Dog is manufactured by the North American Aviation Co. and is powered by a Pratt & Whitney J–52 engine.

MISSILE COMBAT CREWS

The SAC missileman is a highly trained and skilled technician who is working in one of the most selective career fields in the U.S. Air Force. After schooling, depending upon his particular missile specialty, he may be assigned to duty in an operational blockhouse, upon the launching pad itself, with a maintenance or assembly unit, or in a missile control center or command post.

Technicians concerned with actual launch operations have been organized into missile combat crews. Each crew has the same clearly defined mission: to be prepared 24 hours a day—upon receipt of orders initiated by the President—to effect the near instantaneous launch of one or more intercontinental ballistic missiles toward targets located in the territory of a designated enemy.

The size of a missile combat crew varies with the type of ICBM for which it is responsible.

Missile combat crew commanders are senior captains or of higher rank. Each is selected for his maturity, judgment, and proven abilities. He need not be a rated officer.

The performance of missile combat crews must meet the same high standards that have always distinguished SAC air crews.

MEASURING THE COMMAND

How do you measure combat capability in a modern air organization?

In private business, a firm either attains a certain mark on its profit curve or it goes out of business.

But in Strategic Air Command, the only profit is combat capability, a thing much harder to measure than dollars and cents.

The yardstick of SAC's fighting power is a mathematical rating formula that has become as valuable a summary of the command's global operations as the profit and loss statement is to private business.

By reviewing a monthly management control statement, Gen. Thomas S. Power, SAC's commander in chief, gets an up-to-date composite picture of the command's readiness to strike. He learns the results of practice bombing missions, training programs, and other important items contributing to SAC combat capability.

Each month the management control system scores every unit in the command on performance. Scores are worked out on the basis of past performance and reported under general headings such as operations, personnel, materiel, and special missions.

A compilation of the scores indicates SAC's status, whether the entire command is meeting desired standards and actually making a profit. By studying unit scores separately, top units can be spotted on an overall basis or in any desired category.

The rating system has paid big dividends to SAC, for the report tells whether a unit in the command is a good or a bad one, and why.

Assume that under the category, operations, a heavy bomb wing shows a poor score in simulated combat missions.. A cross-check may show that maintenance failed to keep the required number of aircraft in commission. A further check may show that some critical spare parts have been on order for an unusually long time.

Here is a deficiency which can be corrected, and the action must begin all the way back at the supply depot.

A shifting of score value assigned each rated area encourages more attention to weak spots. Should the rating system indicate combat crews are slipping in navigation, the value assigned this category could be raised. Increased efforts in that area by squadron and wing commanders would, therefore, be seen in subsequent reports.

Since the beginning of the monthly rating reports, command scores have ranged higher and higher. As this happens, standards are raised.

The SAC rating system originated in 1949. The biggest problem was to keep the data simple, yet complete.

To combat the danger that the report might mushroom into just a big administrative project, a constant check is maintained. Only needed information and pertinent data is contained.

The report has one single function—to serve as another tool of good management. By applying sound management principles to the data the report provides, SAC commanders at all levels are able to do a better job.

RBS SIMULATED BOMB MISSIONS

Combat readiness of Strategic Air Command bomber crews must be kept at its zenith in peacetime in order to fulfill any future wartime mission. To meet this requirement radar bomb scoring—RBS—is used to test the effectiveness of all combat-ready crews.

Radar bomb scoring began in 1946 with 888 bomb releases for the year against a site in the San Diego area. Seventeen years later bomber crews completed more than 20,000 simulated bomb drops monthly.

During early phases of bomb scoring, crews aimed at circles drawn on sand or other surfaces, then dropped sandbags or dummy bombs on these targets. Today highly sophisticated electronic apparatus scores the accuracy of the SAC crews. The target can be any object within the "eyes" of scanning radar devices.

Electronic equipment used to score the accuracy of the "bomb" drops is maintained by SAC RBS detachments, Army Nike missile batteries, and the Navy. Besides having fixed RBS sites, SAC is also using trains with electronic bomb scoring equipment aboard, and a new semimobile concept, consisting of eight trailer vans housing electronic equipment which move periodically to unfamiliar target areas.

By using the Army Nike and Navy RBS units, a twofold purpose is achieved—SAC bomber crews are scored for accuracy and electronic technicians are given the opportunity to train against detecting high- and low-flying jet bombers penetrating U.S. targets.

Making high- and low-level "bomb" runs against the RBS targets are SAC B–47, B–52, and B–58 jet bombers.

Already recognized as a potent threat from high altitudes, these jet bombers are equally capable of penetrating enemy defenses from low altitudes. This capability greatly compounds a potential enemy's radar defense problem.

When flying at supersonic speeds—mach 2—against the RBS targets, SAC's B–58 bombers fly between 35,000 and 50,000 feet. Subsonic missions are flown at much lower altitudes.

SAC crews will count on the tremendous speed of the B–58 in case of war to dash to any enemy target and return, keeping to a minimum the time the bomber would be exposed to enemy defense.

While flying at supersonic speed, the B–58's will cause sonic booms which may be heard on the ground. Since the B–58 will be flying at high altitude, any sonic boom reaching the earth's surface will be comparatively weak in strength.

Radar bomb scoring permits bomber crews to receive invaluable training in the use of radar bombing against realistic targets, day and night, in all kinds of weather. Using a combination of radio and radar contact between aircraft and RBS site, the effectiveness of combat crews is scored without having to drop a single bomb. Navigator-bombardiers receive practice in recognizing terrain and structural radar returns as they appear on their radar scopes.

The RBS radars "lock on" the approaching bomber, tracking it automatically on a plotting board. Just before the simulated release of the bomb, the aircraft transmits a tone to the RBS site by radio and indicates its point of simulated bomb release by stopping the tone. The target and the radar site have been precisely plotted on the tracking board prior to this action.

By using figures on distance and direction of the bomber from its target, the aircraft's ground speed, heading and altitude, wind conditions, bomb-fall characteristics and other data, RBS technicians can compute the accuracy of the particular bombing mission.

This computation allows RBS personnel to determine exactly if the target was hit, and if not, by how far and in what direction it was missed.

Of direct value to the private citizen is the fact that SAC can train its combat crews in bombing techniques under realistic wartime conditions.

A SAC-Federal Aviation Agency agreement assures a great degree of safety in the exercise of low-level flying, since civilian aircraft are informed which planned routes are in use by SAC bombers. During bad weather, no civilian aircraft are cleared along or through the routes while they are being used by the bombers.

LOW-LEVEL RADAR BOMB SCORING BOMBING MISSIONS

Strategic Air Command B–47, B–52, and B–58 jet bombers are now practicing low-level bombing techniques which will provide greater versatility should these bombers ever be called upon for combat missions.

Already recognized as a potent threat from high altitudes, SAC's jet bombers are equally capable of penetrating enemy defenses from low altitudes. This capability greatly compounds a potential enemy's radar defense problem.

Scoring bomb missions with radar permits crews to receive realistic training in the use of radar bombing against all types of targets. Navigator-bombardiers receive practice in recognizing factories, rail centers, and other structures, used as reference points, as they appear on their radar scopes.

A SAC-Federal Aviation Agency agreement assures a great degree of safety in the exercise of low-level tactics, since civilian aircraft are informed which planned routes are in use by SAC bombers. During bad weather, no civilian aircraft are cleared along or through the routes while they are being used by the bombers.

While flying low-level missions the SAC aircraft fly at subsonic speeds at altitudes at least 1,000 feet above the highest point along the route.

Since the aircraft travels at less than half the speed of sound while on low-level flights, residents of towns along the routes will not hear any sonic booms. No bombs are carried by SAC bombers while on these training missions.

SAC IN THE CUBAN CRISIS

SAC's ability to respond during periods of extreme tension was demonstrated to the world during the Cuban crisis in 1962.

Early in the crisis, the Joint Chiefs of Staff directed SAC to begin reconnaissance photography of the island and on October 14–15 the command's high altitude reconnaissance aircraft obtained the first hard evidence of the presence of offensive weapons in Cuba.

On the weekend before the Presidential quarantine announcement, SAC began dispersing aircraft, moving a number of its Florida-based B–52 bombers and KC–135 tankers to other U.S. bases to make room for the tactical aircraft buildup there.

By October 22 when the President announced the quarantine, SAC had canceled all leaves, temporary duty, and training activities and personnel were called back to their home bases. At many B–47 bases, the SAC medium bomber force dispersed to preselected military and civilian airfields all over the United States, increasing its survivability and shortening its reaction time by placing fewer aircraft at each operating location.

On October 25, the commander in chief, Atlantic—Cinclant—requested SAC's help in locating Soviet surface shipping, and SAC B–47 reconnaissance and KC–97 tankers began combing an 825,000 square mile rectangle north of Cuba between Bermuda and the Azores. Hundreds of visual and radar sightings were made from high altitudes to as low as 300 feet on these missions. Initial contact with the Soviet ships had been made within hours by B–52 aircraft flying airborne alert missions.

Using film exposed by SAC crews, intelligence specialists processed and delivered thousands of feet of film to national agencies during the crisis, normally within 24 to 48 hours of the receipt of the reconnaissance orders.

The most significant of all the manned weapon system activities, however, was this: The Strategic Air Command launched the first airborne alert in the history of airpower, as a number of B–52s took to the air on 24-hour missions designed to keep them within reach of potential targets at all times.

This airborne alert guaranteed the survival of a large part of SAC's strike aircraft from any attack, including one without warning. From its beginning October 22 to its end November 21, when routine airborne alert training was resumed, SAC bombers and tankers flew more than 2,000 sorties calling for nearly 50,000 hours of continuous flight. Under constant positive control, airborne alert aircraft flew more than 20 million miles and transferred some 70 million gallons of fuel during more than 4,000 aerial refuelings.

Also facing the Soviet Union during this period was SAC's growing ICBM force of nearly 200 operational missiles, all capable of reaching Soviet targets. When SAC forces were placed on increased alert, its combat-ready missiles were immediately brought to 100 percent alert. Widely dispersed, they were prepared to absorb a first strike and retaliate under Presidential order.

Commenting later on SAC's role in the Cuban crisis, President Kennedy, speaking from the ramp at SAC headquarters at Offutt AFB, Nebr., praised the command's record during this period and said it was his strong belief:

That peace and security can be maintained directly with the will and courage of the people of the United States and the

strong right arm which is the Strategic Air Force. We're indebted to you all in the past, now, and our security depends on you in the future.

On August 20 and 21 outstanding leaders of the city of Chicago and its environs visited SAC, here and were oriented on the Command's activities. Later on January 14 and 15, 1964, another group of business executives and civic leaders were briefed and toured SAC headquarters facilities and the underground post command—witnessing a demonstration of SAC's famed "red telephone" and other communication systems.

The list of Chicagoans who attended the respective periods were as follows:

CHICAGO CDV'S AUGUST 20–21, 1962

Bailey, Steven, president, Plumbers Chicago Journeymen Local Union 130, 1340 West Washington, Chicago, Ill.

Beisel, E. E., president, Pepsi-Cola General Bottlers, Inc., 1745 North Kolmar, Chicago, Ill.

Andelman, Samuel, Dr., director of health, 54 West Hubbard Street, Chicago, Ill.

Carveth, Chauncy E., executive director, Illinois State Civil Defense, 57th and South Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Gates, Rev. Robert P., minister, First Presbyterian Church, 1101 Hamilton Boulevard, Peoria, Ill.

Halloran, John D., assistant to president, Dynamics Corp. of America, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

Haussler, Dr. A. G., vice president, Bradley University, 1502 West Bradley, Peoria, Ill.

Hollard, J. Paul, brigadier general, U.S. Army, retired, 3720 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Kelly, Edward, president, Waterloo Register Co., Waterloo, Iowa.

Kelly, Very Rev. Msgr. John M. editor, the New World, 109 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.

Kindred, Keith, managing partner, Barcus Kindred Co., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Kirby, Joseph, major, 11034 South Artesian Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Mitchell, Jim, vice president for aviation, Stewart Smith, Inc., 141 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Murry, McGarry, Air Force Academy liaison officer, 1434 West Montrose, Chicago, Ill.

Sigmund, Arthur, vice president, Kraft Food Co., 500 North Peshtigo, Chicago, Ill.

Sims, William W., resident manager, Walston & Co., Inc., 201 South La Salle, Chicago, Ill.

Sweeney, Joseph J., Cook County commander, American Legion, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Tamaraz, Lincoln, State commander AMVETS, 2818 West Farragut, Chicago, Ill.

Tyson, John M., vice president, Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, 919 North Michigan, Chicago, Ill.

Valentine, Paul H., assistant manager, Conrad Hilton Hotel, 720 South Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

Vogel, Carl E., National Bureau of Property Administration, 1824 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

Whitney, Lafeton, Brig. Gen., director, Welboldt Foundation, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Woerthwein, A. T., chairman of the board, Bell & Gossett, 8200 North Austin, Morton Grove, Ill.

Worthy, James, partner, Mid-West Division, Cresak, McCormick & Paget, 100 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

Wygert, E. E., vice president, Pepsi-Cola General Bottlers, Inc., 1745 North Kolmar, Chicago, Ill.

Halligan, Robert F., president, the Hallicrafters Co., 4401 West Fifth Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Lewis, Hugh, vice president, U.S. Steel, 900 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

CHICAGO CVD'S, JANUARY 14–15, 1964

Bensinger, B. E., chairman of the board, Brunswick Corp., 623 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Bunting, Glenn, vice president, Central Farmers Fertilizer Co., 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Coulter, Thomas H., chief executive officer, the Chicago Association of Commerce & Industry, 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

Keck, George, president, United Air Lines, Inc., O'Hare International Airport, Post Office Box 8800, Chicago, Ill.

Lorch, John T., partner, Mayer, Friedlich, Spies, Tierney, Brown & Platt, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mayer, Frank D., partner, Mayer, Friedlich, Spies, Tierney, Brown & Platt, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Mayer, Oscar G., Sr., chairman, Oscar Mayer & Co., Inc., 1241 Sedgwich Street, Chicago, Ill.

Nachman, Norman H., president, Chicago Bar Association, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Swarthchild, William G., Jr., Swarthchild & Co., 22 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

Wilson, Theodore M., executive vice president, Percy Wilson Mortgage & Finance Corp., 134 La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Gray, John D., president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, 36 South Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.

Chapman, Theron T., president, Scott, Foresman & Co., 433 East Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

Kramer, Ferd, president, Draper and Kramer Inc., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

DeMent, George, chairman, Chicago Transit Authority, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

Stephan, Edmund A., general counsel, Brunswick Corp., 523 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Montgomery, K. F., partner, Wilson & McIlvaine, 120 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

Templeton, James, flight operations manager, United Air Lines, Inc., O'Hare International Airport, Post Office Box 8756, Chicago, Ill.

Young, Horace A., president, Illinois State Bar Association, Suite 1525, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Hunt, Robert E., senior vice president of banking department, the Northern Trust Co., 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Cummings, Tilden, president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Blumenschein, C. M., senior vice president and controller, Container Corp. of America, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

Barr, John A., Chairman, Montgomery, Ward & Co., 619 West Chicago Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Haas, Albert F., president, Sandoval Zinc Co., 3649 South Albany, Chicago, Ill.

Haas, Howard G., vice president, Sealy, Inc., 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Moore, C. W., president, Chicago Helicopter Airways, 5240 West 63d Street, Chicago, Ill.

Quindry, Frank E., 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

Tieken, Theodore, Secretary, Babson, Inc., 2845 West 19th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Foreman, Harold E., Jr., president, Willow Service Co., 79 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

Kiley, Roger J., (Honorable) Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, 1212 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

Mannion, John F., senior vice president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

IV. VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE, CALIF.

On February 14, 1964, Members of the House of Representatives visited Vandenberg Air Force Base for orientation. Major Tyler—CSP—as project officer.

Arrival at base operations from Offutt AFB, via VC–137, 1340. We were met by Maj. Gen. S. W. Wells, commander, 1st Strategic Aerospace Division, and Col. Preston C. Newton, commander, 6595th Aerospace Test Wing.

We traveled to Command Briefing Facility—building 9003—1340–1350.

Welcome by Major General Wells and orientation briefing by Major Tyler, 1350–1420.

Briefing by Colonel Newton, commander, 6595th ATW, 1420–1430.

Tour of selected technical facilities, escorted by Col. George E. Howard, chief of staff, 1st STRATAD, 1430–1615.

Travel to and tour of 75–1 launch complex, 1430–1500.

Travel to and tour of Atlas 576–D launch complex, 1500–1540.

Travel to and tour of Minuteman HLCC No. 1 and one launch facility, 1540–1600.

Travel to base operations, 1600–1615.

Depart, 1615.

MISSILE COMBAT CREWMEN

The same high standards which have distinguished Strategic Air Command aircrews are maintained by SAC missile crews on the ground. SAC missile crews are comprised of highly intelligent and broadly educated Air Force personnel who have demonstrated stability and maturity prior to selection for missile training. Missile combat crew commanders are selected from the ranks of senior captains and higher ranks, and are chosen for their proven abilities and technical background. Missile combat crewmen are a highly dedicated, select group of professional airmen and officers.

POSITIVE CONTROL

Could a war be started accidentally? The odds against it happening are so astronomical that it is hardly within the realm of possibility.

The possibilities of a ballistic missile starting a war are precluded by the same positive measures that would prevent a SAC bomber from starting an accidental war.

Orders to launch a missile are received by the missile combat crew commander from SAC Headquarters. Launch orders in a war situation originate with the President of the United States and are transmitted to Headquarters SAC by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

At the receipt of any launch order, a series of positive control measures are undertaken to authenticate and verify the original instructions.

All ICBM launches in the Strategic Air Command are carried out under the system of positive control to insure that launch orders are confirmed before a countdown is started. When a launch order is received in the blockhouse, the missile combat crew commander determines its authenticity by comparing the coded portions of the order with a code which he has in his possession at all times during his period of duty in the blockhouse.

Only after this positive authentication of the launch order has been completed does the missile combat crew commander start the countdown.

The fact that launch procedures require team effort on the part of several crew members insures that no individual can fire a missile inadvertently or irresponsibly.

THE 1ST STRATEGIC AEROSPACE DIVISION MISSION SUMMARY

In contributing to the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile element of the Strategic Air Command, the 1st Strategic Aerospace Division: Conducts and controls ICBM test and evaluation accomplished at Vandenberg AFB; provides a realistic operational environment in support of SAC ICBM system reliability launches; provides technical assistance and data processing service for the SAC missile reliability system; identifies and develops operational readiness training concepts, requirements, and plans for all SAC ICBM weapon systems; maintains an operational ICBM combat capability; and supports all SAC and tenant units located at Vandenberg AFB.

EXPANDING ICBM ALERT FORCE

By far the greatest share of effort since September 1959 has been the expansion of the Nation's operational deterrent force. Three missile squadrons carry out the operational testing and training aspects of the 1st Strategic Aerospace Division mission. These are the 576th Strategic Missile Squadron—Atlas, 395th Missile Squadron—Titan, and the 394th Missile Squadron—Minuteman.

The 576th Strategic Missile Squadron—Atlas: Conducts missile systems test and evaluation and provides technical facilities from which missile combat crews from other SAC bases conduct live system reliability launches. The squadron and facilities have an emergency war order—EWO—launch capability which takes precedence during time of emergency.

The 395th Missile Squadron—Titan: Conducts missile systems test and evaluation and provides technical facilities from which missile combat crews from other SAC bases conduct live system reliability launches. In addition, their facilities have an emergency war order—EWO—launch capability which takes precedence during time of emergency.

The 394th Missile Squadron—Minuteman: Conducts missile systems test and evaluation and provides technical facilities for missile combat crews from other SAC bases which conduct live firings in support of the system reliability launch programs. These facilities have an emergency war order—EWO—launch capability which takes precedence during time of emergency.

SAC's initial operational ICBM capability came into being at Vandenberg on September 9, 1959, when a crew of the 576th SMS sent its first Atlas missile streaking 4,000 miles down the Pacific Missile Range.

Vandenberg's first ICBM launch complexes were designed to achieve an operational status at the earliest possible date, and as such were above ground—soft—and vulnerable. New emplacements have since entered the program and serve the double purpose of providing an operational capability and a realistic environment for operational reliability testing of SAC's total ICBM force. These new, fixed facilities are below ground—hardened—and dispersed over a vast area.

All the hard facts to be learned about actual combat performance of SAC's ICBM's under operational conditions are provided by Vandenberg launches. The base also refines operational concepts and procedures to insure best results from the use of these weapons. By meshing the operational testing cycle for ICBM's with its missile combat crew training program, Vandenberg serves as a ballistic missile proving ground.

A certain amount of daily readiness must be sacrificed to serve other requirements of the assigned mission. The knowledge and experience gained here serves to increase SAC's capability across the entire ICBM force. When this initial training load is completed, the readiness of the Vandenberg facilities will equal that of SAC's other operational ICBM forces and will include the launch emplacements for Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman. A portion of the force will remain operational at all times.

POSITIVE CONTROL

ICBM launches by the Strategic Air Command are carried out under a system of positive control to insure that launch orders are confirmed before countdowns are started. When a launch order is received, the missile combat crew commander determines its authenticity by comparing the coded portion of the order with a code which he has in his possession at all times. After this positive authentication of the launch order has been completed, the countdown begins. Since a launch requires a team effort on the part of several combat crew members, no individual can launch a missile accidentally or irresponsibly.

VERSATILE AEROSPACE CENTER

Today, Vandenberg's varied ballistic missile and space program finds base personnel working with all of the Air Force ICBM and satellite systems presently in the inventory. Vandenberg emplacements include operationally configured Atlas D, E, and F series; Titan I and II; and Minuteman launch facilities.

To help further the development of advanced space systems, Vandenberg supports the launching of Air Force polar orbiting satellites from the base and nearby Point Arguello. This program is providing answers to the problems of space navigation, reentry, and recovery.

The missiles launched from Vandenberg have enlarged the Nation's aerospace power for peace. Through advancing these programs, Vandenberg has steadily advanced the Nation's aerospace power, and has taken its place as the aerospace center of the free world.

THE SAC MISSILE-BOMBER FORCE (MIXED-FORCE CONCEPT)

A combination of the strengths and capabilities of both bombers and missiles provides a far stronger and more flexible strike force than combat units composed of either system alone. Strategic Air Command is already well along in integrating its missile force with its bomber force. As they achieve combat ready status, missile units are assigned under the operational control of numbered Air Forces to correlate missile-bomber operations under the mixed-force concept.

The ICBM has rapidly progressed from research and development to operational systems which possess the necessary fast-reaction time, accuracy, reliability, and flexibility demanded of a strategic deterrent force. A growing number of missile units are on strategic alert within SAC, complementing the far-ranging bomber-tanker force. Combat missile units are integrated into SAC's emergency war order and are capable of launching within the warning time provided by the ballistic missile early warning system—BMEWS. SAC's advanced model ICBM systems—such as Tital II and Minuteman—are protected in hard launch emplacements which provide a high degree of invulnerability to enemy attack insuring this country a creditable retaliatory strike capability.

SAC MISSILE FORCE: SAC MISSILE FACILITIES

Six types of missiles, ranging in size from the 110-foot Titan intercontinental ballastic missile—ICBM—to the less than 15-foot Quail decoy missile, will be distributed to Strategic Air Command stateside bases.

The 576th Strategic Missile Squadron at Vandenberg AFB, Calif., was the first Atlas squadron with operational capabilities. The initial firing of an Atlas missile by a combat-trained SAC crew took place on September 9, 1959, at Vandenberg.

Atlas facilities at Schilling, Walker, Altus, Dyess, Plattsburgh, and Lincoln Air Force Bases are silo-lift, underground sites. All Titan and fixed Minuteman missiles are stored in silos.

Missile sites are located near the following bases. The SAC numbered Air Force having operational control of the units is noted after the State.

Atlas ICBM—SM-65—General Dynamics Astronautics: Altus AFB, Altus, Okla., 2d Air Force; Dyess AFB, Abilene, Tex., 15th Air Force; Fairchild AFB, Spokane, Wash., 15th Air Force; Forbes AFB, Topeka, Kans., 2d Air Force; Francis E. Warren AFB, Cheyenne, Wyo., 15th Air Force; Lincoln AFB, Lincoln, Nebr., 2d Air Force; Offutt AFB, Omaha, Nebr., 2d Air Force; Plattsburgh AFB, Plattsburgh, N.Y., 8th Air Force; Schilling AFB, Salina, Kans., 15th Air Force; Vandenberg AFB, Calif., 1st Strategic Aerospace Division; Walker AFB, Roswell N. Mex., 15th Air Force.

THE ATLAS F

Three versions of the Atlas, America's first intercontinental ballistic missile, have been used since the weapon became operational in September 1959. The pioneer D model is held on alert in aboveground launch buildings grouped around radio guidance facilities. To reduce vulnerability to enemy attack, the E and F models were designed to operate from widely dispersed launch facilities. Each of these self-contained units is constructed below ground level to resist bomb blast. The Atlas E alert force's

launchers are inside shallow excavations. The Atlas F force will be still less vulnerable because its missiles will be kept on alert deep inside massive concrete silos and raised to ground level only for firing. The Atlas F also will be able to retaliate more swiftly to enemy attack because it can be held on alert with fuel aboard. These powerful weapons are produced by the General Dynamics Corp.

Three Atlas F launch facilities are now undergoing final checkout at Vandenberg AFB. One, an operational systems test facility, will initially be used by the Air Force Systems Command for a comprehensive test program. The other two will be used by the 576th Missile Squadron to train crews for Atlas F squadrons becoming combat-ready at other bases. The Strategic Air Command will soon have a powerful force of Atlas F missiles on alert to protect the free world from aggressors.

ATLAS FACT SHEET

Weapon category: U.S. Air Force intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM.

Description: Atlas is a 1½-stage ICBM. Height is 82½ feet with reentry vehicle; body diameter, 10 feet. Launching weight when fueled is more than 250,000 pounds. Dry weight, 15,000 pounds.

Range: Over 6,000 miles.

Propulsion: The Atlas is powered by two large booster engines and one large sustainer engine. Finite guidance supplied by two small vernier rockets. Fuel is liquid oxygen and RP–1, a kerosene fuel.

Thrust: Early D series have thrust of 360,000 pounds at liftoff. The later E and F series have thrust of 390,000 pounds at liftoff.

Performance: All five engines are ignited prior to launching. Within a few minutes, the missile is lifted well into its trajectory and the booster engines are jettisoned. The missile is then accelerated by the sustainer engine until a velocity of over 15,000 miles per hour has been reached. The sustainer engine is then shut off. The small vernier engines are then used to trim the missile in flight. The reentry vehicle separates from the rocket's structure after the verniers are shut down and then follows a true ballistic course.

Guidance: D series—radio inertial. E and F series—all inertial. All inertial guidance is carried within the missile rather than being dependent on ground guidance stations.

Launch configurations: D series—horizontal, soft; E series—horizontal, hard; F series—hardened, vertically storied in silo 174 feet deep, 52 feet in diameter. Elevated to surface for launch.

Manufactured by: General Dynamics/Astronautics, San Diego, Calif.

Miscellaneous information: The Atlas D was the first operational ICBM. On September 9, 1959, the Air Force launched the first operational Atlas D from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. Since that time, more than 120 D, E, and F series missiles have been integrated into SAC's mixed bomber and missile force. All are able to respond within the warning time provided by the Ballistic Missile Early Warning System—BMEWS.

TITAN I FACT SHEET

Weapon category: U.S. Air Force intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

Description: Two-stage ICBM, 98 feet in height. First stage 57 feet long, 10 feet in diameter. Second stage 8 feet in diameter, 41 feet long, including reentry vehicle. Total weight at launch is 220,000 pounds.

Range: Greater than 6,300 miles.

Propulsion: Titan I is powered by engines using RP–1, a kerosene-type fuel, and liquid oxygen—lox. Thrust generated by the first stage engines is 300,000 pounds. The second stage engine, at altitude, delivers 80,000 pounds thrust.

Performance: Titan I accelerates at a speed of 5,300 miles per hour in a little over 100 seconds following liftoff. At that time, stage separation occurs, and the second stage engine ignites and continues to boost speed to maximum 17,750 m.p.h. At predetermined point, the second stage engine shuts down. Vernier rockets then provide final velocity and trajectory correction. The reentry vehicle, or nose cone, separates and continues in a free falling path to the target. The highest point in arc of the trajectory is approximately 500 miles—nearly 2,600,000 feet above the earth.

Guidance: Radio-inertial.

Basing: Two squadrons at Lowry Air Force Base, Colo. One squadron at Beale Air Force Base, Calif.; Larson Air Force Base, Wash.; Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho; and Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak.

Launch complex information: Three missile silos, each with an accompanying propellant terminal and equipment terminal, guidance antenna silo, power production plant and launch control center. All facilities are located below ground level and are interconnected with tunnels allowing personnel access between the various areas.

Manufactured by: Martin Co., Denver, Colo.

TITAN II FACT SHEET

Weapon category: U.S. Air Force intercontinental ballistic missile—ICBM.

Description: An outgrowth of Titan I, using basic two-stage design. The most powerful U.S. Air Force ICBM. The first stage is 71 feet long; second stage, 20 feet; reentry vehicle 14 feet long. Both first and second stage measure 10 feet in diameter. Total fueled weight at liftoff is approximately 330,000 pounds. Titan II incorporates the following advances over Titan I: Greater payload capability; greater range; storage propellants; in-silo storage and launch; increased ability to survive attack; inertial guidance carried within the missile, eliminating the need for vulnerable ground guidance facilities; reduced reaction time; capability to launch in salvo.

Range: In excess of 6,000 miles.

Propulsion: Titan II is the only ICBM using storable, liquid propellants. These propellants are hypergolic, in that they burn on contact with each other, giving more even and complete ignition. First stage thrust is approximately 430,000 pounds. Second stage thrust, at altitude, is approximately 100,000 pounds.

Performance: After launch from its silo, Titan II rises vertically for several seconds. During this time it rolls on its axis to align itself with the target. The missile then climbs in a curving trajectory. When the first stage engines shut down, after approximately 150 seconds of flight, the second stage ignites and separates from the missile carrying the reentry vehicle toward its assigned target at speeds in excess of 15,000 miles per hour. After shutdown of the second stage engine, two vernier rockets make final course and velocity corrections. Following separation, the reentry vehicle follows a true ballistic arc.

Basing: The operational base for Titan II is a hardened silo installation. There are nine silos and control centers in each equadron. Titan II is to be deployed at McConnell AFB, Kans.; Davis-Monthan AFB, Ariz.; and Little Rock AFB, Ark.

Silo information: The silo is 155 feet deep, 55 feet in diameter and has walls 4 to 8 feet thick. Two exhaust ducts for the flame exhausting system also run the length of the silo, and provide an escape for the hot exhaust gases during a launch. These project from the sides of the silo in a W pattern.

MINUTEMAN FACT SHEET

Weapon category: U.S. Air Force intercontinental ballistic missile.

Description: Three stage, solid fuel ICBM, 55 feet long plus reentry vehicle, 5½ feet in diameter. The missile is stored in an 80-foot-deep steel-lined concrete silo. Total weight at launch is approximately 70,000 pounds.

Range: Greater than 5,000 miles.

Propulsion: Minuteman is propelled by a three-stage rocket. First stage thrust is approximately 195,000 pounds. Second stage thrust in the Minuteman is approximately 46,000 pounds and third stage thrust is approximately 19,000 pounds. The later model Minuteman has increased thrust in all stages resulting in greater range.

Performance: In the first launch attempt at Cape Kennedy, Fla., the Minuteman achieved a range of 4,600 miles, its reentry vehicle impacting in the target area. The launch also marked the first time all stages of a multistage ICBM was programed to and performed its assigned functions on the initial flight. The first Minuteman was launched from Vandenberg AFB, Calif., on September 28, 1962.

Guidance: Inertial.

Basing: The Minuteman became operational at Malmstrom AFB, Mont., in December 1962. The missile is scheduled for installation at Ellsworth AFB, S. Dak.; Minot AFB and Grand Forks AFB, N. Dak.; Whiteman AFB, Mo.; and F. E. Warren AFB, Wyo.

Launch complex information: The Minuteman is launched from inside its silo emplacement. The complexes at each operational site will be capable of firing 50 missiles. Each hard launch control center will control 10 of the "instant ICBM's" with 5 centers to each squadron. In the event of an enemy attack, any of the launch control centers is capable of firing all 50 missiles.

Integrating contractor: Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash.

V. AIR FORCE ACADEMY, COLO.

The 10 Members of Congress met Air Force Academy cadets from their home districts, toured facilities of the Nation's newest service school Sunday, February 16. My cadets at the Academy from the 7th District of Illinois are: Flower, Terrence Frederick, class of 1964; Stetz, George Andrew, class of 1965; Strzemieczny, Alan Lee, class of 1966; Andrews Victor Charles, class of 1966; Hogle, Guy Otis, Jr., class of 1966; Minshall, Billy Wayne, class of 1967.

Following luncheon at the officers club, the Congressmen received a thorough briefing on the Academy mission and operation from top officers. The Superintendent, Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, explained the proposed expansion plan which will hike size of the Cadet Wing from approximately 2,500 to over 4,400.

Lt. Col. Charles C. Anderson, Director of Admissions, discussed nomination policies and effects of new legislation.

Following a picturetaking session with cadets in Arnold Hall, the cadet social center, Congressmen toured the unique 17-spired Academy chapel.

MISSION

The mission of the U.S. Air Force Academy is to provide instruction, experience and motivation to each cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge, character and qualities of leadership essential to his progressive development as a career officer in the U.S. Air Force.

Cadets who complete the Academy's 4-year course of study graduate with accredited bachelor of science degrees and commissions as second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force.

COURSE OF STUDY

The 4-year curriculum, totaling 186½ semester hours, is designed to provide a foundation for further development in any of the numerous career fields open to Air Force officers. It is neither an engineering nor a liberal arts program, but combines certain elements of both.

The required academic program totals 143½ semester hours and is balanced almost evenly between the basic and applied sciences, and the humanities and social sciences. However, cadets with exceptional ability or previous college training may participate in the curriculum enrichment program, initiated by the Academy in 1957. Under the enrichment program, cadets may meet prescribed curriculum requirements by transfer of credits, validation examinations, or acceleration of courses. In the time thus made available, cadets may take substitute elective courses. They may also take extra-elective courses, over and above the normal semester-hour load.

Under the enrichment program a cadet may earn, in addition to his bachelor of science degree, an undergraduate major in one or more of the following: Basic science, with areas of concentration in mathematics, physics, or chemistry; engineering science, with areas of concentration in aeronautics, astronautics, electrical engineering, or mechanics; military management; or international affairs. The last two include advanced courses in the social sciences and humanities. Cadets who complete the engineering science major receive accredited engineering degrees. Each undergraduate major requires about 20 additional semester hours of work, and each is so designed that good students, even with no prior college, can complete it by the extraelective method alone.

The enrichment program also includes graduate-level courses which may be applied toward a master's degree. Under cooperative arrangements between the Academy and two civilian universities, selected cadets may earn master's degrees from these universities within 7 months after their graduation from the Academy. Such master's degree programs are available in astronautics and international relations. The Academy is also seeking congressional authorization to award master's degrees at the time of graduation to cadets, chiefly those with previous college, who can complete the requirements of the prescribed curriculum, an undergraduate major, and a year of graduate-level work before graduation.

The enrichment program is completely voluntary, but about 80 percent of the cadets participate, and about 40 to 50 percent complete the extra requirements for an undergraduate major.

MILITARY TRAINING

The military training program, which qualifies each graduate to be commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces of the United States, distinguishes the Academy from other universities. In addition to the 28½ semester hours of professional subjects taught in the classroom and during field study, portions of each day are devoted to a program of practical leadership and command.

The professional program is designed to equip a cadet for a career as an officer, not to train him for a specific job; consequently, the program combines professional orientation, skill indoctrination, and military education in an environment planned to provide lifetime career motivation. Each cadet studies: Weapons systems, their tactical and strategic use; weapons and techniques of the past, present and future; defense planning and operations from the level of a tactical unit to international alliances.

The program of practical leadership experience and command centers on the individual cadet squadron, which consists of approximately 100 cadets. The squadron is a cadet's home at the Academy. He lives in a room shared with one other cadet. He works for someone, and has someone working for him. He learns how to use a military chain of command, the techniques of leadership in command, the importance of discipline and training in daily action, and how these elements may be turned into esprit de corps. He progresses each year into ever-increasing responsibilities of command and staff assignments, until as a first-class man, he shares responsibility for the operation of his squadron. This program, under the supervision of Air Force officers, provides an opportunity for practical application of the theories learned in the classroom.

ATHLETIC PROGRAM

The Academy conducts a carefully developed physical education program, including an intensive system of intramural sports. All cadets not engaged in a seasonal intercollegiate sport are required to participate at least twice each week in intramural competition. To remain eligible for intercollegiate sports, a cadet must maintain proficiency in his academic studies.

Sixteen sports presently are included in the intercollegiate program. They are: Fall—football, cross country, soccer; winter—basketball, wrestling, gymnastics, swimming, skiing, fencing, rifle, pistol; spring—baseball, golf, track, tennis, and modern pentathlon.

KEY PERSONNEL

The Superintendent is Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, of Florida, a 1940 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy. General Warren served in the European Theater of Operations during World War II as a squadron commander, wing operations officer, and commander of the 376th Bombardment Group. He flew 38 combat missions in B–24 bombers. During the Korean war he was Director of Operations, and later, Assistant Deputy for Operations of Far East Air Forces. Prior to his assignment to the Academy in July 1962, he was commander, Air Proving Ground Center, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.

The dean of the faculty is Brig. Gen. Robert F. McDermott, of West Roxbury, Mass., who was operations officer for a fighter-bomber group in England during World War II. He is a 1943 graduate of West Point, where he later taught. He has a master's degree from Harvard Business School and received an LL.D. from St. Louis University.

The commandant of cadets is Brig. Gen. Robert W. Strong, Jr., a native of Painesville, Ohio. He is a 1940 graduate of the U.S. Military Academy and was a pilot and later squadron commander of B–29's in the Pacific during World War II. Prior to his Academy assignment he was commander of the 825th Strategic Aerospace Division, Little Rock AFB, Ark.

FACTS CONCERNING CADET LIFE

The academic year extends from August through May. Cadets have classes or study periods from 8 a.m. to 4:20 p.m. on weekdays, with a 1-hour break for lunch. Unless a cadet is participating in intercollegiate athletics, he practices or plays on a squadron intramural team two afternoons a week after classes. The other three afternoons during the week he spends in study or organized cadet extracurricular activities. Saturday mornings are devoted primarily to military training and lectures in military or academic subjects.

The months of June and July constitute the summer training period. Cadets spend their first summer at the Academy undergoing intensive basic airmanship training. Succeeding summers are devoted to specialized military training at

the Academy, home leave, field trips to bases of the Air Force's major commands, visits to Army and Navy installations, and oversea trips.

During the academic year, all second-, third-, and fourth-class cadets are required to be in the rooms after 7:15 p.m. on week nights and Sunday nights, unless they are studying in the library which is open every night. First-class cadets and second classmen on the Superintendent's merit list are not required to maintain a strict evening study schedule. Taps is at 11 p.m. Unless the cadet is permitted to have late lights, he must be in bed with lights out at taps.

All officer and most noncommissioned officer positions in the cadet wing are held by members of the first and second classes. No second classman outranks a first classman. In addition, a number of third classmen hold the rank of staff sergeant, the lowest cadet noncommissioned officer rank. Cadet rank is shown on the cadets' shoulder boards. Four broad stripes indicate the rank of cadet colonel, held by the cadet wing commander. Three broad stripes, lieutenant colonel; two broad stripes separated by one narrow stripe, major; two stripes, captain; one broad and one narrow stripe, first lieutenant; one broad stripe, second lieutenant. Noncommissioned officer rank is indicated by chevronlike stripes on the shoulder boards. Three chevrons indicate master sergeant; two chevrons, technical sergeant; one chevron, staff sergeant. Rank is based on merit and is rotated each semester to allow the most senior cadets to gain experience by holding positions of responsibility.

All cadets are housed in Vandenberg Hall in the cadet area of the Academy. The building is a quarter of a mile long, and in addition to the cadet rooms, it contains the cadet store, class lounges, and cadet activities rooms. Two cadets share a room. Each cadet has a single bed, desk, lamp, chair, closet, wall bookcase, and chest of drawers.

In addition to his education, quarters, medical and dental care, the cadet receives $111.15 a month. From this money, the cadet pays for some of his books, clothing and other personal needs.

Privileges to leave the Academy campus are based on a gradual transition from the status of a new cadet to a second lieutenant. The new cadet, a fourth classman, is very restricted in the number of privileges he may receive. He is permitted to leave the Academy only on specific holidays, after certain varsity football games, for special cadet activities, and for occasional dining with close relatives or staff officers. A first classman, however, is relatively free during off-duty hours, just as he will be as a second lieutenant. Thus, privileges are progessively increased by class in recognition of added maturity and responsibility.

Perhaps the most significant phases of development for cadets are those which are geared to the operation of the honor code. Simply stated, the honor code is an obligation into which all cadets enter at the end of their initial summer training program. It commits them individually to the observance of the code: "We will not lie, cheat or steal, nor tolerate among us anyone who does."

It is the cadets' own code and they are fiercely proud of it. The idea is not original and basically it is an adaptation of an idea that has worked at the U.S. Military Academy for about 130 years. The cadets are determined that the code shall be a lifetime principle and not a 4-year principle.

COLORS AND MASCOT

The Academy colors are blue and silver.

The cadets' mascot is the falcon; and several falcons are kept at the Academy. Some have been trained by cadets to give free-flight demonstrations at football games and other public events.

OFFICIAL TITLES

The short title for the Air Force Academy Wing is Cadet Wing, not Wing of Cadets. The classes are known by the year of graduation; that is, class of 1963. Within the Cadet Wing, the various classes are also known as fourth class, third class, second class, and first class. The fourth class is the lower; the others are the upper classes. Upperclassmen wear shoulder boards on their summer uniforms; fourth classmen do not until they have completed the first summer's training.

HISTORY

Many of America's pioneer airmen advocated the creation of an academy to prepare officers especially for the air service. One of them, Brig. Gen. William "Billy" Mitchell, tried in vain to persuade first the Government and then private interests to establish such a school. In 1948, the Air Force appointed a Board of leading civilian and military educators to plan the curriculum for an Air Force Academy. The idea made little progress outside the Air Force, however, until Secretary of Defense James Forrestal appointed a Board of outstanding military and civilian educators in 1949 to recommend a general system of education for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Chairman of this Board was Dr. Robert L. Stearns, then president of the University of Colorado, and vice chairman was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, then president of Columbia University. Members included the presidents of several other civilian universities, the executive vice president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Superintendents of West Point and Annapolis, and a representative of the Air Force.

In 1950, this Board concluded that a nucleus of Regular officers for the armed services should be educated, trained, and dedicated from youth onward for a lifetime of service to their country. The Board pointed out that West Point and Annapolis had produced such highly trained and intensely loyal professional officers for many years. It found that the needs of the Air Force could not be met by any desirable expansion of the older service academies, and recommended that an Air Force Academy be established without delay. The Board proposed that, in peacetime, not less than 50 percent of the Regular officers taken into each service should be Academy graduates.

Congress authorized creation of the Academy in 1954. Mr. Harold E. Talbott, then Secretary of the Air Force, appointed a distinguished Commission to assist him in selecting the permanent site. After traveling 20,000 miles and visiting proposed sites in 22 States, this Commission recommended 3 locations near Colorado Springs, Colo.; Alton, Ill.; and Lake Geneva, Wis. From them Secretary Talbott selected the site at the foot of the Rocky Mountains 8 miles north of Colorado Springs. It consisted of approximately 17,900 acres of former ranchland, of which some 10,000 acres are buildable. The State of Colorado contributed $1 million toward the purchase of this land. Construction has been confined primarily to fingers, or mesas, extending eastward from the mountains toward the plains, with family housing for officers and airmen being placed in the valleys between them. The site provides ample room for intramural athletic fields, cadet maneuvers, a proposed airfield, and protection against encroachment.

CONSTRUCTION

Congress appropriated $138,797,000 for construction, including $1,858,000 spent at the interim site on facilities which have reverted to other Air Force uses. In addition to construction funds, the Air Force has spent approximately $23 million for equipment and furnishings at the Academy.

The modern design of the main Academy buildings is less expensive to build than architecture of the type used in many older institutions. Their architectural style is described by the architect-engineers, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, as timeless. Glass, aluminum, steel, granite, and white marble are among the materials employed.

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY FOUNDATION

The Air Force Academy Foundation, Inc., a tax-exempt, nonprofit organization, has a membership and active directors on a nationwide basis. The purpose of the foundation is to provide those facilities for the Academy which cannot be obtained through the use of Government funds.

As part of its program, the foundation already has purchased and donated to the Academy a recreational area located northwest of the Academy site. This heavily forested area with well-stocked lakes provides outstanding recreational facilities.

The foundation also provided the funds for the construction of an 18-hole golf course. Designed by Robert Trent Jones, famed New York golf-architect, the Academy course is a fine test of one's ability on the links.

The foundation has raised $3,500,000 to build Falcon Stadium on the Academy grounds. In addition, the foundation also plans to finance an Air Force Memorial Education Center.

FUNCTIONS OF THE CADET REGISTRAR AT THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The Office of the Cadet Registrar at the U S. Air Force Academy consists of five directorates: Candidate Advisory Service, Director of Admissions, Cadet Records, Evaluation, and Cadet Counseling. These directorates of the registrar

maintain contact with a young man from the time he aspires to be a cadet, through his nomination and appointment to the Academy, during his 4 years of cadet life, and until the day of graduation when he receives his degree and commission.

When a young man is still in high school and first starts thinking about becoming a cadet, he may write to the registrar to obtain information about how to prepare for the Academy and how to apply for a nomination. If he does, the Candidate Advisory Service will send him an Academy catalog and other literature to provide the background he needs. The prospective cadet may obtain further information and personal counseling from one of the Academy liaison officers appointed in communities throughout the country. These officers are members of the Air Force Reserve who are attached for Reserve duty to the Candidate Advisory Service. They work closely with guidance counselors in high schools to motivate and assist outstanding male students who are interested in applying for an Academy nomination.

Most applications are made to U.S. Senators and Representatives who are authorized to nominate a majority of the Academy cadets for appointment. Under current public law each Senator and Representative may have four cadets at the Academy at one time and may nominate six young men for each vacancy which becomes available to him during a year.

After screening their applicants and making final selections of nominees, each Member of Congress submits his list of candidates to the Air Force. The lists are forwarded to the Director of Admissions at the Academy. The Admissions Office schedules each candidate for physical and mental examinations; assembles his academic transcripts, records of his extracurricular activities, and personal recommendations submitted by high schools he attended; and records his examination results. A complete file on each candidate who meets the minimum qualifications for admission is prepared by admissions and sent to selection panels composed of faculty and staff officers. These panels recommend principal and alternate candidates to fill congressional vacancies and other appointments authorized by law. The Academy Board, composed of key Academy officers, passes on these recommendations and submits them to the Secretary of the Air Force for final approval. After approval has been confirmed, notification to Members of Congress and to selected candidates are prepared by the Admissions Office. Selection takes place late in April and the new cadet class enters late in June.

When a newly appointed cadet arrives at the Academy, he is registered for classes by Cadet Records. This office maintains a file with complete background information on each cadet. All course grades through a cadet's 4 years at the Academy are recorded in his file and copies are sent to his parents, secondary school, and nominating authority. If a cadet becomes deficient in his grades or military performance, Cadet Records makes a report to the Academy Board for review. All merit lists denoting outstanding academic grades and military aptitude are prepared by this office. The final graduation order of merit, ranking each cadet in order of his grades, is also prepared by this office.

Throughout the cadet's 4 years at the Academy, the evaluation directorate of the registrar analyzes and scores examinations which are administered to him by academic departments. The achievement of cadet classes on various standardized college examinations is analyzed by evaluation specialists. They also evaluate the method of cadet selection including the validity of mental and physical entrance examinations, the scores assigned to extracurricular activities, and personal recommendations. They monitor the Air Force Academy examination centers and score the candidate examinations.

Any cadet at the Academy has access to the cadet counseling service of the registrar. Counseling specialists in this office assist cadets with personal, social, academic, and general adjustment problems. The counseling staff works in close coordination with other counseling individuals and agencies at the Academy including the chaplains, health and mental hygiene services, academic counselors, legal advisers, and air officers commanding.

A cadet's last point of contact with the registrar comes on the day of graduation when he receives his diploma. Col. Virgil J. O'Connor, assigned as the permanent Academy registrar, presents the diplomas at each graduation.

Colonel O'Connor holds a doctor of education degree from Harvard University. Each directorate of the registrar is supervised by an Air Force officer. Both civilian and Air Force personnel are assigned to accomplish the mission of the directorates.

THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY BUILDINGS

The architect-engineers of the Air Force Academy were Skidmore, Owings & Merrill. Walter Dorwin Teague Associates determined the Academy furnishings and equipment requirement.

In the design and construction of the Air Force Academy, the architects and their consultants thought of their work as functional, as harmonizing with the spirit of the Air Force, and as a part of the landscape in which it was set. In that sense of the word, the architectural style of the Academy is considered by the architect-engineers to be timeless.

The architects employed the natural land forms to enhance the impressiveness of their designs for the academic area. From the academic area, striking views are provided of Cathedral Rock, the aptly named Rampart Range to the west and sweeping panoramas of the Black Forest to the east.

Congress appropriated $138,797,000 for construction, including $1,858,000 spent at the interim site on facilities which have reverted to other Air Force uses. In addition to construction funds, the Air Force has spent almost $23 million for equipment and furnishings at the Academy. The modern design of the main Academy buildings is cheaper to build than architecture of the type used in many older institutions.

The main complex where the cadets live and attend classes contains the following buildings, several of which were named for famous Air Force leaders. The buildings are designed in contemporary architectural style, featuring glass, aluminum, steel, and white marble.

Vandenberg Hall—cadet dormitory: All cadets are housed in this quarter-mile-long building, two cadets to a room. In addition to 1,320 rooms, the dormitory contains a cadet store, tailor shop, barber shop, class lounges, and cadet activities rooms. Named in memory of Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, former Air Force Chief of Staff.

Mitchell Hall—cadet dining hall: The dining hall, enclosed in glass on three sides, is large enough to seat the entire cadet wing. Cadets assemble in front of the dormitory and march to the dining hall in formation. Named for Brig. Gen. William "Billy" Mitchell, pioneer of military aviation and famed advocate of air power.

Harmon Hall—administration building: Offices of the Superintendent and his staff are located here on the west side of the cadet complex. Memorializes Lt. Gen. Hubert R. Harmon, first Superintendent of the Air Force Academy.

Fairchild Hall—academic building: Cadet classes are conducted in this large building containing 168 classrooms, 45 science labs, 5 lecture halls, the Academy library, a dispensary, and faculty offices. To the north of this building is an engineering laboratory named in memory of Gen. Muir S. Fairchild, first commander of the Air University.

Arnold Hall—cadet social center: Social activities for cadets are held in this building which includes a ballroom, a theater, and recreational rooms named for Gen. Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, World War II Air Force leader.

Cadet chapel: The focal point of the area is the cadet chapel with 17 towering aluminum spires. The chapel is divided into 3 areas: a Protestant section seating 900, a Catholic section seating 500, and a Jewish section seating 100.

Planetarium: Housed in a dome-shaped structure is the planetarium, used to teach celestial navigation and astronomy to cadets.

Cadet gymnasium: The gymnasium contains two swimming pools, basketball and volleyball courts, boxing and wrestling rooms, squash courts, handball courts, a gymnastics room, and a rifle and pistol range. Surrounding the gymnasium are a number of athletic courts and fields.

Located in areas south of the cadet complex are two housing developments for officers and airmen, a shopping center, a hospital, the Academy Preparatory School, and a supply and service center. A 40,000-seat football stadium and an 18-hole golf course have been constructed with private funds donated to the Air Force Academy Foundation.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY CHAPEL

The 17,900-acre site of the U.S. Air Force Academy is dominated by the 17 aluminum-covered spires of the Acad-

emy chapel. Towering 150 feet above ground, the spires appear much taller.

The chapel, like all of the other buildings at the Academy, was designed by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, of Chicago, who have labeled the structure the "Chapel of the Future for an Air Force of the Future." Robert E. McKee, Inc., of Santa Fe, N. Mex., was the building contractor.

In the chapel, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish services can be held simultaneously, and the three congregations can enter and leave their respective worship areas without interfering with each other. In addition, there is a meeting room for the use of any religious organization which may not wish to use any of the other worship areas. Thus, the chapel may be said to be an all-faith religious edifice.

The Protestant chapel is at second-story level. Flanking each side of the nave are 38 pews with a seating capacity of 900 persons. Stained glass panels suffuse the area with multicolored light. The reredos, a curved 14-foot high wall behind the altar, was designed and executed by Lumen Martin Winter, who created "The Conversion of St. Paul" for the facade of the Church of St. Paul the Apostle in New York City.

The Catholic chapel area, located on the terrace level, is essentially rectangular in character. Its exterior walls are precast concrete panels with stained glass inserts similar to those of the Protestant worship area. Twenty pews on each side of the chapel provide seats for 500 persons. The sacristy, vestry and altar are located at the north end. Dual sets of steps lead down to the main entrance.

The wall behind the altar is an abstract mural of varying shades of blue, turquoise, rose, and gray glass tessera. Superimposed on the mural are two marble figures. On the left is "Our Lady of the Skies"—the Blessed Mother—and on the right is the Guardian Angel. Above and between the two figures is a marble dove, symbolic of the Holy Ghost. A single slab of polished marble forms the altar.

The Jewish synagogue is on the same level as the Catholic chapel, directly north of it, and seats 100 persons. It is a "circle within a square," enclosed by vertical cypress uprights with inserts of white opalescent glass. The outside walls are of purple stained glass panels, alternating with green and blue stained glass accent windows. The Israeli Air Force donated the 1,631 pieces of Jerusalem stone for the foyer which surrounds the worship center.

The meetingroom for members of those faiths who do not wish to use any of the three other areas is north of the Jewish synagogue, also at terrace level.

FRANK J. SEILER RESEARCH LABORATORY

The Office of Aerospace Research, through its Office of Scientific Research, supports a worldwide program of research in universities, nonprofit institutions and industry. It also operates three in-house laboratories to carry out basic research projects for the U.S. Air Force.

The Frank J. Seiler Research Laboratory, one of the three OAR field laboratories, was established in October 1962 at the U.S. Air Force Academy, and is expected to be in full operation in the spring of 1964. The laboratory was established on the Academy site to perform basic research for the Air Force and provide an environment which will foster an active and imaginative research program among the cadets and faculty. Primary emphasis will be on projects in the chemistry and astronautics fields, but support will also be given to any worthwhile research project in the natural sciences when proposed by cadets or faculty members.

As at any educational institution, U.S. Air Force Academy faculty members must participate in research in order to be more successful as instructors. Their association with the laboratory at the Academy provides closer touch with their profession. Also, the establishment of the laboratory provides a way of assuring that the product of faculty and cadet research is given the support, recognition and dissemination that it should have within the framework of the established research program of the Air Force.

One of the important milestones will be the installation of a large digital computer in the spring of 1964. With the inevitable trend toward computers and data processing equipment within the Department of Defense for diversified applications, it is necessary that the computer installed at the Academy be sufficiently versatile to allow its use for a wide spectrum of problems.

Activity will be concentrated initially on selected research in the following two general fields:

Chemistry: Organic chemistry: Organo fluorines-structures-mechanics; modern inorganic chemistry: Structures-mechanics-nonstoichiometry; radiation chemistry: Energetics of reactions-mode and mechanisms; physical chemistry and chemical physics: Surface chemistry, diffusion-thermodynamics of the solid state-quantum chemistry.

Aerospace mechanics: Mechanics of space flight: methods of trajectory computation-control theory; numerical analysis: Development of testing methods; celestial mechanics: Many-bodies problems; dynamics of flight: Dynamic derivatives-dynamic simulation; aerodynamics: Static forces and moments of winged and clustered bodies.

The above areas are representative of those in which OAR would like to have increased activity within its own laboratories. The particular fields will depend upon the interest and competence of people selected for scientific positions.

The tentative manning of the laboratory calls for one civilian and five military chemistry researchers and one civilian and seven military researchers in aerospace mechanics. One officer will conduct research in computer applications.

In addition to the 15 scientists, 22 support people are being recruited: Technicians, computer operators and programers, and clerical assistants.

ASTRONAUTICS AT THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

What is "astronautics"? The word is not new, but the science which the word represents has only recently begun its phenomenal expansion. So rapid has this growth been that an unabridged dictionary is still needed to find a definition. According to Webster, astronautics is "the science which treats the possibility of traveling through interplanetary space." And even this definition is somewhat outdated in its scope. The Air University at Maxwell AFB, Ala., provides the following definition in its interim glossary of aerospace terms:

Astronautics 1. The arts, skills, or activity of operating space vehicles. 2. In a broader sense, the art or science of designing, building, and operating space vehicles.

The Department of Astronautics at the Air Force Academy—established in 1958, the first to be set up at an undergraduate institution—is charged with the responsibility for transforming astronautics from a dictionary definition into a living science for the cadets who graduate each year and become officers in the Air Force.

For the instructors in the department, this has been no small task. Faculty members had to sort fact from fiction, write a textbook, and establish an entirely new curriculum. This has been a continuing process as this new science expands and more and more information becomes available. The astronautics text is now comprised of 3 volumes totaling approximately 600 pages.

In a dizzying succession of events, the public has witnessed the evolution of successful intercontinental ballistic missiles, earth satellites with hundreds of purposes and applications, and space probes. Manned spaceflight is a reality, and the United States has established the manned lunar flight as a national objective to be achieved in the next decade. Conquering outer space is no longer a fantasy.

Although the dawn of the space age came on October 4, 1957, with the launching of the first Russian sputnik, the Air Force Academy's Department of Astronautics traces its existence to a much earlier stimulus. In 1953 a thermonuclear breakthrough signaled the accelerated development of long-range ballistic missiles, an effort which later became one of the Nation's top priority jobs.

It soon became apparent that Air Force officers should have an understanding of this revolutionary military technology. With the more recent advent of space conquest has come the additional demand for education in advanced rocketry, lunar and interplanetary trajectories, and fundamental guidance and navigation in space.

