

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1620. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations on an interim hurricane survey of the Massachusetts coastal and tidal areas, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 293); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with six illustrations.

1621. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 2, 1965, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim hurricane survey of the New Hampshire coastal and tidal areas, authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 294); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1622. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1094). 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. MILLS:

H.R. 11256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11257. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain distributions pursuant to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 11258. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 11259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMÁS:

H.R. 11260. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that bagpipes and parts thereof shall be admitted free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 11261. A bill to provide for a program to advance the humane care, comfort, and welfare of laboratory animals used in scientific study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 11262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 11263. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 11264. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11265. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 11266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 11267. A bill to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove certain limitations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 11268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H. Con. Res. 515. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to refer the matter of the diversion of surplus arctic water to the International Joint Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 11269. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy E. Kelley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 11270. A bill for the relief of Carmen Taal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 11271. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of Defense at the Granite City Defense Depot, Granite City, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 11272. A bill for the relief of Clement Lalezari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 11273. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ivan Dimich and his wife, Dr. Aleksandra Baj-sanki Dimich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 11274. A bill for the relief of Selma Ibayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 11275. A bill to provide for the free entry of one photomicroscope for the use of the Utah State Training School, American Fork, Utah; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 11276. A bill for the relief of Ning Sheng Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11277. A bill for the relief of Maria Fernandes Carvalho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1965

(Legislative day of Monday, September 20, 1965)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

O God, from whom all holy desires and all good counsels do proceed, rise mercifully with the morning upon our darkened hearts. In this tragic and despairing world we are conscious of our woeful inadequacy to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice and to respond with equity to the myriad causes of human need. Wilt Thou crown our deliberations with Thy wisdom and with spacious thinking as we view human problems in terms of the whole globe. Light our eyes, we pray, with sympathy for all mankind as we face the questions which confront us and almost confound us. Quicken within us, we beseech Thee, every noble impulse and sanctify for Thy glory and for human good our best endeavors.

We lift our prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 22, 1965, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

- S. 192. An act for the relief of Maria Liberty Burnett;
- S. 586. An act for the relief of Maria Tsilis;
- S. 653. An act for the relief of George Paluras (Georgios Palouras);
- S. 703. An act for the relief of Kimie Okamoto Addington;
- S. 861. An act for the relief of Alva Arlington Gurnes; and
- S. 1919. An act for the relief of Laura MacArthur Goditiaboais-Deacon.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Chair laid before the Senate the unfinished business, the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. McNAMARA obtained the floor.

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

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for all committees to file reports, including minority, individual, and separate views, during the adjournment of the Senate.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of U. Alexis Johnson, of California, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John S. Foster, Jr., of California, to be Director of Research and Engineering.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, while I do not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Johnson personally, I am very glad, on this occasion, to salute the appointment of John S. Foster, Jr., to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering. Over the last several years he has demonstrated a supreme capacity to be of service to the American people and to the needs of their defense.

I observe on this occasion, that as a fellow California citizen, I am delighted to see him and Mr. Johnson given these new areas of responsibility.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert A. Brooks, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

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

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement regarding the conference report.

First, I wish to thank my colleagues who served with me on the conference, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The major difference between the two versions of the bill is the authorization by title, resulting in a total authorization of \$1.895 billion in the House bill, and \$1.650 billion in the Senate bill.

The conferees arrived at a compromise figure of \$1.785 billion, which represents an increase of \$135 million over the authorization in the Senate bill, and a decrease of \$110 million from the authorization in the House bill.

The primary difference may be found in title I, where the conferees increased the authorization \$165 million.

The reason for this increase was to provide more money for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which has had great success both in the number of youths participating, and the benefits resulting from their participation.

The conferees received telegrams from many State officials urging that the authorization for this program be increased.

The Senate conferees have receded from the Senate position in section 209(c) in regard to the Governor's veto power.

As the Senate will recall, during Senate consideration of the bill the Governor's veto was dropped from the bill and the Senate rejected seven or eight amendments to reinstate some form of it.

The Senate position was adopted in conference, in lieu of the House language which permitted the Governor's veto but which permitted the Director of OEO to reconsider such actions and override them.

However, the House subsequently voted to recommit the conference report to conference, with instructions to its conferees to insist on the House position.

On returning to conference, the Senate conferees were reluctant to reconsider and recede on this point.

However, in view of the House action, the Senate conferees agreed to recede and to accept the House language.

The Senate conferees receded from the Senate position which provided for Hatch Act coverage to VISTA volunteers and persons employed by agencies administering or carrying on community action programs, and whose salaries are paid in principal part from funds appropriated under the act.

The exclusion of these provisions was based upon the difficulty of applying the existing statutory restrictions to organizations and agencies for which they were not designed.

In no way did the conferees intend any retreat from the principle that these programs must be conducted in a completely impartial manner, free of any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.

In addition, a letter was received from John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, opposing this Senate amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Macy's letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the remaining differences resolved by the House and Senate conferees were relatively minor in nature.

An explanation of the action taken on these amendments is contained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the House conferees' statement in explanation of the conferees' action be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in conclusion, this bill, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965, provides an authorization of funds for fiscal year

1966, and a 1-year extension of the Federal share of financing at 90 percent for programs under title I, parts B and C, and title II of the act.

The legislation was enacted on August 20, 1964, and not funded until October 8, 1964. Involved in its many programs are new concepts to assist in the war on poverty. The progress made thus far deserves our continuing support.

I believe we arrived at an excellent bill in conference, and I urge Senate approval of the conference report.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1965.

HON. PAT McNAMARA,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: The Civil Service Commission respectfully submits the following views regarding section 18 of H.R. 8283, added by the Senate, making the Hatch Political Activities Act applicable to employees of private nongovernmental agencies which administer or conduct community action programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. The amendment adopted by the Senate would revise section 211 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 by inserting a new subsection (a) as follows:

"(a) Any person who is employed by any agency administering or conducting a community action program receiving assistance under this part and whose salary is paid in principal part from funds appropriated pursuant to this part, shall be deemed to be an officer or employee of a State or local agency for the purposes and within the meaning of the Act entitled 'An Act to prevent pernicious political activities,' approved August 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 1147) as amended."

The Commission believes that it would be unwise to extend the general political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act to such a sizable group of persons in the private sector of community life.

Before action is taken on the bill the conference managers should appreciate the full scope and impact of this provision which would constitute a major departure from long-standing precedent in legislation of this type, as established by the Hatch Act. Whereas the Hatch Act covers those who occupy positions of public trust as employees of executive agencies of the Federal Government or of State or local governments, the amendment as adopted by the Senate would prohibit certain employees of private organizations from taking any active part in partisan political affairs. The Senate amendment can be read so as to include, potentially, employees of such organizations as legal aid societies, religious and charitable organizations, and other groups which we believe do not normally have any substantial political involvement.

The primary justification for the restrictive provisions of the Hatch Act is found in the fact that those whose political freedom is curtailed are governmental employees who are expected by the general public to refrain from active political partisanship.

Under the 1940 amendments of the Hatch Act, such restrictions are applied to employees of State and local governmental agencies whose principal employment is in connection with activities financed by Federal loans or grants. There again the Congress directed the prohibitions to officers and employees of governmental agencies only.

Of course, the Commission concurs in the view that partisan politics should be kept out of community action programs financed by Federal grants. In this regard it should be noted that existing law goes far to proscribe partisan political activity in community action programs. Section 12 of the Hatch Act prohibits partisan political activity on the part of any officer or employee of a public

agency who is principally employed in connection with such an activity financed by Federal loans or grants. The same section of the Hatch Act would also prohibit such an officer or employee from using his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or promoting the solicitation of money for political purposes. It is the Commission's position that the Hatch Act will deter most of those engaged in community action programs who otherwise might be inclined to become active in partisan political campaigns.

The Commission believes that the Congress should seriously consider the effect of a legislative prohibition against political activity on the part of private employees. We urge that the amendment be rejected.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 2

JOB CORPS—DISPLACEMENT OF EMPLOYED WORKERS

The Senate amendment contained a provision, which had no counterpart in the House bill, which prohibited the Director from authorizing a Job Corps program which would result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services. The conferees have agreed upon a compromise under which the Director is required to prescribe regulations to prevent Job Corps programs from displacing presently employed workers or the impairment of existing contracts for services.

JOB CORPS—PAYMENTS TO RECRUITERS

The Senate amendment prohibited the Director from making payments to any individual or organization for the service of referring candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps or names of such candidates. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conference report contains a substitute which provides that the Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for the Corps.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—ACCESS OF PUBLIC TO INFORMATION

The Senate amendment provided that community action programs must include provisions for feasible access of the public to information, including but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision, except that the word "feasible" is changed to "reasonable."

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—TYPES OF PROGRAMS

The present act contains examples of programs which fall within the purposes of community action programs. The Senate amendment added to the list the fields of family planning, consumer credit education, and consumer debt counseling programs. It also gave emphasis to the fact that the list is merely to give examples by providing that the programs falling within the purpose of the part include, but are not limited to, the listed fields. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute omits the listing of additional examples of types of permissible programs. It adopts, however, the Senate provision insuring that the listed fields are not the only ones in which programs may be carried. The managers on the part of the House wish it to be understood that the omission of the Senate provision in no way indicates that it is their intention or the intention of the Senate conferees to discourage the continua-

tion and expansion of programs in these fields. Programs in these fields are now being carried on, and are to be encouraged.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE CHRONICALLY UNEMPLOYED POOR

The Senate amendment authorized the Director to make grants for special programs directed at the needs of those chronically unemployed poor persons who have poor employment prospects, and are unable, because of age or otherwise to obtain appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs. These programs, in addition to other services, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community served by the program, including activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands. The program must be conducted in accordance with standards adequate to assure that the program is in the public interest and otherwise consistent with policies applicable under the act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment. It was also provided that \$150 million of the funds appropriated for carrying out title II of the act for the fiscal year 1966 could be used for this purpose. The House bill contained no similar provision. The provisions for these special programs are retained in the substitute agreed upon in conference. However, the provision for earmarking a portion of the funds appropriated for title II for this purpose was not retained.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—SELF-HELP HOUSING REHABILITATION

The Senate amendment contained a provision requiring the Director to give special consideration to programs which would, through self-help, rehabilitate substandard housing and provide instruction in basic skills associated with such rehabilitation. This provision is not included in the substitute agreed upon in conference. However, programs in these fields are now being carried on and are to be encouraged.

Participation of State agencies

The Senate amendment provided for continuing consultation with approximate State agencies in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs. The conference substitute includes this provision except for the word "continuing."

Disapproval of plans

The present act provides that no assistance can be made available for work-training programs or community action programs until the Governor of the State in which they are to be carried on has been given notice of the plan for the assistance and has not disapproved it within 30 days.

The House bill amended this provision so that, in the event of the disapproval of a plan by a Governor, the Director could reconsider it, and if he found it fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this act, could override the Governor's disapproval.

Pursuant to the instructions of the House, the House conferees have insisted on the inclusion of the House provision in the conference report. The conferees expect that the procedures established by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under section 209(a) will include provision for informal hearings held by the Director at the request of the Governor of a State or other interested parties.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS—PRIVATE NONPROFIT AGENCIES

The House bill provided that when the Director receives an application for a com-

munity action program to be carried out in a community in which a community action agency is carrying on a program consisting of several component programs, he must give notice to that agency. The Senate amendment added a requirement that the Director also give notice to the Governor of the State. The Senate amendment also provided that when the Director determines that a separate contract or grant is desirable and practical and that special cause has been shown, he may make a grant directly to, or contract directly with, such agency.

The conference substitute includes both of these Senate provisions, except that the requirement that "special" cause must be shown before the Director may contract directly has been altered to require "good" cause to be shown.

Voluntary assistance program for needy children

The House bill struck out part C of title II of the act providing for the establishment in the Office of Economic Opportunity a center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children. The Senate amendment retained part C, but deleted the provision under which the center was directed to collect the names of persons who voluntarily desire to assist such children financially, and to obtain information concerning deserving and needy children from social welfare agencies.

The conference report adopts the Senate provision.

Indemnity payments to dairy farmers

The Senate amendment extended until June 30, 1966, the program provided for by the act for making indemnity payments to dairy farmers who have been directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use at the time of such use. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

Programs for the elderly poor

The Senate amendment added a provision to the act stating the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor should be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under the act. The conference report retains this provision of the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment also provided for the establishment in the Office of Economic Opportunity of a Task Force on Programs for the Elderly Poor. The conference substitute does not include this provision.

National Advisory Council

The Senate amendment provided for a National Advisory Council of 21 members with the Director an ex-officio member to review and to make recommendations of the programs under the act. The House bill increased the members from 14 to 20 but made no other changes in the provisions of the act. The House bill provision was accepted by the conferees.

Transfer of funds between titles

The Senate amendment added a section to the act permitting up to 10 percent of the amount appropriated or allocated for any title to be transferred for use in carrying out other titles, but the amount available for use for any title could not be increased by more than 10 percent. The conference substitute includes this provision.

Equitable distribution of benefits between urban and rural areas

The Senate amendment required the Director to adopt such administrative measures as are necessary to assure that benefits of the act will be distributed equitably between residents of rural and urban areas. The substitute agreed upon in conference

contains a modification of the Senate provision under which the Director is required to adopt appropriate administrative measures to assure such equitable distribution.

Authorization of appropriations

The House bill authorized the appropriation for fiscal year 1966 of \$825 million to carry out title I of the act. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$535 million for such purpose. The amount fixed in conference is \$700 million.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for fiscal year 1966 of \$680 million to carry out title II of the act. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$880 million for such purpose. The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation for such purpose for such year of \$850 million.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 of \$70 million to carry out title III. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$55 million for such purpose. The conference substitute adopts the Senate figure.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 of \$300 million to carry out title V. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$150 million for such purpose. The conference report contains the Senate figure.

The House bill authorized the appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 of \$20 million to carry out title VI. The Senate amendment authorized the appropriation for such year of \$30 million for such purpose. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the Senate figure.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] without losing the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIA-PAKISTAN: ANOTHER UNITED NATIONS SUCCESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been a long, dry 1965 for the United Nations. The U.N. has been unable to contribute significantly to peace in Vietnam. The U.N. Assembly has been unable even to cast a substantive vote.

But now, thanks to the great skill of the Johnson administration, the forbearing cooperation of the Soviet Union, and the quiet but vigorous efforts of the United Kingdom and others, the United Nations has achieved what appears to be a 10-strike for peace in successfully winning a cease-fire between India and Pakistan.

The war between these two major non-Communist countries of Asia was not only developing into the tragedy of violence and death that characterizes all war, but also threatened to collapse the major bastions of freedom in Asia, with Red China picking up the pieces.

A few days ago, it seemed impossible for the U.N. or any other force to call India or Pakistan back from this religious war.

President Johnson should be especially singled out for commendation. It must have been tempting to step into this controversy as the peacemaker—as, indeed,

he was urged to do by the belligerents. His credentials for this peace-directing role as the President of the principal source of economic aid for both countries, and the major supplier of arms for Pakistan, were mighty impressive.

But the President had the wisdom to restrain the Nation from the glory and the danger of such a role. He wisely recognized the part that the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom could and should play, and he especially perceived how very important this role could be and should be for the United Nations.

The success of the United Nations in serving as the agency that has brought a cease-fire in this war will serve mankind far better than a U.S. unilaterally enforced peace, even if we could have achieved it. This gives confidence to the United Nations and in the United Nations.

As the Washington Post put it in its headline yesterday, "U.N. Makes Peace in Its Finest Hour," the U.N. achievement can be a real harbinger of strength—along with the U.N. success in Korea, the Suez, Cyprus, the Congo, and elsewhere.

Americans should be proud that this Nation, under the leadership of President Johnson, made this U.N. success possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the Washington Post, and written by Louis Fleming, to which I have referred, printed in the RECORD.

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

U.N. MAKES PEACE IN ITS FINEST HOUR (By Louis B. Fleming)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 22.—There was a glow of satisfaction and the return of a long-lost sense of confidence at the United Nations today following the early morning agreement on a cease-fire between India and Pakistan.

The United Nations had made peace—and so had Arthur J. Goldberg. Corridors buzzed about both.

Only a handful of hearty diplomats had been on hand in the Council chamber at 3 a.m. to hear Pakistan Foreign Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto read the cease-fire agreement.

Only eight reporters had stood in the corridor an hour later to hear U.S. Ambassador Goldberg say: "This is a great moment in the history of the United Nations."

CLOSE SHAVE FOR PEACE

And only a few persons knew how close to disaster the path to peace had come in the tense hours between 1:45 a.m. Monday, when the Council demanded a cease-fire, and 3 a.m. Wednesday, when Bhutto agreed.

There was almost universal agreement among diplomats that this was the Security Council's finest hour. The threat of this war, with the backstage role of Communist China, had an importance that most thought greater than earlier Council peace actions.

Most of the delegates agreed that much of the credit belonged to Goldberg, even though he had risked a mutiny by some of the members, and even though the final agreement was threatened by a walkout of some of the same angry members early today.

Goldberg himself was convinced that the agreement early Monday morning was the fruit of continuous negotiations he had demanded as Council president.

SIX THREATENED TO QUIT

At the crucial moment in these negotiations Monday, the six nonpermanent members of the Council handed Goldberg a letter threatening to walk out and challenging his extended talks alone with France, the Soviet Union and Britain while they cooled their heels outside. Fortunately, he had just won agreement from the Big Four on a resolution almost identical to one he had negotiated earlier in the day with the six.

Their mutiny was abandoned and the Council adopted the resolution.

Council members themselves were kept in a state of suspense by Pakistan until Bhutto read the agreement of his government at the exact hour set for the cease-fire in the Council's Monday resolution.

At 2:36 a.m. Goldberg invited Bhutto to address the Council. At this point, no one on the Council yet knew what the Pakistani would do.

BITTER CHARGES

For 20 minutes, the Foreign Minister gave a traditional Kashmir dispute speech, ringing oratory, bitter charges against India, protests of absolute innocence on the part of Pakistan, a threat to fight for 1,000 years if necessary to defend the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir.

But he kept looking at the clock. Just at 3 a.m., the hour of the cease-fire deadline, he halted his speech, pulled out a piece of paper, and carefully read the following message from Pakistani President Ayub Khan: "Pakistan considers Security Council Resolution 211 of September 20 as unsatisfactory. However, in the interest of international peace and in order to enable the Security Council to evolve a self-executing procedure which will lead to an honorable settlement of the root cause of the present conflict; namely, the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, I have issued the following order to the Pakistan armed forces * * *"

Pakistan would stop shooting in 5 minutes, he informed the Council.

Council members recessed to draft their acceptance. The final cease-fire deadline was postponed for 15 hours to give both armies time for implementation.

Elation over the peace agreement was tempered with a realization that, as Goldberg said, the cease-fire was just the beginning. Pakistan obviously was dead serious when it said it would quit the United Nations if the Council allows the question of Kashmir to drift as it has for 16 years.

But it was impossible to exaggerate the achievement in terms of revived prestige for the organization. It was a credit to Secretary General U Thant, whose 9-day peace mission to India and Pakistan laid the foundation for the cease-fire agreement.

And, for the Council, it was a moment particularly significant for the unity of the big four that succeeded in isolating the conflict from the opportunism of Peking.

(The U.N. General Assembly's steering committee recommended—without taking a formal vote—that the Assembly again take up the issue of a seat for Red China, Associated Press reported. U.S. Ambassador Charles Y. Yost said the United States had no objection to full-scale Assembly debate, but added that in the light of recent events he believed the debate "would serve no useful purposes." The steering committee also overrode Communist objections and recommended that the Assembly again take up the Tibet issue.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for so graciously yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the comments he has just made. I invite his attention to what I hope is the beginning of a real peace

offensive, as the result of our success in bringing about a cease-fire between India and Pakistan.

This peace offensive got underway 2 weeks ago at the Washington World Conference on "World Peace Through World Law," which was addressed by the President of the United States, the Chief Justice of the United States, and by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg who, by the way, is reported in the press this morning as having delivered an excellent speech at the United Nations in connection with the cease-fire between India and Pakistan in which he also indicated his intention to support the views of President Johnson that we should now get going on a peace offensive which would include a number of measures on disarmament.

Mr. President, I hope to have something to say about that later in the day. I commend my friend the Senator from Wisconsin for his activity in this regard.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I agree with him wholeheartedly in his remarks. I also invite attention once again to the brilliant speech made at that conference by the Senator from Pennsylvania, on arms control and disarmament. I thought so highly of it that I inserted it in the RECORD. I thought it was a great contribution to the peace offensive to which he has referred.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 23, 1965, was dispensed with.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages, and that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills and resolutions during the adjournment of the Senate, which is anticipated until next Tuesday, September 28, 1965.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. CLARK, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

FOREIGN STEEL FLOWS INTO UNITED STATES AT NEW HIGH RATE, 16 TONS A MINUTE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as everyone knows, coal—coke—is essential to the production of steel.

Recently the American Iron and Steel Institute put out a statement showing that foreign steel now flows into the United States at the new high rate of 16 tons a minute.

Nevertheless, according to the Nathan Report, West Germany, the Netherlands, France, and in this case the United Kingdom, have almost prohibitive quantitative restrictions, quotas, licensing arrangements, and so forth, on the imports of coal.

According to this report, these non-tariff barriers cost the United States up to \$500 million a year on coal alone.

I believe it just and proper that we ask for more economic cooperation from our friends and allies of the free world. We are all in this one together.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN STEEL FLOWS INTO UNITED STATES AT NEW HIGH RATE, 16 TONS A MINUTE

Foreign steel mill products entered the United States at the rate of 16 tons per minute during the first 4 months of 1965. That record was set despite the January-February dock strike on the east and gulf coasts.

In comparison, imports averaged a little less than 11 tons per minute during the same 4 months of 1964 and about 12 tons per minute for the full year. A decade ago, the rate was less than 2 tons per minute.

Within the general increase in steel mill product imports which, at current rates, could bring the 1965 total to almost 8 million tons, significant changes are in progress.

Prior to 1959—the year in which this country became a net importer of steel for the first time in half a century—sheets and strip comprised a negligible item in the total import picture. For example, in 1955, sheets and strip brought in from foreign countries came to a little more than 54,000 tons, or 5.5 percent of the 973,000-ton total. The United States was then, as it is now, the world's largest producer of sheet and strip.

In the steel strike year of 1959 when many domestic steel consumers had to turn abroad for supplies to keep their factories running, sheet and strip imports jumped to over 8 percent of total imports, or 386,000 tons. During 1964 the tonnage of sheet and strip brought into this country from foreign sources increased to almost 1.2 million tons which was 18 percent of total imports.

Through the first 4 months of this year, sheet and strip accounted for 28 percent of all imported mill products—766,000 out of 2,732,000 net tons.

JAPANESE MAKE BIG GAIN

Among the foreign sources of imported steel mill products, Japan has shown the most remarkable gain. During 1955, the 96,000 tons of imports originating in that country accounted for a little less than 10 percent of the total. By 1959, the tonnage had increased to 626,000 net tons (14 percent) and Japanese products have accounted for a larger percentage of total imports in each year since then. In 1964, imports of 2,446,000 tons from Japan represented 38 percent of the total.

Through the first quarter of this year, imports from Japan accounted for nearly 44 percent of all steel mill products entering the United States, and that country is by far the largest single source of sheet and strip.

All sections of the country are affected by the inroads of foreign steel into the domestic economy, as shown below.

Particularly noteworthy among the data shown is the high rank of Japan as a source of steel mill products at the end of such long shipping routes as the Atlantic and gulf coasts and even in customs districts along the "north coast" created by the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In that latter connection, the Michigan customs district (with Detroit primary) ranked third in tonnage of foreign steel received last year—exceeded only by Los Angeles and Galveston districts. New York and New Orleans were the next largest, followed by Chicago.

Together, the great industrial centers in the vicinity of Detroit and Chicago were the targets of more than a million tons of foreign steel last year. Buffalo received 306,000 tons.

OUR UNFAVORABLE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, everyone is becoming interested in the problem of our continuing unfavorable balance of payments, and its relationship to liquidity in the promotion of world trade.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Kansas City Star, entitled, "Secretary Scores Points for Monetary Reform," be printed in the RECORD.

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

SECRETARY SCORES POINTS FOR MONETARY REFORM

Henry H. Fowler, Secretary of the Treasury and traveler, returned from Europe with a fever and a reasonably optimistic report on the prospects for reform in the international monetary system. Armed with proof that the United States is successfully grappling with its own balance-of-payments problem, and bolstered by the momentum of the U.S. initiative, Fowler has obtained agreement from the major nations to get the show on the road. Presumably this will be done at conversations which will begin in October. We are sorry about the fever but we must say that the Secretary turned in a fine piece of work.

In the simplest of terms, the immediate problem—and by immediate, we do not mean tomorrow or the day after, but within the decade to come—stems in part from the U.S. success in bringing its payments balance into line in the second quarter of the year. But the dollars that constituted the American deficit for so many years were the chief fountain of international liquidity. That simply means that dollars dispatched overseas for various purposes were used to finance world development. Not just dollars, of course; but mostly dollars.

It is obvious that the United States does not intend to—and cannot afford to—let its payments balance get so badly out of line for such a prolonged period. Thus there will be fewer dollars to go around. Moreover, with the expansion of the various national economies and with the rapid growth of the population, there is a need for more funds to assure orderly growth. The question is thus proposed: Where are the funds to come from?

This is the crux of the issue at the moment when Fowler can report that the so-called group of 10—the United States, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Sweden—will begin negotiations next month. These will be preliminary in nature. And Fowler has been extremely careful in assuring the underdeveloped nations that the intention is not to create a rich man's club to take charge of reform. Rather, all the members of the International Monetary Fund will be considered and in due time will be consulted. This must be so even though only a few nations—in all probability the group of 10 itself—will provide the bulk of the funds to be used in any

monetary reform. That is the way it must be. Nevertheless, the industrial nations have a large stake in the development of the new and poor nations, and the interest of those nations must be considered.

It thus is a matter of extreme delicacy, involving the intricacies of international finance and the pride of nations. Fowler, as we see it, has so far handled the matter masterfully. And the talks that begin next month could be the opening of a genuine monetary reform that would give new stability to the entire free world.

EUGENE ZUCKERT, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some of us plan to pay our respects and tribute to one of the great public servants of our time, Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, who is retiring next week.

We planned to do so next Monday, but inasmuch as I understand the Senate will not be in session on that day, I should like all Senators to know that immediately after the morning hour on Wednesday, September 29, it is our intention to pay tribute to Mr. Zuckert.

I thank my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for his typical courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is most welcome.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I address myself to the conference report on the Economic Opportunity Act amendments of 1965.

The Senate version of this act added in section 205(a), "family planning," which is illustrative of the programs which the Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract for with local public or private nonprofit agencies. This addition to the major programs initially authorized by the act was included in the legislation in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on my motion.

There was very little discussion within the committee presumably because the members agreed that programs of family planning were, indeed, essential to an adequate attack on poverty in this country.

When the bill reached the floor of the Senate again, there was no discussion on this insertion in the act.

I happened to be unavoidably out of Washington during the course of debate, but the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], at my request, placed in the RECORD a speech in support of the amendment which I had prepared for delivery.

When the bill went to conference with the House, the provision explicitly authorizing family planning, as one type of program which was to be encouraged, was deleted. I have attempted to find out why it was deleted, and I have been quite unsuccessful.

In the Senate report, the statement is made that the bill would add consumer credit education, consumer debt counseling, and family planning to the list of the types of components eligible for inclusion in community action programs.

The Senate report states:

The committee is aware that services of these types are already being provided in some community action programs. The amendment, however, would underscore the interest of the Congress in these fields of activities and, subject to the principle that programs should be locally planned to meet local needs, would serve to emphasize the importance of inaugurating components involving consumer protection and family planning.

Of course, the Senate never makes a conference report. It relies on the report made by the managers of the House to their body for a statement of the views of the conferees. The only paragraph which might shed some light on why family planning was eliminated by the conferees appears on page 11 of the report of the House managers, and reads as follows:

The present act contains examples of programs which fall within the purposes of community action programs. The Senate amendment added to the list the fields of family planning, consumer credit education, and consumer debt counseling programs. It also gave emphasis to the fact that the list is merely to give examples by providing that the programs falling within the purpose of the part include, but are not limited to, the listed fields. The House bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute omits the listing of additional examples of types of permissible programs. It adopts, however, the Senate provision insuring that the listed fields are not the only ones in which programs may be carried. The managers on the part of the House wish it to be understood that the omission of the Senate provision in no way indicates that it is their intention or the intention of the Senate conferees to discourage the continuation and expansion of these programs. Programs in these fields are now being carried on and are to be encouraged.

That is a very nice, fair, and helpful statement, but one wonders why these phrases, and particularly family planning, were deleted from the bill. There is no explanation, and one can only guess.

My guess would be that there were some members among the House conferees who felt that the subject of family planning had only recently become respectable. This occurred 2 or 3 years ago, as a result of the activities of an eminent Catholic physician, Dr. John Rock, the tolerant position taken by Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, and the speeches made on the floor of this body by the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], myself, and a number of other Senators. But perhaps it was thought by one or more of the House conferees that family planning is still so controversial a subject that to include it in the poverty legislation as a permissible, and, indeed, an encouraged program might disturb the calm contentment of some of their constituents who still believe that where ignorance is, for them personally, bliss, it is folly to permit individuals to be wise.

If the matter could be swept under the rug in this fashion, a subject whose mere mention offends the sensibilities of some individuals unwilling to face up to the economic and social consequences of the problem of unwanted children, the House conferees may have thought we had better get rid of that subject without any floor discussion.

I regret that the decision of the conferees to attempt to soft-pedal the Senate action, which candidly faced up to one of the most serious problems confronting our country, makes it desirable to explain why this provision in the Senate version of the bill appeared to me and to the members of the Senate committee, and indeed to the Senate itself, to be a wise one.

The present policy of the Federal Government has been to encourage the research and development of family planning techniques in a number of Federal agencies, and to give assistance to individuals, countries, and groups interested in attaining adequate information on the subject, whether at home or abroad.

Thus, the foreign aid program several years ago was bolstered by a provision introduced in the legislation, at the urging of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT], which authorized technical assistance and research to be made available to countries overseas which were interested in curtailing their birth rate in the interest of their overall economic growth, and were also anxious to dispel that ignorance which is all too often the principal cause of large families of unwanted children.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, has launched a program making family planning information and services available to Indians, Eskimos, Polynesians, and others who are natives of the Pacific Islands which the United States holds in trust and which are under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

One wonders why, if these people are entitled to the right to know with respect to the subject of family planning, it should not be equally wise to encourage the administrators of the war against poverty to make the same information available in the interests of millions of Americans who do not presently have the pertinent information.

The Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is providing research and demonstration grants in the field of family planning and supporting the training of personnel for various disciplines involved in family planning programs.

In an address before the Fall Conference on Public Family Planning Clinics in New York City, the very able chief of the Children's Bureau, Mrs. Katherine Oettinger, recently outlined activities of the Federal Government, the States, and private organizations in the field of family planning.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the address of Mrs. Oettinger may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. I call particular attention to the final comments in that address in which Mrs. Oettinger points out the obvious fact that healthy mothers and babies are a paramount part of our national concern, and that we are greatly concerned that we now rank 10th among the leading nations of the world in reducing the infant mortality rate.

President Johnson, who in his state of the Union message spoke up most courageously in support of spreading information about family planning, has also called for a drastic reduction in the infant mortality rate by the end of this decade.

Mrs. Oettinger raises the question whether it is a mere coincidence that in all but one of the nine nations which rank ahead of us in reducing infant mortality, the birth rate is lower than that of the United States. She concludes that:

Many of us here are working together at a new rapid pace as dimensions of our problem become clearer in reaching the goal of providing better health for the mothers and children of this Nation. If family planning is a useful tool in achieving this goal, then it should be available on a universal basis as a right—

The word "right" being underlined—to parents without coercion, but with a genuine and sympathetic attention to the needs of each human being.

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, also in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is currently spending a rather paltry sum, \$500,000 a year, in supporting research on population problems, including surveys designed to determine the number of children parents desire.

I commend all the various and widespread efforts by the Federal Government to educate the people of the United States in the techniques which are necessary to enable them to decide of their own free will how many children they wish.

It should also be mentioned that the Office of Economic Opportunity on occasion has approved local programs of family planning as part of the war on poverty where the local community is completely unanimous in supporting the request for the grant.

Thus, in Corpus Christi and Austin, Tex., in Oakland, Calif., in St. Louis, Mo., in Buffalo, N.Y., and in Nashville, Tenn., programs are presently going forward. By now it may be that other communities have also received the approval for such grants.

But one must ask why these programs are not spreading to the larger cities where the need in social and economic terms is at least as great as, if not greater, than in the generally smaller sized cities—St. Louis excepted—the names of which I have just read. Why not Brooklyn? Why not Harlem? Why not Philadelphia? Why not Pittsburgh? Why not Watts in Los Angeles? These are the places where family planning services are desperately needed.

Does anybody think there is no right to know the facts of life in those communities? I suggest that the Office of Economic Opportunity should be less

timid and more aggressive in its family planning activities.

Specifically I believe, first, that OEO funds should be permitted to be used to advertise the availability of a family planning program founded by an OEO grant.

Second, positive encouragement from Washington should be given to local community action programs to help persuade them to include family planning services in these programs in the war against poverty.

Third, I believe the OEO should modify its present administrative rules to encourage, instead of discourage, doctors in the program to advocate family planning. In particular, doctors should be permitted to suggest methods which in their view are most suited for particular patients, so long as these methods do not conflict with the religious beliefs of the patient.

Fourth, I suggest that the Office of Economic Opportunity should reconsider the policy which precludes giving information and devices to unmarried women, who, unfortunately in a moral sense, but clearly factually, are an important part of the childbearing impoverished class which increases materially the cost of the poverty program and aid to dependent children. The real question, in my opinion, is the right to know the facts of life. Americans are entitled to decide for themselves the number of children they desire to have. Unfortunately, under present conditions, in many poverty stricken areas, they have no such right today.

I suggest that we take a look at the evidence which establishes the importance of family planning as a weapon in the war on poverty. The correlation between poverty and high fertility is amply established. The following facts cannot be controverted:

First, the poor are more likely than any other group to have large families.

One out of every three families with six or more children has an annual income of less than \$3,000, and that is the rough and ready standard by which those who are living in poverty are determined, \$3,000 being the ceiling below which the poverty classes fall.

One out of every seven families with four or five children has an annual income of less than \$3,000. Only 1 of every 10 families with 2 or 3 children has an income of less than \$3,000 a year.

Consider it in another way. The median income of parents having large families is substantially lower than the median income of other families. Thus, the annual income of two-children families is \$6,900; of four-children families, \$6,500; of six children families, \$5,000. Thus the income goes down as the size of the family increases.

Since large families exist most frequently among those who can least afford to maintain them, they tend to become a burden on the State. A population increase which could be largely sustained by those who produce it would bring problems enough; but a population increase whose major incidence is among those who cannot individually afford it

could spell disaster. One-third of the poor are children—approximately 10 million children.

High fertility among the poor is the prime cause of multigenerational poverty. As anyone who has studied the history of the present condition in Appalachia well knows, when a family which lacks resources to sustain a single child has to try to rear six children, their upbringing is almost certain to be totally inadequate to the task of fitting them for a productive role in society. They are the people who remain destitute to the 7th generation. They are the families, in Appalachia and elsewhere, where grandfather, father, and grandson are all on relief, and the minor children in the family are receiving aid to dependent children.

Aid to dependent children has increased, and is increasing, instead of diminishing. In the last 10 years its burden has grown by 104 percent; and the 4 million people on its roll outnumber the combined total of everybody else on relief—the old, the blind, the disabled, and the other subjects of the public bounty.

High fertility deepens the poverty of the poor, and spreads and intensifies hopeless poverty. In its trend and in its wake come, all too frequently, as was so well demonstrated at Watts just the other day, violent crime, juvenile delinquency, child abuse and neglect, malnutrition, slum housing, and social alienation.

There is not the slightest reason to believe that most of the poor are more anxious than other people to have large families. Many of them do not want all their children. The only difference in this respect between the poor and the middle class is that the poor cannot always exercise their choice, because they are not sufficiently aware that there is a choice. There can be no doubt that poor families are as eager as rich families and middle-class families to have adequate instruction in family planning. Therefore, I say that any war on poverty which either ignores the matter of fertility or tends to soft pedal it is reducing automatically the impacts of its investment; and the investment, of course, comes from the Federal Government and, therefore, from all the people of the United States.

Surely all would agree that programs aimed at reducing poverty cannot achieve their objective unless the impoverished families are helped to have only the number of children they may desire. I am keenly aware of the criticism which has been made of the views of those tens of millions of Americans who happen to agree with me that we are animated by questions of racial or religious bigotry; that we want to maintain the supremacy of the white Protestant ethic, by which the family size is relatively small; and that we are afraid of being overwhelmed by minority groups.

I am aware of the other argument which is made, that we desire to limit the freedom and liberty of others, but not of ourselves. I reject those argu-

ments. I base my case on the right to know.

It is fairly clear that every American family having an income of \$10,000 or more a year has access to all the family planning information it wants, and most of them get it. I want to see the right to know spread to those millions of unfortunate Americans who have been denied access to the basic information. This program must be voluntary. Nobody should have family restrictions forced on him. Nobody's religious beliefs should be adversely affected in any way. But in my judgment, every American, regardless of his or her economic, social, racial, religious, or political status, has the right to the basic facts of life which will enable people to plan their families the way they want to plan them. Accordingly, I regret that that provision of the Senate bill was eliminated in conference. These items must, however, be put in balance. This is a good bill. It is a far better bill than the bill we passed a year or two ago. It provides for many useful programs. It provides adequate financing for those programs. I regret that the conferees have modified, if they did not entirely eliminate, the provision in the Senate bill which would have removed the right of Governors to veto the poverty programs. But even with the right to veto still in the bill, this is a first-class program for every State which has a 20th century government. The way to remedy the situation in States which still have 18th and 19th century governments is perhaps at the ballot box.

I regret also that a provision in the Senate bill which would have encouraged the training of individuals in the poverty community to enable them, through training and self-help, to rehabilitate their housing, was dropped by the conferees. I hope that, through adequate coordination by the Director of the OEO program and his staff with the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Affairs, operating under the Housing Act of 1965, administrative regulations will be adopted which will permit, without in the slightest way displacing present workers, poverty-stricken families to attain skills which will enable them to obtain Federal assistance to rehabilitate the housing which they rent or own.

Mr. President, I shall vote to support the conference report. My sole effort today has been to bring out from under the rug the problem and a method of dealing with it which I believe merits the fullest public discussion.

EXHIBIT 1

THIS MOST PROFOUND CHALLENGE

(By Mrs. Katherine Brownell Oettinger, Chief, Children's Bureau)

I am indeed happy to be here with you tonight for it seems to me that this meeting is a symbol of our national response to one of the most crucial questions confronting the future of this Nation and of the world.

The rapidity of this response can be measured by the rising chorus of our national dialog as all segments of our society seek to make a contribution to the most appropriate national solution of the problem confronting us—the population explosion and its allied problems of health and welfare.

What has been produced, in the short span of 3 years, has been a series of policy ex-

pressions from powerful national groups and individuals which represent a convergence of conviction like beams of light melded together in a prismatic reflection.

Let us consider some of these expressions:

Late last year, the trustees of the American Medical Association urged it to update its stand to "conform to changes in society" and to cooperate with nonprofessional birth control groups which had "adequate medical direction" in dispensing information about family planning.

The AMA trustees asserted: "An intelligent recognition of the problems that relate to human reproduction, including the need for population control, is more than a matter of responsible parenthood; it is a matter of responsible medical practice."

Similarly, last year the American Public Health Association not only reaffirmed its 1959 position "that public and private programs concerned with population growth and family size should be integral parts of the health program but urged that Federal, State, and local governments in the United States include family planning as an integral part of their health programs, make sufficient funds and personnel available for this purpose, and insure such freedom of choice of methods that persons of all faiths have equal opportunities to exercise their choice in accordance with their conscientious beliefs."

In 1962, the National Association of Social Workers called upon social workers everywhere to give attention to the need for family planning services.

In 1964, the American Public Welfare Association's Board of Directors stressed the "importance of family planning to assist families to attain the highest potential and stated that welfare clients should be referred for this kind of assistance if they requested it. "Family planning," the APWA said, "is an individual decision * * * and a fundamental human right."

This spring, the chorus from practitioners in various disciplines was swelled by the scientific findings of the National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, as it reported on the growth of the U.S. population.

"The freedom to limit family size to the number of children wanted when they are wanted is, in our view, a basic human right * * *. Most Americans of higher income and better education exercise this right as a matter of course, but * * * many of the poor and uneducated are, in effect, deprived of the right. No family should be fated through poverty or ignorance to have children they do not want and cannot properly care for. Responsible parenthood requires that couples of all social strata have the ability and means to limit births when they wish to do so, in accordance with their personal convictions. In short, this basic freedom for the individual family should be made effective throughout American society."

The continuing thread running through this dialog has been respect for the conscience of individuals from all faiths to determine freely if they wish to space their families by methods morally acceptable to them.

In his state of the Union message last January, President Johnson said, "I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in the world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

This summer, he was even more specific in asking us to "face forthrightly the multiplying problems of our multiplying populations and seek the answers to this most profound challenge to the future of the world."

Former President Eisenhower mounted a further thrust by vigorously reversing his previous position and stating unequivocally,

"I cannot help believe that the prevention of human degradation and starvation is * * * a moral—as well as a material—obligation resting upon every enlightened government.

If we now ignore the plight of those unborn generations which, because of our unreadiness to take corrective action in controlling population growth, will be denied any expectations beyond abject poverty and suffering, then history will rightly condemn us."

Let us look at the current role of the Federal Government in meeting this "most profound challenge to the future of the world."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has launched a program making contraceptive advice and services available, where desired, to American Indians, Eskimos and natives of the islands the United States hold in trust in the Pacific.

This action prompted the New England Journal of Medicine to comment editorially: "Now the Secretary of the Interior Udall has announced this program perhaps the time is nearing when natives of Massachusetts will share in the new freedom."

The Office of Economic Opportunity now will approve Federal funding for family planning services under its community action programs if the community wishes to undertake that activity. This program is just getting underway, so there is no way yet to know how many communities will place an emphasis on family planning.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the appropriate Federal agency to carry forward all three elements of research, training, and service which must be achieved if we are to illuminate the nature of population changes, to provide new and better methods of controlling fertility and investigate the social and psychological aspects of family planning.

For example, its National Institute of Child Health and Human Development supports basic research in reproductive biology which will lead to better understanding of those factors leading to the creation and development of healthy, new individuals. It is currently spending about \$500,000 a year to support research directly related to population problems.

Most recently, it awarded a grant to Princeton University to survey birth control practices. This study will provide a base for other studies of the influence of birth control practices on the health of women and children. While earlier fertility studies were conducted in 1955 and 1960, the results of the 1955 survey could vary considerably from the current study since oral contraceptives only entered the market in 1960. One of the most interesting aspects of the study is that it should give us reliable national data on the size of the family desired by parents.

The Children's Bureau, as a part of its program related research, is undertaking research and demonstration grants on various phases of family planning. To get at the complexities surrounding the question of motivation for family planning, the Bureau has awarded a grant to the Community and Family Study Center in Chicago to find answers to these two basic questions.

1. Why do some low-income families totally reject family planning or accept it only on a limited or temporary basis?

2. How do prevailing community attitudes and the individual's own psychology work to promote or impede the adoption of birth control measures?

Another grant now underway with the support of Bureau funds has gone to the Hudson Institute in New York, to project what U.S. birth rates might be in 1975 as a basis for developing alternative planning requirements for future maternal and child health services throughout the country.

Still a third grant has gone to the Tulane University School of Medicine, New Orleans,

to continue its study of fertility and attitudes relevant to fertility and family planning among a group of 1,000 mothers living in the New Orleans metropolitan area.

President Johnson has pointed out that "In all sectors of health care, the need for trained personnel continues to outstrip the supply."

In the field of training to meet the Nation's health needs, many parts of the Department are supporting grants, institutes, fellowships and other means of augmenting our supply of trained personnel.

The Children's Bureau has long recognized that there must be a steady and continuing process of upgrading the professional skills of the medical, parimedical, and social work personnel offering services in the three grants programs it administers. In the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, for example, practically all the States are using some of their Federal funds to provide special training opportunities to physicians, nurses, nutritionists, medical social workers, and other professional personnel.

As you know, maternal and child health programs in schools of public health now have family planning in their programs but much more concentration on this aspect of public health is needed in many teaching hospitals.

The Children's Bureau is supporting training programs specifically geared to the roles which various disciplines must play in the most effective planning and carrying forward of family planning programs. It also is interested in the work which the Ford Foundation is financing to establish a university center for population planning in Michigan which includes public health, sociological, obstetric, and gynecological components.

In October, we plan to offer a 4-week course to about a dozen American registered professional nurses to study family planning at the graduate school of nursing of the New York Medical College.

This course, to be given concurrently with the training program for nurses from other countries which is sponsored by the Agency for International Development and the Children's Bureau, will enable both groups of nurses to participate in classroom and clinical experience, including study of the use of specific contraceptive devices.

In a few State maternal and child health programs, inservice training is going forward to supply a pool of physicians able to give consultation on up-to-date methods of application of contraceptive techniques from the medical points of view. On the paramount uses of this pool of technicians is as consultants to counties who want to upgrade their programs. In a very efficient way, this method gives all physicians in a given community the opportunity to take advantage of the most advanced medical knowledge in this area. If this form of inservice training were extended on a national basis, the potential benefit could be immeasurable.

The Children's Bureau is in a key position in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in its involvement in helping to support service programs of family planning. Our basic concern has been, and always will be, to improve the social and physical health of mothers and children throughout the country. Our obligation under the Social Security Act is to assist the States in promoting these health services.

A marked change in attitudes toward family planning and an improvement from the findings of research about various methods that can be offered in very recent years has made it possible for States, many of which already provided such services as an integral part of their maternal and child health programs, to expand these activities and for other States to initiate family-planning programs.

This expansion would not have been possible without the unstinting efforts of voluntary organizations interested in family planning in giving demonstrations, which have always maintained high standards, a valid scientific approach, and excellent interpretations, about the true meaning of family planning as a part of responsible parenthood.

Research foundations have poured millions into studies focused on family planning and pharmaceutical firms have made an immense contribution by developing resource material and inservice training teaching tools which not only enrich the individual efforts to inform parents about spacing their children but can be used by professional personnel as valuable tools in both public and voluntary programs of family planning.

It is against this background that public health has truly become involved in family programs as the numbers of families seeking this service and vast urban and rural areas to be covered outstripped available voluntary efforts. Moreover, the conviction has grown that education and instruction in effective family planning should be an essential component of both the health and welfare agencies responsible for the payment of health services for the dependent families. For it is the families of the poor who too long have suffered spiritual dejection and demoralization after bearing successive babies without hope of these children being able to achieve their full potential or breaking the cycle of poverty.

Federal matching funds are available for medical services connected with family planning under the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. Such services may include inpatient and outpatient hospital services, physicians' services, clinical services, prescriptions for drugs and devices, and other preventative and rehabilitative services associated with a comprehensive program for family planning.

Further impetus for expanded activities came with the enactment, in 1963, of maternal and child health amendments which authorize a new project program of maternity care for women in low-income families. These projects were intended primarily to give the States a chance for intensified attention to reducing the incidence of mental retardation caused by premature births and complications associated with childbearing, especially among concentrations of economically, educationally, and socially deprived low-income groups.

The method is to increase the number of prenatal clinics in neighborhoods where they will be more accessible to pregnant women, and to provide hospital care of good quality for women with complications of pregnancy. The amendments also called for an expansion of services to attend to any health complications of infants cared for under this program.

Most of the States and localities which have chosen to take advantage of the maternity and infant care program have included family planning as a part of their comprehensive care efforts. During fiscal year 1965, 27 States spent some \$1,835,000 for family planning services in relation to maternal health programs.

From State plans submitted to the Bureau for the current fiscal year, it is apparent that in some States they are planning to double the amounts they are spending for family planning services in their comprehensive programs of maternity and infant care. Project directors report a great deal of enthusiasm on the part of the staff concerned in these projects, and have particularly noted the high quality of trained obstetrical personnel who are relating their knowledge and skills, for the first time, to community problems as being necessarily schematic in the proper execution of their role in a planned approach to maternal health.

The Children's Bureau has just added a staff member to obtain further factual information about family planning services provided by State and local health departments. Hopefully, her findings will enrich future program planning in this field. Additionally, beginning with the current fiscal year, we are asking the States to give us basic information about the numbers of persons receiving family planning services which will indicate the scope of the program and where additional new approaches may be needed in some areas if it appears that these programs are not now meeting the needs of all persons requesting service.

Our experience so far in the maternity and infant care programs gives us hopeful indications that the institution of family planning services more than doubles attendance at postpartum clinics and, in some programs at least, seems to have a favorable influence in attracting women to prenatal clinics early, as word gets around that the services are available.

One graphic example of this has been the experience at Augusta, Ga., where in a rural area, between 85 and 90 percent of the women served in a maternity and infant care program return for the critical postpartum examination, and 90 percent of those who do return ask for family planning advice.

We are aware that we are still at the beginning of a learning experience; but early evidence indicates we will come to know much more about the physical aspects of family planning; the usefulness of the devices themselves; peoples' attitudes toward their use; the continuity of interest in this subject.

It should be quite clear, too, that our definition of family planning is not limited to the spacing of children but also includes a concept of service to those couples who seek to correct their infertility in order to have a family.

As a part of this definition, it is a goal—but certainly not a reality—to have services available in communities, not just as a part of the postpartum clinic service, but as a part of regular maternal services which women could use at other times than during the maternity cycle. There is a beginning in this direction—but only a beginning.

Most importantly, we need to know how to communicate with families so that they internally accept family planning as a part of their family pattern. I would like to emphasize, too, that when we speak of family planning, we are talking about both parents—the base of family life. Our efforts will be both futile and misdirected if we fail to involve the husband and father in family planning. To the extent that this is possible, it now is being done in the maternal care programs but greater progress needs to be made in this direction.

I can think of no more concrete example of the need for the involvement of both parents than a letter which came to the Children's Bureau a few years ago written by a mountaineer. It read, in part, as follows:

"DEAR SIR: I am writing to ask your advice. I want some personal advice and not just some little papers or pamphlets." He went on to say that when his wife had given birth to their first and second children she had gotten up in a day or two and begun helping him in the fields. Then he related what happened to her in each successive pregnancy—her third, fourth, and fifth; her sixth ended in a miscarriage. By the end of the first page she had had nine pregnancies. In her 10th, she had a convulsion, then followed her 11th, 12th, and 13th. And now she was pregnant for the 14th time. She didn't want to do anything except lay around all the time. He didn't know whether she was getting lazy or not. He had heard when women had grown children they liked to sit down and let their children

wait on them. The letter ended with the question, "Can it be that my faithful wife don't want to help me anymore?"

We are forced to recognize that men who father children with the very best of intentions of giving them adequate care can be overwhelmed at the economic burden which each successive child brings to the end that family adequacy flounders and the burdens under which the family struggles finally make the family itself a casualty. Even if they take "moonlight" jobs, many of these men cannot make ends meet. In administering the companion obligation for child welfare services which is an integral part of the Children's Bureau's total approach to maternal and child welfare, this situation continues to exist. Despite the principle so long advanced in child welfare that no child shall be separated from his family for economic reasons only, often wind up in public institutions, seriously dislocated from the society of which they must some day be a part.

Daily, social welfare workers are confronted with situations in families where they are forced to search for palliatives rather than solutions to real problems. For example, as a society we must take far more forceful steps than we have, if we are to reduce the growing problem of babies abandoned in our great cities by mothers who do not have the means to care for them. For example, in the first 9 months of 1964 in New York City alone there were 443 well babies left in hospitals by mothers who simply walked out because they had no way of caring for their new babies.

When emergency placement measures are undertaken to clear the hospital beds they occupy so that others can be served, these young infants too frequently spend their growing years in so-called temporary shelters.

The enormous impact of this problem is reflected in our child welfare services program in many ways. In a recent year, 36 percent of all children receiving services by public child welfare agencies were neglected by their parents. The second largest group in the caseload—17 percent—needed care because of illness, desertion or other loss of their parents.

In both Children's Bureau maternal and child welfare programs we are acutely aware that among the most vulnerable women are the young unmarried mothers. We have a special obligation to see to it that they get every special help they need, for we have proof that their children are frequently more susceptible to physical impairments, as well as the indisputable social implications which attend these fatherless home situations.

All these factors point for more attention to the crucial period surrounding the conception, birth and aftercare of the infant. The seriousness of this problem is vividly pointed up by Dr. Allan C. Barnes, obstetrician-in-chief at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore: "In hospital practice the removal of a brain tumor calls for a surgeon with two assistants, a scrub nurse and two circulating nurses, an anesthetist and an assistant. The patient's prognosis is about 18 months and the hospital investment is tremendous. The birth of a new baby at 4 a.m., more often is attended by one physician, no scrub nurse, one circulating nurse and inadequate or haphazard anesthesia coverage. The combined predictable life span of the two patients is over a hundred years, but the hospital investment is minimal."

If the baby is born into a low-income family, he may stay in the hospital 48 hours or less and the unique opportunity to discover congenital malformations and recognize high risk infants during the first days of life may be lost.

There is a discernible gap between what we expect of each new generation and what we have been doing to help meet rising expectation. It is an exciting prospect to think

of the opportunities that now lie before us to remove or ameliorate those health and welfare barriers which now make the future so bleak for many children.