One aspect of the nature of this new technology can be determined by noting that all members of the Department of Astronautics have at least a master's degree in some branch of engineering. Understanding the science of astronautics, they will tell you, requires mainly an adjustment of one's point of view. Natural laws apply equally well in space as on earth, even though the environment of space introduces many engineering problems not previously encountered.

A chief proponent of this view is Col. Richard C. Gibson, professor and head

of the department. Colonel Gibson directs the efforts of the other 10 officers in the department in their pioneering endeavor to make every Academy graduate a potential astronaut.

The department's faculty proudly counts among its number one Sc. D., one Ph. D., a Rhodes Scholar and six rated pilots with many years of professional experience in research and operations.

While the serious student of astronautics always keeps in mind the sociohumanity aspects of this new technology, only a knowledge of the technical disciplines related to astronautics will give an insight into the application and limitations of space weapons.

For this reason, the basic course in astronautics has as its objective: First, to develop an understanding of the fundamental physics of astronautics, and second, to develop an appreciation of the engineering and military compromises which must be made in the creation of a new space vehicle.

This twofold objective is met by building the course upon the fundamental physics developed principally by Newton—circa 1700—and Clausius—circa 1850. Newton established the science of celestial mechanics, upon which the study of trajectories in space is based, and the general subject of dynamics with which the effects of rocket thrust, gravitational forces and atmospheric drag on the vehicle are analyzed.

Clausius was the principal founder of the science of thermodynamics, the study of energy changes in gases. Upon the latter is built the study of rocket engine design and the analysis of reentry heating. Thus, astronautics at the Academy has its roots in man's earliest understanding of theoretical physics.

Every cadet takes three basic astronautics courses, with most cadets taking all three during the first class—senior—year. In this way the astronautics curriculum is able to draw on the cadet's already extensive background in college mathematics, physics, mechanics, electrical engineering, thermodynamics and aeronautical engineering.

The three courses, totaling 8 semester hours, are: Astronautics 411, the fundamentals of astronautics, which covers two-body trajectories, optimum staging of multistage rockets and reentry trajectories, including oscillations of the reentry body and aerodynamic heating; 412, space technology, which includes nuclear rocket propulsion, ion propulsion, space powerplants, separately powered rockets, low-thrust trajectories, lunar trajectories and interplanetary trajectories; 422, ballistic missile guidance, which includes the technology, instruments, and special techniques involved in the guidance and control of a ballistic missile or space vehicle from launch to destination. In all, each cadet spends approximately 140 classroom hours in the study of astronautics.

In addition, the department offers two enrichment—elective—courses. They are: Astronautics 551, advanced astronautics, and 452, linear control system analysis.

The following officers are assigned to the faculty of the Department of Astronautics.

Col. Richard C. Gibson, professor; Sc. D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; is the head of the astronautics department. He was assistant professor of electrical engineering at the Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson AFB, from 1946 until 1951. Prior to coming to the Air Force Academy he was Director of Experimental Vehicles and Instrumentation Division, Headquarters, Air Force Systems Command, Andrews AFB, Md.

Maj. William R. Manlove, assistant professor and executive officer; B.S., U.S. Military Academy, M.S., University of Illinois; is a rated pilot and came to the Air Force Academy from the Ballistic Systems Division, Air Force Systems Command, Los Angeles, Calif.

Maj. Roger R. Bate, U.S. Army, associate professor; B.S., U.S. Military Academy; B.A., B. Sc., M.A., Oxford University; served with the combat engineers in Korea. He has 3 years of research and development experience, having been associated with the design group for an Army package power reactor. He also taught nuclear reactor theory at Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology. He commanded an engineer combat company at Fort Lewis prior to assignment to the Air Force Academy.

Maj. George T. James, Jr., associate professor; B.S., Purdue University; M.S., A.E., California Institute of Technology, is a command pilot who flew B–26 combat missions in World War II. He has 5½ years of experience as a research and development officer, his most recent assignment being that of Special Assistant to the Commander for Weapon Systems at the Ballistic Systems Division, Los Angeles, Calif.

Maj. Bradford C. Healy, assistant professor; B.S., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; M.S., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; joined the department recently after 3½ years with the mathematics department.

Capt. Daniel S. Barnes, instructor; B.S., U.S. Military Academy; M.S., MIT; is a rated pilot and former flight commander in a German-based fighter-bomber wing. He has 2 years of experience in research and development, his most recent assignment being as project officer on the F–105 fire control system.

Capt. Roland E. Thomas, assistant professor; B.S., New Mexico A. & M.; M.S., Stanford University; Ph. D., University of Illinois; has nearly 4 years of research and development experience. His most recent assignment was that of consulting engineer for the electronics branch of the equipment laboratory at Wright Air Development Center.

Capt. Roger W. Johnson, assistant professor; U.S. Naval Academy; M.S., Massachusetts Institute of Technology; is a rated pilot with 7 years of flying experience with Tactical Air Command. He has recently been selected to return to graduate school at the termination of this academic year to obtain a Ph. D. in astronautics.

Capt. Robert D. McKelvey, instructor; B.S., U.S. Military Academy; M.S., Air Force Institute of Technology; is a rated pilot who returned to graduate school after 3 years at TAC. He came to the Air Force Academy directly from AFIT.

Capt. Delbert H. Jacobs, instructor; B.S., U.S. Military Academy; M.S., A.E., California Institute of Technology; is a rated pilot and came to the Air Force Academy from Cal Tech. Prior to attending graduate school, he was an instructor with the German Air Force near Munich, Germany.

Lt. Charles A. Bodeen, instructor; B.S., M.S., M.E., California Institute of Technology; came directly to the Air Force Academy from Cal Tech. He was a project engineer on the rocket test sled facility at Edwards AFB, Calif., prior to attending graduate school.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY CHAPEL—GENERAL INFORMATION

The organs for the Protestant and Catholic Chapels were designed by Mr. Walter Holtkamp—recently deceased—Cleveland, Ohio, and built by M. P. Moller, Inc., Hagerstown, Md.

The components of the steel skeleton or framework of the chapel were cut from tubular steel. The tetrahedrons were fabricated by the Mississippi Valley Structural Steel Co. and shipped to the Academy.

The north and south triangular walls of the Protestant Chapel are of tinted laminated architectural glass. There are 11,000 square feet of this laminated glass which was fabricated by Dearborn Glass Co.

The ramp from the battle area to the chapel has snow melting coils embedded in the concrete.

The aluminum skin of the tetrahedron is striated aluminum.

The chapel is designed for a wind pressure of 50 pounds per square inch.

The acoustical consultants retained by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill were Bolt, Beranck & Newman.

Mr. Walter A. Netsch of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill was the principal designer of the chapel.

Religious affiliation among the military personnel normally run 75 percent Protestant, 20 percent Catholic, and 5 percent Jewish. This ratio influenced the decision on capacity of the three chapels since it was assumed that similar ratios would prevail in the Cadet Wing.

The Catholic and Jewish chapels are at terrace level. North of the Jewish chapel, at terrace lewel, is a meeting room for the use of those denominations which do not wish to use one of the three chapels. With this provision, the cadet chapel is more properly referred to as an all-faith, rather than a trifaith chapel.

The furnishings, liturgical fittings and adornment of the chapel were paid for from gifts of money from private persons and from Easter collections taken at Air Force bases. No appropriated funds have been used for this purpose.

The money for the organs in the Catholic and Protestant chapels came from

the Air Force Command Welfare Fund, also nonappropriated funds.

JEWISH SYNAGOGUE

The Israeli Air Force donated the 1,631 pieces of Jerusalem stone for the foyer of the synagogue.

The furnishings were financed by the National Jewish Welfare Board. The interior design, furnishings, and liturgical fittings are valued at approximately $50,000.

The Jewish chapel is the first specially designed place of worship built for Jewish services on a U.S. military base.

The interior was designed by Ludwig Wolpert of New York's Jewish Museum.

The focal point of the Jewish chapel is the Aaron Kodesh, the Holy Ark which shelters the Scrolls of the Torah.

The synagogue is the only chapel with individual chairs for the congregants.

The Eternal Light hangs to the right of the Ark. Nested in the three Stars of David, it symbolizes everlasting, unquenchable faith.

Architecturally, the synagogue is a circle within a square, the circular design symbolizing the global mission of the Air Force. The square forms a surrounding foyer which is paved with the Jerusalem stone. The outside walls are of purple stained glass panels alternating with green and blue stained accent windows. The inner, circular walls are panels of translucent glass alternating with stanchions of cypress.

The synagogue seats 100 persons.

PROTESTANT CHAPEL

Seats 900 and has 100-seat choir.

Reredos—the wall behind the altar—is a curved, 14-foot high wall covered with pastel shades of tesserra. The painter-sculptor commissioned to do this work was Lumen Martin Winter who designed and executed "The Conversion of St. Paul" for the facade of the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, New York City.

The walls and vaulted roof of the chapel are formed by the repetitive tetrahedrons which at rooftop form the 17 spires. There is no special symbolism to the number of spires. The original design called for 19 spires but when the original bids for building the chapel ran too high and were rejected, the designers effected certain changes for the sake of economy. One of the changes was reducing the number of spires but this did not reduce the basic design nor the square footage within the chapel.

The pews are American walnut and harmonize with the walnut batten wall at the rear and under the choir loft.

Stained glass strip windows, designed by Judson Studios, form ribbons of color between the tetrahedrons.

The floor is lowered and railed off at the side, under the sloping tetrahedrons. This area will provide space for memorialization placques.

The floor of the Protestant chapel is gray-white terrazzo. This floor is heavily soundproofed so that services can be held simultaneously in the Catholic and Protestant chapels. The height from floor to the ceiling ridge is 95 feet.

The altar is free standing and curvilinear.

Harold E. Wagoner designed the furnishings of the Protestant chapel.

CATHOLIC CHAPEL

The Catholic chapel, located at terrace level, seats 500 persons and has a 50-seat choir. The nave is 55½ feet wide and 95 feet long, including the predella.

The sidewalls, from floor to ceiling, are panels of amber glass alternating with strip windows of multicolored stained, cast glass, the random sizes and shapes of which are set in precast, reinforced concrete. The stained glass was cast by Blenko and the strip windows designed by John W. Winterien & Associates.

The reredos is an abstract mural of glass mosaic. The varying shades of blue, turquoise, rose, and gray tessera form an abstract portrayal of the firmament. Superimposed on the mural are two marble figures. On the left is "Our Lady of the Skies"—The Blessed Mother—and on the right is the Guardian Angel. Each is about 10 feet tall. Above and between these two figures is a marble dove, symbolic of the Holy Ghost.

The 14 Stations of the Cross were carved from 4-inch-thick slabs of marble. The recessed backgrounds are covered with the same multicolored tessera of the reredos mural.

The reredos and the Stations of the Cross were designed and executed by Lumen Martin Winter, the renowned artist-sculptor, who created "The Conversion of St. Paul" for the facade of the Church of St. Paul the Apostle, New York City.

The altar is a large tabletop of polished marble mounted on a cone-shaped pedestal. The altar furnishings are of high-gloss nickel-silver. Also on the altar is a 6-foot sculptured nickel-silver crucifix.

The pews are of American walnut trimmed in satin finished stainless steel.

There are two confessionals at the rear of the Nave. Off the Narthex on one side is the baptistry and on the other side is the blessed sacrament room, the walls of which are fashioned of marble chips and semiprecious Colorado stones.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill, H.R. 9903.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the African-American Institute, America's leading private agency conducting educational, economic, and social development projects in cooperation with Africa, is celebrating its 10th anniversary. This, I feel, deserves special attention. AAI has served and is serving Africa and America exceptionally well.

The African-American Institute, founded in 1953 by a group of private citizens who foresaw the coming importance of Africa, confined its activity at first to providing hospitality and help to African students and visitors who came to this country. This was useful as a prelude to broader, more extensive participation in African-American relations.

By the turn of the decade, events in Africa had kindled widespread American public interest in its economic and social problems. Assistance of many kinds was needed. But education was obviously the prime necessity. Education for trained, responsible leadership to meet the changing and evolving needs of Africa was in demand by the new African governments. AAI, responding for the private sector of America, addressed itself to this crucial problem by providing leadership in the development of sensible, effective, and economically feasible educational programs for hundreds of able young Africans capable of making significant contributions to the development of their countries. The success of this private organization specializing in African affairs is told in the dramatic fact that approximately 1,300 African students—carefully selected, carefully placed in our best universities and colleges—are now studying in the United States under AAI programs.

From 1960 onward, AAI assumed expanded responsibilities. The spectrum of AAI services to Africa and America now includes the following programs: The African scholarship program of American universities; the African graduate fellowship program; the AAI scholarship program; the training program for students from Kenya; the AID Guinea program; the East African training project; the teacher placement service for secondary schools in Africa; the Elizabethtown project for West Africa; programing for African visitors; the economic and social development program; the media development program; the educational partnerships program; the books for Africa program; Women's Africa Committee; publication of Africa Report magazine.

The growth and influence of AAI is reflected in a number of ways.

First. As a private, nonpolitical organization working to serve the needs of the people of Africa, it has earned the friendship and respect of African students, scholars, and leaders. Today, AAI enjoys the confidence of the leadership in countries throughout Africa.

Second. AAI has developed functional and financial capabilities that have permitted it to extend its facilities both in Africa and America. AAI has its headquarters in New York. It also maintains offices in Washington, D.C.; Lagos, Nigeria; Dar-es-Salaam, Tanganyika; Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; and Accra, Ghana. In addition, 15 part-time representatives serve throughout Africa. The AAI staff is a dedicated team of competent professionals committed to the development of effective and economically sound projects and programs.

Third. AAI by its capability has earned the respect of American universities, private organizations, corporations, foundations, private citizens, and the U.S. Government. It now conducts relations with a wide range of private Americans who have interests in Africa or wish to participate in African assistance programs. Foundations, including the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Carnegie Corp. of New York, the Hershey Foundation, and others have funded programs under the administration of AAI. The U.S. Government has likewise drawn upon the services of AAI. At present AAI is a contractor with AID and with the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. Department of State for the development and administration of a number of educational programs.

Under President Waldemar A. Nielsen, formerly an officer of the Ford Foundation, AAI has developed four distinctive qualities.

First. AAI has developed into a first-class organization administratively and professionally.

Second. The organization has gained financial stability and strength.

Third. AAI has been able to relate to the various communities of interest that are expressive of American good will toward Africa and to tap the great American impulse to help new countries and help mankind.

Fourth. AAI has developed the consortium approach, which provides a way for combining the funds and forces of universities, corporations, foundations, private citizens, and the U.S. Government or any combination of these to create projects and programs that would otherwise be impossible for an individual organization. The classic example of the consortium idea is the African scholarship program of American universities—ASPAU—which involves 214 American colleges and universities, the Agency for International Development, 27 African governments, a number of American foundations and the African-American Institute.

What has been achieved by AAI to date, however, is only a beginning, and present efforts only scratch the surface of possibilities. Programs for African economic development, community development, mass media development, and for American education and information about Africa may in time be added to AAI's present activities. Over 50 projects and programs are now in the developmental stage, meaning in some instances that only funding is needed to make them operational.

With a budget 10 times greater than in 1959, AAI is now moving ahead with a fundraising effort in order to achieve greater financial flexibility and strength to develop new programs. Foundation grants and private assistance are increasing, but AAI remains heavily dependent upon U.S. Government contracts for funds. Hence, the pace of program development cannot proceed at the needed rate. Additional private funds are required now to meet the growing capabilities of AAI.

I therefore feel that private American interests, particularly the corporate community, ought to give careful consideration to supporting this effective effort in Africa. While AAI should continue to administer Government contracts, its capacity for independence and initiative should be increased. Only private assistance can give it flexibility and strength.

The African-American Institute as a private and nonpolitical organization exclusively committed to serving African and American interests deserves the support of all Americans. The magnitude of its contribution in the past and present and its capability for advancing the cause of better understanding between the people of Africa and the United States in the future make AAI an eminently worthy object of support by all those who would invest in the future of Africa.

THE PROGRAMS OF THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE

The African scholarship program of American universities currently sponsors 800 African students in the United States. Launched as a small pilot project in Nigeria in 1960, this cooperative program now involves 214 American colleges and universities, the Agency for International Development, 27 African governments, and a number of leading U.S. foundations. African-American Institute is the administrative agency.

AAI works closely with the central coordinating office of the participating universities in Cambridge, Mass., directed by David Henry, the originator of the program. In Africa, AAI field officers administer selection machinery set up in all participating countries to identify the best qualified candidates. In the United States, AAI is responsible for disbursement of maintenance funds to students and the management of grants from donor agencies and foundations.

In the summer of 1964, as universities prepare to receive an additional wave of ASPAU students, the first substantial ASPAU group to graduate from American institutions will return home to assume the responsibilities for which they have been trained. This will be America's first major contribution in meeting the critical need for educated manpower for Africa.

The African graduate fellowship program, the newest addition to AAI educational programs, promises to acquire scope and influence in the years ahead and may well become a contribution of primary importance to the development of African education. As African universities begin to develop and as more young Africans acquire undergraduate degrees at home, there will be an urgent need for exceptionally talented persons to take advanced study abroad. The African graduate fellowship program addresses itself specifically to the training of prospective university teachers and potentially higher ranking civil servants in a variety of priority fields. A cooperative program like ASPAU, it gathers a number of leading graduate schools, AID, and African governments in a cooperative effort which this year has provided sponsorship to a beginning group of 23 graduate students from 8 countries. The institute has also been asked by the Department of State to administer in the United States a number of graduate fellowships made available through UNESCO for similar purposes. Responsibility for final selection of candidates proposed by their respective governments under both plans resides in a newly constituted Executive Committee of American Graduate Deans.

The AAI scholarship program is now near termination. Thirty students were originally brought to the United States under AAI auspices, receiving either full or partial support from the Institute. Twenty-three students have already returned home or completed the studies for which AAI sponsorship was initially granted; the remainder will return in 1964 and 1965.

The training program for students from Kenya, partly financed by AID, is now in the second of its 2-year phase. This program provides junior college technical and vocational instruction for 70 Kenya students in the State university systems of New York and California.

The aid Guinea program provides college and vocational or technical training for Guinean students. Technical training is provided in several areas, including civil aviation.

The east African training project is a year-old program administered in Dar-es-Salaam. The objectives are to assist refugee students, mainly from southern Africa, with scholarships for the continuation of their studies in institutions in Africa, in the United States, and third countries. To raise the educational status of those as yet unqualified for higher studies, a special training center has been established by AAI in Dar-es-Salaam. In the summer of 1963, 130 students were enrolled in this school. The faculty members are volunteers from Radcliffe and Harvard Colleges along with a few African teachers. The Ford Foundation provides partial financing for the program.

The teacher placement service for secondary schools in Africa has placed 140 teachers—American, Haitian, and Canadian—in 9 English and French-speaking countries.

The Elizabethtown project for west Africa serving Ghana and Nigeria places

qualified American college graduates of Elizabethtown College, and a group of associate colleges, as teachers in African secondary schools. The Hershey Foundation provides the funding for the project and AAI field offices in Africa give assistance in the placement and counseling of the teachers.

Programing for African visitors is an activity of growing scale in AAI. As one of the major agencies handling African leaders and specialists visiting the United States, AAI has recently strengthened and professionalized its staff capabilities for the effective administration of this program. In the current year, 114 visitors, nearly all student leaders or promising young men and women from Africa have been programed by AAI.

The economic and social development program initiated this year by AAI provides a new approach to working with African leaders in meeting some of their economic and social development problems. This program provides a specialist to work with African officials in an advisory capacity, to give assistance in program formulation, community development projects, and specialized leadership training. In Northern Rhodesia, for example, AAI is making an effective contribution to the country's preparation for independence in 1964. Among the specific projects assisted by AAI in Northern Rhodesia are the training of African confidential secretaries, a legal training institute, the development of a national youth service program, and a preliminary assessment of industrialization possibilities.

This new and experimental approach, if as successful as expected, may be extended to other countries with whose leadership AAI has close and friendly ties.

The media development program is intended to assist Africa's mass media as instruments for national unification, for adult education, and for stimulating the modernization of primitive societies. Since 1961, the Institute has been asked to mobilize public and private resources for an active program in this area and has already undertaken a number of activities: Fellowships and grants-in-aid to African journalism students and practicing journalists to study in the United States and Europe; provision of an American broadcasting specialist as program adviser to the Ethiopian radio system for a 2-year period; and the development of plans by this same specialist for the use of radio in classroom teaching as a means of upgrading primary school teachers. During the summer of 1963, the Institute conducted three highly successful journalism workshops in Addis Ababa, Lagos, and Dares-Salaam for over 100 African editors and newscasters. Staffed by Dean Burton Marvin of the William Allen White School of Journalism at the University of Kansas, Mr. Malvin Goode, commentator for the American Broadcasting Co. at the United Nations, Mr. John McCormally, editor of the Hutchinson News, Hutchinson, Kans., and Dr. Sydney Head, AAI representative in Addis Ababa, the workshops concentrated on the development of journalistic competence and the professionalization of news media personnel. The seminars have been praised highly by the U.S. Department of State and by the African participants.

The educational partnerships program, directed by a volunteer chairman, Mrs. Byron Miller, has addressed itself to providing educational opportunities for secondary school students in Africa who are talented but who lack funds to complete their studies. At present over 180 students in east Africa are able to continue their education through educational partnerships. The program is sustained by contributions from American partners: business firms, voluntary groups, schools, and individuals.

The books for Africa program has been singularly successful. A volunteer effort based in Cambridge, Mass., where it is directed by Mrs. David Henry and Mrs. Nora Fairbanks, books for Africa has succeeded in placing textbooks, scientific works and reference books, valued in excess of a half million dollars, in African schools and universities. Most of the books have been contributed by leading American publishers. Many books have also been given by individuals to African schools of their choice. The cost of shipping the books has been defrayed by a special grant from AID.

Women's Africa Committee of AAI, founded in 1959 by 30 women with a serious interest in African affairs, works directly with African women. Its efforts are based on three considerations: First, African women have heretofore had little formal education; second, as women they have a particularly important role to play in community development; and third, they will play an increasingly important role in the affairs of their countries generally. Women's Africa Committee has therefore initiated educational programs for selected African women to give them the basic competence required for playing an effective role in their new and developing nations. Educational programs have been carried out at Columbia University, Howard University, and the University of Pittsburgh.

Africa Report, a publication of the African-American Institute, is edited by Mrs. Helen Kitchen, and is the leading American journal on Africa. It is an authoritative, comprehensive journal covering development in all fields in the entire continent. It is now read by subscribers in all 50 of the United States, in the countries of Africa, and in Canada, the United Kingdom, Western Europe, the U.S.S.R., Australia, New Zealand, and the countries of the Middle East and Asia. It is required reading in most African studies programs of American universities. Public leadership is now growing as the American people expand their interest in Africa.

The Board of Trustees of the African-American Institute: Mr. Harold K. Hochschild, chairman, honorary chairman, American Metal Climax, Inc.; Hon. Edward R. Dudley, vice chairman, president of the Borough of Manhattan; Mr. Waldemar A. Nielsen, president of AAI; Mr. Lansdell K. Christie, treasurer, president, Liberia Mining Co., Ltd.; Mr. Morris B. Abram, partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison; Mrs. Etta Moten Barnett, director, community services for WYNR, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. L. Gray Cowan, professor, Columbia University, executive secretary, African Studies Association; Mr. Dana S. Creel, director, Rockefeller Bros. Fund; Dr. John W. Davis, special director, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund; Dr. Robert F. Goheen, president, Princeton University; Dr. William Leo Hansberry, senior professor, Hansberry College of African Studies, University of Nigeria; Mr. John H. Johnson, president, Johnson Publishing Co.; Mr. Arthur A. Krim, president, United Artists' Corp.; Mr. Alan J. Pifer, vice president, Carnegie Corp. of New York; Mr. John B. M. Place, senior vice president, Chase Manhattan Bank; Dr. Emory Ross, president, Albert Schweitzer Fellowships; Mrs. Zelia P. Ruebhausen, chairman, Women's Africa Committee; Loyd V. Steere, former executive director, African-American Institute.

African-American Institute officers in the United States are located at: 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y.; 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Executives are: Mr. Waldemar A. Nielsen, president; Mr. E. Frederic Morrow, vice president; Mr. E. Jefferson Murphy, vice president; Mr. John J. Mather, executive officer; Mr. George Loft, vice president.

THE SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PRAYER AND BIBLE READING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision on prayer and Bible reading does not necessarily ban meaningful spiritual material or exercises from public schools. Faced with the Supreme Court ban on State-ordered prayers, the Lancaster, N.H., school system in cooperation with the interchurch council have initiated a classroom program of "Thoughts for the Day"—short, little stories illustrating basic truths. Each clergyman in the community takes responsibility for writing the "thought" for the schooldays of 1 month. This program is a good example of how creative imagination can meet the unfortunate situation created in some schools by the Supreme Court's recent decision and the widely differing interpretations of its real meaning.

Clinton L. White, editor and publisher of the Coos County Democrat, discusses this program in a recent editorial "Substitutes for School Prayers" and includes a sample "Thought for the Day." I commend Mr. White's perceptive and meaningful comments to my colleagues:

SUBSTITUTES FOR SCHOOL PRAYERS

Principal Stanley Tufts advises us that in the Lancaster schools, through the cooperation of the interchurch council and clergymen of its member churches, "Thoughts for

the Day" are used instead of prayers at the opening of the schoolday. This is done because of the interpretation of the Supreme Court's decision relative to school prayers.

Different clergymen write a "Thought for the Day" for each schoolday for 1 month, and another clergyman does it for 1 month. The Democrat, when the idea was first proposed, suggested that these might be published, if given sufficient time to do so, but none had been received until Mr. Tufts sent one written by Rev. John Gregory, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, which will be used in Lancaster schools today. This "Thoughts for the Day" is printed following this editorial.

The Democrat has been and still is highly critical of any prohibition of voluntary prayers in school, but does commend the efforts of school authorities to make a meaningful substitution for what they interpret to have been prohibited by the Supreme Court. We cannot fail to believe that daily prayers in school 5 days a week would reinforce home and church efforts to teach children the importance of prayer.

It certainly is wrong for one to pray only in times of greatest danger, or great trouble, as perhaps may be the case far too many times. But all prayers are not prayers of asking, or what might seem selfish asking. There are prayers of praise and prayers of thankfulness; prayers for others and for forgiving of others. There are prayers for world peace and for the sick and suffering and the downtrodden peoples of the earth. And, perhaps, what is overlooked by those who would excuse failing to pray, is the fact that there are the prayers of those who know their many weaknesses and seek divine guidance and deliverance from temptation so that they may live better lives.

The writer's own rector wrote the "Thought for the Day" that we publish today. Our own thoughts about prayer are by no means intended as any criticism of his fine message but were prompted by some of the remarks we have heard or read supporting cutting out school prayers.

THOUGHT FOR THE DAY

Anyone who is a Boy Scout learns this motto, "Be Prepared." And it's a good one too, for everybody. I'm going to tell you a puzzling story that gives us a good example.

One day a man was sitting on a hill near a river. He was just sitting there, meditating. It was his custom to take a little time each day and just sort of think about things. While sitting there, he noticed a man approach the river as if to swim across. Before he made the attempt, he first knelt down and prayed. Then he plunged in, but in the middle of the river, his strength was gone and he drowned. There was no opportunity to give him help.

Then a second man came to the river. Without pausing for prayer, he succeeded in crossing.

Well, the man on the hill was puzzled. So are you, perhaps. I was puzzled too, when I read this part of the story. But the man who had been meditating, hurried down the hill to meet the man who had successfully crossed the stream. He told the details of what he had seen.

Then the swimmer replied, "I knew that drowned man. He told me he saw no need to pray except when he faced great danger. As for me, I have tried to live my whole life in an attitude of prayer knowing that if I do my part well God is always with me, helping me always.

There is a great lesson in that story. It's just a matter of "being prepared." Whether it's doing an assignment, working out on the team, or just generally living a good life—any task that lies before us can be done well, if we have done our homework.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it would not take long to summarize the state of affairs in Lithuania today, and a constant dwelling upon the situation is something that sickens the human personality.

Those of us who are fortunate to know many Americans of Lithuanian origin or descent, Mr. Speaker, are at a loss for precise words to express our sorrow for their relatives and friends behind the Iron Curtain of despair and desolation.

And yet the freedom that once was theirs still rings in our ears, a sign of the eventual victory of the human spirit.

Victory over the forces of communism will, I am certain, again be possible for the Lithuanians.

For reasons which lie at the very roots of human existence, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced bills to set up a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, and I continue to plead for their eventual enactment. I have also introduced bills on the plight of the Baltic nations, and I am determined that these bills will not be swept aside in these hurried times.

While there is no rejoicing behind the Iron Curtain, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Lithuanians recall the historic date of February 16, 1918, an anniversary we celebrate this year, 46 years after the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. And 1964 is also the 713th anniversary since the formation of the Lithuanian state and the 711th anniversary since the founding of the Lithuanian Kingdom, when Mindaugas the Great was crowned as the first king of the Lithuanian Empire.

This, then, is a historic year for the lovers of freedom and it is cruel and heartless to realize that since 1940 the wonderful, lyrical Lithuanians have been suffering under Communist captivity.

No one has to stress the terrible conditions that exist in the Communist countries. We all know how efficiently the Communists try to wipe out any vestige of pride in national origin or national characteristic.

It is time, clearly, for the adoption of the concurrent resolution I have offered in the first session of the 88th Congress which calls for the freedom for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

This is the most positive action we can take.

It is action that is absolutely essential.

It is action that I urge, and trust, we will take before it is too late.

MORE TAX FUNDS TO FINANCE RUSSIAN WHEAT SALE?

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers raise the horrifying prospect that U.S. taxpayers may have to shell out an additional $720,000 to help finance the first Russian wheat sale. This would heap insult on already-injured taxpayers. They have contributed $25 million toward this dubious deal. Instead of getting hooked for an additional assessment, the way I figure it, they are entitled instead to a $455,000 refund.

The newspaper report, which has not been denied, said the administration is exploring the possibility of an indirect subsidy in an attempt to prevent a union boycott of the shipment. The International Longshoremen's Association and the Seafarers' International Union are blocking the loading of the Russia-bound wheat because the administration has not required that a full 50 percent of the shipment go in U.S. vessels.

Continental Grain Co., of New York, the exporter handling the transaction for Russia, was given a waiver February 12 by the administration. This relieved the firm of further responsibility to sign U.S. ships. The signup of U.S. vessels is 120,000 tons short of the 50 percent goal.

Foreign ships will haul wheat to Odessa for $12 a ton or less, compared with $18 in U.S. vessels. If, as indicated in today's papers, Continental gets an additional taxpayer handout to meet the extra cost of using U.S. ships for the 120,000 tons, this would amount to $720,000.

The way I figure it, taxpayers should get a refund of $455,000 from Continental. If Continental gets an additional bonus, it would inflate a huge windfall into disgusting scandal.

Continental bought the grain January 2 in a package deal which included both the price of the grain and the cost of shipping it to Soviet ports. Normal export subsidies were paid by the U.S. Government for all wheat varieties in the deal except Durum. The Durum export subsidy, financed like the others by U.S. taxpayers, was boosted approximately 14 cents per bushel to meet the extra cost of U.S. shipping.

Continental bought about 13 million bushels of Durum at this super discount.

Thus Continental got a subsidy payment from the U.S. Government $1,820,000 bigger than would have been the case if U.S. shipping had not been stipulated.

Continental got the waiver when it was still 120,300 tons—or 25 percent—short of meeting the U.S. shipping requirement. Therefore, the U.S. taxpayers are entitled to a minimum refund of $455,000, which is 25 percent of $1,820,000.

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, grassroots support for the concept of a Domestic Peace Corps appears to be growing constantly. I have received many communications from various parts of the country expressing complete accord with the principle of the National Service Corps proposal which has passed the Senate and is now pending before the House Education and Labor Committee. This Corps, as envisioned, would fulfill the objectives of what is more commonly referred to as the Domestic Peace Corps.

Shortly after the Peace Corps was established, I strongly advocated the establishment of a similar organization on our home front. I offered legislation to this effect in the 87th Congress and again at the opening of the present 88th Congress. The great success and immeasurable value of the Peace Corps were my main inspiration in advocating and supporting the domestic concept.

I was privileged to discuss the subject with the Attorney General and with others who have been working closely with the administration for the formulation of legislation to effectively carry out this goal. As a result I was privileged to join in the cosponsorship of the administration bill, my measure being H.R. 5852, and to testify in support of its approval.

It is encouraging and inspiring to note the support that has been given the Corps from all over the Nation. Recently, I came across an editorial in the Adirondack Enterprise of Saranac Lake, N.Y. It reflects a cross section of grassroots opinion throughout the country. I commend it to my colleagues.

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

The Domestic Peace Corps barely squeaked through the Senate. The measure which today holds such wide support in its foreign branch has rough sledding ahead at home.

We think the concept is a good one and should get a chance. The Peace Corps volunteers have something to offer us at home as well as abroad; we have problems of training right here in the United States.

When we consider that a group of dedicated citizens in the Gabriels area are looking for teachers to help migrant workers learn to read and write, we realize we are not so far from the need. There are many other men and women across the country who need job retraining or help with particular skills if they are to lead useful lives and contribute to the American economy. Staffing these programs is presently difficult.

The young people have shown that they are willing to give their skills and their time for mere sustenance pay. The need is great and the volunteers are available. Only the legislators seem reluctant.

MOVING OF ROAMA FROM GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, N.Y.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, 1964, the Legislature of the State of New York passed a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate if it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues this resolution which follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK: IN ASSEMBLY, ALBANY,
RESOLUTION 76, FEBRUARY 4, 1964

Whereas ROAMA is now located at Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and

Whereas this is an integral part of our air defense; and

Whereas the worldwide situation is in such a state of turmoil that our defenses must be at full strength at all times; and

Whereas the withdrawal of ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y., would necessarily weaken our position; and

Whereas the moving of ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base would have a depressing economic effect on the entire area near Rome, N.Y.; and

Whereas sufficient reason or cause has not been made public of the feasibility of such plan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to make a full investigation to determine whether or not it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, February 11, 1964, concurred in, without amendment by order of the senate.

G. T. ABRAMS,
Secretary.

PANAMA CANAL ZONE: "A FLAG, A RIOT, AND A BOY"

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the extensive documentation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contained in recent statements by many distinguished Members of the Congress, the communistic revolutionary leadership and long-range Red objectives of the January 9, 1964, Panamanian assaults on the Canal Zone are completely established.

Newspaper and other pro-Red journalists on the isthmus, seeking to divert attention from the real instigators of the sanguinary outbreak, immediately sought out students at the Balboa High School where the initial "incident" occurred and, after hasty questioning of our patriotic but inexperienced youths, accused these fine young Americans and their parents with having started the riots by insisting that the U.S. flag remain flying on U.S. territory in front of that U.S. school.

Mr. Speaker, there could be no greater falsehoods than the venomous fumes of anti-North American propaganda and character assassination that rose out of the jungles at Panama during the January outbreak and were uncritically relayed by pro-Red elements in the mass news media throughout the United States and the entire world.

Inadequately contested in the news media, these mendacious reports from the Canal Zone identified certain individual student leaders by name. This, in turn, led to a flow of vile, insulting, and degrading letters to them from what may well be a communistic revolutionary underground in various parts of the United States in an obvious effort to intimidate those students and their parents by slanderous attacks against displaying their loyalty to the United States. Such psychological aggressions are well-known communistic revolutionary tactics.

In one case, a 17-year-old student was virtually driven from the Canal Zone and thus forced to leave his home, his school, his parents, and his lifelong friends. The pro-Red revolutionary elements in the mass media of our country did not tell this story of evil that resulted from their pernicious effusions.

It is only natural that such venom as was spewed out at Panama caused the parents of these students the gravest concern for their children's future. It is fortunate that the courageous parents of one student, on January 28, 1964, sought to supply the truth. In a moving circular on "A Flag, a Riot, and a Boy," which I shall quote at the end of my remarks, they give a well rounded picture.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of the Congress, the staffs of cognizant committees, and loyal officials in the executive and judicial branches of our Government to read this circular. I urge the loyal members of the mass media and other publicists to feature it immediately in a manner that it may be read by the students of every high school in the Nation and their parents. I urge the civic, fraternal, patriotic, and veterans organizations to duplicate it, give it the widest circulation, and to take the necessary actions to make the venomous character assassins in the press realize that American patriots will not be intimidated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote the indicated letter with deep feeling of pride:

A FLAG, A RIOT, AND A BOY

Early reports circulated throughout the United States, particularly in one widely read magazine, have resulted in a number of vile, insulting, and degrading comments addressed to our son from American "patriots" in various sections of the United States. He has been labeled a delinquent, hoodlum, poor student, and rabble rouser. Our students in the Canal Zone have been accused of inciting the unfortunate events which occurred between the United States and Panama by a number of news services in the United States and abroad.

Inasmuch as hindsight is usually provided with 20–20 vision, which foresight is not, particularly in 16- and 17-year-old boys, we are all aware now that the actions of our

students in the Canal Zone were unwise, to say the least, and perhaps a number of us, adults as well as students, could have acted more prudently.

Be that as it may, the reporters came here, looked around, made comparisons, asked questions of inexperienced youths, posed them in unflattering situations, and then scattered these hastily gathered, often erroneous, observations throughout the United States. It appears that stories of teenage hoodlums, punks, defiance, and rabble rousing attract our reading public and that stories of ordinary boys, often wrong, but usually without cruel or violent intent are not very interesting reading. I mention ordinary boys, boys like our high school boys here and our son, James Jenkins, for whom I speak now.

James was never, and is not now, a delinquent or undisciplined boy. Because he wanted to have his own U.S. flag remain in front of his school, as did most of his fellow students and many of our adults, including my husband and myself, our boy was suddenly thrust from a quiet normal family life into the limelight, labeled a ringleader, and finally has had to leave his home, his school, his parents, and his lifelong friends. He was suddenly subjected to experienced leading questions on a very controversial and delicate issue by veteran reporters. Some of his answers were most unfortunate. He was not aware of the implication which would be placed upon them. Even an older and more experienced person might have answered unwisely under such circumstances. Now when he is cornered by cameramen and reporters he has been trying desperately to defend himself and his fellow students against the hostile and confused reports which have been published by our American press.

Both U.S. citizens and Panamanians who are well informed are aware that the "flag incident" was of little consequence in the true issues, but since James has been singled out as the object of violent fury and hate of Panamanians, and many Americans also, I would like to give you a brief résumé of his normal life. Those of us who know him well are shocked to read about his delinquency, bad manners, lack of discipline, and poor guidance.

Jamie is the youngest of our family. He has two married sisters residing in the United States, two brothers in the United States, one of whom is in the U.S. Army, and a sister in nursing school in the United States. Jamie has been a good son, an easy boy to discipline, and a fairly good student throughout his school years. He has many friends here, both U.S. citizens and Panamanians in the Canal Zone and in Panama. He understands and speaks some Spanish and has visited freely in and out of Panama since he was a small boy. He has lived in the Canal Zone since he was 2 years old, but he has traveled from coast to coast in the United States and has visited many of the historical monuments and natural wonders of our country. He was eager to finish high school and go back to the United States where he had hoped to get a job during the summer to help defray his college expense.

Jamie has earned much of his own spending money while growing up. This is not an easy thing to do in the Canal Zone where jobs such as car cleaning, yard work, and package toting are usually reserved for Panamanians because it is felt that the North American boys do not need the money. Nevertheless, Jamie has managed to earn money continually from his first enterprise, a lemonade stand, through such things as making and selling "snowballs," selling Christmas cards for the Wallace Brown Card Co., in the United States, trading old coins, and finally to his last job as a student aid at 75 cents an hour. Twice a day, every day of the week, he has gone up to the laboratory at Gorgas Hospital and cleaned the dog pens, fed the dogs, and walked them. He left home each morning at 5:45 a.m., took care of his dogs and then went to school. After school he went back and spent another hour cleaning, feeding, and walking the dogs. He worked at this "glamorous" job from May 1963 through the summer and up until he resigned when he left the Canal Zone. Every 2 weeks he received a "take home" pay of $16. He kept $6 for spending money and the rest was put in the bank for him, after his bike was paid for. He had a small "Honda" motorbike, which he paid for, in order to have transportation to and from his job. He had saved approximately $100 before he left for the States.

Throughout his high school years he has been in the ROTC, and attended both summer training classes for noncoms. He has belonged to the camera club, the chess club, and the science club. He took and passed his college board examinations during his junior year with high marks in math and science, his favorite subjects. He had been accepted by both colleges to which he applied for admission, and was trying to come to a decision as to which college offered courses best suited to his future plans and ambitions.

He was a member of St. Andrews Episcopal Church where he was christened when he was 2 years old and confirmed when he was 13. He was an active member of the Pacific Chapter, Order of Demolay, and had just been elected master counselor. He had to leave before his installation which was to have taken place in February. He belonged to the YMCA where he was taking judo lessons and progressing very well. He was also about to complete his driver-training course, and his dad was teaching him to drive the car.

Our U.S. press has exploded this normal, everyday boy into a monster, a hoodlum, a delinquent and has made him the object of vile and cruel letters. His protest to the President of the United States against removal of the Amercan flag from the front of the U.S. schools was truly sincere in its intent, but it catapulted him into a hostile world of misinformed adults who have pointed fingers at him and called him an assassin, who have plastered his name across the Nation as a showoff, and posed him for pictures which any person would be ready to condemn at first sight. There have also been veiled threats such as a shooting incident aimed at a Jenkins residence (no relation) in Cambridge, Ohio, linked to his pending arrival there.

What will happen to our boy from now on? As his parents we are frightened for his safety from fanatics, for possible loss of his faith in love and human understanding, and for his chances in the United States to complete his education. He has been taught to respect the law and to believe in justice. He broke no laws, but he has been condemned.

This incident has already cost him dearly, and his dad and I are praying that he may never become convinced that he was the cause of all the trouble and deaths, U.S. citizens, soldiers, and Panamanians alike, for he and the other students, again both the U.S. citizen and the Panamanian students, were cruelly used as an excuse to unleash trouble already brewed. It was crouched and waiting.

Surely intelligent, thinking, and informed persons cannot honestly believe that the burden of the strife here should rest on the shoulders of a 17-year-old student who, very briefly, backed a cause in which he firmly believed—that of keeping before his school the U.S. flag which was symbolic of his happy childhood and his future life as a citizen of the United States of America—to a lad of 17 the most wonderful country in the world.

BENEFITS TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to revise and extend my remarks and to include a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island memorializing Congress, requesting favorable consideration to legislation providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pension or any other means which provide relief so vitally needed.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

(H. Res. 1043, memorializing Congress requesting favorable consideration to legistion providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which provide relief so vitally needed)

Whereas many hundreds of thousands of our Nation's finest citizens served the cause of democracy during the period of World War I; and

Whereas a large number of these veterans have now reached the age and circumstances in which they are no longer self-supporting, as well as suffering illnesses and infirmities aggravated by this honorable service to their country; and

Whereas through no fault of their own, they have largely become a class of forgotten men, many of whom are close to the grave: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives of the State of Rhode Island recognize the predicament of these veterans of World War I and petition the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to H.R. 2332 (World War I Pension Act) providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of World War I in the form of pensions or any other means which will provide relief so vitally needed; and be it further

Resolved, That the recording clerk of this house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Director of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, to the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States.

SALVATORE R. CASOSO,
Recording Clerk.

H.R. 7381: DUAL COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is a long-awaited and much-needed measure. The chairman

and members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service are to be commended for their long and diligent efforts and for bringing to the House this comprehensive and workable approach to the extremely complicated and diverse dual compensation and dual employment laws now in effect.

Last July I introduced a bill to exempt certain officers of the Armed Forces from dual office and compensation restrictions. This bill would exempt Reserve officers of the Army and Air Force who have served on active duty in a temporary grade equal to or higher than their Reserve grades and are retired for disability in such temporary grades from the dual compensation restrictions of section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended. It would also exempt any non-Regular officer member of the Armed Force who is retired in a temporary warrant officer status from the dual-office restriction of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended.

I am pleased to say that in their wide survey of the inequities involved under our present laws, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service included the provisions of my bill in H.R. 7381.

In the committee's report, numerous cases were cited whereby a Federal agency was unable to obtain qualified persons, because of the limitations placed on the salaries of retired military personnel by the dual compensation-dual employment laws. The bill before us today will eliminate this unfortunate and binding restriction and allow the Federal Government to employ the skilled and knowledgeable manpower it needs.

In addition, it will certainly clarify the existing statutes on dual compensation-dual employment and bring under one statute the Government's policy on this subject. This will undoubtedly eliminate the hardships caused individuals as a result of inadvertent or good faith misunderstandings of the application of the law.

A case in point is a private bill I introduced in the last session to relieve a person of liability for repayment to the Federal Government a rather large sum of money paid him for his services to a Federal agency. This gentleman was a retired chief warrant officer serving as a temporary W–2 when he was granted retirement. A short time later he applied to the Federal agency, at the same time inquiring through the U.S. Navy Finance Center as to his status under the Dual Compensation-Dual Employments Acts. He was told that he was generally precluded from taking a Government position; however, the determination was the responsibility of the employing agency.

On his form 57, his retired status was clearly stated and a short time later he was notified that his application was accepted. Approximately 3 years later it was discovered that this person's employment was precluded by the Dual Employment Act and he was notified that he must repay the 3 years' salary he had received for his services.

In reporting on this bill, the agency stated:

From these facts it is apparent that it was due to an error on the part of this agency that Mr. B was hired. It further appears that while Mr. B had some misgivings about the propriety of his appointment, these were dispelled by this agency's willingness to employ him knowing of his retired status.

It would seem a most inequitable result that the Government should profit from the services of Mr. B.

And still hold him liable for the compensation paid him for those services.

I am pleased to state that H.R. 7381 will eliminate these inequities and hardships and will, most likely, prevent them from ever happening in the first place.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I add my voice in support of H.R. 7381.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the remainder of this week, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), on account of illness.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the week of February 17, on account of official business with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. LIBONATI, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODLING), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA), for 5 minutes, on February 19; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CAMERON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WESTLAND.

Mrs. DWYER.

Mr. WHARTON in two instances.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. TAFT.

Mr. BEERMANN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATSUNAGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. O'NEILL.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7356. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund; and

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1713. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a supplemental report on ineffective program planning and uneconomical utilization of personnel assigned to the Air Force Reserve recovery program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1714. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 231); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

1715. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Chelan Division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 232); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1716. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition of working capital funds at June 30, 1963, and the results of their operation for the fiscal year then ended, pursuant to section 405(c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (10 U.S.C. 2208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1717. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on improper payments to military personnel for travel of dependents of members of the Department of the Army, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 53 and 31 U.S.C. 67; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1718. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the uneconomical replacement of vehicles by the U.S. 5th Air Force, Fuchu Air Station, Japan, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the

Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1719. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on deficiencies in the administration of Government quarters, messing facilities, and military leave at Dow Air Force Base, Maine, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1720. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal in accordance with the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434), and the act approved June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 377); to the Committee on House Administration.

1721. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Office of Coal Research relating to coal research activities undertaken during calendar year 1963, pursuant to Public Law 86-599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1722. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of Philip N. Shepherdson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1723. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to repeal the provisions of law codified in 5 U.S.C. 39, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 9903. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, and to implement more fully the national transportation policy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 10005. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in order to promote the development of phosphate on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 10006. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 10007. A bill to authorize national banks to make certain redevelopment loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 10008. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the redevelopment by private persons of property in the downtown business districts of our cities by allowing the cost of such redevelopment to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10009. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Small Business Administration to assist small-business concerns in obtaining leases of property in downtown business districts by providing insurance for such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 10010. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require that a judge of a U.S. district court shall be a resident of the district for which he is appointed at least 3 years immediately prior to the time of his appointment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10011. A bill to create a U.S. Botanical Survey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 10012. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, so as to extend the benefits of such act to persons captured or interned by, or in hiding from, the Japanese Government in China during World War II; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 10013. A bill to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 10014. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 10015. A bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 10016. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for certain former Members of Congress with 50 years of continuous active service in Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 926. Joint resolution to provide that information relating to the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy shall be made public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H. Res. 626. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study of moving the Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of the West Virginia House of Delegates requesting studies by appropriate Federal and State agencies of the current forest management practices which obtain in the Monongahela National Forest and a change in policy of that management; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the assembly of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make a full investigation to determine whether or not it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 10017. A bill for the relief of Athanasios Panagopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10018. A bill for the relief of Mario Barbati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 10019. A bill for the relief of Santino Pinto, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 10020. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dvora Eisenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 10021. A bill for the relief of Farida Hanna Hazbon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 10022. A bill for the relief of Ricardo G. Mangaccat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

706. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., requesting Congress to investigate certain radio-TV news releases relative to alleged limited circulation of remarks by the President concerning friendly nations trading with Communist Cuba, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1964)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

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

O Thou Father of our spirits, who hearest prayer, and to whom all flesh shall come, breathe now upon our waiting hearts, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm.

Not only in moments of blessed quietness, with raucous sounds shut out, may we hear Thy summons, but also in the thunder of these tumultuous days of destiny may we be conscious that Thy voice to us is calling.

As from this historic Chamber the panorama of the Nation's life in all the yesterdays passes before our eyes and minds, may we here highly resolve that this white-domed Capitol edifice shall be not only an arsenal of material might, but also a cathedral of faith where are proclaimed to all the earth the sanctions of irresistible moral force and of spiritual verities upon which our freedoms

were reared, on which they rest, and without which our boasted democracy is but a bruised and broken reed.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 17, 1964, was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS—LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, being filled with charity and compassion, I shall not object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the working capital funds of that Department, dated June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PRICE DIFFERENTIAL IN SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND STATE OF MARYLAND

A letter from the Comptroller of the Treasury, for the State of Maryland, Annapolis, Md., relating to the price differential in the sale of alcoholic beverages in the District of Columbia as compared with sales in the State of Maryland (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON DEFICIENCIES IN ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN QUARTERS AND MILITARY LEAVE AT DOW AIR FORCE BASE, MAINE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on deficiencies in administration of Government quarters, messing facilities, and military leave at Dow Air Force Base, Maine, Department of the Air Force, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

UNCLASSIFIED LETTER OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an unclassified letter, which transmitted a secret report on ineffective program planning and uneconomical utilization of personnel assigned to the Air Force reserve recovery program (January 1964, B–146831), Department of the Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON UNECONOMICAL REPLACEMENT OF VEHICLES BY THE U.S. 5TH AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the uneconomical replacement of vehicles by the U.S. 5th Air Force, Fuchu Air Station, Japan, Department of the Air Force, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS TO MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR TRAVEL OF DEPENDENTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improper payments to military personnel for travel of dependents, Department of the Army, dated February 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CHELAN DIVISION, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Chelan Division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FINAL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the claims of certain Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT OF NATIONAL FUND FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION

A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of that fund, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by General Joseph Wheeler Post No. 62, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jersey City, N.J., favoring the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Mary Koehler, of Mobile, Ala., relating to the enactment of the civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution passed by the general assembly of the State of South Carolina requesting the President of the United States to take necessary action to protect the woolen industry of the United States from encroaching imports of foreign woolen products.

On behalf of my colleague the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD together with my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take such action as necessary to protect the woolen industry of this country

Whereas between 1947 and 1962 the wool textile industry in the United States has lost (1) over 100,000 jobs; (2) about 300 plants or establishments; (3) 21,836 broadlooms; (4) 2,169,000 spindles; (5) 1,042 combs; and (6) approximately 60 percent of the machinery used in the industry; and

Whereas it appears that the loss trend will continue unless appropriate action is taken by the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas these losses are adversely affecting communities on a nationwide basis; and

Whereas it has been previously determined by acts of Congress and opinions of those connected with defense mobilization that an adequate wool textile industry is essential to national security; and

Whereas the late President John F. Kennedy declared, on May 2, 1961, that "It [the textile industry] is of vital importance in peacetime and it has direct effect upon our total economy"; and

Whereas it is recommended by those with peculiar knowledge of the industry to the President of the United States that—

1. Wool product duties be reserved from the negotiating list scheduled to begin in May under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

2. The Government urgently and unremittingly pursue solution of the wool product import problem through international negotiations and accord; or, failing that;

3. The Government act unilaterally to restrain wool product imports to prevent market disruption and to restore and foster fair competition to avert the liquidation of an essential industry; and

Whereas the members of the General Assembly of South Carolina share in the concern for the future of the woolen industry and wish to convey this concern to the President of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to take such steps as is necessary to protect the woolen industry of this country and urgently recommend that the President act in the following more specific manner:

1. That wool product duties be reserved from the negotiating list scheduled to begin in May under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade;

2. That the Government urgently and unremittingly pursue solution of the wool product import problem through international negotiations and accord; or, failing that;

3. That the Government act unilaterally to restrain wool product imports to prevent market disruption and to restore and foster fair competition to avert the liquidation of an essential industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Member of the congressional districts from South Carolina, and to the Honorable Edwin Wilkinson, president, National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
[SEAL] *Clerk of the House.*

CIVIL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Republican Committee, favoring the enactment of House bill 7152, relating to civil rights.

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

RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPUBLICAN COMMITTEE

Whereas the Republican Party had its origin in contention for human rights and the dignity and worth of the individual; and

Whereas the 1960 civil rights platform of the District of Columbia Republican Committee declared that "We shall not compromise on these fundamental rights of American citizens as guaranteed by our Constitution"; and

Whereas the leadership of the two national political parties has agreed that action on the civil rights bill now under consideration before the Congress should receive nonpartisan support; and

Whereas Republicans in Congress historically have consistently outvoted the Democrats in proportion to their strength on civil rights issues since 1933, and Republican Congressman WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, in cooperation with other Republican Members of Congress, has produced Republican majorities on vital amendments to the 1964 civil rights legislation under consideration in Congress, we urge the Republican Party to help insure passage of said bill at an early time; and

Whereas such support will, as it should, remove the question of civil rights from the area of partisan political debate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Republican Committee does fully endorse and support the civil rights bill, H.R. 7152, now pending before the Congress, with any modification which shall give increased assurance of the recognition of the dignity of the human personality; and be it further

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Republican Committee does recommend and urge all Republican Members of the Congress to give their full endorsement and support of H.R. 7152; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Republican Members of the Congress.

FRED L. DIXON,
Secretary.

FEBRUARY 12, 1964.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION TO REVIEW CERTAIN DETERMINATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Association of County Officers of the State of New York approving the enactment of House bill 6202, granting appellate jurisdiction to review certain determinations.

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

RESOLUTION BY THE COUNTY OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Whereas it is a fundamental principle of our system of government that our courts should always have appellate jurisdiction to review the determination, ruling, and decisions of all public officials, departments, and commissions; and

Whereas this principle is founded upon precedent that no such public official, department, or commission should ever be permitted to assume dictatorial powers; and

Whereas such principle tends to prevent centralization of power in such a public official, department, or commission or in any unit of government whether local, State, or National; and

Whereas the determination of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare of the Federal Government is not reviewable by the courts: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Association of County Officers of the State of New York records its approval of bill H.R. 6202 which would grant appellate jurisdiction to our courts to review such determinations; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive director be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the New York State Senators and Congressmen and to the National Association of Counties.

Attest:

C. L. CHAMBERLAIN,
Executive Director.

Dated February 3, 1964.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic;

William Attwood, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Kenya;

James D. Bell, of New Hampshire, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malaysia;

Robert G. Barnes, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; and

G. McMurtrie Godley, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Congo.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2513. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl E. Halverson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2514. A bill for the relief of Key Suck Yang; and

S. 2515. A bill for the relief of David Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2516. A bill to permit the prepayment of FHA-insured mortgages without requiring the payment of an adjusted premium charge in certain cases involving nonprofit educational institutions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 2517. A bill for the relief of Vicenzo Pulitano; and

S. 2518. A bill for the relief of Phyllis Mayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2519. A bill for the relief of Zehra Ener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S.J. Res. 155. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

RESOLUTION

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF MOVING THE ROME AIR MATERIEL AREA FROM GRIFFISS AIR FORCE BASE, ROME, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. JAVITS) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 298) to authorize the Committee on Armed Services to conduct an investigation and study of moving the Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

JUSTICE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO, OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT, PRESENTS WELL-REASONED PLAN FOR PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the subject of Presidential inability and succession is one that has engaged the attention of the Congress and the Nation's citizens for a century or longer. Interest was always keenest, of course, when, because of some current break, or seeming break, in the continuity of Presidential power, doubts arose as to

the depositary of Presidential constitutional authority.

I recall to you the melancholy period when President James A. Garfield was, because of an assassin's bullet, incapacitated for 80 days prior to his death. No authoritative official or body could or would declare that he was unable to attend to the duties of the Chief Executive. As a consequence, we drifted without a responsible hand in the White House for nearly 3 months. The equally painful period is remembered when President Woodrow Wilson, suffering from a paralytic stroke, was unable to fully discharge the momentous duties of his office for 18 months. Thomas Marshall, his Vice President, was willing to assume the responsibilities of the Presidency but President Wilson would not relinquish his authority. He, in fact, dismissed his Secretary of State when that official, concerned for the affairs of the Nation, called a meeting of the Cabinet. So obdurate was President Wilson in this whole regretful situation that he had, it is contended, his physician publicly declare he would never certify to the disability of the President. Never must we be placed in such an equivocal light before the world.

I have today introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which, if adopted will, I confidently believe, prevent the repetition of the Garfield, Wilson, and other equally unfortunate situations. This amendment to our Constitution will solve the problem of presidential inability and succession and, at the same time, place the Office of Vice President in the setting of dignity and responsibility which it deserves.

In view of the many plans which have been submitted to Congress on this subject, I am naming this proposal the "Musmanno Plan." Its author is Justice Michael A. Musmanno, of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, a personal friend of mine for a quarter of a century, who has devoted many years of study to the subject. As late as February 1958, the noted jurist testified before Senator Kefauver's Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and as long ago as 1929 he wrote a book entitled "Proposed Constitutional Amendments."

Justice Musmanno's plan in essence is as follows: The House and Senate Judiciary Committees will constitute a permanent Commission on Prevention of Lapse of Executive Power. This committee will be subject to call at all times, whether Congress is in session or not, by the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The committee, when summoned, will decide by a two-thirds majority whether a President, in the event he is apparently disabled or unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office for any reason, is in fact so disabled or unable. You will note the use of the word "unable" here, in addition to "disable," the reason being that there can be a state of facts where the President, although physically able to perform his duties, may be inaccessible as, for instance, in the event of a plane misfortune which could land him in the ocean, in a jungle, or on a desert.