Healthy mothers and babies are a paramount part of our national concern for the future well-being of all our citizens. We are, of course, greatly concerned that we now rank 10th among leading nations of the world in reducing the infant mortality rate. President Johnson has called for a drastic reduction in this rate by the end of this decade.

Could it be mere coincidence that in all but one of the nine nations which now rank ahead of us in reducing infant mortality, the birth rate is lower than that of the United States? Sweden, which reports the lowest infant mortality rate, had a birth rate per 1,000 population in 1961 of 13.9 compared with 23.7 for the United States. Only New Zealand, which ranks directly ahead of us in the standing, had a higher birth rate—27.1.

Many of us here are working together at a new rapid pace as dimensions of our problem become clearer in reaching the goal of providing better health for the mothers and children of this Nation. If family planning is a useful tool in achieving this goal, then it should be available on a universal basis as a right to parents, without coercion, but with a genuine and sympathetic attention to the needs of each human being.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor. I had told the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] that if he were not in the Chamber when I concluded, I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, when the war on poverty legislation came before the Senate last year I was one of those who heard the testimony, as a member of the Select Committee on Poverty. I studied the proposed legislation carefully and came to the conclusion that, although there were some things in it I thought unsound, and large there was much good in the measure. I supported the antipoverty legislation on the Senate floor last year and I voted for the appropriations.

This year, when the Congress was asked to continue and expand the authorizations for the war on poverty, I was a good deal more skeptical. The press for months has been carrying disturbing reports of political chicanery, social unrest, administrative bungling, needless waste, and many other disheartening aspects of what I had hoped would be a strong effort to get at the real roots of poverty.

But despite the disappointing record of OEO—all the more disappointing because it reveals so much lost opportunity for helping the poor—I again cast my vote in favor of continuing the war on poverty. And, although I thought the requested authorizations were in some cases higher than they should reasonably have been, I even voted to defeat an

amendment here on the floor which would have held next year's authorizations to this year's level.

Yes, Mr. President, I have approached the war on poverty with an open mind. I believe that it deserves a chance to succeed, so long as those operating the program are making a sincere effort to achieve the lofty goals embodied in the legislation.

In considering and approving this legislation this year, Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare adopted two amendments which I consider to be of very substantial importance in attempting to insure the proper operation of this multibillion-dollar program.

One, proposed by Senator MURPHY and myself, brought under the prohibitions on political activity of the Hatch Act the VISTA volunteers and those persons in the employ of local nonpublic community action organizations whose principal salary is paid from Federal funds.

The other, proposed by myself, completely revamped and restructured the National Advisory Council established by the original legislation to insure that it could provide an effective overview and critique of this sprawling poverty empire.

Later, on the floor, the Senate accepted my amendment to give statutory authority to the task force on problems of the elderly poor, which Mr. Shriver established on June 14 under his general administrative authority. My amendment would also have required an annual report to Congress by this task force.

The conference committee, however, deleted this amendment from the bill. Presumably there will still be a low-level study within OEO, but the study group will not have the prestige that goes with statutory authority, and there is no assurance that its findings will ever be made public to Congress and the American people.

My amendment would not have created any new body, Mr. President. It would not have required any additional Government personnel. It would not have cost any more money. All it would have done was focus public attention on the problems of our older citizens by upgrading what is presently an obscure study group, and by giving that group a tangible goal—a report to be submitted to the critical eyes of Congress and the public.

Now, Mr. President, this low-level group is free to fool around, out of the public eye, with little or no incentive to do the kind of job that needs to be done in this important field. If rejection of this amendment were one isolated incident, Mr. President, I might be able to accept it with less anguish. But, as I have pointed out time and again on this floor, this administration, while attempting to pose as the champion of America's senior citizens, in reality is unsympathetic to the very real problems of the elderly poor. Rejection of this amendment—which would have cost nothing and to which no one could seriously have raised an objection—is just another event in a recurring pattern—a pattern of neglect of those who, in their more vigorous

years, did so much to build the America we live in today.

For let us never forget, Mr. President, the plight of some 13 million of our elderly poor who live under the dark shadow of poverty. Of all those in America who are poor, no group has less opportunity to climb up to a decent level of income than do the elderly poor.

Even with the recent, inadequate increase in monthly benefits, the average retired couple on social security receives only about \$110 a month, or \$1,320 a year, in benefits. Millions must still exist on a preposterous minimum—\$44 a month for a single recipient, \$66 a month for a retired couple. Unless they are lucky enough to find some employment or have outside sources of income, they must make this pittance suffice for food, housing, transportation, and recreation. If a person elects to participate in the new voluntary medical insurance program, \$3 a month goes for that. Is it any wonder, Mr. President, that 37 percent of the Nation's welfare recipients are older citizens receiving social security payments?

Senators will remember that when the social security amendments were before this body, I fought to provide a meaningful increase in monthly benefits, and to broaden the coverage to help more of the elderly poor. I asked that minimum benefits be upped to \$70 a month, with corresponding increases across the board. At that time, I recall, everyone wanted to help the elderly poor, but thought that my amendments would be too costly to the Treasury. I say now to those Members, "Here is an amendment which would, in a small way, help to focus public attention and concern on the problems of the elderly poor—and it would not have cost the Treasury a dime." I am saddened and dismayed, Mr. President, that the Senate conferees backed down so quickly. The Congress must face the ugly facts on poverty among our older citizens, which a conscientious study could not fail to uncover. We need to be reminded of elderly widows who have to plan ahead for months to be able to put just one roast in the oven, or of older couples trying to decide what to give up so they can buy a pound of fresh coffee, or of retired workers shivering in the cold New England winter for want of a warm, sturdy overcoat.

Since the Senate and House conferees have failed to approve even this extremely modest step to help the elderly poor, we can only hope that this obscure study group within the Office of Economic Opportunity—a group whose priority is so low in the eyes of Mr. Shriver that it took him 10 months even to appoint its members—will labor as conscientiously as they can and make a formal report to Congress even though they are not required to do so.

I recall the words of the poet, "Grow old along with me, the best is yet to be." In view of what the conference committee did, these words contain a trace of mockery.

Although I sincerely regret the action of the conferees in rejecting my amendment on the task force on problems of the elderly poor, that action was not as

shocking as the cavalier manner in which two vitally important Senate amendments were scrapped: the amendment sponsored by the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and myself applying the Hatch Act to anti-poverty community action field workers and staff members; and the amendment I offered to revise the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity to insure that it could effectively conduct its function of reviewing the war on poverty and making recommendations for its improvement.

By throwing out the Murphy-Prouty amendment prohibiting political activities in community action programs, the conferees left open the door to wholesale manipulation of the community action programs for partisan political ends.

By throwing the National Advisory Council amendment into the ashcan, the conferees have given new life to a somewhat phony institution, chaired by the very man whose administration it is supposed to review, groveling under his thumb, bereft of staff assistance except the pittance he may allow, free from any accountability to Congress for its operations, and serving only as a high-powered, high-paid transmission belt for the euphoric propaganda perpetually pumped forth by the laboring Munchausens of the poverty headquarters.

The deletion of these two amendments, Mr. President, was accomplished with all the passion, drama, and suspense of the two Liston-Patterson fights. The chairman of the House conferees announced that he wanted no part of either amendment in any way, shape, or form, and the majority members of the Senate conferees quickly acceded to his point of view.

Let me read for the edification of the Senate, Mr. President, the very incisive, perceptive statement, said by the chairman of the House conference delegation to be the position of the President on the proposed revision of the National Advisory Council. It says in its entirety:

Oppose Senate amendment. The proposed council is not an appropriate tool for the purpose apparently intended.

There it is, in all its hard hitting, irrefutable logic. What the administration should have said—to be perfectly honest—was, "We do not want any prestigious body with independent views and means to be able to look closely into the seamier aspects of the war on poverty. We favor continuing with the present yea-sayers, which should do us a great deal of good in selling our plans to the captive aggregation of drumbeaters and voting public."

I am surprised and dismayed, Mr. President, at the role the Civil Service Commission has been prevailed upon to play in this shoddy performance. During my 15 years on Capitol Hill, I have not known a case where this independent Commission, justly hailed as the agency for maintaining the political neutrality of our public servants, has appeared among the administration's army of arm twisters. Yet on the day the poverty conferees were scheduled to meet for the first time, each member of the conference committee received a letter

from the Commission Chairman, Mr. John Macy, Jr., advising him that the Commission is firmly opposed, on policy grounds, to including the proposed persons under the Hatch Act prohibitions. Note, Mr. President, that the chairman did not tell us that the proposed legislation would be unworkable from an administrative standpoint, which would have been within his responsibilities, but that it was bad policy. I submit that it is the business of agencies created by Congress to advise Congress on the technical ramifications of legislative proposals, but I take a very dim view of such an agency taking it upon itself to advise Congress what is or is not wise policy. I think this matter bears some further looking into.

Senators will recall the rather heated debate that transpired in this body with regard to the Governor's veto. During that debate, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] a member of the Labor and Public Welfare and Conference Committees, had this to say:

Our friends across the aisle forget to mention what the Democratic Members, who are in the majority, adopted in committee. They should give us credit for what we did. We voted to have the Hatch Act apply.

I call attention to page 20, section 17, in which we apply the Hatch Act to take the Poverty Corps out of politics.

So, to try to make the poverty program work, we wrote the Hatch Act into it.

I appeal to the Senators across the aisle and remind them that we of the Democratic majority took their amendments applying the Hatch Act to the program, as well as provisions for continuing consultation with the appropriate agencies, to make this program work harmoniously. We took out, however, the arbitrary, absolute veto power. We greatly improved the bill, with the minorities' recommendations, because we wished to make it work.

I say in good faith that we should leave all three provisions in. If we are to give the Governor the veto power, other amendments should come out, too.

Now, in a nutshell, the Senator from Texas told us that because the committee had agreed to bring these potential ward heelers within the prohibitions of the Hatch Act, it was no longer necessary to lodge a veto power with the Governors. Well, now the conference committee has stricken the Hatch Act provisions from the bill. If the principal proponent of deleting the veto power says the Hatch Act provisions made that power unnecessary, and then we strike the Hatch Act language, does this not lead to the conclusion that an effective Governor's veto is really necessary?

Now, the Senator from Texas will say, "The House has now forced us to put the Governor's veto back in the bill, so now we do not need the Hatch Act provisions."

Mr. President, let me point out at this juncture that it is such a limited veto as to be almost meaningless. I shall elaborate on that later.

But this line of reasoning ignores the basic fallacy in the argument advanced by the Senator from Texas: though the veto and the Hatch Act may well be politically related, they are not functionally or administratively related.

What is the purpose of the Governor's veto in the existing law? It is simply to give the elected Governor of a State some say about what kinds of Neighborhood Youth Corps and community action programs the Federal Government may finance in his State. The veto operates prior to the beginning of a project. Once the project escapes the Governor's veto, the Governor has no further authority under the act to modify or cancel the project. The veto applies only to the plan; once the plan is approved, the Governor may not veto its execution by the organizations participating in it.

Now, Mr. President, when would the Hatch Act provisions apply? They would apply after the proposed project has been put into operation, and individuals begin to receive pay from Federal funds for antipoverty operations.

Suppose, under the existing law, a community action program is proposed for one town in a State. After reviewing the plan, the Governor gives it his approval, or at least he does not express his disapproval, within the allowed 30-day period. The plan is put into operation with Federal money. Three months later, the Governor learns that the antipoverty fieldworkers under this community action program are devoting a great deal of their spare time to organizing the poor people into political clubs—perhaps clubs of the opposition party, or perhaps clubs pledged to support an opposition faction of the Governor's party, or perhaps clubs working to overthrow the incumbent town administration at the ballot box. What can the Governor do, Mr. President? Can he veto this sort of activity? He can not. Under this act he has no power to intercede once the plan for this project is approved. He may, of course, accept the challenge and wage political war, with his political supporters vying with these federally paid antipoverty workers for the allegiance of the poor. But under the act there is nothing he can do once he has permitted the plan to go into operation.

All this assumes the existing veto power, as originally provided for in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Even with an absolute veto, the Governor has no power under this Act to prevent the subversion of ongoing community action programs for political purposes at the grassroots level.

Inclusion of the Hatch Act language in the bill would have struck to the heart of this problem. It would have made these local precinct organizers, the people who help the poor during the day at Federal expense and organize them for political activity on their own time, liable to sudden unemployment. I have always been a staunch foe of unemployment, Mr. President, but I confess that I am not unduly alarmed when I contemplate the removal from the Federal payroll of persons who are using the good will generated by their distribution of the taxpayer's money as capital for building a partisan political machine.

To sum up, Mr. President, the Governor's veto and the Hatch Act provisions are not related issues. The former

applies only at the inception of the plan for a community action program; the latter apply only when the program has actually been put into operation and funds are flowing from the Federal Treasury into the pockets of antipoverty workers. It is illogical to say that restoration of a veto—especially the sham veto provided for by the House language—obviates the need for the Hatch Act language. These two provisions are directed at two different evils. Even a true veto would not make the Hatch Act provisions superfluous any more than the Hatch Act provisions would make the veto superfluous.

Far from being a true veto, the language in the bill before us provides that the so-called veto can be overridden, not by the President of the United States, not by the Congress of the United States, but by one appointed Federal bureaucrat not chosen by and not responsible to the American people.

Let me give just a few examples of the insidious subversion of community action programs by the politicians.

CHICAGO

I am reading from an article by Lois Wille in the Chicago Daily News of April 8, 1965, entitled "Political Feelers Start To Go Out for Plums in Poverty War Pie":

A few weeks ago one of Alderman Claude B. Holman's young fourth ward precinct captains conducted a peculiar survey. He began the way Holman's precinct captains begin all of their customary house calls: "How do you think the alderman is doing? Any suggestions? Any complaints?"

But then he added: "As you may know, the alderman is one of four aldermen involved in the war on poverty. * * * There will be 200 paid jobs from this area. * * * Are you interested?"

One of the people he visited, an employee of a private youth welfare agency, says the precinct captain was very vague about what the jobs were. "But he had a form to write down names of people who said they were interested. And he suggested that if we wanted to apply, we should go directly to Alderman Holman's office."

Holman and Deton J. Brooks, Jr., director of Chicago's multimillion-dollar war on poverty, have steadfastly denied that political patronage will swallow up the hundreds of new poverty jobs. "Whatever rumors you may have heard are completely unfounded," Brooks says. "Only the most objective techniques that are available will be used to select staff."

That may be true. Aldermen may have nothing at all to do with filling the jobs. But some of them certainly give a strong impression that they have a hand in it.

This is what happened when a reporter telephoned Alderman Holman's office, explaining that the captain of the 32d precinct said jobs were available:

"Question. He's your regular captain?"

"Answer. Yes."

"Question. Yes, we're taking names now. I'll have your captain call on you, and he'll give you a letter to bring here to the alderman's office, between 3 and 7 p.m. Can you come then?"

"Answer. I think so."

"Question. You come here with your letter and the alderman's secretary will give you a letter of approval from the alderman. That's what you take for your job interview."

Now I'll need your name and address."

The letter system is flourishing all over the south side, according to William H. Robinson, former State representative and

now a welfare consultant to the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

Robinson, Republican committeeman for the second ward, says he is also referring people to Brooks' office at 1 North Wacker Drive for job interviews, but adds:

"The ones who come in with sponsoring letters from aldermen are given long interviews and appointments for tests. The ones I send are told, don't call us, we'll call you."

Job interviewing has just begun, and it is probably too early to tell how significant the sponsoring letters will be. But Robinson says: "The poverty program already has become a tool for powerful aldermen to use to control the poor. That's what concerns me. The aldermen and their captains can use it as they use public housing and public aid, just by dropping the hint—You want a poverty job? Just go see your alderman."

The jobs in question are hundreds of what Brooks calls subprofessional community representatives who will work out of the urban progress centers that will be the backbone of Chicago's war on poverty. "They'll be people living in the communities, because it seems to us they should be peers of theirs in the community," Brooks says. They'll help to create a communications structure * * *. We want representative people, through whom the voice of the community will filter."

Mr. President, these are precisely the people the Murphy-Prouty political activities amendment is aimed at. There is no way that the Federal Government can prevent private citizens from becoming political organizers. But for 25 years and more the Congress has agreed to the principle that political organizers at the local level should not be at the same time on the public payroll. The Murphy-Prouty amendment will make these so-called community representatives choose between political legwork for their alderman and an antipoverty job. They cannot and should not be allowed to do both.

NEWARK, N.J.

Or consider this testimony from Newark, N.J. It is from Tom Hayden, who is on the staff of the Newark Community Union project, sponsored by a very liberal group called Students for a Democratic Society. He quotes one of the trustees of the Newark antipoverty group:

Local, county, and State elected and appointed officials would view with jaundiced eye the emergence of a new power force, with money, prestige, and jobs. However, when this natural fear is compounded because of the participation in leadership roles of recognized political opponents, then it must be anticipated that efforts to weaken or destroy the (United Community Corp.) will occur * * *. The purpose of the UCC is to wage war on poverty. The cooperation of the established power structure is a prerequisite for success. That the existing power structure would derive political dividends and enhancement is a fact of life, and we must accept this if we are serious about our determination to launch attacks on poverty. * * * Our chief and indispensable ingredient is money from Washington.

It is of course impossible to extinguish all political benefits from these programs, Mr. President, but the Murphy-Prouty amendment would at least exclude soft jobs as political henchmen from the list of benefits.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Or let us look right here in Washington. The liberal Washington Post, which

supported the poverty legislation when it became law, had this to say in an editorial on April 27:

The war on poverty will have a profound effect on the politics of the cities where it is most successful. The battle is already loudly joined in New York City, where the new social programs got off to an early start. The same battle is now beginning in the other large cities, even in voteless Washington.

There are two contenders in each city for control of these community action organizations. One is a conservative city administration, representing the middle class consensus. The other contender is, of course, the neighborhood level political leadership of the slums, bitter and impatient, representing the poor.

The war on poverty to be successful will have to recreate the more useful features of the old political machines. Does the community organizer find that Mrs. X needs relief? He takes her to the public assistance division worker in the neighborhood development center. Is Mr. Y's son in trouble with the police? He is put in touch with the lawyer from the Legal Aid Society. Stripped of jargon, the description recalls very accurately the daily work of the old machines. The ghosts of the bosses would be vastly amused to see the reformers sweating now to rebuild what they spent 50 years tearing down.

Artificial though the machines may be, they carry political power. Their networks of community organizers are an invaluable communications system, very much like the old wardheelers.

Under the Murphy-Prouty amendment, Mr. President, these community organizers, paid from Federal funds, could not at the same time be wardheelers.

PHILADELPHIA

As one last example, Mr. President, I would like to read from a story that appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on April 25, 1965, by John McCullough:

Philadelphia's practicing politicians, Democrats and Republicans, are warily observing the preparations for the unprecedented town meetings and neighborhood elections to be held as part of the city's war on poverty. For the most part, it appeared yesterday, the politicians are watching one another.

Each party explained carefully that it wants the program to succeed and thus must make certain that the other side makes no effort to take political advantage of the federally supported plan that will bring hundreds of thousands of people together under new leaders.

Beyond this, as Republican City Chairman William J. Devlin acknowledged yesterday, both the GOP and the Democratic leadership wants to see who will be running this program at the neighborhood level. Devlin said he has directed GOP ward leaders in the areas involved to be present as observers at the neighborhood town meetings scheduled in 12 sections of Philadelphia next Wednesday night.

"We are acting in the open," Devlin said, "to show our interest in and support for this aid project for the city's poor. We want this program to work. We also want to know whether or not some one, or some group, will try to move in and use this project for their own advantage. This is something that must be guarded against."

There was no corresponding order to ward leaders from Democratic Party headquarters, but individual ward leaders said they were keeping a close watch on every development in the war on poverty program.

One ward leader, a councilman in whose district there will be a town meeting next

week as well as a community election on May 26, said that he or one of his aids has attended every neighborhood session thus far held in connection with the program. "You have to remember," he said, "that the parties here are organized along neighborhood lines. Anything new in the community is important to us. We're not trying to take over. We've been told that this is a program that is off limits to politics. But we want to make certain that the Republicans don't try to move in or that someone doesn't try to set himself up as a neighborhood power through this program."

Devlin said that his organization's ward leaders in the areas designated as pockets of poverty already have been attending meetings. He said they have reported that Democratic Party ward leaders and division committeemen always are in attendance.

Mr. President, I cite these newspaper stories only to make the point that the Murphy-Prouty amendment was not prompted by idle fears. If the Federal Government is going to spend the better part of \$2 billion a year to combat poverty, we should do everything within our power to make sure that the program is not destroyed by pernicious influences. The Murphy-Prouty amendment was written into the bill by the unanimous agreement of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee specifically to help keep politics out of the poverty program. We have no illusions that our amendment would purge politics from the poverty program altogether; there are a number of areas susceptible to political subversion that our amendment, with its limited scope, could not reach. But it could have, at the very least, assured that the armies of community organizers and antipoverty fieldworkers be kept out of partisan political action.

I challenge any Senator to rise this afternoon and tell this body that partisan political activity by federally paid community organizers will help strengthen the antipoverty program. I challenge any Senator to rise and state to the Senate that there is no evidence of the political activity that the Murphy-Prouty amendment would prohibit.

You will look about in vain, Mr. President, because no Senator will rise to make those statements. This amendment was scuttled by the Democratic conferees because they envision a political profit to be made. I say to them, whatever profit they foresee for their party is far, far outweighed by the disastrous effects that will be produced in the war on poverty by the action of scheming politicians seeking to exploit the poor.

Mr. President, I have stood by the antipoverty program, often in spite of what I thought was better judgment to the contrary. If the poverty warriors are sincere in their efforts, I say let us give them a fair chance. But the actions taken by this conference committee, I assume at the specific request of the administration, have led me to question the sincerity of the povercrats. They do not want strong provisions of law to prevent the program from becoming a political feeding trough. They do not want any independent group empowered to give the whole program a conscientious review.

At some point every original supporter of the war on poverty must draw the line. I have come to that point, Mr. President. I have gone along as long and as far as I could. I have tried to overlook glaring deficiencies and bungleings. I have tried to lean over backward to recognize the difficulties posed by the intricate and stubborn causes of poverty in America, and the difficulties of getting a billion dollar program off the ground. But now, with this administration-directed action of the conference committee, my support of the war on poverty is for the time being at an end. I shall vote against approval of the conference report, and I urge every Member of the Senate to do the same. If the conference report thus fails of approval, I shall move to request another conference with instructions to the Senate conferees to stand firm on the Hatch Act language and the revised National Advisory Council. If those provisions are returned to the bill, it will again have my support, if not my full confidence.

I want the war on poverty to succeed. It cannot succeed if its benefits are channeled away from the poor and into the pockets of the politicians. It cannot succeed if the administration strives to bury its dirty laundry far from the view of friendly but independent critics.

I appeal to the Senate to act now to recover for the poverty program some sense of respectability in the eyes of the American people. If we do not do so, we shall perpetrate a cruel hoax on the poor and grand larceny on the taxpayer. The time has come to save the poverty program from its misguided advocates, and I hope the Senate will not shirk its responsibility for so doing.

Mr. President, if the conference report is rejected I shall move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, and request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon.

Second, I will move that the Senate conferees be instructed to insist on the language in section 18 of the Senate bill, which includes certain persons within the political prohibitions of the Hatch Act, and section 28, which amends the provision of the Economic Opportunity Act with respect to the National Advisory Council. Then, I shall move that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise at this time to join the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in urging the Senate to reject the report of the conferees in the hope that these two sections which he has mentioned will be restored to the bill.

Mr. President, 2 weeks ago this great body sent to conference legislation covering the poverty program. It included a Hatch Act provision to keep politics out of the poverty war.

I am very disappointed that the conferees refused to give the taxpayers of our Nation that protection and rejected the Murphy-Prouty Hatch Act amendment. As the legislation exists now, paid executives of the community action program and the VISTA projects are permitted to engage in partisan political activity. I believe that the American

people—who are going to pay the bills for this multi-billion dollar Government program—are as disappointed in the conferees' decision as I am.

I am pleased that all Republican members and one Democratic member of the conference committee voted to keep the Murphy-Prouty Hatch Act amendment in the bill. The others, however, must stand accountable for permitting overeager politicians to grab plush poverty jobs and use them for political purposes.

I feel it is appropriate and necessary that the Senate return the poverty legislation to conference and insist that the Murphy-Prouty amendment be included. This is certainly proper in view of the mounting evidence throughout the country that local political battles are keeping the entire poverty program from accomplishing any degree of help to the unfortunate and needy of this country.

While admittedly it is too early to evaluate the effectiveness of the many Office of Economic Opportunity programs—and I frankly feel that some have real potential and I hope they are successful—it is clear that it is not too early to see that the program has produced a real political struggle between politicians at the local level, between local and State politicians, and between local and State politicians and Federal politicians.

In Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Cleveland, Omaha, Albany, and many other cities across the Nation, the program has produced sharp controversy and has been embroiled in political power struggles unmatched in intensity in recent years.

In no State has the program faced greater problems and produced more controversy than in the State of California, the No. 1 State in the Union. Democrats and Republicans alike have criticized it. Gov. Edmund Brown said at the Western Governors' Conference it was "scandalous" that politicians, including elected officials, were fighting each other for "fat-salaried" war on poverty jobs for themselves and their friends solely to enhance their patronage.

Mayor Yorty, of Los Angeles, has charged that the war on poverty is a "huge political porkbarrel."

Democratic Congressman B. F. SISK said that the antipoverty program is "not working well" in California, and that "the program is bogged down in nine different directions."

In San Francisco the controversy over the makeup of the commission to administer funds delayed the program for months, and a total deadlock was averted only by the resourcefulness of Mayor Shelley.

In Fresno, Calif., antipoverty funds have been threatened by a similar dispute over control of the program.

In Oakland, according to a recent article in the Oakland Tribune, the antipoverty program is a "snafu," a "confusing and bewildering operation." The problem was largely attributed to the fact that there has been "undue haste to get something started."

In Contra Costa County, according to reports of the Richmond Independent, the program is "divided, clumsy, and

costly," and after 9 months "has yet to help a significant number of the county's poor." I received a lengthy letter from the Richmond Chapter of CORE asking that the funds be withheld until the mess could be straightened out.

In a telegram to me last month, State superintendent of public instruction of California, Dr. Max Rafferty, said that coordination between Federal Government and local applicants have been poor, that "advance planning has been almost nil," that "project approvals have been on a hit-or-miss basis."

Most of California's leading newspapers have editorialized on the war on poverty and have provided incisive analysis and criticism of the program. To cite a few, the Los Angeles Times, of July 4, 1965, stated:

The poor of Los Angeles County have already paid a high price for the failure of local and State governmental agencies to agree on how to administer antipoverty program funds * * *. In recent months the poor have been all but forgotten in the power struggle for control of the antipoverty effort.

The Long Beach Press Telegram, in an editorial of July 12, entitled "A Stalled Poverty War," calls attention to administrative decisionmaking and control problems involved in allocating poverty funds. The editorial concludes:

One thing is certain. Nobody will benefit from the antipoverty war if the program remains bogged down in disagreement over the makeup of the general staff.

The San Francisco News Call Bulletin reached a similar conclusion on July 12, when it stated:

Pursuit of the poverty war in San Francisco—and elsewhere—calls for dedication on the part of everyone involved. It must not be allowed to become an arena for a power struggle.

And the San Diego Union on July 20, in an editorial entitled, "War on Poverty Tastes Defeat," states:

It is becoming increasingly apparent as the so-called war on poverty unfolds that the only unemployment solved today is that of Washington bureaucrats desperately trying to spend appropriated funds * * *.

The inflexible and poor administration has been a mark of the war on poverty since its inception. It has arbitrarily assumed a set of conditions and tried to fit all problems into the boundaries, regardless of local conditions and pleas. As a result, vast sums have been spent on administration instead of the poor. Local wishes have succumbed to pressures that fit them into the preconceived mold. Flexibility has all but vanished.

And finally, the Oakland Tribune, on August 12, in an editorial on "Politics and Poverty" states:

All the unsavory grubbiness of the political spoils system have plagued operations of the war on poverty since it was authorized. High-salaried jobs, and the right to decide who should get them are the prize sought by local politicians fighting for control of the program in many areas. There is a very real danger that this money-dispensing program may become merely a war chest for big city political machines.

A survey of the situation in California reveals that the criticism is well founded. In Los Angeles, the war on

poverty was stalled for months in a major political struggle between two factions of the Democratic Party. The poor of Los Angeles, like the poverty stricken all across the Nation, received promise after promise when the Economic Opportunity Act was passed last year. But nothing happened. The frustration, the disappointment, the feeling of having been taken in again—these emotions are not hard to imagine, and they have become widespread. The House Subcommittee on Poverty got a glimpse of the bitterness and tension in Los Angeles when it held hearings on the anti-poverty program just 4 days before the tragic riots in the Watts area ripped that city. The chairman of that subcommittee, Congressman AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, has tied the violence to the failure of officials to get the poverty program moving.

On June 28, during the hearings before the Senate Select Subcommittee on Poverty, on page 130 of these hearings, I questioned Sargent Shriver regarding this delay, apparently resulting over the question of who was going to run the program in Los Angeles. Mr. Shriver replied that "the situation" that I described, "was resolved last week." Further, he stated that the problem "no longer exists." That was 12 weeks ago. In reality, this was not the case at all.

I, in turn, wired Mr. Shriver forwarding Mayor Yorty's telegram and requesting that Mr. Shriver personally visit the riot-stricken area to resolve the dispute. Whether Mr. Shriver was too busy pushing public relations for OEO or preoccupied with the Peace Corps, I cannot say. But I do know he failed to give me the common courtesy of an acknowledgment until September 9, which was 74 days later. Even today, the dispute is yet to be fully resolved.

Warnings about the political nonsense in the program have been expressed by newspapers, magazines, and over radio and television throughout the Nation. Mr. Shriver's lone voice of denial is unconvincing to me, and I am certain unconvincing to the American people.

Despite all this criticism, I read in the Sacramento Bee on Sunday, September 5, that Mr. Shriver insists that the poverty battle is doing well. Of course, the question that we might ask is, "Doing well for whom?"

We would have to admit that for the many supergrade chiefs who administer the program, the program has been doing well. It has been reported that 85 percent of the \$5.5 million that has been budgeted under this program has gone for personnel and administrative expenses at OEO. At this stage, Mr. President, it might be said that never in the history of our Nation has the Congress appropriated so much to accomplish so little for so few of those for whom it was desired.

Mr. President, I would also direct the attention to my colleagues to another article which appeared in the same September 5 Sacramento Bee. This article compliments the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], for now turning his recognized ability for uncovering corruption and nonsense in the

Federal Government to the poverty program. Judging from Senator WILLIAMS' shocking disclosure that the poverty war chiefs arranged for themselves a 2-day conference in the plush Suffern, N.Y., area, perhaps this is what the Director meant when he said that the poverty battle is "doing well."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article, entitled "Senate Hawkshaw Eyes Poverty War Expense Account," written by Edward H. Dickson, and published in the Sacramento Bee of September 5, 1965.

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

ECHOES FROM CAPITAL HILL: SENATE HAWKSHAW EYES POVERTY WAR EXPENSE ACCOUNT

(By Edward H. Dickson)

Should Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, ever get tired of being a Member of the Senate—an unlikely possibility, as anybody familiar with the feeding and care of Senators knows full well—he would not necessarily have to retire to his grain business.

The Senator has a real talent for investigative work, much to the dismay of evildoers in the Federal "Gumment."

While he is a Republican, WILLIAMS puts the microscope on the carry-ons by bad guys without regard to political affiliations.

His revelations have resulted in a number of employees of the Internal Revenue Service either being sent to the pokey or being stripped of their epaulettes and form 1040's.

It was WILLIAMS who precipitated the investigation of Bobby Baker, secretary of the Senate Democratic majority and as far as Bobby's official connection is concerned, the present situation can be paraphrased in the words of the old melody:

"Bobby doesn't live here any more."

What puzzles any number of people is how WILLIAMS digs up his information.

Some suspect he has sort of an espionage system all of his own which functions even better than the farflung and expensive Central Intelligence Agency.

Although he is by no means an imposing person and is no spellbinder with a high pitched voice, the people of his State appear proud of the reputation he has won as a sort of national hawkshaw.

He won reelection last year over formidable opposition and despite President Lyndon B. Johnson's landslide victory.

WILLIAMS now has turned his attention on the Office of Economic Opportunity and the war on poverty program, and it is causing uneasiness among even friendly Democrats who feel there are too many chiefs and not enough Indians engaged in the battle.

The Senator has not uncovered anything as yet which might be of interest to an inquisitive grand jury, yet he has dug up some expense accounts which indicate that some of the warriors are living high off the hog in developing their plans for the antipoverty war.

WILLIAMS says a \$230,000 grant was made for a skirmish in the New York area.

Disregarding the old military maxim that a council of war never fights, the poverty generals, WILLIAMS claims, immediately hied themselves for a 2-day conference in the plush Suffern, N.Y., area.

The conference cost \$2,168.26 for the weekend, including motel rooms, meals, and "refreshments."

WILLIAMS says he wanted to make it clear that "refreshments" were synonymous with "booze."

The expenses, WILLIAMS declared, included \$228.30 for dinner at the Restaurant on the

Mountain and \$63.20 for floral decorations from Lucille's Flowers.

There was an item of \$12.85 for the rental of a tuxedo by an official drawing a salary of \$12,500 per year, \$331 for telephones, and \$26 for a table reservation for an unidentified 25th anniversary meeting.

WILLIAMS concludes:

"This is the meetingest group I ever heard of. Apparently they were meeting morning, noon, and night with breakfast, lunch, and dinner, all charged to the taxpayers.

"As to the tuxedo, I suppose the official who rented it thought it necessary so he could get down to the level where he could discuss poverty.

"I do not know who they were telephoning unless they were calling Washington to explain what a terrific job they were doing or is it possible they were calling to discuss what a wonderful time they were having?

"They have just gotten the program started and they already are planning a 25th anniversary meeting of some kind.

"Who says the Great Society is not planning ahead?"

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I offered my amendment in an honest effort to eliminate the political confusion taking place across the country. My amendment was a simple one. It merely extended the coverage of the Hatch Act to VISTA volunteers and to employees of the community action program who receive the principal part of their salary from Federal funds. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare unanimously agreed with me after this issue was fully discussed. I should like to read from pages 13 and 14 of the Senate committee report, where an explanation of my amendment appears:

The committee has added a subsection to section 211 designed to make the Hatch Act applicable to employees of community action agencies. Under the committee amendment, these employees would be prohibited from engaging in political activity where they are paid in principal part from Federal funds.

When public agencies are recognized as the local community action agencies, the Hatch Act is already applicable. When private, nonprofit agencies are recognized, however, the act does not apply. The committee's amendment reflects the belief that the success of community action programs could be adversely affected if local antipoverty officials were actively engaged in partisan politics. Such engagement could impart a partisan character to a program which should be based on a broad spectrum of support within the community.

Also, Mr. President, on page 16, the Senate report discusses my amendment as applicable to the VISTA volunteers, and I read from the report:

The bill includes, finally, one additional amendment relating to VISTA which was adopted by the committee. This would make the Hatch Political Activities Act applicable to volunteers. Although volunteers for many purposes are not deemed employees of the Federal Government, their relationship with the Government has many characteristics of an employment relationship. The committee believes that they should be subject to the same restrictions on political activity as regular Federal employees.

There is nothing complicated about it. It is completely in keeping with the present wishes of Congress and of its wishes during many years past.

During the 5 days that the poverty bill was before the Senate, not a single voice was raised in opposition to my amendment. OEO lieutenants sulked in the galleries. The response to my amendment editorially and from the American people was most favorable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles, one by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, published in the August 22 issue of the Washington Post, and one by Jack McDowell, published in the August 24 issue of the San Francisco News Call Bulletin.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Aug. 22, 1965]

POVERTY AND POLITICS: ADMINISTRATION SOUGHT TO BEAT BAN ON POLITICS IN SPITE OF CONTRARY PUBLIC COMMENTS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

In conflict with public utterances that it wants the poverty program divorced from politics, the Johnson administration attempted a futile fight against such a prohibition.

The poverty bill passed last week by the Senate puts all local poverty workers under the Hatch Act. That means Federal law—not merely agency regulations—will bar local poverty officials from partisan politics.

This amendment to the Poverty Act, sponsored by Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, zipped through the Senate Labor Committee and the Senate itself without apparent opposition.

Behind the scenes, however, two Democratic Labor Committee members were asked privately by the White House to kill the Murphy amendment. One was summoned from a Labor Committee meeting by an urgent telephone request.

Although they usually follow the administration line, the two Senators turned down the White House. They actively supported the Murphy amendment. Consequently, the White House made no public fight.

What makes this particularly interesting are public utterances of poverty chief Sargent Shriver and other officials when confronted with examples of local poverty workers playing politics (including the case we reported of a Philadelphia antipoverty leader lobbying in Harrisburg).

These Federal officials said they would prevent such conduct if Congress would write a prohibition into law.

Hence, the administration's veiled effort to block the prohibition comes as a surprise.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) News Call Bulletin, Aug. 24, 1965]

MURPHY PUT DAMPER ON POVERTY POLITICKING

(By Jack S. McDowell)

In San Francisco, Los Angeles, and many major areas of the Nation there are tremendous battles over who's going to control the Federal war on poverty program.

In most cases, the squabble boils down to the struggle of who will get the various supervisory jobs the program provides and, through this sort of control, who derives the largest number of political green stamps.

There is another important factor. When part of the tab for the poverty war begins to shift from Federal to local pocketbooks, those responsible for local tax rates want a hand on the controls. If control is in the hands of the recipients, they argue, local taxpayers could be spent into bankruptcy and local officials could be spent right out of office.

This fiscal problem, however, seems not to enter into the burning desire of many local politicians to get their cohorts and themselves nailed into the Federal payroll where they would be occupying positions of influence in the spending of millions of dollars. Such positions of fiscal affluence and influence normally evolve into positions of political influence.

MURPHY AMENDMENT

What most of the eager politicians involved have overlooked is the language of a simple amendment to the poverty war act, placed into it by Senator GEORGE MURPHY, California's freshman Republican in the upper House.

This provision declares that employees of the poverty war program clearly and definitely are subject to all provisions of the Hatch Act.

This means, we're informed, that any poverty war soldier who receives most of his income from that position is covered by the act which prohibits Federal employees from participation in political campaigns.

While this is a Federal law and does, indeed, apply directly to campaigns for Federal offices such as Congress, U.S. Senate, and President, it also has been interpreted to apply to include all partisan races such as those for the State legislature and statewide constitutional officers.

PENALTIES TOUGH

Penalty for violation ranges from a minimum of 90 days' suspension from the offender's Federal job to a maximum of permanent removal from the payroll.

This raises a question of whether so many would-be political empire builders would be so anxious to place themselves and their lieutenants on the poverty war payroll if they were aware of the ominous provisions of the Murphy amendment.

It is possible, of course, that the courts would have interpreted employment by the poverty war program as being subject to the Hatch Act. But this would have consumed time and no test could have been possible until the campaign season when a violation could be alleged.

MURPHY's language answers the question in advance. This means that politically inclined poverty war officials will know their enemies will be looking over their shoulders, ready to hit them with a Hatch hatchet.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, following the passage of the bill, I did not have the vaguest idea that my amendment faced any difficulty. Why should it? It was noncontroversial. It had been accepted unanimously by the committee. It had passed the Senate without opposition. But, Mr. President, a funny thing happened to the Murphy-Prouty amendment on the way to conference. Apparently, following Senate approval of the poverty bill, the Shriver forces diverted their attention from the poor, sought additional troops, and secured the highest of chiefs to battle the Murphy-Prouty amendment.

At 1 minute before midnight, so to speak, Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., of the Civil Service Commission, in a letter dated September 1, 1965, to the Senate and House conferees urged the deletion of the Murphy-Prouty amendment. I might say at this point that I was not given a copy of his letter. In Chairman Macy's letter he says:

The Commission believes that it would be unwise to extend the general political activity restrictions of the Hatch Act to such a sizable group of persons in the private sector of community life.

Mr. President, why would my amendment be unwise? I find the Civil Service Commission's reasoning unpersuasive.

While it is true that the acceptance of the Murphy-Prouty amendment would result in an extension of the Hatch Act, it would be a desirable extension and one that could be administered without any difficulty. Although my amendment for the first time extends the Hatch Act to cover persons in the private sector, we must realize that the poverty program itself breaks with tradition by involving the Federal Government greatly in local efforts to assist the needy in communities across the Nation. We must also remember that in 1940, the Congress amended the Hatch Act to extend its restrictions to employees of State and local governments, whose principal employment is in connection with activities by Federal loans and grants. I know that the dangers of political manipulation in 1940 did not begin to approach the potential for abuse that exists under the present poverty program.

Chairman Macy also stated:

The Commission concurs in the view that partisan politics should be kept out of the community action programs financed by Federal grants.

And after citing that the current law does prohibit political activity on the part of State and local government employees in the community action programs, Chairman Macy concludes, "that the Hatch Act will deter most of those engaged in community action programs."

The obvious answer to Chairman Macy's statement can be found by simple examination of what has been happening across the country. My amendment was aimed at preventing political activity on the part of those who received over half of their salary from the Federal Government regardless of whether they were employed by Federal, State or local governments or by a private organization. Its purpose was to prevent all political activity. It was based on the premise that the program is bigger, more important than politics, and should be so preserved.

Also, Mr. President, I was interested in the comments of the House conferees when they said that "their insistence on the exclusion of these provisions was based on the difficulty of applying the existing statutory restrictions to organizations and agencies for which they were not designed."

I cannot understand any difficulty on the part of the Civil Service Commission in administering the act's provisions to employees of VISTA and the community action programs who receive the principal part of their salaries from Federal funds.

In conclusion, Chairman Macy urged "that the Congress should seriously consider the effect of a legislative prohibition against political activity on the part of private employees." What would be the effect, Mr. President? The effect clearly would be to make it law that those who are receiving taxpayers' dollars to operate the local poverty programs would stay out of politics and see that the programs benefit the poor and the needy. The effect would clearly be

to keep politics out of the poverty program, which is the wish that has been expressed by many of the leaders of the administration and many Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I urge that Senators read the debate that occurred on the Senate floor during the consideration of the poverty legislation. I am confident that in so doing, Members of this body will reach the same conclusion as that reached by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], when he stated:

In my whole political career, I have never seen a program so loaded with the ability of political manipulations and deviousness.

The Senator from Ohio further declared that the "arguments have not been about the poor but about who is going to control the loot."

The Senator from Ohio was only confirming what newspapers, editorials, and magazines have reported since the program's inception.

Mr. President, I am truly sorry, as I am sure the American people must be, that the administration seems bent on keeping politics in the poverty program. With the rejection by the Senate and the House conferees of the Murphy-Prouty amendment which would have taken politics out of the poverty program, a Pandora's box has been opened and the politicians are left free to use poverty funds for pure political leverage. I only hope that the committee's action will not result in closing the door on the hopes of the poor—the very people for whom the program was designed.

Since the administration rejected my amendment, I cannot help but wonder about the true purposes of the program. Is it for the poor or is it for the politicians?

In addition, Mr. President, I recently read a rather complimentary article in the September 13 edition of *Newsweek* entitled, "Shriver and the War on Poverty." I was particularly intrigued with the concluding paragraph:

The new assault in an age-old crusade has just been launched. Last week, Congress authorized a second-year appropriation of \$1.8 billion to underwrite the vanguard of the attack. The sniping from the rear mounts even before the first reports from the front are in. Yet Sargent Shriver, the commandant of the war on poverty, imperturbably predicts total victory. How long will it take to win? A decade, predicts the top OEO general. A generation, says another. Forever, says a third with an uncertain smile. You just continue to upgrade the definition of poverty.

I would hope that my colleagues would ponder these reported remarks of a top OEO general stating that the program may last forever and that they would merely continue to upgrade the definition of poverty. I find this shocking.

Mr. President, although I for one hope that the administration does not share the views of these OEO chiefs, I hope that the Senate will recommit the poverty bill with instructions to reinstate the Murphy-Prouty amendment. By so doing the Senate will at least assure that the political confusion and competition that accompany this program will not

continue for a moment longer even if the program lasts for a decade, generation, or forever, as the OEO chiefs envision. We will be taking a proper and necessary step in seeing that the billions of taxpayers' dollars requested by the administration for the poverty program will actually go to the needy and the unfortunate of our country.

I urge that the Murphy-Prouty amendment be restored to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator for his remarks and his effort, even though he was unsuccessful, to have his Hatch Act amendment kept in the bill.

I, too, regret that the administration has seen fit to insist upon the deletion of the amendment which would have prohibited employees administering the poverty program from participating in politics. I cannot understand why the administration insists on the Hatch Act not applying in this instance, unless it is because they are willing to admit that what they are really after is not a solution to poverty but rather an army of paid political workers out in the field on election day serving as an adjunct to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the Senator, I sincerely hope that this is not the case since the President of the United States saw fit to send a personal representative of his to Los Angeles to attempt to straighten out the mess which existed there. People are confused about these affairs. Some Senators are confused. This is a program which has the greatest enthusiastic following of everybody that I know. The program is necessary. Yet we find that, after nearly a year, the progress of the entire program is held up, stymied, confused, and distorted, at least in my State, merely because groups of politicians are fighting over who is to control the money.

I believe that the simplest, most effective, and most direct way to take care of the situation, eliminate the confusion, and write the best insurance that this program can and will succeed is to restore the Hatch Act amendment.

I sincerely hope that this will be done.

I thank my colleague. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I congratulate my very distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from California and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] for their comments.

I know that it was not easy for the Senator from Vermont, after having voted for the original bill and after having gone so far as to sign the first conference report, to come back from the second conference and say, "No; I will not sign the report and I will not vote for the measure." This is not an easy position to take.

I admire the courage of the Senator in doing this. I believe that it exemplifies the problem that is being discussed today.

I admire the courage of my distinguished colleague the Senator from California for his frankness in discussing what is going on in his State, as well as

in other areas, with regard to the political manipulation of the war on poverty.

It seems to me that, when we went into conference, we had three or four major points in the Senate bill. I should like to review them for the benefit of my colleagues.

First of all, we had the issue of the Governor's veto. We fought desperately for the Governor's veto on the floor. Time and again as the various issues unfolded we were defeated by one or two votes, or by a tie-breaking vote cast by the Vice President.

We debated the Governor's veto because those of us who were supporting the right of the Governor's veto felt that this was imperative if we were to get any kind of proper cooperative poverty program activities within the respective States.

We felt very strongly that, without this provision, there would be an injection of Federal power into the local area without any coordination with the local or State authorities who were involved in a similar effort to try to do something about poverty in their area.

We did not win. We were narrowly defeated. We went to conference, and, at that point, it was said, "We will eliminate the veto entirely in the community activities program." However, the House of Representatives would not accept that. They rejected the conference report and sent the measure back to a second conference and said, "We want some form of Governor's veto left in the bill."

What did we get? We got the completely anomalous situation of having a Governor being given the right to veto activities of the Federal Government in his State, which activities he did not like, and an appointive executive being given the power to override a Governor's veto.

That is the type of situation we have now where under the pending measure an appointive Federal agent is given the right to overrule a Governor's veto. I know of no other situation in our legislative history in which that has occurred. Perhaps it did occur in connection with some of the emergency wartime powers during World War II. But I cannot conceive of a situation in peacetime in which an executive appointive official can overrule the elected Governor of a State on activities within that Governor's State. It is incomprehensible to me that such a procedure could be agreed to. But the conference committee so agreed.

My second point concerns the Hatch Act.

Mr. President, the Hatch Act provision, as my distinguished friend the Senator from California has cogently stated, was not even questioned on the floor of the Senate. It was brought up in conference, and is one of the things that the conference committee eliminated in both conferences. It does not make sense to me. If we are trying to do something for the poor, and not for the politicians, it seems to me the very best thing we could do in expanding the poverty war would be to include the Hatch Act provision.

What was the third? It was the advisory council, carefully worked out by members of the committee, to try to form

a study group which could correlate the activities of the various departments of Government involved in the poverty war. In S. 600, the higher education bill which the Senate recently passed, we took the work-study program out of the Department of Labor, and put it into the Department of Education. We have, as I recall, as to student funds, used an override of jurisdiction of some 24 departments and agencies under the war on poverty program. Yet all we provide by way of an advisory committee to assist the director of the program is a committee appointed by him, controlled by him, and designed, as it is said, to act as a kind of sounding board for his ideas, as far as I am able to determine.

Such an advisory committee is not going to be beneficial. It is not going to give the director outside sources for advice to help him better correlate the activity for which he is responsible, and work effectively with other departments and agencies. It is only another method of saying, "Here is a nice bunch of people you can run, and we can get out more propaganda."

The fourth point was the money to be spent in the coming fiscal year on the war on poverty. The authorization for fiscal 1965 was \$947 million. This year, the request from the administration was \$1.5 billion. The Senate bill, as passed, provided \$1.650 billion. We went into the conference and accepted a figure of \$1.785 billion. That is \$838 million more than was authorized in 1965. It is \$135 million more than the Senate approved in its bill. It is \$285 million more than the administration requested. It is \$992 million, almost a billion dollars, more than was spent in 1965. It represents perhaps the most colossal expansion of any governmental program in 1 year that we have ever had in our peacetime history. It is perhaps the most rapidly expanded program we have ever had in the domestic field. I do not know of any other program which has mushroomed to that degree, particularly a program with the problems and the troubles that this one has had in trying to get organized and get underway.

I offered an amendment during the debate designed to cut the program back to a little more than \$1 billion—last year's authorization plus \$150 million to take care of Senator NELSON'S ideas on title II.

My amendment was rejected by a close vote of the Senate. But at no time did anyone ever indicate that it was the consensus of Senators that the amount the Senate authorized should be increased. But that was done by the conference committee. It was increased, as I stated, by \$135 million.

Furthermore, as to the \$150 million provided in the bill as authorization limits for the Nelson program, it is my understanding that the earmarking of that amount for that purpose has been eliminated, and it is entirely possible that that additional \$150 million will find its way into the community action program, where there have been so many problems already.

Mr. President, there have been a great number of newspaper comments and

editorials on this subject. I should like to make reference to some of them, because I believe they bring up the problems that we have, which, in my opinion, have not been dealt with either by the bill that we had before us originally in the Senate or by the conference report.

First of all, I read from an article entitled "Washington Wonderland," in the Reader's Digest, quoting an excerpt from an editorial published in the Seattle Times and reprinted in the Reader's Digest. It reads:

INSPIRATIONAL LITERATURE?

Millions of dollars will be spent this year to develop new teaching materials for teenage dropouts and adult illiterates. A paragraph from one of the new remedial-reading textbooks written for Job Corps campers reads: "Together Pete and Joey slugged away at Hank until his nose was bleeding and one of his eyes was black and blue. Then Pete landed two blows in the pit of Hank's stomach and Hank doubled over. He slumped slowly to the sidewalk. The fight had ended."

Is this the type of material that we are trying to develop in order to train individuals? It strikes me it is a strange way of going about it.

Another brief article, entitled "Whose Welfare?" was originally printed in the Milwaukee Sentinel. It reads in part:

WHOSE WELFARE?

Administrative costs of the antipoverty program, critics say, may exceed the money going to the poor. At Washington headquarters, 44 top officials draw close to a million dollars a year in pay. Director Sargent Shriver's deputy is listed at \$28,500, with three assistants getting \$27,000 each. Of 40 other assistants, 9 get \$24,400 a year, 11 get \$21,445, and 20 draw \$18,935. A staff of 1,150 is planned—as a starter.

Out in the field, the New Jersey director is being paid \$25,000 annually, more than any member of the Governor's cabinet. In Gum Springs, Va., the antipoverty program is to spend \$82,150, with \$56,723 going for salaries and only \$25,427 earmarked for the poor. In New York City, a woman lawyer is getting \$500 a week as a poverty "consultant."

I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a letter to the editor written by a man in Pueblo, Colo., whom I do not know. It reads in part—and I believe this is a rather interesting observation:

Mr. Johnson's Great Society has now provided Project Head Start for the poverty-stricken children, youth camps for their big brothers and sisters, welfare for their parents, and now taxpaid babysitting jobs for their grandparents. It's time now that he did something for the forgotten group, the taxpayer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

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

BABYSITTING

To the EDITOR:

It seems that every time I pick up a newspaper or turn on the radio, there's a new and more idiotic scheme out of Washington.

We've had all kinds of crazy ideas foisted off on us in the name of the Great Society, but this one is the nuttiest by far. Now Mr. Johnson wants to hire 5 million people over the age of 60 years to act as "companions" to neglected children from poverty-stricken homes. In other words, the taxpayers are

now being forced to pay for 5 million babysitters. It used to be that if parents neglected their children, they were arrested and taken into court where they were fined for child neglect. Now the Federal Government sends around a professional companion for the children.

Most of these companions would evidently be persons who never worked enough in their lives to qualify for social security. If they are on social security and need more money, then I say it's time to cut out all the other Socialist hogwash like medicare which Johnson has tacked onto social security, and start paying these people the money they were supposed to get under the original social security law. But taxpaid nursemaids—ugh.

Almost 20 years ago, John T. Flynn wrote a book, "The Road Ahead," in which he made the statement that the Communists encourage our spending programs because the sooner we spend ourselves into bankruptcy, the sooner they can take over. Mr. Johnson is well on the way toward their goal.

Mr. Johnson's Great Society has now provided Project Head Start for the poverty-stricken children, youth camps for their big brothers and sisters, welfare for their parents, and now taxpaid babysitting jobs for their grandparents. It's time now that he did something for the forgotten group, the taxpayer. Oh, I forgot, he does have a nice gift for us—eventual bankruptcy in the name of service to suffering humanity at home and abroad.