Having declared a Presidential disability or inability to serve, the Commission on Prevention of Lapse of Executive Power would decide later, also by a two-thirds majority, when the inability or disability will have ceased.

This plan, it appears to me, is reasonable, just, workable, and wholly democratic. It places in the hands of representatives of the people the serious business of transferring the highest national executive power to an individual other than the President. Many of the plans which have been suggested are fraught with fallacy, danger, and impracticality. For instance, I would not favor the plan which recommends that the Vice President himself declare when he should supersede the Presidency. No person in a representative democracy should be allowed, by his own determination, to displace a higher official.

Nor do I care for the plan which leaves it to the Cabinet to determine whether the President is able to perform his duties. The Cabinet, being composed of Presidential appointees, might have a difficult time making a decision wholly unrelated to their sense of intimacy with the President.

Other plans invest the Supreme Court or a commission headed by the Chief Justice with authority to decide questions on Presidential inability. It would be a mistake to have the Supreme Court determine this delicate question because if litigation should result, the Supreme Court would find itself in the awkward position of having to pass on its own actions or the action of the Chief Justice.

The Musmanno plan is simple, direct and, I repeat, wholly democratic, in resolving the problem of presidential inability which has worried lawmakers and students of government for many decades. This plan goes further and provides for the election of a Second Vice President when the Vice President shall have succeeded the President, permanently or only temporarily.

Under the Musmanno plan we would today have a Vice President. The procedure for the filling of that office, when it becomes vacant, is, like all the provisions in this plan, very simple. The national committee of the political party, of which the President is a member, would submit to Congress the names of three persons qualified for the Presidency; and Congress would elect one of these three persons as Vice President.

In order not to provide for a Second Vice President when the President will, obviously, be disabled for a very short period, the Musmanno plan provides that there shall be no second Vice President unless the vacancy is quite clearly not to endure for 6 months or more.

And now I come to perhaps the most unique feature of the Musmanno plan. Under this proposed constitutional amendment the Vice President would no longer be a member of the legislative department of the Government. He would become, as, of course, he essentially is, a member of the executive department and would be subject to the orders and direction of the President at all times, functioning, indeed, in the President's stead when the President desired to delegate certain presidential functions to him. This delegation of power could only be done in writing and would last only as long as the President wished it to last.

We concede that the President has too many burdens to carry. He, of course, shall always be the leader of the Nation in every field of government, security, and well-being of the American people, but he should be allowed to delegate to the Vice President, from time to time, ministerial tasks which rob him of time and do not necessarily require solomonic decision. As Justice Musmanno said when he testified before the Kefauver committee:

> As of the present moment the President could not even constitutionally delegate his power to sign important documents in the event some accident disabled his writing hand.

And then there are moments in the life of the Nation when momentous decisions must be made regardless of the accessibility of the President. To quote Justice Musmanno again:

> When President Eisenhower underwent surgery at the Walter Reed Hospital for ileitis, he was under anesthesia, according to a signed article in the Washington Post February 2, for 4 hours. It is frightening to contemplate that if during this period the United States had suffered an atomic or missile attack, there would have been no Commander in Chief to coordinate defense, counterattack, and civilian evacuation. He did ready United States defense forces for emergency before taking the anesthesia.

Under the Musmanno plan the President could delegate his powers for an hour, a minute, or for whatever period a crisis might call for. Again quoting the Justice:

> The President, before entering the hospital, for instance, for major surgery, would delegate his full powers to the Vice President for the period of the operation, and the whole country could be assured that in the event of an attack we would not find our great engine of defense immobilized because of the lack of an engineer to pull the levers.

Of course, this constitutional amendment which I have introduced will be fully considered by the committee to which it is referred and in due time Justice Musmanno will, I hope, be invited to testify. The committee will subsequently report on the plan and the Senate will have the fullest opportunity to consider and discuss it. I thought it might be well, in view of the tremendous interest throughout the Republic on the subject, that I give this outline of the proposed amendment for the benefit of the Senate and all those studying this vital and perplexing constitutional problem.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 155) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States on Presidential power and succession, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF ROME, N.Y., AIR MATERIEL AREA TRANSFER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the legislature of the State of New York has just passed a resolution calling on Congress to make a full investigation and review of the impact of the shifting of Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base to other facilities. The resolution clearly asks questions that have been in the minds of New Yorkers ever since this transfer of activities was announced. It calls on every Member of Congress from the State of New York to devote his efforts to achieving a full and fair study of the problems involved.

Mr. President, in pursuance of that objective, I submit, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a resolution to authorize a full study of the proposed transfer of this very active and expanding facility from Rome to other bases which are becoming obsolete and are facing a declining workload.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution of the New York State Assembly, concurred in by the New York State Senate, printed at this point in my remarks.

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

RESOLUTION 76

Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to investigate if it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.

Whereas ROAMA is now located at Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and

Whereas this is an integral part of our air defense; and

Whereas the worldwide situation is in such a state of turmoil that our defenses must be at full strength at all times; and

Whereas the withdrawal of ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y., would necessarily weaken our position; and

Whereas the moving of ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base would have a depressing economic effect on the entire area near Rome, N.Y.; and

Whereas sufficient reason or cause has not been made public of the feasibility of such plan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to make a full investigation to determine whether or not it is for the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move ROAMA from Griffiss Air Force Base at Rome, N.Y.; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Concurred in, without amendment, by order of the senate, February 11, 1964.

ALBERT J. ABRAMS,
Secretary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope it will be understood that what we are doing is, as lawyers say, "Putting the Government to its proof." We have deep convictions, after considerable investigation, that the path being trod is the wrong one. As the Senator has said, the proposal is to change the location of a vital, active, ground-based electronics communications installation. We do not say that the move should not be taken in an effort to keep alive something that ought not to be kept alive on the ground of national interest and security, but take this position because of our conviction that the decision is an incorrect one. Our duty is to put the Government to its proof, and to make our case as horoughly as we possibly can.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator for this comment; he is entirely accurate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 298) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of whether it is in the best defense and economic interest of the United States to move the Rome Air Materiel Area from Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the Senate is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or members.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the Senate is not in session shall be filed with the Secretary of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF LAWS RELATING TO HOUSING, URBAN RENEWAL, AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 423)

Mr. SMATHERS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2468) to help provide adequate dwelling accommodations for more families who have low or moderate incomes, who are elderly, or who are subjected to the special problems of displacement from their homes by Government action; to promote orderly community development and growth; and to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development, and William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and South Asia, Agency for International Development.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

SENATOR McGOVERN A SPONSOR OF ARMS CONTROL RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, several days ago a number of Senators joined me in introducing Senate Resolution 295 to express the support of the Senate for the current Geneva disarmament negotiations and to lend encouragement to the achievement of a verified comprehensive nuclear test ban, among other proposals recommended by President Johnson.

Unfortunately, through an oversight on my part, the name of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] was not included as one of the original sponsors of this resolution.

I regret this error, for Senator MCGOVERN, as former Director of the food-for-peace program and since coming to the Senate, has done outstanding work on the problems of disarmament, on economic conversion as the author of some pioneering legislation I was proud to cosponsor, and in the field of international affairs generally. In fact, the Senator gave me a great deal of help in drafting this arms control resolution, making valuable suggestions and lending his strong support to this effort.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MCGOVERN be added as a sponsor of Senate Resolution 295 and that his name appear on the resolution at its next printing.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and resolution:

Authorities of December 18, 1963, January 14, 1964, and January 27, 1964:

S. 2396. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and

to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office: Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WALTERS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Authority of February 10, 1964:

S. Res. 297. Resolution to amend rule VII to permit morning business statements or comments for 3 minutes: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CLARK, Mr. HART, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio.

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, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader;

S. 1488. An act for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace; and

S. 1518. An act for the relief of Mary G. Eastlake.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1605) to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, to provide for labeling of economic poisons with registration numbers, to eliminate registration under protest, and for otner purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mr. Moss, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. KORNEGAY, Mr. HULL, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, Mr. YOUNGER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6652. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 7751. An act to extend certain construction authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order to provide adequate veterans' hospital facilities in Los Angeles, Calif.;

H.R. 8230. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts;

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy; and

H.R. 9609. An act to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund; and

S. 2317. An act to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H.R. 6652. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell at prices which he determines to be reasonable direct loans made to veterans under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 8230. An act to amend section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts; and

H.R. 9609. An act to broaden the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7751. An act to extend certain construction authority to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in order to provide adequate veterans' hospital facilities in Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 9094. An act to authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of the Monocacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many years, I have urged that Congress adopt a code of ethics governing both its Members and employees—a code which might very well have averted the necessity of holding such an investigation as the one now being conducted by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

More than a year has passed since, along with my colleague [Mr. KEATING], I reintroduced in this Congress my proposal on this subject, Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, which would establish a Joint Committee on Ethics to develop and recommend a comprehensive code of ethics for Members and employees of Congress, and which sets out an interim code, pending the joint committee's recommendations. I believe the public interest demands action on this measure by the Rules Committee during its present deliberations.

In repeating my action of last March, I shall today abide by the disclosure provision of the interim code of ethics embodied in Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, as if it were law, and shall place in the RECORD a current statement of my financial holdings. I do this in order to practice what I preach. I did this last year; and, it now being roughly 1 year thereafter, I do so again, today.

Section 6(b)(7) of the resolution would require that Members or officers or employees of the Congress "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency" should make a matter of public record the nature of such interest by filing a statement with the Comptroller General.

Since the Comptroller General does not now have authority to receive and maintain such lists, I am now making a statement for the RECORD, to demonstrate my concern with the matter. As of this date, my holdings of the described nature are as follows:

As trustee of a family trust, I have an indirect interest in the following companies or their subsidiaries or affiliates, each in an amount exceeding $10,000. These are normal investments in publicly owned corporations, and constitute no element of control, alone or in combination with others: American & Foreign Securities Corp.; Cities Service Corp.; Criterion Insurance Co.; Government Employees Corp.; Government Employees Financial Corp.; Government Employees Insurance Co.; Government Employees Life Insurance Co.; Sinclair Oil & Gas Co.; South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.; Southern Co.; Transamerica Corp. of Delaware, and Radio Corp. of America.

I submit the foregoing, Mr. President, for the information of my constituents or the information of anyone else who may be interested. I repeat that this is a fundamental aspect of a code of ethics which I have long urged upon Congress; and I intend to file such a statement annually, in order to demonstrate that I practice what I preach.

A similar provision is contained in the code of ethics of the State of New York.

If Congress should decide to adopt any other standard in connection with a code of ethics, I would think that greatly to the credit of Congress, and I would cheerfuly comply, even though the one adopted might be somewhat different in form from the one with which I am complying at this time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let me suggest to the majority leader that I wish to make another statement for the record. If he will agree, I should like very much to have a quorum call at this time, in order to have an opportunity to obtain my papers. May I have a few minutes in that way?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CAN THE SENATE RULES BE MADE TO WORK TO PASS THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I read with the greatest interest the statements of the majority and minority leaders yesterday on the issue of civil rights, a subject concerning which, I state with deference, I have had something to do throughout my public life. I would like now to comment upon it.

The aura cast around the subject by the statements of the majority leader and the minority leader was most creditable, and certainly apposite to the historic and serious character of the great debate in which we are about to engage.

First, I should like to pay my respects and tributes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for the enlightening and patriotic spirit which dictated the very important pronouncement which each of them made.

I have been deeply involved in this issue, and undoubtedly will be throughout the debate, and would like to make a statement generally, also for the purpose of setting the stage for the civil rights debate.

The Senate is a very different institution from the House of Representatives. This is the only legislative body in the world in which a minority of Senators may, and often has, prevented, by means of a filibuster, the majority from coming to a vote, or has imposed its terms upon legislation by means of a filibuster or the threat of a filibuster.

The proposed civil rights legislation from the House of Representatives will need, not a majority vote, as called for by the Constitution, but a two-thirds vote, as compelled by the Senate self-made rule XXII. The question is now—and it is the question inherent in everything that was said yesterday—Can this archaic rule be made to work so that the civil rights bill can be passed as the people's representatives wish it to pass?

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 was passed by the Senate by a vote of 72 to 18, and the act of 1960 was passed by the Senate by a vote of 71 to 18. Nonetheless, somehow or other that legislation was not written by the 71 Senators who were in favor of the bill, but what was written in it was very heavily conditioned by what the minority—those who voted against it—thought it ought to contain.

Although cloture has never been invoked on a civil rights bill before and although rule XXII remains an unreasonable barrier to the consideration of such bills, I believe cloture can be invoked now because there is a broad consensus in favor of this bill unlike anything before experienced on a bill of this nature.

Never before has the whole Nation been so genuinely moved by the need for civil rights legislation as it has been moved by the tragic experiences which began with the Birmingham riots and the impressive, disciplined, and solemn march on Washington in August of last year.

For the first time, a broad range of Americans recognize not only the moral imperative involved in giving enforceable meaning to the constitutional guarantees of equal opportunities, but also the tragic alternative of a resort to the streets, with all its potential for violence because the Government has not reasonably interposed its justice through law to answer the Negroes' legitimate grievances.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is no guarantee that, even if the Senate passes the House version of the bill, or strengthens it—as I hope it will—there will be no demonstrations. But it is one thing to have demonstrations for which there is an answer, under a law in which we have tried to do justice, and it is quite another thing to have demonstrations in instances in which there is no answer, and the only thing we can do is to admit that there is no law, there is injustice, and nothing has been done by law to try to end the injustices. On the one basis there is a controlled situation; and on the other basis, there may very well be an uncontrolled situation.

It is recognition of this which accounts for much of the difference between the present time and other times when we have considered civil rights. It accounted for the overwhelming vote for the bill in the House, with both Republicans and northern Democrats joining to pass the bill by a vote of 290 to 130 and to defeat emasculating amendments by similarly large margins.

The question for those Senators who are for the House civil rights bill is one of our determination. There will certainly be, and properly, a period of reasonable debate, and in order to bring this debate within a reasonable compass of time and to make it clear to all that a complete elucidation of their views is practicable, there should be no hesitancy about extending the hours of debate, even into continuous sessions. Let us remember that it took 9 days of such sessions to afford what the opponents regarded as a needed exposition of their views on the 1957 bill. We cannot shrink from this should it prove necessary, and I hope that the leadership will not shrink from it and that those favoring the legislation will be here, as they were in 1957—led by Senator Green, a man in his nineties—to answer the quorum calls.

Mr. President, we have had a very practical demonstration of what the Senate can do if it wants to assert its will, in the consideration of the communications satellite bill in 1962. If the 70-percent vote in favor of the civil rights bill in the House were matched in the Senate, we could invoke cloture on a civil rights bill for the first time since rule XXII was adopted.

I join the majority and minority leaders in their determination that we must meet this issue and that history and duty will not permit us to "choose the course of evasion and denial," but the way to do this is to move in a practical and determined way. It is not to be precipitous but it also means that we proponents must be as determined as the opponents have proved themselves to be on so many occasions. In that way the issue will be joined and determined. I can assure the leadership that as far as I am concerned, there will be no lack of willingness to debate the details and the law in the most considered and respectful way, nor will there be any lack of determination to advocate and to join with my fellow Senators in order to see that the length of the sessions is commensurate with the issue, and that our determination on cloture, the enforcement of the rules, and every other aspect of the debate are fully equal to the determination which has been shown—and undoubtedly will be shown again—by the opponents of the proposed legislation.

RATES OF INTEREST CHARGED BY THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call attention to Senate bill S. 1926, introduced by myself, contemplating the adoption of a law which would require the Rural Electrification Administration to charge a rate of interest in making loans which would reflect the rate of interest that the Government must pay in borrowing the money to make the loans.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that at the American Farm Bureau Federation convention held in Chicago on December 12, 1963, among a number of resolutions proposed, there was offered a resolution dealing with rural electric cooperatives. The American Farm Bureau Federation has gone on record as asking for the approval of a policy that would require rural electric cooperatives to pay to the Government a rate of interest equal to what the Government must pay to borrow money to make the loan.

Mr. President, the Farm Bureau states as its 1964 policy on REA that:

1. We urge power companies to expand their facilities to meet the increasing demand of farm people at reasonable cost. We urge efforts on the part of the local electric cooperatives and other private power companies to reach agreements that will be in the best long-time interest of all concerned.

2. Where further expansion or improvement of power production is contemplated, serious consideration should be given to the possibility of seeking funds for the program on an investment basis from members of the cooperatives. If revisions in legislation or regulations are needed in order to permit such procedures, we will support the necessary changes.

3. Rural electric cooperatives have performed a valuable service for rural America, but many factors affecting their operations have changed materially since Congress authorized their establishment. Any further loans made by the Rural Electric Administration to established rural electric or telephone cooperatives or other borrowers should be made at not less than the cost of money to the Federal Government.

4. Rural electric cooperatives should not participate in financing the rural areas de-

velopment program. We recommend that they confine their activities to the purposes for which they were organized.

The American Farm Bureau Federation was the sponsor of the initial law establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. The father of REA now comes before the Congress, in effect, and states that it should no longer be operated on the basis on which it was started. When the rural electric co-ops borrow money from the Government, they pay an interest rate of 2 percent, while the Federal Government is required to pay 4 percent to borrow the money to lend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio may continue for 2 or 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized for 3 more minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In conclusion, I point out that the rural electrics, which are competing with private power companies, pay 3 cents out of every dollar of their income in taxes. The private power companies pay 22 cents out of every dollar in taxes. Thus, it is apparent that private companies pay in taxes seven times more than do the rural electric co-ops. In addition, the Government is subsidizing these activities, as I have already pointed out, by lending money at 2 percent, while the Government must pay 4 percent on the money it borrows.

I may be a bit obtuse in my understanding of justice, but I cannot bring myself to understand that it is morally or economically right or that it is fair treatment of the taxpayers of the United States.

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. How does the Senator reconcile his opposition to having the REA borrow money at 2 percent when the Congress and the administration have approved the lending of money to foreign countries at three-quarters of 1 percent, with a 10-year moratorium—a policy which I object to, but was unable to have modified?

Mr. LAUSCHE. To the Senator from Alaska I gladly state that in the Foreign Relations Committee I proposed an amendment that would, at the very beginning, require a charge of a rate of interest to foreign borrowers equal to what had to be paid in the United States for borrowing money to make the loans.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the Senator. That was the reform which I sought to achieve.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I could get through only a provision that would allow a charge of 2 percent beginning after the 5th year after the making of the loan. Tragically, that effort was not successful. We are now making loans to foreign countries on a 40-year basis, with no amortization of the loan for 10 years, and finally, at the beginning of the 10th year, with a charge of 2 percent interest. I do not subscribe to that policy.

Mr. GRUENING. While the Senator from Ohio may not agree with me on the REA, I am glad that we find ourselves in agreement on the foreign policy aspects of this question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

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

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

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask how we can justify having the taxpayers of the United States lend money at 2 percent to going business operations when the Government has to pay 4 percent to borrow the money?

Mr. GRUENING. The REA has fully justified its existence. It has done so much to promote the welfare, economic, and social standards of the American people by extending electricity to remote areas which never before had it or would not have received it from the private utilities—the so-called investor-owned utilities—that I think the policy has been fully justified.

AVAILABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR PROUTY ON S. 1732

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Commerce on S. 1732, a bill to eliminate discrimination in public accommodations affecting interstate commerce, appeared a pink slip, which I shall read:

U.S. Senate, Committee on Commerce.

The committee is unable to supply copies of part 2 of Senate Report 872, containing the individual views of Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY. The Government Printing Office has a limited supply of part 2 which may be purchased for 60 cents. Check or money order in that amount should be sent to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Additional copies of part 1 of Senate Report 872 also may be obtained from the Government Printing Office at 25 cents per copy.

To my knowledge this is the first time that individual views have not been included with a committee report; but I wish to make it known that I have a number of copies of part 2, which contains my individual views, and they will be made available to anyone who desires them, without charge.

In addition to my individual views, part 2 contains articles from the Texas Law Review, the Notre Dame Lawyer, the Cornell Law Quarterly, the Stanford Law Review, and the California Law Review, together with various appendices.

I believe my individual views, together with the information contained in the report, will be most helpful to anyone interested in the civil rights proposals.

Again, I say, these reports are in part II of the committee report, and will be available without charge if anyone desires them.

PROCEDURE FOR THE PROMPT SETTLEMENT, IN A DEMOCRATIC MANNER, OF THE POLITICAL STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5945, establishing a United States-Puerto Rico, Commission on the status of Puerto Rico, as amended, by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 5945, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 5945) entitled "An Act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico", with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act."

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, to aforementioned bill, with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this Act, without reimbursement."

and in section 3, subsection (a) strike out "$50" and insert in lieu thereof "$75".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, to aforementioned bill, with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: "not earlier than the later of the two following dates:

"(i) one year from the date of the meeting called for organizing the Commission as provided in section 2(d) of this Act;

"(ii) one year from the date on which the additional six members for which provision is made in section 2(c) of this Act are appointed, if such appointment occurs within six months after the effective date of this Act, and not later, in any event, than".

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendment of the Senate to the title, to aforementioned bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. There is, of course, great interest in anything concerning Puerto Rico in the city of New York; and I should like to ask the Senator if he would explain what is being done and why.

Mr. JACKSON. This would call for the establishment of a Commission to study all factors which may have a bearing on the present and future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. As the Senator from New York well knows, there has been much

debate and discussion on this subject for many years.

Puerto Rico has commonwealth status. There are those who imply that this is something distinct and unique. There are those who say that the compact between the United States and the Puerto Rican people can be changed only by their consent. The committee has gone into the question in detail, and we do not agree with that policy. We realize that Puerto Rico, as a commonwealth within the jurisdiction of the United States, presents unique problems that have not been present in the past in connection with other territories. Therefore, the purpose of the Commission is to update the thinking as to what the long-range future relationships should be between the United States of America and Puerto Rico.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to inquire exactly what the House amendments propose to do which we are asked to adopt?

Mr. JACKSON. The House amendments are not of any substantive nature. The first amendment that the House added would substitute the language in section 2(c) for that adopted by the Senate to provide that assistance or information to be furnished to the Commission by the heads of departments in Puerto Rico shall be rendered "unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this act."

I believe that is clear, that it is to make information available to the Commission.

The second amendment is in section 3(c) of the bill to provide that—

> The Commission is authorized and directed to call upon the head of any Federal department or agency to furnish information and assistance which the Commission deems necessary for the performance of its functions, and the heads of such departments and agencies are authorized and directed to furnish such assistance and information, unless prohibited under any law effective on the date of enactment of this act, without reimbursement.

I believe that provision is clear. It is to facilitate the work of the Commission in making information available from Federal agencies.

The third amendment would amend section 3 by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75."

This relates to the per diem rate.

The fourth one in section 4 proposes that the date for the submission of the Commission's report shall be not earlier than the latter of the two following dates:

> (i) One year from the date of the meeting called for organizing the Commission as provided in section 2(d) of this Act;
>
> (ii) One year from the date on which the additional six members for which provision is made in section 2(c) of this Act are appointed, if such appointment occurs within six months after the effective date of this Act,

All of this means that they are not to report back prior to the elections.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. This Commission, I gather, is a recommendatory body; it is not a body which can bring about any change in the organic relationship; it is merely advisory.

Mr. JACKSON. It is completely advisory, and would be informational to the House and Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committees, which have jurisdiction.

Mr. JAVITS. Do the provisions of the bill provide a procedure by which the recommendations of the Commission might then be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico, or does it leave it to the Legislature of Puerto Rico and the Congress of the United States to decide what shall ensue based upon the recommendations?

Mr. JACKSON. The Commission renders its report to the President, the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico, and to the Congress, and then the Congress acts.

Mr. JAVITS. The Congress of the United States?

Mr. JACKSON. Or the Congress may not act. It is up to the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. As to what it will do with respect to this matter?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. There is no delegation of legislative authority to the Commission to change in any manner the relationship that now exists between the United States and Puerto Rico.

Mr. JAVITS. Nor is the bill a self-operative scheme; but unless stopped by the Congress, it would—or through congressional action, perhaps action by the people or the legislature, or both, of Puerto Rico—come to some final consummation?

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator knows that I am speaking most sympathetically, as I am sure the Senator understands. Puerto Rico has become an important demonstration of American policy in Latin America, especially in the Caribbean. Many of use who are neighbors of Puerto Ricans in the United States have a great interest in the problem. We have problems of migration from Puerto Rico to the United States, or back again. All of these questions are intimately involved in that framework. I was in the Chamber of the House of Representatives when it was shot up by a so-called Puerto Rican nationalist fringe group, of which the Senator is well aware; and that is the reason I ask this question: Is there nothing in the bill which will load the situation in favor of or against any of the three alternatives—commonwealth, statehood, or independence?

Mr. JACKSON. No. Let me point out that in the language on page 5 of the committee report there is this pertinent statement, under "Committee Comment":

> First, if Puerto Rico enacts legislation to provide for its six members of the Commission, it is expected that the members selected will include representatives of the principal parties and points of view on the island.

Mr. JAVITS. That is all parties, across the board?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct. It is the principal parties. There may be some minority parties that could not be included.

Mr. JAVITS. That includes the opposition to Governor Muñoz-Marín also?

Mr. JACKSON. It says "principal parties." It includes all the principal parties. That would include the Governor's opposition.

Mr. JAVITS. We wish to have that made clear.

Mr. JACKSON. I will repeat it. On page 5 of the committee report in this language:

> First, if Puerto Rico enacts legislation to provide for its six members of the Commission, it is expected that the members selected will include representatives of the principal parties and points of view on the island.

That would be statehood, commonwealth status, and independence. Those are the main areas.

Mr. JAVITS. As well as the opposition to the Governor?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; the statehood advocates are clearly on the opposition side.

Mr. JAVITS. I would not wish for a moment to indicate to the Senator from Washington that I do not have the utmost regard for the Governor. We wish to understand what the framework is.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand. The Senator has been helpful in making clear the purpose of the Commission.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Washington for his information.

Mr. JACKSON. The committee report also contains this statement:

> Second, the enactment of H.R. 5945 is not to be construed as committing Congress morally or legally to adopt all or any legislative recommendations the Commission may make.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe that is unequivocal.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Washington, as this is probably the final legislative act in this matter; and I am very grateful to him because he has helped to make clear the position of Congress in this delicate and important matter.

Mr. JACKSON. The senior Senator from New York has helped to clarify any lingering doubts that may have existed about the purpose of the Commission and what is expected of it.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE IMPACT OF AMBASSADOR BOWLES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 6 months ago Mr. Chester Bowles went back to India as the U.S. Ambassador there. I say went back for he served as our Ambassador there from 1951 to 1953. This time he succeeded our able Ambas-

sador, John Kenneth Galbraith, and further came in at a time of considerable disquiet in India. The Congress had turned down support of the Bokaro steel mill when India had counted on our help. The Indian Government was embarrassed to be forced by internal political pressure to pull out of an agreement with us to build a radio transmitter to counter Chinese propaganda. Our military aid to India was also subject to conflicting pressures in Indian politics. The most difficult situation of all however, was the lagging of the Indian plans for economic development.

Into all of these situations, Chester Bowles has moved with finesse. He has been particularly skillful in showing the Indian leaders how a use of private enterprise and foreign investment could help them solve many of their problems.

He has succeeded so well that Pravda, the Moscow daily newspaper, has been provoked to say that "Bowles stirs up trouble" in India. That is exactly what he has not done. He has been good for India and Indian-United States relations. If that is "trouble" for Pravda, they are privileged to make the most of it.

Mr. Bowles has again received a fine compliment, when the leading Communist newspaper attacks him for his effective work in India, which seeks to preserve democratic institutions and the democratic way of life.

The New York Times carried a story on the highly effective, quiet work of Bowles, and I ask unanimous consent to include it in the RECORD at this time, for the benefit of my colleagues.

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

THE IMPACT OF BOWLES—ON SECOND TOUR IN INDIA, ENVOY HAS FACED TOUGH PROBLEMS

(By Thomas F. Brady)

NEW DELHI, January 20.—Chester Bowles, who returned to New Delhi as U.S. Ambassador 6 months ago, recently won from Pravda a resounding comment.

The Soviet Communist Party newspaper's comment on January 6 was that "Bowles stirs up trouble." It was reacting to a series of lectures at the University of Delhi in which the Ambassador analyzed, among other questions, the important role private enterprise can play in a planned economy.

Pravda commented acidly that the "Indian monopoly press," which is as free as any press in Asia, had given extensive coverage to Mr. Bowles' commentary.

Actually, there is one thing Mr. Bowles has not done, and that is to stir up trouble.

When he stepped off the plane here last July 17, he stepped into some nasty problems. The U.S. Congress was turning thumbs down on aid to an important and much-publicized development project, an enormous steel mill at Bokaro. His predecessor, John Kenneth Galbraith, had strongly championed Bokaro as had President Kennedy. Mr. Bowles had to face Indian disappointment.

The new Ambassador also had the duty of burying quietly an agreement from which the Indian Government was forced by left-wing political pressure to withdraw. The agreement called for the United States to provide India with a long-range, high-power radio transmitter to combat Chinese Communist propaganda.

In addition, an almost hysterical Indian feeling of military dependency on the West that followed the Chinese invasion at the end of 1962 had begun to wear off. The Soviet had offered ground-to-air missiles in June in a move to restore some substance to Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's nonalinement policy.

Mr. Bowles had ahead of him politically vestigial joint air exercises, in which the Indian Air Force was to participate in November with units of the United States and British Air Forces. Indian military men were still happy about the project, but Indian politicians were beginning to wish the foreign planes could come to India completely unnoticed. The exercises passed without ill feeling.

Mr. Galbraith had been known here as a close adviser to President Kennedy. A rumor circulated that Mr. Bowles, for a time an Under Secretary of State, had been sent abroad because the Kennedy administration had no place for him at home.

Indeed, the fact that Mr. Bowles had already been Ambassador to India, from 1951 to 1953, and was known for his sympathetic understanding of the country, led some Indians to fear that his counsels might be discounted in Washington as those of a special pleader. Mr. Bowles knew all this and faced it with equanimity.

Then the Indians began to discover that Mr. Bowles was not without honor in Washington. The rear-guard battle he has fought to protect India against cuts in foreign aid has been deeply appreciated here.

An assessment of progress last fall midway through India's third 5-year plan for economic development showed desperate deficiencies in both industrial and agricultural expansion. Mr. Bowles began to explain that private enterprise and even foreign capital were not wholly pernicious—that with proper planning and governmental curbs they might provide vital leaven for the sagging economy.

At the same time he pointed out that the shrinking U.S. foreign aid program could be augmented to advantage by private investment from abroad if the Indians were capable of making their country safe for foreign capital without sacrificing their national interests.

The lesson carefully contrived by Mr. Bowles to avoid ideological offense to India's socialistic liberals started to take hold. The Communists have begun to find a disquieting trend toward "liberalism" in recent Indian economic thinking, and they blame Mr. Bowles.

Moderates at the governing Congress Party's national convention blocked a leftist demand for nationalization of the banks. To Pravda the "coincidence" was "interference in the internal affairs" of India.

The U.S. Ambassador is now faced with what may be the most crucial transition India has known since independence. The sudden illness of Prime Minister Nehru has underlined the question of political succession.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE IN CARACAS DESERVES RECOGNITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am most gratified to call the attention of my colleagues to an event of considerable significance which is taking place in Caracas, Venezuela, February 17–22. It is the First International Meeting of Development Financing Agencies sponsored by the Government of Venezuela and its Economic Development Corporation.

More than 150 of the world's leading figures in the field of development financing will exchange information, experience, and ideas on all aspects of economic development. Out of their discussions will hopefully come regular and permanent procedures for international coordination and cooperation in developmental areas.

All countries of Latin America are expected to be represented except Cuba. Delegates will also attend from the United States, Europe, Africa, and Asia.

The Government of Venezuela is particularly deserving of recognition for initiating this effort which could have far-reaching beneficial effect not only in Latin America, but in all underdeveloped countries of the world. It is an effort additionally deserving of commendation as representative of the spirit of the Alliance for Progress.

It is especially noteworthy that this meeting was planned and announced by the Venezuelan Development Corporation several months before the December election. In so doing that public corporation expressed a confidence which the elections confirmed that the terrorist acts of the Communists would have no effect on the continuity of Venezuela's democratic form of government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with this subject, published in the New York Times of today, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

VENEZUELA HOLDS PARLEY ON FUNDS—WORLD DEVELOPMENT MEETING STRESSES PRIVATE CAPITAL

(By M. J. Rossant)

CARACAS, VENEZUELA, February 17.—Greater reliance on the role of private capital in speeding the economic growth of developing nations emerged as the main theme today at the opening session of the first international conference of financial institutions involved in development.

More than a hundred delegates from all over the world, representing commercial banks, investment houses, internal lending agencies, national development banks, and development corporations, are attending the week-long conference here sponsored by the Venezuelan Development Corporation.

They are exploring the problems associated with economic development in open meetings as well as in examinations of specific development projects through the use of the case method originated by Harvard University School of Business Administration.

NEED FOR STIMULUS CITED

The need to stimulate a big increase in private investment was emphasized by both Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. representative on the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress, and George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York.

Romulo Betancourt, the outgoing president of Venezuela, also addressed the conference. He agreed that foreign private investment was an essential ingredient in accelerating economic growth and invited foreign investors to step up their activities in Venezuela.

President Betancourt said that there was no conflict between government planning as practiced in a democracy and a favorable climate for private investment. Planning, he said, is not "the devil," but a practical way of getting the best allocation of resources.

The stress on private investment at the conference appears to reflect some dissatisfaction with the rate of progress achieved in the developing area under prevailing arrangements, which have been largely government to government. But there was no open criticism of the Alliance for Progress and other development programs.

BETTER MIX URGED

Instead most of the discussion concentrated on attaining a better mix of government and private investment. Mr. Moore and Mr. Moscoso agreed that increasing the amount of capital made available by private sources did not depend solely on a better attitude toward private investment on the part of governments in developing countries. They also said that business interests must cooperate in promoting development.

While there was a surprising degree of agreement on the need for increased investment by the private sector, there were some differences in detail.

Mr. Moscoso, who called for the creation of a "partnership relation" between government and private enterprise, placed particular emphasis on attracting foreign investment. He pointed out that "it is neither politically realistic nor socially just" to depend on domestic sources for development. He added that foreign funds were "generally indispensable" for growth.

In contrast, Mr. Moore gave top priority to policies that stimulate "domestic private capital in its own country of origin." He argued that measures designed to attract domestic capital that has fled to foreign markets will eventually serve to attract foreign funds.

CYPRUS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, now that virtual civil war has erupted between Greek and Turkish citizens of Cyprus, English officials are urgently asking us to intervene to keep the peace in their former colony. Very definitely this is not the responsibility of the United States. Britain, Greece, and Turkey have treaty obligations to guarantee the security of Cyprus. These nations should work together to end existing frictions between the Greek majority and Turkish minority on the island. I definitely oppose armed intervention by our Marines or paratroopers in Cyprus. It would be outrageous were one American soldier to lose his life in this former English colony.

England has not fulfilled her military commitments in Western Europe. We have more than fulfilled ours. Furthermore, since 1947 our Government has spent $4 billion equipping the Turkish army and $3,500 million equipping the armed forces of Greece. This is to protect that part of the free world from Soviet aggression. It was certainly not to arm them to fight each other. It would be tragic were two NATO allies to fight because of rivalries in Cyprus, killing thousands of their soldiers with American weapons. The British should seek a peaceful settlement. If they fail, then that nation should face its responsibility to end the civil war there. Our Nation has no mandate from the Almighty to police the entire world.

FREEDOM FOR LITHUANIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the some 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent have two countries—the United States and their native European homeland. The contrast between the freedom which they enjoy here and the tyranny which oppresses Lithuania heightens their sense of loss. The Lithuanians who remain under Soviet rule have only their memories of 20 years of independence and their national culture and traditions to nourish their continuing struggle for freedom against great odds.

We all share this sense of loss on the occasion of the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, commemorated on February 16. We welcome this opportunity to reaffirm our strong and enduring friendship with the Lithuanian people. The cause of freedom, which is of such immediate importance for Lithuanians, is no less vital to all Americans. We hold that the Lithuanian people are entitled to a government of their own choice, and we look forward to the day when they can again enjoy national independence. It is our firm intention to further the cause of freedom in Lithuania and in all Baltic nations by working ceaselessly to establish a peaceful world order based on the rule of law. This aim will be achieved when and only when the Soviet colonial empire melts under the warming monsoon of freedom—under the winds which have brought liberty and national restoration to countless other peoples since World War II but which until now have been contemptuously ignored by the Soviet imperialists.

WE MUST SEEK TO ELIMINATE POVERTY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, American working men and women have won for themselves the highest standard of living in the world and a fair share of their own production. They rear their families on the right side of the railway tracks and they walk with dignity and love of country.

If I were a workingman, instead of a lawyer and presently a Senator of the United States, I would belong to the union of my craft, and I would sit in the front row.

Today American workers are confronted with a problem as complex and huge as its name is simple and small. That problem is automation. It is both a blessing and a threat, a blessing because it holds forth the promise of an ever greater production of goods, greater leisure and better living for all our people; a threat for the stark fact that it eliminates thousands of jobs.

The new technology has already created a host of problems for workers, indeed for whole communities. In our major industries, giant machines responding to pushbutton control by a few men can now produce goods which a short time ago required the labor of hundreds of men. It will test our ability as a nation to assure that the technological revolution we are experiencing in industry will not bring undue hardship to those whose jobs will undergo change or, worse, will become obsolete.

The fantastic new machines of this second great industrial revolution have already permanently wiped out the jobs of thousands of American workers. The fact is that it threatens to eliminate additional hundreds of thousands of jobs while not creating enough new jobs to replace them.

It is clear that the great potential benefits of automation are being wasted. Instead of benefits, it has brought unemployment, idle plants and machines, and an alarming increase in the number of economically distressed areas.

That this is true can be seen by studying the character of unemployment figures during the postwar period when automation burst onto the American industrial scene. From the end of World War II until 1954, a rather steady rate of 3 percent of the labor force was unemployed. Following the 1954 recession the average unemployment rate was 4 percent, and since the recession of 1958, it has hovered around 5 percent.

Compounding the tragedy of a high, steady rate of unemployment is the fact that more than 2 million workers, most of whom want and need full-time work, are working only part time.

Assurances for the future offered by some business leaders are no substitute for thought and effort. They do not put bread on the table or money in the pockets of American working men and women. Officials of many companies have initiated programs to deal intelligently and fairly with workers whose livelihoods are lost due to automation. It is high time others followed their example.

As Americans, we must value human beings and human welfare above machines. We must assist workers and communities cut adrift by automation to adjust to the new technology and to share in its social and economic benefits.

Toward this end we in the Congress during the last 3 years have enacted into law the Manpower Retraining Act, the depressed areas bill, and the Area Redevelopment Act and have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars to implement them. There is still much to be done. Government, labor, and business must work together to protect workers and their families against the hazards of industrial change.

Full employment and maximum use of our Nation's industrial capacity must be the major goals of domestic economic policy if we are to cope with the swift and awesome challenges of this decade. We must make full employment and full prosperity more than a slogan and a national goal. We must make it a reality. Involuntary unemployment is a great moral wrong.

We must urge business leaders to make every possible effort to plan jointly with representatives of their employees for the sweeping changes of the age of automation. Federal, State, and local governments must aid in this effort whenever possible. Responsible labor leaders have sought, unsuccessfully, for the most part, joint planning with industry to make certain that automation develops as the blessing it can and should be rather than the threat it has become.

Moreover, we who have been entrusted with leadership in this age of change and

challenge, must make certain that our economy grows at a rate which will generate new jobs for an ever-growing labor force. The ultimate test of our economic system is its ability to provide employment for our people. When there are millions out of work who want to work, our economy fails this crucial test.

Mr. President, the solutions to the complex problem of automation will be more difficult to find the longer we defer seeking them. I know that President Johnson and his administration consider the problem of automation one of the foremost facing the Nation. It is part of the overall problem of attacking and eliminating poverty in our country. Under the late, great President John F. Kennedy, I supported all legislation recommended by him to restore the health of the economy and to get our Nation moving forward. I shall support with equal vigor and determination the programs of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

During the last session of the Congress I voted, along with the majority of my colleagues, to eliminate over $1,600 million from our foreign assistance program. To accomplish this took a great deal of research, study, and effort on the part of many Senators. Surely we in the Congress should work as hard—in fact harder—for the unemployed men and women in our country as we do to help the underprivileged in almost every other country in the world. I propose we legislate to eliminate poverty. It is a pitiful situation that more than 1 of 20 worthy and industrious men and women, including youngsters recently leaving high schools and colleges, are unable to obtain work.

Mr. President, we must concentrate upon the sad situation that, in this land of plenty, at least 5 percent of our labor force is unemployed. Involuntary unemployment is a great moral wrong. We must enact legislation and we must appropriate funds to help provide employment for men and women, particularly for the young men of our country, who for various reasons are denied the opportunity to work and to have the kind of future that we want our youngsters to have in this country.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON, A SKILLED TECHNICIAN

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Bill Henry, a knowledgeable columnist of the Los Angeles Times, has written an excellent article entitled "Johnson Skilled as Technician." The article, published in the January 12 issue of the Los Angeles Times, relates some of the multiple talents and abilities of our President. I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 12, 1964]

JOHNSON SKILLED AS TECHNICIAN

(By Bill Henry)

WASHINGTON.—Lyndon Baines Johnson, if he never accomplishes anything else, has made a lot of people sit up and take notice. There has been a tendency among his own party's intellectuals to dismiss the tall Texan as "just a mechanic" who is possessed of a certain amount of skill in the technical side of politics. A good many Republicans who had greater respect for a technician's know-how than the intellectuals in the Democratic Party, still classified Mr. Johnson as "strictly run of the mill." The Johnson state of the Union speech of a few ways back has awakened a lot of skeptics to the realization that the new man in the White House has made fantastically good use of whatever political skills he possesses—and these appear to be considerable. In fact, looking back on the last half-a-dozen weeks, it is difficult to see how his performance could have been improved upon. Towards the end of last November, Mr. Johnson, despite his dashing about on Vice-Presidential chores, was almost a nonentity. He was completely overshadowed by the colorful personality of the then President. The spectacular circumstances of the assassination and the extraordinary nature of the obsequies tended to deify the late President and correspondingly shrink the image of his successor. Yet here in early January Mr. Johnson looms larger than life. His technical skill is smoothly assuming authority during the transition, the deft touch which he has shown in achieving acceptance by widely divergent groups, the bold manner in which he has seized the political initiative—these have combined to move him front-and-center where he is recognized now as a candidate who may be harder to beat next November than his predecessor would have been.

A MASTERFUL PERFORMANCE BY L.B.J.

All in all, this has been a remarkable performance. He has carefully clung to the popular image of his predecessor. He has espoused the Kennedy program, retained the Kennedy personnel. Having done so, he then boldly claimed to have improved on Mr. Kennedy's performance, presenting a somewhat smaller budget, predicting a smaller deficit. Finally he played his trump, declaring war on poverty and promising a bargain-counter Utopia—better life for all at smaller Government expense. His state of the Union message was a smashing political document. It had the effect of seizing the initiative and putting the skeptical opposition in the position of having to prove that what he proposes can't be done. That's hard to do in the few months that remain of the 1964 presidential campaign. It has been a rather triumphant exhibition of political skill and has inspired respect among his critics and perturbation among his opponents.

HOLDING THIS PACE WON'T BE EASY

The catch in all this—if there is one—lies in the fact that it was all accomplished during a political truce which found the opposition mute and disorganized while Mr. Johnson had the opportunity to demonstrate his skill unhampered. Certainly his stock is now at an alltime high. The danger, to him, is that it is so high that there is no way to go but down. Things can happen mighty fast in this modern world. It took almost no time at all for Mr. Kennedy's skyrocketing popularity which followed his inauguration to plummet earthward after the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Any student of government knows that awesome pitfalls await the Johnson legislative program on Capitol Hill. He rides tall in the saddle right now but it will be nothing less than miraculous if he can maintain this fantastic pace during the months that lie between this peak of performance and the moment in November when he must present his political promissory notes at the ballot box bank.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it appears that the Senate has completed morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, morning business is closed. The Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 275, the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution—Senate Resolution 275—providing additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds the Senate of the effectiveness of the rule of germaneness at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed to discuss a matter not having to do with the resolution, and that the rule of germaneness be waived temporarily.

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

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there was great rejoicing 46 years ago February 16 as the Lithuanians proclaimed independence after more than a century of Russian control. This freedom was enjoyed for 21 years, only to be crushed by Nazis and Communists in a ravaging pincer movement.

Once again this brave people was forced to wear the shackles of oppression. Hundreds of thousands were exiled to Siberia, where some still remain. Tens of thousands were executed. Under occupation Lithuania came to know collectivization, increased poverty, and religious persecution.

The institutions of freedom in Lithuania were destroyed, but the spirit of those institutions, conviction and hope could not be so easily extinguished. It is this flame that we of the free world dare not forget. To us it must serve as a reminder of the great courage with which the oppressed fight for survival. But that is not all. Our duty is to keep that flame of hope alive, to let the people of Lithuania know that we have not forgotten their fight for freedom, and to remind the free world that the Soviets, who call themselves champions of anticolonialism, have in fact imposed the most vicious brand of colonial rule known to modern man. Their aim has been to break the spirit of the men, women, and children they conquered. It is a testimonial to the Lithuanians and the peoples of other captive nations that the Communists have never completely succeeded in this mission.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in paying tribute to the brave people of Lithuania on the 46th anniversary of their independence. Lithuania's existence as an independent republic was shortlived, covering only 21 years between 1918 and 1940. These years were made very difficult and troubled because of the constant Soviet propaganda and subversive activity designed

to smother the nation's freedom. Shortly after the outbreak of World War II, Soviet forces overran the country and destroyed its freedom. Over the years the 3 million people of this unhappy state have kept alive the hope of liberty and independence in spite of harsh restrictions, deportations, suppression of religion, and other repressive measures. Their friends and relatives here are helping to keep alive this hope that in the not too distant future, Lithuania will once again become free and independent. I share in that hope and the historic need to gain for Lithuania freedom from Communist tyranny.

TIME TO PUT SOME MUSCLE INTO ECONOMIC SQUEEZE ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most disturbing aspects of our failure to come to grips with the problem of communism in Cuba has been the manner in which our allies have refused to join us in the program of economic pressure. Although the problem of trade with Communist nations is admittedly a thorny one, to which there are no easy answers, our Government has failed to put sufficient pressure on our free world friends to insure that they keep up the economic squeeze on Mr. Castro.

Recent developments involving Britain and France have highlighted the deterioration of our Cuban policy and the rise of business-as-usual sentiment in Western Europe. Unless something is done, and done promptly, to reverse this trend, we might as well scrap our program to put the economic screws to Castroism.

A perceptive editorial published in the Rochester Times-Union of February 10 outlines the manner in which our friends have sabotaged the Cuban quarantine. It should be must reading for all Members of this body and of the executive branch who are concerned about the threat posed by this Communist beachhead so close to our shores. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Rochester Times-Union, Feb. 10, 1964]

U.S. ALLIES BETRAY STRUGGLE AGAINST CASTRO

For years, Europe's Communist-line bleeding hearts have accused the United States of cozying up to dictators to enrich "capitalist imperialists."

Whatever the extent of this dollar diplomacy, and it isn't much, it is peanuts compared with the rescue of Fidel Castro's collapsing economy by greedy English and French industrialists.

First, Britain approved the sale of $10½ million worth of new buses to Cuba, where public transportation had almost halted. Now France has authorized a $10 million truck and tractor deal. Others are pending. And Belgium and Spain want their share of the Cuba trade.

As a final back-of-the-hand to Washington, the goods will be sent in East German freighters to evade the U.S. blacklist of ships which trade with the Cuban enemy.

These "allied" governments cringed in fear of nuclear war when Americans talked of attacking Fidel and his Red band. So the U.S. tried economic isolation from the free world, throwing the full burden of sustaining Cuba on Russia and the Red bloc.

The policy never had much prospect of success, but at least it was causing increasing difficulty for Khrushchev and his Cuban buddy. As the economic squeeze tightened, there was always the chance that Cubans might save their country from ruin by getting rid of Castro themselves.

Now the quarantine, such as it was, is shattered. That leaves the U.S. with the bitter alternatives of (1) living indefinitely with this Communist cancer, (2) imposing a full blockade or (3) invading Cuba to throw the Red bums out. All involve grave risks to world peace.

It seems not to matter to our European "friends" that Castro is a bloody, brutal tyrant who hasn't even bothered to stage the usual Communist referendum, let alone hold a free election. They seem undisturbed over the efforts of Castro's agents to stir up trouble from Panama to Chile, from Caracas to Rio de Janeiro.

So the United States must act on its own—if it has the will—against Castro's threats, ranging from the annoyance of cutting off Guantanamo's water supply to the far graver matter of providing a sheltered Western Hemisphere base for Communist conquest.

But it is tragic that nations which say they share America's devotion to freedom have forced the United States to consider such a harsh and difficult change of course.

CONTRIBUTION OF THE NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during the recent rioting and crisis activities in the Panama Canal Zone, one volunteer agency that continued to perform in a calm and praiseworthy manner was the National Jewish Welfare Board's Armed Forces Service Center in Balboa. From the moment the rioting commenced, the center remained open day and night to individuals and families who sought refuge there. The center's director, Rabbi Nathan Witkin, cooperated successfully with the police in finding ways and means for many American and Panamanian families to return safely to their homes.

Mr. President, this prompt and quiet reaction to the need of servicemen and others requiring assistance in unusual circumstances is typical of the fine work done at home and abroad by the National Jewish Welfare Board. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a detailed account of Rabbi Witkin's efforts during the Panama crisis.

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

JWB CANAL ZONE CENTER IS FOCUS OF WELFARE WORK IN PANAMA CRISIS

BALBOA, C.Z.—The National Jewish Welfare Board's JWB Armed Forces Service Center in Balboa served as a focal point for welfare activities during the recent crisis in the Canal Zone. According to word received by JWB from the center's director, Rabbi Nathan Witkin, who also serves as USO area director in the Canal Zone, at the moment that the rioting began, the center was host to a large group of American military personnel and their wives, civilians, Panamanian citizens and U.S. residents of the Republic of Panama who were attending a lecture.

As the lecture ended, word came to the center that the borders were closed, and no one could return to Panama because of violence on Fourth of July Avenue, the street which forms the border between the Canal Zone and the Republic. As a result, the center remained open all night and many families slept there. Rabbi Witkin was successful in working with police to find routes home for other Panamanian families before blockades were set up.

The center serves American military and civilian personnel in the area and has become a favored locale for communal activities involving citizens of the Republic as well as U.S. families. It was pictured on a recent postage stamp issued by the Republic saluting religious freedom. The center conducts a full-scale religious, cultural and recreational program, and as its sponsor JWB is the only mainland national Jewish organization operating in the Canal Zone.

During the first night of the upheaval, a number of GI families who live in Panama had to leave their homes because of threatened violence and came, with police assistance, to the center. Rabbi Witkin and his aids got in touch with the refugees' husbands and in the morning helped them to transfer to reception centers set up by the military authorities. Since that time, personnel associated with the center have helped at these reception centers, where more than 3,000 dependents were taken after leaving the Republic. Tasks have included gathering clothing, toys and contributions, working with children and giving special assistance to adults.

Rabbi Witkin has been visiting wounded servicemen at hospitals in the Canal Zone and has distributed comfort articles and other supplies provided by JWB.

An amateur radio station at the center handled thousands of messages to the States. No mail was moving, and it was virtually impossible to place commercial telephone calls, so the station provided an important link between personnel in the Canal Zone and their people at home.

Despite tensions which have existed between Panama and the United States over the Canal Zone issue, the Republic of Panama has from time to time recognized the contributions made by the center. In 1962 Rabbi Witkin received the Order of Balboa, the highest decoration given by Panama, in honor of his 25 years of service. The citation accompanying the award paid tribute to his "social welfare activities which benefit both the Panama and Canal Zone civilian communities" and hailed him as a "silent ambassador who has been able to solidify the civilian and religious groups within his mission in the Caribbean area."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him dealing with President Johnson's leadership in foreign affairs, together with an editorial entitled "Johnson on Foreign Affairs," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 3, 1964.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CHURCH

All Americans are well aware of the ability, dedication and experience which Lyndon B. Johnson brought to the Presidency when he assumed that office under such tragic cir-

cumstances. It has been widely noted here and abroad that no other Vice President of the United States, succeeding a stricken President, has been nearly so well qualified, so well equipped to perform the duties of the most demanding office in the world.

President Johnson has clearly demonstrated in both foreign and domestic affairs that, 10 weeks after entering the White House, he is giving the Nation wise, aggressive, and imaginative leadership.

But today I wish to invite the attention of Senators particularly to President Johnson's leadership in foreign affairs. The Nation has been beset by crises all over the world in the last few weeks—in Cyprus, in Malaysia, in East Africa, in Panama, in Paris, and elsewhere. The problem of Vietnam continues to fester with increasing intensity. Already President Johnson has had bilateral meetings with the leaders of Germany, Britain, Italy, and Canada on a variety of subjects ranging from the future of world trade to the strengthening of the NATO Alliance. He has spent countless hours—at midnight and well into the early morning—with his own advisers: the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense and others charged with responsibility for the Nation's security. By virtue of the vast experience he acquired as the majority leader of this body and as a Vice President with unprecedented duties in the field of foreign affairs, Lyndon Johnson has been able to deal with global problems with firmness, assurance, and wisdom. Most importantly, perhaps, he has dealt with the day-to-day crises on the international scene without ignoring the long-range objectives of the American people.

A prominent metropolitan newspaper which does not always see eye to eye with Democratic administrations carried an editorial Monday saying some things that should be emphasized to all Americans. The Philadelphia Inquirer told its readers that President Johnson had offered "good advice" at his weekend news conference, particularly with regard to the South Vietnam situation. The Inquirer is particularly impressive in the historical perspective—the maturity and balance, the perseverance and firmness and long-term view—which the editorial reemphasizes the President brings to his leadership on international issues.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Feb. 3, 1964]

JOHNSON ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President Johnson, in opening his weekend news conference with extensive remarks on U.S. problems abroad, set the general tone of his approach to foreign policy matters. Later, in answering newsmen's questions, he expounded on some specific situations, notably in southeast Asia.

We believe the President made several points that deserve emphasis. He spoke of the need for the American people to view each international crisis in proper perspective, not as an isolated incident but as part of the whole panorama of history. He stressed the importance of keeping the main focus of U.S. foreign policy on the central goals of peace and freedom. He urged the Nation to avoid dealing with every international difficulty on an emergency basis and to strive, instead, for practical solutions that not only meet the immediacies but will stand up over the long term.

The President seems to be following his own good advice in southeast Asia, which is just one of numerous farflung trouble spots he mentioned in the course of the news conference. As Mr. Johnson sees it, neutralization of southeast Asia, an idea being advanced by Charles de Gaulle, offers no real hope for peace and freedom if the neutralizing is to be done under terms favorable to the Communists.

History, past and present, supports President Johnson's thesis. China was lost to the Communists in the late 1940's after Chiang Kai-shek was forcibly persuaded by the United States to give Red leaders positions of responsibility in the military establishment and the civil administration. This, in effect, is the same technique the Communists now like to employ under the high-sounding label of neutralization. This already is apparent in Laos. It would become clear in South Vietnam, also, if the neutralization formula were applied there.

In the light of what is known about Communist objectives of conquest, whether engineered in Moscow or Pieping, it would be incredibly naive to assume that the neutralization of southeast Asia under existing circumstances could achieve anything except pave the way for a complete Communist takeover.

President Johnson is on the right track when he opposes neutralization on terms favorable to Communists. It is a dangerous illusion—more akin to appeasement than to freedom, more likely to produce war rather than peace in the long run.

A matter to which the President needs to direct his attention is finding a satisfactory alternative to neutralization in southeast Asia, especially in South Vietnam. He favors—for the time being, at least—stepping up the military campaign against the Red guerrillas. We hope there is greater prospect for victory than has been evident thus far.

IT TAKES TWO TO MAKE A PARTNERSHIP WORK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the significance to our national interests of cooperation between Government and business cannot be overemphasized. There is no doubt that we need understanding and cooperation between business and Government to effectively insure employment opportunity and economic growth.

Last week one of the Nation's outstanding business leaders most effectively stated the need for a better relationship between business and Government and, what is even more important, urged business to take the initiative.

This address, entitled "It Takes Two To Make a Partnership Work," was delivered by Mr. Lammot du Pont Copeland, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. on February 10 before the New York Chamber of Commerce, New York City.

It is a noteworthy address, which I heartily recommend to my colleagues; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

IT TAKES TWO TO MAKE A PARTNERSHIP WORK

(By Lammot du Pont Copeland)

I was highly honored last fall when my old friend, George Champion, invited me to address one of your winter meetings. It isn't every day that someone from the provinces is offered a captive audience in the business and financial capital of the world. At the same time, I couldn't help wondering what I might say that could possibly be interesting or significant to such a sophisticated group.

It was a temptation to follow the tried-and-true formula which has become almost a tribal custom on occasions like this. Speaking to each other, especially in a year exactly divisible by four which brings a national election, we point with pride to the merits and accomplishments of the free enterprise system, and we view with alarm the threats to that system which always seem to center in the political capital of Washington, D.C.

A little contemplation convinced me that I could add nothing of significance to a theme that has been expounded with force and eloquence so many times by so many others. In fact, I am sure I couldn't improve upon a stern warning delivered as far back as March 2, 1930, by a distinguished citizen of your own State. This speaker dwelt upon the strict limitations of the Constitution on the powers of the Federal Government, and then he said, and I quote:

"On such a foundation have we erected the whole enormous fabric of Federal Government which now costs us $3.5 billion every year, and if we do not halt this steady process of building commissions and regulatory bodies and special legislation like huge inverted pyramids over every one of the simple constitutional provisions, we shall soon be spending many billions of dollars more."

You will doubtless conclude that this speaker had a great gift for prophecy, but this was only one of his talents, as the American people were soon to discover. He was then the Governor of New York, but 2 years later, Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to the first of four terms as President of the United States. Mr. Roosevelt was referring, of course, to the Republican administration then in power when he also said, in this 1930 speech:

"The doctrine of regulation and legislation by 'masterminds,' in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years. Were it possible to find 'masterminds' so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices, men almost godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand, such a government might be to the interest of the country, but there are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history."

It is not my purpose today to pass judgment on whether all the teachings of history have been reversed in the last several decades. I am quite sure you have your own opinions, and I have mine. It does seem to me that this speech to which I have referred—and what has happened since in our country under Democratic as well as Republican administrations—confirm the wisdom of a few words uttered back in the second century by a Roman philosopher, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, when he said: "Observe always that everything is the result of a change, and get used to thinking that there is nothing nature loves so well as to change existing forms and to make new ones."

In the chemical industry, we have been profitably aware of this trait for many years. We rely heavily upon nature's fondness for letting us change existing physical forms and make new ones for the continued health and growth of our business. Perhaps it should come as no surprise to us that nature has been equally active in other areas, including our economy and the role which government now plays in it.

It has become painfully obvious, to me at least, that we are no longer permitted to operate American business in the simon-pure atmosphere of the free enterprise system of Adam Smith. To put it bluntly, there may be reason to suspect that what we once

called creeping socialism in our economy has now learned to walk. At the very least, to employ a more polite phrase, we have a "mixed" economy, and scholars have some difficulty in determining just what it should be called.

An article in a recent issue of the highly literate magazine, Saturday Review, gave a number of definitions, but the author, Prof. R. Joseph Monsen, Jr., of the University of Washington, finally concluded:

"American capitalism is, in one way at least, a little like electricity: Nobody knows exactly what it is, but it works—and works well."

One thing is perfectly apparent. Whether we like it or not, the Federal Government is a partner in every business in the country. For most of us here today, it has been a majority partner, for let me point out that the Government has been taking 52 percent of the earnings of the Du Pont Co. before anything has been available for our 233,000 stockholders who have invested their savings in our enterprise, and who are, at least, its nominal owners.

There are some businesses which have silent partners, but I submit to you that the Government distinctly is not. Our partner looks over our shoulders every minute of the day with virtually as many eyes and ears as there are Federal agencies. We are required to consider the wishes of our partner in virtually every business decision made, for, if he isn't interested as the Internal Revenue Service, he is as the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, the Departments of Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and the Interior, and, of course, the Department of Justice, to name but a few.

Our partner would have considerable difficulty with his hundred-billion-dollar annual budgets if we didn't serve as his tax collector—not only from the business, but from our employees and, in many instances, our customers. We are compelled to file voluminous reports on almost everything under the sun for our partner's vast intelligence system—and the more we tell him, the more he wants to know. We share with our employees the cost of their social security benefits, but our partner makes the disbursements to grateful recipients. We have learned, through costly experience, that the laws our partner enforces are complex and frequently ambiguous, so we maintain extensive and expensive legal staffs to help us understand how we can compete under the Sherman Act—and, at the same time, avoid any injury to competitors under the Robinson-Patman Act.

This not-so-silent partner of ours is significant to business in a number of other ways, too. The Federal Government is the biggest spender, the biggest employer, the biggest property owner, the biggest tenant, the biggest insurer, the biggest lender, the biggest borrower, and the biggest customer in the free world.

Perhaps I could best sum up the stature which Government has reached in our economy with a story. A Delaware farmer heard his chickens squawking in the middle of the night. Grabbing his shotgun and flashlight, he rushed out to investigate. Braced immobile against the wall of the chickenhouse was the dim figure of an intruder.

"What are you doing here?" the farmer demanded. With far greater dignity than the occasion justified, the presumed chicken thief solemnly replied, "Everybody has to be somewhere—all the time."

In contrast to the intruder, the Federal Government is not somewhere, but everywhere—all the time.

You may believe, as I do, that, if we had less government, we would have more enterprise. We are confronted, however, with a condition and not a theory. If we are to retain any hope of solving the grave problems of this age, we must do everything possible under whatever system we have to maintain a strong, healthy, and expanding economy.

What I should like to suggest, in the few minutes of time remaining, is a conscious, determined effort on both sides to improve the relationship between business and Government.

In recent years, much has been said about the necessity for businessmen to get into politics. While I have also heard it said that businessmen, with notable exceptions, make poor politicians, we should certainly add our voices to the chorus which makes the political decisions in our society. However, it is just as important, in my opinion, for businessmen to take a far more active part in the day-by-day processes of government.

It is tempting to ask for a show of hands on how many of you have a personal acquaintance with your representatives in the State and National Legislatures, but this might be embarrassing. Or how long it has been since you sat down with one of them to discuss a problem or proposed legislation affecting your business? Or whether you have ever sought permission to express your views before a legislative committee? Or whether you have ever asked to be heard before an administrative agency?

Too often, I am afraid, we have delegated these responsibilities to our trade associations. The representatives of these organizations render a valuable service, but this is not enough. What interests government decisionmakers, and, I believe, impresses them, is firsthand information from you about your business, and specifically how it would be affected by their decisions.

A better relationship with government also would be furthered if businessmen paid more heed to the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We know from long experience that the way to prevent industrial accidents is to provide safe working conditions and safety training which is insistent as well as persistent. Why, then, do we wait until legislation is drafted before we ring the firebells and try to do something about it?

If we don't know who the policymakers are at the State or National level, we can find out. We should then be diligent to provide them with information, discuss with them our mutual problems, and give them our best judgment based on knowledge and experience as to how these problems can best be handled in the national interest.

Let me cite an example. One of our plant managers recognized, a few years ago, the emergence of a strong demand for State legislation on air and water pollution affecting a highly concentrated chemical manufacturing area. Instead of waiting for bills to be introduced, he and his associates from other plants in the area called in engineers and technicians and drafted an effective bill. It met the problem, but the legislation also was such, as he put it, that industry was able to "live with it." The bill was enacted into law with industry support.

If time permitted, I could cite many other instances from our own experience where determined efforts to bring about a better understanding in Government have been successful. The most notable was carried out by my predecessor, Crawford H. Greenewalt, when the Du Pont Co. sought tax legislation which would permit an orderly divestiture of its General Motors stock. It took hard work over many months in which he paced corridors, knocked on doors, and called personally to explain the facts to virtually every member of the House and Senate committees involved, to key people in interested Government agencies, and to leaders of both parties in the Congress. Then, and not until then, the bill was overwhelmingly approved by the House and Senate and was signed into law by the late President Kennedy.

I don't think we shall ever forget the lesson we learned at that time. In relationships with Government, it is not enough for businessmen to be convinced that what they advocate is fair and right. We must also win the understanding of the appropriate people in Government that it is fair and right. They will listen if we approach them with honesty and integrity, and I think you will find that, regardless of political affiliation or ideology, it is the exception who has a completely closed mind. The exceptions we must bear with, even as we wince under the unfairness of their attacks, content in the knowledge that they usually constitute the minority when the chips are down.

What I am really trying to say, I suppose, is that it would be in the national interest, as well as our own interest, to put an end to what, at times, has seemed like a cold war between Government and business.

We may not like our involuntary partnership, but, as President Johnson said recently, it is possible to disagree without being disagreeable. As businessmen, we need the understanding and cooperation of Government in our efforts to throw the economic machine into higher gear. At the risk of seeming immodest, I believe Government could make better use of the brains, the ideas, and the experience of American business management.

The better relationship which I have proposed will not be achieved by standing off at arm's length or at sword's point. Someone will have to take the initiative. There may be times when we will be rebuffed, and I am sure there will be many times when we are told that our interest is in conflict with the national interest. We should not be discouraged, for I am convinced there will be many other times when these efforts will be richly rewarded.

THE IOU's—NO. 6: METROPOLITAN LIFE AND TVA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one life insurance company has invested more than twice as much in the electric power industry than the Federal Government has invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I believe it is useful to make such a comparison so consumers have a better understanding of private and public investment in the power industry.

The investor-owned utilities attack the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration in their movie, "The Power Within," which I discussed on the Senate floor on January 8, 1964.

Federal investment in TVA, "the biggest power system in the entire country"—to quote from the script of "The Power Within"—is dwarfed by the investment in electric utilities by the world's largest life insurance company, Metropolitan Life.

At the end of the fiscal year 1962 TVA had a net worth of $1.8 billion, well over half a billion more than the $1.2 billion Treasury investment in the system, according to a report issued by TVA last year.

At the close of 1962, Metropolitan Life owned $2.4 billion in utility bonds and $101 million of preferred and common

stock, according to a report entitled "The Electric Utilities," which was published last year by Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS TRIGGERS TAX REFORM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the basic tenets of the Alliance for Progress program is the need for tax reform in many of the Latin American Republics as a condition for American economic assistance. In view of the tremendous partnership task of raising masses of people from poverty and despair to a better life, it is most encouraging to note that nearly all of the Latin countries are in the process of making these needed reforms. An article in the Journal of Commerce for February 3, 1964, points up the reform movement underway and what our own Internal Revenue Service is doing to give technical assistance in tax collection and tax administration. Mr. President, because of the interest in the Alliance for Progress and our need to shore up our hemispheric plans for understanding and development, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. HELP REQUESTED: LATIN AMERICAN NATIONS TRUDGE DOGGEDLY TOWARD TAX REFORM

(By Stanley Wilson)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—While political disturbances boil in the background like erupting sun spots, Latin America plods on haltingly toward the tax reform which can—someday—promote its stability—economic as well as political.

Progress is hard to measure among the 19 Alliance for Progress countries, whose American economic assistance is in theory, tied to reform action. But all save Haiti and Paraguay have made some strides since the Alliance began in 1961.

SOME PROGRESS SEEN

Those involved in the effort from the Washington end feel there has been improvement, by and large, even though it may not be conspicuous. "The training of 200 more auditors doesn't get into the news," was the way one observe phrased it.

Even the optimists, however, do not set a target for visible profit from tax reform, replenished Latin treasuries, diminished unrest, economic progress and the like—before 1965 or 1966.

This timetable could prove to be too slow if the alliance slips or founders, as recent events suggest it might.

With regard to structural tax law changes alone, neither 1963 nor 1964 are apt to be remembered as vintage years for improvements. Colombia had the only major structural advance in 1963," observes one official here. "The other countries were just conducting tidying up operations."

FIRST WAVE DIGESTED

Though circumstances differ very much from one Latin nation to the next, the widespread slowdown in significant structural reform stems in part from the fact that some Alliance countries are just now digesting the first wave of tax law changes effected during 1961–62.

More important, however, a change of emphasis has occurred.

There is a rapidly burgeoning sophistication about the collection of taxes among Latin tax officials in countries notorious for tax evasion.

Latin finance ministers are increasingly conscious of the big shortfall in collection of taxes presently due, which in some cases would be enough to balance the national budget even without changing the law.

Taking advantage of this official interest, now very keen in some countries, the Alliance has called upon the U.S. Internal Revenue Service for technical assistance in tax collection and other phases of tax administration.

Since July 1962, under a program headed by Harold Moss of the Internal Revenue Service, more than 50 IRS advisers have gone down to Latin America, most of them on 2-year tours of duty. Another 25 will be on their way by next June.

IRS teams are already in Colombia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Panama, Guatemala, and Nicaragua. Costa Rica and probably others will receive similar reinforcements this year.

Wherever they go, U.S. advisers not only assist in mapping out working tax programs but set up training programs to nurture sorely needed future generations of Latin American tax administrators and collectors.

DISORDERS COMPLEX

However, the inherited disorders in Latin American fiscal affairs are too complex to be cured simply by making tax administration more efficient.

Latin taxpayers for example, say they don't pay all their taxes because they distrust the competence and honesty of their governments.

To counter this widely held and sometimes justified opinion, the Alliance is sending advisers to counsel on spending objectives and also to introduce modern techniques of "performance budgeting"—i.e. expenditure control in terms of need and utilization rather than simple bookkeeping—into the administration of Latin public finance.

But if tax collection efforts were to achieve complete success under present laws, the result might be a social explosion, since many Latin tax structures are still today highly inequitable.

Latin Americans themselves add a caveat in the opposite direction. To go too quickly in the direction of equity, they point out, might be to siphon off too much private development capital, particularly in the poorer countries.

REFINEMENTS WASTE

A few Americans say that the additions of further refinements to the income tax laws of the area would be a waste. Latin tax systems, they feel, are already too complicated for populations with a high percentage of illiterates.

In the early stages of the Alliance, U.S. officials thought progress toward tax equity could be measured by the extent to which Latins reduced their high dependence on indirect taxes and put more weight on the use of the income tax mechanism.

Now it is being argued in some quarters here that a good sales tax is the best prop in the short run and a tax on land appears to be the most desirable single reform in the period immediately ahead. "With tax collections at 50 percent of potential yield, it makes no sense to soak more money out of those who do pay income tax."

Certain major tax blemishes are apparent in a large number of the Alliance countries, and will have to be corrected sooner or later (in some cases, partial corrections have already been made).

CLUTTER OF TAX LAWS

First is the overall clutter of Latin tax laws, which have accreted enough confusion and contradiction over the years to allow almost every taxpayer to find some avenue of legal avoidance. One of Colombia's brightest achievements has been the reworking of its disjointed heap of old tax laws into a unified code.

Second is the compartmentalization of tax revenues owing to the Latin habit of voting ad hoc special taxes to support autonomous government agencies—i.e., Brazil has a tax on electricity to fund a public body comparable to the U.S. Rural Electrification Administration.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in primitive societies when hunger and want were the rule, the position of the senior citizen was frequently a tenuous one. If the aged could not function in the hunt or produce in the village they often became unwelcome.

In some Eskimo societies the elderly were abandoned when they could no longer stalk the seal, tend the dogs or sew hides. They were left in the cold to freeze as the younger and more vigorous members of the tribe moved on in search of food.

In the United States today where affluence has reached unbelievable peaks this question can be asked: Are we abandoning our aged by failing to provide a comprehensive program of hospital and nursing home care during just that period when society should be most solicitous?

A recent editorial from the Newark Star Ledger answers this query with a resounding "Yes." I agree with the cogent reasoning of the editorial and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Feb. 12, 1964]

A HEALTHY APPROACH

Medicare suffered a severe relapse early in its legislative life.

It went into a steady decline and it has been convalescing for a number of months. The recovery has been slow until this week, when it took a sudden turn for the better. It was a dramatic recovery that some people had been forecasting for the past couple of weeks.

Adrenalin was pumped into the ailing bill by President Johnson with his appeal to Congress for a program of hospital and nursing home care for the aged. This care would be financed through social security.

"There is no need and no room for second-class health services," the President noted in a special health message to Congress.

The President's interest in the revival of controversial medical care for the aged was not unexpected. He made it one of his major points in his state of the Union address that he would push for enactment of this program, originally proposed by the Kennedy administration.

The medical care program being supported by Mr. Johnson is incorporated in the King-Anderson bill that is pending in Congress. Hearings on the legislation were completed 2 weeks ago by the House Ways and Means Committee but no action has been taken.

The financing of the medical care program was detailed by the President in his message. One-quarter of 1 percent would be added to social security contributions

paid by both employer and employee. Annual earnings subject to social security taxes would be increased from $4,800 to $5,200.

All persons over 65 would be eligible for medical care in hospitals and nursing homes. Those not covered by social security would be cared for with appropriations from general funds, giving them similar protection.

Since doctor bills would still have to be borne by the patient, it would remove one of the serious objections by medical groups that the free choice of physician would not be possible under federally financed proposals.

One of the ironies of the dramatic advances made by modern medicine is that it has significantly increased the life span of Americans. They are living longer but their illnesses are longer and prohibitively costly. The declining years of our elderly can and has become a medical nightmare because prolonged sickness can wipe out lifesavings.

For these people, as the President observed, "old age can become a dark corridor of fear."

The care of the aged is a social obligation, a historical obligation that goes back for centuries. It is a debt that society must assume fully and forthrightly. We are doing it now through our welfare assistance programs.

One-third of the aged forced to seek old-age assistance are compelled to do so because of ill health. One-third of the Federal welfare funds are going to older people for medical care.

The big factor missing in the present program is the absymal lack of dignity for elderly people who must seek public assistance because prolonged illness has wiped out their savings.

Under medicare, they would be entitled to this protection. It would not be charity, since they would have paid for it during their lifetime out of their earnings. It is a healthy approach in dealing with the growing problem of the elderly sick.

FOREIGN AID MONEY SPENT IN UNITED STATES REACHES ALL-TIME HIGH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an article published in the Journal of Commerce for February 6, 1964, clearly points out the facts concerning the amount of dollars spent in the United States for goods and services financed by our AID program. The article notes that "figures just released show that 84 percent of all commodities financed by our AID program during the first quarter of fiscal 1964—July through September 1963—were purchased from American suppliers." This percent marked an alltime high rate, six points above the 78-percent average for fiscal year 1963—ended June 30.

Another significant development is the fact that "while purchases in the United States rose, a continued drop was noted for procurement in the 19 developed countries—mainly Western Europe and Japan. Their share declined to 3 percent during the first quarter of fiscal 1964. The remaining 13 percent went to developing nations."

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

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

UNITED STATES SNARES LION'S SHARE OF AID-FINANCED TRADE

WASHINGTON, February 5.—The latest report from the Agency for International Development (AID) refutes more strongly than ever the often-heard complaint that funds provided developing nations bring little or no returns to U.S. business. The figures just released show that 84 percent of all commodities financed by our AID program during the first quarter of fiscal 1964 (July through September 1963) were purchased from American suppliers. This, the agency announced, marks an alltime high rate.

Out of a total of $310.2 million in AID expenditures during the July–September period, $259.4 million came back in the form of orders to U.S. firms. This 84 percent record return was 6 points above the 78-percent average for fiscal 1963 (ended June 30).

Iron and steel mill products headed the commodity list for a total of $52 million in sales. Eighty-two percent of this or $42 million went to U.S. suppliers.

OTHER COMMODITIES

Other commodities involving large expenditures during the quarter, with totals and the percentage purchased in the United States follows:

Chemicals and related products, $31 million, 93 percent; electrical apparatus, $30 million, 87 percent; industrial machinery, $26 million, 89 percent; petroleum and products, $23 million, 46 percent; motor vehicles, engines, and parts, $23 million, 97 percent; railroad transportation equipment, $13 million, 99 percent; construction, mining, and conveying equipment, $13 million, 98 percent; and nonferrous metals and products, $11 million, 89 percent.

The major share of the commodities was sold to countries in the Near East and south Asia ($181 million), and the U.S. share of this business was 93 percent. Latin America got $28 million, with 99 percent of it spent in this country. AID expenditures in Africa totaled $10 million (with 86 percent returning to American firms). In contrast, the agency financed only $4 million worth of commodities for Europe with 85 percent of them supplied by U.S. firms.

While purchases in the United States rose, a continued drop was noted for procurement in the 19 developed countries (mainly Western Europe and Japan). Their share declined to 3 percent during the first quarter of fiscal 1964. The remaining 13 percent went to developing nations.

A TRIBUTE TO TED SORENSEN

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, many words have been spoken and written in tribute to Theodore Sorensen, the Special Counsel to President Kennedy.

Mr. Sorensen will soon be leaving his post to take up the writing of a memorable book covering his years with the late President. No one, it seems to me, has offered a more fitting commentary on the role of Ted Sorensen than Mr. Max Freedman, the distinguished columnist.

Mr. Freedman's commentary entitled "A Tribute to a Kennedy Aid," appeared in last night's Evening Star, Monday, February 17, 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that this deserved tribute to a man marked for greatness be printed in the RECORD.

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

A TRIBUTE TO A KENNEDY AID—THEODORE SORENSON'S ROLE SEEN MORE THAN JUST THAT OF SPEECHWRITER

(By Max Freedman)

On Wednesday, a few days before his departure from Washington, Theodore C. Sorenson, the special counsel for President Kennedy, will be honored at a public ceremony sponsored by the present and former members of the Cabinet and by his closest associates in the Government. It is difficult to recall any other public servant who has received such a tribute, and impossible to think of anyone with an equal claim to public recognition.

It is a strange misconception of Mr. Sorensen's role to think of him primarily or essentially as Mr. Kennedy's most trusted speechwriter. He is the last man to minimize the power of eloquence as the champion of great causes. But he knows that the art of politics consists in turning ideas into achievements; and he towered into greatness as an architect of policy and a master of strategy. He was so valuable to Mr. Kennedy in the drafting of state papers precisely because he was so familiar with the ideals and hopes of the leader whom he delighted to serve.

This surely is the central point, the one which means the most to Mr. Sorensen. He saw in Mr. Kennedy the leader who embodied and fulfilled his own highest principles of government. It was never necessary for Mr. Sorensen to attribute to Mr. Kennedy any specious ideals of his own. His task was rather to draw out and express the ideals which glowed with quiet passion in Mr. Kennedy's mind and heart.

One tiny story will illustrate the almost unique gift which Mr. Sorensen and Mr. Kennedy both had in being able to laugh at themselves without ever laughing at their principles. Within a few days of its delivery, President Kennedy's inaugural address, with its soaring eloquence and majestic idealism, was universally recognized as a noble affirmation of the faith which has often glorified America in times of challenge. The overflowing praise rather embarrassed the President, and one day Mr. Sorensen drew gusts of laughter from Mr. Kennedy by bringing him a hilarious parody—never published to this day—of the inaugural address.

Now Mr. Sorensen would have put his hand in the fire to protect the principles of that speech, and Mr. Kennedy served those ideals with gay courage to the moment of his death. For both of them what mattered above everything else was the victory of principles, not the glory of words; and they shrank with wise reserve from turning the tributes to the speech into the exaltation of the speaker.

We are fortunate beyond the usual measure of men in knowing that before many months have passed we will be able to look at President Kennedy and the record of his administration through the eyes of Mr. Sorensen and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. Their two books will not be competitive, for they will approach their subject from different points of view, and will throw accumulated light on a gallant and unforgettable figure.

Mr. Schlesinger came to the White House with an established reputation as an historian, a biographer, and an interpreter and defender of democratic values. His years in the White House add another notable chapter to his record of public service. But with Mr. Sorensen it is rather different. He will not only be rearing a monument to Mr. Kennedy; he will also be going on a pilgrimage into his own past. He has it within his power to

write a book about President Kennedy that will be at once unique, invulnerable, and immortal, if it is no exaggeration to use Augustine Birrell's words in tribute to Gibbon.

Then, his task completed, Mr. Sorensen will be on his own. That may well be the beginning of a new career of great significance for the American people. Mr. Sorensen will not seek elected office for himself; but in the world of ideas and in the clash of debate his influence will often count decisively, and it will be an influence with which scrambling politicians will have to reckon. Countless people, especially young people with an adventurous faith in the destiny of America, look to Mr. Sorensen as a spokesman for their hopes. Not even the cruel changes of a democracy can dim our memory of his valiant services, not extinguish our conviction that in service to President Johnson and other Presidents he will many times place the whole country again under obligation to him.

THE REPERTORY THEATER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a new revival of an old American institution, the repertory theater, is now sweeping across the country at an accelerated pace. This is one of the important evidences of the cultural ferment that is developing increasingly from coast to coast. Sponsored by communities, by colleges and universities, by public-spirited citizens and by courageous experimental groups, this new phase of the American theater is reflecting a growing public interest. Philanthropic foundations have contributed in substantial measure toward making this cultural growth possible but there are very definite limitations to this kind of assistance. The bill which the Senate passed, S. 2379, contains the proposal for a U.S. National Arts Foundation, which I have sponsored since coming to the Senate and for many years before that. It is now pending in the other body. It can become a vital force in helping the development of this and other movements in the performing and visual arts. I deeply believe that a program of education to the need for this kind of legislation will stimulate public opinion to the need for Federal action in this field. We are in this respect far behind all the other leading developed nations in the world and have a model for action by us consistent with our traditions in the British and Canadian Arts Councils.

An important report on the rise of the new repertory theater has just been published. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report entitled "The Rise of Rep," which appeared with copious illustrations in Time magazine, February 14.

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

THE STAGE

THE RISE OF REP

Repertory theater, never much of an institution in the United States, has grown in recent years in every region of the country, and the movement is overdue. Rep companies are the tap source and 5-foot shelf of theater in other nations; they give actors unmatchable experience, they try new forms, and they keep the so-called classics dusted.

A Rembrandt can be seen and Melville can be read; but Marlowe or Molière are pale shadows in paperback. They must be performed on the stage to come alive, and the commercial theaters are not going to underwrite such performances. Only professional repertory companies, through constant revivals, can preserve the history of the drama in a meaningful form. Similarly, when the art of theater is to be advanced, only a company that is not hooped to commerce can try something new and almost certainly unpopular without fear of financial ruin. By and large, the American theater ignored the obvious need of rep groups until it could ignore them no longer.

OUT OF THE QUAGMIRE

The rise of repertory owes much to Broadway, in a negative sort of way. Broadway has got itself into such an economic quagmire that only its most negotiable shows last very long. Hence acting jobs are few and dispiriting, and actors with big names as well as small ones are more than willing to sign on with rep companies, in most cases abandoning New York. They want to act—in three or four different plays a week sometimes—and they want to know what they are going to be doing a month from now. They don't mind the lower pay; at least it is steady. One good reason that it is steady—beyond the well-demonstrated popularity of rep groups with local audiences—is that the Ford Foundation believes in repertory theater perhaps even more than actors do. In the last 4 years, Ford has given almost $7 million to various repertory groups.

Rep companies across the country are shown in the adjoining color portfolio. An index of how advanced the movement has now become is the fact that New York is catching up with it. Biggest event of the 1963–64 theatrical season was the debut last month of the Repertory Theater of Lincoln Center.

On paper, the group is an assembled dream. The permanent acting company consists of 26 actors working under 2½-year contracts, and includes such names as Jason Robards, Jr., David Wayne, Hal Holbrook, Ralph Meeker, Mildred Dunnock, Zohra Lampert, and Salome Jens. About half the actors are young newcomers who are being trained as they go, both in productions and in daily classes that have been going on for more than a year. The group's guiding lights are Robert Whitehead, who was one of Broadway's most successful producers ("Member of the Wedding"), and Director Elia Kazan ("A Streetcar Named Desire"). Its "executive consultant" is critic-director Harold Clurman ("Waiting for Lefty"). Its stage designer is Jo Mielziner, like the others one of the top men in his profession in the United States.

Established playwrights are giving their plays to Lincoln Center as well. Getting things off to a quite literally sensational start, the company's first production is Arthur Miller's controversial "After the Fall" and its third will be S. N. Behrman's "But For Whom Charlie." Behrman is 70. "I'm left over from another era," he says, "but I'm glad I didn't die." Behrman's "Charlie" is now in rehearsal, as is Eugene ONeill's "Marco Millions," which opens next week.

Most Broadway plays rehearse for 3 weeks. "After the Fall" had runthroughs last summer and started rehearsals 3 months before opening night. "It wasn't really a play we began with," said Robards. "It was more like a large encyclopedia containing all the thoughts Miller had." Miller showed up almost every day to tell Director Kazan just what he wanted, and he even roughed out a plasticine model of the play's thrusting set as a guide for Jo Mielziner. Thus the playwright has an unparalleled opportunity to shape his work as he envisioned it—and its confessional nature, its immediate excitement but its artistic failure, are Miller's own doing.

BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES

That sort of failure—having nothing to do with boxoffice receipts, which are quite good because of 46,500 presold subscriptions—is part of the repertory idea. "Success?" says Kazan. "I'm through with that crap game now. We feel we have an absolute right to errors. No one is on trial. No one is in danger." A play or an individual performer is free to feel his way, to grope toward the boundaries of talent, even to stumble beyond.

Most insular New Yorkers do not realize that their city is joining, not setting a trend. New York thinks it discovered Bertolt Brecht, for example; but San Francisco's Actor's Workshop had "Mother Courage" in its repertory for 7 years, long anticipating the Brecht vogue that later appeared off-Broadway. Sir John Gielgud is about to flash into Manhattan with a backstage modern Hamlet, but Sir Tyrone Guthrie was doing much the same a year ago in his new rep theater in Minneapolis, which is not to suggest that Guthrie invented modern-dress Hamlets, but merely that regional theater is now doing what New York does, and often some time ahead.

There are now, in fact, about as many first-rate professional rep companies as there are franchises in the American League. Among them:

The Seattle Center Playhouse, less than 3 months old, has three productions going in rotation "King Lear," "The Firebugs," "The Lady's Not for Burning," a fourth opening this week "Death of a Salesman," and Robert Ardrey's "Shadow of Heroes" in rehearsal for presentation April 1. "The plays running now are infinitely better than they were when they opened, and they continue to improve," says Director Stuart Vaughan. "That is the beauty of repertory." Operating in a theater built as part of the 1962 World's Fair, the company is heavily subscribed (10,000).

Milwaukee's Fred Miller Theater is battling odds and winning. The odds are Milwaukee itself, where the highest praise the drama critics know how to give is to compare the Miller's actors with the Green Bay Packers. But the Miller Theater is winning because of the extraordinary energy of its 29-year-old director, John Alexander McQuiggan. He has 10 players who do 8 shows in an October–April season. "The Hostage" is the current draw, with Pirandello's "Right You Are If You Think You Are" coming next. "No one can direct eight shows," he says. "We bring in one man for each show and he shoots his wad." In the summer, McQuiggan raises money. What about the Ford Foundation? "That foundation has all the money and has no idea what's happening in the theater," he says, biting off all five fingers and half of the Ford palm. "They gave $17,000 to some theater in San Francisco and nobody even knows where it is. I mean, they don't advertise or anything."

San Francisco's Actor's Workshop does advertise, but its 4,362 subscribers know where it is anyway. Of all U.S. rep companies (now that Greenwich Village's Living Theater is no longer living), this one has its head most completely immersed in cloud 8½. "We limit ourselves to what is not considered popular fare," says Director Jules Irving. "Our audience has to be patient with the kind of discoveries we make." Besides pioneering Brecht, the Workshop

was the first American theater to produce Harold Pinter, whose "Birthday Party" ran there for 3 years. It has a company of 13, frequently produces the works of unknowns. "We didn't spring full-blown like the Tyrone Guthrie Theater," says founder Irving, who comes from New York. "We're indigenous."

Minneapolis' Tyrone Guthrie Theater, established last year, did indeed spring full-blown—on a land grant plus $400,000 from a local foundation, a $337,000 Ford Foundation grant, and scattered donations that launched it in a $2,250,000 theater. That Guthrie was eager to go to Minneapolis indicates the value placed on regional repertory by men of the theater: he was once artistic director of the Old Vic; he helped found the Shakespeare Festival at Stratford, Ont., and his name is a draw both on Broadway and the West End. The Minneapolis group reflects Director Guthrie's special flamboyance. Trumpets blare and drums roll before each performance. Laertes was running about last year with a .38 in his hand. In this season's "Henry V," the tide at Agincourt may well be turned by a hand grenade.

Memphis' Front Street Theater started 6 years ago in the bottom of an empty swimming pool (stage in the deep end, orchestra seats in the shallow), and has been trying to get out from under ever since. Now, with a rented theater, its debt is diminishing, and Founder George Touliatos, 34, hopes to surface this summer, can turn to what his theater ought to produce—"an American theater instead of a New York theater, doing plays born out of the social roots of the community." Meanwhile, he has been sweetening his ledger with things like "The Boy Friend" and "The Tender Trap."

Oklahoma City's Mummers Theater was started 15 years ago by Mack Scism, 36, a graduate in chemical engineering from the University of Oklahoma, who decided that the life of the stage was more interesting than cracking oil. Housed in an old warehouse, the Mummers have set some sort of record by being solvent from the start, especially since they produce Edward Albee and Samuel Beckett as well as surer things like "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof," which closed a successful run last week. "A successful resident theater," says the Ford Foundation, "appears to be dependent upon a single driving, talented director or producer determined to have his own theater company and to have it in a particular place." Ford recently gave Scism $1,250,000 to build a new theater.

Houston's Alley Theater is the oldest rep group of national importance. It was founded in 1947 by Nina Vance, a girl from Yoakum, Tex., who had decided she wanted to be a director but found that New York could not care less. "You know the story about how if you're in college and can't get into a sorority, you can always start your own," she says. "That's what I did." Her company occupies a converted electric-fan factory and does seven mixed-bag productions a year ("Harvey," Molière's "Imaginary Invalid," Chekhov), was an amateur group for 7 years before going Equity in 1954. In 1960 the Ford Foundation began giving the Alley $2,000 a week to hire 10 professional actors and keep them there for at least three seasons. New York professionals rushed to the scene and stayed. The subscription roll has built to 4,500. And last year the Ford Foundation promised Nina Vance $2,100,000 to get out of the fan factory—provided that she could raise another $900,000 on her own. She did, and she is building two theaters: a 600-seater for the moneymakers and a 250-seater for art.

Dallas' theater center group is housed in a theater designed by Frank Lloyd Wright, which looks as if it had been chopped out of a Cunard liner. The theater center was opened in 1959. Its director is Paul Baker, once head of the widely acclaimed drama department at Baylor University. Among this season's productions are two new plays and such varied old ones as Robinson Jeffers' poetic drama "Medea" and Cole Porter's frolic "Can-Can."

Princeton University's McCarter Theater is one of only four professional rep groups that exist at U.S. colleges. Its 25-member company has a fall and a spring season (all Shakespeare this memorial spring), and is intended as a living library of theater: in 4 years at the university, an undergraduate can see performed examples of great drama from all periods.

The Guthrie Theater serves as a graduate study laboratory for the drama department of the University of Minnesota; a roving Equity group called the Association of Producing Artists is at the University of Michigan; and the theater group, founded by Producer John Houseman, is at UCLA.

Washington, D.C.'s Arena Stage, with 11,000 subscribers, has become "comfortably self-supporting," says Zelda Fichandler, who founded it in 1950 just after taking her master's degree in drama from George Washington University. First playing in an old movie theater and later in a brewery, the arena was understandably known for a time as the old vat. New Yorkers used to snicker at it, but no longer. On scattered grants, contributions, and box office success, the arena built itself a stunning, 773-seat theater 2 years ago, which is as impressive as its solid no-star company. It likes revivals such as John Hersey's "The Wall" (now playing) and John Whiting's "The Devils."

America has thus been made safe for citizens who live and breathe theater. The Lincoln Tunnel is no longer a rainspout leading from the hanging gardens to the desert. And the most curious footnote to all this is that Broadway shows are having difficulty finding understudies. On the mere rumor of such an opening, six candidates would once have appeared like genii. But now "Luther," for example, is playing without a substitute Luther because almost every serious young actor who can walk or crawl has gone off to a rep company.

POVERTY—U.S.A.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the President's call for a war on poverty has a great call on the imagination of the American people, and rightly so. It is intolerable that there should be millions of Americans leading substandard and hopeless lives in the midst of economic well-being unheard of in the annals of history.

That a war on poverty should be waged by our society is undeniable, but the strategy advanced so far by the administration is vague, lacks conceptual formulation, adequate funds, and organization. The problem yet remains to be defined. What causes these poor to remain in the lowest income brackets for indefinite periods? What is being done by State and local governments to meet this problem at the community level? How could existing Federal programs be modified to deal directly with rural poverty and poverty in our cities? What new programs could be devised to deal with the problem at the community level? These are just some of the questions that must be answered before an operation designed to affect the lives of 30 million Americans can really get off the ground.

The appointment of a coordinator at the Federal level to increase the effectiveness of existing Federal programs represents a good beginning. In my view, however, the most effective approach mentioned thus far has been the maximum use of community-action-type programs tailored to the varied needs of individual communities across the country. There are numerous such community-action-type programs already in operation in various cities, including New York City. The $13 million mobilization for youth which deals with the problems of the Lower East Side in New York City and the proposed $80 million HARYOU plan to erase blight in Harlem, are just two examples in this regard. New Haven's Community Progress, Inc., is another successful project which operates in Connecticut.

There must also be a great emphasis on cooperative efforts between foundations, private voluntary organizations, universities, and State and local governments to tackle the problems of individual communities through projects tailored to the needs of these communities.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Poverty—U.S.A.," from the February 17 issue of Newsweek.

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

POVERTY—U.S.A.: THE POOR AMIDST PROSPERITY

Lingering poverty in the shadow of unrivaled affluence is the painful paradox of American life today. In a single generation, the richest country on earth has banished the bleak specter of "The Grapes of Wrath" with the gilded fantasy of "The Beverly Hillbillies." But reality has hardly kept pace with the American dream.

Summoned now to Lyndon Johnson's "unconditional war on poverty," Americans can find the battlefield on all sides:

In a squalid Chicago slum, a Negro mother rages: "Why we got to go hungry and naked?" In forlorn Adair County, Okla., the State's poorest, a community leader wryly admits: "Welfare is our leading industry." In snow-crusted Portland, Maine, an arthritic old woman wearily fashions potholders to sell for 35 cents each and sighs: "Sickness takes the money so fast." In southern California's Imperial Valley, a leathery tomato harvester confides: "My highest thinking is not to lose hope. If I lose myself, I lose everybody." On a dreary Toledo street corner, a jobless youth unfit for the Army reports: "Christ, when I get a penny I squeeze it till the Lincoln jumps." And in Detroit, a wife struggling to support her unemployed husband and five children on $60 a week laments: "Next month? I just don't know. Next month is in the hands of the angels."

LIVING ON RELIEF

On any given day, 430,000 men, women, and children—more than the entire population of Louisville, Ky.—live on relief in New York City, thousands of them in such appalling, vermin-ridden tenements that many have resorted to a desperate new tactic: the rent strike. In all, close to 8 million Americans are receiving public aid—$400 million worth a month—and the number has been growing twice as fast as the population since 1955.

In the scarred hollows of Appalachia, there are hamlets so primitive that even an outhouse is an unknown luxury. In the South, half of all Negro farm families cling to survival on less than $1,200 a year. In the dust of Three Rocks, Calif., a huddle of shanties in Fresno County, children gambol who have never seen a kitchen sink. American In-

dians still languish on reservations where the death rate is three times that of the United States at large. At precisely 11 each morning, 1,500 ragged people, some of them women clutching bedraggled youngsters, shuffle to St. Anthony's dining room in San Francisco for a free hot meal, generally their only one of the day.

What, after all, is new about poverty? The Bible says, "ye have the poor always with you"—and so far, even in America, it has been dead right. But in the United States at mid-century, poverty carries a special poignancy, a special frustration. For the first time in history, a society has attained the technological resources to wipe out poverty; yet, ironically, that very technology is aggravating the plight of the poor.

OUT OF STEP

And for the first time, in the midst of an unprecedentedly prosperous majority, America has been experiencing the phenomenon of minority mass poverty. A century ago, the overwhelming majority of Americans would have been deemed poor by today's standards. By the same yardstick, one out of every two Americans lived in poverty during the boom year of 1929. During the depression, Franklin D. Roosevelt's ragtag "one-third of a nation" was more closely two-thirds. But to be poor in America today is to be out of step with the Nation, a stranger in paradise, a frequently faceless member of an alien culture.

"The poor people feel that no one cares," says Paul Jacobs, a onetime labor organizer who recently roved the country on a Ford Foundation grant, disguised as a near-penniless drifter to gather firsthand impressions of unemployment and deprivation. "It's another world—there's their world and ours. They eat meat, and potatoes, and gravy—whoever heard of fruit or a salad? They get no mail—who writes to poor people? They sleep late—what's the sense of getting up? If you sleep late you might save the cost of a meal."

Ever since John Kenneth Galbraith pinpointed the anomaly of depreviation amid plenty in "The Affluent Society" 6 years ago, fellow economists have been haggling over the meaning of "poverty" and the precise dimensions of the problem in the United States. Reading the data by their own subjective lights, they have produced estimates ranging f om an extravagant 90 million American poor—nearly half the population—to a hard-core minimum of 20 million living on the rind of bare subsistence. "The point," sociologist Michael Harrington says bluntly, "is that there are a hell of a lot of poor people in America today."

ONE-FIFTH

In its "war on poverty," under the generalship of Peace Corps Director Sargent Sh iver, the Johnson administration's count of the American poor is 35 million—nearly one-fifth of the Nation. It is an arbitrary figure, like any other, but virtually all experts agree that the figure is essentially realistic.

Who are the American poor and just how poor are they? "The people who are falling behind," says Galbraith, "fall into four classes. Those with poor education, those with physical or mental deficiency, those who live in the wrong geographical area, or those who have restricted job opportunities because of race. The most elementary fact about prosperity is that you have to have a job to participate in it."

The most elementary facts about American prosperity are staggering: After 35 straight months of expansion, the economy is generating a gross national product at the unprecedented rate of $600 billion a year, 67.2 million people are employed, median family income stands at $5,956 a year, up from $4,117 in 1947. But when the income pie is sliced, 80 percent of the population feasts on 95 percent of it.

THE OTHER AMERICA

The remaining sliver goes to the Nation's forgotten fifth—the citizens of what Harrington has christened (in the title of his 1962 study) "The Other America." Up-to-date figures show that more than 30 million Americans live in families with incomes of less than $3,000 a year; more than half of them subsist on less than $2,000—$38 a week. Five million people living alone earn under $1,500 a year.

Most poor families are white, live in cities, and are headed by a man or woman with no better than an eighth-grade education. When the figures are broken down, the characteristics that govern poverty U.S.A. make their mark.

City and country, nearly half—47 percent—of all poor families live in the South; indeed, a southerner's chances of being poor are twice those of Americans living elsewhere. Twenty-two percent of American poor families are Negroes or other nonwhites; a nonwhite family's chances of being poor are 2½ times greater than its white counterpart's. A quarter of all poor families are headed by women, a third by men or women over 65. Thirty percent have no breadwinners at all.

WHO ARE THE POOR?

In the United States there are 47 million families, 9.3 million earn less than $3,000 annually. Of these: 5 million live in cities; 4.3 million live in the South; 6 million have a family head with less than ninth grade education; 2 million are nonwhite; 2.3 million have a woman as family head; and 3.2 million have a family head 65 or older.

Unquestionably, unemployment is a major thread in the pattern of Poverty U.S.A. By the latest count, 4.6 million Americans, 5.6 percent of the work force, are unemployed. Yet like all other individual aspects of the problem, unemployment in the conventional sense is only one part of the story. "Before," Galbraith points out, "we had poverty of the employables. Now we have poverty of some employables and many who are technically unemployable."

Thus, the spectrum of poverty in the United States begins at one end with the nouveau poor—industrial workers, thrust on the slag heap by automation or relocation of plants, who are slowly slipping into want they thought they had escaped forever. In the middle are the millions of low-paid, low-skill migrants, farm laborers, and service workers who simply cannot live on their often sporadic wages. And at the extremity are those too old, too sick, or too incompetent to hold jobs even if they had the chance. In an era of breathtaking technology, those who are left behind find it increasingly hard to make headway. "I think you're treated according to your education," says a bitter Negro mother in Chicago. "If you're unlucky and don't get one, or if you pass up the chance to get one, you have to suffer. You pay for it for the balance of your life."

Scanty education, ramshackle housing, faltering health, gnawing frustration—these are the effects of poverty and, in a vicious, stubborn cycle, the causes of more poverty.

Yet no capsule analysis of the dimensions and roots of the problem can begin to suggest the fascinating ambiguities that make American poverty so distinctly American. In every poverty pocket in the Nation jingles the small change of the affluent society.

STEREO ON RELIEF

In Harlan County, Ky., for example, the heartland of depressed areas, 88 percent of the families have washing machines, 67 percent have TV sets, 42 percent have telephones, and 59 percent own cars. On New York's Lower East Side, a Puerto Rican family living on relief is paying for a stereo phonograph set. In Stilwell, Okla., an old man lives on in a tar paper shack, serene in the satisfaction that he has put every one of his children through college. A 1960 study found that 14 percent of families earning less than $3,000 annually had bought new cars that year; nearly half the families making between $2,000 and $3,000 a year own their own homes.

As a class, the American poor live better today than ever before. And as a nation, America has made significant strides in reducing the percentage of poor in the general population—though in a rapidly growing population, the actual number of poor has been increasing. By the standards of the President's poverty advisers, 32 percent of all American families were poor in 1947. Within a decade, the figure had been cut to 23 percent. But since 1957, the pace has slackened. How to speed it up? That, in essence, is the problem facing the men who are now mapping the strategy of the "war on poverty."

With characteristic politicial élan, Lyndon Johnson has turned the phrase "war on poverty" into an evocative election-year slogan and a full-throated legislative battle cry. "In a way," says one top Washington official, "it's too bad the poverty program struck such a responsive chord with the public. This is a problem that will take decades—not just years—to handle, and I'm afraid people have been led to expect results overnight."

No one familiar with the complexities of the poverty cycle and the scope of the Johnson administration's efforts suffers from such utopian delusions. Indeed, hard-nosed authorities in and out of Government are frankly skeptical that the LBJ war on poverty as presently conceived will do more than attack the symptoms of an age-old affliction.

Few question Mr. Johnson's earnest concern for the plight of the poor. "The President has a great feeling for this program," says a Kennedy administration holdover in the White House. "It's close to his own roots. Where Kennedy may have had only an intellectual appreciation of the need to eradicate poverty, Johnson had a 'gut' reaction to the basic idea."

J.F.K.'S ROLE

Actually, Mr. Johnson's predecessor must get a substantial share of credit for whatever success the new urgent concentration on poverty U.S.A. eventually produces: it was John F. Kennedy's initiative that set the stage for the present drive, and Kennedy-fostered legislative proposals form the heart of the Johnson poverty program.

More than a year ago, the late President asked Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, for a copy of Michael Harrington's newly published, nontechnical report on poverty, "The Other America," and for the more scholarly analyses by economists like Leon Keyserling and Robert Lampman, a University of Wisconsin specialist on low-income families. Last June, Heller sent a note to Lampman: "What lines of action might make up a practical Kennedy antipoverty program?"

Armed with Lampman's guidelines, Heller recommended that the war on poverty be declared, and just 3 days before his death last November, the President gave his chief economic aid the go-ahead to rough out the orders. On the hectic weekend after the assassination, Heller briefed Mr. Johnson on the sketchy planning already undertaken. The new President seized on the idea as a logical extension of the Kennedy philosophy and—since the antipoverty strategy had not yet jelled—a program he could legitimately carry to the voters as his own.

Now, down the hall from newly designated poverty chief Sargent Shriver's fifth-floor offices at the Peace Corps, an eager handful of key planners—Washington insiders have already dubbed them the "Poor

Corps"—are trying to translate good intentions into meaningful reality. The atmosphere is enthusiastic, excited, often more than a little confused—distinctly reminiscent of the early days of the Peace Corps itself.

THE TEAM

Actually, Shriver and his brain stormers—among them Defense Department's Adam Yarmolinsky and Pat Moynihan of Labor, reinforced by intellectuals like Sociologist Harrington—are engaged in only one theater of the poverty war: getting more out of existing programs and developing new ones.

Integral to the war on poverty but essentially distinct from the efforts of Shriver and his "poverty office" is the $11 billion-plus tax cut bill, which passed the Senate last week and is now in the hands of a House-Senate conference committee. As Mr. Johnson's advisers view the problem, no programs—no matter how ingenious—can make headway unless the sluggish economy is jogged and new jobs are created. The tax cut is counted on to do that, automatically winning part of the battle.

THE ARSENAL

A whole range of other programs—public works p ojects in Appalachia, housing and hospital construction, referral of draft-rejected youths to employment or health counselors, studies of the effects of automation and overtime pay—are part of the arsenal, yet not directly connected with the "Poor Corps."

Under the budget proposed by President Johnson, $500 million will be spent by the Shriver office in the next 12 to 18 months. Half of this will be earmarked for new programs, including "community action" projects of all sorts in poverty pockets around the country. The rest will be spent on poverty-related aspects of existing manpower retraining, health, and employment programs technically under supervision of Cabinet departments. The key word is "coordination."

In practice, such bureaucratic differentiations would disappear. A typical community project might well involve Federal funds from a number of old and new programs, augmented by State, local, and perhaps private money. The initiative would come from the community itself in some cases; in others, the impetus would come from Washington—especially in areas themselves slow to fight the war on poverty.

PILOT PROJECTS

An outstanding sample community-initiated project is the 3-year, $12 million youth salvage campaign in poverty-ridden Kanawha County, W. Va., announced last week by Attorney General Robert Kennedy, head of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency. Other pilot programs on the drawing boards involve putting college students from low-income families to work as tutors for potential high school dropouts, and work projects for chronically unemployed men and women coupled with special reading, trade, or adult education classes.

Shriver is conscious of the conflict between those who would stress the jobs and public-works approach, and those who want to concentrate the available funds at first in a fixed number—perhaps 50 or 75—of community projects. By no means has he made all of his key decisions, but it is clear that both approaches will get attention.

"The community approach offers a great deal," says Shriver. "As a matter of fact, it's a great deal like Peace Corps projects overseas. But let me tell you this: I'm not at all interested in running a handout program, or a leaf-raking program, or a 'something for nothing' program. I don't know what we're going to come up with, but when we do, it will be a practical program."

No one doubts that the tireless, pragmatic Peace Corps chief will get the most he can out of the money at his disposal. But even those sympathetic to the intentions of the war on poverty harbor grave reservations about its small budget and limited scope.

"The money figures that are being talked about are utterly unrealistic in view of the goals authorized," grumbles Harrington. "New York could absorb that much just on the problem of the Negro. One billion wouldn't cover any one point in the programs President Kennedy originated."

NOT EVEN A DENT?

A high administration official says: "This threatens to be just a Band-Aid program. God knows it's worth while. Any increased effort to alleviate the pains of poverty is worth while. But until we crank up a massive effort to improve education, cut out the slums, clean out the narcotics rackets, we won't really make a dent in poverty. And don't forget: birth control figures heavily in this. I don't think we are prepared to do what is necessary in this area."

"This war on poverty," gibes Economist Oscar Ornati, "is one in which no general is willing to take a chance."

Another critic, Economist Keyserling, feels the essential point is being missed. "I do not believe that we have a distribution of income in the United States which makes it possible either to reduce unemployment substantially or to reduce poverty substantially," he insists. "You can't get rid of poverty, you can't expedite economic growth, you can't reduce unemployment by regressive budgetary policy, a tight-money policy, a nonspending policy, and a regressive redistribution of the national income through the tax mechanism."

"Free market" advocate Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago—a Goldwater adviser on occasion—has a more radical solution: a "negative income tax." The poor should be uplifted in a twinkling, he suggests, simply by giving them cash subsidies financed by the billions now spent piecemeal by Federal, State, and local agencies on New Deal-style welfare and poverty programs.

Thought provoking as they are, the points raised by Keyserling and Friedman are essentially academic in the face of current political realities. Lyndon Johnson, driving for a balanced budget, is unlikely to resort to massive increases in Federal spending; nor is America's basic commitment to a wide range of social-welfare programs likely to be abandoned in favor of an outright dole to the impoverished.

Indeed, the real problem facing the Johnson administration is how to wring a meaningful array of conventional poverty bills from a reluctant Congress. There are already more than a few ominous portents. Last week, a House committee flatly refused to expand the popular, proven food stamp program. Expansion of another Kennedy-inspired measure, the Area Redevelopment Administration, faces harsh prospects also; it is now bottled up in the House. With a Senate civil rights filibuster certain, the "poverty package" may well become a hostage of the southern bloc.

A POVERTY BLOC?

By the time the President's special poverty message reaches Congress next week or the week after, the southern tactics should be clearer. Harrington, for one, is convinced that the war on poverty is doomed unless Mr. Johnson recruits a coalition of his own: "a new, liberal, antipoverty congressional consensus cutting across party and sectional lines."

Shriver's first order of business these days is to draft the President's poverty message. He has leafed through a whole range of ideas from various Government agencies, solicited the views of business leaders and labor unions, and bounced the results off such trusted friends as Yarmolinsky and Dick Goodwin of the Peace Corps. Last week, for example, he huddled with Economist John Kenneth Galbraith; Charles B. (Tex) Thornton of Litton Industries; C. Virgil Martin, president of Carson Pirie Scott & Co., Chicago department store; Mayor Arthur Naftalin of Minneapolis; Donald Petrie, chairman of the executive committee of Avis Rent-a-Car; Lane Kirkland of the AFL–CIO; Henry Heald, president of the Ford Foundation; Harrington; labor specialist Paul Jacobs; Under Secretary of Agriculture James L. Sundquist; Richard Holton, Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and TV star Richard Boone, serving as a consultant on the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

"I come into this with an open mind," Shriver says. "I've been learning, sifting, and consulting—in just the way I did when I was trying to organize the Peace Corps. I don't mind going slow at the start. I feel that the way a program gets started is important to its ultimate success. So we'll start carefully."

What will be the measure of success? Some administration figures say they would be more than satisfied if the rate of reduction in the U.S. percentage of poor families could be stepped up to 1 percent a year, the pattern that prevailed from 1947 to 1956. But it would be years before such a trend could be gaged with any accuracy.

As the program gets underway, Shriver is characteristically realistic about its prospects. "I don't want anybody to get the idea that with $500 million here in Washington we're going to cure the poverty problem in this country. Nobody thinks that," he says. "But we can do something."

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR ARAB REFUGEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, over the years the persistent efforts of UNRWA have led increasing numbers of Arab refugees along the road to resettlement. Its vocational training program has proved to be one of its most promising efforts and is undergoing rapid expansion. There are now about 10 training centers, most of them in Jordan, and they provide instruction in a number of trades for more than 4,000 refugees. Graduates of these vocational schools are needed to fill existing job vacancies in the Arab countries and despite obstacles these skilled workers readily find gainful employment. The United States provides some of the funds needed for this program but UNRWA is making an effort to enlist support from individuals for this eminently worthy cause. This year the United States has pledged to contribute $24.7 million toward UNRWA's budget of $38 million.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the information about this effort which I have excerpted from a booklet issued by UNRWA entitled "Opportunity."

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

EXCERPTS FROM UNRWA'S OPPORTUNITY

Voluntary agencies and other groups, as well as private individuals who want to help, can best do so through UNRWA's vocational training scholarship program. The scholarship program, launched in 1961, aims to raise $1 million a year from outside sources in the form of $500 (£180) scholarships, each of which pays for 1 year's training for a young refugee, covering tuition, board and lodging, the use of the center's facilities, uniforms,

books and tools, and essential incidental expenses.

Now UNRWA is seeking to raise—and must raise—the sum of $2 million a year in order to keep the vocational training program operating. Some of this, it is hoped, will be donated in the form of technical assistance funds and some in the form of individual scholarships to pay for a year's training for young refugees. Each scholarship costs $500 (£180).

The agency's success in its expanded training program is evidenced by the fact that whereas in the 1959–60 academic year UNRWA operated 2 centers with a capacity of less than 600 trainees, it now has 10 centers of its own and provides training for more than 4,000 refugees.

For the past 2 years the U.S. Government has made a special contribution of $1,700,000 toward the agency's educational program, over and above its regular annual contribution of $23 million.

INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Gov. William L. Guy of North Dakota, made an important resource speech at the 45th annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association in New Orleans on February 3, 1964. Governor Guy presented a strong case for a continuing integrated developmental program for the Missouri River Basin. The Governor pointed out that the State of North Dakota has in the past made a number of sacrifices in the loss of land revenue for the development of flood control protection for States further south in the basin.

The Governor noted that today North Dakotans are seeking the support for Garrison diversion from those States who have previously been the recipients of flood control protection from reservoirs such as Garrison in North Dakota. As the Governor said:

North Dakota certainly is pleased that it has contributed full support to river navigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water, electric power generation, and to other States' irrigation. We simply say that we will stand with you in the future. We hope that you will stand with us in obtaining irrigation through reauthorization of the Garrison diversion unit.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor Guy's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY GOV. WILLIAM L. GUY, OF NORTH DAKOTA, 45TH ANNUAL MEETING, MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, NEW ORLEANS, LA., FEBRUARY 3, 1964

Water means the same thing to everyone. It is something which flows out of a faucet when you turn it on. It can be drunk in its natural state or it can be frozen to add palatability to other things that can be drunk. It can be mixed with dirt to form mud for overshoes, or it can be mixed with soap to take mud off of floors, overshoes or even faces. It has such fantastic properties that men have written hundreds of books about water through the centuries. But, to most of us it is still what drips out of a faucet with a loose gasket. Water seldom seems precious, and yet the last cupful of water on earth would be valued more than the earth itself.

Rivers, however, are vastly different from water. Rivers are to sit by—or to swim in. Rivers are for sailing up or down. Rivers are for getting across and then getting back again. Rivers are for dumping garbage in and composing songs about their beauty. Rivers are for fishing in or falling in. Rivers are for freezing, or for flooding, or for running dry. Rivers can be an economic blessing or they can be brutally negative in their economic impact. Rivers can provide transportation and they can obstruct transportation. Rivers can weld political subdivisions together in common goals, or they can be sharply divisive between cities or even States. Rivers can be used and developed as private property, or they can respond to treatment under public policy. Rivers can be and do pretty much what man makes of them.

We have not always had public policy as it pertains to water and rivers, but public policy in water resource development and conservation is playing a larger role each year. Some folks might say that public policy in water resource development started in 1803 when President Thomas Jefferson bought a vast drainage basin—the Louisiana Purchase. Certainly the most important event of Jefferson's administration was the purchase of the vast territory of Louisiana from Napoleon in 1803. President Jefferson called in two army captains by the names of Lewis and Clark, and ordered them to examine his recent purchase. The two intrepid explorers, I am sure, gulped a few times, saluted smartly and headed northwest by the most logical transportation of the times—the Missouri River.

The Missouri River Basin was a wilderness, but even at that time the value of the basin must have cast a shadow before. The flights of ducks and geese were a clue to the strategic location of the Missouri River as the great central flyway for waterfowl of the continent of North America. Some of you may be interested in knowing that in good years, the State of North Dakota produces about 80 percent of the domestically produced wild waterfowl—ducks and geese—in the United States.

The slap of Lewis' and Clark's canoe paddles sent grazing deer crashing through the willow and cottonwood thickets along the flood plain of the Missouri. These lush lowlands between the bluffs that stand up so beautifully along this valley proved that the river offered a natural sanctuary for wildlife running for hundreds of miles. The bare, grassy plains extended out on either side of the valley for as far as the eye could see. The width of the river and its majestic sweeping bends must have suggested that this river had a great potential for river navigation in the future. The silty, yellow water gouging new channels among constantly changing sand bars was an indication of the senseless brute power and the soil-wasting extravagance of this big river and all of its tributaries.

But the peaceful agricultural plots of the farming Mandan Indian tribes, where Bismarck and Mandan, N. Dak., thrive today, must have given a clue to the agricultural value of this whole flood plain if it were cleared of its brush and trees. To Lewis and Clark the Missouri River, even with its treacherous currents and eddies, must have seemed like a very real main street into the Great Northwest.

The Missouri River with its tributaries was one vast integrated drainage system. This was the significant thing about the river at that time—both the Mississippi and the Missouri. It was an integrated river system of main stem and tributaries. It was to be a vast integrated drainage system in the eyes of mother nature until the westward advance of the surveyor's rod could lay out the system of political subdivisions. These political subdivisions were the sections, the townships, the counties and, of course, even the States.