ROBERT EGNOR.

PUEBLO.

Mr. DOMINICK. On August 21, we had a very difficult situation crop up in the Breckenridge, Ky., area youth camp. I hold in my hand two articles from Morganfield, Ky., dated August 21, compiled from UPI and AP dispatches. In brief, they show that the camp was being operated by a group of "hoods" from beginning to end, at taxpayer's expense, many people were being beaten up and physically assaulted, and many were leaving in fear of their lives.

The article reads in part:

MORGANFIELD, KY., August 21.—Hundreds of youths, who had come to a nearby Federal Job Corps center, with hopes high, left it today, driven by fear.

"They [hoodlums] threatened to kill me three different times," said Gilbert Blankenship, 18, of Jamestown, Ky., as he boarded a bus to leave.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the RECORD.

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

RIOT FEAR DRIVES YOUTHS FROM JOB CORPS CENTER

MORGANFIELD, KY., August 21.—Hundreds of youths, who had come to a nearby Federal Job Corps Center with hopes high, left it today, driven by fear.

"They (hoodlums) threatened to kill me three different times," said Gilbert Blankenship, 18, of Jamestown, Ky., as he boarded a bus to leave.

About 150 poured out of the center at Camp Breckinridge last night, along with most of the teaching staff, after a 3-hour riot in which 10 were injured. Another 100 left today and more were expected to leave.

OVER 500 INVOLVED

Up to 500 of the 650 white and Negro youths at the center were involved in the rioting. State troopers, FBI agents, and U.S. marshals remained near the center today.

Seven youths were arrested for drunkenness and brought before a magistrate in Owensboro, who dismissed the charges at the request of Job Corps officials.

Blankenship said, "There were eight guys (Negroes) in my dorm who threatened to kill me. I'm leaving here until I think it is safe to come back."

"DON'T DO NOTHING"

Blankenship said his locker was broken into and clothing and money were stolen. Ralph Allen, 18, of Pascagoula, Miss., another who is leaving, also said his locker had been broken into and clothing and money taken.

"If the officials here had taken a stand before this would never have happened," Allen said. "They were always giving these guys a second chance."

A Negro youth from New York, who did not wish to be identified, said:

"Man, we don't do nothing here. That's the trouble. I want to be a mechanic but they say there's no room in the mechanics class. Man, there's nothing to do here."

Job Corps officials put up some of the trainees in an Evansville, Ind., hotel in hopes they would return later.

APPEAL BY MAYOR

Morganfield Mayor J. Earl Bell appealed to center officials to rid the corps of "the racketeering and hoodlum element" before it happens again.

"They have got to operate that center on a basis where people are not afraid to go there to work," Bell said. "I'm in favor of the Job Corps. There are some nice kids up there but unless these centers are properly policed they have missed the boat."

Charles Singer, a member of the security guard, said the camp's teaching staff is gone.

"When you're a resident and you have 40 students gang up on you the way they did, well, you can see why they'd want to leave," he said.

RIOT DRIVES TEENS FROM JOB CAMP

MORGANFIELD, KY.—Hundreds of youths, who had come to a nearby Federal Job Corps center with hopes high, left it Saturday driven by fear.

Seven youths involved in Friday night's rioting were arrested for drunkenness and brought before a magistrate in Owensboro, who dismissed the charges at the request of Job Corps officials.

About 150 corpsmen poured out of the center at Camp Breckinridge Friday night, along with most of the teaching staff, after a 3-hour riot in which 10 were injured. Another 100 left Saturday and more were expected to leave.

Up to 500 of the 650 white and Negro youths at the center were involved in the rioting. State troopers, FBI agents and U.S. marshals remained near the center Saturday.

Purpose of the \$10.7-million center, part of the U.S. war on poverty, is to train disadvantaged youths for 10 months to a year. Basic training includes 3 hours of general education and 3 hours of work experience a day.

In nearby Morganfield, Ky., one resident described the center as "the damndest mess you've ever seen."

"It's just like a Sunday school," said Bob Hite, manager of a Morganfield radio station. "If the kids do something, they (the camp officials) say, 'now if you boys don't behave we'll take your pie away.'"

Six angry young Job Corps men told their story.

As the six crossed a dusty field toward a Red Cross hut where they would ask for a transfer to another Job Corps center, one said, "I ain't going to stay here and get my throat cut."

Another added, in reference to a camp protection racket, "After I got off the bus" (on

his return from a weekend trip) "they ask me if I had any life insurance, and I said 'Hell, no.'"

Another student told of watching a beating in the messhall Wednesday: "They just took his head, pushed it in a plate of food, then stomped his face in."

One boy said he told a camp official Thursday night there was trouble brewing at the camp. "They didn't do nothin'," the boy said.

Most of the camp's boys are staying in motels and hotels. The six boys said their stay at a hotel last night was paid for by the Federal Government.

They said the riot sources were:

The protection racket which the six boys said was "nipped in the bud" in their dorm area but may have continued elsewhere.

The boys said they were forced to pay \$13.50 a month—one-half of their monthly take-home salary—in return for "life insurance" to avoid beatings.

A civil rights demonstration August 13 triggered by Negro comedian Dick Gregory, who claimed the camp hired only persons with college degrees. Some students felt that charges of discrimination in hiring were false and staged a counterdemonstration.

Rioting in Los Angeles, creating fear between races.

Dissatisfaction among students. Said one of the six: "I've been here 2 months and I've been to all the classes and haven't learned a damn thing."

The six were Philip Lefferman, 16, New York City; Larry David, 18, Athens, Ga.; Ronnie Stone, 16, Marietta, Ga.; Edward Mattock, 17, Beckley, W. Va.; Antoine Monette, 20, Los Angeles, and Harvey Bunker, 21, Little Rock, Ark.

A mob of about 75 attacked a firetruck they apparently thought was coming to settle Friday's fighting which began between swirling knots of people, said Seymour Bryson, director of student security.

It was determined later that the firetruck had arrived because of a false alarm.

Ten Job Corpsmen were treated at a camp hospital. Most of them had stab wounds, many had cuts and bruises, authorities said.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it is an interesting feature that one of the first things that happened in the war on poverty, one of the first programs that was announced, was reported last October in Time magazine, in January, that in the administration's opening salvo on poverty spending last month, "one project, for example, was a \$25,000 loan to a fruitcake manufacturer in Lafayette, La." The magazine commented further, "Standards certainly must have been flexible."

Let me say, with all due deference, that every bit of factual information which we have received from beginning to end points up one problem after another of this kind.

Here is an article published in the New York Times on June 2, 1965, with a St. Louis dateline, dealing with the problems that the mayors of our towns have been having. Again I should like to quote:

A group of angry big-city mayors failed today in a move to get the U.S. Conference of Mayors to back their charge that the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity was "trying to wreck local government by setting the poor against city hall."

The controversy was shifted to the politically less exposed channel of private consultation with Vice President HUMPHREY.

A strongly worded resolution—accusing administrators of the Federal antipoverty program of creating tensions among the poor

against mayors and of "fostering class struggle" against city administrations—was bottled up today in the resolutions committee.

The resolution was drafted by Mayors John F. Shelley of San Francisco and Samuel W. Yorty of Los Angeles, both Democrats. It had seemed almost certain of passage by the conference at a final plenary session tomorrow.

Mr. Shelley said he had been urged by Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago, who is not at the conference, to "make the resolution even stronger."

In Syracuse, Mayor Walsh said, federally financed antipoverty workers refer to city officials as "the enemy." He said the poor in Syracuse "are being urged to storm city hall."

Mayor Shelley read to the committee excerpts from the Office of Economic Opportunity's "Community Action Agency Workbook," published last March under the name of Theodore M. Berry, the agency's director of community action programs. The book stressed the importance of "organizing low-income residents for political effectiveness."

Mayor Shelley said the Federal agency's insistence that "the poor must dominate this thing" would have the effect of "wrecking the program" by removing it from the control of elected city officials "who are responsible to the taxpayers."

"Look," he said. "I'm a liberal. I was poor. I came out of the labor movement. I am in complete sympathy with what they are trying to do. But they are saying that we can have no voice in the control of expenditures (by local governments) that will be 10 percent of the program this year and 50 percent next year. That creates a situation in which no local government can exist."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is now discussing that aspect of the program with respect to which I stated, when the bill was originally before the Senate:

In my whole political career, I have never seen a program so loaded with the ability of political manipulation and deviousness.

I believe that rather accurately describes what can be done politically under the types of organizations which are substituted for the performance of functions which properly belong to the Government; does not the Senator agree?

Mr. DOMINICK. I completely agree with the Senator from Ohio. We welcomed his support in the original debate on the bill. He was extremely effective in presenting his ideas, thoughts, and rationale on the subject. But, as he knows, the Hatch Act amendment which was in the bill, and which would have helped as an effective weapon in trying to keep out politics, was eliminated by the conference committee, even though the possibility of eliminating it was never even discussed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a number of other articles, a whole series of papers from the State of Arizona, the Phoenix Gazette, the Arizona Republic, the Tucson Daily Citizen, and a variety of other newspapers, all of which have been referred to prior to this time by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], on the problems they have been

having in Arizona with the programs which have been initiated there. Frankly, they depict one horror after another. There are accounts of recently released convicts running the program. The fact is, they cannot find any rationale or motivation for the people they are placing in these camps.

Mr. President, I was entertained, and I believe other Senators might be entertained also, by the report of June 11 in the Arizona Republic, as follows:

Boys recruited for the Job Corps may elect to go home when they please and the government is required to provide transportation.

The other day, at the Winslow camp, an eastern boy arrived and almost immediately asked to return home. Why?

"I can't wait to get back on that jet airplane," he said. "That's the most fun I ever had in my life."

Mr. President, here is a boy being taken out to Arizona at Government expense. He went to Winslow and soon came back at taxpayers' expense merely to enjoy another airplane ride.

It does not strike me that this is doing much about the poverty program as such.

Here is another one:

POVERTY PROGRAM MONEY TO DEVELOP ROCK AND ROLL GROUPS

Latest announcement from the "Nothing-May-Surprise-You-Department" of the poverty program: A program to use Federal poverty funds to develop rock and roll choral groups was announced in Chicago July 19 by Denton J. Brooks, Jr., executive director of the Chicago Committee on Urban Opportunity.

Mr. Brooks said development of rock and roll groups has "cultural implications but also a definite economic effect in the war on poverty because it will give jobs to persons who would not otherwise have jobs."

Perhaps this is a useful endeavor. I do not know. But it does not seem to me to be something on which general tax funds should be spent.

All kinds of groups want to promote rock and roll, but the idea of spending Federal funds on it is beyond me.

Here is another article, dated July 23, 1965, from the Denver Post:

Three of five Job Corpsmen in San Marcos, Tex., charged with felonies in the shooting of two airmen, returned to the job center after being released from jail on a habeas corpus writ.

Here are a couple of fellows who did not like sitting in the camp. They went out on the town and shot two airmen, were released, and returned to the Job Corps camp.

The Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, in August of this year, did a kind of lineup of some of the problems.

I am reciting incidents from various areas of the country to try to indicate to the Senate the kind of problems we have run into.

The Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce reported:

In Ypsilanti, Mich., a local teacher described a Federal grant of \$188,000 in nearby Willow Run village as "a fraud and a disgrace." One antipoverty project planned was a weight-losing class for women who were told "now that summer's coming on, don't fry in your own fat."

It is inconceivable that we are spending Federal funds for that.

The next item relates to St. Petersburg, Fla., about which we heard a great deal before:

The Job Corps Director has resigned. Of the 270 young girls training at the Center, 90 percent were school dropouts.

Blaming the Federal Government for not screening the candidates properly, the Director said one girl arrived emotionally ill, another 5 months pregnant. Six girls were kicked out for drunkenness, several refused to obey regulations; 20 more left because they weren't "motivated."

In New York City—and I am glad to see the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] present—

The 22-year-old neighborhood investigator in Harlem was charged with the stabbing (fatal) of a 16-year-old white boy. The investigator was on the Federal payroll for \$36.50 a week, checking on neighborhood poverty complaints. At the same time he was a member of a gang of rowdies known as the Barbarian Knights.

So the first three States involved that I have mentioned are Michigan, Florida, and New York. The report goes on. It does not stop there. It covers all areas of the country.

LEWISTON, CALIF.—Citizens complain that they are being terrorized by volunteers at the local Job Corps Center. Residents were told that no young volunteer with a criminal record would come to the Center. "Now we learn that parolees are being sent here and that there is almost no supervision," said one Lewiston city official. (A Job Corps official said the "rules got changed—at the Presidential level.")

The next one is from Portsmouth, Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where?

Mr. DOMINICK. Portsmouth, Ohio.

Community action program officials had allowed \$45,000 to rent meeting rooms when, as Congressman WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Republican, of Ohio, reported, "There is plenty of free space they could use." The money is now being held up, pending investigation.

I do not happen to know what happened with respect to that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, where was the rock-and-roll program?

Mr. DOMINICK. That was in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And that is a part of an economic opportunity program on which the taxpayers' money is being spent?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where was the program in which the taxpayers' money was being spent to teach how weight can be reduced? Was that in Ypsilanti?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes; that was in Ypsilanti, Mich.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Those programs are now a part of the general laws?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct—the so-called poverty program.

The next item mentioned in this report refers to Indianapolis, Ind.

The local Project Head Start has a \$1,094,000 budget for a preschool center. Fully two-thirds of that budget is going for salaries of administrators, consultants, coordinators, teachers, aides, office help.

Here is one from Gum Springs, Va.:

Citizens are up in arms over a \$74,000 local poverty budget. Of that budget, \$56,722 is going for salaries for the staff.

Then we get down to Washington, D.C.:

The Public Health Service, with a budget of \$2 billion per year, has wide-ranging health programs for the general public throughout the United States. But poverty program officials aren't satisfied. They are launching their own health service in the form of nursery school setup, complete with medical, dental, and eye benefits. Costing initially \$17 million a year, it will zoom shortly to \$150 million annually. Obviously it will compete with the existing Public Health Service.

The one I have just referred to relates to Washington, D.C. The next one relates to New York City. It is reported that:

The powerful United Federation of Teachers has forced local poverty officials to pay \$8 to \$9.20 per hour to summer nursery school teachers.

I have already referred to the Syracuse, N.Y., blast by Mayor Walsh.

There is another program going on in Washington, D.C., which is thus described.

Poverty officials admitted paying \$87,000 to a private research group "to compile a catalog of more than 170 Federal programs—in addition to those set up by the antipoverty program—which helps the poor.

The Washington Daily News reported the catalog is thicker than New York's Manhattan phone book.

So far we have included the States of Michigan, New York, Florida, California, Ohio, Indiana, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. The areas I mentioned before included Kentucky and Texas. I know that there have been problems in my own State of Colorado.

The Washington Post had this to say when we passed the bill in August. This article appeared on August 23:

Mounting concern across the country that the war on poverty has yet to establish an effective beachhead was ignored in the Senate where administration forces crushed opposition 61 to 29 and passed a 1-year, \$1.65 billion extension of the program.

The time has come to throw away the quantitative yardstick and the tub-thumping press release that tells only how much or how many or how big, and to concentrate on how effective, how lasting is the war to help people lift themselves above poverty and stay there.

I was really interested in my own State. I believe I previously placed in the RECORD an article which was published in the Denver Post which referred to one of the centers of the Job Corps in western Colorado and stated that it had really been successful. When one read below the headlines he learned that one-fourth of those who had gone out there at the Government's expense had already left the camp after they had been there for only 2 weeks. This was supposed to have been a successful camp. I have some more examples of what went on in Colorado.

Here is an article from the Rocky Mountain News dated September 2, 1965, in regard to the new head of the Denver war on poverty. He was elected by a 11-to-7 margin after a secret ballot and

after a motion to postpone the election another month had been beaten down, 8 to 7. The new director is a fellow that I know from my home State, and is an able person.

But once again the political situation, largely within the Democratic Party, has created such a force they have been unable to get anything done that meets with the approval of Washington. That is why when this gentleman, whose name is Corky Gonzales, and incidentally a fine guy, was elected. One of the first things done was to fire the executive director. They have not yet found a new one.

Here is the comment made by another director of the Denver war on poverty. This comes from the Rocky Mountain News of September 3, 1965. He said that the local program can work despite the current internal bickering hampering achievement:

Herrick Roth, president of the Colorado Labor Council, said possibilities for the future are excellent.

Speaking to the Young Democrats of Denver, Roth claimed the issue is who shall be the local spokesman and through whose eyes poverty seen.

"We can take some progressive steps while we're fighting these petty battles," he predicted.

When he got through he said, "I trust it will not be a boondoggle."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

CORKY GONZALES ELECTED HEAD OF DENVER'S WAR ON POVERTY
(By Fritz Lalendorf)

Rudolph (Corky) Gonzales, former ball bondsman and professional boxer, is the new general of Denver's war on poverty.

He was elected Wednesday as chairman of the Denver war on poverty board to succeed Dr. James Galvin, who resigned the top post because of friction with several of his coworkers. Galvin will remain on the board.

Gonzales won by an 11-to-7 margin after a secret ballot and after a motion to postpone the election another month had been beaten down 8-to-7.

The board has been racked by dissension for the past 2 months since Mayor Curri-gan publicly called for the removal of then Executive Director Robert E. Allen for alleged ineffective leadership.

Allen has since been demoted to community relations director, although he is serving as acting executive director until a successor is chosen.

The local program has bogged down amid personality clashes and differences of opinion on how the program should be conducted and which way it should move.

The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Washington has been slow to approve needed poverty funds until the leadership hassle is straightened out and the program is revitalized.

Only 19 of the 33 board members were on hand for the regular monthly meeting Wednesday night.

Gonzales, 37, is director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, a part of the war on poverty.

His salary in that job is \$9,636 a year. The chairman of the Denver war on poverty board is a nonpaying position.

William Blackburn, an oil executive and chairman of the nominating committee, re-

ported the committee favored Walter E. Emery, president of the Bank of Denver, for the top post.

The vote was 4 to 1, he said, with Mrs. Mary Chavez, board member representing "the disadvantaged community," opposed.

Mrs. Chavez said she believed Emery would be unable to communicate with residents of poverty areas.

Blackburn quoted Emery as saying he would be unwilling to serve as chairman if there were opposition to his election, preferring to encourage board unity rather than disunity.

Then followed a motion to postpone the election until the nominating committee could talk it over.

TRIGGERS BLAST

That triggered a blast from Herrick Roth, president of the Colorado Labor Council, AFL-CIO, who has been leading the fight to get the program off dead center.

"How long do we intend to bicker on and on about this?" he asked. "Caution has been part of our problems with this program."

Further postponements, he said, means the war on poverty "does not go forward for a while."

The 8-7 vote closely followed economic lines with the so-called disadvantaged representatives prevailing over the other board members. Emery, however, abstained from the balloting.

After Gonzales was nominated by Mrs. Chavez, Mrs. Lloyd M. Joshel said the board should dissolve itself and start all over again.

"The board is badly split," she said, "in I don't know how many ways."

She suggested appointing a chairman from outside the board "who might be able to pull these patches together."

Attorney A. Edgar Benton called it "a sad commentary" that a community of 500,000 people could not find someone willing and able to take on the responsibility of running the war on poverty program.

He announced he would vote against Gonzales "simply because I don't think he's qualified."

After the election Gonzales said he did not intend to get involved in "politics behind closed doors."

"I don't say that I know everything there is to know but I can learn," he declared. "I do know that we must help the poor people."

COMPLETE SHAKEUP

The board has approved a complete structural shakeup, revamping the administrative hierarchy from top to bottom.

The executive director will oversee six divisions dealing with community relations, education, employment and training, health, home management and research and analysis.

The divisions will be staffed by board members plus professional outsiders subject to board approval.

POVERTY FIGHTER EXUDES CONFIDENCE

A director of the Denver War on Poverty (DWOP) board said Thursday the local program can work despite the current internal bickering hampering achievements.

Herrick Roth, president of the Colorado Labor Council, said possibilities for the future are excellent.

Speaking to the Young Democrats of Denver, Roth claimed the issue is who shall be the local spokesman and through whose eyes is poverty seen.

"We can take some progressive steps while we're fighting these petty battles," he predicted.

MIDDLE GROUND

The labor leader claimed the Denver board, under fire for its ineffectiveness, is neither far behind nor far ahead of other communities.

He said the poverty representatives on the board don't know what their role is and neither does the "power structure."

"In fact," he said, "the power structure probably has less understanding."

He said the current board hassle is a matter of the poverty people being hampered by the "society people who know how to run boards."

He said all the haggling is going on amid the power structure and not the so-called disadvantaged board members who are continually being talked down to.

"I have been critical of the power structure," Roth conceded, "because I don't like to see this bulldozing going on."

FINDING A TRUST

Roth said the election of Rudolph (Corky) Gonzales, a representative of the Spanish-American community, as board chairman Wednesday night amounted to "finding a trust."

"If we walk away from Corky we will be doing him and the war on poverty a disservice," he declared.

Roth said he was sure the board, despite the division in leadership, was united in wanting to move ahead with the program.

Nationally, he said the Johnson administration "may hang its hat or lose it" on the anti-poverty war.

"I trust it will not be a boondoggle," he added.

Mr. DOMINICK. Here is an editorial from the Rocky Mountain News headed "Boondoggle." "I trust it will not be a boondoggle," Herrick Roth said.

The Rocky Mountain News said very pungently:

We certainly trust so, too, but we must admit that nothing in the record so far gives us much cheer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial from the Rocky Mountain News.

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

BOONDOGGLE?

Herrick Roth in commenting on the strife-ridden organization of the Denver War on Poverty, of which he is a director, expressed this hope:

"I trust it will not be a boondoggle." We certainly trust so, too. But we must admit that nothing in the record so far gives us much cheer.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thought I was through the parade of horrors on this matter until I got a new one the other day. Here is one dated September 7 from the Dixon Evening Telegraph in Dixon, Ill. It is an editorial entitled "The War on Poverty Invades Lee County, Ill."

Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Dixon (Ill.) Evening Telegraph, Sept. 7, 1965]

THE WAR ON POVERTY INVADERS LEE COUNTY, ILL.

The war on poverty is to be fought on home grounds in Lee, Ogle, and Whiteside Counties, three of the most prosperous farming and industrial counties in northwestern Illinois.

A great number of the citizens of our community are aghast and utterly disgusted after reading in this newspaper of the press conference called by Rev. Alden R. Hickman, assistant pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Dixon. It has been reported that this committee is a self-appointed, self-perpetuating group controlled by about 10 per-

sons. None of these persons are responsible to county or city voters.

At this meeting the Reverend Mr. Hickman announced that he and his group that he calls the Tri-County Opportunities Council (TCOC) has requested a grant from the Federal Government of more than \$38,000 "to finance a study which will determine the extent and nature of poverty in the Lee-Ogle-Whiteside Counties area."

If approved by the Government the grant will be used specifically to "discover incidents of poverty, resources available, and the possibilities of eliminating or alleviating poverty in this area" * * * said the Reverend Mr. Hickman. Budget information released at this press conference specified that the program director will receive \$10,200 a year. Two assistant directors will receive \$7,200 each. The remainder left in the budget salary allotments will be used for secretarial salaries and for neighborhood aides, whatever that means, and these are the ones he says will benefit. Also included is travel expense of \$7,200 and \$1,800 for consultants who are supposed to evaluate the completed survey. Then there is allotted \$1,950 for office rent, \$2,000 for supplies and postage and \$1,300 for equipment rental.

We can think of better initials to be used for the Great Society than TCOC. We suggest they change their name to the "Payrollers Everlasting Utopia" and call it by its initials (PEU) which would be more appropriate because of this senseless squandering of Federal funds just to put a few people on the payroll.

We were informed by a member of the Presbyterian Church that Reverend Hickman's coming to Dixon and the church was contingent upon his being on this boondoggle payroll at \$10,200 salary. If this information is incorrect we will be happy to correct same.

If this committee, whoever they are, will come to us or any number of people in our community we will tell them why we think some people have less than others—we will tell them for free and save taxpayers \$38,000.

We will even throw in something as a bonus and for free—we will tell why some people have more than others in case these men are planning to spend taxpayers' money in the future to find out why some people have made money and saved it.

We are sure that almost everyone has compassion for people who are unfortunate because of reasons of sickness or of something beyond their control. Our county board of supervisors has a setup that has been in force for years to take up and care for hardship cases.

We have a suggestion. If these men are so willing to get this \$38,000 and use it we would like to be so bold as to say—get it and give it to those who need it but do it through the county supervisors and township men who are already set up and have been doing this over many years. Let's not pay it out in fat salaries for a favored few.

Mr. DOMINICK. In effect what is said here is that the Tri-County Opportunities Council requested a grant from the Federal Government of more than \$38,000 to finance a study which will determine the extent and nature of poverty in the Lee-Ogle-Whiteside Counties area.

The editorial starts out by saying that these three counties are the most prosperous farming and industrial counties in northwestern Illinois.

The editorial goes on to say who is going to get the \$38,000. The program director will receive \$10,200 a year, the two assistant directors will receive \$7,200 a year.

That is \$24,600 out of the \$38,000. The remainder left in the budget salary allotments will be used for secretarial salaries and for neighborhood aides, whatever that means, and these are the ones who will benefit.

Also included is travel expense of \$7,200 and \$1,800 for consultants who are supposed to evaluate the completed survey. Then, there is allotted \$1,950 for office rent, \$2,000 for supplies and proceeds, and \$1,300 for equipment rental.

The editor suggests the name be changed from the TCOC, which is Tri-County Opportunities Council, and that it be called PEU, which is Payrollers Everlasting Utopia.

I do not know whether that situation is going to be changed or not. The editorial is dated September 7, 1965. I presume it will.

The Ypsilanti, Mich., program went through despite determined opposition of everybody in the area.

Then, we have this article of September 9 from the Washington Daily News, and an article by Jack Steele in the Rocky Mountain News. The first one is dated September 9, 1965, and the last one is dated September 12, 1965. I would ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept 9, 1965]

HEAD STARTERS STARTLE PROBERS: "FREE" USE OF CHURCH, \$532 IN "RENTALS"

Senate investigators have reported that a Mississippi Head Start project paid \$100 rent to use a bathroom toilet in a church for 8 weeks.

The project also paid the owner of the church \$10 in rent for use of a garbage can, \$100 to rent a sink, \$120 to use a refrigerator, \$110 for a stove, and \$92 for a carpet during the same 8-week period.

One of the project's officials chartered a twin-engine plane for a 200-mile flight to address a "graduating class of 5- and 6-year-old Head Start pupils. Another chartered a plane to attend a meeting of the project's board of directors, they said.

LEFT HASTILY

And when the Senate staff employees started their investigation, bookkeepers for a New York firm which had received a \$35,000 contract to audit the project, left Mississippi hastily, taking the books and records with them.

These and other alleged irregularities in the project's operations have turned up in the course of an investigation sparked by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Senator STENNIS is preparing a detailed report to present to the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which he is a member, when it considers the administration's request for \$1.5 billion to run the antipoverty program.

MADE PUBLIC

Results of the probe were first made public in dispatches by Morris Cunningham, Washington correspondent for the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, a Scripps-Howard newspaper.

The project involved is the Child Development Group, which was granted \$1,460,748 by the Office of Economic Opportunity to run Head Start classes in 65 Mississippi communities this summer.

Senator STENNIS has charged that the project's facilities were being used as a "staging area" for civil rights demonstrators rather than for their intended preschool educational purpose, and that Head Start funds were used to provide bail and pay fines for demonstrators.

FIRST HAND

In late July, Senator STENNIS asked OEO Director Sargent Shriver for an accounting of the child development group's use of Federal funds. When Mr. Shriver reported his accountants could find no serious irregularities, Senator STENNIS and Appropriations Committee Chairman CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, sent committee investigators to Mississippi for a firsthand look.

When they arrived August 26, they reported they at first were denied admittance to the group's headquarters. After Senators STENNIS and HAYDEN protested to Mr. Shriver, the staff aides were let in and staff accountant William J. Miller started an audit.

VANISHED

When he arrived to continue his work August 30, the records had vanished and so had three bookkeepers for Spokny-Gersten Co., a New York City firm which had the \$35,000 accounting contract, investigators said.

The books were later returned by air express from New York but the bookkeepers never did show up again, the investigators said.

Mr. Shriver's office later announced the contract had been canceled and the routine auditing assigned to another New York City firm, but Spokny-Gersten had received nearly \$27,000 of the \$35,000 in advance.

The Senate investigator, meanwhile, found a check had been paid to the Reverend Harry Howard, listed as owner of St. Peter's Baptist Church, Pascagoula, Miss. Reverend Howard had "donated" use of his church for a Head Start class for the 8-week session, they were told.

"FREE"

However, according to Mr. Miller, an invoice filed in support of the check revealed that although use of the church was "free," Reverend Howard had been paid \$100 for use of a "bathroom commode" (toilet), \$10 for use of a garbage can, \$100 for use of a sink, \$120 for use of a refrigerator, \$110 for use of a stove, and \$92 for use of a carpet during the 8 weeks.

OEO officials here said the rental charges appeared to be exorbitant—and if so, would not be allowed. Presumably, the money can be recovered either from Reverend Howard or from Mary Holmes Junior College of West Point, Miss., official sponsor of the child development group.

The chartered air flights, investigators said, were taken by the Reverend Willie Brown, assistant director of the group, who flew from Jackson to Holly Springs to speak before a Head Start graduating class, and by Dr. Tom Levin, former director, who flew from Jackson to West Point for a board of directors' meeting. Washington officials said Mr. Levin's flight was authorized as necessary.

ABUSES IN HEAD START PROGRAM REVEALED

(By Jack Steele)

WASHINGTON, September 11.—The antipoverty program's own audit of a big Mississippi Head Start project disclosed "questionable and improper" expenditure of portions of the \$1.4 million in Federal funds poured into the project.

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, made public Friday night a sketchy summary of a July 31 audit report, which charged that \$87,778 in "questionable expenditures" were uncovered at this midway point in the 8-week program to

provide nursery schools for underprivileged children.

Shriver made public the audit summary after Nathan Cutler, OEO's chief auditor, had denied reports by Senate investigators, which were published by Scripps-Howard newspapers, of waste and mismanagement in the Head Start project in Mississippi.

Yet Cutler himself stated in the audit summary that "significant weaknesses," which included possible conflict of interest, were uncovered by his auditors.

USED TO PAY FINES

The OEO auditors found that \$1,129 in Head Start funds were used to pay ball and fines for Head Start employees arrested for civil rights activities. They insisted all but \$329 had been recovered.

Shriver himself earlier admitted some OEO employees engaged in civil rights activities "on their own time" and added: "I hope they do it." He insisted they were not intermingling their antipoverty and civil rights activities, however.

The big issue of whether OEO paid high-priced "rentals" on such items as a toilet, a rug, refrigerators, and garbage cans in two Negro churches in Pascagoula, Miss., used as Head Start centers was left unresolved.

Cutler earlier denied the charges—insisting that OEO had purchased these items.

After release of the audit report, Cutler admitted that invoices found in the files of the Mississippi project covering these items used the word "rentals." But he insisted this was a mistake.

SEEK ADJUSTMENTS

Cutler said OEO was trying to work out adjustments in the prices of these articles rather than rip out the toilet and take possession of the other items.

Investigators for the Senate Appropriations Committee, sent to audit the project by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, made the "rental" charges on the basis of the invoices.

Shriver refused to release the full audit report on grounds that it was an internal document of OEO and might contain unsubstantiated charges involving some individuals.

But the audit summary, although all specific charges were deleted, disclosed evidence of wholesale mismanagement of Head Start funds in the Mississippi project, which was operated by the Child Development Group of Mississippi from a center at Edwards, Miss., near Jackson.

WEEK TO CORRECT

Cutler considered the lack of control over the Federal funds so serious that he recommended that the project be curtailed or halted unless the faults were corrected within 1 week.

The report listed among "questionable" expenditures:

- Cost of teacher orientation: \$30,710.
- Accounting and financial services: \$35,000.
- Administrative expenses: \$12,380.
- Printing agreement: \$7,188.
- Retainer legal services: \$2,500.

The report also charged the project had violated conditions of its grant by improper use of funds, by failing to identify the non-Federal share (10 percent) of its costs and by buying furniture and services before the grant was approved.

CONTROL LACKING

It charged the OEO auditors had found no control over petty-cash funds, accounting system deficiencies, and such mysterious other "weaknesses" as "special bank account" and "possible conflict of interest." These were not further explained.

The report stated:

"Our audit indicated the existence of a relatively lax and uncontrolled system of management both at the grantee and sub-contractor levels.

"Essential functions involving cash and check disbursements, purchases, material control, and recordkeeping were informally accomplished and inadequately supervised."

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe most of us have seen these, but this article relates to the Head Start program in Mississippi which paid \$100 to rent a bathroom toilet in a church for 8 weeks, and it went into details of what was being paid out: Scrap basket rental, toilet rental, and screen rental, and all of these things that are plain idiotic use of funds when we are trying to help the poor in this kind of program.

I do not intend to outline all of these things in order to show the difficulties of the program. Of course, there will be difficulties. No program can get started in this way without difficulties and without problems. We all know that.

The point is, to take a program that is already nationally in trouble in all areas of this country and then say we are going to give \$285 million more than the administration wanted and \$135 million more than the Senate provided and millions more than was spent last year in expanding this type of program, without getting administrative help or supervision, it seems to me, is absolute nonsense. If this conference report can be defeated we will have an opportunity to go back to conference and insist on the Hatch provisions, and insist on a fair monetary amount and try to get some kind of advisory council that will be of assistance in this program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to address myself in some detail to this situation, as I believe I am the only Member of my party who signed the conference report. With the indulgence of the Members of the Senate who are present, I would like the privilege of inserting several matters in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so although they are not germane to the pending business. Then I shall ask for a quorum call for the brief time that Members are notified that this debate will be coming to a close.

I ask for such unanimous consent.

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

RETIREMENT OF SECRETARY ZUCKERT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the end of this month, the Honorable Eugene Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, will leave his post in the Government.

Secretary Zuckert has served in that high post longer than any other Secretary in history and, undoubtedly, his contributions have been extraordinary. In 1946, he served as Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of War for Air, and, when the new Department was formed the following year he became Assistant Secretary. His experience had qualified him well for the leadership position to which he was appointed by President Kennedy in 1961.

During his tenure as Secretary we have not always agreed on matters affecting installations in New York, but I respect

his dedication to the public service. I applaud his contributions to the growth of the Air Force and the defense of the Nation, and I admire his unquestioned ability and patriotism.

The Air Force will miss his leadership and the Federal Government his dedicated service. I join Senators in wishing him success, health, and happiness in the future.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY FORMER NEW YORK ATTORNEY GENERAL GOLDSTEIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, former New York State Attorney General Nathaniel L. Goldstein was installed as President of the American Friends of the Hebrew University last Sunday. Mr. Goldstein is one of New York's most distinguished citizens. He served the State as Attorney General from 1942 to 1954 and was my immediate predecessor in that post. During his terms of office under Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, New York moved forward and led the Nation in many areas of government concern, including civil rights, education, and health. Also during that time, Mr. Goldstein was a leading figure in the National Association of Attorneys General. In addition to the bar, he has also distinguished himself in philanthropy and community service.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the acceptance speech of Attorney General Goldstein on the occasion of his installation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXCERPTS FROM THE ACCEPTANCE REMARKS OF FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL NATHANIEL L. GOLDSTEIN OF NEW YORK, UPON HIS INDUCTION AS PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1965

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very kind introduction. May I also express my deep appreciation to the Minister of Commerce of the State of Israel, His Excellency, the Honorable Haim Zadok, for his most gracious remarks. Were I, in turn, to present him to you, I should characterize him succinctly as a brilliant lawyer, a superb public servant and, above all, a gentleman of the highest order.

I accept the idicla of office today with due humility, realizing the duty which goes with it and the accompanying obligation to that great citadel of learning, standing at the crossroads of the Middle East, in all of its majestic glory, beaming its rays of knowledge throughout the civilized world.

The Hebrew University performs a dual function. It supplies the professions to administer to the needs of the people of Israel, the scientists, the doctors, and the lawyers. It produces the teachers so essential to man the primary and secondary schools, for brick and mortar without teachers can be of no avail. I know I need not stress its importance, for it is self-evident and axiomatic.

For the next few minutes, I should, therefore, like to tell you what impelled me, with all of my manifold duties and obligations, to accept the presidency of the American Friends. It is inherent in the second great historic mission of the Hebrew University.

We are the people of the Book, and learning has sustained us throughout the ages, in all of our travail and suffering—and it

is learning which can bring peace and tranquility to the world.

Nuclear weaponry is not the answer, for in a span of 50 years we have fought and won two World Wars, steeped in blood, sweat, and tears. Checkerboard diplomacy will not do it, for with all our statesmanship and diplomatic maneuvering, we find ourselves on the brink of world war III.

Knowledge, learning, education, and understanding must supply the tools, by which the human race can survive, in a world of plenty and splendor.

Unfortunately, America, the most powerful nation on earth, which has done so much good for so many people, has been unable to reach the underdeveloped and newly developed countries of Asia and Africa. Unless there is a rapport with them, I fear that mistrust and misunderstanding will continue. Unless we can infuse them with our democratic way of life, we shall be groping in the dark and in the abyss of dismal failure. We, who are living under the best form of government conceived by man, cannot transmit our good and our blessing to these people.

But there is one ray of hope. In an era when the use of force as a weapon in diplomacy has become an anachronism, the example of Israel stands forth as a guiding light. The diplomacy of economic and technical assistance waged so badly by Israel is doing much to win the hearts and the minds of the people of these developing countries. Dedicated young people trained by the Hebrew University are now practicing the diplomatic art and setting an example which the free countries of the world can follow and learn from.

Let me name a few specifics where the Hebrew University is now playing its important role, helping their Asian and African neighbors. There is, at the university, a unique program for training Africans in modern medicine, under the auspices of the World Health Organization, an arm of the United Nations. The program, now in its third year, will soon graduate the first group of physicians, who will return to their native lands in Africa and head hospitals, research centers, and, before long, be training physicians and technicians essential to the health of their people.

Similarly, there are African and Asian students in economics, social work, the law school, as well as in the multifaceted fields of modern science.

There is presently underway a newly created Institute for American Studies. Although less than a month old, this institute is teaching American history and an appreciation of the guiding principles of American democracy. I can think of no more direct channel to the consciousness of the people of the emerging nations than through the tutelage of another new democracy which has benefited so dramatically from the American experience.

This little State of Israel has been able, in a short time, to reach the eyes and the ears of these Asians and Africans. It has been able to gain their confidence and trust. And this little State, through the Hebrew University must be the catalyst by which these people can be reached.

To eradicate poverty of the body is all-important, but to feed the poverty of the mind is also important, if we are to live in a world of rule by law.

We, in America, must provide the wherewithal, for the Hebrew University can supply the manpower and the brains. All that we are being asked for is dollars, and dollars, unless put to good use, lie fallow and helpless. This, believe me, my friends, is the cheapest insurance premium we can pay for the survival of civilization.

SCURRILOUS TELEPHONE CALLS BY THE ORGANIZATION "LET FREEDOM RING"

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the news media yesterday and today have once again brought to public attention the irrational, scurrilous attacks being employed by the rightwing group called Let Freedom Ring. The current attack is against the National Congress of Parents and Teachers but for the past 3 years this same organization has used the telephone lines of the Nation to attack in the most personal and vicious manner the integrity, and the patriotism of such outstanding, loyal Americans as former Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, Chief Justice Earl Warren, and U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

Now, of course, the method used by Let Freedom Ring—which seems determined to bring hate and fear within the reach of all—is faceless, and anonymous. A voice on the telephone. Not even the written word where the inaccuracies and innuendoes can at least become apparent to reasonable people on considered reading. Just the short message over the phone, which leaves you asking what exactly was said, but with just enough of the message to cause suspicions and doubt.

Telephone officials in many parts of the country feel that there is nothing they can do under the law to regulate the use of their equipment, except in cases of overt criminal activity. But what is strange is that it is almost impossible for the individual telephone customer to find out from his local company just who rents the equipment for Let Freedom Ring broadcasts. On occasions it has even taken the press months to find out who is responsible for these messages.

The public has a right to know who sponsors these messages just as much as who publishes a newspaper or a radio or television broadcast.

I hope to be able to introduce suitable legislation before the end of the current session of Congress to deal with this situation. The public has a right to know who sponsors these messages just as much as it has a right to know who publishes a newspaper or pays for a political radio broadcast. Such persons should be accessible to public attention and to suit for slander.

Just about a year ago, I informed the Senate of the activities of this organization. At that time I said that Let Freedom Ring was plugged into the telephone systems in at least six States. Since that time, this organization has grown. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, which has filed a complaint with the Federal Communications Commission concerning Let Freedom Ring's "abusive and extremist attacks and libels on individuals and institutions," now estimates it is active in more than 30 cities.

This means, of course, that residents of these 30 cities this week can be exposed to the statement that the PTA is "basically a lobby for leftwing educators who work closely with the bureaucrats in the Office of Education to feder-

alize our schools in the Russian manner."

This use of innuendo and half-truth is an old tactic of both the Nazis and the Communists, and Americans have long consigned this type of attack when issued in the radical press or from the platform, to the oblivion it deserves. But when this sort of message is constantly repeated, in all parts of the United States simultaneously, it could do what it is designed by the propagandists to do: Cast the cloud of suspicion over the loyalty of community leaders and elected officials and doubt over the capability of our form of government to defend us from communism.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a report of the Anti-Defamation League concerning the history and activities of Let Freedom Ring, an article from this morning's Baltimore Sun on the attack on the PTA and a series of articles from Miami newspapers concerning Let Freedom Ring activities in Florida.

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

[From Facts, August 1965]

(Published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith)

"LET FREEDOM RING"

"Let Freedom Ring," a new voice of the radical right in America, whispers—in an area where so many shout raucously. It is a quiet recorded voice on the telephone, the constantly changing and always anonymous voice of a man or a woman with a 90-second sermon of fear called a "patriotic message." It can be dialed at any hour of the day or night in some 30 or more cities. For extremists it is a most promising device in their growing store of propaganda techniques.

On April 6, 1965, after the Selma to Montgomery civil rights march, a man in Baltimore, promised a revealing message, dialed a much-publicized number to hear:

"The carnival in Alabama is over and the result is increased hatred between the races, two dead, and a Constitution that is about to be ripped to shreds by a panicky Congress bowing to mob rule and White House tyranny."

A New Yorker dealing a Yukon exchange number heard a similar report. Another man in Chicago, or still another in Miami or in Southern Pines, N.C., could hear much the same thing. In each city the listener was alone and attentive, the speaker nameless but of seeming authority, the message provocative and extremist.

Let Freedom Ring, with national headquarters at Post Office Box 1775 in Sarasota, Fla., is the creation of William Campbell Douglass, M.D., a Sarasota physician who is a member of the John Birch Society. Douglass explains his operation in a mimeographed prospectus:

"Let Freedom Ring is a nonprofit corporation established to disseminate anti-Communist, anti-Socialist, pro-American broadcasts via a telephone tape recording. Your 'customer' dials a number (just like time and weather) and gets 2 minutes of anti-Communist dynamite.

"Let Freedom Ring brings to your area a hard-hitting, often shocking program that is on the air 24 hours a day. * * * You will be amazed at the frantic reaction that you will get from your enemies—they will hate it."

THE FRIGHT NETWORK

By the summer of 1965, after less than 3 years in business, Dr. Douglass' network of

telephone stations had spread to many of the major cities across the Nation. Let Freedom Ring message stations now operate in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit (which boasts 10 tape machines with 10 telephone numbers), Baltimore, Miami, Dallas, Kansas City, Indianapolis, Wichita, Sacramento, and in several cities in the Los Angeles area. In addition, there are stations in Decatur, Bedford, and Calumet City, Ill.; Jacksonville, Sarasota, and Clearwater, Fla.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Boulder, Colo.; Port Arthur, Tex.; Long Beach, Calif.; Brockton, Mass.; Summit, N.J.; Nashua, N.H.; and Southern Pines, N.C. Even as this list is compiled, a dozen additional franchise applications are pending.

Each week, each of these outlets presents a new "patriotic message" to callers in its area—each spoken calmly but so worded as to arouse suspicion, fear and anger, or the urge to enlist in organized radical right activity.

Each message continues for a minute and a half, or sometimes 2 minutes. It is recorded on tape and played automatically to anyone who dials an advertised phone number. This is done by using the Bell Telephone System's automatic announcement service equipment, an apparatus incorporating recorder, playback, and telephone connections in a single unit. This equipment can be rented from local telephone companies at costs varying from \$20 to \$45 monthly (multiple numbers and other optional devices being available). All such arrangements are made and paid for by the local Let Freedom Ring subscriber.

RADICAL RIGHTIST SCRIPTS

The automatic phone-tape service is available to anyone, is easily installed, and is cheap enough to make it an economical medium for propaganda. The scripts are supplied by Dr. Douglass—his single responsibility under the franchise agreement—and they cost the subscriber \$24 the first year, \$12 a year thereafter. The local outlet agrees to use at least 40 of the 52 scripts supplied each year. This leaves an average of one broadcast per month for the subscriber to air local issues in his immediate area.

Let Freedom Ring scripts, like most of the output of the radical right, are lurid visions of a Communist conspiracy lurking behind civil rights, the U.N., the Supreme Court, the last three U.S. Presidents, the State Department, the press, the National Council of Churches, the ACLU, the ADL, and on and on. Early in Let Freedom Ring's history—at the time of the Cuban crisis in 1962—the telephone messages from Sarasota asked:

"How long will the American people put up with treason right in the White House itself? How long before the American people demand the impeachment of John F. Kennedy?"

And more recently (January 26, 1965):
"America will soon be in a position of hopeless military inferiority to the beasts of Russia because of deliberate disarmament by traitors in the Johnson administration."

From such scripts it is easily understandable that Let Freedom Ring has been recommended by Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, as a worthwhile interest for his members. Dr. Douglass writes the Let Freedom Ring scripts, compiling his data from "intelligence reports" and other esoteric-sounding sources which he says are "not generally available." The usual Birch line is discernible in much of the material although Let Freedom Ring has on occasions unearthed a "conspiracy" the nature of which suggests that at least some of the doctor's "intelligence" has been derived from the more excited bulletins and tracts of the far-out fringe.

In his script for the week of April 28, 1964, for example, Dr. Douglass stirred some of his callers' deeper fears:

"The pro-Communist toadies within the Johnson administration must at all costs

keep the truth from the American electorate. If they win the election, they will no longer care what you think, for by 1966 America will have ceased to exist. * * * There are only three possible answers to Lyndon Johnson's criminal neglect of these problems that bear so heavily on our very survival:

"One: Ignorance * * * With our multimillion dollar intelligence establishment this would seem hardly possible.

"Two: Cowardice on the part of the President and his State Department pink ladies in striped trousers.

"Three: Treason, with the President being a captive or willing tool of the Communist conspiracy.

"Americans can no longer trust the Executive branch of our Government."

SEEDS OF DISTRUST

Such seeds of distrust have been spread by the recorded telephone voices through ever-widening circles. During the week of May 12, 1964, the unseen patriotic experts parroted the following dire warning of Mr. Douglass:

"Another fact ignored by the press is that the Communist-lining National Council of Churches is openly promoting bloodshed through armed revolution by Negroes. There is documented proof that Negroes are being armed for open revolution this summer.

"The Communists, working through their errand boys in Congress and the White House, are working feverishly to have passed a bill that will outlaw the ownership of guns by private citizens while at the same time they are urging armed rebellion by Negroes. These carefully coordinated drives are aimed at simultaneously disarming the American people and overwhelming them through Communist-controlled revolts * * * and we also urge our listeners to purchase a rifle or a pistol for home defense. We are not—we repeat—we are not promoting insurrection as does the National Council of Churches. We are merely urging you to exercise your constitutional and God-given right to protect yourself * * *"

The incitement to anti-Communist arms gathering had been buttressed by tales of a weird Government plot against such God-given rights (Let Freedom Ring broadcast in February 1964):

"At the University of Michigan a plan is being developed for the systematic house-to-house search of the entire United States for arms of any kind. The search is to be made by the U.S. Army by blocking off five States at a time, beginning in the western part of the country. The entire civilian population is to be disarmed by the end of 1965."

That horror story so incensed Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, that he queried officials of the Defense Department to establish the truth as a matter of public record. The Senator inserted the following official Department reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, 1964:

"This charge is absurd, completely false, and reflects the hallucinations of an aberrated mind."

JAVITS added an interesting note: the story appeared to have been taken bodily from the October 1963 issue of On Target, official publication of the paramilitary Minutemen organization.

William Campbell Douglass, M.D., conceived of recorded telephone messages as an unstoppable anti-Communist weapon during a long tour of active duty as a U.S. Navy doctor (1957-62). The Navy years did not dull his ideological zeal, and soon after leaving the service he set up the first station of Let Freedom Ring in Sarasota. Apparently failing to establish his organization as a common-law trust, he finally incorporated Let Freedom Ring in the State of Florida as an educational organization on July 20, 1964.

Douglass was born in Port Deposit, Md., on June 2, 1926. He graduated from Sarasota Senior High School, where he was an average student, in 1944. After years spent at many jobs in many States, Douglass entered the University of Miami Medical School, graduating in 1957. After his 5-year Navy tour he settled at 6916 Point of Rocks Road in Sarasota, where he now lives with his wife and two children.

In the reception room of Douglass' professional offices at 1812 Hillview Street, there are stacks of right wing propaganda materials which make possible, for each patient, an educational hour of waiting. These include the latest issues of the Birchite American Opinion magazine and the Dan Smoot Report, and flyers advertising the Christian Crusade radio program of Dr. Billy James Hargis.

At one time Douglass was warned to end his practice of distributing such radical rightist material to patients at the local hospital—not merely to his own patients—and he stopped doing so. He continues, however, to supply local news vendors in Sarasota with books such as John Stormer's "None Dare Call It Treason" and "The Strange Death of Marilyn Monroe" by Frank A. Capell.

Douglass is a political activist. In addition to his Birch Society membership, he is a member of the advisory board of the Conservative Society of America, the radical right political crusade headed by Kent and Phoebe Courtney of New Orleans. The Courtneys have for some years sought formation of a far right third political party, which Douglass himself sees as the ultimate answer to the crowding Red conspiracy.

THIRD PARTY ADVOCATE

When, on the last weekend of April 1965, the Courtneys rallied a "Congress of Conservatives" in Chicago to lay the foundation for a national right wing party, Dr. Douglass was listed as one of their featured speakers, along with Birch Society founder Robert Welch, former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, and Medford Evans of the White Citizens' Councils. Home from Chicago, Douglass began drawing plans for a third political party in his own State, which he hoped would offer a slate of candidates in the 1966 State elections and become the Florida unit of an eventual national third party. Late in May he held a meeting with about 300 supporters and announced formation of the Constitution Party of Florida, designed to "resurrect the hopes of anti-Communists throughout this State and the world."

To the founder of Let Freedom Ring, the greatest cause for terror in this country has been the recent chain of developments in the civil rights struggle. He has met the challenge with near hysteria. To the picture of civil anarchy etched in gunsmoke, Douglass has added the cold, contradictory vision of the air-tight police state; in February 1964, his local outlets were urged to broadcast to their callers the following alarm:

"The 'Civil Rights Act' now before the U.S. Senate, will, if passed * * * turn America into a Fascist state practically overnight * * *. No business; no church; no club, public or private, would be free of the evil smell of BOBBY KENNEDY's marshals and spies."

At another time Let Freedom Ring voices suggested to callers that "It's likely that those three civil rights workers in Mississippi were kidnapped and murdered by their own kind to drum up sympathy for their cause."

While thus stimulating baseless suspicions in propaganda for political goals, Dr. Douglass sets a lofty image for his telephone network, particularly in statements to the press. In January 1965, he said of Let Freedom Ring: "We want to keep it on a high level—out of the hands of racists, for example." Yet in his script of May 12, 1964, in describing a supposed "secret Negro army," the doc-

tor had cited, as a reference. The Councillor, an openly racist weekly published in Shreveport by the Citizens' Council of Louisiana, Inc.

Like many of the radical right's propagandists, Douglass has often been wildly inconsistent in his assaults. In a press release issued in August 1963, for example, he argued that "the Communist Party is tickled to death with our playboy President"—and then, barely 4 months later, he could find reason to pin that same President's murder on "the internal Communist conspiracy." The effects of a telephone message are often lasting, its facts easily forgotten.

THE BIRCH LINKS

The slant, the novelty, and the unique possibilities of Let Freedom Ring have had a natural appeal for people in the John Birch Society as a tool for education and recruitment. The operations of the two organizations have been connected at many stations along Douglass' network, and the alliance has been advantageous to them and to him.

Let Freedom Ring scripts have recommended Robert Welch's American Opinion magazine as well as his book, *The Politician* ("to fully understand the perfidy and deceit of Dwight Eisenhower"). In the Birch Society's Bulletin of March 1965, Welch wrote that Let Freedom Ring "has been catching on quite well, spreading gradually, and transmitting some very worthwhile messages"—and he added that Dr. Douglass "will welcome your inquiry."

The Decatur, Ill., Let Freedom Ring station is sponsored by Freedom House, a right-wing bookstore run by members of the Birch Society.

In Philadelphia, callers are told to send money to a certain post office box for printed copies of the weekly messages. The Philadelphia Inquirer of August 15, 1964, reported that Paul Corbett, a Birch Society "section leader," had rented the box in question. A check mailed to this outlet as a contribution was endorsed by the local American Opinion bookstore.

In the Los Angeles area, a saleslady at an American Opinion Library, which sponsors one of the local Let Freedom Ring outlets, told reporter Paul Coates of the Los Angeles Times that funds for the phone operation had been "donated by a John Birch chapter in North Hollywood."