When this happened, the Big Muddy and its tributaries were still an integrated drainage system to mother nature, but it became a completely segmented water system to all of the political subdivisions that were newly formed by the surveyor's rod. To some, the water was a blessing—to others it was a destructive and treacherous foe. The destruction of floods downstream had to be controlled hundreds of miles upstream where there was little interest in the problem of flooding. Destruction of flooding downstream could be controlled only by upstream dams and the accompanying inundation of the reservoir bottom lands.

It is no wonder that the State of North Dakota, with one-half million acres inundated by main stem reservoirs, would find little enthusiasm for solving the flood problems of Iowa and Nebraska. It is understandable that the State of Montana, with its dramatically beautiful, churning white water, would have little interest in the level of navigational waters that were flowing along the States of Kansas and Missouri. What would cause private utility customers in Minnesota to be interested in the Federal hydropower being generated for REA customers in South Dakota or for the public power customers of Nebraska? Obviously, the integration of water resource development in the Missouri Basin was to take more than the individual application of any one of the 10 States lying wholly or in part within this drainage basin. The Federal Government had to be the one to act as a common denominator in a water development program as vast as that represented by the Missouri drainage water development projects, and it was necessary that private citizens initiate action and generate broad vision among leaders in all States in the river basin. The Mississippi Valley Association has done a remarkable job in this respect.

The first step in taming the Big Muddy was the construction of multipurpose dams. These multipurpose dams had to furnish a spectrum of benefits to be justified to the greatest number of people. There is no doubt that the wild, destructive Missouri has been tamed. The question remains, however, as to how well and how completely this tamed giant can be put to work. Many benefits are dramatic in their impact, and they are easily seen. The silt-laden water is no longer added to farmlands and spread through flooded cities downstream. But the clear water flowing through our main stem dams has a silt-absorbing quality which is requiring bank stabilization downstream. The barge traffic reaches further north than ever before, and is assured of water under keels for more weeks in the year than at any time in the past. Cities and industries downstream can plan and expand with confidence—confidence that a constant water supply will be theirs.

Pollution control and flushing have made great strides in assuring people and industry of uncontaminated waters. A blooming water recreation industry has confounded even the most optimistic of 10 years ago. It was only natural that the tremendous heads of latent power in reservoir storage should be released in an orderly manner which could turn the huge turbines to provide low-cost hydro-generated power to preference customers and private utilities throughout the Midwest area. An excellent job has been done in integrating the water resources of the Missouri Basin to date.

One discordant note still remains in this symphony of harmonious river benefits. That discordant note is the failure to partially offset, by means of irrigation, some of the economic losses so graciously sustained by upstream States so that downstream benefits might become a reality. If the Missouri River drainage basin lay all in one State, the pluses and minuses of river development

would average out to a new high plateau of gains in that particular State.

However, the Missouri Basin drainage area does not lie within one State. The pluses and minuses are distributed unequally among many political subdivisions. The economic losses projected into the future become even more important to an affected political subdivision, such as a State. These losses become compounded as each year passes. States are required to furnish services to their people. When a State gives up a substantial portion of its economic base for the benefit of people in another State, then the losing State has not kept faith with its own. To absorb such losses to the individual States, a timetable of water resource development in the Missouri Basin was supposed to offset losses with gains as soon as possible. Such has not always been the case.

The mighty Missouri bottomland that once furnished the headquarter units for hundreds of ranches and dryland farms has been completely inundated in North Dakota. This inundation of more than half a million acres has also destroyed the sanctuaries of wild game which had made our State a hunter's paradise. A study by the North Dakota State University conservatively estimates that the annual net loss of more than $18 million in economic productivity is North Dakota's subsidy of downstream Missouri water resource development. Today, we North Dakotans seek your help in driving for such irrigation projects as the Garrison diversion unit in our State, the Oahe project in South Dakota, and the Mid-State project in Nebraska.

We admit, as North Dakotans, that in the many years past it has been some of our water that has flowed downstream, causing the havoc of flooding in other States. In years past, it might be said that the States downstream were subsidizing some of the drainage in North Dakota. Now, the coin is turned and North Dakota is subsidizing the developments downstream to quite a substantial sum of money in terms of North Dakota economics. North Dakota has sought unsuccessfully to recover only a portion of its annual loss through using some of its own Missouri River water to irrigate dryland acres.

The Garrison diversion irrigation project is economically feasible. It would bring water to land now in full production of surplus cash grain crops. I think this is significant. Oftentimes, reclamation means bringing desert lands into production, but the reclamation we are talking of is the reclaiming of lands which are now productive. In this instance, we are talking of changing the type of agriculture on lands that are now productive, but not as productive as they could and should be in the type of agriculture which is in growing demand—that of producing the animal protein and noncereal foods. This irrigation would bring the stability necessary to convert some of these surplus cash grains into livestock production crops consistent with growing consumer demands for animal protein food. Because of the lag in the completion of the Garrison diversion irrigation project, North Dakota can never fully recover its annual cash contribution to water resource development to other States in the Missouri Basin.

Quite simply, what I am saying is that because irrigation projects extend in their construction phases over so many years, the State of North Dakota can never hope to reclaim, even through the increased production of irrigation projects, the losses that it incurs annually as a member of the integrated Missouri River Basin system.

Missouri Basin water resource development is a bittersweet thing. It is a sweet thrill and a pleasure to see the improvement and development of benefits all along the main stem and far up into the tributaries. It is bitter to see the areas which already have accomplished benefits lose interest in or even refuse to recognize the negative impact that remains in other political subdivisions of the Missouri River Basin. The only real justification for looking toward economic advantages from water resource development is that of providing productive jobs for people. Until we have committed every drop of Missouri Basin water for productive use consistent with the need to spread benefits as equitably as possible among States, we are failing to follow through on a thrilling project that can furnish increasing job opportunities to those of each generation who have the right to believe that our economic system can expand job opportunities consistent with our rise in population.

This great river can be a positive influence in the affairs of every State it touches. There is great need for all thinking people to look at multistate water development as a problem which has a different and separate impact on each State involved. We as river States must present a united front formed from unselfish points of view. North Dakota pledges her support to complete water resource development in the Missouri Basin and in the total Mississippi Basin.

Just in the short 10 years or so that North Dakotans have been involved in river development on the Missouri, I think we have seen evolution of thinking of people, not only in this State but all over the United States.

I was impressed recently in listening to a woman judge from New York City who spoke in Fargo, N. Dak. She spoke of the despondency and frustration of hundreds of thousands of youthful, employable people below the age of 21. She spoke of the fact that the absorption of young people into productive work is becoming a very difficult problem.

All over the United States, people are becoming aware that even though we might be the most affluent society on the earth, we have a definite responsibility to see that people get a part of this affluent society and are employed at an early age of adulthood. River development, whether it be in the Missouri River or any other river basin, is part of the challenge of employing people. As proud as we are of the initiative and drive that there is in our type of capitalistic system, we are nevertheless fully justified as a Federal Government and a State government to do what is necessary to develop our natural resources so that they can contribute to the further growth of our capitalistic system.

The Missouri River and the Mississippi River, I think, provide a provocative source of expansion of free enterprise and the capitalistic system up and down the rivers and in every State they touch.

I believe that the Nation is becoming more aware of all water development potential. When I look ahead in the coming years, I see less difficulty in obtaining programs to conserve natural resources, particularly water.

When we look back at the short span of time since the great economic crash of 1928, we are looking back at the same interval of time we face between now and the year 2000. In this short period of time ahead, we must plan the opportunities for satisfying lives for almost double our present population. By the year 2000 we can expect 350 million citizens in the United States. By that time, people will be working an average of 32 hours a week and will have 30 days of annual vacation.

On this past Christmas night some of you may have seen an NBC television documentary of life in Calcutta, India. Here is a city of 6 million people drowning in its own garbage. Three hundred thousand people live permanently on the cement sidewalks and streets. Each morning the night's crop of dead are collected. This tribute to squalor, poverty, and disease is the result of a single city and its nation being unable to plan its own destiny.

Social costs to India of her failures in planning are repeated all over the globe. No nation enjoys immunity from the degradation and hopelessness that accompanies a failure to recognize the necessity of not only economic planning but social planning as well. We can talk proudly of States rights and responsibility, but we should remember that it is from Calcutta's wound that India's life blood is flowing. Our Nation can no longer use Horace Greeley's advice of "Go west, young man, go west" as its great answer to the social problems of poverty, employment and economic growth. We need to recognize our Nation's maturity and the need to plan the development of opportunity for all of our people.

Water resource development is much more than cost-benefit ratios and dollars and cents; it is also a challenge to social planning. The use of clean water in residences, industries and recreation in the years ahead has strong social overtons. The spreading of industry and irrigation farming over extensive areas also has important sociological ramifications. Time is shorter than we realize to get on with long-range planning. Public works projects take years in planning and construction.

North Dakota certainly is pleased that it has contributed full support to river navigation, flood control, municipal and industrial water, electric power generation, and to other States' irrigation.

We simply say that we will stand with you in the future. We hope that you will stand with us in obtaining irrigation through reauthorization of the Garrison diversion unit.

MEAT IMPORT AGREEMENTS TO SURRENDER

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, less than a week ago it was my privilege to speak at the National Conference on Foreign Trade in Meats sponsored by the National Livestock Feeders Association, in St. Louis, Mo. My remarks entitled "How Much of a Rollback on Beef Imports?" were addressed to negotiations then underway by our State Department with several principal importers into the United States of beef and veal products. At that time I pointed out that agreements with foreign countries, to serve any useful purpose, would have to provide for a substantial rollback in import quotas, preferably not more than the level of imports for the 1958–62 average. This average would come to about 6.5 percent of annual U.S. consumption.

Yesterday the terms of the agreements with Australia and New Zeland were announced. They are sad and discouraging. They were described as a "rollback" to the average imports for the years 1962–63.

This is no rollback; it is surrender.

Such an agreement fastens on the cattle industry as well as other parts of American agriculture the import levels that contributed so heavily and ruinously to the cattle price break of the past 12 months. These agreements will help to make permanent a condition which has proved to be almost unbearable in the past 12 months because of the further provision that a growth factor of 3.7 percent is attached to the quality of imports allowed.

RECENT AND SHARP IMPORT GROWTH

In the past 10 years Australian beef and veal imports to the United States increased by more than thirty-two thousand percent. In the past 5 years they jumped from 18 million pounds to 517 million pounds of veal and beef, with a very small percentage of mutton. The average for the period 1958–62 was 213 million pounds. The quotas set by the agreement, are 542 million pounds in 1964; 562 million in 1965; and 582 million pounds in 1966. These increasing figures are accounted for by the growth factor of 3.7 percent for each following year after 1964. As a "rollback," this situation is cruelly mislabeled and misnamed.

The total of beef and veal imports which we are talking about for 1963 came to about 1,750 million pounds, which is roughly some 11 percent of the year's consumption. This poundage represents the beef from somewhere between 3½ to 4 million head of cattle, depending somewhat on who is doing the calculating.

DROP IN FARM INCOME

Mr. President, had this number of cattle been produced entirely in the United States, they would have consumed more than 20 billion pounds of feed grain equivalent—most of it in surplus feed grain. This demonstrates that the serious situation at hand is not one of the cattle raiser or the cattle feeder, but of all agriculture. Mind you, during 1963 there was a drop in farm income of 3 percent, while the general consumer income increased 5 percent. For 1964 the picture is even more glum because the Department of Agriculture's present estimate is a further 5-percent drop in farm income this year.

One of the greatest single factors in the disappointing 1963 income cut was the heavy reduction of cattle prices; and one of the chief (in the minds of some, the chief) factors in their drop were the imports from foreign nations. True, the number of cattle in the United States stand at a high figure; but over many years, the cattle industry and the nation have worked their way out of similar high cattle population. But with today's size, type, persistence, and threatening future of cattle imports, we have a different problem altogether.

The agreements between the United States on the one hand and Australia and New Zealand on the other, are a sore disappointment and setback to the cattle industry and all related industries as well. It is obvious that they do nothing to solve or even lighten the problem. Indeed, they worsen it. As the months of catastrophically low prices dragged on, pressures have built up for effective action of some kind. Apparently the administration felt it had to show some sort of action to satisfy the stockmen and others involved. Apparently it was desperate for some agreement, any kind of agreement, which could be presented to the country as a solution. The announced agreements are the result, but obviously they will not do the job.

They build into the cattle industry a high, unfair, and an intolerable factor of even a greater cattle population than ever before, with this exception: That part of the added millions of cattle which will be needed to produce 3½ to 4 million head of cattle annually—to furnish the imports allowable under the agreements—will be grown in the exporting countries. There they will consume foreign-produced feed, laborers and management will be from those countries, taxes will be paid there, and so on. Yet their impact on the U.S. market will continue to the detriment of the American farmer. It is an impact that has proved difficut to live with during these past 12 months. It will become increasingly burdensome and unacceptable in the years ahead.

COLD DAY FOR STOCKMAN

Mr. President, yesterday was a cold day in February for the American stockman. Indeed, for all of American agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that extracts from my remarks in St. Louis on February 12 to the National Conference on Foreign Trade in Meats, be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, Mr. President, the Omaha World-Herald is rendering a valuable public service in a series of articles by Darwin Olofson and Howard Silber dealing with the disastrous course of cattle prices of this past year, with the beef import situation, and other aspects of the problem. This series started on Sunday. I ask unanimous consent that the first two articles of the series be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

HOW MUCH OF A ROLLBACK ON BEEF IMPORTS?

(Extracts from remarks of ROMAN L. HRUSKA, U.S. Senator from Nebraska, prepared for delivery at the National Conference on Foreign Trade in Meats, St. Louis, Mo., Feb. 12, 1964)

We have arrived at the climactic point in a long campaign—a campaign of education and agitation to push and persuade the administration to do something concrete about these mounting imports of beef. Most of last year the Department of Agriculture spent insisting that beef imports had nothing at all to do with the price of cattle. But the more they insisted, the more beef came in, and the farther prices fell.

Now the Department has finally conceded that something must be done about imports. Something, but how much? And when? Those questions are still not answered.

* * * * *

You are all aware that beef imports increased more than 3½ times between 1957 and 1962—and then increased some more in 1963. The exact percentage of increase in 1963 is not available yet, but apparently it will be nearly 15 percent over 1962, which was the alltime record year up to that time.

Unless we can secure a substantial rollback from the high levels of the last 2 years, we know that imports in such heavy volume will continue to depress our cattle markets.

* * * * *

AVAILABLE AVENUES TO COMBAT IMPORTS

I. Government purchases

A very limited fund is available for purchases of surpluses to be used in the school lunch program and for distribution to the needy. This program cannot possibly have any big or effective impact on the problem; it is too small. Last fall, 33 million pounds of frozen ground beef were bought for the school lunch program, but, of course, that is just a drop in the bucket as against an annual beef and veal production rate totaling over 17 billions of pounds.

* * * * *

II. Tariff Act

Escape clause: If an industry proves injury to the required degree as a result of imports, it is possible that relief under the 1962 Export Trade Act, in the form of technical assistance to convert to production of a new item, tax benefits, special unemployment allowances, training benefits to workers, etc.

This is obviously unfitted and not applicable to cattle industry.

Not a single domestic applicant under this clause has been granted relief under this clause of the 1962 act. Every applicant has been turned down.

National security clause: If damage to national security is shown to the satisfaction of the Office of Emergency Planning (not the Tariff Commission in this case), relief can be granted. Of the large number of applications filed, only one industry has been given help—the petroleum industry—on crude petroleum and certain products. So there is not much hope here.

Investigation under section 332: This section provides for an investigation only. Its only purpose would be to secure an impressive report which may or may not be helpful from a public relations standpoint in securing remedial action of some other sort. But in and of itself, such investigation does not lead directly to any relief. Such an investigation is now underway by the Tariff Commission in regard to beef and beef products being imported. Hearings are scheduled for April 28. Every effort should be made to prepare a very complete and convincing case.

III. Section 22—Agricultural Act

It provides that import quotas may be imposed on products with price supports. This is of no value since cattle do not have any such supports. No cattlemen, and nobody else that I know of, want them to have such support. Good riddance.

IV. International agreements

A. International commodity agreements, by treaty: This has been resorted to in the case of wheat and coffee, for example. Such an agreement would take a long time. It might conceivably include the element of production controls for the U.S. producer. The ugly head of supply management under any guise, national or international, is not a welcome sight. We can do without it.

B. Bilateral agreements: For example, between Japan and the United States on textiles, and in some instances on cotton garments. They are voluntary and are partially at least designed to prevent a public outcry in the United States which might produce more severe action or restriction.

C. Section 204—Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended: President may negotiate agreements limiting imports of any agricultural product or textiles or textile products. In 1962, the act was amended to add: If a several-nation agreement has been entered into "accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles" being imported, then the President may take steps to limit imports from nonagreement countries who are also importing that same item.

Section 204 Agreement—Greatest Hope

It is on this avenue that the greatest hope for progress rests.

It is the most suitable and most practical. It has been used for cotton textiles. It can be resorted to with speed and with substantial degree of hope for success, if pressed vigorously and resourcefully.

The 1962 amendment was enacted to give effectiveness to otherwise partial agreements for import quotas.

The Mundt-Hhruska amendment (to H.R. 10788) proposed that the cotton textile agreements would not go into effect until similar international agreements had been negotiated with respect to beef, veal, and other products. It failed of passage.

The Hruska bill (S. 2168) introduced in 1963 would direct the President to initiate negotiations for international agreements on beef, veal, lamb, and mutton under section 204. No action has been taken or scheduled on this bill as yet. The Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to any legislative approach.

What Should Import Volume Be?

Last year, total beef imports—in all forms—amounted to between 1,600 million and 1,700 million pounds, carcass weight equivalent. That excludes live cattle. Seven years ago—1957—they were less than 400 million pounds. That was between 2 and 3 percent of our total consumption. Before then, annual imports were even smaller.

American cattlemen have not asked that imports be cut off completely. Neither have we asked that they be cut back to the levels of 1957 and before. We recognize that a certain amount of trade is reasonable and desirable with Australia, which is one of our closest friends and allies.

One suggestion has been that imports be set at the average level of 1958 to 1962. Of course, every year during that 5-year period showed large imports, so it would not be a low base period. Average imports for that period were 1,045 million pounds, equal to about 6.7 percent of our own production.

Certainly that seems reasonable—high, if anything. It would represent a rollback of about 600 million pounds a year—enough to give a good deal of strength to the cattle market.

* * * * *

How have the negotiations been proceeding? Just before I left Washington, I tried to take a check on that. Progress was being made, I was told, but that is about all I was told.

The trouble is, we got off to a soft start on the thing. The Australians got the jump on us by saying, "We will be agreeable to fixing the import quotas at 1963 levels plus a growth factor of 2 or 3 percent."

Of course, that wouldn't be any settlement at all; it would be surrender. We need a substantial rollback to do us any real good.

* * * * *

Now, if we can't make any headway by negotiation, we'll have to take congressional action. Frankly, congressional action now to arm the executive branch with additional powers would strengthen our hand immeasurably in the negotiations. I say this: If there is a good faith effort made by the Secretary of Agriculture and by the President, our negotiations will be successful. But when the Secretary of Agriculture constantly opposes legislation and refuses to secure that compulsory power as a means of dealing with the Australians, Australia assumes that we really don't intend to press hard for a fair agreement.

* * * * *

V. Legislative action

As a last resort in case other methods fail, Congress could enact legislation placing flat import quotas, by quantity spelled out or by formula given in percentage of production or in similar fashion.

This would indeed be doing it the hard way. It is seriously urged and earnestly hoped that it will not be necessary to resort to it.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Sunday World-Herald, Feb. 16, 1964]

THE CATTLE CRISIS—BEEF IMPORTS TRAMPLE ECONOMY OF MIDLANDS—WORLD-HERALD SURVEY FINDS FEEDERS FACE RUIN

(By Howard Silber and Darwin Olofson)

The U.S. cattle industry is sick.

The affliction begins at the ranch and extends into virtually every segment of the economy of the midlands.

In the middle—and hardest hit to date—is the cattle feeder, the man who uses grain and know-how to convert the lean range animal into luscious steaks and tender roasts.

The typical feeder is a Corn Belt farmer. In some cases he may be a southerner, a Coloradan, or a Californian.

Wherever he is, whoever he is, he lost money, or at best broke even, in 1963, on every creature he marketed. His 1964 prospects are no better.

And unless the trend changes quickly and dramatically, the cattle producer—the rancher and the farmer who breeds beef animals—will be far worse off this year than he was in 1963.

Across the country, 1963 was a good crop year. But the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported farm income declined 3 percent—while general consumer income climbed 5 percent.

TIDE OF IMPORTS DEVASTATING

And the USDA is predicting that agricultural income will take another plunge this year. The estimate is 5 percent.

Largely responsible is the sickness of the cattle industry.

In the Omaha livestock market, the largest and most important in the United States, the average price of fat steers during the week ended February 6 was down 15 percent from the level of the first week of February in 1963. The average price of fed heifers was down 12½ percent.

And most feeders say they lost money, or barely broke even, on cattle they sold a year ago.

As for replacement stock—the animals that will soon be taken from range and pasture to be fattened on corn, sorghums, and other grain—Kansas State University reports their prices are down between 10 and 20 percent.

Cattlemen, economists, bankers, and other agriculture experts agree that there are two principal reasons for the ruinous conditions:

A devastating and continually rising tide of imports which, in 1963, saw a record of 1,750 million pounds of foreign beef swamp the U.S. market. This quantity, converted into steaks, roasts, hamburger, stew meat, processed meat and other beef table products, would supply the beef needs of every American family for more than a month.

Too many cattle here at home.

The two causes are interrelated. Experts believe a reduction in beef imports would help reduce the size of domestic herds. But more about that later.

FEEDLOTS—RANCHES—MEXICO

For more than a month, two World-Herald staff writers and the newspaper's chief photographer have been taking a hard look at the beef crisis.

They have visited feedlots and ranches of the Corn Belt, the Mountain States and the Southwest. They have crossed the dry border from southern California into Mexico. They have crossed the Rio Grande at several points.

They have talked with cattlemen, financiers, meatpackers, economists—as well as importers, purveyors of imported beef, and foreign cattlemen.

They have filled a dozen notebooks, made scores of photographs.

Their findings—the story of the destructive effects of unrestrained imports of beef on the cattle industry of the United States and on the economy of the Nation—are presented in this series of articles.

A total of 1,750 million pounds is a lot of beef.

Depending on who does the calculating, it is the equivalent of between 3,500,000 and 4 million cattle on the hoof.

Had these animals been produced entirely in the United States, they would have consumed more than 20 billion pounds of feed grain equivalent—mostly surplus feed grain.

Had these cattle been produced in this country, the process would have provided more than 1 million additional man-hours of gainful labor in a nation which is fighting a serious unemployment problem.

Most of the imported meat came from Down Under. Australia and New Zealand accounted for 67 percent of the total.

BEEF OWN WORST COMPETITOR

Australia is the giant. In 10 years the Aussies have increased their shipments of beef and veal to the United States by more than 32 thousands percent, customs records show. In the last 5 years, the product weight—net weight—of Australian beef has rocketed from 18 million to 517 million pounds. New Zealand hasn't stood by idly. Its tonnage of beef consigned to the United States increased by some 16 hundred percent in the same decade.

Ireland and Mexico rank third and fourth as exporters of beef to the United States.

U.S. cattlemen say the imported beef competes directly with the American product. The economists agree.

Most of the beef which enters this country is of standard or utility grade, used primarily for hamburger, lunch meat, sausage and the like. Nevertheless it has a depressing effect on the fat cattle market.

Added influence comes from the fact that beef competes with beef. It is generally regarded as its own worst competitor.

Floyd Segel, president of the Wisconsin Packing Co., Milwaukee, provided the World-Herald with this illustration:

"If you've just eaten meatloaf—made with foreign beef hamburger—there's no room in your stomach for beefsteak."

And low-grade imported meat has a subtle but serious effect on cattle production in the United States. Cows are a normal source of manufacturing meat. With cheaper foreign beef flooding the United States, domestic cow prices at the packinghouse have been poor.

ONE LESS BITE CONSUMED

As a result, instead of culling many old cows from their herds, ranchers have left them around for another year to get still one more hundred-dollar calf from them. The result: more calves on the range and, in turn, more animals crowding the feed bunkers.

Dr. Everett Peterson, University of Nebraska agricultural economist, commented on this situation:

"When the packer has to compete more vigorously for the old cow we'll see a decline in our overall cattle numbers."

Roland R. Renne, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Foreign Affairs, noted that production of fed beef in the United States was 11 percent higher in 1963 than in 1962.

"When, to this heavy increase in domestic production of beef during 1963, is added the increase in imports," he declared, "it is clear why beef cattle prices were appreciably lower in 1963 than in 1962."

James J. Regan, Jr., of Omaha, who has extensive ranching and cattle-feeding interests, summed up the effect of booming beef imports:

"Every time someone takes a bite of foreign beef one less bite of American beef is consumed."

AUSTRALIAN MEAT SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES

Four ships left Australia in late November and early December with 13,865,600 pounds of beef, 2,755,200 of mutton, 29,120 of lamb, and 42,560 of variety meats for the United States.

Ship and sailing date	Destination [1]	Arrival date	Cargo	Quantity
	WESTERN PORTS			
				Pounds
Ellen Bakke, Nov. 30	Seattle	Jan. 19	Beef	293,440
	Tacoma	Jan. 21		
	Portland	Jan. 25	Beef	206,080
	Los Angeles	Jan. 31	do	134,400
	San Francisco	Feb. 5	do	407,680
	EASTERN AND GULF PORTS			
Lake Ontario, Dec. 7	Norfolk	([2])	do	33,600
	Tampa	Jan. 4	do	1,173,760
			Mutton	288,960
			Lamb	29,120
			Various meats	13,440
	Charleston	Jan. 9	Beef	44,800
			Mutton	302,400
	Philadelphia	Jan. 11	Beef	960,960
			Mutton	67,200
	New York	Jan. 14	Beef	3,960,320
			Mutton	1,064,000
			Various meats	8,960
	Boston	Jan. 18	Beef	318,080
			Mutton	224,000
Wharanui, Dec. 11	Houston	Jan. 9	Beef	248,640
			Mutton	201,600
	Charleston	Jan. 15	Beef	147,840
	Norfolk	Jan. 16	do	67,200
			Mutton	67,200
	Boston	Jan. 18	Beef	107,520
			Mutton	56,000
	New York	Jan. 20	Beef	1,276,800
			Mutton	103,040
	Philadelphia	Jan. 24	Beef	235,200
			Mutton	100,800
Cap Verde, Dec. 12	Charleston	Jan. 6	Beef	98,560
	Boston	Jan. 10	do	418,880
			Mutton	64,960
	Norfolk	Jan. 12	Beef	221,760
			Mutton	67,200
	Philadelphia	Jan. 15	Beef	152,320
			Mutton	38,080
	New York	Jan. 17	Beef	3,337,600
			Mutton	109,760
			Various meats	20,160

[1] Cities listed indicate location of purchaser and usually the port of arrival and general market area, but meat may be diverted to other areas for sale.
[2] To be transshipped.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Feb. 17, 1964]

THE CATTLE CRISIS—SHATTERED HOPES, WEATHERED FEED BUNKS TELL SAD STORY—IF FARMER IS LUCKY, HE CAN BREAK EVEN

(By Howard Silber and Darwin Olofson)

Don Foster is a burly, powerful, willing man of the soil.

He has farmed near Indianola, Nebr., for 17 years. He has worked hard. For the most part he has made a living.

But Don, who is 36 and the father of four, has yearned for something more than just a living. As a tenant farmer who rents the land he tills, he realized long ago that one way to achieve this modest ambition would be to increase the value of his share of the grain he raises.

This could be done by feeding it to cattle, processing the grain into beef.

Last year Don Foster became a cattle feeder. With bank loans, he purchased over a period of months about 200 head fresh from the range. Each weighed between 600 and 700 pounds. He paid an average of 26 cents a pound.

Using grains he raised and commercial feed supplements, Don built up the size and quality of his animals. When their weight approached 1,100 pounds he marketed them.

He was paid between 20 and 21 cents a pound.

Don Foster was the victim of a severely depressed fat cattle market. He took an average loss of $40 an animal. His cattle-feeding venture resulted in an $8,000 deficit.

DON WILL TRY AGAIN

In an effort to make ends meet Don is working at the Urling Grain Elevator at Indianola.

"Sure I'm going to farm in the spring," he told the World-Herald, "and I'm going to feed cattle again—if I can borrow the money to buy the cattle and if it looks like the market will be right. I've got to feed again. It's the only way I can get even.

"I hope this year will be better. All I've got to show for 1963 are weathered feed bunks and the smell of the cattle that are gone."

Audubon County, Iowa, is some 300 miles east of Don Foster's place. It is a county of well-kept farms that roll over gentle hills. The county prides itself on the efficiency of its farmers, the excellence of its corn crops and the high quality of its transient livestock population—cattle on feed.

Last month, the Audubon Junior Chamber of Commerce named Darrell Jensen, 30, the county's outstanding young farmer of the year. A. A. Kruse, executive vice president of the First State Bank of Audubon, heartily indorse the selection.

"Darrell's a good farmer—hard working, smart, and full of fire. You can't keep him down," the banker declared.

Darrell fed 203 head of cattle in 1963. "I was lucky," he said. "I broke even, got all my bills paid. I guess I sold at the right time."

EFFICIENT, UNPROFITABLE

In the lush Imperial Valley of California the family farm is often a multimillion-dollar establishment and the cattle feeder commonly tallies his livestock in thousands.

"Because we're so big compared with the farmer-feeder of the Corn Belt, our losses are proportionately higher," said Richard Kershaw, of Brawley, Calif. "We believe we operate efficiently, but we're losing money on every head of cattle we feed.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture told in a recent report how much the feeders—all the Don Fosters, Darrell Jensens, and Dick Kershaws—have been hurt.

The farmer, who fed a steer calf to choice weight during the 1962–63 cycle, said the Department, marketed the animal for an average of $1.46 more than the direct cost of the calf and the feed it ate, plus transportation and marketing expenses.

The $1.46 had to take care of such things as interest on the bank loan which made the purchase of the calf possible, depreciation of equipment and improvements, taxes, insurance, death losses, water costs, and of course, labor.

It didn't come close.

ALL THIS, AND BOBBY BAKER

The $1.46 was not extreme. The same study showed that the feeder who purchased a yearling steer in the fall of 1962 and marketed it the following spring at choice weight took an average direct loss of $20.12 a head. Here again the statisticians admittedly ignored interest, overhead, and labor.

The cattle rancher has only one real market for his product—the farm and feedlot. His problems began with the drop in the price of fed cattle, but he didn't feel them directly until about a year later, last year.

As a result, he is slightly better off than the feeder—just slightly, and temporarily, say the cattle finance men and economists.

"The producer faces a deficit in 1964. Some of us lost last year, too," said Brooks J. Keogh, Minot and Keene, N. Dak., rancher and president of the American National Cattlemen's Association. "Prices we receive are down. We didn't feel the pinch as early as the feeder, but we feel it now."

This is more than the story of Don Foster, Darrell Jensen, Dick Kershaw, and Brooks Keogh.

It is the story of the entire cattle and beef industry—in the ranching areas of the West and Southwest; in the Corn Belt, Far West, and Great Lakes States; in the rapidly developing cattle areas of the Deep South, and lower Atlantic seaboard.

It is also the story of the man who has learned to pilot a small airplane to increase his speed and efficiency when he checks the bores—we call them wells—of a vast cattle station in Australia's dusty, horizonless outback.

It is the story of the farmer of New Zealand's fat Canterbury Plains whose product will make its way to a Boston or Denver restaurant which features T-bone steak dinners for $1.29.

It is the story of the handsome Mexican engineer who now uses his logarithm tables to check the probable weight gain of the cattle in the feedlots he oversees.

And the story has many other characters. They run the gamut from the headline-making Bobby Baker to the honest, hard-working operator of a small food market in your neighborhood.

All have a role in the story of the tremendous quantity of imported beef that is flooding the United States and its effects on the American rancher and farmer and on the economy of the Nation.

DOWN, DOWN, DOWN

This table from the U.S. Department of Agriculture shows what has happened to the price of fed cattle. It gives the prices—per hundredweight—for steers and heifers sold

by farmers and feeders at 12 principal markets—Omaha, Chicago, Cincinnati, Denver, Fort Worth, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Oklahoma City, St. Louis, Sioux City, Sioux Falls, and St. Joseph.

	1962	1963	1964
January:			
Steers	$24.77	$25.72	$21.63
Heifers	24.10	24.94	21.02
February:			
Steers	24.85	23.82	----------
Heifers	23.96	23.09	----------
March:			
Steers	25.15	22.28	----------
Heifers	24.08	21.67	----------
April:			
Steers	25.49	22.55	----------
Heifers	24.44	22.02	----------
May:			
Steers	24.61	21.73	----------
Heifers	23.82	21.46	----------
June:			
Steers	24.21	22.03	----------
Heifers	23.52	21.75	----------
July:			
Steers	25.16	24.06	----------
Heifers	24.01	23.31	----------
August:			
Steers	26.77	24.01	----------
Heifers	25.15	23.24	----------
September:			
Steers	28.25	23.53	----------
Heifers	26.19	22.69	----------
October:			
Steers	27.88	23.35	----------
Heifers	26.15	22.34	----------
November:			
Steers	28.36	22.55	----------
Heifers	26.81	21.73	----------
December:			
Steers	27.40	21.25	----------
Heifers	26.23	20.48	----------

REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL CASES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1057) to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Indigent Defendants Act of 1963".

SEC. 2. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding immediately after section 3006 the following new section:

"§ 3006A. Representation of indigent defendants

"(a) In every criminal case arising under laws of the United States in which the defendant appears without counsel, the United States commissioner or the court shall advise the defendant that he has the right to be represented by counsel and that counsel will be appointed or assigned to represent him if he is financially unable to obtain counsel. Unless the defendant waives the appointment or assignment of counsel, the United States commissioner or the court, if satisfied after appropriate inquiry that the defendant is financially unable to obtain counsel, shall appoint counsel to represent him or, in the alternative, shall assign a counsel who is made available by a bar association or legal aid society. The United States commissioner or the court shall appoint or assign separate counsel for defendants who have such conflicting interests that they cannot properly be represented by the same counsel, or when other good cause is shown. Counsel appointed by the United States commissioner or the court shall be selected from a panel of counsel designated or approved by the judge of each United States district court. No Member of Congress shall be appointed to serve as counsel in any case covered by this Act.

"(b) A defendant for whom counsel is appointed or assigned under this section shall be represented at every stage of the proceedings from his initial appearance before the United States commissioner or court, or from any subsequent stage at which counsel is appointed or assigned, through appeal. If at any time after the appointment or assignment of counsel the court having jurisdiction of the case is satisfied that the defendant is financially able to obtain counsel or to make partial payment for the representation, he may terminate the appointment or assignment of counsel or authorize payment as provided in subsection (e), as the interests of justice may dictate. If, at any time during the course of the criminal proceedings, including an appeal, the court having jurisdiction of the case finds that the defendant is financially unable to pay counsel whom he had retained, the court may appoint counsel as provided in subsection (a) and authorize payment as provided in subsection (e), as the interests of justice may dictate. The United States commissioner or the court may, in the interests of justice, substitute one appointed or assigned counsel for another at any stage of the proceedings.

"(c) An attorney appointed or the bar association or legal aid society which made an attorney available for assignment pursuant to this section shall at the conclusion of the representation or any segment thereof be compensated at a rate not exceeding $15 per hour for time expended in court and $10 per hour for time reasonably expended outside of court or before a United States commissioner, and shall be reimbursed for expenses reasonably incurred. A separate claim for compensation and reimbursement shall be made to the district court for representation before the United States commissioner or that court, and to each appellate court before which the attorney represented the defendant. Each claim shall be supported by an affidavit specifying the time expended, services rendered, and expenses incurred while the case was pending before the United States commissioner or court, and the compensation and reimbursement applied for or received in the same case from any other source. The court shall, in each instance, fix the compensation and reimbursement to be paid to the attorney: *Provided, however,* That the total compensation to be paid to the attorney for such representation shall not exceed $500 in case of a felony and $300 in case of a misdemeanor.

"(d) The court, in an ex parte proceeding, may authorize the appointed or assigned counsel to obtain investigative, expert, or other services necessary to an adequate defense to each defendant determined by the court to be financially unable to obtain them. The court which authorized the services shall direct the payment of reasonable compensation to the person who rendered the services: *Provided, however,* That such compensation shall not exceed $500 per person in case of a felony and $300 per person in case of a misdemeanor. A claim for compensation shall be supported by an affidavit specifying the time expended, services rendered, and expenses incurred on behalf of the defendant, and the compensation received in the same case for any other source.

"(e) Whenever the court is satisfied that funds are available for payment from or on behalf of a defendant, the court may authorize or direct that such funds be paid to appointed counsel, to an organization which made an attorney available for assignment, or to any person authorized pursuant to subsection (d) to assist in the representation. Except as so authorized or directed, no such person or organization may request or accept any payment or promise of payment for assisting in the representation of a defendant.

"(f) Each district court and judicial council of a circuit shall submit a report on the appointment or assignment of counsel within its jurisdiction to the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in such form and at such time as the Judicial Conference of the United States may specify.

"(g) There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States courts, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. When so specified in appropriation Acts, such appropriations shall remain available until expended. Payments from such appropriations shall be made under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

"(h) The term 'district court' as used in this section includes the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the District Court of Guam, and the district courts of the United States created by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code."

(b) The table of sections at the head of chapter 201 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding immediately after item 3006 the following:

"3006A. Representation of indigent defendants."

SEC. 3. Each district court and court of appeals shall commence compensation for appointed or assigned counsel within six months from the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House and ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. HART, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. KEATING conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SALES OF WHEAT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule of germaneness be waived and that I may speak on another matter.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is considering this week, in executive session, proposed new legislation for wheat and cotton. Programs are badly needed for both those commodities. I am hopeful that the Senate will take action at an early date to provide relief for the producers of those basic crops.

Any measure that we pass should contain a provision that the Commodity Credit Corporation be not permitted to sell Government-owned wheat for unrestricted use for less than 115 percent of the loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges.

This provision is contained in existing cotton legislation. With regard to wheat, however, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to make sales at 105 percent of the loan rate, plus the carrying charges.

Mr. President, it now appears likely that the carryover stocks of wheat on July 1, 1965, will be down to about 600 million bushels, or possibly even less. In other words, we shall then be at a level of minimum desirable carryover stocks or—to state the matter in another way—strategic food reserves. For some types of wheat, such as Soft Red Winter, our carryover stocks will be at the minimum by July 1, 1964.

As markets begin to respond to the demand for wheat and as the price to the farmer begins to rise, the Commodity Credit Corporation can establish a price ceiling by selling its Government-owned stocks at 105 percent of the loan rate. If there is no wheat legislation this year, the national average wheat loan this summer—and I emphasize the words "wheat loan"—would be about $1.26. Under present Commodity Corporation sales authority, wheat prices would not rise above $1.32, plus carrying charges, if Government sales continue to be made at the minimum authorized by law.

Mr. President, again I point out that the law sets the minimum, not the maximum.

By requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell at not less than 115 percent of the loan rate—which I recommend—the wheat farmer could receive from 10 cents a bushel to 15 cents a bushel more for his wheat. At the same time, the value of the inventory held by the Commodity Credit Corporation would increase. So, Mr. President, from both points of view, including the Government's investment in its own inventory of wheat stocks, a provision of 115 percent of the loan rate as the minimum sales price for the Commodity Credit Corporation would be desirable. To the farmer, it would be very desirable, because it would mean the market price would be affected in a beneficial manner by increasing that price by anywhere from 10 to 15 cents a bushel; also, the Government could realize a higher price for its wheat, due to strong world demand and the free market could operate to provide realistic differences between grades and types.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that so little attention is given in Congress to farm problems, many Members have almost lost interest in the facts relative to these complicated marketing arrangements. It is a fact that today the United States and Canada are practically the only major sources of export supplies of wheat. Why in the name of commonsense our Government should sell the wheat out of the Commodity Credit Corporation's inventory at a low price, when the world needs the wheat, is utterly beyond my comprehension.

Both Congress and the Department of Agriculture have responsibility in this connection. In fact, Congress set 105 percent of the loan rate as the minimum sales price for Commodity Credit Corporation wheat. So what we really are doing is giving the whole world a big bargain in connection with the wheat stocks owned by the Government of the United States, and paid for by the U.S. taxpayers, at a time when we could receive a much fairer price for our wheat inventory. This situation is very similar to that in which a buyer is in great need and a seller—in this case, the United States—has the available supply. I cannot imagine that any businessman who found himself in a situation of having the available supplies almost totally under his control would, by his own action, deny himself a fair price from a world market that desperately needed those supplies.

We should not overlook the position of the small wheat grower in this situation, either. Nationally, 2 out of every 3 wheat growers harvest less than 15 acres; in many States, the proportion is 9 out of 10. Many of these growers of winter wheat will not be in a position to participate in a new program, because they already have planted more than their 3-year average, less 10 percent—the requirement for eligibility in proposed legislation. Therefore, these hundreds of thousands of growers will have to depend on the free market in 1964 for their income from wheat. No legislation which we could pass now, in terms of an overall wheat bill, could affect these hundreds of thousands of small wheat producers. The placing of a ceiling of 105 percent of the loan for these farmers will sharply reduce the wheat income of this substantial group, and also, I may say, will sharply reduce farm income.

Mr. President, less than 10 days ago the Senate passed the tax-reduction bill, the purpose of which is stimulation of the American economy—in other words, to place in the hands of consumers and investors more free capital, to be used by the consumers for the purchase of goods and services, and to be used by the investors for the purpose of expanding our industrial base. But if we do not watch out, we can seriously reduce the effectiveness of the tax bill which we recently passed, with much heralding of its beneficial effects on our economy, by having a sharp drop in farm income; and if there is a sharp drop in farm income, there will be a reduction in the effect of the tax-reduction bill on our economy and a further consolidation of American agriculture into larger and larger units, thus displacing thousands of farm families and sending them to overcrowded cities, where all too few jobs await those who are not skilled in industrial activities. The best market in America for development and the best potential purchasing power in America, if the farmer receives a fair price for the commodities he produces, is in rural America; and in rural America the effects of poverty are most visible and most obvious; and in rural America, with a slight increase in per capita income, there can be a very great increase in sales, which will result in marked improvement of the overall well-being of the American economy.

Mr. President, the recommendation I make today of a commodity credit minimum sales price of 115 percent of the loan rate on wheat—identical to the sales rate on cotton—is especially valid in view of the radically altered situation in the wheat economy of the world, a change which should fundamentally affect the world wheat price level. I have commented on that subject previously. Just as after many months the world sugar price level reflected a new demand and supply situation, so the Communist wheat failures will be a significant market factor in the next few years. We should let that express itself in realistic free market prices. By July 1, 1964, the carryover stocks of wheat held by the four wheat-exporting nations will be the equivalent of only 2 months' requirements of the world.

I repeat, by July 1, 1964, the total carryover of wheat stocks in the world will be merely enough to provide for 2 months' consumption. In the kind of crazy world in which we live—a world that is plagued with disorder, revolution, and social unrest, a world in which we have no certainty of crop production, because crop production depends upon weather, and is even affected by pestilence and disease—2 months' supply of wheat stocks is skating on the thin edge of famine on a worldwide basis.

Therefore, it appears to me that all of those factors ought to be taken into consideration as we contemplate our agricultural policy.

The total supply will be only 1,500 million bushels. However, of that total it should not be overlooked that the stocks on that date in the Argentine and Australia will have been fully committed for export or for their own carryover needs for strategic reserve uses.

Argentina and Australia are the other two great wheat-producing countries, aside from Canada and the United States. Those two countries already will have committed their total supply. The Australians have established by national policy a national food reserve. Ours is the only nation that thinks we can eat bullets.

Every week I hear a report from the Department of Defense as to the amount of ammunition we need for reserves. Time after time it has been stated we must have a certain amount of ammunition for troops in Vietnam. We must have a certain amount of fuel oil for the Air Force in Europe. Repeatedly we are reminded by the Defense Department that we really have no defense, unless we have supplies available to carry us through several weeks of war or defense needs. Apparently someone has forgotten that troops must eat.

I never have been able to understand how a nation which has the responsibility for the defense of the free world, and which leads the whole free world in terms of defense commitments, can fail to write into law national security food reserves. We ought to have it clearly understood and known to friend and foe alike, and to the market—those who are wheat growers, in the grain business and in the food business—that our Government has available at all times a certain amount of food supplies that are set aside and maintained as a fresh supply of food and fiber for national security reserves.

It may be more important to have available food supplies than to have available atomic bombs. There is some hope that if there should be a war, a few

people would survive, and if there are to be survivors, they must eat. Food supplies would be a target of military attack as much as or more than cities or industries.

Very few of the great powers outside the Soviet Union, which because of its bungling and its collective farm setup has failure on its hands, have given serious attention to the problem of food supply.

Some governments have to give the subject attention because they are deficit food countries. They must import. But we, as an exporting country, surely should give the subject plenty of attention.

I have introduced proposed legislation to establish a National Food and Fiber Policy Commission to study our total agricultural policy and to update it, or at least make recommendations to the Congress, to the President and to the American people.

Much of our agricultural policy is outdated. It does not relate to the facts of 1964. I have introduced legislation to provide for the establishment of national security food and fiber reserves. As we cannot defend our country without such a policy, we are derelict in our responsibility if we merely rely upon good fortune for those reserves.

I have been commenting upon the need for strategic reserve uses. I pointed out the available world supply in 1964.

Of the Canadian estimated stocks of 450 million bushels, 175 million bushels, or a year's domestic needs, can reasonably be considered as a strategic Canadian need. Of the 800 million bushels estimated U.S. carryover, some 600 millions are considered essential for U.S. carryover needs.

Thus, of the estimated July 1, 1964, stocks of 1,500 million bushels, only about 500 million bushels are available for world export needs. This means that the world free reserves have been cut in half in 1 year, and by July 1, 1965, will have been cut in half again because the United States will have arrived at the minimum desirable level.

Mr. President, these facts are sufficient argument for lifting the Commodity Credit Corporation resale level to 115 percent of the loan rate.

I do not make the point that that is all that needs to be done. It would not be a fair statement. I am only saying that the resale level should be lifted to 115 percent. This is a more fair and reasonable resale price for Commodity Credit Corporation stocks than the present price of 105 percent of the loan rate.

Beginning with the 1964 marketing year would be a desirable time to let the farmers of the Nation obtain the full benefits of a less restrictive sales policy. The Commodity Credit Corporation and farmers need not be competitors for available markets. As one of the strong supporters of the Commodity Credit Corporation from its inception, I know it was designed to encourage orderly marketing by taking supplies off the market at harvest time. What is needed is to permit the free market price system through the commodity markets to really operate and fulfill its essential economic function of moving wheat from the producer to the ultimate consumer at the least cost.

Many times I have found myself in some difference of opinion on agricultural policy with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle and with some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. But I was much impressed with the statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] some weeks ago on the world wheat situation and pricing policy. He gave a constructive analysis of the situation that prevails in wheat production and marketing practice. I believe its purpose was to be helpful. While I do not believe it meets all the needs there are, it surely was a constructive and helpful message. I want to associate myself in part with it.

The Senator from Vermont has had wide experience. While he and I have on occasion disagreed on agricultural policy, I find myself more and more impressed with many of his arguments on the use of our food and fiber, how best to market it, and how best to manage our production. His views should be given careful consideration.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will promptly report to the Senate a bill relating to cotton and wheat. If we do not have legislation to help our cotton producers and our textile mills, there will be economic stagnation in the cotton market and the cotton processing areas of this country. We have a responsibility in the Congress to see that this does not happen. We are familiar with the dangers in the wheat production areas. I have introduced a wheat bill. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] introduced a bill. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] introduced a bill. So have others. We do not lay any claim to pride of authorship. What we are more interested in is legislation.

I conclude by most respectfully suggesting to my colleagues and to my able and distinguished friend who is the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, and his associates in the Department, that the statement I have made today, to which I have given considerable thought and attention, be read with the objective of seeing whether it has something constructive to offer as to the price situation affecting agriculture.

I am hopeful there can be a meeting of minds on this subject. It will do no good to leave this session and go home saying we were not able to do anything for our farmers. American agriculture deserves more than that.

I am not interested in any partisan fights. I have been through those before. Too often agriculture has been the victim of many partisan battles. It is important to recognize the predicament we are in, and take whatever administrative steps are needed to alleviate the situation, and to act legislatively as soon as possible.

The President has sent a message on agriculture to the Congress. It was a good, constructive message. I plead that it be considered at the earliest possible time. Farm legislation cannot be passed late in the year. It must be done as soon as possible. It is necessary that we get behind the President's proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a paper entitled "105 Percent versus 115 Percent Resale Price," which was prepared by Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson, executive secretary of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

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

THE 105-PERCENT VERSUS 115-PERCENT RESALE PRICE—THE PROS AND CONS OF A PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN SUPPORT AND RESALE PRICES OF WHEAT IN 1964 LEGISLATION

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, provided that in selling commodities for unrestricted use, the CCC price should be not less than 105 percent of the support price plus "reasonable carrying charges" (interest, storage).

2. In 1958, Congress provided, in the case of cotton, that the CCC sales price formula should be changed from 105 to 115 percent. There are a large number of proposals to make a similar change applicable to wheat in 1964 legislation.

3. The largest influence on the open market price of wheat at or immediately after harvest is the level of support prices available in the form of loans or purchase agreements to farmers. In subsequent months, the market price is influenced increasingly by the CCC selling price formula, usually called the "resale price." This price is published monthly by CCC covering sales from its inventories for unrestricted use.

4. The loan price at harvesttime provides the major alternative to sale for cash at the current market price by producers. Thus, the loan serves the function of a "floor" price for wheat. So also, the CCC resale price becomes the "ceiling" price because buyers of wheat will not pay more than the price at which at a given time they can buy it from CCC.

5. The range between the "floor" and the "ceiling" prices, as described above, has been narrowed by reduction in the CCC markup to reflect carrying charges in recent years.

Earlier, CCC sold at 105 percent of the support price during July, the first month of the wheat marketing year, then added 2 cents per month to its price to cover interest and storage costs to CCC for a total of 9 months ending April 30. It added no carrying charges for May and June—then reset its price at 105 percent of the applicable support July 1.

The carrying charge of 2 cents per month was halved. (There were, as always, variations reflecting grade, class, location, billing, etc. Loading-out charges avefaging three-fourths of a cent were added to offset any such cost if incurred by CCC in connection with the sale and, as in the case of "in" charges, can, for purposes of this discussion, be disregarded in examining the changes in the formula price.)

Thus, CCC's resale price was reduced well below the cost experience of grain firms and well below customary trade practice.

6. CCC operations are required, under the charter enacted by Congress in 1948–49, to employ the usual and customary channels of trade and commerce. Unless restraint is exercised, in view of its great and growing power, its vast money resources, its nonneed to subject its operations to profit-and-loss criteria, CCC can dominate wheat prices, wheat supplies, sales, movements—in short, all wheat commerce of a significant character. To do so is neither contemplated, required, nor encouraged by Congress under

the laws so far enacted, but it is probably necessary for Congress to restate its position from time to time.

II. ADVANTAGES OF THE 115-PERCENT PROVISO

1. Recently in arguing the advantages of certain measures intended to reduce CCC inventory, USDA estimated the cost of carrying a bushel of wheat as averaging 26.21 cents per year. This was made up of 13.53 cents for storage and handling, an average of 3.93 cents for transportation, an average cost incident to resale of 1.24 cents per bushel, and interest computed at its estimated cost to CCC of 7.51 cents per bushel.

Such estimates compared with the value judgments expressed in the advance in price to reflect carrying charges at a maximum of 9 cents per bushel over a 12-month period indicates a major contradiction. Furthermore, it indicates that CCC has traveled far indeed from the patterns employed in the usual and customary channels of trade in figuring carrying charges.

This contradiction also illustrates that mandates from Congress can turn and twist in unfathomable ways within a few years; that the current practice with respect to carrying charges are unrealistic, illogical, and in violation of CCC charter provisions.

This situation requires correction without regard to determination of the merits of 105 percent versus 115 percent.

2. If Congress desires to encourage the grain-marketing industry to exercise initiative and enterprise, it must reexamine the condition and durability of the rules Congress established to prevent unfair competition by CCC.

3. The 105- versus 115-percent issue, for purposes of objective examination of advantages and disadvantages, should be analyzed without regard to the specific level of support. In the case of various proposals for legislation for wheat presently under consideration, there is a considerable variation in the proposed levels of support.

The issue should be examined, first of all, in terms of its effects on stimulating private trade efforts in the marketplace.

4. If the considered views of the grain-marketing industry were requested, it may be remarked parenthetically that in excess of 95 to 99 percent of the leaders would be found to view CCC's present role as needlessly large and as in a state of aggressive growth.

An example: CCC requested the grain marketing industry to expand grain storage space for a number of years. Rates were gradually increased on a number of occasions. Warehousemen were offered other incentives to expand facilities. The result has been an increase in commercial grain storage facilities from about 1.25 billion bushels in 1950 to 5,453,240,000 bushels as of January 1, 1964. The latter figure is at least two to three times the normal needs.

In addition, CCC owns bins and other storage facilities with a capacity presently rated at 965 million bushels and has no program for reducing or disposing of these facilities which were originally brought into being with assurances to the grain marketing industry that they were for "standby and emergency use."

It is axiomatic that one Secretary of Agriculture, even within the same administration, is not bound by the pleadings or promises of his predecessors. Thus, the present Secretary, unless continuity of policy in fairness to the marketing industry is insisted upon by Congress, may proceed as he desires in a number of areas with results which can be most serious to the grain marketing industry.

To illustrate:

(a) He may favor the use of CCC-owned storage over commercial space, despite the language of the CCC charter. The CCC-owned storage facilities pay no taxes to school districts, townships, counties, States, or the Federal Government; they are not essential to provide storage service at present except in a very few localities; they are expensive to maintain and administer because they do not justify the cost of modern equipment for large, efficient bulk handling of grain.

(b) He may, as he has only recently intimated, place grain storage rates on a competitive bid or other basis which would destroy the public utility principle of equal treatment for all farmers and other depositors. The bid system could result in curtailing operation of the higher cost structures in areas with the highest operating costs. It would provide a very great advantage to the lowest cost but least serviceable storages from the long-range standpoint of providing farmers an efficient marketing system—such as sheepshead-type storage and similar facilities, including remodeled military barracks, abandoned railroad roundhouses, etc.

(c) Unless restrained, he could exercise unchallenged authority to cut existing carrying charges even further than they have been cut. He might, for example, reduce to zero the incentive of grain firms to build inventory for resale or for millers to acquire stocks from CCC at prices largely dictated by CCC's resale policies and practices.

5. The 115-percent resale minimum would reduce program costs because it would have the effect of increasing the volume of purchases to meet their requirements by millers and other end-users during harvest and through the redemption of loans by farmers. This would reduce the takeover volume of CCC.

Each bushel of grain which passes into the hands of CCC involves a considerable cost and a substantial loss, especially during the period of declining prices which are now in prospect.

For example, the reduction in the value of CCC inventory, assuming it will be about 1 billion bushels as of July 1, in case the support price is reduced from that in effect last year to $1.30 or so, national average, next July 1 is obviously a very substantial sum.

6. The following illustrates the basis for computing the CCC resale price under 105 and 115 percent provisions in case the national average wheat loan level should be $1.30 as of the marketing year beginning next July 1:

(a) The resale price for CCC stocks of wheat acquired under past programs for July of this year would be $1.30 times 105 percent, or $1.365. On August 1, 1 cent would be added and 1 cent per month thereafter for 8 additional months. The resale price would reach its maximum of $1.455 in April 1965, remaining at that level until adjusted for the new marketing year starting July 1, 1965, in accord with the law then in effect.

(b) Should the 115 percent provision be in effect, the resale price for July 1964 would be $1.30 times 115 percent, or $1.495. By April 1965, the addition of an unrealistic "loss-leader" carrying charge of only 1 cent per month would bring the resale price for April, May, and June of 1965 to $1.585.

7. The 115 percent formula would help insure that the United States would not have to place an embargo on wheat exported to comply with the minimum price under the international wheat agreement, pursuant to the Nation's commitment under that agreement.

The July 1964 price, under a $1.30 loan level and the 105 percent proviso, would place the United States in a position where it would be offering wheat into export channels below the minimum price as related to the schedule setup under IWA, unless some unusual action was taken by the U.S. Government to insure meeting the IWA commitment.

Authority to deal with this matter was delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture by the late President Kennedy soon after farmers voted to reject wheat marketing quotas in the referendum conducted in May 1963.

8. There are other reasons to support the 115 percent proviso, chiefly centering on lower costs to the CCC, encouraging the use of the marketing system, and reducing the prospect of cycling of CCC stocks. This is the process whereby CCC takes possession of stocks acquired under price support with one outstretched hand while, with its other long hand, it sells out inventory which it has possessed for 1, 2, or 3 years. Where CCC owns the commodity outright, this should be known as the stalling period.

For demand to be met out of current production by farmers: Assists in reducing CCC costs; it reduces the cycling of stocks; it contributes to more aggressive marketing activity on the part of the grain marketing industry to meet domestic and export needs.

III. THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE 115-PERCENT PROVISO

1. The Secretary of Agriculture has, at present, authority to increase support and resale prices. The principal argument in opposition to writing into law a provision requiring a minimum resale price of 115 percent of the support price or the market price, whichever is higher, is that such authority resides in the Secretary of Agriculture at the present time and that he would exercise it if need be.

It is argued that public confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture on the part of farmers and the wheat marketing industry, on the part of Members of Congress of both parties, and on the part of the public generally, is extremely high; that he should be entrusted with the broadest possible delegation of authority by Congress in such matters as the CCC resale price.

Furthermore, Congress should, it is argued, leave to his judgment and discretion such matters so as to insure that "a nonpolitical, scientific, and enlightened policy and program would be pursued devoid of congressional controversy" which such program specifics as the 115-percent proposal might engender; that it is assumed he would seek the guidance of the marketing industry, of farm organizations, and of farmers themselves to guide his decisionmaking.

2. The decisions he would make, because they would not be announced in advance, could well keep competitors of the United States in the world wheat trade guessing long and hard; that this tactic would be in the best tradition of Yankee trading and would immeasurably increase the bargaining power of the United States in international wheat markets because of his experience and proved skill in such matters.