The box number of Let Freedom Ring's Miami station (Box 21, Miami Shores) was formerly listed under the name of the John Birch Society.

The Summit, N.J., Let Freedom Ring address (P.O. Box 715) is that of an American Opinion Library there. Summit's telephone equipment stands in the 40-foot finished basement in the home of Dr. Forster G. Ruhl, an active local John Birch Society member. Next to Ruhl's Let Freedom Ring phone equipment stands an almost duplicate set of equipment which, using a different phone number, send John Birch Society recruiting messages to its callers.

When telephone use of a Let Freedom Ring tape was halted by officials of the Pacific Telephone Co., in Canoga Park, Calif., after many serious complaints, the American Opinion Bookshop (which ran Canoga Park's Let Freedom Ring operation) was represented in conversations with the telephone company by John Rousselot, national relations director of the John Birch Society.

When Dr. William C. Douglass himself was asked in a letter (quoted in Let Freedom Ring's script for December 17, 1963) about the best source of anti-Communist information, Douglass replied: "We suggest . . . 'A World Gone Crazy' which can be obtained for \$1 from American Opinion, Belmont, that's B-e-l-m-o-n-t, Belmont 78, Mass."

EVALUATION

Let Freedom Ring services the radical right, from its isolated ax-grinders to its largest

national membership organization, with a weekly propaganda scare available around the clock. This, as Dr. Douglass has pointed out, makes the Let Freedom Ring message a broadcast schedule at the callers convenience—and it is one with a personal and therefore more persuasive touch. Moreover, the telephone message is a quick exhortation which is just as quickly finished, affording the caller no chance for rereading or analysis. This allows the use of some of the bluntest of propaganda tricks. On May 23, 1965, for example, Dr. Douglass' script read, in part:

"Under the provisions of the Civil Rights Act, a convicted rapist applying for a job in a girl's school could file suit against the school if they requested a picture with his application. . . . Does this sound crazy?"

Crazy, no—but clever, perhaps, in that the caller has no time to evaluate the words spoken to him so quickly and in so sincere a voice. He hangs up—the Let Freedom Ring equipment has an automatic cutoff, anyway—and all that remains is the image of a rapist roaming the corridors of a girls' school, plus the seeds of confusion and hate.

A further element of Let Freedom Ring appeal lies in the fact that the subscriber's name and address can often remain a secret, buried in the telephone company's files. His number, though widely publicized, is technically an unlisted one, its holder therefore a legitimate albeit hypocritical claimant to anonymity—and the ironic "privacy" of telephone messages—insulates the local Let Freedom Ring sponsor against personal responsibility. (Contrast this to the identification and responsibility demanded of publishers and broadcasters.) Let Freedom Rings' nameless voices change from week to week, spreading messages of fright and suspicion that no individual person need answer for.

The question of responsibility nettles many who are concerned about the use of a public communications medium for the spreading of hate. Can nothing be done? The telephone companies, passive but unquestionably unwilling partners in Dr. Douglass' operation, have pointed to the dilemma posed by the question of civil liberties. Their position has been succinctly stated by the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania in a letter to the city of Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations:

"1. It is the duty of the telephone company to furnish services and facilities to anyone who will use the service in a lawful manner. . . . The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has made it clear that public utilities are not censors. . . ."

"2. Automatic announcement service is a regular telephone service which is available to any customers. . . . A user of automatic announcement service determines for himself the content of the messages handled by the service.

"3. Regardless of its views on the contents of recorded messages, the telephone company is prohibited from interfering with the lawful exercise of a customer's right of free speech."

Bell System officials have pointed out that public utilities are prohibited under Federal statutes from discriminating—i.e., in offering preferential service or in withholding services at will—and further, that they are forbidden to censor or even to monitor private calls. True, the telephone company may intervene in the case of messages which violate criminal laws (e.g., bookmaking operations or obscene calls) when requested to do so by police agencies. Various courts have held, moreover, that the company may act when it has reasonable cause to believe that the telephone is being used for illegal purposes, even without a specific police request. The crucial difficulty is in proving an "illegal" purpose.

In the present case, this would necessitate a reasonable cause for belief that the material of Let Freedom Ring's tapes constitutes

criminal libel. Telephone officials are hesitant to admit that such reasonable cause exists. Mindful that evidence of criminal libel must usually show a tendency to create a breach of the peace, and fully aware that the courts extend the broadest protection to freedom of speech, these company officials say that they would take action only if advised by law enforcement agencies of the existence of criminal libel in specific cases.

One remedial suggestion that has been offered is to extend to this type of telephonic public announcements the Federal Communications Commission's regulations which are applicable to radio and television broadcasting. Such controls, thoroughly tested and upheld in the courts, provide for a certain degree of Federal control under license requirements to maintain "standards of public convenience, interest, and necessity." Is there not, in the telephone company's automatic announcement service, a potential that is profoundly similar to that of a radio station—in that such service provides for the increasingly public use of a public communications medium? The promoter so believes since he speaks of "broadcasts via a telephone tape recording" and of a "program that is 'on the air' 24 hours a day."

The telephone company's answer is that phone messages reach only those persons who wish to hear them, thus limiting the broadcast nature of Dr. Douglass' programs and negating any tendency on the part of those broadcasts to create a general breach of the peace. (But no one is forced to listen to radio or TV broadcasts either.)

Such arguments, of course, would not invalidate suggestions of the possible need for new Federal legislation—or for a whole new approach, considering the expanding electronic possibilities in the area of telephone communications. For such arguments do not answer the possibility that wide publicity and advertising of the appropriate phone numbers have given the anonymous broadcasters of Let Freedom Ring a greater daily audience in some cities than many a radio news broadcast. Here, the case for privacy may indeed be a shaky one.

Dr. Douglass feels confident, from seeing the recent impact of his operation on various key cities, that Let Freedom Ring cannot be stopped and that it will become one of the major rightwing influences within the next 2 years.

"You will be amazed at the influence that you have on public opinion almost immediately," he states in his prospectus. "Last year, for instance, we were given credit for having killed the UNICEF Christmas Card drive locally—an accomplishment of which we are very proud."

Against the doctor's pride stands a growing indignation among persons and organizations who recognize the perils inherent in the "Let Freedom Ring" technique, which Senator JAVITS has called a pushbutton approach to mass libel.

JAVITS warned in the Senate on October 2, 1964, that the Douglass network was a nationwide organization not run by professionals but by enthusiastic amateurs and apparently inaugurated and dedicated to bringing hate and fear within the reach of all.

The usually conservative California Federation of Republican Women, on May 13, 1965, adopted a resolution calling Let Freedom Ring's messages "false and treacherous propaganda" and asked the FBI to look into the "origin, sponsorship, and objectives of this vicious activity." (The federation had been particularly angered by a Let Freedom Ring script labeling General Eisenhower "pro-Communist" and accusing the former President of having attended a meeting at which he supposedly had joined in a discussion on "the best way to surrender you and your family to the Reds.")

The question of free speech is bound to arise in any discussion of Let Freedom Ring's gross misuses of public utilities. It is noteworthy, then, that a strong statement on the issue of Dr. Douglass' operation has been broadcast by a leading radio station, for broadcasters certainly have a special interest in the preservation of freedom in communications. WCAU, an important radio voice in Philadelphia, has stated:

"WCAU believes that such hate messages * * * are feeding the fires of race hatred and possible violence. And we call upon all decent people to renounce such tactics * * *"

Upon all decent people. Here is where the matter most obviously will rest, as so often it does in a free society—a society whose concept of liberty is broad enough to allow for its own abuse.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 24, 1965]
PHONE CALLS SMEAR PTA, LEADER SAYS—
LET FREEDOM RING IS CALLED IRRATIONAL
AND VICIOUS ATTACKER

CHICAGO, September 23.—The president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers said today the organization is the object of scurrilous attacks from an unidentified source.

Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, the PTA president, said the attacks, which she characterized as similar to "Communist smear tactics," emanate from a recorded anonymous message played from telephones in Chicago, Detroit, Indianapolis, Des Moines and other cities.

Heard in Chicago, the recording describes the PTA as "basically a lobby for left-wing educators who work closely with the bureaucrats in the (United States) Office of Education to federalize our schools in the Russian manner."

IMPLICATION CALLED VICIOUS

"To imply that the PTA works 'to federalize our schools in the Russian manner' is vicious, untrue and irrational," Mrs. Moorhead said in a statement. "What's more, this venomous strategy smacks of Communist smear tactics so abhorrent to every loyal American."

Mrs. Moorhead said she had protested to Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., regarding the use of company equipment "to attack an organization that has devoted itself so effectively for 68 years to securing for every American child the highest advantages in physical, mental, social and spiritual education."

The message is broadcast by the organization called Let Freedom Ring. It closes its 1-minute message by urging callers to write to a Sarasota, Fla., box number for anti-PTA literature.

Mrs. Moorhead said both the box number and the telephone listings are anonymous.

Let Freedom Ring was founded 3 years ago in Sarasota by Dr. William C. Douglass, a 39-year-old general practitioner and former Navy flight surgeon.

AWAKENING SOUGHT

Its purpose, Dr. Douglass says, "is to awaken Americans to the extreme danger of communism within and without."

Senator JAVITS, Republican of New York, the object of a Let Freedom Ring recording a year ago, charged on the Senate floor that the organization was a radical rightwing group spreading suspicion, hate and invective.

Douglass replied, "Mr. JAVITS always calls any group effectively fighting communism a radical rightwing group. That's standard procedure for liberals in both parties."

In New York, a spokesman for the Bell Telephone Co. said State laws regulating public utilities do not permit the company to take any action against such telephone subscriber, but added:

"We are taking steps to make it possible to provide the names of sponsors of these

anonymous services when we are asked for them."

[From the Miami News]

A VIEW OF THE NEWS—RING OF THE RADICALS
(By Jack Kasewitz)

The recent attack on the U.S. Peace Corps by the Let Freedom Ring telephone network comes as no surprise to those who have closely watched this rightwing propaganda machine.

In more than 30 cities, one only has to dial a telephone number (Miami's CA 1-6767) to hear an anti-Communist, anti-Socialist, pro-American tape recording which generally is either attacking the United Nations, the civil rights movement, the Supreme Court, the State Department, Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, or Eisenhower, the newspapers, National Council of Churches, American Civil Liberties Union, and/or the Anti-Defamation League.

Let Freedom Ring is the idea of a Sarasota doctor, William C. Douglass who says, "A lot of people are listening to us" after only 3 years of operation. The radical right line sees a Communist conspiracy in the pulpit, the school, and the libraries. Therefore, it is not surprising that Robert Welch, founder of the John Birch Society, recommended Let Freedom Ring to his followers.

HALLUCINATIONS

One message of Let Freedom Ring bears repeating to illustrate the line of the far-out paramilitary groups also associated with Dr. Douglass' efforts. The telephone listener was told:

"At the University of Michigan a plan is being developed for the systematic house-to-house search of the entire United States for arms of any kind. The search is to be made by the U.S. Army by blocking off five States at a time, beginning in the western part of the country. The entire civilian population is to be disarmed by the end of 1965."

Senator JACOB JAVITS, the New York Republican, was so angered he asked the Defense Department to establish the truth as a matter of public record. This reply was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"This charge is absurd, completely false, and reflects the hallucinations of an aberrated mind."

The Michigan story, Senator JAVITS discovered, was derived almost verbatim from an issue of On Target, official publication of the radical Minutemen organization. The Senator went on to warn:

"Let Freedom Ring is a nationwide organization not run by professionals but by enthusiastic amateurs and apparently inaugurated and dedicated to bringing hate and fear within the reach of all."

A THIRD PARTY

Dr. Douglass is a member of the board of the Conservative Society of America, political crusade headed by Kent and Phoebe Courtney of New Orleans. Dr. Douglass was a speaker at the recent less than successful congress of conservatives convention in Chicago, and designed to offer the foundation for a national rightwing party.

The doctor is hoping to start a third political party in Florida which would select a slate of candidates in the 1966 State elections. All he needs to do is to find 7,500 registered voters who will admit they are followers of the radical right and sign his petitions to create a new faction.

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 6, 1965]
TELEPHONE MESSAGE—FAR RIGHT "VOICE"
RAPS PEACE CORPS
(By Miller Davis)

A South Dade telephone number that offers uncharitable opinions about the Peace Corps and the State Department is plugged into a national network of way-out rightists, the FBI disclosed Sunday.

The program is "Let Freedom Ring." The Dade number is CA 1-6767. It is usually busy.

It is sponsored by a 39-year-old Navy man turned doctor who lives in Sarasota and says he sees Communists coming out of the woodwork in 45 U.S. cities.

"I have no apologies about this," says Dr. William Campbell Douglass, founder of the "Let Freedom Ring" broadcasts. "A lot of people are listening to us."

A lot of people in Miami are dialing the home of friendly locksmith L. T. Gacek, 8541 Southwest Third Terrace, where the telephone company reports the recordings originate.

Gacek said the "number won't be here much longer" and referred a reporter to Sarasota and Dr. Douglass.

Beginning with, "This Is Let Freedom Ring," the taped message launches immediately into the theme, "The Peace Corps Tragedy."

"One gets the uneasy feeling," the carefully modulated male voice goes on, "that the Peace Corps is something akin to the Hitler Youth Movement with a Communist twist. It is a taxpayer-financed anti-American, brain-washing operation for American youth."

Pause:

"Peace corpsmen are engaged in open treason in the Dominican Republic, aiding the rebel Communists who are killing U.S. marines."

"Yet no one in the Peace Corps has been tried for treason, and Sargent Shriver (Corps Director) has not been fired for incompetence."

The recording charges Syracuse University in New York with harboring a leader of African terrorists groups who is indoctrinating Peace Corps students there. It identified him as Euardo Montaigne.

It accuses a Peace Corps adviser, the Reverend James H. Robinson, of "10 Communist-front affiliations," and says a Congressman asked that Robinson be removed. Shriver ignored the demand the message says.

The tape concludes with the apparently irrelevant observation that the State Department made very little effort to hide its involvement in the Berkeley (University of California) riots.

The Let Freedom Ring phone number in Dade County appears from time to time in newspaper ads and pops up on bulletin boards, on some churches, civic clubs and even in an occasional police station.

An FBI spokesman in Washington Sunday identified the recordings as originating in Omaha, with wide distribution in major cities.

The spokesman described the group as "extreme rightwing," adding that, "We're aware of what they're doing." He did not elaborate.

Peace Corps Director of Public Affairs Donovan McClure said his office became aware of the national character of the organization when telephone calls from "Denver, Baltimore and other places" began flooding Corps switchboards in Washington.

"Many were corps parents, frightened after hearing the messages, and wanting to know what they are about," McClure said.

McClure added, "Radio Moscow and Peiping have been labeling the Peace Corps capitalist imperialism, for some time."

"But this is the first time we've been called Communists," he said.

Joseph Reap, a State Department information officer, said, "I can't figure out what they mean, about the University of California riots. The State Department had nothing to do with the rioting. What possibly could they mean?"

The occupants of the home from where the freedom messages originate were not at home Sunday, and neighbors were unaware of the voice in their block.

[From the Miami News, Sept. 15, 1965]
**FCC CRACKING DOWN—ANONYMOUS PHONE
 SETUPS RAPPED**

(By Louise Blanchard)

Federal Communications Commission attorneys, prompted by questions raised here, are seeking a way to regulate anonymous recorded telephone messages.

They will attempt to find a legal way to make available the identities of local sponsors of such messages, if the messages discuss public issues or attack individuals, groups, or institutions.

The idea is that the sponsors—like newspapers, magazines, and radio and television stations—should be identifiable to sue for libel if the recorded messages justify such a suit.

Miami is one of about 30 cities where it is possible to dial a telephone number and get a recorded right-wing message.

Dr. William Campbell Douglass, Sarasota physician who furnishes the Let Freedom Ring messages, is a member of the rightist John Birch Society.

Harry P. Cain of Miami, former Republican Senator from Washington, raised the question with the FCC after an anonymous recorded telephone message here attacked the University of Miami.

Senator Cain said the attack on the university "was cowardly, scurrilous, distorted, misleading, and inaccurate" and that it made him so angry he talked to FCC Chairman E. William Henry.

"I posed this question," Senator Cain said: "Is there or should there be an opportunity for slander and libel by telephone that is not tolerated or possible on radio or television?"

John F. Cushman, Henry's administrative assistant, said in Washington today:

"We're going to do what we can. Our authority is questionable under present law. We have relatively little jurisdiction over telephone calls within a State."

Cushman said FCC attorneys are conferring with officials of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. and that they are working to determine what kind of legislation would be needed to deal with the problem.

"If it can't be corrected administratively," Senator Cain added, "I have been strongly led to believe that many Senators would view with favor any legislation that does not seek to prevent what a person wants to say but does seek to make certain that person can be held legally responsible for what he says."

He said he has discussed the problem with half a dozen Senators who would support such legislation.

In New York City, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has filed a formal complaint with the FCC against "the use of anonymous recorded telephone messages for abusive and extremist attacks and libels on individuals and institutions."

The ADL's general counsel, Arnold Forster, said the organization wants to correct a legal situation that gives libel victims "little chance to seek redress."

In Miami, this week's message accused the National Council of Churches of being "Communist-dominated." It suggested that listeners mail 25 cents to a Miami Shores post office box for a publication called "The NCC Story." Postal authorities refused to identify the renter of the box.

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

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

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield, without losing my right to the floor, to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on the adoption of the conference report, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, I yield to no one in the extent to which I fought, in committee, on the Senate floor, and in the conference, for the very things which other Senators have raised in their extremely valid objections to the omissions in the conference report.

I pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who stood fast to his position, whose heart is as big as that of any other Senator, and who, in the final analysis, in the best of conscience, felt that he could not—much as he felt for those who are affected by the program—sign the conference report. Although I came to a contrary conclusion, I wish to affirm the seriousness with which he regarded the decision, and the pain and reluctance he felt when he found he just could not go along. I respect and honor that kind of intellectual integrity.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from New York for his kind words. The Senator from New York fought by my side throughout the efforts to make changes which we believed were desirable. I appreciate his cooperation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I made a special trip here because I knew the roll would be called on this question, and I felt it my duty to lay before the Senate the considerations which induced me to take a somewhat different road and at the same time to pay tribute to those who did not take that road but who, I believe, had valid reasons for so doing.

The issues involved in this matter are four: First, the improvidence of the program; second, the effort to immunize it from political handling, namely, the Hatch Act provisions; third, the effort to introduce public scrutiny through a more independent National Advisory Council; and fourth, the Governor's veto provision. I should like to address myself, briefly, to each of these subjects.

First, as to the improvidence of the program, there is no question that there are improvidences that have continued; that they have been severe; and that, notwithstanding notice, they have not been adequately dealt with.

The whole question is: What is the weight of the evidence? What is the preponderance of the evidence? Is there enough evidence of improvidence to re-

quire that the program be stricken down? That becomes a question of judgment and factual evaluation. I came to the conclusion that there was not such evidence. I could readily understand how someone else might come to the conclusion that there was. But there is no question whatever that there is improvidence, misuse, abuse, and stupidity in the program.

This is a very widespread program, probably one of the largest scale direct aid programs that the country has ever had. Six million eight hundred thousand families, whose annual income is less than \$3,000 a year, are affected. Another 5.3 million individuals, not in families, are also in that income bracket. The total of persons potentially affected by the program is 34.3 million.

The latter figure is enough of an indication of the scope of this program to show that there is plenty of room for difficulties, improvidences, excesses, frauds, and so on, still to leave a great deal that is being done and needs to be done.

I point out—and this information is based on the Senate report—that if we add up the number of people who are directly affected by the first year's work, including the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, work study, community action, adult basic education, rural loans, migrants, and work experience, the total, in round figures, is 1,300,000. When we consider the Head Start program, which has been so widely advertised—and I think quite properly so—with preschool opportunities for well over half a million children, many of whom are children of working mothers, and when we consider the programs which has taken so many youths off the streets, reaching almost 280,000, we become impressed with the magnitude of what we are about.

I believe, with all due respect, that almost every American must glow with pride that we at least have a nation on earth which can, without looking ridiculous, undertake to fight a war to eliminate poverty. We have the productive power and economic resources and spirit of national sacrifice and the national will to make an effort which has probably never been made on this earth by any government.

I am very proud of our having undertaken that effort, whatever comes of it. I believe that every American ought to feel the same way.

I should like to give one other instance which I think is rather important, to be balanced against the improvidence in the program; I will not try to draw too much of a conclusion, but still I believe it is a legitimate point. In New York City, which is a racial tinderbox, we had riots in 1964, as everybody knows. I believe that, in part because so many youths were taken off the streets and put to work, we did not have such trouble in 1965.

I am sad that that same was not true in Los Angeles. I do not know whether the program would have helped a bit there. However, I am sorry that it was not true there, so that we might have seen whether this program would help.

I can affirm that it helped materially in New York City when it was tried.

I realize that, like a war—and this has some of the aspects of a war—all is confusion in such a field of activity. We are dealing with people who have been denied an appreciation of opportunities which should have been available to them for so many years, and in some cases for generations. We must expect at least confusion, let alone a lack of appreciation and cooperation. Yet, everyone who has worked on the poverty program—and I know hundreds of distinguished social scientists and doctors and case workers—is proud of the degree of cooperation and resources which are found among the poor when we begin to open the doors of opportunity in a very appreciable way.

As one who has worked in philanthropy in the most ardent way, it is clear to me that our effort has not been sufficient to meet the present needs. I am active in an organization in New York which raises over \$100 million a year for hospitals, homes, and community action efforts very much like these. It has been engaged in this effort for years. It is the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. It is operated probably as well as any organization anywhere in the world on a local level. However, the effort is not enough. We have had and continue to have an endemic poor population of 30,000 or 40,000 families in the New York area, which experience most of the narcotics addiction, the crime, the degradation, and the denigration of the entire society in which they live. This situation is attributable to the fact that these families are endemically poor.

Mr. President, while accepting the improvidence of the program in so many areas, I must affirm that the weight of the evidence so far is in favor of continuing, rather than discontinuing this noble—and I use that word advisedly—and historic effort of which no nation on earth was capable, in my judgment, until the United States came along.

It is the duty of my colleagues and it is my duty to unearth every instance of improvidence and foolishness and dishonesty, and to endeavor to correct it. This is the function of legislative oversight. I know and everybody else knows that if the administration is not agile and quick and active on that score, the program will go down the drain because the weight of the evidence will turn in the other direction.

This is merely the second year, and already there is great promise, but there is also great difficulty. I believe that, so far, the weight of the evidence is on the side of the maintenance of the program.

Mr. President, the amount involved is \$1.785 billion. We arrived at this amount in conference. It is a great deal of money in itself, but it is not a great deal of money when considered in proportion to the program. I am satisfied that it is not lush, and that, if it is well administered, it can be tremendously effective.

I point out, in answer to the arguments made against this figure, that

even the Senate figure was \$1.65 billion. When one gets up into that range, an increase of approximately 10 percent—which is what we have come back to the Senate with—does not change the order of magnitude. The result is approximately a split between the House and Senate figures. It is approximately the order of magnitude of the bill which was reported to and passed by the Senate. I do not believe that we can condemn the program on that ground.

Mr. President, the next issue concerns the Hatch Act. I am highly sympathetic to the criticism of the conference report in that regard. I do not agree at all with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Macy, who wrote to the conferees on this subject. I think very highly of Mr. Macy, but I do not agree with him at all in this particular case.

I believe that there is the danger of political abuse of the poverty program by workers who receive their principal salary from the Federal Government, though they work for local organizations. I believe that the Hatch Act provision, authored by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], was a very intelligent way in which to approach the matter.

I believe that the Senate committee and the Senate as a whole were absolutely correct in going along with the amendment of the Senator from California. I believe that the conference committee should have gone along with this amendment. I believe that that was the correct thing to do and a very wise thing. It would have saved us much trouble in the future.

However, this is a bicameral national legislature. I participated in the conference, as did the chairman, who is present in the Chamber at this time, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA]. We were faced with a hard-rock situation. If we wanted the poverty program, we could not have the Hatch Act provision. I believe there are other provisions in the bill concerning which the Senate would have acted in exactly the same manner and said, "if you want the program, you will have to go along with us on these particular matters."

Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with my colleagues on that subject. We had to decide in that conference whether we did or did not want the program.

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

Mr. JAVITS. May I just finish my thought? I believe the Senator will then find his observation to be more pertinent.

If I had felt that we were wrong in this respect, I would have voted against the conference report and I would be here now advocating a vote against it. However, I believe that the power of legislative oversight by a committee such as ours is so great that we can haul in anybody in the country at any time. I believe that the disposition of our committee is clear. We said so in our report to the Senate on this bill, that we can bring in anyone from anywhere in the country

when we have the remotest glimmer of suspicion that there is political abuse of the program.

I feel that that is, for the moment, not satisfactory, but at least a way in which to approach a solution to the problem. That is the reason why I felt that we had to go along.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, relating to what the Senator just said concerning the fact that, if we wanted a poverty program, we must eliminate the Hatch Act supervision over what might be political activities of workers engaged in administering the program, why would the opponents of the application of the Hatch Act provisions advocate its elimination?

Mr. JAVITS. The opponents said that the Hatch Act was designed to deal only with government employees, either Federal or State or local, who draw the preponderant parts of their salaries from the Federal Government. They refused to extend it to private persons and private agencies, notwithstanding the fact—and I believe our position is absolutely correct on this—that in this case, the private agency becomes a governmental means, and therefore acquires a governmental character. The Hatch Act should reach those employees; I do not think there is any question about it.

The most we could get out of them was the provision contained in the conference report, which reads as follows:

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

The Senate amendment contained provisions, which had no counterpart in the House bill, relating to the application of the Hatch Political Activities Act to persons employed by agencies administering or carrying on community action programs and to persons serving in the VISTA volunteers.

The managers on the part of the House wish to make it clear that their insistence on the exclusion of these provisions was based upon the difficulty of applying the existing statutory restrictions to organizations and agencies for which they were not designed. They in no way intend to depart from the principle that these programs must be conducted on a nonpolitical basis, free of any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That principle can be declared, but the fact remains that the law now provides that employees of volunteer nongovernmental agencies, though paid in part by Federal money, shall be free to engage in political activity.

Mr. JAVITS. It certainly does. To make it even stronger for the Senator, we did not even attempt in the Senate to extend the Hatch Act to those "paid in part by Federal money." We provided that it applied only where the preponderant part of their compensation came from Federal money. We were very careful and very restrictive about it, and yet we could not get anywhere even with that. They were adamant.

The question then was, "Shall we let that be the rock upon which we crash, or not?" As I say, it was my feeling, and apparently that of the majority of the conferees, that it should not be the rock on which we failed to get a report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. The next point to which I address myself is the National Advisory Council.

Here again, in my judgment, our case is irrefutable. There is an Advisory Council in the poverty program today, but it is absolutely ridiculous. It meets only at the request of the Director. It reports to the Director only upon matters upon which he asks it to report. It is as powerless, weak, and ineffective an advisory committee as I have ever seen provided by any statute. I can hardly believe we turned this bill out in the first place with that kind of provision.

We tried to get a stronger Advisory Council, which our committee and the Senate had agreed to. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] knows, we tried constantly in conference and could not get to first base with it, because the attitude of the conferees from the House was, "You do not need an Advisory Council. You can always haul them up here. You have two legislative committees, and you can examine them to your heart's content."

Again, it was a question of deciding whether this was the rock upon which we break. I decided one way, Senator PROUTY decided another. Only the Lord knows who is right.

Finally, the Governor's veto. Here, as has been said time and again, I think it is fair to say that the Senate feeling was evenly divided on whether or not to have a veto. But I certainly feel that a majority of Senators wanted the Governor to have a strong voice in the matter. Personally, I was disappointed, and I think it was only because of the legislative situation, that the bill was sent to conference without at least the House provision, plus a provision for hearings. I think that, at the least, was the majority sentiment in the Senate. Nonetheless, it was sent with only the provision for hearings. On the first conference, the House did not insist, and hence the Senate provision prevailed. But when the measure went from conference to the House, it voted affirmatively for the conditional veto which it had written into the bill, and that is the way conference went.

I point out that we have firmed that up somewhat by affording public hearings to those who would complain about the fact that a Governor is seeking to veto a provision, and to the Governor himself. I call to the attention of the Senate the express provision in the report of the managers for the House, found at page 10 of the conference report, which says:

The conferees expect that the procedures established by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under section 209 (a) will include provision for informal hearings held by the Director at the request of the Governor of a State or other interested parties.

The 30-day stay which a Governor can obtain is retained in the bill absolutely, and I honestly believe that on the Governor's veto, we have come as close to a consensus as is possible. The Governor is entitled to such opportunity and such authority, and I think, within reason, we have retained it.

Finally, we have also retained adequate publicity in the community action program, including hearings for those who are denied participation at the city-wide level. We have retained a channel for desirable programs to go directly to the director for funding if their proponents feel aggrieved by denial at the city-wide level. And we have provided for greater coordination with cooperative State agencies throughout the planning and administration processes. I believe that in every other respect which I have mentioned, the bill is a sound one.

In my judgment, the weight of the evidence so far, notwithstanding all the things which have been said about this program—with many of which I agree—is that we should continue it in the form in which it is outlined in the conference report. As one Senator who signed the report with grave concern, I pledge myself to join others who have reservations to exercise the most scrupulous care in terms of legislative oversight, to assure that our fears—many of which have been realized—are dealt with in the work of our committee, and in its scrutiny of what is done by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I close by expressing the hope that the President, at long last, may decide to take Sargent Shriver off his two jobs, namely, the Peace Corps and the poverty program, and put him on the poverty program alone. That, too, would give us some measure of assurance that every effort is being made to see that the job is well done.

Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. And may I suggest that attachés on both sides call their Senators and ask them to be present.

Mr. PROUTY. And explain to them that a vote will occur very soon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Poverty and Politics," written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak and published in the Washington Post on Sunday, August 22, 1965.

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

POVERTY AND POLITICS—ADMINISTRATION SOUGHT TO BEAT BAN ON POLITICS IN SPIE OF CONTRARY PUBLIC COMMENTS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

In conflict with public utterances that it wants the poverty program divorced from politics, the Johnson administration attempted a futile fight against such a prohibition.

The poverty bill passed last week by the Senate puts all local poverty workers under the Hatch Act. That means Federal law—not merely agency regulations—will bar local poverty officials from partisan politics.

This amendment to the Poverty Act, sponsored by Senator GEORGE MURPHY, Republican, of California, zipped through the Senate Labor Committee and the Senate itself without apparent opposition.

Behind the scenes, however, two Democratic Labor Committee members were asked privately by the White House to kill the Murphy amendment. One was summoned from a Labor Committee meeting by an urgent telephone request.

Although they usually follow the administration line, the two Senators turned down the White House. They actively supported the Murphy amendment. Consequently, the White House made no public fight.

What makes this particularly interesting are public utterances of poverty chief Sargent Shriver and other officials when confronted with examples of local poverty workers playing politics (including the case we reported of a Philadelphia antipoverty leader lobbying in Harrisburg).

These Federal officials said they would prevent such conduct if Congress would write a prohibition into law.

Hence, the administration's veiled effort to block the prohibition comes as a surprise.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have a short item which I think is of interest in connection with the debate we are having today. It is a news ticker item, and reads as follows:

News conference, 11 a.m.: Three Job Corpsmen joining the private business firm of the Mechanical and Engineering Service Division, Consolidated American, suite 200, 1726 M Street NW. Subject: These are reported to be the first Corps trainees to go to work outside. Press contact: W. C. Hobbs, 659-1990.

This is ironic. The organization has been in operation for about a year. I do not know how many people have gone to Job Corps camps, but I believe they number in the hundreds, if not in the thousands.

Finally, three Job Corpsmen, in a great publicity announcement, are going to get a job with a private business firm, after having had some Job Corps training.

THE WAR ON POVERTY IS NOW FREE FROM THE TYRANNY OF THE GOVERNOR'S VETO

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as one of the Senate conferees with the House on the 1965 antipoverty law, I wish to note that the bill as finally agreed upon effectively curtails the power of Governors to frustrate the purposes of the war on poverty.

Under the new law the Governor of a State will have 30 days in which to study a Neighborhood Youth Corps, community action program, or adult basic education program. If he vetoes a project, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity will reconsider the application, and if he finds it to be consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of the war on poverty, he shall override the Governor's veto and the project will go forward.

In other words, under this bill the Director of OEO can veto the Governor's veto. A Governor no longer has a final veto. He can delay but he cannot kill or destroy a program, as he could under the old law.

While most Governors in the Nation cooperated with and supported the anti-poverty program so well that no curtailment of the Governor's veto power would have been thought of or necessary, a few Governors in the United States vetoed projects, or held them up, or purged participants under the threat of a complete veto. It was the crippling actions of a few Governors which have caused this veto power to be taken away from the Governors of all 50 States, most of whom did not misuse this power.

A few Governors have used veto power to cut wages down on projects, to purge people they did not like from serving on local boards on projects, and in one extreme to absolutely veto an 11-county rural anti-poverty project, said to be the best planned rural anti-poverty project in America. It was such irresponsible action that forced me to devote much time to aid in eliminating the Governor's unrestricted veto over poverty projects, which has now been done.

This anti-poverty bill, by ending irresponsible and unreviewable Governor's vetoes, and making every such veto subject to administrative review in Washington, has greatly strengthened this anti-poverty law.

We are now entering the second year of the war on poverty. The first year of our campaign has produced good results, considering the unique nature of what we are attempting to do here, and the shortness of time available. But weaknesses have become apparent. If we can correct these, and if those who administer the program will go forward with dedication and imagination, willing to try new things, as I know many of them already are, this program can make a great contribution to the continuing American revolution, which has always stood for justice and equal opportunity for all Americans.

AMENDMENT OF CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1766) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Secretary is also authorized to make or insure loans to associations, including corporations not operated for profit, and public and quasi-public agencies to provide for the application or establishment of soil conservation practices, shifts in land use, the conservation, development, use, and control

of water, and the installation or improvement of drainage or waste disposal facilities, and recreational developments, all primarily serving farmers, ranchers, farm tenants, farm laborers, and other rural residents, and to furnish financial assistance or other aid in planning projects for such purposes.

"(2) The Secretary is authorized to make grants aggregating not to exceed \$50,000,000 in any fiscal year to such associations to finance specific projects for works for the development, storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water or the collection, treatment, or disposal of waste in rural areas. The amount of any grant made under the authority of this paragraph shall not exceed 50 per centum of the development cost of the project to serve the area which the association determines can be feasibly served by the facility and to adequately serve the reasonably foreseeable growth needs of the area.

"(3) No grant shall be made under paragraph 2 of this subsection in connection with any facility unless the Secretary determines that the project (i) will serve a rural area which is not likely to decline in population below that for which the facility was designed, (ii) is designed and constructed so that adequate capacity will be or can be made available to serve the present population of the area to the extent feasible and to serve the reasonably foreseeable growth needs of the area, or (iii) is necessary for orderly community development consistent with a comprehensive community water or sewer development plan of the rural area and not inconsistent with any planned development under State, county, or municipal plans approved as official plans by competent authority for the area in which the rural community is located and the Secretary shall establish regulations requiring the submission of all applications for financial assistance under this Act to the county or municipal government in which the proposed project is to be located for review and comment by such agency within a designated period of time. Until October 1, 1968, the Secretary may make grants prior to the completion of the comprehensive plan, if the preparation of such plan has been undertaken for the area.

"(4) a. The term 'development cost' means the cost of construction of a facility and the land, easements, and rights-of-way, and water rights necessary to the construction and operation of the facility.

"(b) The term 'project' shall include facilities providing central service or facilities serving individual properties, or both.

"(5) No loan or grant shall be made under this subsection which would cause the unpaid principal indebtedness of any association under this Act and under the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended, together with the amount of any assistance in the form of a grant to exceed \$4,000,000 at any one time.

"(6) The Secretary may make grants aggregating not to exceed \$5,000,000 in any fiscal year to public bodies or such other agencies as the Secretary may determine having authority to prepare official comprehensive plans for the development of water or sewer systems in rural areas which do not have funds available for immediate undertaking of the preparation of such plan.

"(7) Rural areas, for the purposes of water and waste disposal projects shall not include any area in any city or town which has a population in excess of 5,500 inhabitants."

(8) In each instance where the Secretary receives two or more applications for financial assistance for projects that would serve substantially the same group of residents within a single rural area, and one such application is submitted by a city, town, county or other unit of general local government, he shall, in the absence of substantial reasons to the contrary, provide such assistance to

such city, town, county or other unit of general local government.

(9) *Provided further*, That no Federal funds shall be authorized for use unless it be certified by the appropriate State water pollution control agency that the water supply system authorized will not result in pollution of waters of the State in excess of standards established by that agency.

In the case of sewers and waste disposal systems, no Federal funds shall be advanced hereunder unless the appropriate State water pollution control agency shall certify that the effluent therefrom shall conform with appropriate State and Federal water pollution control standards when and where established.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 308 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 is amended by—

(1) striking out "\$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$450,000,000";

(2) in clause (a) striking out "except that no agreement shall provide for purchase by the Secretary at a date sooner than three years from the date of the note"; and

(3) striking out clause (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "(b) may retain out of payments by the borrower a charge at a rate specified in the insurance agreement applicable to the loan".

(b) Section 309(e) of such loan is amended by striking out "such portion of the charge collected in connection with the insurance of loans at least equal to a rate of one-half of 1 per centum per annum on the outstanding principal obligations and the remainder of such charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "all or a portion, not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the unpaid principal balance of the loan, of any charge collected in connection with the insurance of loan; and any remainder of any such charge".

(c) Section 309(f)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is this the Aiken water bill which was introduced and cosponsored by 93 Senators?

Mr. AIKEN. This is the multiple-sponsored rural water facilities bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the vote by which the House amendments were concurred in be reconsidered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BASS. As one of the cosponsors of the Aiken water bill, I commend the Senator from Vermont for the outstanding work he has done, and express my personal appreciation to him for passage of this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. He was one of the earliest cosponsors of the bill, which was sponsored by 63 Democrats and 30 Republicans.

Mr. BASS. It is called the Aiken-Bass bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I appreciate the compliment, and I accept it.

ON THE SUBJECT OF LOYALTY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on September 16, 1965, Lt. Gen. Thomas S. Moorman delivered an address at the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, Colo., on the subject of loyalty.

While in this day and age, as he points out, loyalty is supposed to be a very common subject to talk about, which is supposed to be much understood, General Moorman has been successful in defining and analyzing the components of loyalty, and what it means, especially to the members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the RECORD, and I recommend its reading to all Senators.

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

REMARKS BY LT. GEN. THOMAS S. MOORMAN FOR AIR FORCE ACADEMY OFFICERS' DINNER-IN, SEPTEMBER 16, 1965

My remarks this evening will be directed to the subject of loyalty. Because the subject does not lend itself easily to levity, it could become deadly dull. Loyalty, as with patriotism and national pride, is a subject that is too often approached with pomposity or embarrassment. Neither is fitting, and I shall attempt to avoid both pitfalls.

Because loyalty is a word so common, it is often misunderstood. As with so many other things that are present in our everyday lives, even its meaning is perhaps misunderstood.

Webster defines "loyalty" as the act of being faithful to a cause, an ideal, a custom or a person and goes further in definition with two phrases—in this order:

Faithful in allegiance to one's government;
Faithful to a private person to whom loyalty is due.

In selecting that descending order of importance on things to whom loyalty is due, I believe the compilers of the dictionary have unveiled the key to true loyalty.

First, loyalty to our Nation and its national purposes. Next, to our service, its mission and customs. Then to our own organization or unit. And, lastly, to each other.

In our growth as individuals as well as members of the military, we find that we build our loyalties in reverse order. Our initial loyalty as youngsters was to our parents, our brothers and sisters, our immediate family. Then, as we grew older, our loyalties extended to our school, our city, and our State.

This is a normal progression.

It has been said that in all human enterprises, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. This is certainly true in the military service. We join a new unit. We gain respect for our fellow airmen and our commander. We then progress from respect

to loyalty to these individuals. As we become more knowledgeable concerning the purposes of our unit and our service, we gain a greater respect for them and transfer our greater loyalty to them. Thus it is that in the final analysis, our greatest loyalty should, and must, be to our national goals and purposes.

We cannot be loyal to that which we do not understand, respect and believe in. It is through this pattern that the proper order of loyalties is established and maintained.

You will remember that the White Committee pinpointed as a contributing factor in the cheating incident the fact that there was confusion in the minds of the individual cadets as to the mission of the Academy. This led to a situation in which cadet loyalties were brought into conflict with one another. The respect, understanding, transference pattern broke down. In the final analysis, faced with a choice between loyalty to other individuals or loyalty to the honor code and thus to the Academy's mission, the Air Force and the Nation, the cadet chose loyalty to other individuals as his course of action.

If we are to instill this pattern as our way of life, we must understand the meaning behind our national purpose and respect the reasons for that purpose.

The cause we serve would not be loyally served if ours was a blind, unquestioning obedience.

The great danger and tragedy of the Communist movement is the fact that it has become a perfect instrument for a fanatical and insensitive loyalty.

The military has been included among the three great dedicated callings of our time. The other two are the religious and the educational. In our capacity as members of the staff and faculty at the Air Force Academy, we find that our endeavors really place us within the parameters of two of these callings.

It is certainly not chance that has molded these callings into similar structures. The growth of the professional scale and the knowledge of any individual who enters the callings is designated by a grade, a title that we call rank, and that these ranks have universal meaning, not only within a given society or culture but within any society or culture, for these professions have similar characteristics in all societies and cultures.

Each is controlled by a rigid and conditional discipline that includes the orientation of the individual to the requirements of his profession as a whole. And the profession vests judgment concerning the requirements of its practitioners in those of senior rank. This, in turn, involves the acceptance of limits of personal reward and, in effect, allows rewards only in terms of increasing responsibilities and ever deepening dedication.

Military leadership has been defined as the management of violence, which is indeed a paradoxical definition, for violence always carries a connotation of unmanageability. Now we are faced with the certainty that violence, if it is again released on a large scale, will be unmanageable.

In this strange situation, military organization must be increasingly compact, increasingly skilled, increasingly disciplined in order to avoid tragic error. It also must become increasingly dedicated to its basic purposes.

Consider the nature of the responsibility which the individual officer will have to assume in a combat role of the future. One young officer alone and unsupervised may be responsible for executing an extremely difficult and hazardous mission which may destroy a vital segment of enemy strength.

One officer may have the responsibility for stopping an enemy aircraft which is capable of wrecking one of our cities.

The officers of the Air Force must be men to whom responsibilities such as these can be entrusted with complete confidence.

Just what are the qualities in a man that enable us to give to him, with confidence, responsibilities such as these? When we think of such men, we think of courage and endurance and integrity and all that is included in the term "leadership." These traits are somewhat descriptive of what we are trying to determine, but they do not add up to the whole man. The element of purposeful meaning must be included.

Courage for what?

Endurance in what service?

Integrity with respect to what ideas?

What purpose in life must a man have that will permit these human qualities to appear before us in action as the performance of duty? For the answers to these questions we must look into the things officers live by and for. And it would seem logical that we would seek to identify these things within ourselves.

One thing I think we will all find—that we have neither the strength nor the will to live alone. We have need for a purpose; for a cause bigger than ourselves; something that requires us to take strenuous action if necessary, to face danger if necessary, against the opposition of instinctive impulses to avoid such discomfort or danger.

Each of us making such an inquiry will come up with somewhat similar findings. When I look at officers in the Air Force whom I know and respect, I feel sure that I can detect things they hold in common. One of these common denominators is the need of which I have been speaking. Those officers who command our instant and continuing respect are invariably those who, whatever their abilities and whatever position of responsibility, put their responsibility first and foremost in all they do.

This common attribute may be best described as loyalty. If I am right in this assumption, these men have shared the common human experience of needing a goal in life and have found that goal in their loyalty to a cause they serve—a loyalty that serves them both as an incentive and a guide, and sometimes as a very hard taskmaster.

Loyalty has always been considered a warrior's virtue. Throughout history a legion of men have been true to their colors and died for their causes, and some were pretty small causes, and many were lost causes. The one noble thing that shines forth from all the bloody pages of history is this capacity of man for loyalty. Perhaps this is proof enough that we are talking about one of man's greatest needs as well as one of his attributes of greatness.

The causes we serve must be tangible and concrete enough to be a specific guide for decision and for action. It must be a cause that we can comprehend, that we can make our own in a personal way, and to which our own personal contribution, however small, will be of some significance.

I believe we have all espoused such a common cause when we took the oath of office as commissioned officers of the U.S. Air Force. In that oath we swear faith and allegiance to a cause which commands our loyalty and our lives.

Let us examine this cause for a moment. I believe that a study of the Constitution will show that it proceeds from several fundamental ideas.

One is a conviction that man amounts to something as an individual, that the individual is good and can become better and stronger and wiser. It is a belief that the American people can build a nation that can endure and that can offer to each of its citizens an abundant life, personal liberty, and the fellowship of freemen.

Despite the many changes in economic theory and international relations, this marvelously flexible instrument still stands for

the enduring ideals and the aspirations of the American people.

At the moment, it seems clear that we can serve humanity best by serving our country well.

Our cause has been well and truly served by loyal men throughout the history of our country. Such progress as we have made toward our national goals can be attributed to the sacrifice and the service of these loyal men. Today the country, and particularly the Air Force, has need of such men in greater numbers than ever before. To meet this need, we of the Air Force Academy faculty and staff must direct our training toward the development of loyalty in its deepest sense.

We still have much to learn about the problem of developing in the young men who enter our training program a willing acceptance of these ideals of loyalty and service.

Dr. John A. Hannah, in testifying for an Air Academy before Congress, said that he had not been in favor of an academy because he felt that the civilian colleges could meet the need, but that he had since become convinced that they could not, because they do not attempt to develop the qualities of character and integrity required for that service.

The other service academies and similar institutions have for a long time, by traditional methods, produced great leaders—not always many and not always soon, but enough loyal men to lead us through the great emergencies. Effectiveness of traditional methods and of precedent would appear to be historically demonstrated. The problem is to keep tradition and precedent in tune with changing requirements and situations.

Fortunately, most of us need to tie our loyalty, not only to a cause, but to an organization. Morally and intellectually, our objectives may be clear, but practically and personally speaking, we need a team to which we can belong.

Perhaps this intense identification with the Air Force is a human weakness, certainly it is a source of greater strength. In the unit, pride and esprit de corps of any good combat organization is to be found, perhaps the greater expression of human genius for loyalty.

In differentiating between our way of life and that of the Communist nations, our loyalty requires that we be critical of ourselves, of one another, and of our service and country, while at the same time it must insure a discipline based on willing obedience derived from confidence in the moral integrity in our leaders and the essential soundness of our cause.

I believe our objective of building a stronger loyalty can be accomplished by traditional means. I include in this traditional means the intellectual problem of establishing the country's need for loyal officers. I include moral problems, which can best be solved by powers of example. I include disciplinary training based on a man's pride in his powers, his unit and his country.

We cannot make officers in any training program. All we can do is present the challenge, point out those obstacles in the way that must be overcome, and give the help and guidance to the individual in overcoming them. In this way and subject always to the power of example, the young men in our training program who have the potential, will make themselves into the officers the Air Force needs. This is a continuous process which will not stop when a man is commissioned a second lieutenant.

We are all shot through with human imperfections and we shall all fall short of our highest ideals; but if in this loyal brotherhood we find helpful understanding, human sympathy, and affection, then the strong will

help make the weakest of us stronger and together we will find our powers multiplied many times over.

We must direct our efforts here at the Academy toward the development of loyalty in its deepest, truest sense—in the cadets, in our associates, and in ourselves.

In establishing a basis for loyalty, I set down respect as one of the foundation blocks. Actually, in obtaining respect from a subordinate, you do so by showing respect for him and his views. I believe that one of the first responsibilities of a junior officer to his superior officer is to present his point of view.

I heard a general officer instruct a new junior staff officer many years ago on this subject.

He said, "I expect—no, I demand—that you argue like hell with me on any subject under discussion—before the decision. Translate the courage of your convictions into words and let me have the benefit of them. I'll make the decision and then you have one other responsibility which I will also hold you to just as strongly. You will abide by and defend my decision as if it were your own. In this way we will demonstrate our loyalty to each other and to the mission."

In searching for methods of imbuing the wing with a deep sense of loyalty to the Air Force and the Nation, we must be continually aware that our purpose can only be served by our own loyalty to the mission of the Air Force Academy. Our program must be a strong, integrated union of the major departments: the academic, the military, and the athletic, with each of us demonstrating the finest traits of loyalty in wholeheartedly supporting the efforts of the other departments.

In closing, permit me to quote Mr. Elbert Hubbard, learned essayist, concerning the philosophy of loyalty:

"If you work for a man, in Heaven's name work for him. If he pays your wages that supply your bread and butter, work for him, speak well of him, think well of him, stand by him and stand by the institution he represents."

Thank you.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask the attachés to notify all Senators to come into the Chamber because there will shortly be a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. I know that many Senators have other engagements and are anxious to leave the Chamber, but I should like to explain the proposal which I am making in greater detail. I shall try to be as brief as possible, and then we can have the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, the only thing we are trying to do here is to insist on the Hatch Act provisions in the Senate bill which were approved by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and by the Senate; and to insist on the Senate language restructuring the National Advisory Council to make it an independent, impartial, conscientious body for reviewing the operations of the war on poverty and making recommendations to the Director, the President, and Congress for its improvement.

I had originally intended to move to recommit the conference report, with instructions to the Senate conferees to stand firm on these two provisions. I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that such a motion is not in order, and that instead the Senate must reject the conference report. Once the conference report falls of adoption, motions will be in order to request a new conference with the House and to instruct the Senate conferees to insist on the Senate provisions regarding the Hatch Act and the National Advisory Council. If the conference report is rejected, Mr. President, I will make these subsequent motions, the practical effect of which will be to recommit the bill to conference with instructions.

As a Senator who has always cast his vote in favor of the antipoverty program, I should like to take special care to point out that a "nay" vote on acceptance of the conference report should not be construed as a vote against the continuation of the war on poverty. On the contrary, I believe a rejection of the conference report leading to the reinstatement in the bill of the Hatch Act and National Advisory Council provisions adopted earlier by the Senate would be a course of action that would strengthen the bill and enhance the prospects of the entire antipoverty operation.

Mr. President, I believe that these two amendments will do much to make the program work as it should. Without them, we will find that the antipoverty programs will all too frequently succumb to the schemes of the professional ward bosses and machine politicians. Then, unhappily for those for whom the antipoverty program has kindled a spark of hope, the people of this country will rise up in righteous protest against the abuses the present law is not designed to prevent.

If the Senate follows the course of action I have outlined, Mr. President, and the new conference reports a bill including the Hatch Act and National Advisory Council provisions, then I will again cast my vote in favor of the continuation of the war on poverty program. If the conference report is approved at this time, however, it will be approved over my opposition—not because I am opposed to the basic purpose of this legislation, but because I want to make sure that the law is written so that its purpose may be achieved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. INOUE. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is paired with the

Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 22, as follows:

[No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alken	Gruening	McNamara
Bartlett	Harris	Metcalf
Bass	Hartke	Monroney
Bible	Hayden	Moss
Brewster	Inouye	Muskie
Burdick	Jackson	Nelson
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Pell
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Russell, S.C.
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smith
Clark	Kuchel	Talmadge
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	Magnuson	Yarborough
Douglas	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Ervin	McGee	
Fong	McGovern	

NAYS—22

Allott	Hill	Murphy
Boggs	Holland	Prouty
Carlson	Hruska	Russell, Ga.
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Dominick	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Miller	
Hickenlooper	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—32

Anderson	Mansfield	Robertson
Bayh	McIntyre	Saltonstall
Bennett	Mondale	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Montoya	Simpson
Cotton	Morse	Smathers
Curtis	Morton	Sparkman
Fannin	Neuberger	Stennis
Fulbright	Pastore	Symington
Gore	Pearson	Tower
Hart	Randolph	Tydings
Long, La.	Ribicoff	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have just completed final action on a most controversial piece of legislation in the Senate's acceptance of the conference report on the so-called antipoverty act. In an area of our society where so much can be done and where so little attention has been directed heretofore, the range of viewpoint could well be expected to be as it was. Great credit very justly goes to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] who so diligently, skillfully, and expeditiously piloted this bill through every stage of the sometimes seemingly tedious legislative process. He has demonstrated again not only his great concern for the segment of our society to be benefited by this bill but also the value and benefits of his long experience in this body.

In similar fashion, I commend the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] for presenting their views and constructive criticism with such precision. I know that the inefficiencies they have claimed exist will not go uninvestigated and that the country has benefited from their scrutiny of this issue. To the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] we owe our thanks for the attention and assistance he has given to the completion of this bill.

I commend the Senate as a whole for demonstrating again that thorough and deliberative action can be accomplished expeditiously.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1766) to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply and water systems serving rural areas and to make grants-to-aid in rural community development planning and in

connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 728) to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7371) to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2127) to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7371) to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONTOYA, and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 2562. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2563. A bill for the relief of Yu Yu Ma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 2564. A bill for the relief of Yoshio Sumida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia:

S. 2565. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Savannah Revolutionary Battle Site National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2566. A bill for the relief of Ngan Hok Ng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for memorials to the past Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

GOLD MINES ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BIBLE,

CANNON, DOMINICK, METCALF, MONTOYA, and MUNDT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for financial assistance payments to present and potential domestic gold producers based upon cost of production experience.

The purpose of this measure is to stabilize and increase the life of existing gold properties, provide financial inducement sufficiently attractive to reopen our dormant gold mines, and stimulate an aggressive search for new gold ore reserves. I believe the time has arrived for the Congress to recognize the fact that due to almost constant escalating costs of production our once thriving domestic gold industry is facing extinction. This segment of the mining industry, just prior to World War II, supplied jobs to thousands of miners in the Western States and provided economic stability for a number of western mining towns. In 1940, American gold mines produced nearly 5 million ounces of gold, exclusive of the Philippines. Today, our annual production in the United States has dropped to approximately 1.5 million ounces of which 40 percent is produced by one mine, the Homestake, located in my State of South Dakota. A few other mining properties are devoted exclusively to mining gold, but most of the remainder of our domestic production is derived as a byproduct from the copper mines of the Nation.

I need scarcely remind my colleagues of our dwindling silver supply since the Senate was so recently confronted with the necessity of passing legislation to resolve our critical coinage problem arising from our fast dwindling supply of silver. Silver production did not keep pace with the increasing demands for the use of this precious metal for industrial and coinage requirements, with the result that the Congress had to take emergency remedial action.

It would be tragic indeed were this Congress to ignore the storm signals with respect to our fast disappearing gold mines. The Members of this body are well aware that the flight of gold from our shores has reduced our gold reserves some 23 billion in the last 8 years. The solution to our balance of payments deficit is a matter of vital importance to the economic well-being of the people of the United States.

Treasury officials agree that they would like to see an increase in our U.S. gold holdings and profess sympathy for the plight of our gold miners. However, in the past, they have objected to legislation providing incentive payments to domestic gold producers on the ground that such action might be interpreted by foreign central bankers as an indication that the Federal Government is tampering with the monetary price of gold. If this appraisal be correct, I believe this fear is psychological rather than realistic. The Gold Mines Assistance Act, which I am introducing, is purely domestic legislation to provide financial assistance payments to domestic producers based upon a domestic costs of production formula. It does not, in any manner, seek to change the monetary price of gold.

To allay both Treasury fears and foreign apprehension, the bill provides that it is the intent of the Congress that the Act shall have no relation to the monetary price for gold paid by the Treasury of the United States.

For current domestic gold producers, including Homestake, who have demonstrated a capability of remaining in operation despite the ravages of increased production costs, this bill provides very modest financial assistance payments. For example, in the case of Homestake, the subsidy payments would amount to somewhere between 1½ to 2 percent of invested capital, or, together with net earnings, 7 percent on invested capital.

In the case of dormant gold mines, or as a stimulus to the search for new gold ore reserves, my bill provides much more generous payments. From a realistic standpoint, financial assistance payments must be provided which will definitely encourage reopening our closed gold properties and lend real incentives to a search for new gold mines. These incentives are provided in section 3(b) of the proposed legislation. It is logical to assume with the realistic incentives provided in my bill that domestic gold production will attain a rate as high, and quite probably higher, than the situation which existed in 1940, particularly in view of improved techniques in discovery methods in the past 20 years.

The Canadian Government has paid a cost of production bonus to its gold mines since 1948. British Columbia has gone one step further and adopted a statute which provides for a 3-year tax exemption for income derived from new mines producing any minerals except clay, shale, and stone quarries. Australia pays a subsidy to its gold producers. Foreign banking interests have not exhibited any concern over the Canadian or Australian gold subsidies which relate to the internal affairs of those two countries.

Under this bill, dormant properties reopened and new mines would be paid \$35 per ounce for their gold when sold to the U.S. Treasury, but, in addition, would receive financial assistance payments made under the direction of the Gold Mines Assistance Commission amounting to 125 percent of their total gold bullion receipts produced from such properties for the year preceding the date of their application.

The Consumers' Price Index, U.S. Department of Labor, has increased by 126 percent since January 1, 1940. Provision is made in the bill for constructive cost determination of the differential between 1939 and the date of application which must show 125 percent increase to enable the applicant to be eligible for subsidy payments. There should be no difficulty in applying the 125 percent financial assistance payment to the last year's total gold bullion receipts because any dormant mines with known substantial marginal ores, or new properties with demonstrable valuable ore reserves, should have no difficulty with financing in order to permit them to open and operate for 1 year to provide a base as to which the subsidy formula will apply.

Furthermore, taking a long-term view, those who are interested in adding to

our national gold reserve should not overlook the fact that under this bill existing gold producers will be enabled to mine marginal ores which are currently being lost forever. In short, this bill will aid greater utilization of our natural resources by stimulating extraction of marginal gold ores not now being mined.

I believe this legislation is in the national interest particularly in view of the excessive gold drain of our reserves. I have no doubt that the mining industry will be able to demonstrate that this bill provides the necessary incentives to reactivate the gold mining districts of the West. I hope that hearings will be held on this measure by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee early in 1966, and trust that as a result of such hearings the Treasury Department will reappraise its position with reference to remedial legislation for our domestic gold industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2562) to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold, introduced by Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I introduced earlier today to provide assistance to the gold-mining industry be permitted to lie at the desk for additional sponsors for 5 days.

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

PRESIDENTIAL MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce again a joint resolution substantially the same as that which was first offered on September 8, 1959, on my behalf by then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

This resolution, which I again introduced on May 4, 1962, provides for the establishment of a commission to formulate plans for memorials to past Presidents of the United States.

Mr. President, it is my belief that any man who has been so highly regarded by his fellow citizens as to be elected as the President of the United States ought not to be unremarked and unrecalled in this Capital City of the Nation. Yet of all the 35 Presidents who have served this Nation, only 7 have received a memorial or a statue in this city. Three great monuments are dedicated to three of our greatest leaders—the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Jefferson Memorial. Statutes may be found here of Washington and Lincoln, and of Buchanan, Garfield, Grant, and Jackson. It is expected that the planned Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial will some day become a reality; the John F. Kennedy Center is well on its way; and James Madison is to be honored in the new building of the Library of Congress

which has recently received attention. We have Theodore Roosevelt Island, and there have been some plans to erect a memorial to him there.

But what of John Adams, James Monroe, Woodrow Wilson, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and all the others? To the tourists who come here by the hundreds of thousands, there is no evident recognition for them. The Memorial Commission called for by my resolution would be authorized to plan for a permanent memorial to all of our past Presidents, to accept gifts for use in construction or other expense, to work with the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capitol Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, or others. Four of the 12 Commissioners would be Members of this body appointed by the President of the Senate, 4 would be Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House, and 4 would be appointed by the President. None of the Commissioners would receive salary, but expenses would be reimbursed. The initial authorization is a very modest \$10,000.

There are ample precedents for the procedures embodied in this bill, including the authorization of the Commission to receive private gifts for use in such a project.

Public subscriptions amounting to \$300,000 helped finance the Washington Monument, together with congressional appropriations of \$1,094,000. The Lincoln Memorial Commission was established by an act approved February 9, 1911, leading to dedication of the memorial 11 years later, on May 30, 1922. Cost of the Lincoln Memorial, all paid for by Federal funds, was \$3,678,000.

The resolution establishing the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission in 1934 specified that it might accept money or property from either public or private sources to finance its activities, which resulted in dedication of the Jefferson Memorial on the 200th anniversary of his birth, April 13, 1943.

Other than the three memorials which are such an integral part of the Washington scene, those to Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson, there is the 1853 statue to Andrew Jackson in an equestrian pose located in Lafayette Park; the statue of James Garfield at First Street and Maryland Avenue SW., erected in 1887; a 1922 equestrian statue of Ulysses S. Grant at the Mall and First Street SW.; and a statue of James Buchanan to be found in Meridian Hill Park, dating from 1930. There are also two statues of Abraham Lincoln, one dating from 1868 in Judiciary Square and another dedicated in 1876 in Lincoln Park. The equestrian statue of George Washington to be found in Washington Circle dates to 1860.

Aside from these few, we have not honored our long list of Presidents in this, the Capital of our Nation. It is time we recognized them. We have Halls of Fame for our sports heroes in baseball and in professional football, but we have neglected men far greater who live in history, who led our Nation in the nearly 2 centuries of its history. Let us now remedy the defects of the past with

a memorial which will in one place give them the honor that is their due.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.*

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 113) to establish a commission to formulate plans for memorials to the past Presidents of the United States, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That (a) there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "Presidential Memorial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, or in its immediate environs, of a permanent memorial to past Presidents of the United States.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twelve Commissioners appointed as follows: Four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, four Senators by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(c) The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(d) The Commission shall report such plans, together with its recommendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual reports of its progress to the President and Congress.

(e) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(f) The President shall designate a chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—

(a) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949;

(b) procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals;

(c) make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such purposes;

(d) accept gifts to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction or other expenses of such memorial;

(e) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into contracts for personal services and otherwise, and do such other things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution; and

(f) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and such Commissions and Council

are authorized, upon request to render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$10,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution introduced earlier today by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] be held at the desk for cosponsors until the close of business on Friday next.

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

REPORT OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP (S. DOC. NO. 59)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk the report of the Senate delegation to the eighth meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, of which I was chairman, held in Ottawa and Montreal last May. The report is under 50 pages, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 24, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2127) to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, and for other purposes.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert H. Cowen, of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of North Carolina, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Thomas L. Robinson, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Tennessee, term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, October 1, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DAN MONROE RUSSELL, JR., OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday,

October 1, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Dan Monroe Russell, Jr., of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge, for the southern district of Mississippi, vice Sidney C. Mize, deceased.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKAL], and myself, as chairman.

PROMINENT WASHINGTONIANS URGE CAUTION ON KENNEDY SITE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 109, which would require the National Capital Planning Commission to make a detailed study and to hold public hearings on the subject of the best possible site for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Since introducing this legislation I have received numerous phone calls and letters supporting such a proposal. It is becoming more and more evident that there is a sizable block of knowledgeable individuals in the Washington area that have serious reservations as to suitability of the proposed Potomac River site. This was illustrated again last Tuesday when 78 prominent Washingtonians, all of whom are donors to and supporters of the Center, submitted a petition to the Center's board of trustees urging a 60-day moratorium on work toward the construction of the Center. Such a moratorium could then be utilized to enable a review committee to hear, study, and make recommendations concerning all questions relating to the location of the Center.

Mr. President, the signers of this petition represent a segment of the Washington community that has kept a close watch on the developments of the Cultural Center and I believe their views should be heard. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the petition, together with the list of signers and the background information which prompted their petition.

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

SEPTEMBER 20, 1965.

CHAIRMAN AND TRUSTEES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS,
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW.,
Washington D.C.

DEAR SIR: We, representing the persons listed thereon, request that you consider and respond to the enclosed petition.

Yours very truly,

E. FULTON BRYLAWSKI,
Mrs. W. JOHN KENNEY,
Rear Adm. NEILL PHILLIPS.

A PETITION RELATING TO THE LOCATION OF THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Whereas the location of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts is of utmost importance to the future of the city and to its inhabitants and visitors; and

Whereas questions have been raised about the suitability of the river site as proposed;

We, whose names appear below, urge a 60-day moratorium on work toward the construction of the Center to enable a review committee, appointed for the purpose, to hear, study, and make recommendations concerning all questions relating to the location of the Center.

Alice S. Acheson.
Mr. and Mrs. Charles Arrott.
Mrs. Christopher Bramwell.
E. Fulton Brylawski.
Mrs. Douglas Burden.
B. Bernei Burgunder.
Edward Burling, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Albert B. Carter, Jr.
Aldus H. Chapin.
David Sanders Clark.
Mr. and Mrs. Jack Coopersmith.
Andre deLimur.
James A. Donohoe, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Richard Dudman.
Mr. and Mrs. Clive L. Duval II.
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Elchholz.
Mr. and Mrs. Edward Finkenstaedt.
Jean Friendly.
Mr. and Mrs. Gerhard A. Gesell.
Mrs. John Timberlake Gibson.
Charles C. Glover III.
John I. Immer.
Mr. and Mrs. Andrew Keck.
Mrs. W. John Kenney.
Katharine McCook Knox.
Sidney Lansburgh.
Mrs. Casanove Lee.
Mrs. Newbold LeGendre.
Miss Janet LeGendre.
Mr. and Mrs. H. Gates Lloyd.
Alice Longworth.
Arthur T. Lyon.
Mrs. Edward Macauley.
Mrs. Atherton Macondray.
Arthur K. Mason.
Mr. and Mrs. Frank W. McCulloch.
Constance Mellen.
Rt. Rev. Paul Moore, Jr.
Mr. and Mrs. Edward P. Morgan.
Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Morgan.
Mr. and Mrs. James Newmeyer, Jr.
Laughlin Phillips.
Rear Adm. Neill Phillips.
Mr. and Mrs. John A. Pope.
Mrs. Merriweather Post.
Robert Rosenthal.
Mr. and Mrs. David Rust.
John H. Safer.
Richard Sinclair.
Mr. and Mrs. Francis Spalding.
Mr. and Mrs. Philip M. Stern.
Mr. and Mrs. John Stillman.
Mr. and Mrs. Carlton Swift, Jr.
A. Lloyd Symington.
Mrs. Cyrus Vance.
Mr. and Mrs. DeForest Van Slyck.
Morton H. Wilner.
Mr. and Mrs. Calvert Carey.

LOCATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

1. The subscribers to the petition are donors to and supporters of the Center, or representatives of organizations which have made donations.

2. Questions have been raised and opinions expressed about the suitability of the proposed location, and about the desirability of a downtown location. These questions and opinions are of sufficient import to justify careful consideration by a review body before any construction is begun at the proposed site. The request for such a review is the basis for the petition signed by Center supporters and the subject of three bills introduced in the House (Representatives WIDNALL, CURTIS, and MATHIAS) and one in the Senate (Senator MUNDT), with the probability of more forthcoming.

(a) Critics have raised the following objections to the proposed location:

1. Physical site: Now that the roadway system and the large Watergate complex are

partially completed, it is apparent that the Center structure (which could house two Dulles terminals with room to spare) would crowd its site, and create a wall between the city and the river. The building and its access roads would destroy the park-like setting. The Center site would be little more than a "traffic island."

2. Road system: Access and egress to and from the Center present "tricky problems of design." New Hampshire Avenue—the only apparent access to the Center—will be choked with traffic before and after performances. Though it appears that the approach from Virginia is direct, in fact, it too must fuel into New Hampshire Avenue. New Hampshire Avenue, an important boulevard, terminates as a garage ramp. To accommodate the Center, the existing Parkway must be relocated and rebuilt. The Los Angeles cultural center approach system is so inadequate that it takes as much as 1½ hours to get to it, and as much to leave. Washington should avoid a similar mistake.

3. Parking: According to congressional testimony, the 1,600 underground parking spaces will be inadequate to serve its full capacity of 7,000 patrons. No relief parking is available on the surrounding streets. The garage, located in a relatively isolated area, would serve only the Center. There is no pedestrian approach.

4. Rapid transit: No subway stop in the recently approved rapid transit plan will serve the Center. The nearest stop is ½ mile away at 23d and H Streets.

5. Air traffic: Because the Center is in the path of planes serving National Airport, excessive measures must be taken to insulate the Center against this noise.

(b) Downtown location: Several persuasive arguments have been advanced for a downtown location for the Center. It would be more central to the city and therefore more convenient to reach from most areas. It would greatly reinforce current efforts to revitalize the central city area, drawing people downtown, particularly at night. It would be easily accessible to all, would be served by the new proposed subway system.

3. Late hour criticism: It is believed that there are several compelling considerations which fully justify the raising of these 11th hour questions. When the site was selected, the physical reality of the highway complex and the Watergate development were not yet apparent. The Pennsylvania Avenue plan, opening up site possibilities, had not come into being. Assistance for downtown construction under urban renewal was not then available, as it now is. Finally, the mass transit plan, which provides for no stop at the riverside, was not in existence.

4. Location: While the petitioners feel that a specific site should not be chosen without careful review of all factors by the review committee, the best arguments so far presented support a downtown location. With the current intensive interest in the Cultural Center, the time loss should be minimal. Primarily, the petitioners urge that expediency and hurried decisions not be allowed to squander this unique opportunity for a great experiment. Because of the overwhelming criticism of the Kennedy Center as now planned, a final review of its merits and liabilities in the light of the developments mentioned above is imperative.

The petitioners will welcome additional support from all who are interested in insuring that the Kennedy Cultural Center, when built, will be the great national institution it should be.

THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following calen-

dar measures were considered and acted upon as indicated, and excerpts from the reports thereon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEASE OF PORTION OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY CONVEYED TO THE CITY OF CLARINDA, IOWA, FOR AIRPORT PURPOSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2434) to clarify authorization for the approval by the Federal Aviation Agency of the lease of a portion of certain real property conveyed to the city of Clarinda, Iowa, for airport purpose, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding section 16 of the Federal Airport Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized, subject to the provisions of section 4 of the Act of October 1, 1949 (50 App. U.S.C. 1622c), to grant releases from any of the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions contained in the deed of conveyance dated March 26, 1947, under which the United States conveyed certain property to the city of Clarinda, Iowa, for airport purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT (No. 772)

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to permit the city of Clarinda, Iowa, to lease certain real property, previously conveyed to Clarinda, for nonairport purposes. This authorization would be accomplished by treating the subject property as though it had originally been conveyed pursuant to the Surplus Property Act rather than the Federal Airport Act.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION

The subject property which the city of Clarinda, Iowa, seeks authority to lease for nonairport purposes consistent of approximately 36 acres and is a portion of a larger parcel conveyed by quitclaim deed to the city of Clarinda on March 26, 1947, by the War Assets Administrator. The property was conveyed with the agreement that it would be used for airport purposes. The conveyance was made pursuant to section 16 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1115) which authorizes the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to request conveyance of U.S.-owned property to local airport sponsors if such land is deemed necessary to the airport project and is otherwise consistent with the objectives of the Federal Airport Act. Such a request is submitted to the Government agency having control over the particular property necessary to the accomplishment of the airport project. If the agency having such control determines that the conveyance is not inconsistent with the needs of the department or agency, it is authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General, to make the conveyance requested. All conveyances made pursuant to section 16 contain a reversionary clause which provides that in the event the property conveyed is not developed, or ceases to be used, for airport purposes, it automatically reverts to the United States. In this connection, it should be pointed out that property conveyed under the terms of section 16 of the

Federal Airport Act does not require a determination that the property is surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. It requires only a determination that the land is necessary for airport purposes and that the transfer would not be inconsistent with the needs of the agency having control of the land. Land is not declared surplus unless it is determined that no other department or agency of the Federal Government has a need for it. If such determination is made, the property is disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act or the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

In this particular case, it is significant to note that prior to conveyance of the subject property to Clarinda, the War Assets Administrator had declared the property surplus. However, at the time of conveyance, section 13(g) of the Surplus Property Act, Public Law 289, July 30, 1947, had not yet been enacted. As both the Federal Aviation Agency and the General Accounting Office observe, had section 13(g) been law at the time of conveyance—March 26, 1947—of the property to Clarinda, it would logically have been conveyed under that provision as opposed to section 16 of the Federal Airport Act since, as noted previously, the property had been declared surplus at the time of conveyance.

At the suggestion of the Federal Aviation Agency, the committee has incorporated a technical amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to make the conveyance subject to section 4 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. This section, in effect, requires that before property is released for nonairport purposes it must be determined that the property is no longer necessary to accomplish the purpose for which it was originally transferred and is not necessary to protect or advance U.S. civil aviation. It further provides that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency may impose such conditions on the conveyance as he deems necessary so as to insure that any proceeds arising from nonairport use of the property will be used for the development and maintenance of the airport.

Under the circumstances outlined above, the committee feels that this bill is fair and reasonable and accordingly recommends enactment.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY TO DETERMINE A SITE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SEA LEVEL CANAL CONNECTING ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC OCEANS

The bill (S. 2469) amending sections 2 and 4 of the act approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), providing for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a new sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans was announced as next in order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, does the bill in anyway favor one site over another?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not. The President on April 18, pursuant to the terms of Public Law 88-609, appointed the Atlantic-Pacific Inter-Oceanic Canal Study Commission to make a full study of the most suitable site for and best means of constructing a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. That law was the result of an original bill unanimously reported by the Commerce Committee last year.

The Chief of Engineers has been selected to conduct the required engineering feasibility study with the assistance of consultants retained by the Commission. In its first annual report to the Congress, the Commission stated that it expects to begin on-site surveys of possible routes early in 1966.

It is not confined to any one site.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I understood we had already granted authority to create this Commission and that it had been appointed and was perhaps functioning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding, if the distinguished Senator will yield, that this bill makes only minor technical changes in the law and that the Commission still functions.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. On that assurance from the distinguished majority leader, I shall not object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the President of the United States and the President of Panama are simultaneously making a statement with respect to the Panama problem, based in large measure on the work being done by special Ambassador Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third time, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Act approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) delete section 2 in its entirety and substitute the following therefor:

"Sec. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Commission may—

"(1) utilize the facilities of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the United States Government;

"(2) employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem;

"(b) The members of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per diem. The members of the Commission, including the Chairman, shall receive travel expenses as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons employed intermittently."

(2) The following is added after the word "appropriated" in section 4: ", without fiscal year limitation."

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT
(No. 773)

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

S. 2469 would authorize compensation to the members of the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission at a per diem rate of \$100 plus travel expenses and would permit the Commission to employ experts and consultants at rates not in excess of \$100 per day.

The bill would also make the funds authorized for use by the Commission available without regard to fiscal year limitations.

BACKGROUND

The President, on April 18, 1965, pursuant to the terms of Public Law 88-609, appointed the Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission to make a full study of the most suitable site for, and best means

of constructing a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. That law was the result of an original bill unanimously reported by the Commerce Committee last year.

The Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, has been selected to conduct the required engineering feasibility study with the assistance of consultants retained by the Commission. In its first annual report to the Congress, the Commission stated that it expects to begin on-site surveys of possible routes early in 1966.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

Under the present law (Classification Act of 1949) the Commission may retain consultants at a maximum per diem rate of \$83.04. However, the Corps of Engineers is authorized under the civil works program to pay consultants at the rate of \$100 per day for the same type of work. The Commission expects to retain many of these same consultants on the canal study and desires authority to compensate them at the same per diem rate. The Bureau of the Budget advised the committee that 22 Federal agencies have authority to hire consultants at the rate of \$100 per diem.

The authority to compensate Commissioners under the general law has also been questioned. The bill, therefore, establishes the rate of compensation at \$100 per day for each member of the Commission and authorizes payment of travel expenses.

The present law requires that funds appropriated for service in any fiscal year must be spent or obligated to meet needs that arise within that fiscal year unless the enabling legislation expressly permits the appropriation to be carried over (31 U.S.C. 712a et seq.). Rivers and harbors projects are excepted from the rule.

Public Law 88-609 authorized the expenditure of \$17.5 million in general terms. The canal study which closely parallels rivers and harbors projects must be completed within a relatively short period of time, no later than June 30, 1968. In order to provide orderly planning and programing of the study, the reported bill would make the authorized funds available without regard to fiscal year limitations.

DISPOSAL OF CHROMIUM METAL,
ACID GRADE FLUORSPAR, AND
SILICON CARBIDE FROM THE
SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 330) to authorize the disposal of chromium metal, acid grade fluorspar, and silicon carbide from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT
(No. 774)

PURPOSE

This resolution would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of three items of substandard and contaminated materials now held in the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started. The materials are (1) chromium metal, (2) acid grade fluorspar, and (3) silicon carbide.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law congressional approval is required for materials in the supplemental stockpile, except when the proposed disposal action is based on the determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war. The proposed disposal of these materials is a result of their not meeting quality specifications. Consequently,

congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Chromium metal

The chromium metal held in the supplemental stockpile is a part of the quantity delivered to the Government under contract BSD-SM-57-48 with Continental Ore Corp. pursuant to the barter program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Public Law 480. The acquisition cost of the specification grade metal under this contract was \$1.135 per pound of contained chromium, f.o.b. carriers conveyances at Baltimore or Philadelphia.

Since this 17 tons of metal contains excess sulfur and oxygen, it was accepted with a \$0.15 per pound allowance.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning established a revised stockpile objective for chemical grade chromite on March 19, 1964, at 600,000 short dry tons. Included in this objective is 2,500 short tons of aluminothermic chromium metal. As of March 31, 1964, the quantity of chemical grade chromite excess to this objective was 659,036 short dry tons; and the aluminothermic chromium metal excess to the subobjective was 1,924 short tons of specification grade and the 17 short tons of nonstockpile grade material. This latter quantity is the material proposed for disposal.

Chromium metal is used in the production of a wide variety of chromium-bearing alloys, among which are electrical resistance alloys, high-temperature and corrosion-resistant alloys, nonferrous metal-cutting tools, chromium bronzes, hard-facing materials, welding electrode tips, and certain high-strength aluminum alloys.

The U.S. consumption of chromium metal is about 2,000 short tons annually. The proposed sale of this small quantity of metal should have no significant impact on producers, processors, distributors, or consumers of chromium metal.

Fluorspar, acid grade (contaminated)

Fluorspar is one of the strategic non-metallic minerals in our industrial economy. Classified according to grades, acid grade fluorspar is the commercial source of hydrofluoric acid which is an essential raw material in the chemical industry.

Acid grade fluorspar is a very finely divided flotation concentrate normally stored in large piles in outside storage. When delivery to the piles has been completed they have been covered to protect the fluorspar from wind and water erosion. During the formation of the piles in the delivery period and before coverings have been placed some material has at times been washed off the piles onto the adjacent ground. In picking up the material washed off the piles some of it has become contaminated with the dirt, sand, or gravel of the area surrounding the storage pad. Similar washouts have occurred due to failure of the coverings after the piles have been formed. All of this material that has thus been contaminated has been segregated from the main fluorspar piles and this is the contaminated material proposed for disposal. It will require some reprocessing before being usable for the purpose for which it was acquired.

The three major quantities involved are at storage depots at Curtis Bay, Baltimore, Md.; Memphis, Tenn., and Granite City, Ill.

Other storage sites contain contaminated material in lesser amounts.

The average acquisition cost of the supplemental stockpile inventory was \$49.80 per short dry ton including accessorial costs.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning established a revised stockpile objective for acid grade fluorspar on February 28, 1964, at 540,000 short dry tons. As of March 31, 1964, the quantity excess to this objective was 604,090 short tons of specification grade and 11,890 short tons of non-stockpile grade material.

U.S. consumption of acid grade fluorspar in 1963 is estimated as 414,000 short tons, an increase of 41,000 tons over 1962 consumption, but not quite equalling the record 424,000 tons in 1961.

Decreased production of domestic fluorspar that started in 1959 continued in 1963, according to reports from producers to the Bureau of Mines, U.S. Department of the Interior. The quantity and value of shipments of finished acid grade fluorspar from domestic mines have decreased for 5 years. In 1962 the quantity shipped was 141,277 short tons valued at \$6.9 million, and estimated 1963 shipments were 119,000 tons valued at \$6.2 million. Fluorspar imports for consumption have come mainly from Mexico, Spain, and Italy. Imports were lower in 1963 than in 1962, but the estimated 1963 quantity of acid grade was 369,000 short tons.

The tonnage of contaminated fluorspar to be disposed of represents less than 1½ percent of the annual consumption of acid grade fluorspar. It comprises a very small portion of the quantity of fluorspar in excess of national stockpile requirements.

Based upon previous GSA experience in offerings of contaminated fluorspar from another inventory and other locations, there is little interest shown by the industry in reprocessing the small quantities. The impact on the markets of producers, processors, or consumers is minimal.

Silicon carbide, crude, nonstockpile grade (contaminated)

Silicon carbide is an artificial crystalline mineral that is of commercial use chiefly because of its extreme hardness and heat resistance. Crushed to five grain sizes it is used as an abrasive, but nonabrasive uses account for approximately one-third of its production.

The artificial abrasive industry in North America has largely migrated from production plants originally established around Niagara Falls, N.Y., to Canada where advantage is taken of lower power costs. Most of the crude abrasives produced in Canada are sent to the United States for processing.

The material for disposal is of Canadian origin. The acquisition cost was approximately \$203.50 per short ton, including accessorial costs.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning established a revised stockpile objective on April 2, 1964, for crude silicon carbide at 30,000 short tons. As of March 31, 1964, the quantity excess to this objective was 166,445 short tons of specification grade and 56 short tons of nonstockpile grade material. This latter quantity is the material proposed for disposal.

At Romulus, N.Y., some of the silicon carbide is stored in canvas-covered piles. Difficulties have been encountered with the coverings, and an estimated 50 short tons have become contaminated by being wind-blown. This material has been salvaged off the ground and placed in two piles designated A and B.

In evacuating the GSA-DMS Depot, Buffalo, N.Y., this bulk material was moved from warehouse storage to outside storage. Approximately 12,275 pounds became contaminated with dirt. This contaminated silicon carbide was salvaged and placed in drums for outside storage until disposal is authorized.

Production of crude silicon carbide in the United States and Canada was 115,716 short tons in 1962. There is no published market price for the crude form, but from sales reported in 1962 and the first 9 months of 1963 an appropriate \$198 per short ton is indicated. There should be no difficulty in the market absorbing this contaminated material. It can be upgraded into a usable form.

TRANSFER OF COPPER FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE TO THE BUREAU OF THE MINT

The bill (H.R. 10748) to authorize the transfer of copper from the national stockpile to the Bureau of the Mint was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT (No. 775)

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval of the transfer to the Bureau of the Mint of approximately 110,000 short tons of copper now held in the national stockpile; and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required before such a transfer could be accomplished.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of copper is based on the determination that the inventory of copper is excess to stockpile requirements and not because copper is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

Moreover, disposals from the national stockpile normally may be accomplished only after a waiting period of 6 months following publication of a disposal notice in the Federal Register. Waiver of this requirement will permit immediate transfer of excess copper to the Bureau of the Mint.

Why disposal is proposed

The current stockpile objective for copper, which was established by the Office of Emergency Planning, is 775,000 short tons. The national stockpile inventory of copper exceeds this objective by approximately 156,000 short tons.

The Bureau of the Mint requires copper for coinage. Until now the mint's requirements for copper have been met from the Defense Production Act inventory, but all the copper remaining in this inventory has been committed for use by the mint and an additional 110,000 short tons are needed to meet planned requirements.

The copper to be made available from the stockpile must be refined before it can be used by the Bureau of the Mint for coinage. Since this refinement requires time, a waiver of the 6-month waiting period will allow the necessary refining to proceed.

Financial information

The Bureau of the Mint will reimburse the General Services Administration for the copper at its fair market value. The current average domestic market price is 36 cents per pound. Approval of this legislation will avoid Government expenditure of approximately \$80 million that otherwise would be required for the purchase of copper and it will also result in storage and maintenance savings.

DISPOSAL OF CHEMICAL GRADE CHROMITE FROM THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

The bill (H.R. 10715) to authorize the disposal of chemical grade chromite from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT (No. 776)

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval of the disposal of approximately 659,100 short tons of chemical grade chromite now held in the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before disposals from the national stockpile can be begun.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Existing law requires congressional approval for the disposal of materials in the supplemental stockpile unless the proposed disposal is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of chemical grade chromite is based solely on a determination that the quantity of this material in the supplemental stockpile is excess to requirements. Consequently, the proposed disposal requires the express approval of the Congress.

Why disposal is proposed

The quantity of chemical grade chromite in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile is 1,259,036 short dry tons. The stockpile objective is 600,000 short dry tons and thus approximately 659,100 short dry tons are excess to current requirements.

Chemical grade chromite is an ore that is converted into sodium bichromate, from which other chrome chemicals are derived. These chemicals are used for such purposes as plating, anodizing for metal protection, paint pigments, tanning of leather, and textile and chemical manufacturing.

The proposed disposal of this material will probably require 20 to 25 years to complete. The sales for the first year will be about 20,000 short tons.

Financial information

The chemical chromite in the supplemental stockpile was acquired at an average cost of \$17.80 per short dry ton. The current market price is quoted at \$17 per short dry ton, f.o.b. Atlantic ports.

DISPOSAL OF COLEMANITE

The bill (H.R. 10714) to authorize the disposal of colemanite from the supplemental stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT (No. 777)

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of approximately 67,600 long dry tons of colemanite now held in the supplemental stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before disposals from the supplemental stockpile can be started.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the supplemental stockpile except when the proposed disposal is based on determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of colemanite is based on a determination that the quantity of colemanite in the supplemental stockpile is excess to stockpile requirements and not because colemanite is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, congressional approval is required for the disposal.

Why disposal is proposed

The colemanite that is in the supplemental stockpile was acquired through the barter of surplus agricultural products and was placed in the supplemental stockpile under authority contained in the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended. A national stockpile objective was never established for this material.

Colemanite is a mineral that is the source of boron compounds, such as borax and boric acid.

Financial information

The colemanite was acquired at an average cost of \$39 per long dry ton. There is no domestic market for this material but European prices are quoted at \$25 to \$27 per metric ton, f.o.b. Turkish ports.

is 38,962 long tons and thus approximately 23,962 long tons are excess to current requirements.

Financial information

The chestnut extract was acquired at an average cost of \$279 per long ton and the current market price is \$207 per long ton.

The quebracho cost \$247 per long ton on the average, and the current market price is \$201 per long ton.

The average cost of the wattle was \$252 per long ton and the current market price is \$199 per long ton.

Approval of this bill will enable the Government to sell surplus quantities of these materials for cash.

World production of abaca now is at a rate of about 250 million pounds annually. More than 95 percent of this product is from the Philippine Islands.

The United States, Canada, Japan, Europe, and the United Kingdom are the principal consumers of abaca fiber. Consumption in the United States and Canada is at a rate of about 70 million pounds annually, almost half the consumption rate for North America of 10 years ago before the use of synthetic fibers became extensive.

Under congressional authority granted earlier, the General Services Administration sold 5 million pounds of abaca between July and September of 1962 and about 16 million pounds between September 1959 and June 1960. Consumption levels in the United States and Canada at the time of those disposals were not materially different from now. The earlier sales were made without adverse impact upon markets and the General Services Administration is of the opinion that the present surplus can be disposed of without seriously disrupting current markets.

The committee was informed that disposals in the first year will be limited to 5.5 million pounds and that after the initial disposal there will be additional consultation in an attempt to keep disruption of markets at a minimum.

Financial information

The surplus abaca was acquired at an average cost of \$0.2525 per pound. The current market price is quoted at \$0.22 per pound for Philippine grade, Davao SJ-1, landed New York.

DISPOSAL OF VEGETABLE TANNIN

The bill (H.R. 10516) authorizing the disposal of vegetable tannin extracts from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional approval for the disposal of (a) 15,000 long tons of chestnut tannin extract, (b) 111,457 long tons of quebracho tannin extract, and (c) 23,962 long tons of wattle tannin extract; and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period ordinarily before disposals from the national stockpile may be accomplished.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of the vegetable tannin extracts that are named in this bill is based on a determination that the quantity of these extracts now in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because they are obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize the immediate disposal of these vegetable tannin extracts by waiving the normal requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

In recent years U.S. consumption of all vegetable tannin extracts has declined to less than one-half of the quantities consumed 20 years ago. This decline is primarily a result of a diminishing use of heavy leather instead of its being a result of the use of substitutes. The increased use of rubber, plastic, and synthetic shoe soles has had the greatest impact on tannin consumption; less than 30 percent of the shoes produced today have leather soles. This downward trend in the production of heavy leather is expected to continue. Substitute materials, such as Corfam, have displaced lighter leather, but these substitutes have not substantially affected the use of vegetable tannin extracts.

The stockpile objective for chestnut extract is 15,000 long tons. The inventory is 33,544 long tons, of which 3,544 long tons have been authorized for disposal under earlier congressional authorization. The remaining excess of approximately 15,000 long tons would be made available for disposal by this bill.

The stockpile objective for quebracho tannin extract is 86,000 long tons. The inventory is 197,457 long tons and thus 111,457 long tons are excess to current requirements.

The stockpile objective for wattle tannin extract is 15,000 long tons. The inventory

DISPOSAL OF ABACA

The bill (H.R. 6852) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed six-month waiting period, of approximately ninety-seven million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile."

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT
(No. 779)

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 97 million pounds of abaca now held in the national stockpile and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law, congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of abaca is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the abaca is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of abaca by waiving the statutory requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The current stockpile objective for abaca is 50 million pounds. The national stockpile inventory is 147 million pounds. Hence 97 million pounds of abaca are surplus to stockpile objectives.

Abaca is subject to deterioration. Most of the surplus abaca is 7 years old or older. Unless disposal is authorized, rotation of the older fiber may be required to avoid loss of the Government investment of about \$24 million in the quantity of fiber that is surplus. The rotation of 9.5 million pounds annually would cost the Government approximately \$500,000 each year. The annual cost of storing the surplus of 97 million pounds is approximately \$240,000.

Information on abaca

The principal use for abaca fiber is in the manufacture of rope for marine, industrial, and farm purposes. Some quantities of the fiber are also used in the manufacture of various products.

DISPOSAL OF NICKEL

The bill (H.R. 10305) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 124,220,000 pounds of nickel from the national stockpile which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "approximately", to strike out "one" and insert "two".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed six-month waiting period, of approximately two hundred and twenty-four million two hundred thousand pounds of nickel from the national stockpile."

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT (No. 780)

PURPOSE

This bill would (1) grant congressional consent to the disposal of approximately 224,200,000 pounds of nickel now held in the national stockpile, and (2) waive the 6-month waiting period normally required before such disposal could be started.

EXPLANATION

Why congressional action required

Under existing law congressional approval is required for the disposal of materials in the national stockpile except when the proposed disposal action is based on a determination that the material has become obsolescent for use in time of war.

The proposed disposal of nickel is based on a determination that the quantity of this material in the national stockpile is excess to requirements and not because the nickel is obsolescent for use in time of war. Consequently, express congressional approval for the disposal is required.

Moreover, the bill would authorize an immediate start on the disposal of nickel by waiving the normal requirement for a 6-month waiting period after notice of the proposed disposal is published in the Federal Register.

Why disposal is proposed

The current stockpile objective for nickel is 100 million pounds. The national stockpile inventory is approximately 324,200,000 pounds. Hence, 224,200,000 pounds of nickel are surplus to stockpile objectives.

In November of 1964 the General Services Administration formulated a long-range disposal program for all surplus nickel, including that held in the Defense Production Act inventory. In developing this disposal plan the General Services Administration consulted extensively with all segments of the nickel-producing and the nickel-consuming industries. The initial disposal rate was set at 15 million pounds annually, with specific limitations on the several types of nickel such as electrolytic, cathodes, ferromnickel, and nickel oxide powder. Three quarterly offerings have been made and participation has been better than expected. Because of a strong market the disposal rate has been raised to 25 million pounds for fiscal year 1966. Sales of balanced quantities of the several forms of nickel will help to prevent disruption of normal markets and authority to dispose of nickel from the surplus in the national stockpile is needed to permit balanced sales beginning with the second quarter of this fiscal year.

Financial information

Nickel in the national stockpile was acquired at an average cost of 54 cents per pound. The current market price is 79 cents per pound. If this price remains stable, the Government could realize receipts of more than \$177 million, of which more than \$50 million would be a profit from the sale of surplus nickel.

COMMITTEE ACTION

As referred to the committee the bill authorized the disposal of 124,200,000 pounds of nickel, 100 million pounds less than the entire surplus.

In its original request to the Congress the General Services Administration had sought authority for the disposal of the entire surplus of 224,200,000 pounds.

During a hearing on this bill a nickel industry witness urged that a portion of the surplus should be retained in the stockpile to provide for the possibility that the stockpile objective for nickel might be raised in the future. The committee requested the General Services Administration and Office of Emergency Planning to submit additional information justifying the request for authority to dispose of all the surplus. Letters from these agencies in response to this request appear at the end of this report.

After considering the additional information submitted, the committee concurred in the desirability of authorizing the disposal of 224,200,000 pounds of nickel.

THE LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7812) to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may lend to friendly foreign nations, on such terms and condi-

tions as he deems appropriate, ships from the reserve fleet as follows:

(1) Italy, two submarines, and (2) Spain, one helicopter carrier.

SEC. 102. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of vessels transferred under this title shall be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may sell or lend, at his discretion, to friendly foreign nations of Latin America from the reserve fleet, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, destroyers as follows:

(1) Argentina, two destroyers, Brazil, three destroyers.

SEC. 202. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of vessels transferred under this title shall be charged to funds provided by the recipient government under the reimbursable provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

SEC. 203. Notwithstanding sections 7304 and 7305 of title 10, United States Code, should the President determine that the vessel or vessels shall be sold to the recipient government, said vessel or vessels shall be stricken from the Naval Vessel Register. The vessel or vessels shall be sold at not less than \$1,000,000 each over and above any cost of activation, overhaul, or modification. All sales will be made pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. Notwithstanding section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, or any other law, the President may lend to friendly foreign nations, on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate ships from the reserve fleet as follows:

(1) Turkey, two destroyers, and (2) Philippines, one destroyer escort.

SEC. 302. All expenses involved in the activation, rehabilitation, and outfitting (including repairs, alterations, and logistic support) of vessels transferred under this title, shall be charged to funds programed for the recipient government as grant military assistance, or as reimbursable, under the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, or successor legislation.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. Loans executed under this Act shall be for periods not exceeding five years, but the President may in his discretion extend such loans for an additional period of not more than five years. They shall be made on the condition that they may be terminated at an earlier date if necessitated by the defense requirements of the United States.

SEC. 402. No sale or loan may be made under this Act unless the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, determines that such sale or loan is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall keep the Congress currently advised of all sales or loans made under authority of this Act.

SEC. 403. The President may promulgate such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 404. The authority of the President to sell or lend naval vessels under this Act terminates on December 31, 1967.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

EXCERPT FROM THE COMMITTEE REPORT
(No. 781)

PURPOSE

The bill as amended would authorize the loan of 11 ships to the following countries:

Argentina (destroyers).....	2
Brazil (destroyers).....	3
Italy (submarines).....	2
Spain (helicopter carrier).....	1
Philippines (destroyer escort).....	1
Turkey (destroyers).....	2

The destroyers to be loaned or sold are of the *Fletcher* class (2,100 tons), and the submarine is of the *Balao* class (1,500 tons).

BACKGROUND

The law

Before 1961 U.S. naval vessels could be transferred to friendly foreign nations under the provisions of the Mutual Assistance Defense Act of 1949, as amended. Public Law 82-3, which was approved in 1951, the text of which appears in section 7307 of title 10, United States Code, requires that a battleship, carrier, cruiser, destroyer, or submarine that has not been struck from the Naval Register may not be sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of without express congressional approval.

Since 1951 Congress has enacted 17 laws relating to ship transfers. Eleven of these laws provided authority for new loans and extensions of existing loans and the other six dealt with loan extensions only.

Summary of transfers

The 17 laws relating to ship transfers enacted since 1951 have authorized the loan of 94 ships, the transfer of 9 ships, and the sale of 4 ships. Of the 94 ships authorized for loan, 72 have actually been loaned. Of the four ships authorized for sale, one has been sold. All of the nine ships authorized for transfer have been transferred.

Requests received

Since World War II the United States has received many requests for ships from foreign countries. These requests have been evaluated in terms of the needs of the requesting countries, mobilization requirements of the United States, worldwide demands on our resources, and the availability of mutual defense assistance funds.

Ships proposed for loan under this bill will satisfy some of the more urgent requests that have been considered. The ships that are proposed for loan under the bill are part of our mobilization base, but they will be in the possession of allies and not lost by the United States.

Definition of a "friendly foreign nation"

Responsibility for determination of a "friendly foreign nation" is vested in the President by sections 503, 506, and 507 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

TITLE I

This title authorizes the loan of two submarines to Italy and a helicopter carrier to Spain.

The submarines will be used by Italy to replace obsolete submarines now in its navy. The vessels to be loaned would improve the proficiency of the Italian antisubmarine warfare forces. Limited activation of the submarines will be accomplished in the United States before transfer to Italy where they will receive extensive overhaul and modernization.

The helicopter carrier will be used by Spain to build an antisubmarine warfare capability that would be helpful to the United States in combating the threat posed by the submarine forces of potentially hostile nations. The Spanish Government will pay the cost of activation, overhaul, and modernization in U.S. shipyards and will

buy helicopters for the carrier from the United States.

TITLE II

This title authorizes the loan of two destroyers to Argentina and three destroyers to Brazil.

These ships will be used by the recipient countries to replace obsolete ships and to standardize on general purpose vessels that are suitable and effective for peacetime surveillance of coastal waters, support of counterinsurgency operations in coastal areas, and wartime patrol of convoy routes along the coasts.

The bill gives Argentina and Brazil the option to purchase the ships at a price of not less than \$1 million per ship.

TITLE III

This title would authorize the loan of one destroyer escort to the Philippines and two destroyers to Turkey.

The destroyers will be used by Turkey to meet responsibilities assigned to it by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The destroyer escort for the Philippines is intended as a replacement for the Philippine Navy flagship that was sunk during a typhoon in the summer of 1964. This vessel will also provide a quicker response and a greater force than can now be provided by Philippine patrol ships.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The loan of the ships under authority of this bill may be for periods not exceeding 5 years and the President may extend the period of the loans for an additional period of not more than 5 years. All loan agreements must contain a provision that the loan can be terminated if necessitated by defense requirements of the United States.

The loan or sale of the vessels must be preceded by a determination by the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that the loan or sale is in the best interest of the United States. The Secretary of Defense is required to keep the Congress currently informed of transfers made under authority of the bill.

The authority to sell or lend vessels would terminate on December 31, 1967. This period of time is needed to provide for negotiation and the orderly planning of activations and overhauls.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

The cost of the limited activation of the two submarines to be loaned to Italy will be borne by the Italian Government. The Spanish Government will pay the cost of activating the carrier—approximately \$10 million—and in addition, will buy helicopters costing \$10 million from the United States. Hence there will be an inflow of gold of more than \$20 million.

The ships for Argentina and Brazil would result in a minimum of \$14.5 million or a maximum of \$28.5 million favorable flow of gold, depending on the extent of overhaul and modification and whether the recipient countries desire to purchase the ships.

Even the expense associated with ship loans that is grant aid would be paid by the United States for work done in our own shipyards. Consequently, there is no gold outflow.

The cost of activating, overhauling, and rehabilitating a destroyer varies between \$3.3 and \$5.7 million and similar costs for a destroyer escort are between \$2 and \$2.7 million. These costs are typical and vary somewhat from ship to ship.

VIEW OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The executive branch originally recommended ship loan legislation in three separate bills. This bill, as amended, does not contain all the loans recommended but the committee was informed that the executive branch supports authority for all the loans contained in the bill.

BILL PASSED OVER

At the request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following bill was passed over:

H.R. 9247, to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair of 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

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

HEMISFAIR 1968 EXPOSITION, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 759, H.R. 9247; that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business, not to be acted on before Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9247) to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair of 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

OIL CONSUMERS HIT AND HURT BY HOEHN APPOINTMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning when I opened the Washington Post, I was shocked to read that Secretary Udall has said that if newly appointed oil import administrator Elmer L. Hoehn should lean too far in the direction of industry in administering oil imports he—Udall—and Hoehn's predecessor, J. Cordell Moore, newly appointed Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources would supply the "corrective."

Now keep in mind, Mr. President, this is the same Elmer Hoehn who was executive secretary of the Independent Oil Producers and Land Owners Association in Kentucky, Illinois, and Indiana, and that has been hammering away at cutting imports of oil.

So Hoehn has just been the hired hand for the special interest dedicated to cutting imports to get their own price to American consumers up.

This is the Hoehn whose job is to allocate oil imports among qualified applicants. He is the man who will issue licenses on the basis of these allocations.

And the Secretary of the Interior says that if Hoehn lives up to his advance billing, in favor of the oil industry, the Secretary and Assistant Secretary Moore will lean on him—will correct him.

Now I ask you, what kind of way is this to run a Department; Secretary Udall is

saying, in effect that he will oversee Hoehn's operation, that Hoehn will be closely watched to see that he does not favor industry.

If there is any simple truth in administrative operation it is that in these immense Federal departments with their farflung responsibilities and their thousands of employees, the Secretary as head of the Department cannot possibly watch his subordinates carefully. Nor in fact can his Assistant Secretary. This is exactly why these appointments are so immensely important.

Does Secretary Udall imply that he will issue the import licenses, that he will make the oil import allocations? Of course he won't.

Mr. President, it has been said: "Let me write the songs for a nation and I care not who writes its laws."

Well Mr. President, let me determine who serves in these key subordinate positions in this or any administration and I care not who are in the higher positions. It is the hundreds of Elmer Hoehns who run this Government.

Any efficient executive must delegate to subordinates the authority to make the decisions within the responsibility of that subordinate; and it is clear that the big decisions on imports of oil are delegated to Elmer Hoehn by clear Department policy and experience and directive.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the American oil consumer does not deserve to have a man in this position whose actions must be carefully watched. I pointed out earlier this week that Hoehn's appointment was an insult to the American consumer and now Secretary Udall has confirmed this opinion.

I deeply hope that Secretary Udall will reconsider this rash move. Cordell Moore, Mr. Hoehn's predecessor is a career civil servant. He exemplified the type of man who was beholden to no special interest group.

There is no reason on the face of the earth why another man of this disinterested caliber could not have been chosen for the job.

I am not impugning Mr. Hoehn's character. However, no man can escape his background and his preconceptions and associations. Think of the pressure Mr. Hoehn will be subjected to by his old compatriots. Think of the point of view with which he will undoubtedly approach all policy decisions.

Mr. President, Secretary Udall should make a public, not a special interest appointment to replace Mr. Hoehn. Then there would be no question of "correctives."

The Secretary of the Interior should not be a probation officer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post article entitled "Udall is Delighted With Oil Import Chief."

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

UDALL IS "DELIGHTED" WITH OIL IMPORT CHIEF

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall told a news conference yesterday that he is

"delighted" with the appointment of Elmer L. Hoehn as oil import administrator.

Hoehn, a former member of the Indiana House of Representatives, has for the last decade been executive secretary of the Independent Oil Producers and Land Users Association, Tri-State.

When the appointment was announced, Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, scored it as an "unethical betrayal of the consumers' interests. PROXMIRE said the Tri-State group had played an active role in advocating the cutting of oil imports.

"I am delighted that we have someone who has an insight into the oil problem," Udall said yesterday. He said that Hoehn had prepared, at Udall's request, a signed statement that neither he nor any member of his family had any financial interest in oil companies.

The oil import program has been under review for the last 6 months and is now being studied by the White House. Udall said the program, "a very tight, compact, compartmentalized program dedicated to protecting consumers' interests," is now in the final stages of examination.

In response to questions, Udall said that if Hoehn should lean too far in the direction of the industry in administering oil imports, he and Hoehn's predecessor, J. Cordell Moore, newly appointed Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources, would supply the "corrective."

L.B.J.-H.H.H. STRIKE ANOTHER BLOW FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President has today announced several changes in the Government's civil rights program designed to improve our efforts in this field. Among those recommendations is the suggestion that the Community Relations Service be transferred from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice. I should like to point out that this recommendation shows, by implication, what remarkable progress we have been making in the field of civil rights.

I know that my colleagues will applaud the recommended reassignment of civil rights functions which Vice President HUMPHREY has made to the President.

I believe that this is one of the most far-reaching proposals for the strengthening and clarification of the goals of this administration within the area of civil rights.

It is indicative of the administrative talents of the Vice President because it brings into clear focus the fact that what we have been doing in the field of civil rights can be continued and even improved by the changes that he has proposed.

By his concurrence in these recommendations, the President has indicated his own feeling that it is of great importance to attach responsibility for effective civil rights programs to each and every official of the Federal Government. As you know, during his term as Vice President, the President served as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Because of the heavy workload which he brought to this office and because of the big strides made by the Committee during his chairmanship, he has remarkable understanding of the problems involved in the field of civil rights.

I am sure that Members will agree that his suggested reorganization will allow

us to move ahead faster and further in this most important field.

The Community Relations Service was located in the Department of Commerce by the Congress when it enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We did this on the assumption that the primary role of that Service would be to conciliate disputes arising out of the public accommodations title of the act. But the acceptance of the public accommodations provision, even in those areas of our country where those provisions constituted a reversal of generations of local custom and practice, has far exceeded our most optimistic predictions.

Thus, what we expected to be the primary function of the Community Relations Service has all but disappeared. The President's proposal—which was recommended by the Vice President in his capacity as Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity—seeks to locate this valuable service where it can make greater contributions to other aspects of the race relations problem. Locating the service in the Attorney General's office will enable it to supplement the broad and deep experience of the Department of Justice in racial matters. From that vantage point, the Service can call upon the appropriate departments of the Government to conciliate any disputes which arise.

At the same time, the clearinghouse and data-gathering functions, currently performed by the Community Relations Service, will be taken over by the Civil Rights Commission, which already has similar responsibilities.

These and other changes will be coming before the Congress as part of a reorganization plan to be submitted at the next session. Not only will such a plan eliminate costly duplication of effort, but it will greatly strengthen the Government's ability to fulfill its civil rights responsibilities under the law. It represents another step closer to our goal of assuring equal opportunity and full freedom for all our citizens.

A WELCOME TO MADAME CHIANG KAI-SHEK AND DEFENSE MINISTER CHIANG CHING-KUO

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the Washington community is privileged at this time to be the host for two distinguished citizens of the Republic of China. The gracious First Lady, Madame Chiang Kai-shek, is here on an unofficial visit, while her stepson, Defense Minister Chiang Ching-kuo, is the guest of the Secretary of Defense.

Today I wish to extend my personal aloha to Madame Chiang Kai-shek and to Defense Minister Chiang Ching-kuo, and to commend them for helping to keep the Republic of China "the guardian rock in the western Pacific standing watch in a tossing, churning, treacherous sea."