3. By delegating the broadest possible powers to the Secretary of Agriculture, Congress will be arming him and his successors with the tools and authority to exercise his demonstrated skills in public management, in achieving efficiency and economy, in inventory management, in reducing operating costs of the Department of Agriculture, and related matters.

4. It may well be that the Secretary, after studying the matter, may decide that resale of wheat should be at 120 percent or a higher percentage of the support level. For Congress to have specified a minimum of 115 percent might, in such event, appear to be inhibiting the making of a decision to specify a higher resale price.

5. It is also argued that the utility of merchandising efforts, domestic and export, of the grain marketing industry have been greatly overvalued and overstated; that the farmers' interest would be better served by enlarging the role of Government in acquiring stocks and disposing of them; and that leaving the matter to the determination of the Secretary would facilitate this development.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Is the Senate still operating under the rule of germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The Senator may request that he be recognized to address himself to another subject.

Mr. McNAMARA. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes on two separate items.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, Sunday, February 16, was the 46th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, but Lithuanians, in America or in the Republic of Lithuania, are not celebrating this date as a holiday—for the Soviets have violated their sovereignty and made a mockery of freedom.

Since June of 1940, Lithuania has been cruelly oppressed by the military occupation forces of Soviet Russia. Through extermination and deportation, this courageous nation has lost more than one-fourth of its entire population. At least 20 percent of the present inhabitants are Soviet colonists. Almost one-third of all Lithuanians live abroad. Over a million have chosen America as their refuge.

When one considers that those who were murdered and deported have been the strongest elements of the country, this population loss would strike a fatal blow at the chance of survival of the Lithuanian nation if it were not for the courage and sacrifice of its patriots.

Mr. President, I share the hopes of millions of persons of Baltic origin that the day will come when the brave people of Lithuania free themselves from the Soviet tyranny that now oppresses them and that they once again enjoy the state of national independence they so strongly desire.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S EXECUTIVE ORDER AGAINST AGE DISCRIMINATION IN HIRING

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, last Thursday, President Johnson issued an Executive order prohibiting Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of age in the hiring of employees.

As one who has long been concerned with this problem, and who has attempted to solve it at the legislative level, I wish to commend the President for taking this important, and long-needed step.

The President's order prohibits Federal contractors and subcontractors from setting maximum age limits for most jobs. The few exceptions are largely of a technical nature.

In effect, the President's order applies to the growing number of workers—45 and over—who have been the principal victims of this employment bias, based on age.

This emerging pattern of age bias has been a matter of concern for several years to the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and to its predecessor, the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, both of which I have had the honor of serving as chairman.

These Senate study units found that jobseekers as young as 45 were denied employment, even though they were fully qualified in all respects, on the sole basis of age.

As a direct outgrowth of these findings, I introduced legislation in the 86th and 87th Congresses designed to forbid age discrimination by Federal contractors and subcontractors.

The goal of these bills was identical to that of the Executive order issued last week by President Johnson.

That President Johnson has accomplished this goal by Executive action is a source of great satisfaction to me.

I sincerely hope that all employers affected by the order will cooperate fully in achieving its worthwhile purpose.

It is my further hope that employers, labor organizations, and local and State governments not covered by the order will take note of this Presidential action and follow the example set here, to eliminate one more barrier to realizing the American tradition of equal opportunity for men and women who are willing and able to work.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 847, Senate bill 178, and temporarily lay aside the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 178), to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, is this the authorization bill for the Garrison project?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct. It would amend the authorization.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the amount of the authorization?

Mr. BURDICK. In money?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. BURDICK. The construction money for a period of up to 25 years is $212 million under the present bill.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the total cost?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes; over the construction period.

Mr. CURTIS. Roughly, how is that divided between flood control allocations, irrigation allocations, fish and wildlife, and so on?

Mr. BURDICK. Municipal industrial water, $11 million; irrigation, $191 million; fish and wildlife, $30 million; recreation $12 million; and flood control $2,800,000. These are round numbers, of course.

Mr. CURTIS. The irrigation allocation is $191 million?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. What portion of it will be repaid by the landowners?

Mr. BURDICK. The landowners will pay approximately 13 to 14 percent. The balance will be paid from power revenues.

Mr. CURTIS. With reference to the power revenues, has the committee received the power report on rates from the Department of the Interior?

Mr. BURDICK. I believe they have.

Mr. CURTIS. This information, then——

Mr. BURDICK. There has not been any specific action either by our committee or the House committee on the power formula yet, but I understand it will be reached in due time.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the bill correspond to the provisions set forth in the power revenue?

Mr. BURDICK. In the power payout which is proposed by the Secretary of the Interior an increase in rates in the Missouri River Basin and also for a change in the interest rate.

Mr. CURTIS. Will those changes require legislation?

Mr. BURDICK. I believe the interest rate may require legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. The interest rate would be changed from what to what; does the Senator know?

Mr. BURDICK. It would be changed to 2½ percent for the basic rate for the corps projects on river systems to make it compatible and consistent with the river systems; such things as the Columbia, and others.

Mr. CURTIS. But the hearings on the Garrison diversion unit were held prior to receipt of the power payoff?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Hearings in the House are being held this week. It is anticipated that perhaps whatever impact the power report may have may be reflected in the House amendments?

Mr. BURDICK. That is what I anticipate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I notice that $191 million of the $248 million project is for irrigation; is that correct?

Mr. BURDICK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. What would be the benefits of the irrigation, if any, in terms of crop production?

Mr. BURDICK. In order to construct the dams and the reservoirs, it has required 568,000 acres which have already been taken out of production in North Dakota to make room for the reservoir system. The original authorization, which we are amending today, would call for an irrigation project embracing a million acres. In other words, at the time of the 1944 Flood Control Act, we lost this land to main stem reservoir system and in return would receive a million acres back in irrigation. This amendment reduces that figure to 250,000 acres, or less than half the acreage that has been taken out for reservoir purposes.

The actual change in farming operations will result in a shift from surplus crops, such as wheat, to nonsurplus crops such as feed grains and alfalfa, and things of that nature, and bringing in a supplemental economy based on livestock. But there is no new land being brought into production. As a matter of fact, all the lands embraced by this project are already in production and would be shifted from present production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How much of this production will be in feed grains? It is a price support program, which, of course, the Senator from North Dakota knows much better than I.

Mr. BURDICK. I was thinking of crops like alfalfa and others of that kind used in beef production and meat production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Has any comparison been made as to the difference in the value of the crops produced?

Mr. BURDICK. The answer to that question is in the report, if the Senator cares to have the answer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do.

Mr. BURDICK. On page 3 of the report it is stated:

> About 75 percent of the irrigated acreage should be used for forage crops and feed for livestock production.

Therefore, for at least 75 percent of it, there would not be a cash crop.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The land that has been taken out of production, is out for all time.

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Whether the bill is passed or not, that is something that has been accomplished. Is that correct?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. In 1944, we took out 568,000 acres. This irrigation project was approved as a part of the consideration for the reduction of the acreage. This was a part of the 1944 package. This has already been authorized. All that this amendment would do would be to provide an authorization for reducing the irrigation part to 250,000 acres over a period of 25 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is the Senator saying, then, that if this authorization bill is not passed, more land will come into production?

Mr. BURDICK. It is argued that we already have an authorization for a million acres.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then we do not need further authorization, do we?

Mr. BURDICK. Except that in cases of this kind Congress always likes to take another look at project authorizations, when they are as old as this one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I approve of that policy. The benefit-cost ratio is 2.5 to 1. If we disregard the benefits which would flow from an increase in the agricultural surplus, is there any way of calculating the ratio so that the benefit ratio would be unity? The cost of the project, as I understand, is $248 million.

Mr. BURDICK. It is $212 million, because the difference has already been assigned as a part of the reservoir cost.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. The cost ratio is 2.5 to 1. The benefit would have to be in the neighborhood of $700 million. I wonder what the value of the crops produced would be, so that I may calculate whether, if we disregard what I would disregard—because we already have a surplus of all crops—this would be a unity ratio or less.

Mr. BURDICK. I regret that I do not have that computation, but I think it would be because under irrigation the cropping pattern is changed and there are other project benefits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 178.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "acres", to insert "municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control"; in line 6, after "1962", to insert "(Revised May 1963)"; after line 8, to strike out:

> SEC. 2. In connection with the carrying out of the plan for the Garrison diversion unit, the Secretary is authorized to make provision for the conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources of the area in accordance with the authorities and procedures of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (38 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661, et seq.): *Provided*, That no land for the conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources of the area shall be acquired with funds authorized to be made available pursuant to this Act unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District or the Oahe Conservancy Sub District in their respective States.
>
> The Secretary is authorized to construct recreational facilities essentially as described in aforesaid House Document Numbered 325, and to withdraw or acquire by such means as he considers in the public interest, additional lands required therefor if the State of North Dakota, or a political subdivision thereof, or a public entity agrees to operate and maintain such recreational facilities for a period of at least twenty years. After twenty years of State or local operation and maintenance, the Secretary is authorized to convey to the State, or to a political subdivision thereof, or to a public entity, without monetary consideration, the recreation facilities, including land therefor, to be used, operated, and maintained by the State, or political subdivision, or public entity exclusively for public park, recreation, and conservation purposes. Except for works and areas which will be administered by an agency of the Department of the Interior, provision of specific facilities for these purposes shall not be undertaken by the Secretary until suitable agreements have been made with State or local agencies respecting, among other things, administration and the bearing or sharing of appropriate operation and maintenance costs. Appropriate shares of the Federal costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the Garrison diversion unit shall be allocated to the purposes specified in this section and shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable as are certain other purposes of the project under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto).

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

> SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, as a part of the Garrison diversion unit, to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities, including access roads, to acquire or withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the unit; these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State, or local public agencies, or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertaking described in this paragraph, including the costs of investigation, planning, operation, and maintenance, and an appropriate share of the joint cost of the Garrison diversion unit shall be nonreimbursable.

On page 4, after line 20, to strike out:

> SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the existence of any reservation of right-of-way for canals under the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 371, 391; 43 U.S.C. 945), the Secretary is authorized to pay just compensation to the owners of private lands west of the one hundredth meridian, for all lands or interest in lands required for right-of-way purposes for the Garrison diversion unit.

On page 5, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "4" to "3"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "5" to "4"; in line 14, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "project" and insert "unit", and at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "6" to "5"; 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 the general plan for the Missouri-Souris unit of the Missouri River Basin project, heretofore authorized in section 9 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), as modified by the report of the Secretary of the Interior contained in House Document Numbered 325, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session, is confirmed and approved under the designation "Garrison diversion unit," and the construction of a development providing for the irrigation of two hundred and fifty thousand acres municipal and industrial water, fish and wildlife conservation and development, recreation, flood control and other project purposes shall be

prosecuted by the Department of the Interior substantially in accordance with the plans set out in the Bureau of Reclamation report dated November 1962 (revised May 1963) supplemental report to said House Document 325.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, as a part of the Garrison diversion unit, to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities, including access roads, to acquire or withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the unit; these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other unit purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State, or local public agencies, or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, transfer, exchange, or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertaking described in this paragraph, including the costs of investigation, planning, operation, and maintenance, and an appropriate share of the joint cost of the Garrison diversion unit shall be nonreimbursable.

SEC. 3. The Garrison diversion unit shall be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works constructed or authorized to be constructed under the comprehensive plan approved by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944, as amended and supplemented. The Secretary shall give consideration to returning to the Missouri River to the fullest extent practicable such of the return flows as are not required for beneficial purposes.

SEC. 4. The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs allocated to interest-bearing features of the unit shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is initiated, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue.

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water from the project authorized by this Act shall be delivered to any water user for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I did not have notice that the pending bill would be considered at this time. At the present time we are considering important wheat legislation in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, in fact an amendment of mine is now pending. I am very pleased, though that this bill is being brought up at this time and I feel sure it can be disposed of in a very short while.

The legislation the Senate is now considering is very important to North Dakota and to the Nation. I should like to make a brief statement with reference to this bill.

What we have before us in S. 178 is reauthorizing legislation with respect to the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota, which has already been authorized under the Pick Sloan plan of 1944.

Because of a change in the point of diversion, a shift in the area within North Dakota to be irrigated, and because of the years that have elapsed, it was considered best to reauthorize the project now.

This bill will mean a great deal in our efforts to stabilize the economy of North Dakota. The population of North Dakota is approximately the same as it was 30 years ago. Many of our people had to leave because of lack of opportunity, the increasing size of farms, and a prolonged period of drought.

The project would go a long way toward stabilizing not only our agriculture but the whole economy of North Dakota.

It would produce, for example, alfalfa and other feed crops, and encourage smaller farm operations, as well as provide opportunity for all our people. It would also furnish water to the cities in the eastern part of North Dakota, such as our two largest cities, Grand Forks and Fargo, which in drought years have faced serious water problems. In the drought years, they had a very difficult time in providing water to their then much smaller populations. The project under consideration would provide the needed additional water which these cities need, and which other cities in North Dakota also need.

It is sometimes argued that this is not the time to engage in further reclamation projects, because we already have big surpluses. Mr. President, if we had waited to start new reclamation projects until there were no surplus in crops we would never have had any irrigation projects initiated anywhere in the United States. There never was a time when there was not a surplus of food in the United States. I hope there always will be. However, the only way we can assure an adequate food supply for the future is through projects such as this. In any event, the bill itself provides that no crop in surplus can be produced under irrigation for 10 years from the date of its enactment.

Irrigation projects are largely responsible for the great empire that we have built in the western part of the United States. The proposed project will do as much for the State of North Dakota, I believe, and for the whole Nation.

Finally, I should like to make one more point. North Dakota is the No. 1 duck propagation State. This project, with its wildlife features, will do a great deal toward helping in duck propagation, as well as in the propagation of other wildlife and fish. It is of great interest to outdoorsmen and to sportsmen all over the United States.

Under the Pick-Sloan plan, North Dakota now has the Garrison Dam which is a multipurpose dam.

The multipurpose features include benefits from flood control, power generation, reclamation, and even some navigation. North Dakota lost approximately 500,000 acres of its best agricultural land in the areas flooded by both the Garrison Dam in North Dakota and by the Oahe Dam in South Dakota, which backs water up into North Dakota.

For these and many other reasons, I am hopeful that the Senate will favorably consider the bill and will pass it promptly. This is an irrigation project we in North Dakota have been striving for for nearly a half a century. It is an excellent project with a highly favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. It would be of great benefit not only to North Dakota but to the entire Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement I made before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on June 6 last.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG OF NORTH DAKOTA

Senate bill 178, sponsored by Senator BURDICK and myself of North Dakota, and Senators MUNDT and MCGOVERN of South Dakota, is the most important piece of legislation affecting my State to be considered by Congress for a long, long time. North Dakota has, for almost 75 years, diligently sought a means to divert water from the Missouri River to central and eastern North Dakota. Although many proposals were advanced in the first half century of this effort, it was the authorization of the Missouri River Basin project by Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 that gave the needed impetus to the proposal.

The interest and support of North Dakota for a Missouri River Diversion project was greatly intensified during the drought period of the 1930's when the importance of water was so dramatically emphasized. The Red River of the north, at that time supplying water for two of North Dakota's largest cities as well as two important cities on the Minnesota side, had practically dried up. During much of the 1930's, and many times since, we have had severe drought periods that had a tremendous adverse effect on all of our agriculture. You can better realize the importance of water and irrigation to North Dakota when you consider that we have often had years of marginal rainfall and this, when agriculture represents more than 80 percent of all the income. Irrigation is badly needed in North Dakota to stabilize our farm and other income.

The Bureau of Reclamation investigations of the diversion project have resulted in certain recommended modifications to the original authorization of diversion from the Missouri River in the Flood Control Act of 1944. I wish to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this project has been authorized and all we are seeking is the modifications proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Reclamation recommends modifications to the plan originally proposed insofar as the point of diversion and the location of lands to be served are concerned. These investigations have also determined that the project is engineeringly sound and economically feasible. Today we are asking for your approval of the changes to the originally authorized Missouri River diversion project in North Dakota, now designated the Garrison diversion unit, so that we can proceed with its development. By approving the new modified plan you will contribute immeasurably to the economic health of North Dakota, as well as to the upper Great Plains region and the Nation as a whole.

The Missouri River Basin project, as it evolved and was authorized by Congress in 1944, recognized the needs of all the basin as well as the contributions each of the States would, or could, make to the project and the economy of the Nation. Beneficial use of water for irrigation and municipal and industrial purposes in the upper basin States was an integral part of the plan and represented their primary interest, just as flood control and navigation represented the principal interest of the lower basin States. To accomplish these objectives it was also recognized that large upstream main stem dams and reservoirs would be required to control and store floodwaters. There was no alternative but to flood millions of acres of valuable river bottom land in the upper basin States for these reservoirs. In North Dakota over 550,000 acres were acquired for the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs.

It was our understanding from the start that this great loss in acreage would be partially offset by irrigation that was possible through development of the Garrison diversion unit. When the Senate Appropriations Committee was considering funds to start the construction of Garrison Dam, I told the committee, and this appears in the hearings of the committee, that if North Dakota did not one day attain a sizable irrigation project Garrison Dam and Reservoir itself would be a net loss to North Dakota. We were willing to make this sacrifice, but always with the understanding that the Pick-Sloan promise of irrigation was equally important as the other benefits to be accrued from the Missouri River Basin program such as flood control, hydroelectric power, and navigation.

By far, the greater part of the major benefits accruing from the Garrison Dam to date, which include flood control, navigation, and power benefits, accrue to areas outside of North Dakota. Irrigation development in the upper basin, North Dakota's principal interest, has not kept pace with other project functions. Approval of S. 178, which will authorize an initial 250,000-acre phase of the potential million acre Garrison diversion unit, will pave the way to correct this situation.

The multiple-purpose Garrison diversion unit will serve a number of important needs. In addition to providing water for irrigation and municipal and industrial uses, new recreation opportunities will be available, and fish and wildlife resources will be enhanced. The project costs allocated to each function appear to be reasonable, particularly when compared to the extensive benefits that will be derived from each of the important services from the project. Over 80 percent of the total investment required for the Garrison diversion unit is reimbursable and will be repaid to the Federal Treasury by the water users, the Garrison diversion conservancy district, and surplus Missouri Basin power revenues. The 250,000-acre initial phase of the Garrison diversion unit has a very favorable 2.51 to 1 benefit-cost ratio as reported by the Secretary of Interior in its official report to your committee.

The citizens of North Dakota are solidly behind the Garrison Diversion Unit. Virtually every statewide organization in North Dakota, including farm, civic, and conservation organizations as well as the Greater North Dakota Association, counties, municipalities, chambers of commerce and other local farm and civic groups, have endorsed and support the project.

The North Dakota Legislature created the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District which now includes 25 counties in the State to further the project. This district has the authority to contract for certain aspects of the project and finance these contracts through a general tax levy that will be spread over all property in the counties in the district. The ability to tax indirect beneficiaries to the extent contemplated through the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District is a unique feature of this district.

The farmers who own irrigable land have voluntarily organized 8 irrigation districts in the Garrison Diversion Unit area. These districts and the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District have substantially agreed to contracts that will be negotiated with the Bureau of Reclamation for the construction and operation of the project.

Although the legislation before this committee will authorize only one-fourth of the originally proposed project, I very strongly urge its enactment. We ask only for our fair share of the benefits from the overall Missouri River Basin project, and the opportunity for our State to make its full contribution to the growth and strength of our Nation.

I earnestly hope that this committee will take favorable action on S. 178.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the report on the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being on objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 870) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

Enactment of S. 178 would provide for necessary modifications in the Missouri River Basin project authorizations to accommodate the special conditions of the Garrison diversion unit. The principal revision would be to reduce the irrigated acreage from the original proposed 1,007,000 acres to 250,000 acres, with the corresponding decrease in costs.

NEED

This project will be of increasing importance to the future growth, economy, and well-being, not only of the area directly affected, but of the entire State of North Dakota. The economy of the State was adversely affected when it lost 548,000 acres, mostly farmland, flooded by the Missouri River Basin reservoirs. The irrigation of the 250,000 acres proposed under the Garrison unit will go a long way in offsetting the loss of land that has been flooded.

North Dakota, like the other Great Plains States, is on the borderline between the humid and the arid areas of the Nation. Some years there is plenty of rainfall for a large portion of the State, but in a good many years the precipitation is entirely inadequate. During those dry years or years of short supply the farmers who are dependent solely upon rainfall for the mositure requirements of their crops suffer serious and extreme losses. The proposed irrigation would supplement the rainfall and would give assurance of a full crop year in and year out.

The development of the project would actually result in a reduction of agricultural surpluses. Most of the land to be irrigated is now growing wheat, but when irrigation water is provided the rules of irrigation economics will dictate that wheat acres be displaced by feed-crop acres on the farms of the unit.

About 75 percent of the irrigated acreage should be used for forage crops and feed for livestock production—items which are not in surplus, and for which demand is increasing faster than for other agricultural products.

Because of today's surpluses of wheat and corn grain, on the one hand, and the rising population growth rate, on the other, the proposed time schedule for development of irrigation on these lands was carefully considered. The testified schedule of irrigation development for the Garrison diversion unit provides for only 20 percent of ultimate development by 1980.

PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

The plan of development for the initial stage provides for irrigation of 250,000 acres, a municipal and industrial water supply for 15 towns and cities, 24 areas for fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation development at 7 major water impoundments. Flood control and incidental drainage of nonirrigable lands are other benefits.

Six areas make up the 250,000 acres. They constitute a feasible development, but other areas could also be used in the event any should drop out of the initial development. The system includes 1,932 miles of canals and laterals, 4 regulating reservoirs, 156 pumping plants, and about 2,265 miles of drains to control ground and surface water. Pumping power will be supplied by either existing or proposed federally constructed facilities, or by wheeling over electric cooperative or utility lines.

The facilities to serve the modified plan will be constructed during a period of about 11 years to full initial size, with first delivery water for irrigation during the fifth year of construction. Construction of deferred drains is expected to continue for another 20 years.

PROJECT LANDS

About 30 percent of the gross area surveyed and classified is irrigable. Almost without exception the topsoil of the irrigable land is a dark-colored, open, permeable material that is high in organic material and free from harmful accumulations of salt or alkali. All irrigable land is of good quality, capable of producing a variety of irrigated crops over a long period of time. Nearly 50 percent of the irrigable land included in the 250,000-acre development has been fully investigated and delineated by a detailed land classification survey.

WATER SUPPLY

Water supply for the unit will be diverted from Garrison Reservoir, constructed by the Corps of Engineers on the Missouri River. Estimated annual diversion from Garrison Reservoir for the 250,000 acres is about 805,000 acre-feet.

Cost

Project cost	$248,234,000
Irrigation	191,132,000
Repaid by irrigator and conservancy district	25,546,000
Repaid by power	165,586,000
Municipal and industrial water	11,285,000
Power	37,000
Fish and wildlife (nonreimbursable)	30,845,000
Recreation (nonreimbursable)	12,122,000
Flood control	2,813,000
Total	248,234,000
Construction cost of Garrison unit	212,383,000
Assigned cost, Garrison Reservoir	17,768,000
Assigned cost, pumping power	18,083,000
Total	248,234,000

NOTE.—Benefit-cost ratio, 2.5 to 1.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Flood Control Act of 1944 provided for a comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin. In the interests of the overall program in several States, North Dakota sacrificed 568,000 acres of good farm and ranch land for Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs.

As partial compensation for this sacrifice, North Dakota was to benefit from

an irrigation development which it has not yet received. Flood control, pollution abatement, navigation, municipal and industrial water supplies, and power benefits have accrued principally to areas outside North Dakota.

North Dakota to date has sustained a net loss because of the Missouri River Basin project in the permanent loss of the land and the wealth produced on it.

The negative impact of the loss to North Dakota in land resources has been emphatically set forth in a study conducted by the North Dakota State University titled "Negative Impacts of the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs on the North Dakota Economy." Facts pointed out in this study indicate the following: First, based on the potential land use of the areas acquired, the direct loss to the North Dakota economy totals $15.7 million annually because of these main stem reservoirs; second, the indirect loss related to the severance of the bottom lands from the uplands amounts to $2.7 million each year; third, the net annual loss to wildlife habitat is estimated at $216,000; fourth, the value of timber resources lost through reservoir inundation is estimated at $38,649,000; fifth, approximately 217,000 acres of irrigable land are inundated by the reservoirs or subjected to erosion; therefore, the increased contribution that irrigation development of these acres could have made to the economy of North Dakota has been forever destroyed; and sixth, an estimated 5,850 million tons of lignite coal was left in the land inundated by these reservoirs.

Engineering investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation since 1944 have determined the necessity of shifting the location of the lands to be irrigated from the northwestern part of North Dakota eastward. The Bureau recommended a start on an initial 250,000-acre phase of the originally contemplated 1-million-acre project. Included in the project are provisions for municipal and industrial water supply, recreation, fish and wildlife enhancement, flood control, and lake restoration.

Because of the engineering investigations, a modified authorization was required. The modification is accomplished by S. 178, which I introduced, with my colleagues, MILTON YOUNG, GEORGE MCGOVERN, and KARL MUNDT, as cosponsors.

In short, the plan for the Garrison diversion unit is a modern and modified version of the original proposal for irrigation development in North Dakota.

Mr. President, limited and erratic rainfall severely restricts the opportunity of North Dakota farmers to diversify their operations. The 250,000 irrigated acres will be integrated with up to 1 million acres of adjacent dry land, bringing stability and balance to agriculture in the area and eliminating the constant threat of drought.

I wish to emphasize that the Garrison diversion unit will reduce the acreage devoted to wheat and other small grains which, as we know, are in chronic surplus. An estimate by the North Dakota State University indicates that 85,000 acres currently devoted to the production of wheat and other small grains will be diverted to crops required for livestock.

In this connection, it should be noted that the Nation's requirements for meat are increasing and are expected to increase further with population growth.

Even the 250,000-acre phase of the irrigation development will require 25 years to complete; by that time, the population is expected to be 120 million greater than it presently is.

In the Garrison diversion unit, we are not reclaiming desert land; all of the land that is to be irrigated is now in agricultural production.

The net effect of the project will be to reduce the production of surplus crops. In fact, written into S. 178 is a prohibition against the raising of surplus crops for a period of 10 years from the date of authorization.

Extensive studies by the Bureau of Reclamation over a 20-year period indicate that the Garrison Diversion Unit is sound and feasible and will produce $2.51 in benefits for each $1 invested. Annual benefits total $22,166,000.

Some impacts on the trade and business economy and indirect benefits that will result from the project are:

Population increase in project area	17,500
New retail business establishments	650
New service establishments	190
New wholesale establishments	185
New manufacturing establishments	51
New job opportunities	4,500
Increase in nonfarm personal income	$26,355,000
Increase in Federal income tax (annually)	$3,200,000
Increase in State income tax (annually)	$550,000

Conservative effects from other functions that the initial phase of the project will serve are an increase in migratory waterfowl production habitat by 20 percent; increase in fishing use by over 700 percent; and increase in recreation use by over 1,100,000 visitor days each year.

In undertaking the Garrison diversion project, the Federal Government would be making an investment that would pay for itself many times over. Studies indicate that over a 50-year period the increased income from individual farmers in the project area would yield Federal income tax revenues $160 million higher than at present. Combined with $25.5 million that would be returned to the Government from the irrigators and conservancy district, 98 percent of the cost allocated to irrigation would be covered. In addition, more than $160 million will be available from surplus power revenues. These returns in the Federal Treasury far exceed the investment in the project.

The unit undoubtedly is one of the best planned irrigation projects that ever has been presented to Congress. Refined cost estimates indicate the construction cost of the initial phase is $212,383,000. The project also has been assigned costs from investments already made for mainstem dams and power facilities totaling $36,630,000.

Mr. President, more than 80 percent of the costs of the project will be repaid to the Federal Treasury by water users and from power revenues. The remaining 20 percent, associated with fish and wildlife enhancement, recreation and flood control, is considered to benefit the public at large and, according to national policy, does not have to be repaid.

The two best waterfowl production areas in the Nation are contained in the Garrison Diversion Unit area. The necessity of protecting these nationally significant areas and of improving these resources and the opportunities for the public to utilize and enjoy them are recognized throughout the project plan.

Thirty-six major and thirty minor areas constitute the fish and wildlife features of the plan. These areas will contain more than 56,000 acres of water and marsh that will have a constant and controllable water supply available, substantially enhancing the migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources of the area.

The people of North Dakota who stand to benefit from the Garrison Diversion Unit have expressed their willingness to assume their responsibilities. Nine years ago, they organized the 25-county Garrison Conservancy District, representing all the areas that will benefit from the project. The district was granted the authority to levy a general tax over all property within its boundaries to finance the repayment obligations for the project.

In addition, 9 irrigation districts, including about 420,000 acres of irrigable land, have been formed by potential irrigators. These districts stand ready to contract with the Federal Government for their share of the project costs.

The Garrison Diversion Unit not only will compensate my State for the land it has sacrificed for the Missouri River Basin Project, but its development is the key to new life to the area and new wealth to the region and the Nation.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give their approval to S. 178.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from North Dakota that this matter came up rather quickly, and that it is my fault that he was not notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the con-

sideration of Calendar No. 842, Senate Resolution 275.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 275) providing additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-eighth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purpose, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 770, H.R. 2772.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. H.R. 2772 is now the pending business before the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

RECESS TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 19, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 18 (legislative day of February 10), 1964:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Frederick C. Belen, of Michigan, to be Deputy Postmaster General, vice Sidney W. Bishop, resigned.

William M. McMillan, of Texas, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Frederick C. Belen, elevated.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

William S. Gaud, of Connecticut, to be Deputy Administrator, Agency for International Development, vice Frank M. Coffin.

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Administrator for the Near East and south Asia, Agency for International Development, vice William S. Gaud.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Marshall K. Phillips	Robert E. Gardner
Kenneth M. Lumsden	Clayton W. Collins, Jr.
Gordon R. Campbell	Ralph G. Isacson
Richard D. Mellette	Ronald McClellan
Martin F. Groff	

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Harry D. Smith	Harold E. Stanley
Paul J. Bouchard	Billy R. Mull
Daniel C. Mania	Leroy W. Peterson
Richard H. Hicks	Carl W. Snyder, Jr.
Robert E. Potts	Philip M. Lebet
Robert E. Diller	Edward A. Walsh

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Luther C. Heinz	Arnold F. Schade
Ralph L. Shifley	Charles E. Loughlin
Paul Masterton	James O. Cobb
George P. Koch	Thomas A. Christopher
George F. Pittard	
William M. McCormick	Robert A. Macpherson
Robert L. Townsend	Carlton B. Jones
Herman J. Kossler	Paul D. Buie
Noel A. M. Gayler	James R. Reedy
Kenneth L. Veth	Henry S. Monroe
Draper L. Kauffman	Lester R. Schulz
Eugene B. Fluckey	Lester S. Chambers
Harry Hull	John H. McQuilkin
Robert H. Weeks	William F. Petrovic
Thomas H. Morton	James A. Brown
John S. Coye, Jr.	
Joseph W. Williams, Jr.	

MEDICAL CORPS

Walter Welham

SUPPLY CORPS

Emory D. Stanley, Jr.
Stephen Sherwood

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Alexander C. Husband

The following-named Reserve officers for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

James D. Hardy	Robert W. Copeland
Harry H. Hess	Carl E. Watson
Eric C. Lambart	Leslie L. Reid
Thomas J. Killian	Robert H. Barnum
Leonard S. Bailey	Charles E. Rieben, Jr.
William M. McCloy	Stephen E. Jones
Ralph G. Coburn, Jr.	

MEDICAL CORPS

Moore Moore, Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Harold W. Torgerson
Edgar H. Reeder

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Louis R. LaPorte

DENTAL CORPS

Alton K. Fisher

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Abel, William H.	Adams, Chester A.
Abercrombie, Frank E.	Adams, James W.
Abernathy, William K.	Adams, Max L.
Ablowich, Dean A.	Adams, Raymond A.
Adams, Robert W.	Baker, Curtis L.
Adcock, Thomas W.	Baker, Hugh B.
Adler, Alan B.	Baker, Maurice R.
Affourtit, Daniel J., Jr.	Baker, Robert J.
Ahern, James W.	Baker, Robert P.
Akers, Bruce	Baker, Wayne E.
Akerson, Arthur C., Jr.	Baker, Willard D.
Albaugh, Cleve W.	Bakun, William D.
Albers, Robert J.	Baldwin, William E.
Albert, William A.	Ball, Willie H., Jr.
Alden, John H.	Ballard, James O.
Alexander, Dale E.	Ballard, William C.
Alexander, Willis H., Jr.	Ballou, Charles L.
	Ballou, Thomas B.
Allain, Charles J.	Bancroft, William P.
Allen, Bert L.	Banes, Robert E.
Allen, George R.	Bangert, William R.
Allen, James W.	Banister, Richard M.
Allen, Julian A.	Banks, Richard
Allen, Richard C.	Bannan, Edward K.
Allen, Robert J.	Barber, Robert F.
Allen, Stanley E.	Barber, Stephen W.
Allison, Robert E.	Banner, David R.
Allwine, Robert A.	Barbre, George W.
Alrick, Richard D.	Barclay, William A.
Alston, Vernon D.	Bard, Stephen A.
Amantea, Thomas R.	Bareilles, John L.
Amend, Robert J.	Barell, John F.
Ames, Albert M.	Barlow, Johnnie T.
Anderson, Charles E.	Barmes, Vernon T.
Anderson, Earl N. J.	Barnaby, Kenneth A.
Anderson, Gordon R.	Barnes, Harley H., Jr.
Anderson, Gordon W.	Barnes, Harlan L.
Anderson, Ira B.	Barnicle, Paul E.
Anderson, James L.	Barns, David W.
Anderson, Lawrence G.	Baron, Michael
Anderson, Robert E.	Baron, Theodore L.
Anderson, Thomas M.	Barr, Charles T.
Anderson, Varro D.	Barrett, Hoyt S.
Andrasko, Michael B.	Barringer, Larry E.
Andrew, Kenneth C.	Barry, Kenneth R.
Anglin, Hubert L.	Barry, Richard D.
Anselmi, Ernest A., Jr.	Bartels, Albert L.
Anthony, John A., III	Bartholomew, Joseph W.
Anthony, John P., Jr.	
Antonio, Robert J.	Bartolett, Frank S., III
Aragona, Francis J.	
Arbogast, James B.	Barton, Glenn L.
Arkin, William E.	Barton, Jere A.
Armbruster, Robert E.	Bartusek, Marion E.
Arms, Fay H.	Basham, Darell C.
Arms, Philip B., Jr.	Bashaw, Lloyd W.
Armstrong, Charles E., Jr.	Bass, William F.
	Bassett, James R.
Arnaud Antoine J. A.	Batchellor, John K., Jr.
Arnett, Verlin M.	
Arrasmith, Thomas M., III	Bates, George E., Jr.
	Bates, Henry W.
Arsenault, Oscar W.	Battaglia, William F.
Ashbaugh, Charles I.	Batterton, George B.
Ashley, Roger T.	Batti, Donald E.
Aspas, Paul T.	Baublitz, John E.
Aulenbach, Glen L.	Bauer, Jerry F.
Aurell, Donald L.	Baumann, Arthur C.
Ausley, Paul C., Jr.	Baumer, Donald G.
Austin, Gene M.	Baxley, Jarman G.
Austin, Leon	Baxter, James B., Jr.
Averna, Vincent S.	Bay, Warren H.
Avery, Charles G.	Bazzel, Roderic C.
Avore, Malcolm A.	Beach, Venton E.
Ayre, Donald	Beam, Henry H.
Babb, Dewey E.	Beam, James C.
Babcock, William L.	Bearshall, Elmer W., Jr.
Babiash, William E.	
Bable, Samuel S.	Beatty, Thomas J.
Bacon, Daniel K.	Bechtold, Joseph M.
Bacon, William S.	Becker, Robert E.
Baer, Robert D.	Bee, Fred A.
Baesman, Richard F.	Beebe, Bruce A.
Bahre, George L.	Beech, Henry D.
Bailer, Donald W., Jr.	Behling, Henry J.
Bailey, Charles E., Jr.	Belford, Ralph W.
Bailey, Grover C., III	Bell, Charles F.
Bailey, Howard L.	Bell, Gary E.
Bailey, James H.	Bell, Ned D.
Bailey, Roy, Jr.	Bell, Nolie L.
Bailey, Stanley J., Jr.	Bell, Robert W., Jr.
Baimbridge, Horace H.	Belmont, Richard J.
Baird, Dean D.	Bender, Thomas J.
Baird, James D.	Benge, Albert H.
Baker, Arthur J., III	Benites, Robert D.
	Bennett, Hugh M.

Bennett, Roger L.
Bennigson, Lawrence A.
Benoit, Felix
Bensinger, Darrell L.
Benson, James H.
Benson, Jerome E.
Benson, Leo, III
Benson, Perry S.
Benson, Peter H.
Berg, George W., Jr.
Bergert, James W.
Bergmann, Leland D.
Berigan, Francis M.
Berkey, Lloydallan
Berklite, Ronald B.
Berkowitz, Ross
Berry, James T.
Berry, Kenton C.
Berube, Raymond E. Jr.
Best, James B.
Betterton, Don M.
Betz, Dale S.
Beumer, Theodore H.
Beveridge, Jerry D.
Beyrle, Robert F.
Bicknell, James N.
Bickum, Gilbert W.
Biermann, Kenneth E
Biggerstaff, Paul O.
Billings, David J.
Billings, Robert A.
Binder, Donald
Birchett, John A. K., III
Birtwistle, Richard, III
Bisbing, Raymond H.
Bishop, Arles R.
Bishop, John A.
Bissell, Allen M.
Bissing, Walter W.
Bittner, Francis E.
Bixby, Joseph A.
Black, Oscar T.
Black, Phillip R.
Black, Rudolph R.
Blackburn, William J.
Blackstock, Fletcher L
Blair, Charles R.
Blair, Joseph H., Jr.
Blair, Nelson A.
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.
Blomquist, Richard O.
Blood, David H.
Bloodsworth, George E.
Bloore, John L.
Blubaugh, John G.
Blum, Ervin R.
Blunden, Alec R.
Boarman, John T.
Bodenner, George E.
Boecker, Donald V.
Boesenberg, John J.
Boggs, Dallas B.
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.
Bonham, Charlie L.
Bonnel, Gordon A.
Bonneville, Joseph E., Jr.
Bonsall, Donald E.
Bonsky, William F.
Boomgaarden, Marvin E.
Boose, Donald E.
Booth, Ronald J.
Boreen, Allen R.
Borges, Robert P.
Bornemann, Alfred
Borris, Charles M.
Borinem, Russell A.
Bos, Peter G.
Bost, Donald W.
Boswell, Freddie L., Jr.
Bouchillon, Milton D.
Bourke, Robert H.
Bouscaren, William J.
Bowdoin, Bernarr M.
Bowen, Alfred G.
Bowley, Frederick C.
Bowling, Weldon J.
Bowman, Peter B.
Bowman, Robert J.
Bowser, John V.
Boyd, Thomas M.
Boyd, William T., III
Boyer, Larry A.
Boylan, James D.
Boyle, Francis J.
Boyle, Robert H.
Boyles, Aubrey L.
Bozarth, Jack E.
Bracken, Robert T.
Braden, Morse S.
Bradford, Alfred E.
Bradford, Erby D.
Bradt, Donald E.
Brady, John B.
Brandon, John R.
Brandquist, Roland
Branham, Powers E., Jr.
Branson, Harry W., Jr.
Bratton, James E.
Braun, Frank B.
Breckenridge, Donald R.
Bregenzer, Karl E.
Brehm, James H.
Brenton, Robert J.
Brewer, Eddie R.
Brewer, Shelby T.
Brewer, Vincent E.
Brice, Ronald R.
Bright, Calvin F.
Brimmage, Kirby L.
Bringhurst, William, Jr.
Bristol, William W.
Broach, John C.
Broadfield, Donald E.
Broadwell, William R.
Brocken, John F., Jr.
Brockhausen, Frederick C., Jr.
Brockman, John L., Jr.
Broglio, John D.
Brooks, Edward W.
Brooks, James S.
Brooks, Robert H.
Brouhle, William R.
Brown, Baldwin B.
Brown, Charles K.
Brown, Chester A.
Brown, Clyde E.
Brown, Donald H.
Brown, Edward E.
Brown, Elbert L., Jr.
Brown, Floyd W.
Brown, George R.
Brown, Harold E.
Brown, Lester M.
Brown, Marion L.
Brown, William L.
Browning, Robert E.
Bruen, Richard J.
Brugman, Thomas C.
Brundridge, Harry L.
Bruntlett, Carl E.
Brust, Philip J.
Bryan, John W.
Bryan, Timothy E.
Bryant, Cordis C.
Bryant, Donald W.
Bryant, Ernest W.
Bryant, Raymond, Jr.
Bryant, William H.
Bryant, William J.
Buchans, James C.
Buchart, John R.
Buehler, Roy R.
Buie, Ralph H.
Bullock, James P.
Burdett, Hubert W., Jr.
Burdett, Lawrence P.
Burdge, Ronald E.
Burgess, Kenneth L.
Burke, Robert D.
Burkette, Jerry W.
Burkhard, Charles D.
Burnett, William C.
Burnette, Ray E.
Burnham, Robert C.
Burnham, William T.
Burns, Walter W., Jr.
Burroughs, Eugene S., III
Burrows, Melvin M.
Burton, Robert E.
Bush, Thomas O.
Bush, William J.
Bushouer, Ronald F.
Butler, David E.
Butler, Harry P.
Bybee, Raymon A.
Byrne, Barry J.
Byrne, Edward M.
Byrne, Robert A.
Byrnes, Albert M.
Byrnes, Henry F., Jr.
Callahan, Thomas J.
Callaway, Linnaeus T.
Callaway, William E., Jr.
Calvert, William R.
Cameron, James J.
Cameron, Robert F.
Cameron, Thomas A.
Camp, William P.
Campbell, Albert M.
Cannon, William T.
Canup, Theodore, Jr.
Capito, George R.
Carbajal, Ruben
Carey, William F.
Carlson, Frederick P.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carlson, John A.
Carlson, Patrick J.
Carman, Jesse L.
Carnathan, Fred H.
Caron, Francis O.
Carpenter, John D., Jr.
Carper, Teddy G.
Carr, Robert E.
Carrier, Milton G.
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.
Cater, Charles E.
Cates, Donald E.
Cathey, Carl D.
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.
Chalifour, Clark L.
Chambers, Thomas D.
Chancy, Eugene J.
Chandler, Harold, Jr.
Chapman, Charles A.
Charters, Michael F.
Chase, Leroy O.
Chetion, Edward E.
Chenard, John H.
Chenoweth, Eldred E.
Cherry, William G., Jr.
Chesnutt, Billy
Chew, David G.
Chidlow, Douglas O.
Childers, John V.
Chiles, Henry G., Jr.
Chrisman, Rex C.
Christensen, Merle L.
Christian, Howard B.
Christian, John T.
Christopher, Charles E.
Church, Edgar C.
Cima, Frank J.
Ciocca, Michael A.
Ciotti, Anthony
Cislo, Walter J.
Claman, John S.
Clark, Alfred L.
Clark, Daniel B.
Clark, Donald D.
Clark, George N.
Clark, Joseph A.
Clark, Kenneth G.
Clark, Menzo T.
Clark, Theodore L.
Clark, Warren H.
Clark, William M.
Clark, William E.
Clark, William T.
Claunch, James I.
Clawson, Carl H., Jr.
Claxton, Irvin O.
Clay, Theodore A.
Clemente, William J.
Clements, Thomas J.
Clemons, 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, John A.
Coffey, Wiley E., Jr.
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, Bernice W.
Collins, Dan E.
Collins, Ed N.
Collins, William T.
Colonna, Michael A.
Combemale, Jeanloup R.
Comeau, Charles R.
Comiskey, Michael R.
Condit, Norman E.
Confer, William A., Jr.
Conner, Lewis W.
Conner, William T., Jr.
Conner, Willis D.
Conyers, Thomas R.
Cook, Charles I.
Cook, James J.
Coolican, Donald J.
Cooper, Jerry A.
Cooper, Paul W., Jr.
Corbeille, Reginald C.
Cordell, Glen D.
Corkill, James L.
Cornwell, Alton E.
Correll, Robert A.
Correll, Robert D.
Cote, Arthur J.
Cotterman, Andrew G
Coughlen, Thomas D.
Coughlin, Daniel T., Jr.
Coulapides, Anthony C.
Coulter, Glenn R.
Counsil, William G.
Court, Charles W.
Courtney, James R.
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.
Craig, Charles E., Jr.
Cranford, Leon B.
Craver, William D.
Crawford, Denis H.
Crawford, John C.
Crayton, Johnny L.
Craze, James W.
Creed, William K.
Creter, Arthur P., Jr.
Crigler, Charles H.
Crisman, John C.
Criste, David M.
Crockett, Richard L.
Cronfel, Ramsey L.
Crossland, Clifford T.
Crow, Hugh E.
Crow, Robert L.
Crowder, Kenneth L.
Crowder, Thomas E.
Crowley, Lawrence F.
Csernelabics, Richard C.
Cullen, Donald C.
Cumella, Walter S.
Cumm, Homer J., Jr.
Cummings, Michael G.
Cummings, Vincent P., Jr.
Cummins, Glen S.
Cummingham, Glenn J.
Cunningham, Donald E.
Cupp, Larry L.
Curling, Fred B.
Curtis, Grant R.
Curtis, Jon E.
Curtis, Thomas G.
Curtiss, Daniel J.
Dahlem, Francis E.
Dahlgren, Arthur W.
Dahlgren, Charles E.
Daily, Donald E.
Daily, Roger M.
Dale, Henry
Dalessio, Robert M.
Danforth, William L.
Dankievitch, John A.
Darling, Frank R.
Daschbach, Joseph F.
Dascombe, Ronald E.
Davidson, Dennis M.
Davidson, Richard E.
Davidson, William G., III
Davies, Robert L.
Davies, William E., Jr.
Davis, Doyle L.
Davis, Francis J.
Davis, George W., VI
Davis, Jack A.
Davis, Leonard G.
Davis, Richard B.
Davis, Vibert H.
Day, Robert O.
Deaton, John H.
Decker, Cecil E.
Decker, John P.
Deehan, Paul K.
Dehaemer, Michael J.
Dehler, Richard F.
Dehn, William S., Jr.
Delamorton, Howard F. B.
Deloach, Jesse H.
Deloury, Edward M., Jr.
Delp, George D.
Delpaine, Nick, Jr.
Delude, Howard D.
Demirjian, Edward
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.
Dettloff, Edward D.
Devenny, John P., Jr.
Devine, Ralph R.
Devine, Thomas W.
Dewinn, Donald A.
Dexter, Dillon C.
Diamond, Glenn B.
Dibble, John P.
Dickinson, Norman R.
Dickson, Paul B.
Dietrich, Lawrence H.
Digiovanni, Armand F., Jr.
Dilley, David
Dillingham, Donald R.
Dillon, John P.
Dimartino, Joseph D.
Dinger, Harlan E.
Dinning, Donald McP.
Dirksen, John V.
Dix, Donald W.
Dobbie, Donald W.
Dobes, Joseph C.
Dobrosky, John
Dodd, James H., Jr.
Dodge, Elmer L., Jr.
Dodson, Richard E.
Doege, Arthur G.
Dolan, Peter B.
Donahue, James R.
Donahue, Thomas M.
Donnelly, John J.
Donofrio, Anthony L.
Donovan, Larry C.
Dooley, John J.
Doose, John C.
Dorrough, Vernon R.
Dothard, Joseph R.
Dotterer, Kenneth R.
Dougherty, Thomas G.
Doughty, Robert
Douglass, Willie B.
Dovalgo, Richard R.
Dowell, George W., III
Downey, Edward V.
Downey, Harry J.
Doyle, John F.
Draper, Lilbourne E.
Draughon, Harry C., Jr.
Dreher, Robert H.
Dressor, Robert F.
Drummond, William K.
Drury, Melvin R.
Duchnick, Stanley M.
Dudley, James I., Jr.
Duff, Robert D.
Duffy, Francis K.

Duffy, James F.
Dufore, Maurice C.
Duggan, Edward H., Jr.
Duley, Donald G.
Duling, Martin L.
Dunbar, Bartlett S.
Duncan, Angus F.
Duncan, John W.
Duncan, Lawrence D.
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, Joseph T.
Earle, Ronald L., Jr.
Eaton, Allan L.
Eayre, Dean C.
Eberle, John D.
Eberlein, Bernard E.
Eckerman, Orvin E.
Edgar, Peter D.
Edwards, Ronald
Eighme, Dean W.
Eilertsen, James T.
Ekberg, Elden A.
Elkins, Paul, W.
Elliott, Robert O.
Ellis, Elwood G.
Ellis, Martin A.
Ellis, Russell D.
Ellis, Willie C.
Ells, Marvin R.
Elmore, Cleo A.
Elmquist, Robert J.
Elster, Robert E.
Embry, Hugh C.
Emrick, Grover O.
Endsley, James E.
Enriquez, Jose
Erdei. Elmer A.
Ernest, Charles L.
Eshom, Roy L.
Esslinger, Jon H.
Estep, Fred R.
Etchells, Edward J.
Evans, Harry H.
Evans, Homer D.
Evans, James R.
Evans, Neal C.
Evans, Oliver K.
Evans, William E.
Evans, William L.
Evans, William R.
Everding, George A.
Everman, Leon E.
Everson, Richard W.
Ewalt, Frederick M.
Ewing, Keith R.
Fadden, Byron M.
Fahsbender, Thomas F.
Falk, Dennis J.
Faller, Arthur R.
Fallin, Thomas B.
Fang, George W.
Fant, Iley W.
Farley, Robert T.
Farnham, Robert
Farrell, Norman L.
Farris, Claude P., Jr.
Fay, Frederick O., Jr.
Fay, Vincent P.
Febel, Joel W.
Fee, Jerome J.
Felguth, Ernest G.
Felix, Dennis F.
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.
Fetterman, Leroy W.
Fiedeldey, Joseph W., Jr.
Field, Royal R., Jr.
Fields, Floyd H., Jr.
Fields, George W.
Finkelstein, Milton M.
Finucan, Thomas E.
Firebaugh, Charles D.
Fischer, Charles F., II
Fisher, Ben H.
Fisher, Cornelius W.
Fisher, George D.
Fisher, Robert A.
Fisher, Thomas J.
Fitzgerald, Raymond N.
Fitzgerald, James F.
Fix, James E.
Flanigan, Alan H.
Fleitz, William V., Jr.
Fleming, Charles H., Jr.
Fleming, Michael J.
Flesch, Robert W.
Flinn, John E.
Florance, Earle S.
Flores, Arthur J.
Fluke, John W.
Flynn, Gerrish C.
Flynn, Henry M., Jr.
Flynn, William J.
Foberg, Raymond H.
Foery, Donald G.
Fogel, Edwin L.
Foley, James A.
Foley, William H., Jr.
Follett, John R.
Folstad, Hartley I.
Folta, Kenneth D.
Folts, Roger H.
Ford, Marvin J.
Foreman, Earl L.
Forsman, Jalmar F., Jr.
Fortenberry, William S.
Fortney, Doyle W.
Foster, George S.
Foster, Hiram A.
Foster, Ralph V.
Foster, William Leslie, Jr.
Foster, William Lewright
Fournier, Leo R.
Fowler, Richard C.
Fox, Henry W.
Fox, Joe E.
Fox, Robert E.
Foy, Frederick D.
Frailey, Julius R.
France, Donald F.
Frank, Sammy L.
Franklin, David C.
Fraser, Dale H.
Frasher, John A.
Frazier, Kendall L.
Freedman, Leonard A.
Freehill, Robert L.
Freeman, Michael H.
Freiberg, Harold M.
Freiheit, James E.
Fresco, Nace E.
Friedmann, Alfred R.
Friend, Leslie E.
Frontz, Richard F.
Frost, Norman C., Jr.
Fuller, Donald S.
Fuller, Richard E.
Funston, Walter H., Jr.
Furlong, Joseph W.
Furnholm, William G.
Furr, Jack C.
Fuss, Donald D.
Fussell, William R., Jr.
Gadsby, Donald F.
Gagliardo, James E.
Gailey, Lonnie D., Jr.
Galamaga, Donald P.
Gale, Earl L.
Gallagher, Thomas J.
Gallagher, James T.
Gallagher, Michael T.
Gallegos, Joe R.
Galloway, Earl W.
Gamba, Robert V.
Gandy, Asa J.
Gardner, Heisey E.
Garduno, John F.
Garfield, Peter J.
Garner, Richard E.
Garrett, Loren E.
Garrison, Joe R.
Garver, Bruce M.
Gasser, Robert E.
Gauthier, Charles C.
Gauthier, David P.
Gaviak, Michael W.
Gaydos, Cyril M. G.
Geer, David W.
Gehman, Thomas E.
Gehrlich, Richard E.
Geiger, William A.
Geiling, Terry L.
Gelinas, Norman H.
Geller, John B.
Gephart, Ernest B.
Gerasimoff, Philip J.
Gerber, Eugene D.
Gerity, Robert S.
Germain, Russell F.
Gershon, Jon J.
Gessner, Lynn E.
Gibason, Edward T.
Gibson, Harvey D.
Gibson, James W.
Gieseke, William D.
Gieske, Neal D.
Gilbreath, David S.
Gilchrist, Orville L.
Gill, Donald L.
Gillen, Robert F.
Gillespie, William M.
Gillespie, Clarence E., Jr.
Gillett, Lewis C., Jr.
Gillis, John W.
Gilstrap, James R. L.
Gingles, William G.
Gingold, Joel E.
Gipson, Jack D.
Glaspell, Grayson M.
Glotfelty, Robert L.
Gneckow, Gerald E.
Godwin, Gordon T.
Goff, Franklin L.
Goforth, James E., Jr.
Golden, George H., Jr.
Golden, Mark M.
Gonsalves, David
Goode, Sanchez
Goodrich, Walker R., Jr.
Goodwin, Willis M.
Gorecki, Walter
Gordon, Bradley W.
Gordon, Frank
Gordon, Max H.
Gosselin, Henry E., Jr.
Gost, William J.
Goubeaux, Richard F.
Gould, Daniel H.
Gould, George W.
Grafel, Lynn H.
Grafton, Jay T.
Graham, Ernest A.
Graham, Frank
Graham, James R.
Graham, William B.
Graham, William W.
Grant, Carroll D.
Grant, Dale P.
Grantham, Frank H.
Graves, Bibb L.
Gray, Gordon L.
Green, Conrad G.
Green, Lorin D.
Green, Richard M.
Greenberg, Abe
Greenberg, Samuel J.
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.
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.
Gustavson, Roy S.
Guter, Richard J.
Haas, Phillip E.
Hadley, Richard J.
Hafer, Otto D.
Hagen, John M.
Hagerty, Cornelius J., Jr.
Haggerty, John F.
Haines, Floyd C.
Haisten, John, Jr.
Hakanson, Gary E.
Haker, Carl L.
Haldiman, Martin F.
Hale, Frederick G.
Hall, Benjamin S.
Hallman, Lee A.
Hallowell, Benjamin H., Jr.
Halpin, Hugh
Hamby, Thomas, Jr.
Hames, William J.
Hamilton, Piez
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.
Hampton, Thomas D.
Hanberry, Royce S.
Hancock, Eugene W.
Hancock, James E.
Hand, David R.
Hanes, Quanah C.
Haney, Raymond E.
Hankins, Jack T.
Hansen, Eigil L., Jr.
Hansen, Kirby W., Jr.
Hansen, Roy E.
Hanson, Ralph E., Jr.
Hanson, Ronald D.
Hanvey, James W.
Harden, Jon D.
Hardesty. Michael A.
Hardgrave, James L.
Hardin, Billie R.
Hardin, Bruce H.
Hardman, Herbert F.
Hardt, William A.
Hargrave, Paul E.
Hargrove, James C.
Harker, Donald A.
Harkness, Melvin D.
Harmer, William H.
Harmon, Edward K.
Harmon, Elmer L., Jr.
Harnadek, Joseph J.
Harrell, Richard E.
Harris, Carl E., Jr.
Harris, "J" "M"
Harris, Jack D.
Harris, William J.
Harrison, Granvel L.
Harrison, Joe P.
Harrison, Marion C.
Harrison, William L.
Hart, Clifford A.
Hart, Edward M.
Hart, Irving H., III
Hart, John A.
Harter, Gary L.
Hartman, Clarence P.
Hartman, Herbert C.
Hartsell, Clyde W.
Hartz, Edward E.
Haskell, Edward G.
Haskell, Richard D.
Hassel, William G., Jr.
Hastie, William J.
Hatchett, Monroe T.
Hatfield, Everette
Hatley, Carmon W.
Hatton, William C.
Haughton, David E.
Haungs, Richard E.
Havery, John W.
Hawkey, Robert J.
Hayes, Charles W.
Hayes, James W.
Hayes, Raymond R.
Hays, Jimmie D.
Hays, Russell O.
Hazard, Edward P., Jr.
Hazelwood, Ernest R.
Hazucha, Paul C.
Heacock, Louis W.
Head, Thomas A.
Healy, Patrick R.
Heasley, Allen D.
Heath, David M.
Heckman, Ronald W.
Heckman, Robert J.
Hedley, Peter F.
Heffernan, Charles F.
Heger, Wayne F.
Hegg, Daniel R.
Heilpern, Roger F.
Hellyer, James A.
Helms, David F.
Helms, Lawrence S.
Helsley, Jack
Hemry, Jack M.
Henderson, Thomas S.
Hendry, John A.
Hennessey, John T.
Henning, Harold E.
Henrizi, John T.
Hensley, Hershal W.
Hepburn, Raymond G.
Herbein, John G.
Herbert, Robert W.
Herkert, Richard H. H.
Herring, "J" Michael
Hervey, John C., Jr.
Hess, Aubrie D.
Hettich, Bobby S.
Heuberger, Nathan A.
Heying, Ernest H.
Heyneman, Russell E.
Hickey, Dennis J., IV
Hickey, Edward F.
Hickman, Joseph C.
Hickman, Junior D.
Hicks, Horace R.
Hicks, William D.
Hilder, Lewis E.
Hill, Charles W, Jr.
Hill, Frederick W., Jr.
Hindal, Marvin O.
Hinely, Elliott P.
Hinkel, Jay E.
Hinkel, Ronald W.
Hinton, Aloneous S., Jr.
Hite, Thomas H.
Hixson, John D.
Hoch, Robert G., Jr.
Hodges, Myron W.
Hoecker, Richard G.
Hoernlein, Russell P.
Hoffman, Carl K.
Hoffman, Drake A.
Hoffman, Hubert L.
Hoffman, Joseph F., Jr.
Hoffman, Richard P.
Hoke, John R., II
Holcomb, Edward L.
Holden, Durward B.
Holland, Donald M.
Holloway, Richard E.
Holmes, John A.
Holmes, Roland E.
Holtz, Robert S.
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.
Horton, Andrew S.
Horton, Jack O., Jr.
Horton, Norman L.
Howard, Albert O., Jr.
Howard, Lee F.
Howe, Donald L.
Howell, Frederick J.
Howell, Norman B.
Howell, Swebston S., Jr.
Howerton, Norman J.
Hubbard, Charles W., Jr.
Hubbard, Clarence H.
Hubbard, Orrin E.
Hubbard, Terrence C.
Huberman, Benjamin
Hudson, Jack D.
Hughes, Emerson J., Jr.
Hughes, Joe P.
Hughes, Royston C.
Hughes, Roy J.
Hugo, James W.
Huhn, John H.
Hulvershorn, Frederick W.
Hunnell, William R.
Hunt, Frank M., Jr.
Hunt, George W., Jr.
Hunter, Jack E.
Hunter, Raymond A.
Huntley, Donald E.
Hurlburt, Joseph S.
Hutchins, James R.
Hutchinson, Aubry B.
Hutt, Thomas E., Jr.
Hyde, Thomas A.
Hyde, Walter J.
Ianucci, Robert J.
Ide, Henry C.
Ieuter, Fredric E.
Ilg, Raymond P.
Inderlied, William T., III
Ireland, Delbert H.
Irons, Gary S.
I vine, Kenneth M.
Irving, Verne H.
Isaksen, George A.
Isenburg, William, Jr.
Ivy, Richard G.
Iwatsu, David K.
Jackson, John P.
Jacobs, Lawrence R.
Jacobson, Clyde A.
Jacobson, Gerald
James, Aaron C.
James, John D.
James, Stephen R.
Janes, Cornell M.
Janke, Roger A.
Jaskolski, Kenneth J.
Jaye, James M., Jr.
Jeffreys, Robert E.
Jenkins, Clifton W.
Jenkins, Wendal L.
Jennings, Lawrence F.
Jennings, William T.
Jensen, James L., Jr.

Jensen, Melvin H.
Jerding, Frederick N.
Jerrell, Donald G.
Jeske, Donald C.
Jochem, Raymond D.
Joerres, Donald C.
Johannesen, Robert E.
Johniken, Teddy A.
Johns, Homer C., Jr.
Johns, James E.
Johnsen, Donald C.
Johnson, Albert P., Jr.
Johnson, Clayton A.
Johnson, Clayton J.
Johnson, Clinton B.
Johnson, Donn R.
Johnson, Frederick B.
Johnson, Iver R.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, James W.
Johnson, Joseph H.
Johnson, Kenneth A.
Johnson, Kenneth S.
Johnson, Kenneth
Johnson, Larry D.
Johnson, Melvin E.
Johnson, Robert C., Jr.
Johnson, Ronald B.
Johnson, Ronald E.
Johnson, Stephen, Jr.
Johnston, Douglas M., Jr.
Johnston, James R.
Johnston, Lawrence H., Jr.
Johnston, Robert A.
Jones, Calvin L.
Jones, Charles D.
Jones, Gordon S.
Jones, Hugh S.
Jones, Jerry S.
Jones, John R.
Jones, Joseph J.
Jones, Keith S.
Jones, Raymond G., Jr.
Jones, Robert E.
Jones, Ronald L.
Jones, Wallace E.
Jones, Walter R.
Jones, William H.
Joost, Rodney E.
Jordan, Alexander J., Jr.
Jordan, Aubrey H.
Jordan, John L., Jr.
Jorgensen, Ejnar O.
Jortner, Marvin W.
Joy, Joseph E.
Juergens, Kenneth C.
Junker, Howard R.
Kaelin, James N.
Kagy, Virgil C.
Kahler, Robert C.
Kalb, David G.
Kalenowsky, John E.
Kanady, Garland H., Jr.
Karampelas, Angelo N.
Karl, Daniel D.
Kartvedt, Maynard O.
Kauffman, Lawrence B.
Kaullen, Fred P.
Kay, Francis D.
Kazebee, Raymond G.
Kear, Patrick V.
Kearney, Laurence J., Jr.
Keating, Arthur L.
Keen, Burlin J.
Keenum, Guy
Keepin, Robert H.
Kehm, William C.
Keinrath, Frank C.
Keister, Jamieson C.
Keith, Joseph
Keithline, William W.
Kelliikoa, Edward N.
Kelley, Thomas G.
Kelly, Michael J., Jr.
Kelsay, Leslie R.
Keltner, Jackie L.
Kennedy, Eugene M.
Kennedy, Jerry F.
Kennedy, Joseph A.
Kenney, John M.
Kennon, Jack A.
Kephart, Robert M.
Kephart, Robert V.
Kerner, Leon W.
Kerns, Alexander H.
Kerns, Ernest C.
Kerns, Lyle K.
Kesler, Gene P.
Key, Paul L., II
Khoury, Charles R., Jr.
Kilgallon, James R.
Killen, Kenneth B.
Killinger, Edwin E.
Kincheloe, Lawrence R.
King, James W.
King, Jerry C.
King, Kenneth P.
King, Tom M.
Kingsbury, Karl C.
Kingsley, Frederic T.
Kinney, James R.
Kinnie, Phillip B., Jr.
Kirklen, Jack L.
Kiser, Hoyt, Jr.
Kiser, William R.
Kishel, Gene F.
Kitch, Dale
Kitzmiller, Oscar V.
Klausegger, Robert B.
Kling, Thomas C., Jr.
Klingebiel, Alfred C.
Knapp, Carl A.
Knight, Dennis R.
Knight, Vaughn L.
Knoll, John R.
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.
Kohut, Joseph J.
Konetchy, George J.
Konewko, Everett L.
Koontz, Ronald L.
Korbs, Donald E.
Korchek, 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, Gail A.
Kromer, Ronald C.
Kropac, John R.
Kroyer, George P.
Krulisch, Alan H.
Kubishen, Michael A.
Kuckelkorn, Josef S.
Kuhlman, William
Kuhrt, Edward C.
Kujawa, Gail S.
Kundrat, Reginald
Kunkle, Robert E.
Laber, George E.
Lablanc, 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.
Lakin, Charles R.
Lamb, Donald K.
Lamb, Jay W.
Lambertson, Roy F., Jr.
Lambertson, Wayne R.
Lammers, Lennis L.
Lamontagne, Richard R.
Land, Walter R.
Landry, John A.
Lane, Clinton R.
Lane, "J" "D"
Lane, John W.
Lang, James R.
Lang, Joseph M., Jr.
Lang, Peter T.
Langdon, Stewart D.
Langen, Joseph H.
Langston, James D.
Lanham, Michael S.
Lanini, Harold M.
Lanning, Bruce E.
Lanouette, Raymond F.
Lansdowne, Alan E.
Lantz, Phillip E.
Large, Elwyn F.
Larkin, Eugene F., Jr.
Larsen, Lawrence M.
Larsen, Richard M.
Larson, Richard H.
Larson, Stanley M.
Lasch, Charles A.
Latimer, Peyton R
Laukattis, Edward F.
Laurvick, Richard E.
Laux, William J.
Lavelle, John M.
Lavery, Richard J., III
Lawinski, Henry A.
Lawrence, Frederick W.
Lawrence, Henry L. H., Jr.
Lawson, Fred W.
Leader, John C.
Leahy, John F., III
LeBlanc, Henry R.
Lebrecht, Clifford W.
Ledbetter, Gary C.
Leduc, Ernest R.
Lee, Lawrence L.
Lee, Robert C.
Lee, Tommy H.
Lees, Michael J.
Legare, Thomas C. R., Jr.
Leggett, Melvin E.
Lehane, Jeremiah J., Jr.
Leimonas, Sigitas
Leipold, Frederick J.
Lekebusch, Adolf O.
LeMaster, James L.
LeMaster, Morris
Lemond, William T.
Leonard, William J.
Leszczynski, Edward J.
Letourneau, Joseph R. L.
Lettington, Thomas F.
Levasseur, Rudolph G.
Levasseur, Marshall J., Jr.
Levesque, Raymond D.
Levin, Victor
Levine, Emil H.
Lew, Girard T.
Lewis, Harry C.
Lewis, Porter, Jr.
Lewis, Ralph M.
Lewis, William E., Jr.
Libert, John J.
Lickfold, Frederick 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.
Littlefield, James W.
Litzinger, Richard F.
Livingston, James M.
Livingston, Gerald W.
Lloyd, Roger M.
Lloyd, Roger W.
Lloyd, William B., Jr.
Locher, James R.
Locher, William W.
Lockie, William E., Jr.
Loden, Richard L.
Loebel, Leonard F.
Logan, Alexander S.
Logan, Billy B.
Logue, John F.
Logue, Richard J.
Lomax, Norman
Long, Gaeton, A., Jr.
Long, Joseph
Long, William C.
Longdon, Robert S.
Longmeier, Norman H.
Longton, Edward B.
Loonam, Bernard J.
Lopresti, Frank P.
Love, Bonnie R.
Lovejoy, James L.
Loveland, Kenneth W.
Loveland, Lynn S.
Lowe, Robert W.
Lowery, Fred H., Jr.
Lowman, Raymond D.
Lowrey, Donald F.
Lowsley, Ivon H., Jr.
Loy, Donald L.
Lucas, Edward
Lucas, James E.
Luce, George B.
Luke, John C.
Lukert, James L.
Lund, Frederick M.
Lunny, Robert M.
Lusby, John F.
Lusignan, John M.
Lusk, James B., Jr.
Lynch, Edward T., Jr.
Lynch, James B., Jr.
Lynch, John F., Jr.
Lyons, Daniel B.
Mabry, Fred W., Jr.
MacDonald, Walter F.
MacFadden, Robin C.
Machholz, Donald E.
Mackay, George W.
Macke, Richard C.
Mackie, David L.
MacKinnon, William B.
MacLeod, Kenneth L., III
MacNevin, James E.
Madigan, William P.
Magnussen, Norman J.
Mahany, Walter H.
Mahathey, Clague O.
Main, Christopher A.
Maki, Weldon E.
Makovic, George S.
Makowski, Walter F.
Mallari, William A.
Malmberg, Norman R.
Malone, Claude H.
Malone, Elmer D.
Malone, John P.
Mamer, Edwin J.
Manlove, James C.
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.
Marker, William J.
Marlin, Richard E.
Marquis, David R.
Marr, George M.
Marsh, Frank J., Jr.
Marshall, James Samuel
Marshall, James
Marshall, Ronald P.
Martel, Normal L.
Marti, Thomas J.
Martin, Clifford I.
Martin, Frank
Martin, Glynn
Martin, Joseph R. R.
Martin, Thomas D.
Mashburn, Charles A.
Mason, Charles C.
Mason, Ronald R.
Mathews, James E., Jr.
Matthew, Gail E.
Mattson, Karl R.
Matulka, Robert D.
Mauro, Peter J.
Maxfield, Jack M.
May, Walter A.
Maynard, Mark J.
Maynard, Theodore W.
Mayo, John B., Jr.
Mazzan, Carl A., Jr.
McAfee, Robert E.
McAfee, Robert S.
McAfee, Ronald J.
McCabe, Michael J.
McCall, James R.
McCallum, Carl P.
McCarthy, Robert J.
McCartney, Roy S., Jr.
McCaskill, Charles E., Jr.
McCausland, John E.
McClanahan, Ashby A.
McClanahan, Ted
McClarren, Ralph G.
McCloskey, Terry J.
McClure, Melvin M.
McClure, Thomas W.
McConnell, James T.
McConnell, James M.
McCormack, Elmer L.
McCormick, Walter S., Jr.
McCormick, Ollie B.
McCourtney, Theo H., Jr.
McCoy, Jimmy H.
McCoy, Jimmie D.
McCracken, Robert F.
McCracken, William P.
McCrork, John C., Jr.
McCullough, Larry D.
McCullough, Michael S.
McCune, George B.
McDole, James E.
McDonald, Lee R.
McDonald, William M.
McDonell, John G.
McDonnell, Lawrence J.
McDonough, Thomas F.
McDougall, Donald J.
McDowell, Thomas N.
McDowell, William A., Jr.
McEwan, Donald P.
McFadden, Donald O.
McFarlane, Robert D.
McGargill, Mark
McGaughey, James P.
McGaw, Robert
McGinn, John P., Jr.
McGonegal, William F.
McGovern, John P.
McGrath, Milton A.
McGregor, James R.
McHenry, Milton R.
McKean, Robert A., III
McKenney, George G., Jr.
McKeown, Edward J., Jr.
McKeown, William J., Jr.
McKimens, Paul K.
McKinley, Douglas E.
McKinley, Robert N.
McKinna, Michael D.
McKinney, James B.
McKinney, John W.
McKinney, Kenneth W.
McLaughlin, James A.
McLean, James R., Jr.
McLean, John H.
McManus, Arthur T.
McMurray, Marquis E.
McNabb, John M.
McNaughton, William E.
McNee, Malcolm R.
McNew, Clyde E., Jr.
McPherson, Willard W.
McQuaig, Clarence M.
Meadows, Jackie W.
Means, Michael G.
Meardy, Ronald R.
Medaris, William W.
Meek, William A. J.
Meeker, Harold L.
Meeks, Joseph R.
Megill, Thomas L.
Mehl, Henry T.
Mehl, Wayne J.
Meier, George E.
Meinicke, Thomas A.
Mellott, Harlan B.
Mendenhall, Robert L.
Meng, William F.
Mengason, James
Menikheim, Douglas K.
Mercer, Benjamin F., III
Meredith, Richard B.
Meritt, Donald L.
Mermagen, Peter J.
Merrick, Martin P.
Merrill, Michael H.
Mervine, Lowrie R.
Meyer, Robert A.
Michael, Glen R.
Michaels, Albert M.
Michalski, Louis, Jr.
Michel, Alan E.
Midas, Michael T., Jr.
Miles, Samuel A., II
Millar, Robert L.
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, Leon R.
Miller, Phil A.
Miller, Robert B.
Miller, William E., Jr.
Milligan, Frank T.
Milliken, John N., Jr.
Million, Edwin F., Jr.
Mills, Richard B.
Millsaps, Richard Z.
Milne, Douglas S.
Mims, Norman W., Jr.
Mims, William J.
Minugh, Edward M.
Mishler, Douglas L.
Misuna, Charles W.
Mitchell, Frederick G.
Mitchell, Paul J.
Mitchell, William A.
Moerdyk, Bernard N.
Moerschel, David C.
Moller, Arthur E., Jr.
Moller, Herman W.

Montague, Gerald F.
Montanaro, Joseph A.
Montgomery, David R.
Moon, Charlie M.
Moore, David K.
Moore, Dennis A.
Moore, Durward E., Jr.
Moore, James L., Jr.
Moore, James E.
Moore, John A.
Moore, Lawrence B.
Moore, Walter B.
Moore, William F.
Moore, William R.
Moorehead, William S.
Moot, Zane A.
Morales, Alfonso H.
Moran, Maurice J.
Morgan, Harold R.
Morgan, Morris
Morris, Carl M.
Morris, Clarence A., Jr.
Morris, John E.
Morris, Lewis L.
Morris, Robert, III
Morris, Robert C.
Morris, Thomas V.
Morrison, Richard
Morrison, Robert H.
Morrissey, Jon E.
Morrow, Frederic I.
Moscoe, Loren J.
Mosher, Andrew C.
Mosher, Francis E.
Moss, Ambler H., Jr.
Mrazik, Albert
Mucha, Marvin F.
Muckenthaler, John L.
Mudd, Richard L.
Mulhearn, Raymond R.
Mumford, Stanley E.
Munck, Philip L.
Munger, Francis X.
Munroe, Frank A., III
Murdock, Charles D.
Murphy, Howard L.
Murphy, Michael L.
Murray, Allan W.
Murray, Arthur P.
Murray, Francis H.
Murray, Joseph A., Jr.
Murray, Roger P.
Musser, Benjamin C.
Mussman, Edward J.
Mustard, James D.
Myers, George C., Jr.
Myers, Michael P.
Naab, Geoffrey
Nagel, David J.
Nagle, Charles L.
Nanney, Robert G.
Nantau, Norman B.
Neal, James J.
Neapolitan, Richard C.
Neary, Joseph P., Jr.
Neblett, Robert E.
Neef, James V.
Neff, Rupert T.
Neher, John D.
Neifert, Donald L.
Neill, William S.
Neiman, Howard A.
Nelson, Francis E.
Nelson, George A.
Nelson, Gerald A.
Nelson, James R.
Nelson, Norman R.
Nelson, Roger W.
Nelson, Stuart N. M.
Nelson, Victor L.
Nemcosky, Martin J., Jr.
Nesbitt, Robert C., Jr.
Nesmith, Raymond C.
Nester, Irvin C.
Newman, Donald W.
Newman, Jack G.
Newton, Winston P.
Niccum, Leonard G.
Nichols, Herschel C.
Nichols, Keith A.
Nichols, Roger A.
Nickerson, Charles A.
Niederer, Robert A.
Nitschke, Richard N.
Nixon, Murray C.
Noland, Robert F.
Nordwall, Curtis C.
Norman, Robert A.
Norman, Sheldon
Norris, Kay L.
Northrup, Russell L.
Norton, Paul S.
Novak, Harlan W.
Novotney, Clayton L.
Noyes, Arthur L.
Nuernberger, Herbert C.
Nugent, Leonard J.
Nunez, Samuel
Nunn, James L.
Nystrom, Robert E.
Oates, Kenneth L.
Oberlander, Clifford C.
Oberson, Herbert B.
O'Brien, Frederick
O'Brien, George D., Jr.
O'Brien, Gerald H.
O'Brien, James E.
O'Brien, Thomas
O'Brien, Thomas P.
O'Brien, Ward J.
Odell, Ralph V.
Odom, "J" "W"
O'Donnell, Francis X.
Ogles, Homer C.
Oldfather, Daniel O.
Oliver, Chester F.
Olney, Warren M., Jr.
Olsen, William P.
Olson, Donald L.
Olson, Leray
O'Malley, John P.
O'Neill, Edward J., Jr.
Oney, Warren W.
Orbish, Vincent A.
Ortengren, Ralph W., Jr.
Ortlieb, Alfred A.
Ortman, John C.
Osborne, John B.
Oshell, Walter E.
Otis, Howard L.
Otis, John W.
Ott, Keith M.
Otte, Walter H.
Otto, Albert C., Jr.
Ouellette, Thomas A.
Overstrom, Ronald G.
Owen, Tommie J.
Owens, Bruce H.
Owenson, Alfred T.
Ownby, James F.
Pace, Joseph L.
Padgett, James A.
Padilla, Nicholas S.
Paletta, Joseph, Jr.
Palmer, Walla R., Jr.
Pankratz, John M.
Panshin, Daniel A.
Papa, Henry W.
Parcells, Paul W.
Paris, Robert L.
Pariseau, Richard R.
Park, Earl P.
Parker, Carl K.
Parker, Charles S.
Parker, Joseph W., Jr.
Parker, William H.
Parkinson, David L.
Parlette, William T.
Parrish, Hubert N.
Parry, Ira E., Jr.
Parsons, Edwin F., Jr.
Pastre, Robert L.
Pateas, Theodore N.
Paterson, Robert W.
Patterson, Donald D.
Patterson, Bradford H.
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.
Pearl, Vincent J.
Pearsall, Nelson H.
Pecor, Glenn O.
Peden, Joe D.
Peebles, Robert H.
Peek, Joseph H.
Peigh, Carl
Pellegrini, Charles A.
Peltier, George A., Jr.
Pendleton, Reid, Jr.
Penner, Vernon D.
Perkins, Richard A.
Perrinello, Louis F.
Perron, Joseph H.
Perry, Elmer L., Jr.
Perry, Lyman S. A.
Peters, Donald L.
Peters, James F., Jr.
Peters, Thomas J.
Petersen, Peter M.
Petersen, Ted M.
Peterson, Charles H.
Peterson, Donald L.
Peterson, Ernest K.
Peterson, Harold A.
Peterson, Richard N.
Pethick, John A., II
Petrie, Arthur B.
Petrilla, John A.
Petrovitz, George, Jr.
Petty, Benny M.
Pezet, Walter A., III
Pfleckl, Louis W.
Pfouts, John P.
Phelan, James E.
Phelps, Harold R., Jr.
Phemister, Larry L.
Philbrick, James W., Jr.
Philhower, Peter P.
Phillipes, Peter M.
Phillippi, Frederick E., Jr.
Phillips, Grady H.
Phillips, George B.
Phillips, Glen R.
Phillips, Henry L., Jr.
Phillips, Robert W.
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.
Pippen, Merrill D.
Piritz, Ronald B.
Pitt, William M.
Pittelli, Robert J.
Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
Ploeger, Paul H., III
Plummer, Grant W.
Pochordo, Stanley
Poindexter, Chris H.
Polaski, Harold E., Jr.
Pommer, Edward P.
Pomrehn, Hugo P.
Ponton, Melvin V.
Pool, Herman M.
Pope, David K.
Poppert, William R.
Porter, Donald J.
Porter, Ethan O., Jr.
Porter, William M.
Porter, William J.
Potter, Robert A.
Potter, Roderick H.
Powell, George A.
Powell, William L., Jr.
Powell, William B.
Powers, Byron L., Jr.
Powers, Harvey R.
Powers, Robert C.
Powers, Robert J.
Prater, Donald C.
Prather, James T.
Pratt, George W.
Pratt, Joel S.
Pratt, Marvin J.
Prebola, George J.
Presley, Thomas M.
Price, Gary J.
Price, Harold R.
Prince, Robert V.
Prohaska, Frank B.
Provaznik, Clarence E.
Prueske, Elmer W.
Puckett, Nathan L.
Pugh, John S.
Pullen, Leonard A.
Purcell, William C.
Purl, John D.
Purpura, Frank F.
Pursel, John J.
Purtee, Jack W.
Qualls, Fred H.
Quarterman, Joseph L., Jr.
Quinn, Jack C.
Quinn, Joseph S.
Rader, Keith E.
Raftis, Paul E.
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.
Ravetta, Richard C.
Ray, Harry, Jr.
Rayburn, Clarence W.
Raymond, David A.
Raymond, Henry A.
Raymond, Robert W.
Read, Gustavus C., Jr.
Reck, Richard L.
Redman, Charles D.
Reed, Joseph W.
Reed, Richard D.
Reed, Ross M.
Reeder, Hugh A.
Rees, Richard J.
Reese, Evan P.
Reese, Ronald M.
Regan, James J., Jr.
Regner, Clarence H., Jr.
Reich, Harry B.
Reichle, Philip S.
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.
Repine, Marlin D.
Repp, John T.
Ressler, Paul M.
Reuter, Stewart E.
Reynolds, Dexter H., Jr.
Reynolds, James C.
Rhinebeck, George C.
Rhinebolt, Henry J.
Rhodes, Forrest T.
Rhodes, Melton E., Jr.
Rhodes, Robert M.
Rhodes, William A.
Rice, Robert P.
Rice, William R.
Richards, Frank M.
Richardson, John M., Jr.
Richardson, Thomas J.
Richardson, Bruce R.
Richartz, Arthur O.
Richey, Howard L.
Rickelman, John H.
Ridder, Wendell C.
Riden, Harold W.
Riehm, Charles E., Jr.
Riggs, Harold S.
Riggs, William D.
Riiff, Francis J.
Riley, Harold P.
Riley, John T.
Riley, Roy G.
Rimelen, Harry J.
Riner, Robert E.
Rinnert, Henry J.
Ritchie, Lloyd T.
Roark, William M.
Robbins, Albert H.
Roberson, Franklin P.
Roberts, Charles K.
Roberts, Donald A.
Roberts, Ernest P.
Roberts, Lawrence W.
Roberts, Richard R.
Robertson, Teddie E.
Robertson, Delmaine A.
Robertson, James F., Jr.
Robins, Thomas D.
Robinson, Marion B.
Robinson, Richard E.
Robinson, William B.
Roche, James G.
Rodgers, William E. L.
Rodriguez, Antonio B.
Roeder, Bernard F., Jr.
Roemish, Eric M.
Rogers, George R.
Rogers, John L.
Rogers, Roy L.
Rognlien, Robert P.
Rohr, Edwin M.
Rohr, Robert C.
Roller, Donald G.
Rollins, David J.
Rolph, Kenneth E.
Romanelli, John N.
Rooney, Henry F.
Roop, Charles W.
Roper, Lidge B.
Roselle, Curtis C.
Rosenburg, Herman E
Rosengren, Joseph R.
Ross, Robert W.
Ross, William M., Jr.
Ross, William W.
Roth, Daniel McK.
Rothschild, Stephen G.
Rothschild, Robert E.
Roudebush, Jackie L.
Rouse, William A.
Routt, William, Jr.
Rowan, Charles L.
Rowland, Robert C.
Rowley, James E.
Ruckersfeldt, George E.
Rudy, George H., III
Ruhsenberger, John F.
Runnels, James M.
Rupert, Clarence W.
Russell, James H.
Russell, William R.
Russick, John A.
Rutherford, Robert R.
Ryan, Kevin T.
Ryan, Larry E.
Ryan, Lester E.
Ryder, Albert
Saari, Colin H.
Salesky, Theodore E.
Sanderlin, Francis R.
Sanders, Donald W.
Sanders, Gilbert E.
Sanders, Loren L.
Sanders, Ralph G.
Sanders, William E.
Sanford, Harold W.
Sargent, Elbert W.
Sarno, Lawrence F.
Sasser, Sidney J.
Saunders, Franklin H.
Savage, Kenneth D.
Sawyer, Harmon W.
Sawyer, John L.
Scalf, Fred R., Jr.
Schaefer, Joseph F., Jr.
Schappaugh, Earl L.
Schardein, Edgar A.
Schisler, Billy W.
Schlicht, Donald L.
Schmeltz, Victor C., Jr.
Schmer, Conrad J., Jr.
Schmidt, John A.
Schneider, George T.
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, James F.
Schultz, William V.
Schultz, Willard E.
Schulz, Robert J.
Schuman, Stanley D.
Schutte, Frank A.
Schweizer, Earle G., Jr.
Schwer, Frederick A,. Jr.
Scott, Charles T.
Scott, James H.
Scott, Johnnie W.
Scott, John R.
Scott, Thomas W.
Scoville, Frederick W.
Scruggs, Sidney L., III
Scully, Vincent F., Jr.
Seale, Eugene B.
Seaman, Stewart R.
Seebirt, James E.
Seekell, Warren W.
Seelen, Charles
Seeley, Howard G.
Seiden, Paul E.
Sellers, William E.
Senhen, Linus A.
Serfass, Robert E.
Sessions, Thomas F., II
Sestric, Joseph L.
Sevario, Byron W.
Shaffer, John G.
Shaffer, Phillip H.
Shanley, Peter A.
Shanok, Michael E.
Sharp, Grant A.
Sharp, John B., Jr.
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.
Shephard, Alfred D.
Sherman, Howard E.
Sherman, John M.
Sherron, Cole A.
Sherwood, Raymond W.

Shindledecker, John B.
Shipp, Jimmie S.
Shirk, Robert L., Jr.
Shoemaker, Brian H.
Shoemaker, Hugh L.
Short, Richard H.
Shovlin, Daniel M.
Shreckengaust, James A.
Shufelt, William J., Jr.
Shuford, Robert E.
Shumake, George E.
Shumway, Louis A.
Shy, Julius T.
Siebecke, Alfred G.
Siepel, Willard E.
Sievers, Arthur W.
Simms, Gordon H.
Simonelli, Norman W.
Simons, Charles F., Jr.
Simpson, Frank T.
Simpson, Harold L., Jr.
Singer, Arnold
Singleton, "J" Arthur
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 R.
Slezak, Norman L.
Slick, Charles O.
Slobodny, Joseph J.
Smiley, Robert W.
Smith, Billie J.
Smith, Clyde W.
Smith, David W.
Smith, Donald A.
Smith, Edgar N.
Smith, Fairon J.
Smith, Frank R.
Smith, George E., Jr.
Smith, George R.
Smith, Glenn H.
Smith, Hugh J., Jr.
Smith, "J" "B"
Smith, Jackson E. M.
Smith, James A. D.
Smith, John F.
Smith, John N.
Smith, Kenneth L.
Smith, Larry L.
Smith, Lowell E.
Smith, Peter D.
Smith, Peter H.
Smith, Ray W.
Smith, Regis R.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Robert W.
Smith, Ronald C.
Smith, Roy C., IV
Smith, Thomas D.
Smith, Vance G.
Smithson, Alva P.
Smits, Walter I.
Snell, Wendell D.
Snodgrass, Roger R.
Snow, Charles H., Jr.
Snow, Richard M.
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.
Souval, Paul T.
Sovey, Paul L.
Sowell, Harley A., Jr.
Spang, Norman W.
Spann, Alton B.
Sparks, Ernest E.
Sparks, Paul W.
Spearman, William R.
Speegle, Arthur R.
Spencer, Edmund B.
Sperling, Harris
Sperry, Seifert T.
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.
Staes, James P.
Staley, Wayne E.
Stalnaker, Frank
Stamer, Leonard P.
Stampfle, Richard A., Jr.
Standard, Louis F.
Standley, John R.
Stanley, Bolling C., Jr.
Stanley, Howard C.
Stanley, Joe M., Jr.
Stanley, William M.
Stansell, John A.
Starling, Frank E.
Stasko, Nicholas J.
Stauch, Eugene A.
Steedley, Duncan M.
Steele, Robert L.
Steelhead, Wesley L.
Stefencavage, George
Steffens, Marcellus P.
Steiner, Duane R.
Stenson, Henry B.
Stephens, Darrel L.
Stephens, Manuel C.
Stevens, Stanley L.
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, Glendale P.
Stewart, Harvey T., Jr.
Stewart, Kelsey S.
Stewart, Richard L.
Stewart, William J.
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.
Strangerthorsen, Rolf
Stratton, Bobbie E.
Straughn, Wyatt F.
Strawbridge, David A.
Striedel, Henry C.
Struck, Gerald L. V.
Strunk, Alvin A.
Stryker, Lyal M.
Stuart, Walter A.
Stumbo, Stanley C.
Sturm, Edward J.
Sturm, Harold F., Jr.
Suddath, Jewel J., Jr.
Suggs, Robert F.
Sullivan, Francis E.
Sullivan, George E., III
Sullivan, John F.
Sullivan, James E., Jr.
Sullivan, Patrick H.
Supek, Louis R.
Super, Richard N.
Surber, John S., Jr.
Surprenant, John P.
Surratt, Jon E.
Sutcliffe, William G.
Sutliff, Robert C., Jr.
Sutor, John K.
Sutter, Henry E.
Svatek, Joseph F.
Svensen, Stanley R.
Swap, John E.
Swearingen, Howard W.
Swilley, Aaron E.
Syck, James M.
Szczepanski, Kazimierz J.
Szeyller, Edward P.
Taber, Alton E., Jr.
Tabor, Don C.
Tackney, Peter M.
Tadlock, James D.
Taff, Dennis V.
Taipale, Denis G.
Tait, David N.
Tait, John H.
Tait, Thomas M.
Talarico, Frank
Talbot, Bruce R.
Talken, George F.
Talley, James C., Jr.
Talley, Kirby L.
Tallman, James R.
Taubee, William H.
Taylor, Clarence R.
Taylor, Donald E.
Taylor, Frank L.
Taylor, Jerry I.
Taylor, John F.
Taylor, Lloyd F.
Taylor, Lowell S.
Taylor, Nelson D.
Taylor, Raynor A. K.
Taylor, Robert G.
Taylor, Thomas W.
Taylor, Turner W.
Taylor, William E.
Teal, Thomas H., III
Teeter, Richard E.
Temple, Nicholas B.
Tereo, Michael
Terry, Charles L.
Terry, Dennis H.
Terry, Donald L.
Terry, John R.
Terry, Thomas J., Jr.
Tew, Jasper L.
Thames, Lewis H., Jr.
Thibeault, Frederick L.
Thomas, Carlysle J.
Thomas, Christopher R.
Thomas, Frank A.
Thomas, Glenn R.
Thomas, John B.
Thomas, Larry D.
Thomas, William E.
Thompson, Alton K.
Thompson, Earle A., Jr.
Thompson, James E., Jr.
Thompson, Phillip S.
Thompson, Robert E.
Thompson, Thomas N.
Thorderson, John R.
Thorgerson, Eric J.
Thornburgh, Eldon L.
Thorner, Michael G.
Thumser, William D.
Tilton, Donald A.
Timm, Leroy A.
Tisdale, Jesse W.
Tobin, Kiefer A.
Todd, William D.
Tolderlund, Douglas S.
Tollaksen, Duane M.
Tomkins, Harold L.
Tomkins, Norman E.
Toms, Malcolm E.
Tool, Stephen R.
Toomer, Garland W.
Topp, David P.
Torrance, Harold S.
Tourney, Keith M.
Towle, Robert L.
Townsend, William J.
Trainor, John J.
Trainor, Walter C.
Traister, Robert E.
Tranchini, Joseph
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.
Tucker, Robert E., Jr.
Tullis, Robert D.
Tully, Neal C.
Tully, Vernon C., Jr.
Tumminelli, Joseph P.
Tupaz, Jesus B.
Tupaz, Terencio
Turk, Eugene J.
Turner, Ellis L.
Turner, Rolland R.
Tuttobene, Anthony T.
Tyler, Donald K.
Tyson, James P.
Uhrhane, Francis J.
Valk, Jerome W.
VanAuken, Ivan E., Jr.
VandenBroeck, Thomas A.
VanderVort, Harry E., Jr.
VanHouten, Otis E.
VanHyning, Carl W.
VanNess, Peter R.
Varley, Edwin R., Jr.
Varner, Dale N.
Vaughn, William E.
Vaught, Clarence T.
Vawter, Vernon J.
Veazey, Luther T.
Verona, Francis M.
Verwers, Robert A.
Vest, Calvin L.
Vied, Dennis H.
Vincent, James M.
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, Edward F.
Wagner, Fred D.
Wagner, Theodore
Walker, Arthur J.
Walker, Charles E.
Walker, Edward T., Jr.
Walker, George R., Jr.
Walker, Horace G.
Walker, Wilburn O.
Walker, William H.
Wall, Edward J.
Wall, Thomas E.
Wallace, George L.
Walls, James M.
Walsh, George A., Jr.
Walsh, Patrick A.
Walter, Everett R.
Walters, Horace M., Jr.
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 R.
Warren, Robert S.
Warren, Roger C.
Waterman, Larry W.
Watilo, Kenneth E.
Watkins, Donald E.
Watkins, James
Watrous, David
Watson, James D.
Watson, John W.
Watson, Louis H.
Watt, Robert H.
Watts, Donald W.
Wax, Gary N.
Weatherspoon, Joseph R.
Weaver, Milton W.
Webb, Lowell E.
Webb, Paul H.
Weber, Daniel D.
Weeks, George R., Jr.
Wegele, Edward
Wegner, Arthur E.
Weichman, Bruce E.
Weinhardt, William J.
Weir, Glendon H.
Weisenberger, Frederick P.
Welch, Walter E.
Welenc, Joseph
Wendholt, Gregory W.
Wentzel, Richard D.
Wenyon, Leonard J.
Wert, Peter Karl W.
Wertman, Franklin, Jr.
Westbrook, John F.
Westerman, John P.
Westover, Richard L.
Weymouth, Charles R.
Whalen, Joseph M., II
Wheeler, Donald R.
Wheeler, Donald C.
Wheeler, Raymond M.
Wheeler, William W., Jr.
Whelan, John F., Jr.
White, George E.
White, Lawrence W.
White, Marshall N.
White, Richard J.
White, Robert D.
White, Thomas L., Jr.
White, Thomas O., Jr.
Whitehead, Charles T.
Whitely, John E., Jr.
Whiteman, William E.
Whittington, William J.
Whittle, Delma H., Jr.
Wichman, James H.
Wigfall, George H., Jr.
Wiggins, Jack
Wightman, James E. R.
Wilbur, Paul J.
Wilcox, Emory E.
Wilcox, Loran A.
Wilcox, Wayland E.
Wiley, Edwin H.
Wiley, Talmadge K.
Wilgenbusch, Ronald C.
Willenbucher, Marshall R.
Willey, Marshall L.
Willey, Percy W., Jr.
Williams, Albert L.
Williams, Bryce W.
Williams, Clarence R.
Williams, Douglas A.
Williams, Dallas K.
Williams, Ersel M.
Williams, Hugh T.
Williams, John R.
Williams, John D.
Williams, James W.
Williams, Johnny L.
Williams, Morris B.
Williams, Walter L.
Williams, Zane G.
Williamson, James V., Jr.
Williamson, Charles B.
Willsey, John M.
Wilson, Ashley V.
Wilson, Donald M.
Wilson, Edward A.
Wilson, James R.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, Richard E.
Wilson, Richard V.
Wilson, Robert A.
Wilson, Seth T., Jr.
Wilson, Thomas E., Jr.
Wilson, Waldo W.
Wilson, William O.
Wimberly, William R.
Winarski, Daniel A.
Winkle, Arthur D., Jr.
Winston, Richard J.
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.
Wolfgram, James K.
Wolod, William A.
Wolverton, Donnie R.
Wombold, Arthur D.
Wonnell, Stanley E.
Wood, James E.
Wood, Leslie E.
Woodall, Jere W.
Woodaman, Ronald E. H.
Woodard, John S.
Woodbury, David E.
Woodruff, Frank C.
Woodruff, Harold H.
Woods, Leonard W.
Woods, Philip J.
Woodward, Albert J.
Woodward, Frank, Jr.
Woodward, John D.
Worden, Douglas W.
Worley, Loren
Worley, William F.
Worth, Charles W.
Worthen, Fred V.
Worthington, James T.
Wren, Robert P.
Wright, Hendon O.
Wright, Robert W.
Wright, William C.
Wright, William E.
Wubenhorst, Richard F.
Wynn, Alvin D.
Wynn, Hugh J.
Wyse, William J.
Yarber, Gene
Yarborough, Paul E.
Yeager, Dale A.
Yelinek, William A.
Yeske, Lanny A.
Yocher, Edward H.
Youmans, Edwin E.
Young, Charles T.
Young, Frederick J., Jr.
Young, John R.
Young, Richard K.
Zak, Eugene A.
Zang, Robert L.
Zari, Albert B.
Zeller, Raymond G.
Ziemkowski, Gerald J.
Zierden, William E.
Zimmerman, William C.
Zmorzenski, Frank P.
Zumwalde, Richard T.
Zurich, Richard W.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

IN THE NAVY

LINE

Abel, Jon F.
Byrnes, Joseph L.
Danner, John C.
Hill, Ronald V.
Murray, Edward P.
Osborough, Harry R.
Sandidge, Edward D.
Shewchuk, Jon D.
Bennett, Donald M.
Burnette, Mark I., Jr.
Butts, Maurice R.
Donahue, Charles P.
Landers, Edward J.
Lynch, Frederick W.
Mitchell, Robert E., Jr.
Scoggin, James M.
White, Bernard G.
Wiese, Richard J.
Wilson, Leon D.
Wright, Lindell W.
Cain, Richard L.
Jones, Wayne A.
Leahy, William F., Jr.
Mears, Ronald T.
Painter, Floyd C.
Quinn, Michael E.
Russell, Jerry C.
Smith, Clyde C., Jr.
Smith, Earle L., Jr.
Walker, Wallace H.
Cheshire, Leonard P., Jr.
Dalrymple, John R., Jr.
Holtel, Kenneth P.
Johnson, Robert A.
Knepley, Joseph E.
Shaftoe, Lyndon R.
Wagner, Thomas C.
Labrecque, Thomas G.
Miltenberger, Arthur D.
Nannini, Albert A.
Oettinger, John R.
Smith, Alfred G. III
Sunderland, Bruce
Williams, John R.
Luenser, Kenneth H.
Bowers, Charles R.
Burke, Patrick J.
Chapman, Ronald E.
Cole, Gerald L.
Durant, Robert J.
Evans, David C.
Kennedy, Larry B.
Mayo, Lester M., Jr.
O'Donnell, James P.
Riley, Thomas F.
Rogers, William J., Jr.
Ruth, Paul A.
Earls, Larry R.
Sheehan, John J. III
Waples, William F.
Westerman, Clifford J.
Whitley, William R.
Wildman, Fred D.
Barrett, James H.
Borchard, David C.
Flynn, Robert J.
Proshek, Robert M.
Thrush, John C.
Wright, George F.

SUPPLY CORPS

Barry, George H., Jr.
Billeter, Paul R.
Butler, Paul K.
Collette, Royal G. C.
Copeland, Stuart W.
Hatchett, William J., Jr.
Jackson, Stephen J.
Yeoman, William R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Pitcher, William F.
Struthers, Lynn C.

NURSE CORPS

Frolio, "M" Ellen

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Calhoun, William B., III
Chapdelaine, Jerrold E.
Coleman, Richard F.
Denton, Terry J.
Eckart, James H.
Pickard, Dallas, Jr.
Wood, Leon G., Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bond, Hollis H.
Edwards, John R., Jr.
Kelley, Thomas W.
Schwartz, Walter "J"

NURSE CORPS

Edwards, Donna J.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Kenneth R. Adams, Jr.
Anthony J. Adaschik
Michael R. Addison
Hugh M. Alexander
Henry D. Allen
Gunter Amtmann
Andrew G. Anderson, Jr.
Cecil C. Anderson
Daniel S. Anderson
David C. Anderson
Dixon J. Anderson
Thomas P. Anderson
John P. Angell
Gary E. Angerhofer
Lester A. Apple
Stephen S. Applegate
Marc T. Apter
James D. Arterburn
Brian P. Atkinson
Sid E. Atkinson
David C. Atwater
Lawrence J. Baack
Donald J. Baird
*Richard B. Bakewell
George K. Baldwin
James H. Ball
Robert C. Ballenger
Warren M. Banks
Nicholas T. Bard, Jr.
George H. Bare
Kenneth D. Barker
William J. Barksdale
Dennis R. Barnhart
Richard A. Bates
Alan E. Baumrucker
George G. Baxter III
Richard D. Becker
Michael E. Beckes
Ted Beckwith, Jr.
Robert A. Berdine
Peter W. Berg
Carl R. Berman, Jr.
Stephen M. Bernstein
Donald T. Berry
James E. Biddle
Theodore J. Bielen, Jr.
David L. Bintinger
Francis M. Black, Jr.
Bert E. Blackwell
Jack R. Blair
Donald R. Blakely
George A. Bleyle, Jr.
Wayne A. Boatman
Donald L. Boggs
Craig G. Bonesteel
Louis J. Boos
Carl B. Borchers
*Walter C. Borman
James S. Borona
John D. Bourdo
Charles A. Bourn
Robert W. Boyce
Bruce J. Boydell
James L. Boydston
Bruce A. Boyer
Francis X. Boylan, Jr.
Timothy S. Brady
William E. Bragunier
Harry B. Brandon III
Craig M. Brandt
Robert A. Bransford, Jr.
Hugh E. Brazil
Alan F. Breininger
James L. Brewer
Jeffrey Bricker
Larry L. Bright
Albert R. Brittain, Jr.
Ronald M. Brittain
Earl B. Brookbank III
Donald C. Bross
James A. Brown
Jeffrey L. Brown
Lawrence O. Brown
Robert P. Brown
David L. Browne
Brooks Bucher
William F. Buckley
Winston P. Bullard
Andrew L. Burgess, Jr.
David S. Burr
James F. Byrne
David W. Cable
Joseph F. Cahill, Jr.
Ray L. Caldwell
Laurence A. Callahan
Leonard P. Callahan
Michael W. Callahan
William E. Cameron, Jr.
William T. Cameron, Jr.
John A. Campbell, Jr.
Malcolm L. Campbell
James R. Carey
Richard S. Carey
Thomas K. Carroll, Jr.
William F. Case
Alan M. Cashman
Byron M. Cavaney, Jr.
Arthur K. Cebrowski
John E. Chadwick, Jr.
Alfred P. Chambliss III
Joseph J. Chappell, Jr.
Anthony W. Charlton
Paul R. Charron
Peter T. Chiodo
Charles J. Chotvacs
William P. Christie
Raymond Cinco, Jr.
Paul A. Ciotti
John C. Clary
Kenneth E. Clemens
Halbert R. Cliff
Michael L. Cline
Clarence H. Clover, Jr.
Richard S. Cloward
Clarence D. Coburn, Jr.
Edward C. Coffey
Walter S. Collins
Andrew J. Combe
Michael S. Confer
Michael Conlin
Dale M. Content
Paul A. Conterno
Douglas W. Cook
John B. Cooper, Jr.
Thomas M. Corwin
Maurice W. Coulon
Martin C. Coyne
Robert C. Cross, Jr.
Edward M. Crosson, Jr.
Lionel Crowley
Paul A. Croy
David W. Curry
George L. Custodi
Robert E. Curtis
James Allan Davis
James Alvin Davis
James W. Davis, Jr.
Ralph R. Davis
James R. Day, Jr.
Richard C. Dearmond, Jr.
Donald D. Delmanzo, Jr.
Robert A. Delorenzo
Joseph G. Demarco, Jr.
Philip W. Dempewolf
William R. Denslow, Jr.
Jerome L. Devilbiss
Richard W. Dewey
James T. Dewing, Jr.
Robert P. Dillman
Brian D. Dillon
Henry M. Dodd, Jr.
Michael W. Doyle
James L. Dozier, Jr.
Dennis G. Draper
Raymond M. Drew
Carl H. Dreyer
David R. Drinan
Mitchell O. Driskell, Jr.
Snowden C. Dubois
Jerry M. Dunagan
John L. Earle
Jerry C. Ebersbaker
George L. Edgar
Julian D. Edge, Jr
Leslie S. Edmondson
Harry S. Edwards, Jr.
Henry B. Edwards, Jr.
John N. Edwards
Theodore J. Ehlers
Richard W. Elliott
John M. Emerson
James D. Ennis
Richard A. Epperly
Robert F. Erdman, Jr.
Clifford M. Erickson
Paul F. Erickson
George F. Erwin
John W. Essig
Peter J. Eversole
James J. Evans
David L. Eustis
Larry A. Evans
Robert L. Ewing
William H. Ewing, Jr.
Frank J. Fabre, Jr.
Richard T. Fagan
Glenn E. Fant, Jr.
Claude S. Farmer, Jr.
Michael J. Farmer
David W. Farrar
Stephen A. Fausett
James J. Feder
Michael A. Ferrara
Charles D. Feustel
Everett E. Fine
Joel R. Fitts
John W. H. Fitzgerald
Thomas R. Fletcher
Ernest H. Forman
Gary L. Forsberg
John B. Foster III
Thomas A. Frame
Carl L. Frederick
William E. Free III
Charles A. French
Dennis D. Frick
Harold J. Fricke, Jr.
Jon H. Friedman
James M. Frost
Duane S. Fulkes
Joseph A. Fulmer
James L. Fulwiler
John E. Furrow
James A. Gabala
Arlan D. Gadeken
Thomas A. Gaither
Gaylord W. Galiher
Robert M. Gallen
James C. Gamrath
Wilmer C. Gangloff, Jr.
Mark E. Garrett
Tom S. Garrison
Michael W. Gaupin
John C. Gawne
Marvin J. Gay
John M. Geddie, Jr.
John W. Gemmill
Gary L. Genson
Larry F. Germann
Donald W. Getts
George J. Gides
Edwin F. Gier
Michael J. Gigl
James J. Gildea
Gary D. Giller
Ronald J. Gilles
James G. Gilmour
Robert P. Gilpin
Frederick T. Gilson, Jr.
Eugene H. Ginchereau
David M. Gist
Clarence H. Glover, Jr.
Charles W. Gnilka
Jerome L. Gogat
Gerald L. Good
Barry A. Gordon
Robert P. Gordon
Robert L. Gorham
Peter J. Graef
James J. Graham
Richard D. Graham
Stephen I. Grant
John C. Graves III
Kenneth E. Graves
Daniel E. Green
William F. Green
James B. Greene
Alan R. Greenwood
George W. Grier III
Harry A. Guess
Richard Guglielmino
James E. Gutierrez
Joseph R. Hackett
Ronald S. Hadbavny
Donald H. Haight
Edward T. Hallahan, Jr.
James W. Hambleton
Gerald K. Hamilton
Howard H. Hamilton
Mark I. Hampton
Richard E. Hansel
Robert T. Hanson, Jr.
Richard W. Hardy
Philip B. Harper
Christopher B. Harris
Stewart M. Harris
William I. Harris
Hollis W. Harmon
Thomas R. Harter
William M. Hartman
Robert A. Hauser
Roger M. Hawk
William W. Hawke
John A. Hawley III
Kipp T. Hayes
James K. Hayward
Benny J. Heeb
William A. Heep
Philip Heidinger
David L. Heiserman
David W. Heist
Jon S. Hemming
James R. Hendricks
Owen S. Henning
Louis W. Hennings III
Robert E. Hereford, Jr.
Gerald R. Hess
David W. Heyer
Robert W. Heyer
Frederick H. Heyse
Michael F. Hewlett
George P. Hibbard
Robert P. Hickey, Jr.
John L. Hildebrandt III
David M. Hill
Frederick W. Hillmann
Samuel H. Himes, Jr.
James E. Himmelspach
Sidney W. Hite, Jr.
Thomas E. Hogarth
David L. Holick
Grant T. Hollett, Jr.
Merlin B. Hollinger
William H. Holme
John T. Holmes
Daniel C. Holsenbeck
John T. Holton
Thomas R. Holton
Alan K. Holzapfel
James J. Horan
Albin Horowitz
Robert B. Horton, Jr.
William V. Horton
Jonathan P. Houghton
Robert L. Houlder
William D. Howey, Jr.
Howard H. Hubbard II
Philip T. Hufford
Edward M. Hughes
Jerry M. Hultin
Gordon W. Hunter
William J. Hurd
Jerald R. Hyde
Harry W. Hydrick
Robert F. Hynes
Peter M. Igoe
John L. Ingwersen
Larry A. Irwin
Phillip W. Isaacs
Michael T. Isenberg
John P. Jannik
Paul W. Jardis
Timothy D. Jaroch
Mark D. Jarrett
Frederick A. Jennerjohn
Frank J. Jerabek
Joseph J. Joerg, Jr.
Frank W. Jones
Gary P. Jones
James G. Jones
Kip E. Jones
Thomas H. Jones
Wilton S. Jones
James A. Jordan
Robert K. Julian
Lindsey E. Kalal

Richard A. Kalyn
Michael Kampf III
Ronald C. Katahara
David O. Kauppi
James M. Kearney
Walter E. Kearns
Paul H. Keefe, Jr.
Francis M. Keim
Thomas D. Kenneally
Dennis S. Kennedy
Hugh D. Keogh
Harry D. Kerr
Joseph A. Keyes
Louis J. Kienlen
Dennis W. Kiley
Kent H. Killam
Stephen M. Kimerling
Wayne B. Kingsley
Louis F. Kirchhoff, Jr.
John A. Kirkebo
Jack G. Kitchens, Jr.
William G. Kline III
Warren H. Klink
Kenneth D. Klocek
Byron P. Kloeppel
David M. Knight
Harold S. Koenig
Keith G. Koerber
Donald S. Kohla
John D. Kolata
Roy A. Kott
John M. Kozma
David L. Kranz
Michael A. Krebs
Paul B. Kurke
Richard G. Lacher
David R. Laehn
Paul W. Lagreek
James R. Lamping
Gerald T. Lang
Michael A. Lang
Kenneth J. Larsen
David R. Lartaud
Eric W. Laub
David W. Lawrence
Aaron R. Lawson
Gerald S. Lazarczyk
Francis T. Lebens
Allan R. Lee
Ronald S. Lehman
William T. Lehman
Armond C. Lepage
Laurin H. Letart
Stanley C. Lewczyk
Eben W. Lewis, Jr.
Leland G. Lewis
David J. Lherault
Donald H. Liebich
George H. Lindsay
Ronald L. Lindsay
Sidney E. Linton
Peter L. Litrenta
Wade S. Little
John A. Loarie
Robert J. Loarie
Peter V. Locke
Stephen F. Lotterhand
Steven J. Loucks
David N. Lucas
George M. Lucas
Ronald G. Ludlow
John R. Lutz
George Lyford, Jr.
Paul R. Lyon
Thomas H. MacBain, Jr.
Herbert M. MacDonald III
Bruce A. MacFadyen
Daniel I. MacIntyre IV
Paul J. Madigan
Leonard A. Magazine
Bruce B. Magnuson
Clarence B. Mahoney, Jr.
Ronald L. Main
Lee S. Mairs
Richard G. Majer
Andrew A. Makowka
Richard A. Malahowski
Phillip J. Mall
Joseph W. Manke
Alcide S. Mann, Jr.
Wayne R. Manning
Walter Marciniak, Jr.
John T. Margeson
Charles L. Marsh, Jr.
Ralph K. Martin
Theodore J. Martin
William D. Martin
Edward J. Mathias
Christopher T. Maurer
Walter L. Maurer
Joseph P. Mayer III
John R. Maynard
William C. Mayrose
James T. McCarthy
Charles K. McCoy
Francis M. McCoy, Jr.
Mike C. McCoy
Howard R. McDaniel
Robert J. McDaniel
John F. McDonald
David T. McEachen
Robert T. McGee
Barry L. McGhee
John D. McGill
Daniel J. McGrath
Michael L. McGraw
Rob R. McGregor, Jr.
Hagen B. McGuire
Scott A. McKenney
David H. McKinley
Bruce, W. McLaughlin
Terrence A. McLaughlin
Dana C. McLendon, Jr.
John A. McMullen
Stafford F. McNamee, Jr.
Dale L. McPherson
William M. McWilliams III
Robert N. Meals, Jr.
John M. Medlock III
Grant S. Meiner
Michael A. Merback
Andrew C. Messer
Philip J. Metres, Jr.
Paul A. Metz
Walter L. Meyers
Dennis A. Michele
Thomas M. Mickelsen
John R. Mileski
John C. Miller
John R. Miller
Kent P. Miller
Michael M. Miller
Philip R. Miller
Richard L. Miller
Archibald E. Millis, Jr.
John O. Miner, Jr.
Gordon L. Mitchell
William R. Mitchum III
Karl F. Mohns
Robert J. Moir
Frank J. Monahan
Steven M. Mondul
Philip R. Monroe
John D. Monticello
Arl Van Moore, Jr.
Kenneth J. Moore
Richard A. Moore
Harry E. Morgan
David N. Morris
Willard W. Morris
James L. Morse
Donald L. Moseley
Benjamin M. Moyer, Jr.
James W. Mulholland
John B. Mulligan, Jr.
Thomas D. Munsch
George J. Murphy
William H. Murphy, III
Phillips S. Murray
Terry D. Murray
Michael A. Nave
Evan A. Neff, Jr.
Richard G. Nelson
David C. Neubauer
Marino J. Niccolai
Douglas R. Nichols
Larry A. Nichols
Michael Nickelsburg
Frank J. Nivert
Robert M. Noah
Ernest J. Notar
Harold L. Novick
James E. Novitzki
Herbert D. Nowlin, Jr.
Dwight E. Nunn, Jr.
Lawrence M. O'Connor
Richard D. O'Connor
Douglas A. Oglesby
Theodore T. Okasinski
Wayne E. Oldendorph
Walter M. Olechna
Murray F. Olsen
Gaylord C. Olson, Jr.
Jack E. Olson
Charles P. O'Neill, Jr.
John L. Onestinghel
John D. Orsburn
Frederick J. Osgood
Richard A. Oudal
James E. Owen
Richard E. Owen
Eric H. Oxboel
Gary V. Paddock
Harry N. Paduano, Jr.
Bruce D. Page.
Charles W. Page, Jr.
Peter M. Pandolfi
Brance J. Parker
Michael W. Parker
Richard S. Parodi
Thomas L. Parry, Jr.
Jerry L. Parsons
Edward J. Pasahow
Bohdan Y. Paschyn
James G. Pastorius, Jr.
Wesley F. Patience, Jr.
John W. Patterson
Robert E. Patterson
Charles B. Payson
Jay W. Pease
Carl A. Pelzer, Jr.
Philip C. Perine
James K. Pernini
Robert A. Perron
Paul E. Perrone
Bradford K. Perry
James H. Perry, Jr.
Eric L. Peterson
Richard S. Peterson
Kenneth W. Pettigrew
Robert H. Pewett
Morgan S. Pirnie
Harry P. Planchon, Jr.
Michael F. Plumkett
Walter E. Pollock III
Ernest H. Pomerantz
Bernard B. Poore
Thomas L. Potter
Robert R. Powell
Craig D. Pozzi
Jay L. Press
Joseph M. Price
Thomas L. Price
Rudolph P. Price, Jr.
William H. Prouty
Allen F. Pulk
Gareth D. Quale
Norman C. Radder
Allie J. Ralston
Clayton R. Ramskill
Richard C. Ranes
James R. Ratliff
Richard R. Ratzlaff
Jerry W. Rayfield
David W. Read
Robert A. Reardon
William P. Rebarick
John P. Reberger
Russell Reddoch
Philip F. Rehbock
Walter J. Reid, Jr.
Robert A. Reineke
Charles D. Reite
David J. Reitmeyer
Robert H. Reller
John P. Ribka
John W. Richardson
Charles A. Riggs
Gary I. Roberts
William R. Roberts, Jr.
John E. Robertson IV
Millard L. Robertson, Jr.
Robert E. Robertson III
Matthew G. Rode
Richard A. Rollins
Richard B. Romney
Leonard H. Ronnie, Jr.
David R. Roth
Dexter R. Rowell
Marvin J. Rozner
William J. Ruhe, Jr.
Peter K. Rumely
Charles E. Russell
Bruce A. Ryan
Edward J. Ryan, Jr.
Allan E. Rypka
Thomas W. Sampson
James E. Sanders III
Peter G. Sarafian
Joel R. Sartoris
Charles J. Savage
Richard V. Schermerhorn
Roger E. Schlechte
Carl H. Schmitt
Stuart O. Schmitt
Randolph E. Schnabel
Carl E. Schneeberger
David D. Schoeff
Dean A. Schofield
Russell C. Scholl, Jr.
Charles F. Schomann III
Thomas A. Schroeffel
Robert J. Schweers, Jr.
David T. Scott
Kenneth E. Scott
Patrick R. Scott
Joel S. Seffel
Murphy A. Sewall
Richard A. Sewell
William A. Shannon III
Jerry L. Sharp
David F. Sheaff
George T. Sheffer
Robert E. Sherman
Andrew M. Shields
Ronald Y. Shigetani
Ronald E. Shriver
John R. Shultz
William L. Shumate
William M. Siddens
Bradley W. Simmons
Glen L. Sjoblom
William J. Slaughter III
Robert S. Slifka
William T. Sloan, Jr.
Frederick K. Smallwood
David O. Smith
J. Palmer Smith
John W. Smith
Ralph F. Smith
Robert I. Smith
William T. Smith III
William G. Smither
Gerald C. Snell
Ivan J. Snyder, Jr.
Keith R. Snyder
Stanley J. Snyder, Jr.
Robert W. Spellman, Jr.
Charles H. Spence, Jr.
George M. Spilseth
David A. Spina
Fredrik H. Spruitenburg
William L. Stahl, Jr.
Sammy D. Stair
Kevin T. Staley
David W. Stamps
Sam R. Stanbery, Jr.
Paul M. Stanford
William G. Stanley
Russell B. Starkey, Jr.
Douglas R. Starritt
John M. Stebbins
Robert S. Stephens
Daniel M. Sternberg
Edward M. Steudel, Jr.
Robert P. Stevens
Wilbur T. Stevens, Jr.
Clement O. Stevenson, Jr.
Joseph N. Stineman
Richard J. Streeter
*Terrance L. Stringer
John R. Suckow
Alfred H. Suhr
David J. Sullivan
James J. Sullivan
Herbert F. Swanson, Jr.
Roger B. Swift
*Kelly F. Swindle, Jr.
Daniel N. Swinford
Harley H. Swink
Wayne J. Switzer
Dennis A. Tabel
Alexander A. Taday, Jr.
John H. Talbot, Jr.
Daniel R. Talhelm
William W. Talley II
Clark M. Taylor
Keith A. Taylor
James T. Tedder, Jr.
Robert J. Terhune
Gerald A. Theisen
Douglas J. Thiel
Terry N. Thies
Glenn R. Thomas
James R. Thomas, Jr.
Albert F. Thomasson
James A. Thompson
Roy W. Thompson
Ronald C. Tipper
Gary H. Tobey
John H. Todd
Gordon V. Tollefson
Alfred C. Tollison, Jr.
John T. Toohey
Donald A. Tortorice
Robert N. Tracy, Jr.
David M. Treadwell
J. Forrest G. Trembley
Allen J. Trucano
Richard P. Trumpler
Richard P. Tull
James F. Tune
George E. Turner
James E. Turner, Jr.
Laurence H. Turner, Jr.
Thomas W. Turner
Daniel T. Twomey
William D. Tyson
Jerry L. Unrau
Anthony S. Vadopalas
Timothy L. Vaill
John M. Vanasek
James I. Vanliere
Kenton W. Vanlue
Pieter K. Vanwinkle
Douglas E. Veum
Russell T. Vickers
Randall W. Vitek
Edward P. Vollertsen III
Ernst P. Vollmer
Robert B. Vosilus
John A. Waeltz
Frederick P. Wales
Francis A. Walker
Francis D. Walker III
Robert F. Walker
Ronald E. Walkington
Leonard D. Walter
Frederick F. Wangaard, Jr.
Jimmy D. Warfield
George T. Wasleski, Jr.
Mitchell L. Watson
Peter K. Watt
Ben A. Weaver
Harry C. Weber
William R. Welch
David R. Wesley
Howard V. West
Charles H. Whelan, Jr.
Albert E. Whitehead
David G. Wilbourne
Jeffrey Wilk
Adrian R. Wilkins
Harry R. Wilkinson
David I. Williams
Donald E. Williams
Keener T. Williams
William H. Williams, Jr.
Thomas A. Willis
Jack W. Wilson
Frank G. Winant
John C. Winquist
Henry R. Wismer
John E. Wohlfiel
Neil F. Wood
Jerry F. Woolett
Douglas F. Wright
John R. Wright
John T. Wright
Robert E. Wright
Bruce N. Yarborough
Hugh W. Yarbrough
Gary A. Young
Gerry A. Young
Joe E. Young
James J. Zabritski
Jacob H. Zakarian
Robert J. Zimmer
John T. Zohlen

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) candidates to be permanent ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David G. Bezanilla
Jerry W. Bliley
Robert E. Borton, Jr.
Faxon D. Chapin, Jr.
Thomas M. Cribbin
Martin J. Cross
James M. David
Joseph M. Doares, Jr.
Victor F. Duggins II
*Herbert E. Fish III
Kenneth M. Gladstone
Emmett W. Grandy III
Robert C. Heim
*Bruce A. Hopkins
Frederick T. Jaffin, Jr.
William J. Karry
Guinn O. Leverett, Jr.
William F. Magrogan, Jr.
Kent B. Massie
William B. McCowan, Jr.
Roger G. Morris
Robert J. Moutrie
David F. Palmerlee
Thomas J. Schmiege
Robert W. Thornburgh, Jr.
William I. Trandum
Ronald C. Wilkinson

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John E. Bingham
Michael D. Christian
James G. Fernald
Gordon D. Helyer
Michael G. Jensen
Robert E. Lutz, Jr.
Robert J. Myshka
Richard E. Pietrzykowski
George S. Renshaw
Jack W. Samford
Gerald J. Sieren
Duane R. Smith
Roger B. Spencer
Winfred D. Vallance

*Fred J. Bice (Navy enlisted scientific education program) to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in the line as previously nominated and confirmed, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Robert W. Browning (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 lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William L. Anderson, Jr.
George A. Playford
David M. Reeves

Lynn E. Leffler (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.