A concrete manifestation of the strength of the Republic of China is its economic stability, which prompted the United States to terminate our economic assistance programs to Taiwan earlier this year. I congratulate the Republic

of China for its economic victory over years of struggle against overwhelming odds, and I am confident that the energy, foresight, diligence, and skills which the free people of Taiwan and their great enlightened leaders have demonstrated will lead them to even greater progress and prosperity in the future.

I am happy to note that Dr. Diosdado M. Yap, president and editor of Capital Publishers, Inc., and a well-known scholar on the problems of the Far East corroborates my optimistic outlook of the Taiwan economy. In his brief, but extremely comprehensive, study entitled "What Now For Free China?" Dr. Yap wrote:

Despite the termination of U.S. aid at the end of June, the prospects for industrial development were never better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following excerpt from Dr. Yap's timely booklet be printed in the RECORD.

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

INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES IN TAIWAN

Taiwan never had it so good. Despite the termination of U.S. aid at the end of June, the prospects for industrial development were never better.

In the last decade, the private sector of Taiwan's economy has been hustling and busting toward an Asian prosperity that is unprecedented except in Japan.

In only 10 years, the gross national product has risen 45 percent. Foreign exchange reserves are at an alltime high. Exports are climbing. Per capita income exceeds U.S.\$150.

Not long ago, agricultural products were the major export items. Now the leading products include textiles, timber and products, ores, metals and manufacturers, and cement.

As the fourth 4-year economic development plan got underway in January of this year, Taiwan had reached the point of having to make the leap from high-profit, low-investment small industry to low-profit, high-investment heavy industry. The need is for steel, petrochemicals, synthetics, and other highly sophisticated products requiring huge capital and immense know-how.

Natural gas, a raw material that can provide petrochemical intermediates, has an estimated reserve of 18.5 billion cubic meters. Its abundant supply and a fast-growing, man-made fiber and plastics industries assures rapid development of petrochemicals. Natural gas also can be used as fuel in making steel.

The Chinese Petroleum Corp.'s refinery in Kaohsiung produces naphtha, the other basic material of petrochemicals. The government's development program calls for joint private-public investment to expand the production of natural gas and naphtha.

Foreign investment will be welcomed and helped to establish heavy industries. The Allied Chemical Corp. of the United States, which is already making urea fertilizer from natural gas in Taiwan, is investing U.S.\$28 million to produce petrochemical intermediates for dacron and nylon fibers.

The National Distillers & Chemical Corp., also of the United States, will build a plant costing more than U.S.\$7 million to make polyethylene, a raw material of plastics.

Polypropylene, a petrochemical raw material for fibers, can also be made from natural gas. The construction of a polypropylene plant with capacity of 15 million pounds a year is projected.

Most of some 50 steel mills in Taiwan are small and poorly equipped. As industrial development accelerates, the need for iron and steel products will soar to the point where an integrated steel plant should be profitable. A plant with annual output of 170,000 tons of rolled steel products would require investment of U.S.\$60 million.

Metal processing also requires considerable investment and development. The Metal Industries Development Center, established with the financial assistance of the U.N. Special Fund, is helping with employee training, improving cost control and plant equipment, and developing new products. Growth of this industry will lead to reduction in machinery imports and enable Taiwan to manufacture machinery and parts for foreign factories.

The government will encourage the export processing industry in an attempt to maintain the annual rate of industrial growth at 11 percent. The construction of an export processing zone has begun at Kaohsiung. Factories will be entitled to all tax benefits available under the existing investment law and also will be exempted from paying import duty on equipment, raw materials and semifinished components. Commodity taxes will not be levied, and import and export licensing requirements will be reduced to a minimum.

Nor has the saturation point been reached for light industry. Investment studies have recommended plants making optical products. Watches and clocks also are sure profitmakers.

For any size plant, a profitable future is assured by such advantages as low-cost skilled labor, sites at reasonable prices, a stable social and political environment, and government cooperation and assistance.

AN ILL-CONSIDERED ACTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our late, great President John F. Kennedy was proud of his accomplishments in connection with the creation, organization and strengthening of the Alliance for Progress and it was largely by reason of his leadership and farsightedness that we overcame the enmity of people of Latin America and stilled the slogans "Yankee, go home," "Viva, Castro," and the charge of Yankee aggression and Yankee imperialism.

In fact, never since the time of the good neighbor policy of Secretary of State Cordell Hull was our relationship so close and so friendly with Latin American people and rulers as was accomplished by the Organization of American States in the exercise of individual and collective defense of the Western Hemisphere and joint action of all members to prevent, or combat, Communist subversion in all areas of South and Central America.

Unfortunately, recently in the other body, House Resolution 560, with a lot of "hoopla" and evidently very little thought, was adopted by a vote of 312 to 52. This resolution was not requested by our President who certainly has the prime responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs. It was a gratuitous slap at the governing officials of all Latin American republics. This resolution asserted that our Nation would go anywhere that it chooses in the Western Hemisphere without consulting heads of state of our neighbor nations to

take any action we, as one nation of the Organization of American States, decided to take to halt Communist subversion in this hemisphere. Unfortunately, passage of this resolution no doubt pleased and encouraged Communist elements in countries such as Peru, Brazil, and, of course, in Castro's Cuba. The only nation really harmed by the adoption of this resolution was the United States of America. It is to be hoped that no such resolution will be introduced, or seriously considered, in the Senate. Such action as was taken in the other body has been, and should have been, resented by our Latin American friends. Its net effect would make Communists rather than prevent communism.

Furthermore, as a matter of propaganda, reading from this resolution one's attention is immediately called to the following utterly false statement:

The subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations.

It seems fantastic for a majority of Members of either body of the Congress to broadcast to the world that communism threatens the sovereignty and political independence of all nations in the Western Hemisphere which would include Canada and the United States. I repudiate and deny as absurd any statement that "subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly threaten the sovereignty and political independence" of the United States or Canada. Of course communism thrives on misery, unemployment, hunger and in nations where the ruling oligarchy keeps peasants and laborers in conditions of helplessness, squalor, misery, and servitude.

If the other body of this Congress has nothing more constructive to do than pass such a resolution then it should adopt a resolution to recess or adjourn sine die.

BIG BROTHER: LIE DETECTORS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one aspect of invasions of privacy is the growing use of polygraphs—the so-called lie detector—both for law enforcement work and in many other fields of activity. One of the latter is the use of polygraphs to test the reliability of prospective employees, both in Government and industry.

In my view, the lack of professional training of operators is one of the weakest links in the use of this privacy invader. This and other shortcomings of the polygraph have been brought to the attention of the Congress and the public in a set of most interesting and valuable hearings which have been conducted by the able Representative from California, Mr. JOHN MOSS.

Recently, Mr. Lee M. Burkey, of the Illinois bar, wrote a most enlightening article on this subject in the September 1965 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. I ask consent that this fine article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CASE AGAINST THE POLYGRAPH (By Lee M. Burkey, of the Illinois bar (Chicago))

Public attention frequently has been drawn to the polygraph through press reports of its use by law enforcement agencies or by politicians who propose it be used to settle disputed points of fact arising from the fervor of political debate. Interest has been heightened recently by the efforts of organized labor to ban its use in industry.

The polygraph, better known as the lie detector, is an electronic device that, on being applied to the human body, graphically records blood pressure, pulse, respiration and perspiration. Its use as an investigative technique is based on these assumptions: (1) that lying leads to conflict, (2) that conflict causes fear and anxiety, (3) that this mental state is the direct cause of measurable physical changes that can be accurately recorded on the polygraph and (4) that the polygraph operator by a study of these reactions can tell whether the subject is being deceptive or truthful. None of these assumptions is wholly true. Even the most enthusiastic supporters of the polygraph readily concede that errors are made.

Since efforts were first made to introduce lie detector results in evidence, the great majority of State and Federal courts, believing the method to be scientifically unreliable, have refused to permit them to be introduced either in criminal or civil proceedings.¹ With few exceptions,² courts have also denied admission of test results even though the parties have stipulated to their use.³ Illinois, by statute, not only forbids the court's requiring that a litigant submit to a lie test in any civil trial or pretrial proceeding,⁴ but in a criminal trial also forbids the court's making such a suggestion.⁵

COMMERCIAL OPERATORS SELL POLYGRAPH'S USE

Commercial polygraph interests, finding their methods rejected by the courts, have nevertheless continued to foster the myth that the polygraph is an extremely accurate, if not infallible, method of getting at the truth. A vigorous campaign has been waged in the last decade among employers to secure its adoption as a supplement to other traditional methods of plant security. The result is that more and more employers, assuming that use of the polygraph is an efficient and relatively simple method of stopping thefts within the plant, are requiring their employees to take the tests. Some employers also subject all job applicants to a pre-employment screening that includes a polygraph examination. It has been estimated that there are now approximately 3,000 polygraph operators in the United States who give between 200,000 to 300,000 tests each year. In 1963 the U.S. Government alone gave over 19,000 tests.

Unlike suspects taken into custody by the police, who may not have lie tests used against them in judicial proceedings, employers with no evidence other than the test results frequently discharge employees suspected of unlawful conduct. As the loss of a job under these circumstances means the

¹ *Frye v. United States*, 293 Fed. 1013 (D.C. Cir. 1923.)

² *People v. Houser*, 193 P. 2d 937 (Cal. 1948); *State v. McNamara*, 104 N. W. 2d 568 (Iowa 1960); *State v. Valdez*, 371 P. 2d 894 (Ariz. 1943).

³ *LeFevre v. State*, 8 N. W. 2d 288 (Wis. 1943).

⁴ Illinois Revised Statutes ch. 110, sec. 54.1.

⁵ Illinois Revised Statutes ch. 38, sec. 736.2.

loss of reputation and may effectively bar a worker from future employment, it is no surprise that labor opposes its use. At first labor's opposition was expressed only by contending in labor arbitration proceedings that under a labor contract an employer did not have "just cause" for the discharge of an employee when the evidence of wrongdoing was based solely on the employee's failure to pass a lie test or on his refusal to take one. Most arbitrators have agreed.⁶ Administrative bodies, such as civil service commissions, unemployment compensation boards of review, and the National Labor Relations Board, after some hesitancy, are also taking a similar position.⁷

Concurrently with these developments, labor groups at local and State levels also have sought legislation forbidding the use of the lie detector either on employees or job applicants. Six States now forbid the imposition of polygraph tests on employees by employers as a condition of employment⁸ and similar legislation is being considered by the legislatures of several others. Early this year polygraph testing suffered another setback when the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations initiated a national campaign to prohibit the use of the lie detector in labor relations.

In response to the criticism implicit in the opposition of organized labor, the proponents of lie detectors are trying to raise qualifications of polygraph examiners, whose standards are still so deplorably low that one authority, Fred E. Inbau, professor of law at Northwestern University, has publicly stated that 80 percent of the polygraph operators are not qualified to interpret the results.⁹ Of the three States now requiring licensing of polygraph operators, Illinois has adopted what is regarded as a model act. Under it a polygraph operator must have "an academic degree at least at the baccalaureate level" and have "satisfactorily completed not less than 6 months of internship."¹⁰ Because this act permits persons who have administered "detection of deception examinations for a period of 2 years" prior to the passage of the act to continue to do so, it is obvious that many years must pass before the unqualified are eliminated. Furthermore, it is doubtful that the act really upgrades the standards of examiners, for the mere possession of an academic degree does little, if anything, to qualify an operator unless the degrees are advanced ones in the physiological or psychological sciences.

Despite growing public interest in the subject, few impartial studies have been made on the validity of polygraphic investigation, probably because of the difficulty in checking the results against irrefutable extrinsic facts. The suspect who beats the lie box does not say so, and even confessions themselves are frequently misleading, as those experienced in criminal investigation know. Sev-

eral years ago a Chicago judge bitterly criticized a nationally known polygraph firm for obtaining a confession from a 13-year-old boy that he had set fire to a school, thus causing the death of nearly a hundred people. The judge rejected the confession as inconsistent with all the other evidence in the case. Unlike the cardiograph and other techniques for diagnosing illness, the validity of which can be verified by autopsy, there is no independent means of confirming whether a person who is cleared or condemned by the polygraph has or has not told the truth.

Illustrative of the hazards of the polygraph to the emotionally disturbed is a report in the American Journal of Psychiatry of a young bank officer who, while taking a routine lie test, violently reacted to questions about ever having stolen money from the bank or its customers. Believing that the polygraph could not be wrong, he confessed to thefts that subsequent audits revealed had not taken place. Finally, on receiving psychiatric treatment, he was found to have deep guilt feelings about his wife and mother, both of whom were bank customers. The psychiatrists who examined him criticized the polygraph examiner, saying:

"Psychological factors other than conscious deception causing deviant autonomic responses include such situations or stimuli that produce frustration, surprise, pain, shame, embarrassment, etc. Some of these stimuli (e.g., startle and pain) are almost universal (though there are some exceptions), whereas others (frustration, shame and embarrassment) tend to be more idiosyncratic. The polygraph examiner may not and the commercial operations usually do not, know enough about their clients to evaluate these idiosyncratic factors. This aspect is even more complex when the client is, himself, unconscious of the emotional quality of the stimuli."¹¹

The Warren Commission likewise conclude that physiological responses due to factors other than deception, such as fear, anxiety, neurosis and other emotions, had to be given consideration in evaluating the polygraph.¹²

A team of professional psychologists who had been engaged in extensive research on polygraph techniques and the claims of commercial operators recently came up with this startling conclusion: " * * * there exists no public body of knowledge to support the enthusiastic claim of operators. There are no publications in reputable journals, no facts, no figures, tables or graphs. In short, there is nothing to document the claims to accuracy or effectiveness except bald assertions."¹³

They reported that the only adequately controlled studies of the effectiveness of the lie detector that have been made by physiological psychologists indicate that the degree of success is close to 70 percent—a much lower figure than the usual 95 to 99 percent estimate made by the commercial polygraph operators.

If the lie detector is wrong 3 out of 10 times, it certainly carries a margin of error that justifies the continued reluctance of the courts to permit its use and that explains labor's strenuous effort to ban its use in industry.

¹¹ Dearman & Smith, "Unconscious Motivation and the Polygraph Test," American Journal of Psychiatry 1017 (May 1963).

¹² Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, 813 (official ed. 1964).

¹³ Sternbach, Gustafson & Collier, "Don't Trust the Lie Detector," Harvard Business Review, November-December, 1962, page 127, 130.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS RESULT IN CRITICISM

Extensive hearings on the use of the polygraph were held in 1964 by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, under the chairmanship of Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, of California, after the propriety of the conduct of some of the Government's polygraph operators was questioned. When those hearings were concluded, the committee issued a scathing report in which it said there is no such thing as a "lie detector."¹⁴ This view seems to coincide with that of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who in connection with the Ruby investigation made this comment:

"It should be pointed out that the polygraph, often referred to as 'lie detector,' is not in fact such a device. * * * The FBI feels that the polygraph technique is not sufficiently precise to permit absolute judgments of deception or truth without qualifications."¹⁵

The Committee on Government Operations emphasized that many physical and psychological factors make it possible for an individual either to beat the polygraph when guilty or to fail to pass it when innocent. It also decried the fact that the polygraph technique forces an individual to incriminate himself and often to confess to past conduct not pertinent to the original purpose of the examination.¹⁶

One distinguished authority, after careful analysis of the theory of lie detection by polygraph, has said: "There seems to be little evidence that upholds the claim to a regular relationship between lying and emotion; there is even less to support the conclusion that precise inferences can be drawn from the relationship between emotional change and physiological response." He added that because of these basic theoretical limitations he saw "little reason for supposing that a test with very high unconditional accuracy will ever be developed."¹⁷

To the frequent suggestion that suspects should be permitted "voluntarily" to take lie tests, the committee replied that as long as notations are made in any official file on an individual that he has refused to take a polygraph test, the examination is in no sense "voluntary."¹⁸ All too often a refusal to take the test is regarded as additional evidence of guilt. It is obvious, though, that none of the defects of the polygraph method are overcome merely because a person voluntarily submits to it. The innocent volunteer may rue his naivete when the results are released.

USE BY EMPLOYERS CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED

No doubt the polygraph will continue to be regarded in some quarters as a valuable investigative aid, particularly when it evokes confessions from those who believe in its infallibility, but its use by civil authorities and employers, to the exclusion of a sound and thorough investigation of extrinsic facts, cannot be justified. The argument advanced by advocates of the use of the lie detector that to resist its use is to protect the guilty becomes specious once the defects of the machine and the false assumptions of the method are recognized.

¹⁴ H. Rept. Doc. No. 198, 89th Cong., 1st sess. 13 (1965).

¹⁵ Warren Commission Report, op. cit. supra note 12, at 815.

¹⁶ H. Rept. Doc. No. 198, 89th Cong., 1st sess. 12, 19, 20 (1965).

¹⁷ Skolnick, "Scientific Theory and Scientific Evidence: An Analysis of Lie Detection," 70 Yale L. J. 694, 726, 727 (1961).

¹⁸ H. Rept. Doc. No. 198, 89th Cong., 1st sess. 20 (1965).

⁶ For representative cases, see *General American Transportation Corporation*, 31 Lab. Arb. 355 (1958); *B. F. Goodrich Company*, 36 Lab. Arb. 552 (1961); *Continental Air Transport Company*, 38 Lab. Arb. 778 (1962); *Louis Zahn Drug Company*, 40 Lab. Arb. 352; *Lag Drug Company*, 39 Lab. Arb. 1121 (1963).

⁷ *Stape v. Civil Service Commission*, 172 A. 2d 161 (Pa. 1961); *Swope v. Florida Industrial Commission*, 159 So. 653 (Fla. 1964); *Lone Star Company*, 149 NLRB No. 67 (1964).

⁸ Massachusetts, Oregon, California, Rhode Island, Alaska, and Washington.

⁹ Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations ("Use of Polygraphs as 'Lie Detectors' by the Federal Government"), 88th Cong., 1st sess. pt. 1, at 8 (1964).

¹⁰ Illinois Revised Statutes ch. 38, sec. 961.

The delicate problem of balancing the protection of property against the preservation of human rights will become more urgent as Americans seek to combat the increase in crime, but if the price of its reduction is the destruction of innocent men, the price is too great. The reason for our concern for the rights of the innocent was never better explained than by that staunch lawyer-patriot, John Adams, when in defense of the British soldiers involved in the Boston Massacre he reminded the jury that in their zeal to punish the guilty they should not disregard their duty to protect the innocent, and said: " * * * it may be proper to recollect with what temper the law requires we should proceed * * * we find it laid down by the greatest English judges * * * we are to look upon it as more beneficial that many guilty persons should escape unpunished than one innocent person should suffer. The reason is because it is of more importance to the community that innocence should be protected than it is that guilt should be punished."¹⁹

WHY LIE TEST RESULTS ARE NOT EVIDENCE

The courts, arbitrators and administrative bodies have usually justified their refusal to admit lie test results in evidence for the following reasons:

1. The machine's operation and interpretation depend wholly upon the skill of the operator, many of whom have little or no training in either the psychological or physiological sciences.
2. The emotional state of a sensitive person may render the test less accurate or in some instances useless.
3. The machine itself is not free from error.
4. There is no conclusive proof that a physical response correlates with the mental state of the subject.

In addition to finding the polygraph to be an essentially unscientific and unreliable investigative method, many recent administrative decisions also hold that its use violates the right of privacy and the right against self-incrimination. If these decisions are any guide, emphasis will probably continue to shift from science to civil rights in future cases.

THE RECENT CIVIL DISTURBANCE IN THE WATTS AREA OF LOS ANGELES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, tragic riots in the Watts area of Los Angeles have attracted the attention of the Nation and have caused much speculation as to the causes of the riots and as to the conditions in that area. Since those terrible events, I have myself visited the area and discussed the situation with many community leaders, including the able mayor and chief of police of Los Angeles.

Recently my attention has been drawn by two articles in U.S. News & World Report which I believe deserve reading by interested persons—and I think all our citizens should be interested in this matter.

Morton B. Jackson, a very capable young Los Angeles attorney, who also conducts a weekly radio program, broadcast a speech which contained a frank and extremely articulate discussion of the riots. That speech was reprinted in the September 20 issue of U.S. News & World Report. The September 27 issue of the same publication contains an article by the distinguished Director of

the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, entitled "Police Brutality: How Much Truth—How Much Fiction?" In view of the fact that this issue has been raised in the Los Angeles riots and Chief Parker, who commands the respect of law enforcement officers and understanding citizens across the Nation for his efficient administration of the Los Angeles Police Department, has had to deal with it, this article has a timely application to the Los Angeles situation. I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 20, 1965]

"SECOND CIVIL WAR"—A CLOSER LOOK AT LOS ANGELES RIOTS

(Following are excerpts, reproduced by special permission, from the transcript of an address, "The Second Civil War," broadcast by M. B. Jackson over radio station KMPC and TV station KTLA, Los Angeles, Aug. 15 and 16, 1965.)

One hundred years ago the Civil War ended and, with it, the bloodiest episode in our country's history. Not many realize it, but the Civil War toll in dead and wounded was greater than that in all other wars in which we have been involved put together—including World War II and the Korean War.

Recently, Los Angeles has witnessed and been the victim of a state of anarchy and virtual civil insurrection probably unmatched since the last one.

To deny that it was racial in character or motivation—as some have attempted to do—would be like denying that slavery was an issue in the Civil War. It erupted in a depressed, heavily Negro area, and has been fought and carried on by Negro mobs and gangs consisting of young and old alike.

Slavery was a secondary issue in the Civil War. The preservation of the Union was the principal one. By the same token, the racial aspect of this second one is a secondary, albeit important, issue. The preservation of the fabric of our society and our type of government is the principal one here.

The consequences of the Los Angeles rioting sound like a catalog of major crimes: riots, pillage, arson, looting, murder, aggravated assault, armed robbery, beatings, burglary—you name it. Scenes of fire and destruction remind one of London during the Battle of Britain—and they call to my mind many vivid combat scenes during the war in the Pacific.

The extraordinary thing is that this should have happened in California. This is not the Deep South. Los Angeles has an enviable record for good race relations among its citizens, and they are justifiably proud of it. It has its poorer sections—no large city is without them—but they are nothing compared to some of the slum areas in the large northern cities of this country—to say nothing of other large cities in the world.

Why did it happen here? What caused it? What is the answer? What is the cure?

As usual with anything as cataclysmic as this, there are no easy answers. But many of the basic factors involved are not difficult to identify. The trouble is, however, that they are unpleasant to face, and people in positions of responsibility and leadership in the community—National and State as well as local—frequently try to sidestep them or avoid coming directly to grips with them in the terms they require.

We might start off by eliminating a few shopworn excuses that are invariably offered up when situations like this break out, and

are beginning to be peddled about in this one.

The first of these, and probably the most vicious, is that police brutality—that old bugaboo—is responsible for the whole mess. A few eastern commentators have already played this tune. But it just doesn't play this time.

Los Angeles has probably the finest metropolitan police force in the country, if not the world—and I am familiar with many of them. Its record and efforts in the field of community and race relations is particularly noteworthy, and it is there on the record for anyone who is interested in facts to check. I made a point of this myself a year or so back and spoke not only with Chief [William H.] Parker and several of his people, but also with several prominent members of the Negro community, including one who is now a member of the city council.

At that time, complaints of police brutality were among the reasons cited by those who favored the creation of a police review board. When asked for examples of this, they invariably boiled down to complaints of "verbal brutality"—use of offensive language, or at least language offensive to Negro sensitivities. I was cited to not one example of actual, physical brutality. Even this complaint was met by a special training course given to police officers who were instructed in the niceties of language to be employed when dealing with Negroes, and particularly when handling Negro suspects.

Actually, no better evidence of the lack of police brutality is furnished than the very restraint with which our law enforcement officers have conducted themselves under conditions of extreme provocation during the rioting * * *.

Paraphrasing, I frequently wonder how it is that those who get themselves so worked up over "police brutality," so-called, can feel so little apparent corresponding concern over the brutality practiced on hundreds of innocent citizens by lawless mobs.

The second cliché which is being offered up is that the Negro is simply reacting by giving vent to long-pent-up frustrations—that he has been held down and mistreated too long, and the inevitable reaction is setting in. One is given the impression that this has been the result of a deliberate, almost single-minded conspiracy on the part of the white community. The utterance comes as a sort of breastbeating, a mea culpa, and it is heard from white and Negro apologists alike who, incredibly, seem to justify and excuse, in their own minds, murder, arson, assault, armed robbery, and every other crime in the book by the mere fact of social maladjustment or economic under-privilege.

Again, this one does not play, because it does not square with the facts—nor does it face them.

The opinionmakers in our society today—the journalists, writers, political leaders, etc.—seem to have a preoccupation with sickness, social and physical * * *. However, let's consider for the moment a different type of citizen from the one we have heard so much about recently. He is the one you never hear of, and seldom hear from, but, contrary to the impression that might be gained from reading the papers, he represents the vast majority of the people in this country.

This citizen has educated himself—has taken advantage of the marvelous schools this country affords. He works for a living and supports himself and his family. He pays his taxes, and he doesn't complain too loudly over the fact that they are high and that a large part of them goes to pay the cost of maintaining programs for the relief of those who haven't gone at things the way he has. He is probably making payments on his own home, but the property taxes are getting so high that he wonders

¹⁹ 1 Smith, John Adams 124 (1962).

if he will be able to hang on to it. Welfare programs, which soak up over half of this State's budget, alone keep pushing them further and further up.

Our Mr. Citizen obeys the law. He may grumble at an occasional traffic ticket, but he has respect for the officer nevertheless. He probably uses his seat belt when he drives but, more importantly, he respects the rights of others on the highway. He supports and stays with his wife and children, and he is concerned to see that his children receive a good education, hopefully at the college level, so that they may do better in life than he has done. He probably belongs to his local PTA, and very likely is a member of his community church. The likelihood, also, is that he put in a weary and dangerous stint fighting for his country, and that his son may possibly be in Vietnam now, or at least available for the draft. Neither he nor his son relishes the idea, but they accept the obligation.

This Mr. Citizen we have been talking about has a quality that is part of the root structure of our society—a sense of responsibility. He is a vital and accepted part of his community because of his contribution to it. This is the essence of his identity with it. He doesn't take or demand—he gives, contributes, in the best sense of our common Judeo-Christian tradition. As a consequence he is respected.

It was this sense of obligation, this notion of personal responsibility, and this type of contribution to the community, which gave rise to our Nation and gave it the character which has kept it stable and thriving for 200 years. * * *

You will notice that the Mr. Citizen I am talking about is not white or black or yellow or red, because his qualities still characterize the vast majority of our countrymen, including the vast majority of our so-called minority communities—Negro, Jewish, Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, Polish, Italian, Irish, Scandinavian, or what have you.

These citizens contribute to their communities. And they ask only to be secure in the equal protection of the law which it is the government's obligation to extend to them. They don't bother their neighbors, but they demand, and have a right to expect, protection from injury by neighbors who would bother them.

STARTLING CONTRAST IN MINORITIES

These citizens stand out in startling contrast to those in that community which spawned the bath of fire and blood recently witnessed here: one where crime is rampant; where over 1,000 felonies have been logged in the last few months, including 196 murders and other major crimes; with an illegitimacy rate of 25 percent or higher and a divorce rate of 33 percent or higher; an area containing at least 500 probationers from the commission of major crimes and a large proportion of whose population lives on relief.

The lawless fringe of this same community in the Nation as a whole is responsible for over 50 percent of the crimes of violence committed in the country.

Their insurrection is indeed connected with these conditions. But to cite these conditions as the cause of what occurred here is, I think, to confuse the symptoms with the sickness.

The Negro has very legitimate grievances in certain parts of the country, and most certainly has every right to demand equal treatment under the laws of our country. He has just witnessed a massive and historic Federal legislative accomplishment designed to secure to him these very things in the diminishing areas where they have been denied, and to secure to him equality of opportunity in every area where he can legitimately expect it.

Parenthetically, it might be noted that the principal sectors of recent Federal civil rights legislation have already been on the books as State law in California for many years.

But the demands have gone beyond this, and they have received encouragement and even incitement from various political and community figures on the local and national scene. On the fringes of the rights' cause one hears these shrill voices on every hand demanding equal this and equal that, with no corresponding note of the obligation, contribution or responsibility which economic or social stature inevitably requires.

TO LAWLESS, AN INVITATION TO RIOT

To the lawless and irresponsible elements of the Negro community—and I emphasize again that, as with other sections of our national community, they represent a minority—these incitements and exhortations amount to an invitation to lash out and take by force that which they are constantly told has been denied them and withheld from them. They receive encouragement from all sides to disregard the law—pay no attention to it—to treat our law-enforcement officers with contempt or worse. Our youth and theirs have been invited to challenge and question authority. Our police are systematically restricted further and further in the fundamental tools of law enforcement they may employ in order to maintain public safety and arrest and punish criminals.

Small wonder then that, when the occasion arose on a steamy night in Watts, this lawless, irresponsible element of the Negro community decided to give it a try—and have a ball. Which is just exactly what they did.

They had been encouraged to believe that they were only taking what was rightfully theirs and what had been wrongfully withheld from them all these years. They had been told they were being willfully suppressed, so they were getting even.

One could see it written on their faces as they emerged from gutted stores loaded down with loot. They seemed actually to be proud of what they were getting away with.

It was a tragedy for the entire community. It was a tragedy for the poor fools who delighted in the rampage—tragic because they didn't realize they were destroying the very things they want most to gain.

The even greater tragedy, however, lies with the responsible members—the great majority—of the Negro community who must live and suffer with the humiliation done them by their own people, as well as the incalculable hurt this has done to their own cause.

What is the answer?

Taking first things first, the immediate answer, quite simply, is force: sufficient force to restore law and order and to fulfill government's primary obligation to insure the safety and protection of the public. Here is one situation where the obligation to the law-abiding citizen and the community must take precedence over feelings of concern for the salvation of the criminal. * * *

Secondly, every effort should be made to assure the capture, the conviction and punishment of those whose crimes can be identified and proved. The restoration of order will be merely temporary if those who caused it—or are disposed to emulate it—are not swiftly and surely convinced that they will wind up behind bars for their pains, instead of being fawned upon or even lionized as social misfits.

Thirdly, and most importantly, we need some basic rethinking among our own community leadership and among the Negro community on new approaches to the Negro's final goals: an approach with a little less "gimme" and a lot more give, an approach which emphasizes responsibility rather than privilege.

It is an approach which has worked before, and the only one which can produce lasting results. A shining example is our Japanese community, which has known discrimination—official and unofficial—as deep, as unyielding and as vicious as any in our midst, but one which has, by its own integrity, hard work, sense of responsibility, and by the magnitude of its contribution to the community as a whole, earned a well-merited respect and an honored and accepted place in that community. Dwelling on the senselessness of the prejudice and the baseless suspicion and animosity they had to overcome in the process is a useless exercise; it is merely accentuating the negative, a mistake which the Japanese never made. The important thing and the one which should attract our attention now is how they overcame it—the positive action they took to pierce that curtain of prejudice and to shred it.

Another community in our midst that knows these truths very well is the Jewish one. They have known this problem for centuries. Their situation in our society today is the positive and eloquent evidence of how well they have learned and practiced these same truths. Their contribution to our society in every field—business, arts, sciences—is immeasurable and this country would be poorer without them, considerably poorer.

Each of us has the right to expect equality of opportunity: the right to start out from the same starting line, to be judged on his own performance, on the merits, by the same ground rules, and to harvest the reward of patient and diligent effort, and to be secure in those fruits.

But none of us has the right to demand, of society or anyone else, that these fruits, without the commensurate effort, be handed over on a platter.

REAL AIM OF CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

The civil rights legislation recently passed is designed to insure, to the Negro and to everyone else, precisely such equality of opportunity. And it means to say: If there have been obstacles in your path, we have done our best to remove them; now it's up to you.

The law does not say, and could not safely attempt to do or say, that equality of accomplishment or equality of wealth is yours, as a matter of right, and will be guaranteed to you. But this, in effect, is precisely what many of these shrill voices are demanding, and what many of the lawless and ignorant, as a consequence, have been led to expect. They see visions of television sets and other goodies, private homes with views and two cars in each garage in sections of their own choosing, etc., now as a matter of right.

These things can be had when they are earned—and only then—as others who enjoy them have learned. To insist otherwise is to sound the death knell of our society. It's worth recalling that the funds allocated by government to relief and welfare programs and to rehabilitation projects are there to be used only because other citizens earned them and were responsible enough to pay their taxes. If the responsible are taxed to subsidize irresponsibility, society takes a downturn.

But the important thing is that all the demands and petitions and grievances and demonstrations in the world cannot give to the Negro the thing he most wants—respect: the respect of others and, almost more important, self-respect. Even though society as a whole might gladly bestow it, if only to solve the problem, it cannot be done. Respect cannot be demanded or given. It has to be earned. It has to be merited.

Here is where the basic rethinking must start. It must, I think, start with the Negro leaders themselves. They must say to

their own people: "We have fought hard for laws which will insure to us a fair shake, and we are on the threshold of a new day. Now it is up to us to make the most of the opportunity this gives us. It's time to roll up your sleeves, spit on your hands and go to work. Keep your children in school. Re-educate yourselves. Keep your homes together. Learn to know your community and learn to know its police and other peace officers—they're not bad types at all when you get to know them; they would like to help you, if you would give them a chance. And, above all, don't let yourself be suckered into the temptation or the luxury of claiming that every setback or disappointment is the fault of some white man or some brutal cop. It may seem comforting to tell yourself that, but it's phony comfort and one that will betray you. If you want decent things—good housing, good jobs, good education—then work for them—put out. The opportunities are there, but the job is up to you."

This is largely the job of the Negro leaders themselves, for such advice from the white community would probably be ill received. Dutch uncles are sometimes listened to; outsiders, seldom.

But the community leadership as a whole, from the President on down, has a tremendous role to play also in redirecting and re-orienting this basic thinking: a little less negativism, a little more positive approach; a little less political emotionalism, and a little more commonsense. Educational and vocational-rehabilitation programs now on the boards should be given every push, but with wise and sensible administration and without political coloration.

Welfare programs should be reshaped and directed toward the relief of the needy, yes. But funds should be used on an open-ended ad infinitum basis to support only those who are permanently indigent through no fault of their own or through the consequences of some incurable handicap.

For those in temporary need, relief funds should, on the contrary, be administered in such a way as to encourage rehabilitation and to stimulate and furnish incentives toward self-help, readjustment and eventual self-reliance. They should not be poured out to subsidize irresponsibility and insolence, or to perpetuate maladjustment. Subsidies can be good things, but they have an inevitable tendency to perpetuate the very problems they are designed to relieve.

THE CHOICE THE NATION FACES

Perhaps the shock of the riots, not simply to Los Angeles and California but to the Nation, may be great enough to produce the genesis of just such a new look. If so, and if it takes hold, we could be on the threshold of a national rebirth of sorts; a clear morning after a night of terror.

If not, however, we can expect more of the same, whether here or elsewhere, in a mounting crescendo which will continue, make no mistake about it, until these facts are faced.

For as long as we continue to hear from the demagogues the tired cries of police brutality, enforced underprivilege and deprivation, just so long will the ignorant and lawless on the fringe of the Negro community continue to believe that it is not their fault. And they will continue to respond in precisely the same manner, while their decent, hard-working, law-abiding brothers suffer along with the rest of the community—perhaps even more.

As an optimist, I believe and hope that the turning point has come, and that responsibility and not demagoguery may once again become the fashionable and respected point of view.

[From U.S. News & World Report,
Sept. 27, 1965]

POLICE BRUTALITY: HOW MUCH TRUTH—HOW MUCH FICTION?

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation)

The cry of "police brutality" is being heard all across the land with increasing frequency.

It is a charge which strikes fear into the heart of every freedom-loving man.

Is it, however, a charge which is justified in the United States? Or is it a charge made with malicious intent by some individuals who have little concern for the truth so long as their interests are served?

Yes, there is police brutality in the United States, but certainly not to the extent which some would have you believe.

Like all conscientious law-enforcement officials, I abhor any misuse of police authority. It is inexcusable and cannot be tolerated. Thankfully, it is not tolerated, for in most instances the few misfits and unsuited individuals who get into law enforcement and improperly use their authority are ferreted out and eliminated as soon as possible.

How extensive is police brutality? We can only gage this on the basis of complaints received by the FBI from the victims or other sources. At this point, I want again to state clearly and without equivocation that I am opposed to police brutality in any shape or form. We know that there are instances of police brutality, particularly in the less progressive police organizations. I want to emphasize that any allegations of police brutality coming within this Bureau's jurisdiction will receive immediate and thorough investigative attention, and that the facts developed in these investigations will be furnished to the Department of Justice for prosecutive consideration. Statistics of these investigations in the last 3 fiscal years present the following picture:

In fiscal year 1963, there were 1,376 allegations of brutality received by the FBI. Investigations of these complaints resulted in indictments being returned in 12 of the cases involving 20 officers. Convictions were recorded in three cases involving four officers.

In fiscal year 1964, there were 1,592 complaints of police brutality. Sixteen of these cases resulted in indictments against 28 officers, and convictions were recorded in two cases involving 4 officers.

Fiscal year 1965 brought 1,787 allegations of police brutality with indictments being returned in 13 cases involving 23 officers. Convictions resulted in five cases involving six officers.

While many complaints of police brutality are made sincerely and in good faith, some charges are unfounded, and irresponsible. Often it is obvious they are made purely for the purpose of intimidating local law-enforcement agencies and harassing the FBI.

FBI agents in our southern offices have been referred from one civil rights worker to another in their efforts to run down allegations of police brutality. Individuals who allegedly possess the facts often are "unavailable for interview" when agents arrive to investigate.

Earlier this year, FBI agents interviewed one person who had sent a telegram to a Government official containing, among other things, allegations of police brutality. He stated he had objected to these allegations being included in the telegram, since they did not have merit. Another official of the organization concerned, however, had insisted the irresponsible charges be included, he said.

There have been irresponsible and brutal acts by certain law-enforcement officials and, because of them, it has been easy to spread

the impression that many or all law-enforcement officers operate in the same manner.

However, some charges are unfounded. Occasionally, allegations of police brutality result in prosecution of the complainant when it can be conclusively shown that he has purposely filed a false complaint. FBI investigations into such complaints, therefore, can result in prosecution of the accused or the accuser.

Many complaints of police brutality, however, are never officially lodged with the FBI or any other law-enforcement organization. They are indiscriminately made to representatives of various news media, shouted from the soap box at a street corner rally, proclaimed from the podium and often from the pulpit, and circulated through printed pamphlets.

Rarely is proof offered to support these blatant accusations, which are designed mainly to incite the listener or the reader. Many riots or near riots which have occurred in this country in recent months have been preceded by such charges.

Charges of police brutality also have been heard with great frequency before, during, and after the drunken orgies and youth riots which have occurred at some of our resort areas in recent years.

Allegations of police brutality have been "supported" by still and motion pictures which invariably show one or more policemen subduing or carrying away some participant in the disorder. Rarely do these pictures reveal the full story—the unprovoked attacks on the officers involved which necessitated their use of force.

It is a known tactic of international communism to take advantage of both real and contrived opportunities to undermine constituted law-enforcement authorities with charges of brutality. We know the Communist Party, U.S.A., as well as various splinter Communist organizations in this country have used this tactic. Communist adherents have fanned the flames of passion wherever unrest against law enforcement has been prevalent. Frequently, Communist agitators have been sent into areas of unrest to sow their seeds of treason through the spoken and printed word. The Communist press continually grinds forth distortions, often outright falsehoods, about police intimidation and brutality. The Communists miss no opportunity to blacken the name of a representative of law enforcement or the profession as a whole.

Not only do the Communists directly exploit unrest, but they frequently spread their germs of subversion through front groups and dupes. This tactic has become increasingly evident in recent demonstrations by young people where police have been charged with brutality in handling picket lines or demonstrations involving racial matters or protests against U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

Communist adherents are schooled in methods of intimidating law enforcement. Whenever they are confronted by a law-enforcement officer, the word brutality is foremost upon their lips. It is their aim to humiliate, exasperate and provoke the law-enforcement officer in an effort to prevent his judicious and calm enforcement of the laws he is to uphold.

I am not implying that all charges of police brutality emanate from the Communists or their dupes. If this were true the problem could more easily be solved. The fact is, however, such charges are coming from many well-meaning, if ill-informed and poorly advised, citizens.

On the other hand, I recognize that one of the greatest preventives of brutality is a responsible and alert citizenry which is quick to complain.

The conflict resulting from the fake charges of police brutality is a problem which must

be solved, for it is eroding the already declining respect for law and order in our great Nation. When our laws no longer enjoy the respect of our citizens, then our present form of government will be lost. It is just as important that the enforcers of the law be given respect, for without it their task will be insurmountable.

There is no panacea, no pat solution to this problem, for it exists primarily in the hearts and minds of men. It is a problem in human nature, a problem in man's relation to man and his physical surroundings.

An efficient police force is the first line of protection for the law-abiding citizen. The conscientious law-abiding citizen should rise in righteous anger against those who falsely cry "police brutality" to cover their insidious scheming to gain something they covet but are not willing to acquire the judicial way.

There is a constant barrage of brutality allegations and obvious attempts by certain elements to control the police through "citizen review boards" to hear charges, many of them fabricated. It is a wonder that men are willing to don a policeman's uniform and put their lives on the line every time they step out onto the street.

It should be noted that the majority of advocates of this solution are members of, or are allied with, the minority groups which most frequently allege police brutality. They contend such boards would help convince minority groups that they can receive fair treatment, would act as a deterrent on the few police officers tempted to abuse their powers, would result in reasonable restraints being imposed on officers, and would be an impartial means of clearing the air of irresponsible charges.

On the opposite side are the vast majority of law-enforcement officers, including myself. There already is sufficiently adequate machinery to handle complaints against law-enforcement officers established within the framework of the agencies themselves and the constituted government under which they operate. An independent review board would abridge the administrative authority which should rest with the responsible officials of the agency; it would undermine the efficiency and sap the morale of the agency; and it would deter officers in the proper performance of their duties for fear of having charges placed against them which would be judged by individuals wholly unfamiliar with law enforcement work. Naturally, every special-interest group in a community would demand representation on any such board.

Some self-styled spokesmen for the civil rights movement have advocated the establishment of an independent Federal agency to handle all investigations relating to civil rights matters. They are openly critical of the FBI's objective handling of such investigations, and apparently will be satisfied only with some super-Federal agency available at their beck and call. Objectivity and impartiality are not their aim. Rather, they seek a rubber-stamp agency which will approve their claims without regard for facts. Certainly, there is no place for such an organization in a democratic society.

What has been accomplished in the civil rights field under the FBI's policy of strict objectivity? In the last several years FBI investigations in 170 counties in 6 Southern States resulted in numerous suits being filed by the Department of Justice which enabled thousands of previously disenfranchised Negroes to register to vote.

The FBI investigation of the brutal murder of three civil rights workers in Philadelphia, Miss., in June 1964, resulted in 21 individuals being arrested in connection with this crime. Elsewhere in Mississippi, FBI investigations brought a halt to a series of bombings of Negro churches and homes. Nine men were arrested and subsequently

pleaded guilty or nolo contendere. They were, however, released on probation after being given suspended sentences by a local court.

THE FBI HAS PENETRATED THE KLAN

Today, the FBI has effectively penetrated the Ku Klux Klan and thus is aware of many of its activities and plans. An FBI informant in the Klan enabled almost immediate arrest of the individuals charged in connection with the recent murder of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo on a lonely road between Selma and Montgomery, Ala. We shall continue pressing every investigation in the civil rights field, but objectivity will always be our standard.

Great strides have been made in elevating law enforcement to a professional status worthy of respect. But more can be done. Personnel standards of law-enforcement officers need to be raised in some areas. It is doubtful this can ever be accomplished so long as society neglects the law-enforcement officer in terms of salary. Here, positive action can be taken, but many who profess to be seeking solutions have totally ignored this need.

The police officer is human. He has a family which looks to him for the necessities of life. He feels pain when he is struck, indignation when he is cursed, anger when he is spat upon, and humiliation when he and his fellow officers are ridiculed. His work the streets and in the dark alleys where danger lurks at every moment. He is the first person called when trouble arises and the first one condemned when something goes wrong.

Such are the requirements of law enforcement, and, if one member of the profession commits some wrong, his guilt is shared by all. Law enforcement needs trained men. Neither his school nor college education alone will make a good law-enforcement officer. He must be trained in the techniques of enforcement, schooled in the legal responsibilities of his job, and taught the rudiments of human relations as they relate to law enforcement. Above all, he must learn self-control, lest he be baited into some foolish deed.

HOW DEMONSTRATIONS ARE EXPLOITED

On the opposite side of this issue there is need for some elimination, also, for there are misfits and irresponsible individuals who are most active in fostering unrest. The civil rights movement has made great strides but not without cost. A few spokesmen for the movement have been among those who have made irresponsible and inflammatory statements. There is good evidence, in fact, that some so-called civil rights demonstrations have been designed specifically with the hope of coercing law-enforcement authorities into taking action which could be exploited as a "cause" and used to gain publicity.

The true leaders of the civil rights movement should promptly put a stop to such irrational and irresponsible activities, just as the responsible officials of law enforcement must continually strive to eliminate the few irresponsible members in its ranks.

Who will be the winner if, in the drive to attain civil rights, the laws and their enforcers are destroyed? This, of course, is what our Communist enemies would like to see.

One of the greatest achievements of American law enforcement has been in preserving, nurturing, and strengthening the proper relationship of the individual to the state.

This Nation emerged on the basic principle that the individual must be protected from the tyranny of the state. Law enforcement has assumed a frontline role in fighting to preserve and strengthen the integrity of free government, the dignity of man, the

supremacy of law over force, the basic freedoms we hold priceless. It is a continuing challenge to define and preserve the proper balance between the rights of the individual and those of society, and to prevent the forces of crime and communism from upsetting or undermining this balance.

If we destroy the integrity, the effectiveness of our local law enforcement agencies, whence do we turn for protection from the evil forces which stand ever ready to devour us? We have no national police force foisting its will on an unwilling local entity. Our Nation depends on the sanctity of its local police agencies. We cannot afford their destruction, their weakening through unreal, unfounded charges.

Our investigations indicate that a large number of police brutality allegations have no basis in fact. Police brutality and police misuse of authority are rapidly becoming issues of the past. Responsible law enforcement officials are dealing with these transgressions quickly and emphatically.

The great specter of police brutality is being exploited by some selfish-minded, irresponsible men who apparently are concerned only with what they can gain today and who are totally oblivious to the great disservice they are doing to their country.

MR. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY].

It has become all too common a practice in recent months to attack and criticize the courageous men we pay to enforce our laws and maintain order.

All too infrequently are there voices raised in defense of these men, largely underpaid and overworked, who literally risk their necks in behalf of the society they serve.

Much of these recent waves of criticism have come from so-called leaders of the widespread series of demonstrations which have contaminated our campuses and our streets. Cries of police brutality have been raised with no more foundation than that arresting officers were enforcing the law.

The leaders of these lawless demonstrations seek to enlist public support by casting themselves and their followers in the role of the persecuted. The truth, of course, is that they are performing a disservice to the causes they represent, but more ominously, they are encouraging lawlessness, mob violence, and criminal activity.

The U.S. News & World Report interview with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which the junior Senator from California had printed in the RECORD is a most worthwhile and informative analysis of the often emotional and frequently groundless charge of police brutality.

Of particular significance is Mr. Hoover's observation that the policeman "is the first person called when trouble arises and the first one condemned when something goes wrong."

This was true in the case of the Los Angeles riots. In the wake of the riots, charges of police brutality and other accusations were made against the Los Angeles Police Department and the resignation of its chief, William H. Parker, was demanded.

It was my good fortune to have met and conferred with Chief Parker on

Monday of this week while in Los Angeles for a scheduled hearing of one of the Senate judiciary subcommittees. I came away with the impression that here is one of the most able, dedicated, and competent law enforcement officials in the country—a view that is shared widely in law enforcement circles throughout the country.

Chief Parker is a lawyer and has been a member of the Los Angeles Police Department for 38 years. He has been its chief for the past 15 years. He is one of the few chiefs of police of a major city who is a career civil servant.

He presides over a progressive, highly trained force of 5,000 police officers who have the staggering task of trying to enforce law and order in a booming city of more than 2½ million population with a land area of 456 square miles. By contrast, Washington, D.C. has an officer corps of about 3,000 for a city of about 800,000 population and an area of 61 square miles.

Mr. President, this Senator can personally attest to the progressive nature of the Los Angeles Police Department. During consideration of the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, I obtained firsthand knowledge of some of the pioneering done by the Los Angeles Police Department in bringing scientific technology to bear on the problems of law enforcement. Police Lt. William Herrmann, who incidentally is a doctor of philosophy, shared with my staff and me the benefit of his experience in this field.

One of the department's projects, involving the application of advanced computer technology and crime information retrieval, has been reported recently in Western City magazine.

Charges have been made that the Los Angeles Police Department discriminates against Negroes in its hiring policies. While it is a fact that only 200 out of the 5,000-man force are Negroes, Chief Parker has assured me that there is now an absolute policy of nondiscrimination in hiring practices and has been for many years. While the officer corps is only about 4 percent Negro, the administrative staff is about 20 percent Negro. Recruiting campaigns have been and are being conducted to get qualified Negroes to join the force, but without much success. Qualified Negroes are particularly in demand in the large defense and space industries in southern California. These industries, responsive to Federal procurement policies, are aggressively recruiting qualified Negroes at top wage scales far exceeding those offered by police agencies.

Charges have been made of police brutality against the Los Angeles Police Department. A few have proved to be substantial and the offending officers have been subjected to appropriate punishment or court action. But overlooked is the fact that last year alone there were 695 assaults committed on Los Angeles police officers. In contrast 122 complaints of the use of excessive force by police officers have been filed, 10 of which were sustained.

Charges have been made that certain Southern States were the home States of

the preponderance of the officer corps of the Los Angeles Police Department. Further, officers with this background were prone to discriminate against Negroes. This accusation was at variance with the facts. While the State of original residence had not been and is not a factor in the hiring policies of the department, a complete check of personnel records was made. It was found that the South had the least representation of the whole country on the force. This fact was made known to the public. Yet the charge was repeated and is still being repeated in Los Angeles today.

Mr. President, Chief Parker recently appeared on the television program, Meet the Press. The text of that appearance is well worth reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I salute the junior Senator from California for calling Mr. Hoover's interview to the attention of the Senate. It is high time that informed voices be raised in defense of our overworked, undermanned, and shockingly underpaid law enforcement officials.

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

MEET THE PRESS

The National Broadcasting Co. presents "Meet the Press," America's Press Conference of the Air, produced by Lawrence E. Spivak.

Guest: William H. Parker, chief of police, city of Los Angeles.

Panel: Len O'Connor, NBC News, Chalmers Roberts, the Washington Post, Wallace Terry, Time magazine, Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member.

Moderator: Ned Brooks.

Mr. Brooks. Our guest today on "Meet the Press" is the chief of police of Los Angeles, William H. Parker, a storm center of the recent riots in that city, which have been described as the worst of this century. A lawyer and a member of the Los Angeles Police Department for 38 years, he has been its chief for the past 15. He has been called the most respected law enforcement officer in the country, after J. Edgar Hoover, and at the same time the most controversial. The recent Los Angeles riots have brought charges of police brutality against his department and demands for his resignation, as well as high praise and wide support.

We will have the first question now from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the "Meet the Press" panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Chief Parker, some reporters have placed the blame for the Los Angeles riots on your police department. Where do you place the blame?

Chief PARKER. I think, Mr. Spivak, there are two situations involved here that have to be treated in combination. One is that [of] the area itself and the conflicts within it and the potential difficulty that is constantly within the area, and, then, a situation which triggered the outburst and the violence that has been classified as a riot.

I believe that if our officers had made this arrest, which marked the beginning of this, that this riot would not have occurred. I have had an opportunity to study deeply the reports, and I believe that the lack of training and experience on the part of the officers who made the arrest in that area—

Mr. SPIVAK. I don't quite understand; who were the officers who made the arrest?

Chief PARKER. The California Highway Patrol, which is essentially a highway enforcement organization, began their activity out in the county and pursued the suspected

drunken driver into the city. It was at 116th and Avalon in the city of Los Angeles where this arrest was made. But we make hundreds of thousands of arrests like this in this area without riots, and I don't believe that they have the training and experience to handle that kind of a situation in that area, and I think this case discloses that.

Mr. SPIVAK. Am I to understand from what you said that your own officers were not involved in triggering the riots but that the California State police were?

Chief PARKER. The California Highway Patrol was the involved agency, and our officers did not come upon that scene until a considerable period of time after the original contact and after the arrestees were already handcuffed and in the highway patrol vehicle.

Mr. SPIVAK. Other cities, Chief Parker, might profit from your experience in Los Angeles. Do you think the Los Angeles riots could have been prevented or were they really inevitable?

Chief PARKER. Of course, in retrospect it would be well if we could have found some way to prevent them. I think all of the experts in the field, which will probably have to include myself—have all sorts of answers to that, but the fact remains that no one anticipated the riots. If they did, no one was notified that should be that they were coming, and perhaps if this had not triggered them, something else would. This type of an outburst, what Dr. King calls a social revolution, I suppose was inevitable. I only hope that from this we can learn not one but many lessons.

Mr. SPIVAK. Were you surprised by the riots? Didn't you anticipate them at all? Didn't you expect them? Didn't you know conditions in Watts that might have triggered them?

Chief PARKER. We were surprised by the fact that this situation took. We were not surprised about the problem because over a year ago I had discussed the matter with the Governor after the riots occurred in the East, and at that time I realized that because we had a small department in comparison to the magnitude of our task, we couldn't possibly handle any large riot without assistance, and I talked with him about the National Guard then. We even developed liaison with the adjutant general of the State of California, so that if the Guard was required, we would not have to go through preliminaries that could have been dispensed with. At that time I acquired helmets for all of the men in the field that were mobile, although I did not permit them to wear them, and the helmets were carried in the back of the vehicle, concealed. Those things were done in anticipation that we might have a problem.

Mr. SPIVAK. But Chief Parker, one of the most frequent given reasons today for the riots in Los Angeles was the frustration and utter hopelessness of the ghetto-locked Negro. Do you agree that frustration and hopelessness of the Negro played an important role in the riot?

Chief PARKER. I would imagine that this is an element, but I think this has been exaggerated because according to the Urban League, the Los Angeles Negro was in a superior economic position to those of the rest of the Nation. So if this were the major factor, then these riots should have occurred somewhere else.

I might add that in relation to your former question that the course this riot took was very unusual. It started, it stopped, it started again, and this was very puzzling to us.

Mr. ROBERTS. Chief Parker, one of the sore points I found in Los Angeles had to do with the number of Negroes on your police force. As I gather from your officials, you have a force of about 5,000 men of whom about 200 are Negroes. However, there are no

lieutenants or captains in contrast to a number of other cities. Why is this, and do you intend, as the Los Angeles Times has urged, to increase recruitment of Negroes on your police force?

Chief PARKER. We have been concentrating on attempting to get qualified young Negroes to come to our force. We realize that 4 percent of the force does not compare to the 16 percent of the population. We did have lieutenants in our department, people who could have gone up to higher ranks, but they left our department for other jobs, and this seems to be the fate of them. They seem to be so much in demand in private industry and other areas that they can take their pensions within 20 years and go out and do other things and make additional money. So, it hasn't been a lack of progress; it has just been that as these men move up in ranks—we had three lieutenants at one time, all of whom retired, one is now a councilman of the city of Los Angeles.

There are many factors that dissuade the qualified young Negro from becoming a police officer, and I think before anyone reaches any rapid conclusions as to why there are only 200 out of a force of 5,000 that we should go into some of these details, which I am sure you don't have time to do now. We are very willing to accept all of the qualified Negro officers that we can get.

Mr. ROBERTS. Chief Parker, in all the discussion about so-called police brutality which you and the mayor have denied during this recent rioting, there is another aspect I would like to ask you about—and that perhaps relates to the question of Negroes on the force—some of the phrases you yourself have used, I found quite a bit of anger that you had made a statement, as I understand it, referring at one point in the riot to people acting like "monkeys in a zoo." What did you actually mean by that? Did you mean to cast an aspersion on Negroes in general, as it was interpreted?

Chief PARKER. I know better than to cast aspersions on any people in our city. I was referring to the history of riots and particularly the Boston riot where 2 hours after the police were taken out of Boston someone broke a window and stole a pair of shoes. And then everyone emulated this activity and followed suit, and within 2 hours the city was totally looted, and this was not a Negro riot. And I am sure the men who were there and heard that statement understood it. It was explained, but for some reason someone took the phrase out of context and twisted it around to make it appear that I was casting aspersions at the people involved.

Mr. TERRY. Chief Parker, next to unemployment, the Negro people in the Watts community that I have talked to complained most about the handling of the police department of them. Three years ago you told the California Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights that basically you did not believe there was any difficult problem existing between the Los Angeles Police Department and the Negro community. Nevertheless, this same Committee concluded after public hearings on charges of police brutality that a substantial number of Negroes lack confidence in the police and that they are at the mercy of bigoted policemen. Do you still believe there is no difficult problem, and what explains this lack of confidence which Negroes today still claim exists?

Chief PARKER. My answer, Mr. Terry, I think, had better be given this way: On July 27, 1964, Governor Brown, of California, called me from the mansion in Sacramento to discuss the National Guard, and at that time he told me—and this is almost a direct quote—"Judge Miller tells me, chief, that you have the hundred percent support of the Negro community with the exception of a few red hots."

I said "Well, Governor, that is very gratifying. I have no way of measuring it." And he repeated the phrase, that "Judge Miller" referring to Loren Miller, who at one time was a publisher of a large Negro newspaper in Los Angeles, "tells me," said the Governor, "that you have a hundred percent support of the Negro community with the exception of a few red hots."

There was also a California poll that was conducted a year after Yorty was in office that indicated that the resentment among the Negroes toward the police department was very small compared to the support. I think it was about 8 percent out of 100 percent, and the balance of the Negro people interviewed had no criticism of the police department. I could go on again in great detail as to how this particular advisory committee arrived at its decision, but I would prefer to quote the Governor.

Mr. TERRY. Chief, you must have been alarmed by some of the findings in the course of that committee's investigation, because your force issued a press release announcing a number of changes, including a course in human relations at the police academy and a series of training bulletins in the use of proper language in dealing with minorities.

I have listened to the people at Watts, and they say that still 3 years later Negroes are being referred to by your officers by their first names or in derogatory expressions. Why haven't these changes come about?

Chief PARKER. Of course your first conclusion is in error—that this course was instituted because of that committee's report. A number of Negro lawyers in the city of Los Angeles volunteered their services to the Negro community to investigate brutality complaints, and they spent several months, nights and weekends, after advertising for these complaints, and at the conclusion they were unable to bring one single, solitary complaint upon which action could be taken. Then it was suggested that our problem was verbal brutality and not physical brutality, and that was the basis for this course in which we attempted to take these high school graduates of ours who come from all over the United States and redesign their vocabulary.

I am not aware of these complaints that you refer to recently, because they haven't reached me, but we did a complete readjustment of vocabulary of the men of our force in a unilateral approach to adjust to this Negro community on a better basis so that we would have less trouble in it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Chief Parker, you have been quoted as having said that you might go down in history as "the only police chief that they ever sacked a whole city to get rid of." If you said this what did you mean by that?

Chief PARKER. Well, the embers hadn't cooled yet but what it was decided in some quarters by the same people who had demanded my resignation, removal, doing away with or however you do it for the past 5 or 6 years, that I was the cause of the riot and would have to go. And so apparently my removal was associated in their minds with this riot.

Mr. O'CONNOR. How does that associate with the sacking of the whole city?

Chief PARKER. This, as I am sure you are aware, was probably a facetious remark indicating that the two seemed to go together, the firing of Parker and the burning of Los Angeles.

Mr. O'CONNOR. A facetious remark?

Chief PARKER. I am sure they didn't burn Los Angeles because of Parker.

I will tell you this, sir, that if I believed that my removal from that office would bring peace to the city of Los Angeles, I wouldn't even return to that office from here. But I am convinced and so is the majority of the people of the city of Los Angeles that it would

only result in a deterioration of security in the city of Los Angeles, and thus, because of their opinions, I am forced to remain.

Mr. O'CONNOR. You are taking the whole thing out of the context, then, of a racial problem, exclusively?

Chief PARKER. The only reason that I would say it is a racial problem is because the only people who have demanded my resignation represent one race.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do you think there is any basis for allegations that certain civil rights people have made that Negroes who live where the riots occurred hate the Los Angeles Police Department?

Chief PARKER. We processed 2,500 of those arrested and found that 76 percent of them had criminal records prior to the riot, and this might be the genesis of the answer to your question.

Mr. SPIVAK. Chief Parker, there are some people who think that the rioting in Los Angeles is not over because the reason for the rioting, whatever it is, is still there. What do you think?

Chief PARKER. Of course, again, based upon the Urban League's report and other facts, I think that Los Angeles offers more for the Negro citizens than any other city in the world, and it is hard, therefore, to associate these two things together. We in California have gained nothing out of the Federal legislation because all of the gains in civil rights in the recent years have already existed in Los Angeles for a number of years. As long as people are there, the ingredients are there. Of course we have had to assimilate a tremendous number of people who have come into Los Angeles and where employment was not available to them—I don't know whose responsibility it is to care for these people, but Watts was the gravitation point where this particular group came into, and when you have people who have nothing to do and they listen to all of the speeches about their dislocations and they are sitting around day and night, I suppose that in time they will become convinced that there is justification in lashing out against the people who have impeded their progress.

Mr. SPIVAK. Did Newsweek quote you accurately when they said that you said, "We had better give the police the support they deserve or the next time this happens, they will move in and sack the whole city"?

Chief PARKER. Yes, they certainly did.

Mr. SPIVAK. What do you mean when you say they will move in? Who will move in?

Chief PARKER. I mean by that that the difficulty we are having in getting young men in America to become police officers—and this is going on all over the United States, even to the point where New York is apparently now trying to train high school dropouts to take care of their vacancies—that unless the people begin to support the rule of law and the men who represent the force that represses crime, why then eventually the permissiveness of this society will overwhelm the police. These attacks upon the police and these repetitive charges of police brutality and so forth, I think, are designed sort of to deaden the police and to drive them into a sense of inactivity. The result of it is—and we had it in this riot—that it is very difficult for them to regain aggression.

Mr. SPIVAK. Chief, I have one more question. On television the other day President Johnson said he asked himself, "What can I do so that we don't have any more Los Angeles riots in this country?" What do you think he can do?

Chief PARKER. If the President of the United States doesn't have the answer, I am sure that I don't. I wish I knew what could be done. I think that it will take a great many people with knowledge pooling their resources to bring about the conditions that will eliminate the dissatisfaction that will

cause people to do this sort of thing. No simple answers, no one agency can do it, and I only hope that all the emotion is scraped away when we try to look at this thing in reality and find out exactly what its component parts are and how we can replace them so that the community can be spared any future violence.

Mr. ROBERTS. Chief, is it a fair summary of your position that in the first place the police department has no blame coming due to it for these riots taking place, and therefore, you don't intend to do anything in terms of how you run your police force differently than you did before? Is that what you are saying?

Chief PARKER. You have a question there and a statement, Mr. Roberts. Which would you like to have me address myself to?

Mr. ROBERTS. Is it your position that the police department has no share of the blame for what took place?

Chief PARKER. It depends on how you use the word "blame." The police department, of course, is in the business of repressing crime, and this particular area is a high-crime area, and so the police department is in presence there in somewhat greater strength than it is in other parts of the city. This produces a frictional situation, particularly as I pointed out, where 78 percent of the people arrested have already had criminal records. If this is "blame"—because the police go in and enforce the law—then we will have to take part of the blame.

But as far as triggering this riot, we have made hundreds and hundreds of arrests under emotional situations just as difficult as this without having any riot, so on the basis of that, I would have to conclude that we are not responsible for triggering the riot. On the other hand we suffered some injuries, but the firemen suffered as many as we did. There were some 80 policemen injured and some 80 firemen injured, so we get into a situation here where the attempt to fix this responsibility on the police begins to lose definition.

I suppose that somewhere some policeman has done something that irritated someone, but this seems to be a unilateral situation, because we have tried very, very hard to produce a department that does not create unnecessary frictions. But we are in the business of enforcing the law, and it is a tough business. We have had over 800 men assaulted last year, and that means physical contact in which force is used. So you could sit back and pontificate and say, "Well, because force is used by the police in the community, they must share some of the blame," and if this is your conclusion, then I would have to agree with you.

Mr. TERRY. Chief Parker, in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report you are quoted as saying, "You can't blame some of these people for buying guns." Here you are referring to white people in Los Angeles who heard a 16-year-old Negro boy say on television that "We are coming into white areas." A couple of thousand guns were purchased by whites, you are quoted as saying, ostensibly to protect themselves.

Chief PARKER. I don't know anything about the number of guns that were purchased, Mr. Terry, but go ahead.

Mr. TERRY. It is correct that you said "I don't blame them one bit?"

Chief PARKER. That is correct.

Mr. TERRY. Then, do you believe a police chief on the strength of what a youngster says or on the strength of what the rumor might say, should encourage vigilante action when normally the police in any crime outbreak discourages any army on any side?

Chief PARKER. Mr. Terry, I think it would be well if you would look at Los Angeles in this magnitude, where we had 46 square miles of county and city under occupation, and there wasn't a single assault by a Caucasian upon a Negro. Go back to the Detroit riots.

You were very young then, where whites invaded the Negro district and killed Negroes. The Los Angeles community stood quiet and allowed its law enforcement to handle this situation, which is unique in the history of riots in this country.

At the time the Governor discussed with me an order taking all the arms away from the people, there were a number of merchants lying in their stores in that area attempting to protect their merchandise with guns, and this was the basis of this discussion, not what the 16-year-old boy said on television.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Chief, when you speak of having 4 percent of the force nonwhite—

Chief PARKER. No, Negro.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Four percent of the—well, Negro.

Chief PARKER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Four percent of the force are Negro. It means, does it not, that you are policing submarginal Negro neighborhoods with white policemen exclusively?

Chief PARKER. That doesn't quite square away, Mr. O'CONNOR, because actually the Negro police are not working in the Negro area, except a very few, because years ago we were requested and urged to infiltrate them throughout the department, so even the 200 that we have don't work there. Actually our total force is over 20 percent Negro, but that includes the clerical force as well. We have had no difficulty recruiting there, but not policemen, that is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I ask you this, sir, there have been rumors that the Los Angeles department has acquired a lot of former policemen from Georgia, Mississippi, and so forth.

Chief PARKER. This was a very vicious thing, and I don't know why the answer is never published, because we then went to the difficulty of determining the place of birth of every one of our officers, and then we published that. This was a shotgun charge out of whole cloth, and we found that the South is the most poorly represented section of the country on a population ratio basis insofar as the members of the Los Angeles Police Department are concerned. This is another situation where the police are charged without substance and then are put to the difficulty of having to prove that the charge is false.

Mr. SPIVAK. Chief Parker, Dr. Martin Luther King was quoted as saying that Negroes found guilty of rioting in Los Angeles should be placed on probation rather than jailed because jailing them would only embitter them further. What is your reaction to that?

Chief PARKER. I had a long discussion with Dr. King about that, but that was a private discussion. I might say we didn't agree, but I would rather not go into it.

Mr. SPIVAK. I am asking you the question, though.

Chief PARKER. You certainly can't give people probation who burned out an entire market and beat people half to death, that were moving stolen property across State lines to the east, that already had probation and were on parole. There were 26 of these people on parole at the time they were arrested.

Mr. BROOKS. I am sorry to interrupt, but I see that our time is up. Thank you very much, Chief Parker, for being with us today on Meet the Press.

EVERY CHILD MUST GET THE BEST EDUCATION THE NATION CAN OFFER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial which appeared in the September 12 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Lauding the President's educational program and recent Senate approval of the \$4.7 billion higher education bill, the article reviews the congressional achievements in this field. Appropriately, the editorial concludes with the admonition that the development of our human resources is the "most indispensable element" of our greatness. Indeed, the cost of education is an investment yielding significant returns.

One of my specific legislative interests has been to make possible a college education for every qualified student; and I am particularly pleased with the progress we have made in this direction during this session.

It is gratifying, I know, to the President and my fellow lawmakers that Courier-Journal gives recognition to this progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for I wholeheartedly concur with the principle stated in its title that "Every Child Must Get the Best Education the Nation Can Offer."

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

[From the Courier-Journal, Sept. 12, 1965]
EVERY CHILD MUST GET THE BEST EDUCATION THE NATION CAN OFFER

To his string of dazzling legislative triumphs, President Johnson added one of the most remarkable with Senate approval, 79 to 3, of the \$4.7 billion higher education bill. Like the House version, its provision of the first Federal scholarships for undergraduate study, no less than the creation of a teacher corps to improve educational opportunities for disadvantaged youngsters, makes it a landmark in the recognition of national responsibility for national education.

The Senate vote, with only two Mississippians and one Virginian opposing the overwhelming bipartisan majority, is fit testimony to Mr. Johnson's success in winning converts to his belief that the Nation must provide education of the highest quality for all its people, that every child must have the best education our Nation can provide. So, too, is the Senate's first-year authorization for the 4-year program of more than twice the \$250 million the President proposed—greater, by a few million, than the House allocation.

MASSIVE AID IS CERTAIN

Since the House version differs little from the Senate's and also won overwhelming endorsement (367 to 22), there is no doubt that the compromise measure now being hammered out will provide massive aid to needy students and to institutions of higher education throughout the Nation. An estimated 140,000 needy students will get opportunity grants or Federal scholarships averaging \$500 the first year, with such grants going eventually as high as \$1,000, the kind of Federal scholarship program approved several times in the past by the Senate, but until now always clobbered in the House.

Also certain to be included in the compromise bill are Federal insurance for private low-interest loans to college students (a field in which some operators have been exacting usurious rates), with some 900,000 students expected to get loans of up to \$1,000 in the first year; a work-study program expected to provide jobs for 260,000 students; funds to improve college libraries and train librarians; a new program of aid to small and newly developing colleges; additional funds for the construction of more college

classrooms; a new program of grants to colleges to buy television, audio-visual and other teaching aids; fellowships for teachers seeking graduate degrees; and a new program of university-community service projects for urban areas similar to the extension service program in rural areas.

The Senate vote caps 20 months in which Congress has passed seven major education bills, including the \$1.2 billion Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the most sweeping commitment to education in the Nation's history. All speed the day when, to the satisfaction of the great majority of Americans and of a President who describes himself as a teacher "still on leave from Houston Public School," poverty will bar no educational opportunity to any qualified and ambitious American—from kindergarten to university and graduate school.

The program will cost billions, but this richest of all nations will be the richer for it in that most indispensable element of its greatness, its human resources. For it is true, as the President said more than a year ago, that "the guardian genius of our democracy and our freedom is * * * an educated mind."

IOWA VETERAN CITES NEED FOR NEW GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the antipoverty bill, just passed by the Senate, is a distinct improvement over last year's bill. The bill sharply limits the power of Governors and gives the Office of Economic Opportunity the power to veto a Governor's veto. Thus the 89th Congress has passed measures to help practically all of the underprivileged people of the country except the cold war GI veterans. They constitute one group that the Government itself pulls out of their normal way of life and puts into an abnormal life for 24 months, making it impossible for them to earn a livelihood. The result is that twice as high a percentage of cold war veterans are unemployed as are persons in the same age brackets who have not served or do not serve in the Armed Forces.

Although attention has been called to the availability of some inservice educational programs for veterans, the experience of hundreds of thousands of veterans has established the fact that significant academic advancement and serious military duties are not compatible with military life. It is said that the men in service can go to college while they are serving. But who can go to college in Vietnam? To obtain a college education while in the service is absolutely incompatible with full military service.

The only realistic method of making intellectual progress for these hundreds of thousands of able men and women, who have had from 2 to 4 years taken from their civilian lives while they have served their Nation, is the enactment by Congress of the readjustment provisions of the cold war GI education bill, S. 9, which has passed the Senate by a vote of more than 4 to 1, and is now pending in the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September 6, 1965, which I have received from Mr. Robert F. Bina, 1654 West 29th Street, Davenport, Iowa.

The letter relates to testimony by college professors and the showing that Senator ROBERT KENNEDY made before the committee that the objections to the measure by the Department of Defense are absolutely untenable.

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

DAVENPORT, IOWA,
September 6, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reading the hearing record on S. 9, the cold war GI education bill, I was particularly interested in the testimony of Dr. Eugene Garbee, president of Upper Iowa University at Fayette, Iowa, and of course the commentary by Senator ROBERT KENNEDY in reference to comments by the Defense Department witness.

I agree very much with the views expressed by Senator KENNEDY. The Veterans' Administration is certainly not making a sincere effort to help itself in its own program. I enlisted in the U.S. Army within 1 week after I graduated from high school. My idea of a college education in the military did not materialize. I spent the majority of my service time in an overseas command and found that there was very little time available to work toward such a degree and in my particular situation very few courses were offered. I was stationed on a particularly small post.

My college education came after completion of my military obligation. I had made an E-5 pay rank within my first 3 years and had thought of reenlistment, but it appeared that college would not be any more a reality if I did. Then, too, study of academic subjects is extremely difficult while in the service.

In order that I might obtain a college education I found myself holding at least three part-time jobs at the same time. I was able to gain some assistance from the National Defense Loan program, but this depended to a great extent on the number of people or students who applied for loans.

I certainly have hopes that the Government of this country will someday come to realize the fact that people who serve their Nation are entitled to a bit more than a cynical comment and a slap in the face. Korea and Vietnam are not very important if you do not have to serve.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. BINA.

A MOVE FORWARD ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the President has today taken a major step toward streamlining and strengthening the civil rights effort of this administration. Under the reorganization just announced, as a result of an intensive study by our distinguished Vice President, each officer and employee of the Federal Government who administers the Federal program will be charged with responsibility for making certain that his program is administered without discrimination and with full consideration of our objective—equal opportunity for all Americans.

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, chaired first by President Johnson when he was Vice President, and now by Vice President HUMPHREY, has made a valuable and lasting contribution to eliminating dis-

crimination in employment. Thanks largely to its efforts, we now have a blueprint of procedures which will enable every agency of the Federal Government to apply the principles of nondiscrimination to its day-to-day work.

For example, the Department of Labor will now be directly responsible for reviewing complaints and insuring nondiscrimination by Government contractors.

Similarly, the Civil Service Commission will now directly insure that the Federal Government does not discriminate in its employment and promotion policies. Under President Johnson's leadership, with the magnificent contributions of our Vice President, the executive branch and Congress, together, have made greater strides in the area of civil rights than ever before in our history. As a result of the reorganization of our Government-wide civil rights activities, we are now preparing to make still greater strides in the months and years ahead.

THE BOBBY BAKER CASE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Chicago Tribune of September 23, sharply and critically discusses what an editorialist feels is the continuing cover-up in the Bobby Baker case.

The newspaper views with some concern the proposed appointment of David Bress as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. It correctly points out that this is the office which would normally handle the prosecution of Bobby Baker, if he were indicted as the result of the current investigation into his background. Two questions are raised:

First, As a former attorney for Baker's Serv-U Corp. "it would be unethical for him—Bress—to make available all of his knowledge of Baker's affairs and that this would prevent him from properly carrying out his duties."

Second, The alternative statement by the Attorney General—that Mr. Bress would be bypassed in handling the case—would result in the case being brought directly under the "watchful eye of the administration."

The lid—

The writer said—

could be clamped down quickly whenever any unpleasant information threatened to arise linking the Johnson clique with Baker's affairs.

Mr. President, these questions are serious. Unless the administration takes action to quiet such fears and such concern over the whitewash of the Baker case, the necessary public confidence will be lacking.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "The Baker Cover-Up Continues," be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BAKER COVER-UP CONTINUES

The Johnson administration has committed two wrongs in order to make what it considers one right; namely, the prevention of any further embarrassing disclosures in the Bobby Baker case.

The first wrong was the appointment of David Bress, a former lawyer for Baker's Serv-U Corp., as U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. This is the office which would normally handle the prosecution of Baker, if he is indicted in connection with his various influence-peddling schemes. The proceedings would be public, and a good many influential brows might perspire.

Senators WILLIAMS of Delaware and MILLER of Iowa, both Republicans, objected to the nomination of Bress, pointing out that as an erstwhile lawyer for Baker it would be unethical for him to make available all of his knowledge of Baker's affairs and that this would prevent him from properly carrying out his duties.

Instead of withdrawing the nomination, Attorney General Katzenbach came up with a neat alternative—one which looks suspiciously like what the White House intended to do all along. Mr. Katzenbach told the Senate committee considering the appointment that there was no need to worry: Bress wouldn't have to handle the Baker case. The Justice Department would bypass him and handle the case in its own criminal division. Here, needless to say, it would be directly under the watchful eye of the administration. The lid could be clamped down quickly whenever any unpleasant information threatened to arise linking the Johnson clique with Baker's affairs.

We have to admire the ingenuity of the administration troubleshooters in devising means of keeping the Baker case out of public sight, but it's getting a little tedious. We shudder to think how bad the truth must be to warrant all this hocus-pocus. Senator WILLIAMS has all the more reason to keep up his investigations.

"SHUNPIKE" TRAVELOG

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, much has been written and said about the success of the campaign to "See the U.S.A." Mr. and Mrs. Ralph E. Fisher, publishers of the Moorefield, W. Va., Examiner, have taken the time to write of their trip through great sections of the United States and Canada.

I found their account, which was published on September 22, 1965, to be most enjoyable and worthy of study by other Members of the Senate.

They entitled the report "Shunpike" Travelog, because they "shunned" the turnpikes for the roads through valleys and along rivers.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the entire article from the Moorefield Examiner.

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

"SHUNPIKE" TRAVELOG

We took a trip last week, which is no big thing for everybody travels these days. But ours was the aimless type, no destination, no itinerary and no time schedule. To give you an idea, we started out by going through the Trough. Since our area is going all out for tourists, we decided to become the typical gawking country tourist to evaluate the treatment we received, so that we could return home and recommend emulating that treatment to the tourists and visitors here.

As it turned out we went north, across the St. Lawrence into the Canadian Province of Ontario, back across the St. Lawrence and through northern New York State, Vermont, Maine, to the seacoast and down the coast to Cape May, across the ferry and back to West Virginia. We deliberately stayed off

the turnpikes—except for the crowded megalopolis from New Haven, Conn., to Atlantic City, N.J., and it was a godsend through that area. To give you an idea, we went from Mount Vernon, N.Y., to the Jersey flats in 28 minutes, all the way across New York City.

To get back to our study of people and their treatment of tourists, the Canadians won hands down. They were kind and polite, went out of their way to be nice and helpful and everyone seemed to know the history of the area. We went into Canada at Ogdensburg, N.Y., and followed the St. Lawrence to Cornwall. This is called "Upper Canada." We found out that it simply meant the upper St. Lawrence. Of course, there is a turnpike to Montreal but we were on a "shunpike" tour so we went along the river road. This was literally a park for a hundred miles. We passed a place called the Upper Canada Village and decided to investigate. When the power and navigational dams were built on the St. Lawrence starting in 1958 many of the historic villages were inundated by the dammed-up water. The parks commission tore down and rebuilt historic buildings or moved them intact to the model village. A water-powered woolen mill, a water-powered sawmill, the blacksmith shop, typical homes, early settlers' huts, a church, an inn, a store and tavern, a school, a fort, a canal with bateau pulled by a horse, a farm with sheep, oxen, cattle and swine, a cheese factory, everything you could find in a village in the early 1800's. The furniture was not necessarily from the original buildings but were from the period. Everything was as authentic as could be and the people in the buildings were dressed in period clothes and costumes, going about their chores of making blankets, baking bread, making cheese, sewing, carpeting, shoeing horses—just as if you had walked into the village in 1840. They explained what they were doing, how and why, and seemed real pleased to be able to answer all the questions. As an example, the church had plain glass windows, beautiful things made of diamond-shaped glass about 10 inches high. The rector explained that the stained glass windows were not available or used until about 1857.

The upper Canada area was settled by people from the States who were loyal to King George III. They built a string of forts along the St. Lawrence expecting an invasion from the United States, again in 1812 and as late as the Civil War. We cannot recall from our history that the United States ever seriously considered invading Canada but apparently we did and we were soundly defeated in a battle on the Chrysler farm. Probably that is why we never read about it in our history books. Anyway, the Canadians protected their own, the American forces retreated across the river, and the Canadians weren't bothered again by the United States.

The upper Canada village is in the Chrysler Farm Battlefield Park.

One of the most interesting features in the complex is the Memorial Garden. When the eight villages were inundated, the cemeteries were covered too. Most of the remains in those ancient burial grounds had returned to the dust from whence they came but the headstones were intact. Records from all the stones were carefully copied and are available for researchers or descendants. Some 300 stones were selected from the eight villages and imbedded in a brick wall. The wall consists of four rectangles about the size of a house lot around a center square. Flagstone walks led around the inside of the wall with beautifully kept sod and flowers in the center of the five plots. The headstones of various shapes and sizes were a permanent part of the wall, which was about 6 feet high. A tiny number cataloged the cemetery from which it was taken. It was an

impressive and beautiful solution of preserving the cemeteries. We thought a similar memorial park would be an ideal way of preserving the abandoned and forgotten burial plots scattered around our hills in Hardy County.

Most of the visitors in the village and the Memorial Garden were Canadians, as the U.S. tourists haven't found this newly opened representation of a bygone America. Incidentally the Canadian dollar is worth 92.20 cents and the business firms, stations, inns, restaurants and motels are meticulous about giving you the discount. If you tender, for example, a \$10 bill for a \$4 purchase you will get \$6 change and then they will hand you an extra 70 cents with the words "And this is your exchange, sir." Canadian money is readily acceptable all along the U.S. border States, at a discount of course. Anything you buy or spend in Canada, for all practical purposes, is at 7 percent discount.

We came down Lake Champlain below Montreal traveling on the islands, linked by bridges, and spent the night in Montpelier, Vt., in an ancient hotel next to the capitol building where La Fayette was entertained. We visited a maple sugar candy factory and a maple sirup museum, crossed New Hampshire where we bought a State lottery ticket, and headed for the Maine coast. We found that lobster costs just about as much in New England on the coast as it does in Washington. A shortage this year. Wandering on south on the coastal roads, we went through fishing villages and resorts and were astonished to learn, after all these years, that New Hampshire has a seacoast.

We got lost in Boston trying to get through, found that the Naval air station we flew out of during World War II was now a marina and a manufacturing complex, went on to Cape Cod, were astonished again at the number of Negroes living in the small towns on Cape Cod. We didn't get to see the Kennedy compound at Hyannis Port for the simple reason they wouldn't let us in. We went to the Whaling Museum in New Bedford, gawked at the fabulous homes at Newport of an era which will never be duplicated because of today's tax system and went through every college campus we passed.

We came down the Jersey coast through Atlantic City to Cape May and crossed the Delaware Bay on the ferry. An hour and a half trip, escorted by a school of porpoises. The porpoises were not on the schedule.

All States have signs along the roads warning of the fine for littering. They ranged from a low of \$20 in luxurious Newport and Rhode Island to the high of \$300 in Maryland. Other signs that intrigued us were the ones at Atlantic City and Ocean City in New Jersey. They simply say "Criminals must register." Anyone with a record must report and register with the authorities. Not a bad idea and maybe all States and towns should adopt that requirement for anyone with a record.

Quite naturally we were interested in the farms and farming in that northern area. We wondered where all the labor came from to harvest the apples in New York and the truck garden crops. We were told that migrant workers came in, mostly Puerto Ricans, because they were the only ones who would work. We know why pumpkin pie is a New England dish for we saw fields of them as large as 50 acres. And 50 acres of pumpkins is quite a spectacle.

We recommend a "shunpike" tour, and we found that a good many other folks were finding the back roads more interesting. The turnpikes are all right to get from one place to another, but they are highly monotonous and you never get to see anything.

To get back to one of the objectives of our little tour and what we could suggest as something for our Hardy County folk to do to encourage more tourists, we came up with

people. It is the people that make a place and not the things. When people are courteous, friendly, and helpful that place automatically becomes a place to which you want to return. No matter what the attraction is if people are discourteous, grabby, and greedy, it is a lousy place you won't urge your friends to go to. A pleasant smile and a friendly, pleasant word really makes a place if you are a stranger. Please remember that this weekend when we have the house and garden tour and crafts exhibits visitors.

WHEELING (W. VA.) NEWS-REGISTER CELEBRATES 75TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I call the attention of the Senate to the 75th anniversary of the Wheeling, W. Va., News-Register. The News-Register is an afternoon newspaper and, as the largest daily publication in the upper Ohio Valley region, it has won justifiable acclaim for its outstanding reporting of news events, for its leadership in civic affairs, and, of special interest to many people, for its never-ending drive to expose crime and lawlessness.

Mr. President, I personally believe that the efforts of the News-Register to focus the attention of its readers on the need for better respect for the law, stands as one of the brightest beacons in our Nation.

I believe that Mr. Austin V. Wood, publisher, Mr. Harry Hamm, editor, and the many others who daily produce this great newspaper, should receive highly deserved credit for meritorious service to the public.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an appropriate editorial from the News-Register of September 22, 1965.

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

ON THIS OUR 75TH BIRTHDAY

With the ambition and confidence of youth, the late Herschel C. Ogden, 75 years ago today watched the first edition of his Wheeling News come off an ancient press.

Mr. Ogden was then but 21 years of age, but already he was demonstrating the foresight which was to mark his outstanding newspaper career. At that time all over the country the leading newspapers were morning publications, yet Mr. Ogden saw the possibilities of the evening newspaper field.

Newspapers had been coming and going in Wheeling for nearly a century before Mr. Ogden appeared on the scene after graduating from West Virginia University. Only two—the *Intelligencer* and *Register*—had stood the test of time. Both were published in the morning, leaving the evening field wide open for a new publication.

The Wheeling News started in a modest way and had to overcome fire, floods, and finances in its battle for circulation. Aggressive local reporting and innovation insured continuous and steady growth. The News originated surveys and forecasts on political elections and began a weekly industrial report gathered by reporters who visited the mills and factories in the area.

In August 1935 the News was merged with the Wheeling Register to become the Wheeling News-Register. Today it is the largest daily newspaper in this upper Ohio Valley region.

To the present day, the News-Register has carried on the policy of its founder, to pro-

vide the fullest possible community coverage and to foster local progress. This newspaper has never deviated from its advocacy of good government. During its 75 years the files will show that its searchlight has been frequently turned upon official conduct of public officials.

In the area of civic enterprise, the News-Register has been a leader. One of the most interesting episodes in the history of the early Wheeling News was the campaign conducted for the establishment of a high school for the children of Wheeling. There was no such institution when the paper was founded. Finally, in 1897, the News, strongly supporting citizens groups behind the movement, had the satisfaction of seeing the city's first high school opened in September.

Similar campaigns were waged in behalf of a public library, parks and recreation, highways and industrial and commercial expansion. An example of the outstanding enterprise of the News, undoubtedly, was the leading part it played in the great tax reform fight beginning in 1904.

The campaign was centered on the inadequacy of the tax assessments of railroads and public utilities, depletion of natural resources of the State and the inequitable share of taxation carried by the owners of real estate. The battle was won and among the first fruits of the 1904 victory was the reassessment of utility property. For the first time in the history of the State the coal companies began to contribute something to the public treasury in taxes on leaseholds.

Other notable campaigns by the News and News-Register included the adoption of the Workman's Compensation Act, recognition of the area's highway problems, elimination of tolls on the Ohio River bridges, fight for a new river bridge, municipal parking garage, air pollution control, urban renewal, razing of the Market Auditorium and establishment of a downtown park, flood control, construction of a new city-county building, various city charter reforms, industrial development, antigambling and racketeering crusades, advocacy of parole reforms and public housing projects for low-income families. These are but a few of the many causes in which this newspaper has taken the lead over the years.

The true measure of a newspaper's greatness is in its service to the community. After 75 years the News-Register proudly stands on its record. It has resisted the temptation of popularity for popularity's sake. It never has hesitated to dig out the facts which have been so cleverly covered by those who hold the public trust. It never has been afraid to take a stand.

On this anniversary day, the News-Register welcomes and appreciates the faith you, the reader, place in it, and pledges continuing service and a vigilance, without fear or favor.

A HEALTH MAINTENANCE PROGRAM FOR ADULT AMERICANS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in just a few months, some 19 million Americans who are 65 years of age or older will become eligible to receive the wide variety of hospital, extended care, and home health services made available by the historic expansion of the social security program authorized by this Congress.

Unquestionably, medicare represents a most significant milestone in the Nation's march toward longer life, to be enjoyed with a vastly increased freedom from the tragic cost of catastrophic illness and its destructive impact on individuals, their families, and their communities.

Let me offer this proposition, however, that by means of medicare—and all the other essential health legislation which this Congress has enacted—we are able to attack only the visible portions of the disease and disability problems which block progress toward optimum health and well-being for all Americans.

We have approved the expenditure of billions of dollars for research, for the expansion of community health facilities, for the development of new treatment resources; more billions will be forthcoming through the health insurance benefits mechanisms of social security to alleviate the burden on individuals of the high cost of modern medical care. But none of these actions provide for any concerted effort to protect the health of the aged and aging before obvious signs of illness and disability appear.

If we compare the Nation's health needs to an iceberg, we might say that our major current efforts are in large measure directed toward the tip, the visible portion—the known sick and disabled for whom we can and will provide treatment and other necessary care services. The hidden portion, much larger than the tip, represents the undetected diseases, the potential for future crippling or total impairment of persons who might otherwise be self-sustaining, in command of their own lives, earning income, or managing retirement annuities successfully.

To ignore the hidden segment of national health needs would inevitably impose increasingly heavy medical care responsibilities on our health service professions—and we are already hard pressed to recruit and train enough physicians and nurses and other specialized personnel. Further, we might ask how much more our economy can be taxed to support more and more community health facilities where medical and related care services can be given.

Medicare is a vital first step, but only part of a complete program of health care for our adult population.

What we must have now is a national program for health maintenance.

It is not enough to provide financial assistance after illness occurs. It is equally essential to protect health before costly illness strikes.

We can take pride in our participation in planning for more and better medical care. But the pursuit of health, like the pursuit of happiness, is endless. Therefore, as we look ahead to future national health needs, let us not overlook the hidden mass of the iceberg, the undetected diseases or proneness to disease.

By unmasking early danger signals, we know that steps may be taken to prevent, halt, or delay the costly process of illness and accompanying disability.

What I am saying, of course, is that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

About a hundred years ago, Dr. Henry Dobell, in his London lectures, rather mildly asserted the belief that early disease detection would lead to "immense benefit to the public." We have seen this concept applied to the control of the communicable diseases—so effectively,

in fact, that during the past half century they have virtually been subdued. Improvements in diagnosis and treatment, sanitation, nutrition, housing, and working conditions, as well as specific preventive measures such as immunization, have aided the conquest of communicable disease.

But this victory produced a new challenge, the challenge of chronic illness. People are living longer. They have a better chance to survive acute illness—but also a greater chance to fall victim to the onslaught of one or more chronic diseases. These conditions are most common during our middle and later years and they have become our No. 1 national health problem. A few facts demonstrate why.

Our aging population is increasing at the rate of 800 per day, according to figures supplied by the Office of Aging in HEW. The Public Health Service informs me that by 1970 there will be enough Americans aged 65 or older to fill cities the size of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

An estimated 74 million Americans are afflicted by 1 or more chronic disorders—and more than half of those over 65 years of age are limited, to some extent, in their activities.

Two out of every three deaths in the Nation result from heart and circulatory disorders or from cancer. Cardiovascular diseases alone claim more than 900,000 lives each year, and cancer adds another quarter of a million to this grim harvest.

Allied with these and other "killer" diseases are a host of cripples. More than 20 million Americans are affected by blindness, deafness, epilepsy, mental retardation, and other neurological or sensory diseases; 12 million have some form of arthritis or rheumatism; 2 million are known diabetics and an equal number are believed to have diabetes which is undetected and untreated. Also, 1.3 million Americans over 40 years old have glaucoma; half of these do not know that the disease is present and may lose their eyesight if it is not detected and treated.

So, we are faced with a rapidly increasing aging population whose needs for medical and related care may be expected to increase in proportion to our neglect of their potential susceptibility to chronic illness.

The final answer to the health problems of the aging and aged is surely not limited to the provision of a broad range of care services to all who need them. We must also envisage a more comprehensive effort to identify and control, during our productive years, those chronic diseases which, if ignored, take such high toll in later life.

Who among us would not choose, if we could, to learn about an incipient disease in time to be treated successfully by our own physicians, often without hospitalization and without substantial absence from work or interruption of community and social activities? Industry agrees that this kind of preventive medicine is a good investment—hence, the numerous employee health programs

which are being maintained, and the policy of many organizations to safeguard executive health by periodic physical examinations. Such regular health checkups are expensive and time consuming, but they invariably uncover many conditions which, if ignored, would drastically reduce the number of years through which essential manpower might continue to contribute creative ideas, managerial know-how, and the technical skills acquired through training and experience.

Think of the lives we might save, the disabilities we might prevent, if we could place 10 million Americans a year in a planned program of screening for hidden, asymptomatic disease, followed by treatment and continued health maintenance through periodic reexaminations and medical evaluation of individual needs.

Only a major national commitment to apply the principles and techniques of preventive medicine on a mass basis will stem the rising tide of an increasing burden of medical care in terms of manpower, facilities, and dollars.

We have the technological capacity to do this.

Recently, I was informed of an unusual project underway in California Assisted by a grant from the Division of Chronic Diseases, Public Health Service, the Kaiser Foundation health plan in Oakland has developed a multifest laboratory in which patients receive automated tests and personally fill out health history questionnaires. The tests and the health history data are fed into a computer which is programmed to print out a compilation of the results indicating normal and abnormal values. The entire procedure requires only about 2½ hours of the participant's time, during which he receives a battery of more than 20 automated or semiautomated health tests. Most of these are tests that would be done by a physician giving a complete physical examination to rule out or discover sources of disease or impairment. If performed by conventional methods they would take 2 days to complete and cost about \$300 per person. The automated testing, however, costs only a fraction of this amount. I am told that it is also immensely accurate, eliminating the margin for human error occurring when laboratory reports and other diagnostic information is read, recorded, and summarized by technicians.

Some 40,000 Kaiser-Permanente health plan beneficiaries are participating in this pilot health appraisal program. In part, it is a research venture which will demonstrate the feasibility of applying our best technological knowledge to perfect a quick and economical method for providing high-quality periodic health examinations. But the project is also discovering heretofore unknown cases of diabetes, glaucoma, heart disease, and other chronic diseases which need medical treatment.

If such a program were available to general population groups, the results of the automated tests would be referred to the participant's physician who would then be responsible to prescribe and treat or to do whatever additional diagnostic

work was indicated. Thus, the overburdened practitioner could function at the highest level of his capability for which he was prepared during long and costly medical education. He could also be spared the time-consuming work of taking lengthy personal histories, and his diagnostic facilities could be kept free for definitive testing of patients with complex or severe medical care problems.

The Kaiser program has already demonstrated that automated health appraisal need not be impersonal. During the 2½ hours the participant is being tested, he is in constant and close personal relationship with nurses, technicians, and medical specialists trained to conduct the various tests. The purpose of each test is explained—what the electrocardiogram is for, for example—and how simultaneous mechanical reading of heart data makes it possible to get a complete EKG in about 5 minutes.

I am sure that this is heart-warming news to all of us who have spent so many hours in going through the accepted normal procedures of these days.

The Senate doctor has been after me to take an electrocardiogram for some time. The burden of work has been such that I have not found that hour in which to go to the doctor's office. These new devices certainly can make preventive health care almost a simplified procedure.

A marvelously complicated device is able to separate instantly a single blood specimen, taken by one technician, into eight or more units for automated measurements of protein, cholesterol, calcium, glucose, and other significant blood content, as well as to determine hemoglobin and white cell count. A retinal photograph is made in 2 minutes, as is the tonometer test for glaucoma. Nothing is overlooked, from height and weight measurements to tests for cancer and cardiovascular conditions and chest X-rays.

It seems to me to be the time, now, to consider putting our national health resources to work more effectively to prevent the onset of crippling and long-term illnesses. Technological developments—such as the one program I have mentioned briefly—are available for almost unlimited application, if we have the foresight and courage to move ahead with a large-scale health appraisal system for older adults.

We have battled in the Congress of the United States for better than a decade for medicare. It seems to me that now would be the time to consider this matter, and I do not expect it to be a long struggle. I believe that logic indicates that it is time for us to avail ourselves of what may be considered in the field of medicine to be a program of preventive care.

Certainly, one group of citizens who should immediately welcome the opportunity for speedy, thorough, and economical periodic health checkups are those 65 and older who are becoming eligible for health insurance benefits under Social Security. By the same token, the early detection of illness, or the quick and effective determination of potential disease, should offer tremendous div-

idents to Medicare officials in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and in the States who are to be faced with an endless procession of applicants seeking minor as well as major care services of all kinds.

Automation, of course, is not the only answer. But I cannot see where we are going to get the large numbers of technical and professional personnel we would need to offer manually conducted health appraisal programs—or how our communities could afford to pay their salaries.

Automated systems have proved themselves to be efficient and economical, and have enabled science and industry to achieve phenomenal progress in a single generation.

I would like to see equally modern methods applied to protect and improve our most precious resource—the health of our people.

Every dollar we spend in health maintenance, every dollar we spend to detect incipient disease, to prevent the development of long term chronic conditions needing constant surveillance and care, will pay off in savings of millions of dollars which would otherwise have to be spent in often futile attempts to save or restore damaged lives.

Let us not hesitate to add another milestone beyond Medicare.

Let us not hesitate to recommend to the proper authorities a thorough investigation of the opportunities available to us for health protection and health maintenance for our aging and aged citizens.

Let us give Medicare its next logical handmaiden, preventicare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters I have received from Dr. Morris F. Collen of the Permanente Medical Group, Dr. Arnold B. Kurlander of the Sinai Hospital of Baltimore, and Dr. Wilson T. Sowder, State health officer of Florida be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I am sure their commentary on the importance of preventive medicine will be interesting to my colleagues.

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

SINAI HOSPITAL OF BALTIMORE, INC.,
Baltimore, Md., August 31, 1965.
Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: During the past several years emphasis has been placed on the medical care problem of older people. The recent monumental amendments to the Social Security Act will have a favorable impact on the health of the Nation.

While it is important and necessary to see that medical care is available when needed, it is equally important to do everything possible to prevent the onset of disease. In some instances complete prevention is possible; in other instances only intervention is possible to prevent or delay the development of disability or the occurrence of premature death. For many years I have been involved in the development and promotion of methods and techniques of preventing or detecting chronic disease. I was, therefore, delighted to learn of your interest in early detection programs, and certainly want to lend my support.

On February 10, 1965, I presented a world-wide broadcast on chronic and degenerative disease under the sponsorship of the Voice of America health forum series. The following excerpts from that paper may be of interest to you:

"The active search for chronic disease among apparently healthy people is a fundamental aspect of prevention. Case finding or early detection programs are mainly directed toward the middle-aged. Frequently diseases which might produce noticeable signs or symptoms in children and adolescents do not do so in the middle-aged or older adult. Thus the disease process may begin and progress for some time before producing symptoms severe enough to cause the individual to seek aid. Irreparable damage may be done. Discovered sufficiently early, many of the disease processes can be reversed or ameliorated.

"The annual health maintenance examination, especially for persons 35 years and over, is productive in the early detection of hidden chronic disease. An increasing number of people are undergoing such examinations. However, there are difficult logistics problems related to the number of persons requiring such examinations and the availability of qualified physicians with the time to perform them.

"To help solve this problem and to bring preventive examinations to large masses of people with minimal expenditures of time and money, a number of alternative approaches are in use. They are based primarily on conserving the physician's time for those things that only he can do, diagnosis and treatment, and having technicians administer simple, inexpensive laboratory tests and operate other measuring devices. Screening programs are of all types and combinations, some simple, others complex and highly organized. They range from the individual-centered streamlined health maintenance examination, with a self-completed medical history and laboratory tests administered by technicians; to the mass use of a single test for the detection of a single categorical disease; to the application of multiple tests to large numbers of people for the detection of many conditions. When valid and reliable screening tests are properly applied and effective followup procedures are incorporated to assure diagnosis and treatment, screening programs are practical and productive attacks upon the problem.

"The most promising approaches to the prevention of cancer are techniques of detection applied to the uterine cervix, the oral cavity, the breast, the colon-rectum area, the lungs, and the skin. Microscopic examination of cells cast off into body fluids affords the best possibility to discover cancer of the uterine cervix at a stage when complete cure can usually be assured. In initial projects, one may expect positive findings in 5 of every 1,000 women examined. This technique is being used more and more in the offices of practicing physicians and in community hospitals. In addition, there are at least 20 full-scale organized community projects now in existence.

"Better techniques of screening for cancer of the colon and rectum and for cancer of the lung are being developed. The use of soft-tissue X-rays of the breast is being evaluated as an aid in the detection of breast cancer.

"Screening programs for the early detection of diabetes, by both blood and urine examinations, are now widely used in all parts of the country. Increasing attention is being placed on screening for glaucoma, a condition responsible for 15 percent of the blindness in this country which, if found early, is susceptible in most instances to amelioration.

"Certain screening techniques for the early detection of heart disease are being refined.

Of particular interest are the efforts to improve utilization of the electrocardiogram, one of the most widely used and often the most significant diagnostic tests in the management of heart disease. Methods are being developed to permit automated analysis of electrocardiograms and thereby save millions of hours of cardiologists' time which might be better used for the diagnosis and care of patients."

Sincerely yours,
ARNOLD B. KURLANDER, M.D.,
Executive Director.

THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP,
Oakland, Calif., September 3, 1965.
Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Knowing of your interests in preventive health services for older age groups, I thought you might care to know of some of the experiences of the Kaiser-Permanente medical care program in the field of preventive medicine.

Since its inception in 1942, the Kaiser Foundation health plan, a prepaid comprehensive medical plan, has included preventive medicine as one of its basic principles.¹

In the care of older age groups, in whom it may be assumed that the majority have some chronic degenerative disease, preventive medicine can be effectively practiced by utilizing periodic health examinations directed to detecting early abnormalities and measuring the extent of clinical disease; then attempting to prevent progression of disease and disability by instituting appropriate therapy.

To meet increasing requests for periodic health checkups from our health plan members and provide such examinations at a reasonable cost, multiphasic screening techniques were first utilized in our Oakland Permanente Medical Group offices in 1951. Our multiphasic health checkup consists of a battery of test procedures and a physical examination by an internist. In an attempt to further improve services, refine procedures, and conduct preventive medical research, our enlarged automated multiphasic screening project² was initiated in our Oakland and San Francisco medical centers in 1962. We are presently examining approximately 4,000 adults monthly in these two facilities, of which about 10 percent are over the age of 65. In the Kaiser-Permanente program, periodic health examinations are also provided in the traditional manner.

We believe that there is a great need for intensive research in preventive health services in the adult. Utilizing the established automated multiphasic screening project and the resources of our medical care program, with the support of a community health project grant (CH 05-8 D-66) and a grant from the chronic disease division (CD-00142-01) of the Bureau of State Services, we are involved in an extensive research program directed to investigating preventive medical methods for more effective detection, prevention, and control of chronic disease and disability.

¹ Cutting, C. C.: "Medical Care: Its Social and Organizational Aspects; Group Medical Practice and Prepayment"; *New England Journal of Medicine*, 269: 729-736, Oct. 3, 1963.

² Collen, et al.: "Automated Multiphasic Screening and Diagnosis," *American Journal of Public Health*, 54:741-750, May 1964; "Computers in Multiphasic Screening," chapter 14, "Computers in Biomedical Research," vol. 1, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1965; "Periodic Health Examinations Utilizing an Automated Multitest Laboratory," read before the joint meeting of the section on preventive medicine and section on general practice, American Medical Association, June 23, 1965.

Although we are investigating improved medical methods and conducting preventive medical research, conclusive statistical data from our studies are not yet available. However, based upon our experience, we can express the following opinions:

1. Periodic health examinations are popular and in demand by the public. In total, about 40 percent of our members avail themselves of this service.

2. Periodic health examinations uncover a large hidden reservoir of asymptomatic disease. In the adult, period health examinations provides an effective means for detection of important, common chronic diseases (such as hypertension detected in about 7 percent of our examinees, diabetes in 4 percent, glaucoma in 1 percent). This permits early institution of medical care and often helps to prevent or postpone serious, and even permanent disability.

3. If periodic health examinations are to be provided to large numbers of people at a reasonable cost, the utilization of an automated multitest laboratory such as ours has several advantages, namely:

(a) Conservation of time and money of patients is accomplished through improved efficiency of services by close integration of many test procedures. For a working population, the arrangement of convenient hours to receive a battery of tests conserves time from their work.

(b) Conservation of time of physicians results from transferring many routine and repetitive procedures to paramedical personnel and instrumentation. It is becoming increasingly important to optimize the time and efforts of the doctor, since physician time is our most expensive cost factor. Utilizing an automated multitest laboratory decreases the need for the doctor to spend time doing routine repetitive history taking and measurement recording; the physician can utilize this time more productively in counseling, treating and talking with the patient.

(c) Standardization of procedures, better quality control and accuracy results in overall improvement in quality.

I appreciate the opportunity to outline our activities and present our opinions in the field of preventive medicine for the aging. I should be pleased to elaborate any areas which may be of interest to you.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS F. COLLEN, M.D.,
Director, Medical Methods Research.

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Jacksonville, September 2, 1965.

HON. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: With the passage of Public Law 89-97 (medicare) great effort, attention, and money will be expended in helping people who are sick; but as you know, this law does not provide any means for preventing illness. Also, although the pending bill on heart, cancer, and stroke has an inserted and tangential reference to prevention, its central focus is on the application of methods of treatment for known diseases already developed.

As State health officer of the State of Florida—where great numbers of older people live either permanently or seasonally—I am painfully aware that over 80 percent of our senior citizens suffer from one or more chronic illnesses.

In Florida we have conducted programs of screening for diabetes, heart disease, and glaucoma that have detected many cases of disease which were unknown to the individual. In many instances these could be treated successfully at this stage in a doctor's office or an outpatient clinic, thereby making costly hospital admissions at later stages unnecessary. Early identification of chronic disease can do much toward pre-

venting the disabling effects in later life. In fact it is impossible to overestimate the benefits of early identification in terms of suffering prevented and the prolonging of useful life.

Public Law 89-97 provides for the treatment of illness. However, the prevention of illness is certainly of at least equal importance. There is a great need for a system of health appraisal facilities and programs leading to the early detection of disease in the interest of preventing or modifying the illness before intensive care is required. Frequent health appraisal is the nucleus of good health practice, for only through examinations can chronic disease be identified early.

Moreover, such examinations should be available to the middle-aged adult as health in older years is most certainly influenced by health practices earlier in life.

Early detection and prevention of illness is absolutely necessary in providing health protection for our senior citizens.

If, as I understand, you are quite interested in the health and well-being of our older Americans, you may wish to insure that future legislation contains this necessary emphasis on casefinding and prevention.

Sincerely,

WILSON T. SOWDER, M.D.,
State Health Officer.