Van Melvin, warrant officer, to be a permanent chief warrant officer, W–2, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Seth E. Anderson, Jr.
George L. Bass, Jr.
Howard S. Berg
Robert A. Bielinski
Ronald C. Bloodworth
Sydney D. Bogart
Peteris Bormanis
Benjamin C. Bowen
Ronald E. Bullock
Robert J. Campbell
Herbert L. Cares
John W. Chidsey, Jr.
James J. Coatsworth
Richard J. Corbett, Sr.
Daniel M. DeYoung
Richard E. DuBois
John R. Dunkelberg
Frank E. Ehrlich
Edward A. Ellis
John B. Emery, Jr.
Edwin H. Engert, Jr.
Stuart S. Fleming, Jr.
Donald G. Gallup
Roger L. Gilbertson
Frank J. Gillen, Jr.
Howard D. Gunlock
Robert B. Harrison
Ronald M. Hughes
Lawrence G. Hunsicker
David H. Jackson
George T. Jamarik, Jr.
Thomas B. Janter
Charles M. Jenkins
Alfred N. Karickhoff
Thaddeus E. Kelly
James E. Kopp
Hunter C. Leake III
Lloyd L. Leider, Jr.
Daniel B. Lestage
Kenneth G. Magee
James R. McMillian
Kenneth H. Messner
James E. Moorman, Jr.
James R. Moyes
Terence J. O'Toole
Stanley M. Patterson
Sam L. Pool
Kenneth L. Raulston, Jr.
Larry D. Reed
David M. Reeves
Elster D. Roberts
David I. Rosen
Kenneth R. Roth
Joel E. Sherlock
Rayburn R. Skoglund
Walter H. Snider, Jr.
Jerry C. Sutkamp
Britton E. Taylor
Charles W. Toup
Dennis H. Wessels
Reginald D. Wheat
Eugene J. Wolski

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 therefore as provided by law:

John E. Abbott
John R. Afinowicz
Robert J. Ailes
Gordon R. Alena
Edward P. Andersen
John N. Anderson
William L. Anderson, Jr.
Curtis R. Baker
Don B. Bane
Anthony Barone
Sylvester Barrington
Stanley L. Bartley
Earl D. Baxter
Donald D. Bell
Anthony P. Belmont
Charles H. Bercier, Jr.
William F. Bigham
Harold "W" Blevins
Bruce R. Blome
John E. C. Bocker
William J. Boehmler
Robert L. Bonsanti
Adam G. Brandau, Jr.
Roger W. Brassel
David A. Brian
William H. Brigance
Robert B. Brigden
Robert F. Brill
Jim R. Browning
Kenneth T. Buckley
Robert A. Bullock
Horace E. Buzhardt
Doyle E. Campbell
Dudley K. Campbell
Anthony A. Cassens, Jr.
Carlton L. Chambers III
James W. Cole III
Thad F. Connally
Taylor I. Cook
Ted A. Cook
Bernard J. Cordes
James H. Covey
Wilton W. A. Cox
Alvin H. Crawford
William G. Crawford
Billy B. Crowell
Samuel L. D'Amato, Jr.
Jerome H. Davis
Timothy J. Davis
Donald A. Deinlein
Robert D. de la Fuente
Paul T. DiGaudio
Herbert S. Dodge
James B. Edwards III
Wilbur F. Eich III
William L. Ekman
Jerry E. Enis
Stanley A. Englund
Richard H. Fair
Anthony E. Fathman
Lewis J. Fisher, Jr.
Thomas H. Fisher
James M. Fitts, Jr.
William C. Flanagan, Jr.
George E. Fleming
John R. Fletcher
James R. Fowler
Lynn R. Frary
Colin M. Freeman
David B. Gillis
Robert L. Gingell
Barry Goldman
Daniel H. Golwyn
Edward F. Good
Dennis B. Goodman
John E. Grasinger
Richard G. Grassy, Jr.
Cecil D. Grimes, Jr.
James A. Grimes
John M. Grollmus
Frank R. Gudas
James W. Ham
Ronald L. Hamm
Kenneth R. Hansen
Terry J. Happel
John M. Harrelson III
Daniel T. Harrington
John E. Hill
Larry W. Hill
William M. Hinz
James J. Houser
Robert L. Houts
John K. Howe, Jr.
Ernest W. Hunt, Jr.
William B. Jackson
Clifford J. Jeremiah
James D. Johannes
Francis D. Keenan, Jr.
Denis L. Keleher
Leon R. Kelley
Dan A. Kelly
"R" R. Kenner
Gerard F. Kenny
Peter T. Kirchner
John L. Kitzmiller
Raymond W. Klofkorn
George L. Koomos, Jr.
Kevin B. Lake
William R. Lamb
Alan M. Larimer
Robert C. Lecher
Lewis H. Lipsius
Paul A. LoCascio
Michael J. Logan
James T. Love, Jr.
Louis N. Ludington
George A. Lussier
John R. Lyons
John W. Mace
Thomas A. MacLean
Bruce A. Mallin
Harry A. Mangold
Edward C. Mattison
Martin E. McKenney
Robert T. McKinlay, Jr.
William E. McNally
Thomas B. Merritt
John M. Mertus
Karl V. Metz, Jr.
David E. Miller
John P. Miller
Donald S. Minckler
Richard Y. Mitsunaga
Frank A. Munden, Jr.
John F. Murphy
Bruce A. Naylor
Louis T. Nielson
Frederick C. Norcross
Clifford T. O'Connell
Michael A. O'Keefe
Benjamin C. Olliff, Jr.
James H. Oury
Ralph G. Owen
Stanley M. Patterson
James H. Patterson, Jr.
James P. Perry
Roger A. Potter
Ralph F. Principe
Willard R. Prouty
Stephen C. Pruyn
Gene H. Purvis
Charles N. Reed III
Delbert L. Remy
Glen V. Rice
Roderick P. Robertson
Donald M. Robinson
William D. Roche, Jr.
William A. J. Ross
William A. Scaring
Wendelin W. Schaefer
Jenkins L. Schley
Paul A. Selecky
Larry J. Severson
Robert M. Seymour
Charlie W. Shaeffer, Jr.
James O. Shaw
William D. Shea
Ernest L. Simms
Daniel C. Sisemore
Ronald L. Smits
Joseph P. Smyth
Harold L. Spencer
Robert H. Spratt
Richard D. Stevenson
Regis T. Storch
Eugene S. Strout
Robert M. Taxman
Stephen C. Telatnik
Joel D. Todino
Frank A. Trefny
Ricardo J. Trevino
David E. Ulmer
Peter V. Van Tassel
Leonard L. Vertuno
Richard P. Wagner
George G. Wells
Gerald M. West
Harold D. West, Jr.
David O. Westmark, Sr.
Robert H. Wheelock
James E. Wilkerson
Ackerman C. Williams, Jr.
Bernard M. Williams
George A. Williams
Samuel W. Williams
Tom V. Willis, Jr.
Orville D. Wilson, Jr.
Walter S. Yourchek, Jr.
David C. Ziegler
Jack E. Zimmerman

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Herschel M. Timmons, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Henry D. Barratt
Duard L. Beebe
John R. Bell
Roderick E. Benton
James M. Chance
Roger J. Claus
Charles E. Conway, Jr.
Joseph C. Dangler
Francis T. Dettrey
Wilson R. Dodge
Joseph J. Dzielski
Elbert A. Foster
Marshall M. Grice, Jr.
Leon A. Guimond
William P. Hamilton
Billie E. Hicks
Fred L. James
Herbert C. Johnson
Robert L. Jones, Jr.
James A. Kinniger
Ronald C. Kraus
L. J. Lott
Kenneth R. Maddox
Enrique A. Mauri
Joseph R. Paquette
Joaquin D. Pereira
Roger P. Pilcher
Herbert F. Posey
Thomas R. Preston
H. L. Redding
Richard R. Reuschling
Donald J. Robinson II
Anthony J. Scaran
George R. Schipper
Frederick W. Schroeder
Delmas D. Sharp, Jr.
Kenneth E. Shelton
Billy E. Simpson
Alan T. Snyder
Jerry L. Stricker
Frank D. Strong
William E. Tisdale
William G. Van Zanten, Jr.
David B. Werner
Theodore L. Whisler
David F. Winecoff
Anthony A. Zadravec

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ronald L. Allen
Henry W. Austin
Earle G. Breeding, Jr.
Jack R. Brinker
James R. Coughlan
Ronald V. Debrincat
Lawrence L. Downey
James H. Pinnick
Moffatt F. Wylie
Paul E. Rudeen, Jr.
William R. Griggs
John W. Raymond
John P. Caynak
James E. Selway
Ronald F. Thomson
David L. Lawson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George W. Atteberry
Dennis A. Cavagnaro
Robert F. Rodgers
David A. Villeneuve
John T. Radzyminski
Thomas L. Elser
James L. Losey
Edward R. Doane
John G. Flynn
Warren A. Culpepper
Robert G. Whaley
John R. Fritsch
Delbert H. Dupont
Herbert E. Hoppmeyer, Jr.
William F. Tremper
Robert L. Babos
Allen L. Powers
James D. Gilliard
Benny M. McKenzie
Richard C. Bradfield
Edward F. Kubik, Jr.
Edward L. Green
Terry C. Jackson
Glenn O. Kennedy, Jr.
William C. Reed, Jr.
William J. Feind
James P. Crowley
Joseph G. Dentz
Jerry L. Lathrop
Zane B. Fisher

The following-named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John B. Caskey
John B. Crell, Jr.
Alan W. Hitchens
Sammy R. Claxton

NOTE.—* indicates interim appointment issued.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Need for a New Trade and Embargo Policy With Communist Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, events of recent months have pointed up once again the crying need for a reexamination of present trade practices and policies with the Communist nations and for the drawing up of a firm statement of principles based on that study. It is not only the American people, but the entire world, that has now become completely confused by the vagaries and inconsistencies of U.S. policies.

Clearly these policies are entirely ineffective today and are leading to misunderstandings and differences of opinion with other nations of the free world, which may well jeopardize the structure of NATO and other relationships with free nations unless action is taken to clear them up. A place at which we might start would be with a reevaluation and revision of our entire policy toward the blacklisting of ships visiting Cuban ports and the Johnson administration's new policy, put into effect in December of 1963, under which ships may be removed from that blacklist. The facts are that at the present time there are 200 ships on this blacklist and since December 38 ships have been removed from the blacklist, but even with this removal there has been a net addition of 2 ships to the blacklist since the first of December 1963. This shows clearly that our blacklisting policy is not working and that since the revision in our policies, there has been a net increase of ships, other than Russian ships, visiting Cuban ports, rather than any decrease. This is not surprising in view of the lax provisions under which blacklisted ships can now be removed from the list. Of the total of 38 such removals, 6 have been British ships, and 14 have been Greek ships. It should particularly be noted that the pledge given by the owners, in order to remove such a ship from the blacklist, specifically excludes any commitment that ships already chartered for Cuban trade will be withdrawn before the termination of their charter if such charters were entered into before December 16, 1963. Such charters may in some circumstances last 2 or 3 years. The feeling of many in Congress, in which I share, is that this removal procedure should itself be removed and that we should extend our embargo policy insofar as U.S. ports are concerned to the ships of any registry which continue to visit Cuban ports after a warning period of 2 or 3 months, regardless of the terms of outstanding charters. Those ships would have an option to make their choice one way or the other, and we could look for some net decline in the number of ships from our allies using Cuban ports and helping to sustain the Communist effort in Cuba, which is being strengthened by this trade.

At the same time, a reexamination of our entire trading policy with Communist nations in other parts of the world should be studied and new principles clearly stated and instituted. A good place to start on this project would be to reconsider the decision forced upon the Congress by President Johnson on Christmas eve, under which the Export-Import Bank and presumably other financing sources are specifically permitted to guarantee the credit of Communist nations on shipments of wheat or of any other products for which export licenses are granted. If the wheat sale proposal had been submitted to and considered by the Congress and it had stuck to the original terms of cash on the barrel head, one half American shipping, and guarantees against diversion to Cuba, it might have been acceptable to many Americans.

However, the idea of guaranteeing Communist credit, of increasing subsidies on such oversea shipments, and of otherwise taking steps to assist the faltering agricultural economy in Russia is wholly abhorrent to them. But with such attitudes officially endorsed, we can not be surprised at the decision of Great Britain and other nations to indulge in Cuban trade to their heart's content as witnessed by the recent bus sale and by the present discussion of French truck deals which may soon materialize.

These are just a couple of examples of the inconsistencies and confusion which dominate the whole question of U.S. trade policy with the Communists at the present time. If we do not know where we stand or where we are going ourselves, it is hard to see how we can expect the rest of the world to understand us or to cooperate with us in our efforts. There is little time to be lost in correcting this situation because the ramifications in our relationships with other nations are themselves as dangerous and upsetting as the increased strength given to Communist Cuba.

The 43d Anniversary of the Armenian Revolt Against Soviet Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT McCLORY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all freedom loving Americans—and particularly on behalf of those Americans of Armenian descent—I rise on this day, the 43d anniversary of the successful Armenian revolt against Soviet tyranny and terror.

No people have demonstrated greater determination or more love for freedom than those who once were part of the Armenian nation; and who are now spread in various lands around the globe, including a great many who reside in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois.

Our Nation supports the independence of an ever-increasing number of new nations. However, it is appropriate to point out that little or nothing is being done to assist the Armenian people—or other nations which are now encompassed by the Iron Curtain—to regain their national freedom.

I call again upon the administration to give support to the resolution—House Joint Resolution 15—offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, to establish a Captive Nations Commission. This measure would restore hope and—eventually, I trust—freedom for Armenia as well as for the provinces and satellite nations, which are now under Communist domination.

The adoption of this joint resolution would seem to be a first step in encouraging Armenia's emergence as a free nation.

The determination of Armenians to remain free—no matter where their temporary abode—is hailed here, today. Freedom loving people everywhere applaud the dreams, hopes, and realistic goal of a restored free and independent Armenian nation.

Georgetown University Debating Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure today to announce that the debating team from Miami Beach High School has won the 13th annual Georgetown University high school debating tournament.

Two seniors, David Kaye and Allen Fuller, from Miami Beach High School, defeated Jesuit High School of New Orleans in the final round of the tournament. The topic for the debates was "Medicare," with the teams alternating between the affirmative and negative position for each successive round.

These two young men are members of the National Forensic League, the national high school honorary debating society. For their supreme efforts here in Washington during the 3 days of keen competition, the Miami Beach team was presented the Ryder Challenge Cup, named in honor of Father Ryder who established the Philodemic Debating Society around 1831.

The Miami Beach team is not the only one from Dade County, Fla., to take home honors. The highest individual award of the tournament went to Martin Galbert, of Miami Senior High School. He was named the top debater of the entire tournament.

Mr. Speaker, I am justly proud of these fine young people from the district which I have the honor to represent—the Fourth Congressional District of Florida. I might add that of the three Florida teams competing, all were representing high schools from the Fourth Congressional District. They were Miami Beach Senior High School, Miami Senior High School, and Coral Gables Senior High School.

The four young people representing Coral Gables Senior High School paid a visit to my office yesterday. They were: Cynthia Perwin, Louis Sperling, Jose Garcia, and Larry Mans. Although I did not have the pleasure of greeting them personally, my office staff was most impressed by their eagerness and enthusiasm and their keen awareness of domestic and world affairs.

The Georgetown University tournament, which began last Friday and went through Sunday, was the largest high school debating tournament ever held. A total of 180 teams from 103 schools competed; 30 States were represented by approximately 500 of the top debaters in our Nation.

This grueling tournament began with 6 preliminary rounds which narrowed the field to the top 16 teams. The remaining teams met in four sudden-death rounds, leaving 8 teams, then 4, then 2, and finally the winning team. The Miami Beach team won a total of 10 debates to carry off top honors.

My heartiest congratulations to all the young men and women competing in this nationwide debating tournament, and in particular my congratulations and sincere thanks to the winners who represented Florida and Dade County so outstandingly, and to their teachers and coaches.

The 88th Congress Reconvenes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district are greatly interested in knowing what legislation may be forthcoming from Congress this year. For this reason, I have made the 2d session of the 88th Congress the subject of my February newsletter.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my newsletter, as well as the paragraphs under the heading "As I See It," in the RECORD:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JACK WESTLAND, SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY, 1964

THE 88TH CONGRESS RECONVENES

The 2d session of the 88th Congress has begun with a new skipper at the helm. President Johnson begins his first full year as President and the country will shortly find out if his is a new program or a continuation of the old. Time will tell. Many are still trying to figure out how we can provide all the programs the President is asking for and still keep the budget at the level he proposed. While it's true he's asking for nearly a billion less than last year's budget, the $97.9 billion requested still includes an anticipated $4.9 billion deficit. Most important is the request for $103.7 billion in new obligational authority. This is the gage of what an administration actually plans to spend. If that authority is granted it could eliminate most of the $6.5 billion Congress saved in appropriations for the current year and produce an actual $10.7 billion deficit for the coming year.

The recent resignations of Arthur Schlesinger and Ted Sorensen, both considered to have wielded great power in the White House, would indicate that the Johnson programs and methods may be different than those of former President Kennedy. If their resignations mean a disenchantment of the liberal wing of the Democrat Party then the President can face some intraparty battles.

This session should be a comparatively short one. An election year makes quite a bit of difference in the activities of Government. Although I may be sticking my neck out I'll predict that we'll adjourn not later than September 1; that we'll pass a civil rights bill by April; that we'll pass the tax bill by March 1 (retroactive to January 1); and that we'll pass a wilderness bill that everyone can live with. I'll predict that Pacific Northwest power preference legislation will pass which will protect the industries of the State of Washington.

I also believe that Congress has a fair chance of bringing our budget almost into balance, something I've fought for for years. But I can see no relief for the lumber industry in the northwest—the President's recent veto of even the labeling (country of origin) bill indicates the lack of sympathy of the administration.

I can see no satisfactory conclusion to the war in Vietnam which is costing many lives and a million dollars a day.

I can see no success in our relations with Castro Cuba—it would be more predictable that that situation may even get worse since Mr. Bunker, who arranged for the Sukarno (Indonesia) takeover of the Dutch West Indies, has been named ambassador to the Organization of American States.

I can see no improvement in our relations with De Gaulle, but to the contrary a worsening.

I can see no improvement in the composition of the United Nations—in fact the admission of Red China becomes a distinct possibility now that France has "recognized" them.

I guess that's about enough of looking into the crystal ball for this letter. Maybe (and I hope so) I'll be wrong in my assessment of our position in foreign affairs.

Just don't forget for 1 minute that, despite all our problems, this is the greatest nation on earth and the envy of the entire world.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

I am aware that one of the fine opportunities which goes with congressional life in Washington, D.C., is to be invited to be a hostess at the Annual Congressional Wives Prayer Breakfast. On February 5, 1964, the breakfast was held at the Mayflower Hotel. Congressional wives, and member guests of prayer groups, totaling 750 ladies, heard sincere remarks from both President and Mrs. Johnson, and from Dr. Billy Graham, who incidentally was introduced as the husband of our main speaker, Mrs. William Graham of North Carolina.

Mrs. Graham is an unusually attractive, tall young lady; in fact, she and her husband look very much alike. She's an excellent speaker, with warmth and a sense of up-to-date humor. I appreciated her remark that she does a lot of her praying on the hoof—while washing dishes, tending to children, etc. I find waiting for elevators, and the underground tunnel walk from the House Office Building to the Capitol are good areas for "praying on the hoof."

One of Mrs. Graham's favorite prayer stories is about the man who was trying to "get with religion." His prayer was this: "Lord have mercy * * * cause mercy suits our case."

All in all, this was a splendid way to start a day.

VISITORS

Anacortes: Mr. and Mrs. Marion O. Berentson; Mr. Steve Petcoff.

Blaine: Mr. and Mrs. Jack Gloslie; Mr. and Mrs. Boyd McPhail.

Clinton: Sue Kinskie.

Edmonds: Mr. R. C. Schiefelbein.

Monroe: Mrs. Dorothy J. Bennett.

Port Angeles: Douglas Crowell.

Sedro-Woolley: Mrs. Frank S. Evans.

P.S.—Let me remind you that your letters are welcome any time you want to give me your ideas on legislation before the Congress or any time you have a problem involving the Federal Government.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, when we attempt to legislate on economic problems, and particularly one such as unemployment in private industry, it is most unfortunate that more of our colleagues have not experienced meeting a payroll, completing the myriad of Government forms and reports, or competing for business against larger or more favorably situated organizations.

In connection with the current proposal for double overtime pay, one of my constituents, a brick manufacturer of long standing, writes me as follows:

DEAR MR. WHARTON: This is with respect to H.R. 9802—premium wage rates for overtime work. We have given this proposal considerable study. We look with a skeptical eye on the statement of its supporters that the tripartite committee would restrict its recommendations for not less than double time for overtime to selected industries. Double time for overtime for our little company would involve a cost burden that would wipe out our incentive to operate. It is impractical for us to hire extra help as an alternative. We hope that you will take a position against H.R. 9802.

Obviously, we are not going to encourage employment by putting employers out of business, and this is exactly what has been going on for some time. Government regulation has reached the saturation point and I hear many complaints concerning this harassment of private industry. New York State lost 4,000 small farms last year because all of our farm assistance programs are designed to assist the big operator, and

Federal regulations have discouraged many more thousands of small businessmen in the same period. The least we can do is to stop encouraging unemployment through such ridiculous ideas as this.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, continuing the practice which I established with gratifying results during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I include in today's RECORD a complete tally of my voting and attendance performance during the final weeks of 1963 and the first legislative month of 1964.

As most Members are perhaps aware, these periodic reports are sent to all registered voters in California's 25th District. Their reaction to this method of keeping them informed has been extremely heartening, and is sound rebuttal to the cynical view that "What the voters do not know cannot be used against you." In my judgment, a voter's right to know is sacrosanct and one of the cornerstones upon which this great Nation was built.

I know that the vast majority of my colleagues have developed in varying degrees their own methods of keeping in touch with their constitutents, through monthly newsletters, radio and television, yearend wrap-up reports, questionnaires, and so on. I would not presume to suggest that one method is better than another, or more effective, nor would I advise anyone how best to fulfill the electorate's desire and need for information concerning the representation it is receiving.

Nevertheless, I would suggest that all of us study the methods of communication used by each other. In so doing we can perform a great public service by helping develop to as fine a degree as possible an important tool designed to further the cause of government of, by, and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I include my first congressional voting record report for 1964:

Roll call No.	Date	H.R. No.	Vote				Brief description
			R.B.C.	Yea	Nay	Not voting	
221	Dec. 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Carey, Democrat of New York (94 Members absent).
222	Dec. 6		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Kyl, Republican of Iowa (207 Members absent; R.B.C. at meeting with Peace Corps Director, Thailand).
223	Dec. 9		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Adair, Republican of Indiana (71 Members absent).
224	do	7885	Yea	195	165	74	On acceptance of conference report re foreign assistance authorization bill. (1 Member answered "present"; see rollcall No. 133.)
225	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Harsha, Republican of Ohio (87 Members absent).
226	do	8929	Yea	278	76	80	Motion to recommit District of Columbia rapid transit bill.
227	Dec. 10	8747	Yea	356	22	56	On acceptance of conference report on independent offices appropriation bill.
228	do	8747	Not voting	170	204	60	Motion that House recede from disagreement with Senate amendment earmarking $1,700,000 for construction of veterans' hospital in Florida. (R.B.C. at meeting with Roger Hilsman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs); would have voted "nay."
229	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Harris, Democrat, of Arkansas (61 Members absent).
230	do	6518	Yea	273	109	53	On acceptance of conference report on Clean Air Act. (See rollcall No. 102.)
231	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois (75 Members absent).
232	do		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Hays, Democrat, of Ohio (83 Members absent; R.B.C. in office with visitor from Turkey).
233	do	579	Yea	345	12	76	To permit consideration of bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts (1 Member answered "present").
234	Dec. 11		Yea	214	166	54	Motion to adjourn by Mr. Albert, Democrat, of Oklahoma.
235	Dec. 12	9140	Yea	330	47	57	On acceptance of conference report on public works appropriation bill (1 Member answered "present").
236	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Conte, Republican, of Massachusetts (78 Members absent).
237*	do	4955	Nay	180	193	60	Motion to recommit conference report on vocational education bill.
238*	do	4955	Yea	301	65	68	On passage of vocational education bill conference report.
239	Dec. 13		Present				Quorum call by Mr. McLoskey, Republican of Illinois (115 Members absent).
240	do	9139	Yea	300	4	130	On acceptance of conference report on military construction appropriation bill.
241	Dec. 16		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (55 Members absent).
242*	do	9499	Nay	218	169	46	Motion to recommit foreign aid appropriation bill for Export-Import Bank amendment (1 Member answered "present").
243*	do	9499	Yea	249	135	46	On passage of foreign aid appropriation bill (4 Members answered "present").
244	Dec. 17		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Stinson, Republican of Washington (70 Members absent).
245	do	8667	Nay	329	41	63	Conference report on public works appropriation bill—motion that House insist on disagreement to Senate amendment (1 Member answered "present").
246	do	9413	Yea	352	6	76	To provide coinage of John F. Kennedy 50-cent pieces.
247	Dec. 19		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Findley, Republican, of Illinois (98 Members absent).
248	do	875	Yea	324	4	106	Supplemental appropriations to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for mental retardation programs.
249*	Dec. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Derwinski, Republican, of Illinois (144 Members absent).
250*	Dec. 21		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa (169 Members absent; this call came at 2 a.m.—R.B.C. sleeping in office, failed to receive whip call).
251*	do	598	Nay	182	95	156	On adoption of resolution to permit consideration of conference report on foreign aid authorization bill (1 Member answered "present").
252*	do	9499	Nay	141	136	153	Motion to maintain House disagreement on Export-Import Bank amendment to foreign aid bill (3 Members answered "present") (adjourned at 5:45 a.m.).
253	do		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (162 Members absent).
254	Dec. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (146 Members absent).
255*	do	600	Yea	202	105	125	On adoption of resolution to permit consideration of conference report on foreign aid bill on same day rule granted (¾ vote needed for adoption; resolution failed).
256*	Dec. 24	9499	Yea	189	158	80	On passage of foreign aid bill conference report (6 Members answered "present").
1* to 21*	Jan. 7-31		Absent				R.B.C. conducting congressional report meetings in the District.
22 to 29	Feb. 1-8		Present				Quorum calls by Messrs. Gross, Cederberg, and Van Pelt (average of 25 Members absent per call).
30	Feb. 8		Yea	220	175	36	Motion to adjourn at 10:07 p.m.
31	Feb. 10		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican of Iowa (23 Members absent).
32*	do	7152	Yea	290	130	11	On passage of Civil Rights Act.

*Items so marked are considered to be of greater significance, and a brief explanation is included herein.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 237 AND 238, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

In this era of increased automation and mass unemployment of the unskilled, there can be little question that Government must take a firm hand in helping equip our young people for full and productive careers in vocational occupations. This consensus is certainly reflected in the final House vote of 301 to 65 on H.R. 4955. It has been more than 17 years since Congress enacted far-reaching legislation in this field and in the intervening years the labor market has made greater and greater demands on workers. More education and a higher degree of skills are needed, but recent statistics indicate that about 35 percent of our children now in grade school will not become high school graduates. Approximately half of those students who graduate from high school will not go to college, but will seek jobs. Yet only about 13 percent of our high-school-aged children are presently enrolled in vocational educational programs. This alarming trend must be reversed and I am hopeful that the Vocational Education Act of 1963 will help bring this about.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 242, 243, 251, 252, 255, AND 256, FOREIGN AID BILL

At 7 a.m. on December 24, the House met for final consideration of the foreign aid authorization bill, a measure which 8 days earlier had cleared the House with a provision that would have blocked underwriting by the Export-Import Bank of wheat sales to the Soviet Union. On rollcall No. 242 I voted against attaching this amendment to the bill, but when it was included in the bill, I supported passage of the entire measure. I was confident, however, that the Senate would not accept the Bank amendment, and this prediction was borne out in conference committee. House and Senate conferees dropped the amendment and the bill was returned to the House. Then came the donnybrook that did much to tarnish the image of Congress in the public eye. With Christmas only a few days off, the House Democratic leadership was unable to keep its forces in the Capital. Republicans, however, showing strong party discipline under the leadership of the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman HALLECK, were on the floor for rollcall No. 252 and by a five-vote majority refused to accept the conference committee's discarding of the controversial amendment. The conference report again came before the House on rollcall No. 256, this time with a Democratic majority on the floor. The foreign aid bill passed in the form recommended by House-Senate conferees.

It is regrettable that the GOP keyed its attack on the so-called wheat amendment to an issue of "communism versus anticommunism." This was not the issue. The issue was one of foreign policy, trust in the President of the United States, and the use of every weapon at our disposal in waging the cold war. I consider all of my votes—whether the issue be aid to education, departmental appropriations, mental retardation or what have you—to be votes for a stronger and more prosperous America, and therefore against communism. I am sure this is true of all Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle and accusations and insinuations to the contrary are a disservice to the entire body.

The Export-Import Bank amendment was designed to sharply curtail Presidential flexibility in conducting foreign policy, an area of responsibility which is given to the executive branch by the Constitution. Whether the Bank may or may not extend credit in the sale of wheat for dollars is a judgment that should properly be made by the President, reporting to Congress, and by the hard-headed businessmen who formulate the Bank's policies.

It is worth noting that Edwin Neilan, president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, had this to say about the wheat sales:

> The action of President Kennedy and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges in approving the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union through private commercial channels at the world price for cash or short-term credit is commendable. It will benefit the U.S. economy particularly in the area of reducing our balance-of-payments deficit and by providing an outlet of surplus wheat which is costing taxpayers enormous sums in storage charges.

President Eisenhower made this observation:

> If in a matter of an economic deal we saw that we got a very great advantage, then it is a good horse trade, and in a horse trade * * * there is no principle that is being furthered, it is just a material gain. If there is a mutual advantage you can't kick about a trade.

In the words of a spokesman for the American Bankers Association:

> Since every dollar of gold they [the Soviet Union] pay us is another dollar they cannot spend for military purposes, I cannot see any valid objection to this proposed sale.

This entire line of reasoning was obviously shared by the Eisenhower administration for in 1957 the Export-Import Bank guaranteed a $30 million loan to Poland to buy a tinplate mine, and again in 1958 the Bank guaranteed a $25 million purchase of pharmaceutical products to this same Communist country.

The greatest irony in the entire wheat amendment hassle was the violent antisale position taken by extremist groups. Hurling their familiar charge of "treason" at anyone with whom they disagree, they failed to recall that one of their most ardent supporters and leading spokesmen, former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, advocated the sale of surplus agricultural products to Iron Curtain countries as far back as 1955. In fact, in that year, a multimillion dollar sale of hybrid corn and seeds and farm machinery to Russia was transacted.

I saw no objection to the foreign aid authorization bill conference report. It said in simple language that the Export-Import Bank is not to guarantee any payment incurred by a Communist country in the purchase of any product, except when the President determines that it is in the national interest to extend credit. It is a matter of having faith in the President's judgment. I have that faith.

A Small Businessman Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, although it remains to be seen what action Congress will take on the proposals to lower the workweek to 35 hours, H.R. 3102, and the double overtime bill, H.R. 9802, I believe it is our duty to refer both bills to one of our semiactive investigating committees for interment in a manner not unlike the Domestic Peace Corps, ZIP code numbers, and other ill-advised theoretical schemes that are best remembered for their ability to incite adverse public comment.

One of my very substantial constituents, who employs a dozen men or so, has, I believe, expressed the sentiment of the small businessman on H.R. 3102 in a manner which is both amusing and alarming. He writes:

> The 35-hour week bill, H.R. 3102, if passed would throw at least one-half of the small businessmen out of business. In order to organize and administer a 35-hour week, the small businessman would have to work 70 to 80 hours, so we figure why bother, liquidate, get a job ourselves causing more unemployment and maybe a 15-hour week. Nice dream?

More Questions on Our Puzzling Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that my puzzlement and amazement over many phases of our foreign policy increase as time goes on.

Some time ago I raised some questions as to why we subsidized Communist leaders like Tito to the tune of billions of dollars—all taxpayer money, of course—on the grounds that we thereby are weakening communism. Perhaps I am unable to grasp the esoteric reasoning of our policy planners, but it seems to me, that by contributing billions of dollars to Communist dictators, we are underwriting a system that is dedicated to our destruction.

In the recent Zanzibar rebellion, every news story I read attributed the overthrow of the elected government to Cuban-trained revolutionaries. The State Department, however, said it was not certain that the new government was Communist. Even after the new rulers proclaimed Zanzibar as a peoples republic in the fashion of the Communist nations, the State Department remained unconvinced. I recall our diplomatic experts in the State Department did not believe Castro was a Communist until the day he announced his communism to the world.

Many other phases of our foreign policy baffle me. One recent instance has me quite bewildered. Here is the situation. In effect, we are underwriting and supporting the regime of Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the former Belgian Congo. We have spent in this disorganized country some $500 million, through the United Nations and our own foreign aid program, and will give it much more. We backed the U.N. attack on Moise Tshombe, former President of Katanga Province, forcing Katanga, which wanted to become independent, to subordinate itself to Adoula.

One Holden Roberto is the leader of a movement intended to drive the Portuguese out of Angola, a Portuguese possession in West Africa. Roberto maintains a government-in-exile on the soil of the former Belgian Congo. This government has been recognized by Adoula,

and he is assisting Roberto in his plans for an invasion of Angola. Incidentally, Roberto is being assisted also by other African nations, including Ben Bella, Algerian dictator, who is friendly to Castro and hostile to the United States.

Charges have been made from time to time that Roberto has had Communist backing. These have been denied by our State Department. In fact, there have been rumors that we looked with favor on Roberto, regarding him as a sort of Adoula, who would be on our side when the Portuguese are driven out of Africa. However, Pieter Lessing, and other reputable authorities, have insisted that Roberto had Communist backing for his invasion of Angola in March 1961. Roberto's band of terrorists tortured and butchered, sparing neither age nor sex. The atrocities were represented in this country as justifiable acts by a heavily oppressed people. The United States sided with Roberto's assassins, and, at the U.N. our representatives actually voted with Communist Russia to condemn the Portuguese for defending themselves. But many reputable journalists and commentators visited Angola after March of 1961. Their stories were quite different than the early reports which were spread by Portugal's enemies.

But early this year Roberto did a most embarrassing thing, embarrassing to our foreign policy planners. He suddenly announced that he intended to seek Communist support, including Red Chinese support, in his campaign against the Portuguese. He is quoted in the New York Times as saying that he intended to visit Peiping, Moscow, and possibly Cuba.

He is quoted in the New York Times as saying:

> The Communists assured me that we can have whatever we need in arms and money. We are firmly decided to accept.

The open Roberto-Communist alliance raises some very interesting questions. We are underwriting Adoula, who in turn is underwriting Roberto. Moreover, without a haven in the Congo, to which he can retreat after striking at Angola, Roberto cannot operate. It is evident that he has little support inside Angola, itself.

Do we still intend to allow Roberto to use the Congo as the base for Communist operations intended to drive the Portuguese out of Angola? Do we still intend to underwrite an operation aimed at a friendly nation, Portugal, on behalf of our deadly enemies?

Someone may say that we cannot tell Adoula what to do. No, but we can stop giving him taxpayer dollars. If we do that, he would not be able to continue in business. We can use our influence to have the U.N. troops removed from the Congo, where they are preventing utter chaos. We can stop helping finance the destruction of the free world and our own destruction as well.

Finally, does the State Department intend to continue to be guided in its African policy by the American Committee on Africa? This outfit has been Roberto's backer in the United States and has helped him with propaganda, and in other ways. There is plenty of evidence that the committee, which once included many prominent and deluded citizens as members, has been heavily infiltrated by Communist sympathizers. One prominent staff member, Hope Stevens, has belonged to 20 or more Commie fronts, over a period of years. Still others have played footsie with the Commies on many occasions.

Yet, George M. Houser, executive director of the committee, is a member of the State Department's Advisory Council on African Affairs. Dr. John A. Marcum, another American committee member, also is a member of the Council. And Frank Montero, prominent in American committee affairs, actually is a member of our U.N. delegation.

If these men are shaping our African policies, we can look forward to continued support for Roberto, who plans to take over Portuguese Africa with Communist support.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have had no answers from our foreign policy makers to my queries about foreign affairs. Perhaps, personally, I am not sufficiently important to warrant attention from our great State Department. Yet, I insist that the questions I have raised are pertinent and deserve attention. They go to the very heart of matters, and may explain why the Communist tide is advancing over the world and why the retreat of democracy continues.

Lumber Standards Change Could Cripple Our Ports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, a move is now underway by a few giant timber companies to change the size standards of lumber. The crippling effect that this development could have for ports, such as my home port of Boston, is spelled out in an excellent article in the February 2 issue of the Boston Globe. The first two sentences of the article, written by Mr. Earl Banner, explain why this question should be seriously considered by every Member of this body who has a port in his district:

> A move by some giants of the lumber business to eliminate so-called green lumber from the American Lumber Standards Code, and still further reduce the dimensions of the prosaic 2 by 4, most commonly used stud in the building trade, could cost the port of Boston more than a quarter of its general cargo imports.
>
> The joker in the proposal is that Government approval of a newer, slimmer 2 by 4 (now only 1⅝ inches by 3⅝ inches, but perhaps soon to be a dainty 1½ inches by 3½ inches) will automatically enrich some of the proponent companies by millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, these giant timber companies should not be permitted to perpetrate such a major economic move under the guise of making technological improvements. At least, this vital economic matter deserves the fullest public airing before any action is taken by the Department of Commerce. In this regard, I am pleased to learn that my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, who is chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Distribution, has announced tentative plans for hearings on the lumber standards issue. I also understand that our beloved Speaker has urged our colleague from California to allow adequate time for the presentation by Massachusetts port interests and wholesale and retail lumber dealers at these hearings. Please be assured, Mr. Speaker, that I will give this matter my fullest support.

At this time, under unanimous consent, I include the Boston Globe article and the press announcement of the hearings by the gentleman from California in the RECORD:

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Feb. 2, 1964]

LUMBER INDUSTRY MOVE COULD COST PORT PLENTY

(By Earl Banner)

A move by some giants of the lumber business to eliminate so-called green lumber from the American Lumber Standards Code, and still further reduce the dimensions of the prosaic 2 by 4, most commonly used stud in the building trade, could cost the port of Boston more than a quarter of its general cargo imports.

The joker in the proposal is that Government approval of a newer, slimmer 2 by 4 (now only 1⅝ by 3⅝ inches, but perhaps soon to be a dainty 1½ by 3½ inches) will automatically enrich some of the proponent companies by millions of dollars.

National adoption of the proposed new 2 by 4 will automatically increase the number of 2 by 4's in a given log by roughly 10 percent.

"It will amount to a 10-percent boost in inventory, and capital gains that will be counted in the hundreds of millions," one opponent of the proposal contends.

One of the chief proponents of the still slimmer 2 by 4 is the Weyerhaeuser Co., the lumber industry's Goliath whose timber acreage is exceeded only by the Government itself.

This proposed revision of lumber standards, already under consideration by the U.S. Department of Commerce, could dry up the movement of lumber tonnage (more than 100 million board feet last year) from Boston Harbor.

GREEN LUMBER BID

That segment of the industry seeking elimination of green lumber from the American Lumber Standards, presented its proposals to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges in Washington on Friday.

House Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and EDWARD M. KENNEDY have asked Secretary Hodges to give equal time to that segment of the national lumber industry opposed to the proposals.

The petition signed by the Bay State's three congressional leaders informed Secretary Hodges they were "particularly anxious to have Mr. Sherman Whipple, president of Wiggin Terminals, Inc., Boston, included in the equal-time meeting with you."

Whipple told the Globe the proposed elimination of all but kiln-dried lumber from the American Lumber Standards would end waterborne shipment of lumber from the west coast.

"All government and large-scale building projects must adhere to American Lumber

Standards," Whipple explained. "Elimination of so-called green lumber which simply means it is not kiln dried—would eliminate green lumber from the trade. Kiln-dried lumber cannot be shipped via ships."

Import of green lumber into Boston comprises 26 percent of the port's general cargo imports. Most of the lumber is discharged and stored temporarily out of doors at the big Castle Island terminal.

LUMBER EASTBOUND

Most of the domestic lumber imports received here are carried in ships of either States Marine or Calmar, a subsidiary of the Bethlehem Steel Co.

These carry cargoes of structural steel westbound, and lumber eastbound.

"Unless they can carry lumber eastbound, this last surviving segment of the once-thriving intercoastal trade will die out," Whipple said. "It will be a serious blow to the whole port community."

Other east coast lumber terminals with just as much reason for concern as the port of Boston are at Providence, New Haven, New London, Newark, and Brooklyn.

Speaker McCORMACK also received a request for his services in arranging an equal-time conference with Secretary Hodges from John R. Furman, president of Furman Lumber, Inc., who reported that New England lumber people opposed to the proposed new standards include three firms with combined gross annual sales of over $100 million in the Northeast.

These include Blanchard Lumber, of Walpole, Shepard & Morse, of Boston, and the New England Wholesale Lumber Association (40 wholesalers).

In Washington last week, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, announced aspirant for a Senate seat, wrote to Secretary Hodges relaying complaints he has received about the proposed new 2 by 4.

"In summarizing the contents of the complaints received," wrote ROOSEVELT, "I would say they reduce to five basic issues."

These are, he said:

1. The proposed new standards are discriminatory.

2. The American Lumber Standards Committee proposing these new standards is not broadly representative of the lumbering industry and is dominated by monopolistic interests.

3. The economic impact resulting from the proposed standards will cause hardship on many in the lumber industry, particularly on the smaller business organizations.

4. There has been no demonstration that the proposed changes will be of benefit to the consuming public, whereas there is reportedly evidence to show that the changes will be of considerable benefit to the relatively few motivating proponents of the changes.

5. The conception and promotion of the new standards are in violation of the law.

GRAVELY CONCERNED

"I am gravely concerned about these charges," ROOSEVELT wrote.

"The allegation that the proposed changes are discriminatory stems from the fact that the existing national standards for lumber allow for both dry and green, or unseasoned, lumber, whereas the proposed new standards include sizes for dry lumber only."

"This obviously means that green lumber would be a nonstandard item immediately upon the Department of Commerce's promulgation of the changes as they are now proposed. The significance of this point is underlined by the fact that more than half of all softwood lumber production is green lumber."

ROOSEVELT, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Distribution (under the Committee on Small Business), reported he is receiving communications supported by affidavit and other data which "if correct, indicate a movement is underway by large organizations in the lumber industry which could ultimately eliminate smaller organizations."

ROOSEVELT informed Hodges, "If hearings appear necessary, it is my intention to open them in California."

[From the office of Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT]

ROOSEVELT TO HOLD LUMBER MEETINGS

Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California, will meet with California lumber representatives on February 16 and 17 to discuss proposed hearings on size changes in lumber standards.

ROOSEVELT, chairman of the House Small Business Subcommittee on Distribution, has been asked by California timber spokesmen to hold hearings on the controversial proposal which has divided the entire lumber industry.

On Sunday at 11 a.m., at the Beverly-Wilshire Hotel in Los Angeles, ROOSEVELT will meet with wholesale and retail lumber dealers and southern California port interests.

On Monday, February 17, he will meet in San Francisco with northern California lumber producers, manufacturers, and port and shipping interests representing both management and labor. The meeting will be at 2:30 at the Fairmont Hotel.

The issue at stake is a proposal to change the size of nominally 2-inch dry kiln lumber to 1 to 1½ inches, without including comparable size change for unseasoned or green lumber. The larger lumber manufacturers are in favor of the proposed change, while smaller lumber operators are contending that it would put them out of business.

ROOSEVELT said he was considering holding subcommittee hearings in both northern and southern California, on the east coast, and in Washington, D.C. "If we decide to hold hearings, we will want the fullest possible exposition of the facts from both sides," he said. "Commerce Department officials have informed me that this proposal has provoked more mail and more pressure from both sides than any issue to come before them in a long time. Because it so vitally affects both the consuming public and the small businessman, there seems to be a definite need to publicly air the facts of this controversy."

In announcing the meetings, the California Congressman also released the text of a five-page letter he had written to Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, asking that Commerce Department action be delayed until his subcommittee could determine whether hearings are required. The Commerce Department has jurisdiction over standards in lumber sizes.

In his letter, ROOSEVELT informed Hodges that he has received considerable evidence "which, if correct, indicates a movement is underway by large organizations in the lumber industry which could ultimately eliminate smaller organizations."

"This, of course," ROOSEVELT said, "is contrary to the public interest in whose behalf we are both committed to act."

ROOSEVELT said that a summary of the widespread complaints he had received from lumber producers, consumers, wholesale and retail, and shipping interests, boils down to five basic issues. He listed them as follows:

1. The proposed new standards are discriminatory.

2. The American Lumber Standards Committee proposing these new standards is not broadly representative of the lumbering industry and is dominated by monopolistic interests.

3. The economic impact resulting from the proposed standards will bring hardship to many in the lumber industry, particularly to the smaller business organizations.

4. There has been no demonstration that the proposed changes will be of benefit to the consuming public, whereas there is reportedly evidence to show that the changes will be of considerable benefit to the relatively few proponents of the changes.

5. The conception and promotion of the new standards are in violation of the law.

"If any of these charges are true," ROOSEVELT concluded, then the makeup of the American Lumber Standards Committee "would appear to be open to the charge made against it of being a biased committee that is dominated by selfish interests."

Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey, Speaks on Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 18, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from New Jersey, Hon. CLIFFORD CASE, spoke last week in Plainfield, N.J., on the need for, and commonsense behind, better governmental planning among communities located in heavily urban areas.

Senator CASE's speech is particularly valuable, I believe, because he makes his case simply, factually, and persuasively. In an area of government where poor communication has sometimes brought needless misunderstanding, Senator CASE has expressed commonsense proposals in a commonsense way.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senator CASE's speech:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE, OF NEW JERSEY, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE PLAINFIELD BUSINESS ASSOCIATION, PARK HOTEL, PLAINFIELD, N.J., THURSDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 13, 1964

As businessmen, you plan ahead. This is accepted, indeed expected, as sound business practice. It is also good governmental practice, although some profess to see something sinister in it when it involves more than one political subdivision. In fact, sitting down with one's neighbors across town or county lines is often essential to the efficient and effective use of public moneys.

Throughout New Jersey, the most highly urbanized State in the Nation, there is a growing trend among our communities to plan together when it becomes the interest of an area as a whole to do so.

In Monmouth County, for example, exploratory talks have been going on among seven communities bordering the Shrewsbury River with the thought of establishing a single major sewage treatment plant to serve all.

Would seven individually built, individually financed treatment plants discharging their effluent into the Shrewsbury River be an improvement over a single plant, jointly financed, with sewerlines capable of discharging the treated waste beyond the river and into the Atlantic Ocean? The answer seems clear.

The Federal Government may also have a role in this project. For there is a Federal program of assistance to, among other things, construction of sewage treatment facilities. The Federal Government also has funds available for planning joint studies.

In our State there are many Federal programs which affect cities and suburbs. One problem of increasing severity in some communities is the relocation to decent homes of those displaced from slums by highways, urban renewal, and other federally financed public works projects.

In order to assure that urban renewal, for example, is in the interests of the neighborhoods affected, a workable program concept was initiated. This is designed to provide assurance by the communities to the Federal Government that the local people have a long-range plan for overall community development. Relocation plans for those displaced are included.

But the uprooting of families from old neighborhoods has given rise to second thoughts about urban renewal. In some places, the emphasis has already shifted from the bulldozer approach to rehabilitation. Not always is it best to flatten everything that may look like a slum on the outside. It is not always possible or desirable to relocate every family or every business. Disruption of stability which families have known in their neighborhoods can be much more demoralizing than living in modest, but clean and safe, quarters.

Enforcement of housing codes helps avoid the bulldozer. New emphasis on citizen participation in a community's urban renewal activities has helped.

Many difficulties in urban renewal have developed because community leaders have not been kept informed as plans develop, or afforded an opportunity to express their views before a proposal is formally before the local governing body.

Once this stage is reached, the community and its constituent neighborhoods may find themselves in a take-it-or-leave-it situation. Had there been adequate consultation and an effective planning process a number of years ago, the urban renewal program of Federal-private redevelopment of urban and suburban areas would have been much more successful for the individuals affected. It is scarcely sound, I believe, for the Federal Government to measure the success of its urban renewal program by the number of loan and grant contracts it has entered into with municipalities. Nor can we measure the success of our redevelopment programs in terms of the number of slums our bulldozers flatten. The real measure is to be found in individual and community well-being, that is to say, in human terms. And in these terms the current reappraisal is certainly in order.

A number of Federal programs cut across political boundaries affecting whole regions as well as single communities. These programs range from private housing assistance to direct Federal subsidization for public housing, highways, air and water pollution aids, and many others.

Such questions as the location of a jet airport, to be built in considerable part with Federal funds, can drastically affect the future of New Jersey's remaining green areas.

Because conflicts involving Federal programs inevitably arise both within individual communities and in the broader regions which the programs are designed to serve, I believe that the Federal Government's role in the planning process needs reviewing. A bill which has just recently passed the Senate points the way. Senator MUSKIE, of Maine, is the chief sponsor of this bill which includes several legislative proposals of my own.

This Senate-passed bill would encourage individual communities and counties to join in areawide or regional solutions to problems. The bill has four broad objectives.

They are (1) to increase the economy and efficiency of operations of Federal, State, and local governments in meeting the needs of metropolitan areas; (2) to facilitate the coordination of intergovernmental relations and activities on a continuing basis; (3) to provide a more effective exchange of information in the planning and development process; (4) to encourage comprehensive planning and development on an areawide basis without regard to political boundaries.

To accomplish these goals, the bill provides that each application for a federally assisted loan or grant affecting a metropolitan area be accompanied by the comments and recommendations of a planning agency performing metropolitan or regional planning for the area in which the assistance is to be used. Secondly, a statement is to be submitted by the applicant that it has considered these comments and recommendations prior to formal application. These provisions would apply to all applications made after June 30, 1965, for urban renewal and open-space projects in a metropolitan area, and for the construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage and waste treatment works, highways, public housing, and transportation facilities.

The need for local and areawide review of Federal loan and grant applications is created by a combination of factors, among them, the rapid population growth of these areas, the many Federal programs affecting the development of urban and suburban areas, and the number of local units of government independently initiating such applications. These proposals for Federal assistance are often made without reference to other Federal, State, local, or private development programs. Frequently their impact on the overall urban area which they are designed to serve is not fully considered.

This bill, if finally passed by the House, will help us to insure that the desires of the communities and larger areas which would be affected are reflected in federally assisted public works projects.

Effective regional and metropolitan planning by itself will not cure all our urban problems. We will probably always have to fight the natural disinclination to attack the hard decisions, including the allocation of scarce land, water, and economic development resources. One way to overcome it is to encourage greater collaboration among all the various groups and agencies concerned with urban developments.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1964

(Legislative day of Monday, February 10, 1964)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O God of all mankind, for the day in which we are living.

It is a day that demands the best of all men. Thus, we come in this historic body, beseeching Thy guiding presence.

This is a day, however, that is darkened by men's ignorance of each other—a day in which we hardly know whom to trust and who is our enemy or friend. But back of these clouds the sun is ever shining. There is the God of peace, love, forgiveness, and eternal life. How we thank Thee for the sunlight of this day.

Be very near to these men and women assembled to give good leadership in a great country. Surround them with the light of sound judgment. Quicken their minds and hearts with Thy Spirit of peace and good will to all mankind.

Great decisions are being made in these Halls of Congress. May the paths of right for all be found during these hours.

Give to the President of these United States and to these leaders the security of knowing that the people are prayerfully with them. Surround them with the light of Thy countenance, that this day may be made brighter because God and men have worked together through great problems.

Help us to be grateful for the material blessings which are ours. We are not favorites of Thine; however, we are a favored people. May we be wise enough to convert this abundance of material blessings into world leadership of strong, moral, and spiritual purpose.

During this month when we remember two of our greatest leaders, we express a patriotic, poetic prayer of a spiritual giant of the past who enlightened his day by his prayer; send through it the light of God for our new day:

Lord, while for all mankind we pray,
Of every clime and coast,
O hear us for our native land,
The land we love the most.

O guard our shores from every foe;
With peace our borders bless,
Our cities with prosperity,
Our fields with plenteousness.

Unite us in the sacred love,
Of knowledge, truth, and Thee;
And let our hills and valley shout
The songs of liberty.

Lord of the nations, thus to Thee
Our country we commend;
Be Thou her refuge and her trust
Her everlasting Friend.

—JOHN R. WREFORD.

This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will be glad and rejoice in it.

We pray this prayer in the name of Jesus Christ, the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 18, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its