NEW PANAMA CANAL TREATY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this afternoon President Lyndon B. Johnson and President Marco A. Robles of Panama issued a joint statement in their respective countries concerning the status of negotiations over a new treaty for the Panama Canal. These talks have been going on now for some 18 months and seem to have made great progress toward a new and mutually acceptable agreement to replace the old treaty, which has been in force since 1903. It is notable that the heat of the tempers which raged so strongly for weeks during the costly riots in Panama in January of 1964, has been conspicuously absent from the negotiating table these last months. It is obvious that negotiators on both sides have acted responsibly, honorably and with mutual self-respect—dedicated to reaching a satisfactory agreement within the context of the inter-American system. Our own representative, Ambassador Robert B. Anderson, and his staff are to be congratulated for their outstanding work to date.

We can be proud of their achievements just as Panamanians can be justly proud of their representatives at the negotiating table.

The areas of agreement so far reached are particularly significant in that they are a true sign of the spirit of justice and fair play which have governed the talks between two sovereign nations but even more, as friend to friend, once again reasonable men have sought reasonable solutions and have found them.

The free and unobstructed flow of traffic through the canal is vital to the interests of almost every trading nation in the world. If these interests are to be served a just and lasting agreement is a necessity. I believe we now have the basis for it.

Whatever decision is made concerning the construction of a new canal, whether

it be in Panama or elsewhere, its proper operation will greatly depend on what has been done here. Good engineering and good construction are not enough if good statesmanship is forgotten. President Johnson has kept this in mind and I commend him most highly for the guidance, the understanding and the statesmanship he has shown.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint statement issued by President Johnson and President Robles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA, SEPTEMBER 24, 1965

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Panama announced today that areas of agreement have been reached in the current treaty negotiations along the following lines:

In order to meet their present and future needs the two countries are negotiating separately a new and modern treaty to replace the 1903 treaty and its amendments, a base rights and status of forces agreement and a treaty under which there might be constructed across Panama a new sea level canal.

The two countries recognize that the primary interest of both countries lies in insuring that arrangements are provided for effective operation and defense of the existing Panama Canal and any new canal which may be constructed in Panama in the future.

With respect to the status of the negotiations on a new treaty to replace the 1903 treaty and its amendments, general areas of agreement have been reached. The details of these areas of agreement are the subject of current negotiations.

The purpose is to insure that Panama will share with the United States responsibility in the administration, management, and operation of the canal as may be provided in the treaty. Panama will also share with the United States in the direct and indirect benefits from the existence of this canal on its territory.

The areas of agreement reached are the following:

1. The 1903 treaty will be abrogated.
2. The new treaty will effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the area of the present Canal Zone.
3. The new treaty will terminate after a specified number of years or on about the date of the opening of the sea level canal, whichever occurs first.
4. A primary objective of the new treaty will be to provide for an appropriate political, economic and social integration of the area used in the canal operation with the rest of the Republic of Panama. Both countries recognize there is need for an orderly transition to avoid abrupt and possibly harmful dislocations. We also recognize that certain changes should be made over a period of time. The new canal administration will be empowered to make such changes in accordance with guidelines in the new treaty.
5. Both countries recognize the important responsibility they have to be fair and helpful to the employees of all nationalities who are serving so efficiently and well in the operation of the canal. Appropriate arrangements will be made to insure that the rights and interests of these employees are safeguarded.

The new treaties will provide for the defense of the existing canal and any sea level canal which may be constructed in Panama. U.S. forces and military facilities will be maintained under a base rights and status of forces agreement.

With respect to the sea level canal, the United States will make studies and site surveys of possible routes in Panama. Negotiations are continuing with respect to the methods and conditions of financing, constructing and operating a sea level canal, in the light of the importance of such a canal to the Republic of Panama, to the United States of America, to world commerce and to the progress of mankind.

The United States and Panama will seek the necessary solutions to the economic problems which would be caused by the construction of a sea level canal.

The present canal and any new canal which may be constructed in the future shall be open at all times to the vessels of all nations on a nondiscriminatory basis. The tolls would be reasonable in the light of the contribution of the Republic of Panama and the United States of America and of the interest of world commerce.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, September 28, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 24 (legislative day of September 20), 1965:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Edward L. Bailey | Donald M. Morrison, Jr. |
| Raymond E. Womack | |
| John P. Sanken | Donald B. Davis |
| Donald L. Sherman | Ronald G. Malone |
| Frank E. Braman | Thomas P. Nolan |
| Kearney L. Yancey, Jr. | Tommy G. Woodworth |
| John V. A. Thompson | Peter J. Rots |
| Roger W. Millett | Robert L. DeMichiell |
| Charles S. Wetherell | Matthew J. Ahearn |
| Hugh L. Murphy, Jr. | John I. Maloney, Jr. |
| Richard A. DeCorps, Jr. | Everett L. Crowell |
| | Ralph Z. Del-Giorno |
| Mitchell J. Whiting | John R. Erickson |
| John B. Lynn | Thomas T. Matteson |
| John W. Kime | William R. Babineau |
| Harlan D. Hanson | Richard Buell |
| Richard J. Green | Harry J. Reckitt |
| Thomas D. Combs, Jr. | John P. Flaherty, Jr. |
| James E. Brown, Jr. | Carol E. Conry |
| George D. Pasamore, Jr. | John R. Mitchell |
| | Richard J. Marcott |
| | Andrew R. Rippel |
| Louis K. Bragaw, Jr. | Edward B. Holtzman |
| Richard J. Collins | William E. Morris, III |
| Charles S. Niederman | Dick G. Taylor |
| George P. Vance | Warren J. Frederick |
| Ronald A. McClellan | Weymond Davis |
| John C. Wirtz | Dale H. Huff |
| David R. Markey | Gordon D. Crandall |
| Robert A. Johnson | Maurice V. Goodroe |
| William C. Parish | Bruno A. Forsterer |
| Richard W. Michaeis | Milton J. Thompson |
| Douglas B. Thurnher | Jack A. O'Donnell |
| Henry J. Harris, Jr. | Herman G. Pinter |
| James C. Osborn | Walter H. Riddle, Jr. |
| Keith D. Ripley | Carlton D. Leonard |
| John M. Cece | Floyd A. Rice |
| Harold E. Fallon, Jr. | Edward V. Dempsey, Jr. |
| Richard D. Thompson | |
| Arnold B. Beren | Charles H. Denmark |

- | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Charles B. Morrison | Richard H. Wight |
| Russell D. Edens | Gene N. Cooper |
| Benjamin S. Beach, Jr. | Ronald G. Eastman |
| James J. Gaughan | Robert O. Slade |
| Albert D. Grantham | Herbert D. McQuarrie, Jr. |
| George T. Kulick | |
| Roy E. Nichols, Jr. | Noel G. Ballinger |
| Ara E. Midgett, Jr. | Mark W. Byrd |
| Thomas D. Keith | Robert H. Elkins |
| Russell E. Sawyer | Donald P. Nachtwey |
| Richard N. Westcott | Theottis Wood |
| Richard J. Briggs | Duane P. Gatto |
| Wallace A. Herrington | Jack W. Dunn |
| Sanford H. Pierpoint | Luther L. Barr |
| Samuel A. McDowell, Jr. | Ralph T. Martin |
| | John E. Bosk |
| Vern R. Potter | Alfred H. F. Marchant |
| Richard F. Elden | Robert E. Hynds |
| Paul E. Peterson | Kenneth R. Rider |
| Rea F. Pitzer | Bruce C. Timmerman |
| James G. Glasgow | Dorwin W. Newman |
| Richard B. Eldridge | James D. Lombard |
| William P. Penney | Dan S. Meginley |
| Rudolph T. Sommer | Philip P. Coady |
| Robert C. Nichols | Robert A. Janecsek |
| Robert P. Knauff | Alvin J. Arnett |
| Aaron W. Rogers | Franklin E. Thrall |
| Richard M. Connor | James G. Lang |
| Lee I. Levy | Galen B. Nielsen |
| Costa J. Alton | John J. Janda, Jr. |
| Robert Farmer | William H. Dotson |
| John C. Hanson | Hugh T. Williams, Jr. |
| Karl F. Welty, Jr. | Philip R. Spiker |
| Robert S. Cutler | Charles H. Leckrone |

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3304, and 3305.

To be colonels

- | |
|--------------------------------------|
| Abernathy, Sterling H., XXXXXX |
| Ackerson, Duane W., XXXXXX |
| Adams, William L., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Adams, Willis J., XXXXXX |
| Adcock, Charles W., XXXXXX |
| Aerni, Francis J., XXXXXX |
| Agnew, Robert H., XXXXXX |
| Alcorn, James P., XXXXXX |
| Alexander, Charles R., XXXXXX |
| Alexander, Joseph P., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Allen, Fred C., XXXXXX |
| Almquist, Elmer H., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Anderson, Ben L., XXXXXX |
| Anderson, Lawrence R., XXXXXX |
| Andresen, Carroll W., XXXXXX |
| Andrews, Theodore H., XXXXXX |
| Appel, John G., XXXXXX |
| Arnold, Henry H., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Arntz, John P., XXXXXX |
| Arthur, John E., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Atteberry, Roy L., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Austin, Charles F., XXXXXX |
| Ayres, Harold B., XXXXXX |
| Bailey, Claude E., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Bailey, Frederick J., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Balkman, John P., XXXXXX |
| Ball, Frank E., XXXXXX |
| Ballard, James L., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Balthis, Jack L., XXXXXX |
| Bangert, Athel, XXXXXX |
| Barfield, Thomas H., XXXXXX |
| Barney, John C., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Barnhart, Norvel H., XXXXXX |
| Barrett, William S., XXXXXX |
| Barsanti, Olinto M., XXXXXX |
| Barthe, Robert C., XXXXXX |
| Barton, Claude D., XXXXXX |
| Bauch, Alfred R., XXXXXX |
| Bautz, Edward, Jr., XXXXXX |
| Beatty, George S., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Beaudry, Charles L., XXXXXX |
| Becker, Marshall O., XXXXXX |
| Becker, William A., XXXXXX |
| Bennett, Robert B., XXXXXX |
| Benson, John S., XXXXXX |
| Berry, John T., XXXXXX |
| Best, George W., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Bestor, Richard J., XXXXXX |
| Biggs, Richard C., XXXXXX |
| Bird, Daniel C., XXXXXX |
| Birdsong, William H., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Blackburn, Donald D., XXXXXX |
| Blacker, Kemuel K., XXXXXX |
| Blakefield, William H., XXXXXX |
| Blazzard, Howard C., XXXXXX |
| Blinn, Ashley A., XXXXXX |
| Bloch, Orville E., XXXXXX |
| Blom, Arthur R., XXXXXX |
| Blomgren, Holton E., XXXXXX |
| Boatwright, Linton S., XXXXXX |
| Boggs, Adelbert D., XXXXXX |
| Boggs, William M., XXXXXX |
| Bone, George A., XXXXXX |
| Borman, Robert C., XXXXXX |
| Boswell, Henry, Jr., XXXXXX |
| Boulger, Jack A., XXXXXX |
| Bowen, Thomas J., XXXXXX |
| Bowlby, Lawrence, XXXXXX |
| Boyce, Wilbur C., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Boyer, Donald P., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Boykin, James H., XXXXXX |
| Boyle, Herman B., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Branch, James S., XXXXXX |
| Brand, William F., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Branson, Boyd L., XXXXXX |
| Brice, Charles S., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Bristol, Delbert L., XXXXXX |
| Brodbeck, William D., XXXXXX |
| Brooks, John M., XXXXXX |
| Brown, Earl V., XXXXXX |
| Brown, Harry C., XXXXXX |
| Brown, Horace M., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Brown, James H., XXXXXX |
| Browning, James M., XXXXXX |
| Buchanan, Earl K., XXXXXX |
| Buerschinger, Harold F., XXXXXX |
| Bunte, Donald W., XXXXXX |
| Burgess, Albert F., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Burke, James L., XXXXXX |
| Burney, Samuel M., XXXXXX |
| Burns, Kenneth P., XXXXXX |
| Burtchaell, John W., XXXXXX |
| Burton, William E., XXXXXX |
| Bushway, Collin, XXXXXX |
| Callaway, John W., XXXXXX |
| Camp, Thomas J., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Campbell, Raymond P., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Canella, Charles J., XXXXXX |
| Cannady, Preston B., XXXXXX |
| Cannon, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Caprino, Charles T., XXXXXX |
| Carlisle, Gerald, XXXXXX |
| Carpenter, Sidney C., XXXXXX |
| Carr, Frank F., XXXXXX |
| Carroll, Charles A., XXXXXX |
| Carter, George W., XXXXXX |
| Carter, Lamar G., XXXXXX |
| Carter, Washington C., XXXXXX |
| Cary, Victor L., XXXXXX |
| Cason, Duane S., XXXXXX |
| Castle, Edmund, XXXXXX |
| Caulbe, Gordon B., XXXXXX |
| Chamberlain, Clifton H., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Chapman, Daniel T., XXXXXX |
| Chapman, Ernest W., XXXXXX |
| Charlton, George F., XXXXXX |
| Chenault, James K., XXXXXX |
| Chesley, John W., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Chrietzberg, Abb., XXXXXX |
| Ciccolella, Richard G., XXXXXX |
| Clark, Harry A., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Clark, Howard W., XXXXXX |
| Clarke, Fred DeM., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Clayton, George A., XXXXXX |
| Cleary, Thomas J., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Clifford, William E., XXXXXX |
| Coakley, Robert J., XXXXXX |
| Cobb, William W., XXXXXX |
| Cochran, Harrington W., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Coffey, Alfred E., XXXXXX |
| Coffin, Robert E., XXXXXX |
| Cogswell, David G., XXXXXX |
| Coleman, Robert M., XXXXXX |
| Colkitt, Thompson McC., XXXXXX |
| Collins, Fred W., XXXXXX |
| Collins, Leroy P., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Colquitt, Rawlins M., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Conaty, Francis S., Jr., XXXXXX |
| Condon, Jack G., XXXXXX |

Condy, William, XXXXXX
 Connor, John E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Connor, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Conroy, Raymond C., XXXXXX
 Cook, Benjamin F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cook, Julian A., XXXXXX
 Cooper, Thomas H., XXXXXX
 Corey, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Costable, Raymond C., XXXXXX
 Covert, John R. M., XXXXXX
 Cowan, Alvin E., XXXXXX
 Cox, William E., XXXXXX
 Crane, Glenn, XXXXXX
 Crawford, Grover L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Crawford, Harold M., XXXXXX
 Crayton, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Creek, Roy E., XXXXXX
 Crosby, Ralph D., XXXXXX
 Cross, James C., XXXXXX
 Cross, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Crown, Francis J., XXXXXX
 Culhane, Roger J., XXXXXX
 Cummings, Charles S., XXXXXX
 Cummins, George M., XXXXXX
 Curtis, Clifford A., XXXX
 Curtis, Elmer P., XXXXXX
 Curtis, Homer K., XXXXXX
 Dalley, Paul P., XXXXXX
 DaPonte, Peter L., XXXXXX
 Dalton, Ralph L., XXXXXX
 Davidoff, James E., XXXXXX
 Davies, Walter J., XXXXXX
 Davis, Art H., XXXXXX
 Davis, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Davis, Clarence E., Jr., XXXX
 Davis, Don, XXXX
 Davis, Franklin M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Davis, Gerald W., XXXXXX
 Davis, Oscar E., XXXXXX
 Day, Paul C., XXXXXX
 DeLuca, Arthur J., XXXXXX
 DeNoya, Louis L., XXXXXX
 DePuy, William E., XXXX
 DeYoung, Guy O., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dean, John W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dean, William A., XXXXXX
 deSaussure, Edward H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Desobry, William R., XXXXXX
 Di Meo, Frank G., XXXXXX
 Dickerson, George W., XXXXXX
 Dickson, Ned R., XXXXXX
 Dickson, Robert S., 3d, XXXXXX
 Dillon, Wilbur S., XXXXXX
 Dingeman, David R., XXXXXX
 Dingle, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Doherty, Paul E., XXXXXX
 Donley, Edwin I., XXXXXX
 Donnell, Francis S., XXXX
 Downing, Edward P., XXXXXX
 Drewry, Guy H., Jr., XXXXXX
 DuParc, Jules M., XXXXXX
 DuBois, Edmund L., XXXXXX
 Duda, Frank, XXXXXX
 Duffie, Johnnie D., XXXXXX
 Duke, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Dukes, Dan K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Duncan, Jack M., XXXXXX
 Dunlop, Donald D., XXXXXX
 Dunn, George R., XXXXXX
 Dunn, Jerry F., XXXXXX
 Durrenberger, William J., XXXXXX
 Dwan, John E., 2d, XXXXXX
 Dwight, William A., XXXXXX
 Dyer, William B., XXXXXX
 Dyson, James H., XXXXXX
 Eberhardt, Leo H., XXXXXX
 Eddy, Dayton W., XXXXXX
 Edger, Robert H., XXXX
 Edmondson, Carl C., XXXXXX
 Edwards, Bob E., XXXXXX
 Edwards, Richard A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Elcher, Roger A., XXXXXX
 Elsiminger, Sterling K., XXXXXX
 Elder, John H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Elder, John W., XXXXXX
 Elliott, Glenn P., XXXXXX
 Emerson, Kary C., XXXXXX
 Erickson, Kenneth W., XXXXXX
 Farrar, William L., XXXXXX
 Faust, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Featherston, Howard H., XXXXXX
 Fee, Henry J., XXXXXX
 Feeman, William E., XXXXXX
 Ferguson, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Ferrari, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Feyereisen, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Finley, Gibson R., XXXXXX
 Finley, Glenn S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fischer, Frank O., XXXXXX
 Fisher, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Fitzpatrick, Francis C., XXXXXX
 Fives, Paul E., XXXXXX
 Flanders, Charles L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Flegeal, Foster F., XXXXXX
 Fleming, Elmer P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fletcher, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Flynn, Ralph M., XXXXXX
 Fonk, Elwyn J., XXXXXX
 Forbes, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Ford John A., XXXXXX
 Ford, John M., XXXXXX
 Forsythe, George I., XXXXXX
 Foss, Erling J., XXXXXX
 Foster, Hugh F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fragala, Augustine M., XXXXXX
 France, Douglas C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Franklin, Wesley C., XXXXXX
 Franks, Edward R., XXXXXX
 Franz, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Frazier, Douglas F., XXXXXX
 Freeman, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Freeman, Wilson, XXXXXX
 Fritter, Lee W., XXXXXX
 Garbacz, Joseph F., XXXXXX
 Gardiner, William D., XXXXXX
 Gardner, Glenn H., XXXXXX
 Garrett, Leonard E., XXXXXX
 Garrett, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Gattis, Floyd D., XXXXXX
 Gauvreau, David G., XXXXXX
 Geer, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Geise, Jack P., XXXXXX
 Georgelas, John G., XXXXXX
 Gerace, Felix J., XXXXXX
 Gibbons, James J., XXXXXX
 Gilchrist, Frank, XXXXXX
 Gildart, William J., XXXXXX
 Gile, David A., XXXXXX
 Gillespie, Hubert W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Girard, Charles J., XXXXXX
 Gleason, William T., XXXXXX
 Glover, William C., XXXXXX
 Goers, Melvin A., XXXXXX
 Gold, Norman H., XXXXXX
 Golladay, Howard O., XXXXXX
 Gompf, Clayton N., XXXXXX
 Gonsett, Kenneth M., XXXXXX
 Goodman, John M., XXXXXX
 Gordon, Donald B., XXXXXX
 Gordon, William T., XXXX
 Grace, Denis B., XXXXXX
 Grady, John W., XXXXXX
 Graham, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Graham, Erwin M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gray, Asa P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gray, Paul, Jr., XXXXXX
 Greeley, Donald H., XXXX
 Green, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Greene, Lawrence V., XXXX
 Greene, Michael J. L., XXXXXX
 Greer, Howard W., XXXXXX
 Gregg, Francis H., XXXXXX
 Gribble, William C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Griffin, James S., XXXXXX
 Grimsley, Ralph J., XXXXXX
 Grinnell, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Griscil, Walter E., XXXXXX
 Grove, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Grygiel, Joseph S., XXXXXX
 Guerin, Vincent C., XXXXXX
 Guest, James W., XXXXXX
 Gunn, Frank L., XXXX
 Gustafson, Karl W., XXXXXX
 Haley, James W., XXXXXX
 Halper, Maurice J., XXXXXX
 Hamilton, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Hamilton, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Hammer, James E., XXXXXX
 Hanes, Lloyd LeR., XXXXXX
 Hanes, Wallace M., XXXXXX
 Hannah, Paul V., XXXXXX
 Hansen, John C., XXXXXX
 Harbert, John E., XXXXXX
 Harden, John H., XXXXXX
 Harper, James H., XXXXXX
 Harrington, Patrick W., XXXXXX
 Harris, Frederick V., XXXXXX
 Harris, James F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Harris, William N., XXXXXX
 Hart, William F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Harvey, Glenn M., XXXXXX
 Harvey, William W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hatch, James J., XXXXXX
 Hatch, Merrill G., XXXXXX
 Hathaway, Edward N., XXXXXX
 Hauser, Auburon P., XXXXXX
 Hay, John H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hayes, John, XXXXXX
 Healy, James G., XXXXXX
 Healy, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Heatwole, James W., XXXXXX
 Hebbeler, James A., XXXXXX
 Heffelfinger, Hugo W., XXXXXX
 Helena, Cecil C., XXXXXX
 Henderson, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Herrington, Jay W., XXXXXX
 Herstad, John O., XXXXXX
 Hickman, Mahlon D., XXXXXX
 Hicks, Herbert C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hicks, Thomas A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hidalgo, Stanley P., XXXXXX
 Hines, Jack G., XXXXXX
 Hinkley, Paul P., XXXXXX
 Hinman, John M., XXXXXX
 Hislop, Albert H., XXXXXX
 Hitchcock, Raymond H., XXXXXX
 Hoag, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Hogoboom, Dale D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hoile, John D., XXXXXX
 Holbrook, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Holland, James G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holliman, Earl J., XXXXXX
 Hollingsworth, James F., XXXXXX
 Holly, George J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holmes, William E., XXXXXX
 Hough, Parkhurst C., XXXXXX
 Howell, Harry R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Howton, James R., XXXX
 Hubbard, William H., XXXXXX
 Huffman, Burnside E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hughes, James F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hughes, John S., XXXXXX
 Hunnicutt, Cecil F., XXXXXX
 Hunt, James W., XXXXXX
 Inge, Andrew V., XXXXXX
 Ingerski, Jerome A., XXXXXX
 Inman, Roy L., XXXXXX
 Irving, John W., XXXXXX
 Irving, Thurman A., XXXX
 Irwin, Wilbur J., XXXXXX
 Irzyk, Albin F., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Bennett L., XXXXXX
 Jeffries, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Jeffries, James C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Edward N., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Francis L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, John F., XXXXXX
 Jennings, Edward B., XXXXXX
 Jennings, Gregg N., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Allan G. W., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Lynnwood M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Malcolm C., XXXXXX
 Johnston, Myron T., XXXXXX
 Jones, Bruce B., XXXXXX
 Jones, Grant E., XXXXXX
 Jones, James O., XXXXXX
 Jones, Leo B., XXXXXX
 Jones, Luther G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jones, Morton M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Joseph, Vern L., XXXXXX
 Kaiser, James L., XXXXXX
 Kane, Roy A., XXXXXX
 Karnosky, Benedict A., XXXXXX
 Karstedt, Warren H., XXXXXX
 Katherman, Elliott T., XXXXXX
 Keirsey, Jim D., XXXXXX
 Keller, Lucien F., XXXXXX
 Kelley, Roy S., XXXXXX
 Kemp, Harry M., XXXXXX
 Kennedy, Kenneth W., XXXXXX
 Kent, Harold R., XXXXXX
 Kent, James R., XXXXXX
 Kernan, William F., XXXXXX

Kerns, Merlin C., XXXXXX
 Kerr, Billy H., XXXXXX
 Kessler, Roy M., XXXXXX
 Kight, Harry D., XXXXXX
 Kimball, Robert E., XXXXXX
 King, James H., XXXXXX
 King, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kirkbride, Max V., XXXXXX
 Kirkpatrick, Byron M., XXXXXX
 Kisiel, Edwin O., XXXXXX
 Kloos, Edward J., XXXXXX
 Knowles, Richard T., XXXXXX
 Knowlton, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Knox, Jack C., XXXXXX
 Kobayashi, Thomas M., XXXXXX
 Koepcke, Henry, Jr., XXXXXX
 Kolb, Roland L., XXXXXX
 Koob, William L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kovalevsky, Vitaly, XXXXXX
 Kramer, Robert S., XXXX
 Kramers, John T., XXXXXX
 Krampitz, Charles T., XXXXXX
 Kreutzer, Richard B., XXXXXX
 Kugler, William R., XXXXXX
 Kuzell, Ralph E., XXXXXX
 Kuznicki, John F., XXXXXX
 Kyle, David McV., XXXXXX
 LaHatte, William F., XXXXXX
 Lacey, Peter J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Laiche, Weldon E., XXXXXX
 Lancey, William S., XXXXXX
 Land, Leroy C., XXXXXX
 Lane, Douglas H., XXXXXX
 Lang, Clarence J., XXXXXX
 Langland, Kenneth F., XXXXXX
 Langley, William C., XXXXXX
 Lanigan, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Lanterman, John V. S., XXXXXX
 Larson, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Lash, Frederick F., XXXXXX
 Latimer, Raymond LaV., XXXXXX
 Lavin, John J., XXXXXX
 Lawrence, Leon S., XXXXXX
 Lawson, Joel W., XXXXXX
 Lawson, Melvin M., XXXXXX
 Lawson, Roger L., XXXXXX
 Leary, Francis X., XXXXXX
 Leber, Walter P., XXXXXX
 Lee, James H., XXXXXX
 Lee, John C. H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Leeney, Lewis W., XXXXXX
 Legare, Ben W., Senior, XXXXXX
 Lent, Morris A., XXXXXX
 Leonard, Theodore, XXXXXX
 Liggett, John C., XXXXXX
 Lind, William J., XXXXXX
 Lindjord, Haakon, XXXXXX
 Lindley, Harold C., XXXXXX
 Lindner, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Linn, James W., XXXXXX
 Linnell, Frank H., XXXXXX
 Loiselle, Postford A., XXXXXX
 Long, Glen C., XXXXXX
 Looney, Ned I., XXXXXX
 Loop, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Love, James W., XXXXXX
 Lucre, Morris J., XXXXXX
 Lundy, William G., XXXXXX
 Lynch, William R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mabry, George L., Jr., XXXXXX
 MacFeeters, Donald W., XXXXXX
 MacKenzie, Stuart A., XXXXXX
 MacMillan, Latimer W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Maixner, Harold V., XXXXXX
 Maline, Paul J., XXXXXX
 Maling, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Maliszewski, George M., XXXXXX
 Mancuso, Stephen J., XXXXXX
 Maness, Lewis E., XXXXXX
 Mantz, William M., XXXX
 Manzolillo, Russell J., XXXXXX
 Maples, Herron N., XXXXXX
 Marfing, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Marsh, Harley T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Martin, William N., XXXXXX
 Martin, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Matis, Theodore C., XXXXXX
 Mather, Walter E., XXXXXX
 Matthews, Clinton F., XXXX
 Matthews, Jack B., XXXXXX
 Maxwell, James S., XXXXXX
 Mayo, Joseph B., XXXXXX
 McBride, Edward E., Jr., XXXXXX
 McBride, Francis G., XXXXXX
 McCachern, William Y., XXXXXX
 McCaffrey, George W., XXXXXX
 McCartney, Robert W., XXXXXX
 McConnell, C. W., XXXXXX
 McConnell, John A., XXXXXX
 McCorkle, Philip H., XXXXXX
 McCoy, Jim H., XXXXXX
 McCulloch, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXXX
 McDannel, Carlyle F., XXXXXX
 McDowell, James E., XXXXXX
 McDowell, William D., XXXXXX
 McGrane, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXX
 McGrath, Vincent J., XXXXXX
 McGraw, Robert E., XXXXXX
 McGregor, Edward W., XXXXXX
 McIntosh, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXX
 McIntyre, George W., XXXXXX
 McKean, Sterling J., XXXXXX
 Meacham, Joseph R., XXXXXX
 Meanor, James B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mehaffe, Louis H., XXXXXX
 Meyer, Arthur L., XXXXXX
 Michael, George P., XXXXXX
 Mickelson, Rolf E., XXXXXX
 Middleworth, Henry V., XXXXXX
 Milano, James V., XXXXXX
 Miller, Crosby P., XXXXXX
 Miller, Joseph G. K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Miller, Olaf G., XXXXXX
 Millikin, John Jr., XXXXXX
 Mist, Ellis H., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Burt L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Joseph D., XXXXXX
 Mitman, Floyd B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mobley, James H., XXXXXX
 Montrone, Alfred J., XXXXXX
 Moody, Alfred J. F., XXXXXX
 Moore, Felton H., XXXXXX
 Moore, George B., XXXXXX
 Moore, Harley L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Moore, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Moran, Edward E., XXXXXX
 Moran, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Morgan, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Morgan, John J., XXXXXX
 Morgan, William O., XXXXXX
 Moucha, Miroslav F., XXXXXX
 Mueller, Arndt L., XXXXXX
 Mueller, Edmund L., XXXXXX
 Muggelberg, Glenn E., XXXXXX
 Mulcahy, James P., XXXXXX
 Muller, Frank M., XXXXXX
 Muller, Henry J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mundy, Reuben W., XXXXXX
 Munster, Daniel F., XXXXXX
 Murphy, James O., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Naselroad, Winfred C., XXXXXX
 Nathan, Aubrey P., XXXXXX
 Nawn, Leo J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Neary, Elmer J., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Harold E., XXXXXX
 Newland, Jess E., XXXX
 Newlin, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Newman, John T., XXXXXX
 Newton, Albert, XXXXXX
 Nichols, Edwin A., XXXXXX
 Nilsson, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Nolan, Hubert L., XXXXXX
 Northington, Hartsell H., XXXXXX
 Norton, John, XXXXXX
 O'Farrell, Hugh R., XXXXXX
 Ohl, William C., XXXXXX
 Olliver, Leonard F., XXXXXX
 O'Neill, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Ortenzi, Anthony H., XXXXXX
 Osgard, James L., XXXXXX
 Ostrom, Charles D. Y., XXXXXX
 Oswald, John R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Packman, James L., XXXXXX
 Page, Robert W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Palmblad, Frederic H., XXXXXX
 Panke, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Parker, Harold E., XXXX
 Parker, James C., XXXXXX
 Parsons, Albro L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Parsons, Marcus L., XXXXXX
 Patterson, Douglas H., XXXXXX
 Patterson, George D., XXXXXX
 Peabody, Herbert G., XXXXXX
 Pearson, Raymond L. V., XXXXXX
 Peoples, Edward T., XXXXXX
 Penson, David, XXXXXX
 Penzkofer, Claire B., XXXXXX
 Pepke, Donn R., XXXXXX
 Phelps, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Philbin, Tobias R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Philp, John F., XXXXXX
 Phipps, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Pickard, Andrew D., XXXXXX
 Pickering, Ellis E., XXXXXX
 Pickett, George B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pierce, Fred A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pillsbury, Glenn T., XXXXXX
 Piper, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Pitts, George T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pixton, Allan G., XXXXXX
 Plant, Ottis M., XXXXXX
 Poffenberger, John T., XXXXXX
 Porter, Howard E., XXXXXX
 Powell, Edwin L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Powell, Marcus L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pratt, John B., XXXXXX
 Preer, Carleton, Jr., XXXXXX
 Prendergast, Joseph T., XXXXXX
 Prewitt, Daniel W., XXXXXX
 Pribnow, Andy W., XXXXXX
 Pridgen, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Prusaitis, Joseph J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Purdy, William A., XXXXXX
 Purnell, Sterling E., XXXXXX
 Quashnock, Enro J., XXXXXX
 Quigley, Hugh E., XXXXXX
 Quirey, William O., XXXXXX
 Raffaelli, Raymond J., XXXXXX
 Rall, Lloyd L., XXXXXX
 Ramee, Paul W., XXXXXX
 Ramey, Stanley M., XXXXXX
 Randall, Burr J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Raney, Maynard C., XXXXXX
 Ransone, Alexander L., XXXXXX
 Ray, John, XXXXXX
 Read, Beverly M., XXXXXX
 Redfern, Ira C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Redmon, John G., XXXXXX
 Reed, Wilson R., XXXXXX
 Reid, John E., XXXXXX
 Reid, Samuel LaF., XXXXXX
 Reilly, William R., XXXXXX
 Renfro, Charles G., XXXXXX
 Rice, Arnold E., XXXXXX
 Rice, Edward S., XXXXXX
 Rice, Irvin M., XXXXXX
 Rice, Johnny M., XXXX
 Rich, Arthur A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Richeson, Hugh A., XXXXXX
 Riegle, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Riley, Jacob L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Riley, Thomas W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roberts, John K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Paul F., XXXXXX
 Robinson, John H., XXXXXX
 Rogers, Jack A., XXXXXX
 Rogers, Maurice A., XXXXXX
 Rogers, William C., XXXXXX
 Rollins, Andrew F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Root, Paul C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roper, Willard, XXXXXX
 Ross, Samuel R., XXXXXX
 Roth, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Roton, William F., XXXXXX
 Rowny, Edward L., XXXXXX
 Rubottom, Donald C., XXXXXX
 Ruffner, Clifford H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Russi, Gilbert C., XXXXXX
 Ruwet, Vincent L., XXXXXX
 Sablitz, Henry H., XXXXXX
 Sage, Jerry M., XXXXXX
 Sage, Rex R., XXXXXX
 Salisbury, Lloyd R., XXXXXX
 Sallee, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Samusson, Ernest, Jr., XXXXXX
 Sanden, James V., XXXX
 Sanders, Cecil M., XXXXXX
 Saunders, William W., XXXXXX
 Savilla, Roland, XXXXXX
 Sawbridge, John J., XXXXXX
 Schaad, Carl W., XXXXXX
 Schaf, Frank L., Jr., XXXXXX

Schmedemann, Keith M., XXXXXX.
 Schmidt, Graham E., XXXXXX.
 Schmierer, Elmer, XXXXXX.
 Schreiber, William L., XXXXXX.
 Schremp, John E., XXXXXX.
 Schuler, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Schulz, Robert H., XXXXXX.
 Schutz, Albert D., XXXXXX.
 Schweiter, Leo H., XXXXXX.
 Scott, Emmett G., XXXXXX.
 Scott, Richard P., XXXXXX.
 Seitz, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Seneff, George P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Servis, John D., XXXXXX.
 Sewell, Harry B., XXXXXX.
 Sharp, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Sharpe, Granville A., XXXXXX.
 Sharpe, Thomas J., XXXXXX.
 Shaw, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Shea, Gerald H., XXXXXX.
 Shettle, Charles G., XXXXXX.
 Shurtleff, Carlyle H., XXXXXX.
 Sidle, Winant, XXXXXX.
 Sifford, Wilson, XXXXXX.
 Simmons, James E., XXXXXX.
 Simpson, Paul A., XXXXXX.
 Skinner, William G., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Skowronek, Paul G., XXXXXX.
 Sloan, Nicholas E., XXXXXX.
 Sloan, William N., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Albert H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Aley L., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Bill G., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Herbert A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Jack D., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Magnus L., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Robert B., XXXXXX.
 Smith, Willard A., XXXXXX.
 Smith, William M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Smoak, Robert A., XXXXXX.
 Snapp, Elbridge L., XXXXXX.
 Snetzer, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Snoddy, Cecil C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Sparra, Charis R., XXXXXX.
 Speaks, Robert J., XXXXXX.
 Spencer, Thomas F., XXXXXX.
 Spiller, Benjamin A., XXXXXX.
 Spillner, Siegfried H., XXXXXX.
 St. Clair, Harold J., XXXXXX.
 Stafford, Robert S., XXXXXX.
 Stanford, Marvin N., XXXXXX.
 Starr, James C., XXXXXX.
 Starr, William F., XXXXXX.
 Steichen, Woodrow J., XXXXXX.
 Steinbacher, Raymond L., XXXXXX.
 Stern, Herbert I., XXXXXX.
 Stewart, Lee L., XXXXXX.
 Stewart, Thomas N., XXXXXX.
 Stillman, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Stone, Frank H., XXXXXX.
 Stone, William W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Storey, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Stout, Morris C., XXXXXX.
 Strain, James W., XXXXXX.
 Strait, Lewis J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Strider, Nicholas S., XXXXXX.
 Strok, Michael J., XXXXXX.
 Strong, John L., XXXXXX.
 Strother, Tom B., XXXXXX.
 Strunk, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Sullivan, John L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Sullivan, Martin F., XXXXXX.
 Sullivan, William G., XXXXXX.
 Sutherland, James W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Sweeney, Francis P., XXXXXX.
 Swenson, J. Elmore, XXXXXX.
 Swope, Francis A., XXXXXX.
 Tabb, Jack S., XXXXXX.
 Taber, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Talbott, Orwin C., XXXXXX.
 Tansey, Patrick H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Tarbox, Robert M., XXXXXX.
 Tarkenton, James C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Taylor, George I., XXXXXX.
 Taynton, Lewis C., XXXXXX.
 Teir, William, XXXXXX.
 Terrell, Cader C., XXXXXX.
 Terrell, Joseph S., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Terry, James K., XXXXXX.
 Thomas, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Thompson, James B., XXXXXX.

Thompson, John R., XXXXXX.
 Thompson, Lowell E., XXXXXX.
 Tobey, Nelson W., XXXXXX.
 Todd, Walter B., XXXXXX.
 Tonetti, Oscar C., XXXXXX.
 Traylor, John P., XXXXXX.
 Triplett, Austin, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Tyler, Max C., XXXXXX.
 Tyner, Layton C., XXXXXX.
 Unger, James F., XXXXXX.
 Urban, Peter L., XXXXXX.
 Vallery, Joy K., XXXXXX.
 Van de Voort, Leo D., XXXXXX.
 Van Sandt, William A., XXXXXX.
 Vanderpool, Jay D., XXXXXX.
 Vaughan, William J. D., XXXXXX.
 Vidlak, Frank J., XXXX.
 Vilhauer, Jonas A., XXXXXX.
 Vincent, Dale L., XXXXXX.
 Vinquist, Glenn M., XXXXXX.
 Walker, Glenn D., XXXXXX.
 Walker, John K., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Walker, Lawrence H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Wallace, Victor M., XXXXXX.
 Wallace, Winston E., XXXXXX.
 Ward, Donald R., XXXXXX.
 Ward, Kenneth A., XXXXXX.
 Ward, Linus P., XXXXXX.
 Warden, Irving D., XXXXXX.
 Warren, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Washington, William R., XXXXXX.
 Watson, Thomas E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Webb, William E., XXXXXX.
 Weber, Milton J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Welch, Lamar A., XXXXXX.
 Wellems, Edward N., XXXXXX.
 Wells, Robert B., XXXXXX.
 Wells, William L., XXXXXX.
 Welsh, Robert J., XXXXXX.
 West, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Weyard, Frederick C., XXXXXX.
 Wheeler, Sheldon H., XXXXXX.
 Wheelis, Reuben E., XXXXXX.
 White, Stanley W., XXXXXX.
 White, Stephen H., XXXXXX.
 Whitsitt, Menon W., XXXXXX.
 Williams, Floyd D., XXXXXX.
 Williams, John W., XXXXXX.
 Williams, Ralph I., XXXXXX.
 Williamson, Ellis W., XXXXXX.
 Wilson, Eugene A., XXXXXX.
 Wilson, John M., XXXXXX.
 Wilson, Leroy B., XXXXXX.
 Witcover, Henry W., XXXXXX.
 Witte, Carl G., XXXXXX.
 Wohner, John H., XXXXXX.
 Wojcik, Walter K., XXXXXX.
 Wood, Edgar C., XXXXXX.
 Woods, David H., XXXXXX.
 Woodward, William H., XXXXXX.
 Woolwine, Walter J., XXXXXX.
 Wootton, William B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Yates, Elmer P., XXXXXX.
 Yoder, Donn W., XXXXXX.
 York, Dantes A., XXXXXX.
 Yourtee, Leon R., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Zais, Melvin, XXXXXX.
 Zaumeyer, Lawrence M., XXXXXX.

To be colonel, Chaplain

Bell, Richard R., XXXXXX.
 Betzold, John W., XXXXXX.
 Donnelly, Augustine P., XXXXXX.
 Fitzgerald, William R., XXXXXX.
 Sullivan, Maurice L., XXXXXX.
 Taylor, Newell E., XXXXXX.

To be colonel, Medical Corps

Austin, Richard B., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Barron, Thomas S., XXXXXX.
 Brennan, James T., XXXXXX.
 Maret, Raymond, XXXXXX.
 Miller, Elsworth L., XXXXXX.
 Mordecai, Lindley R., XXXXXX.
 Offutt, Harry D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Reed, Paul A., XXXXXX.
 Travis, LeRoy O., XXXXXX.

To be colonel, Dental Corps

Burke, Allyn D., XXXXXX.
 Enmeier, James M., XXXXXX.
 Grundler, Richard A., XXXXXX.

Mosley, George W., XXXXXX.
 Sunnicht, Russell W., XXXXXX.

To be colonel, Veterinary Corps

Gochenour, William S., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Lord, Willys E., XXXXXX.
 Reid, Joseph E., XXXXXX.

To be colonel, Medical Service Corps

Bryan, Roy A., XXXXXX.
 Caldbeck, Raymond J., XXXXXX.
 Chapelle, Francis O., XXXXXX.
 Colyer, Andrew J., XXXXXX.
 Cowgill, Charles J., XXXXXX.
 DeSautels, Francis O., XXXXXX.
 Dowless, Joseph D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Edwards, Sam A., XXXXXX.
 Francis, James R., XXXXXX.
 Frick, Lyman P., XXXXXX.
 Hack, Vincent I., XXXXXX.
 Hilcken, John A., XXXXXX.
 Hitchings, Donald L., XXXXXX.
 Jetland, Robert I., XXXXXX.
 Leibovitz, Albert, XXXXXX.
 Levesque, Paul M., XXXXXX.
 Marks, Edward, XXXXXX.
 Medwed, John D., XXXXXX.
 Mendenhall, John V., XXXXXX.
 Rattan, Volney H., XXXXXX.
 Southard, William W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Stable, Joseph N., XXXXXX.
 Stewart, Thomas B., XXXXXX.
 Thornton, William H., XXXXXX.
 Ware, Marvin A., XXXXXX.
 Wolf, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXX.

To be colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Jump, Katherine R., XXXX.
 Rosasco, Louise C., XXXXX.

The following named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be major

Comiskey, Donald N., XXXXXX.
 Manjeot, Lloyd H., XXXXXX.
 Sheehan, John J., XXXXXX.

To be captain

Catron, Robert L., XXXXXXX.

The following named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenant

Anderson, Edwin P., XXXXXXX.
 Armstrong, David B., XXXXXXX.
 Baer, James T., XXXXXXX.
 Bartlett, LeRoy, 3d, XXXXXX.
 Blanco, Frederick A., XXXXXXX.
 Blouin, James O., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Brooks, Joseph H., XXXXXXX.
 Brookshire, Robert E., 2d, XXXXXX.
 Brown, Russell D., XXXXXX.
 Bulger, John P., XXXXXXX.
 Bushong, James T., XXXXXXX.
 Cannan, Patrick F., XXXXXX.
 Carey, Roland, XXXXXX.
 Carlson, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Carlton, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXXX.
 Causar, Wilburn R., Jr., XXXXXXX.
 Chapman, Michael G., XXXXXXX.
 Christian, Donnie G., XXXXXXX.
 Clements, Lawrence J., XXXXXXX.
 Cowan, Ronald L., XXXXXX.
 Craddock, Ollie C., Jr., XXXXXXX.
 Crews, Norman A., XXXXXXX.
 Cullum, Bobbie J., XXXXXXX.
 Dales, Betram B., 3d, XXXXXX.
 Davis, William I., XXXXXXX.
 Dicklson, Daniel R., XXXXXX.
 Donelan, James J., XXXXXXX.
 Donoghue, Glen M., XXXXXXX.
 Dorch, John D., XXXXXXX.
 Duncan, James L., XXXXXXX.
 Eastum, Thomas P., Jr., XXXXXXX.
 Ernest, Marlon D., XXXXXXX.
 Evans, Richard F., XXXXXXX.
 Everly, Julian R., XXXXXXX.
 Feerick, Martin S., Jr., XXXXXX.

Fincher, Hubert T., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Frederick, Gilbert H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Freeman, Donald W., XXXXXXXX
 Frierson, Donald M., XXXXXXXX
 Ginsburg, Norman I., XXXXXXXX
 Goodwin, Bobby A., XXXXXXXX
 Greer, Robert H., XXXXXXXX
 Guenzburger, Albert, XXXXXXXX
 Gustafson, Jan A., XXXXXXXX
 Hadawat, Bobby G., XXXXXXXX
 Hadley, Miles B., XXXXXXXX
 Hagerty, Neil M., XXXXXXXX
 Haines, Charles O., XXXXXXXX
 Hammett, Grady E., XXXXXXXX
 Hammock, Millard E., XXXXXXXX
 Harrell, George L., 2d, XXXXXXXX
 Harvey, Joe B., XXXXXXXX
 Haslemann, Walter, XXXXXXXX
 Henson, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Howerton, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Andrew J., XXXXXXXX
 Kalinowski, Donald D., XXXXXXXX
 Kampf, Michael E., XXXXXXXX
 Killebrew, James E., XXXXXXXX
 King, Earle E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Leach, Frank J., XXXXXXXX
 Leyda, Craig H., XXXXXXXX
 Lindsey, David H., XXXXXXXX
 Love, Earnest E., XXXXXXXX
 Mann, Carl A., XXXXXXXX
 Mann, Robert E., XXXXXXXX
 Mathis, Foy M., XXXXXXXX
 Matje, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 McClure, William M., XXXXXXXX
 McDaniel, Quannah L., XXXXXXXX
 McLemore, Oran F., XXXXXXXX
 McPherson, Arthur R., XXXXXXXX
 Moentmann, Werner A., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Alan L., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Moss, Pat L., XXXXXXXX
 Mullis, Harry E., XXXXXXXX
 Murphee, John D., XXXXXXXX
 Murray, David B., XXXXXXXX
 Myatt, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Nicolai, Larry D., XXXXXXXX
 Noel, Albert E., XXXXXXXX
 Novembre, Peter J., XXXXXXXX
 Ortiz, Luis, XXXXXXXX
 Owen, Charles S., XXXXXXXX
 Pabst, David A., XXXXXXXX
 Parlow, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Pastor, John D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Patterson, Jerry R., XXXXXXXX
 Peffer, William D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Poff, Gary L., XXXXXXXX
 Powell, Horace W., XXXXXXXX
 Pritchett, Charles H., XXXXXXXX
 Reed, Arthur W., XXXXXXXX
 Reilly, William F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Rutz, Stephen F., XXXXXXXX
 Samas, Frank R., XXXXXXXX
 Seldomridge, John A. A., XXXXXXXX
 Showalter, James V., XXXXXXXX
 Shurtleff, Billy K., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Charles F., XXXXXXXX
 Spencer, William P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Stevens, William L., XXXXXXXX
 Stutz, Darvel C., XXXXXXXX
 Swearingen, Mark A., XXXXXXXX
 Sydes, Thomas A., XXXXXXXX
 Towne, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX
 Van Loon, Weston O., XXXXXXXX
 Wagner, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX
 Waters, John K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Whitehead, Charlie L., XXXXXXXX
 Whitehead, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Williamson, Clyde T., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Windsor, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX
 Winslow, William R., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Higgins, Betty L., XXXX

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Brown, Carl D., XXXX
 Colbert, Bill N., XXXXXXXX
 Damian, Kenneth J., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Charles T., XXXXXXXX
 Gatens, Paul D., XXXXXXXX
 Gmelich, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Hallisey, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Harrington, Jack O., Jr., XXXXXXXX

Hartman, Thomas E., 2d, XXXXXXXX
 Humma, Patrick J., XXXXXXXX
 Iwamoto, Raymond S., XXXXXXXX
 Kitchin, David J., 3d, XXXXXXXX
 Lightfoot, Donald R., XXXXXXXX
 Pauley, Richard E., XXXXXXXX
 Powell, Frederick C., XXXXXXXX
 Van Broekhoven, Rollin A., XXXXXXXX
 White, Joseph S., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, David G., XXXXXXXX
 Yamanouchi, Kenneth K., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Jackson, Lelia J., XXXXXXXX
 Knox, Rhona M., XXXXXXXX
 Nace, Patricia A., XXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Andrea B., XXXXXXXX
 Williams, Karyn S., XXXXXXXX

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be captain

Chamberlain, Smith B., XXXXXXXX

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Rohn, Gordon (Armor), XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant

Russillo, Michael P., Jr. (MSC), XXXXXXXX

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Becker, Eugene T., XXXXXXXX
 Burruss, James H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Garrant, George F., XXXXXXXX
 Grundset, Arvid G., XXXXXXXX
 Hamlett, Archie, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hilburn, Percy B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lee, Chew-Mon, XXXXXXXX
 McDonald, Donald T., XXXXXXXX
 Pinckard, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Weeks, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXXXX

To be captain

Abel, Kenneth B., XXXXXXXX
 Baker, William, XXXXXXXX
 Bernd, Roy B., XXXXXXXX
 Berry, Joe D., XXXXXXXX
 Bottorff, Gerald L., XXXXXXXX
 Burbules, Peter G., XXXXXXXX
 Chandler, Robert P., XXXXXXXX
 Clemmons, Robert H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Clemons, Charles H., XXXXXXXX
 Cromer, Aldine, XXXXXXXX
 Danno, Ronald M., XXXXXXXX
 Davis, Bobby G., XXXXXXXX
 Deis, Donald R., XXXXXXXX
 Doerer, Richard C., XXXXXXXX
 Drake, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Dramis, George J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Elliott, Roy P., XXXXXXXX
 Fultz, Forrest G., XXXXXXXX
 Garretson, Edmund S., XXXXXXXX
 Gaudreau, Ronald P., XXXXXXXX
 Gourley, Richard M., XXXXXXXX
 Greer, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Greschel, Bill F., XXXXXXXX
 Hord, Ben F., III, XXXXXXXX
 Kitterman, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Knapp, Peter T., XXXXXXXX
 Kramer, Leslie J., XXXXXXXX
 Lotz, Alvin W., XXXXXXXX
 Mathison, Theodore R., XXXXXXXX
 McCarty, Billy W., XXXXXXXX
 McWhorter, James H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Nelson, Russell D., XXXXXXXX
 Plagianis, Gus S., XXXXXXXX

Randall, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Ranieri, Larry D., XXXXXXXX
 Roark, Billy R., XXXXXXXX
 Roberts, Alfred, XXXXXXXX
 Rogers, David K., XXXXXXXX
 Roverser, Eugene O., XXXXXXXX
 Sims, Harold R., XXXXXXXX
 Sisk, Herbert T., XXXXXXXX
 Stout, Kenneth O., XXXXXXXX
 Sutton, Jerry W., XXXXXXXX
 Tagge, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Joel F., XXXXXXXX
 Trankovich, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Vining, Ray E., XXXXXXXX
 Wynne, Thomas L., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant

Batley, Bruce T., XXXXXXXX
 Bradham, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Brooks, Lawrence D., XXXXXXXX
 Burdick, Mario A., XXXXXXXX
 Burkett, Jimmy D., XXXXXXXX
 Caldwell, Haskell W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Canady, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Carrington, John E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Childers, Jerry W., XXXXXXXX
 Chura, Howard J., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Paul C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Conrad, Paul F., XXXXXXXX
 Cooke, Joseph D., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Cote, Albert H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Cothran, James M., XXXXXXXX
 Currie, Aubrey G., XXXXXXXX
 Curtis, Myron F., XXXXXXXX
 Daws, Robert N., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Detrio, Richard, XXXXXXXX
 Dorrance, James M., XXXXXXXX
 Earhart, Larry L., XXXXXXXX
 Eck, Carleton L., XXXXXXXX
 Edwards, George W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Fetkenhour, Gordon K., XXXXXXXX
 Folcher, Albert G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Foster, Charles B., XXXXXXXX
 Foster, Francis H., XXXXXXXX
 Georges, Thomas N., XXXXXXXX
 Gray, William T., XXXXXXXX
 Habel, James W., XXXXXXXX
 Hahn, Richard O., XXXXXXXX
 Hammerbeck, Allan W., XXXXXXXX
 Heath, Roderick C., XXXXXXXX
 Hepler, James M., XXXXXXXX
 Herrera, Angel, XXXXXXXX
 Higdon, George P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hooper, Lynn C., XXXXXXXX
 Hopkins, Norman P., XXXXXXXX
 Hosman, Patrick M., XXXXXXXX
 Huff, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Edward J., XXXXXXXX
 Keller, Richard F., XXXXXXXX
 Kilkenny, John M., XXXXXXXX
 Kimball, Gerald W., XXXXXXXX
 Kyle, George W., XXXXXXXX
 Laska, James N., XXXXXXXX
 Lee, Edward, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lethcoe, Gerald E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mayhue, Don W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McAllister, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 McBride, Hugh M., XXXXXXXX
 McDonough, William G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McRee, Marshall R., XXXXXXXX
 Merlino, Carl S., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Frank L., III, XXXXXXXX
 Newell, Thomas K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 O'Dwyer, Roger P. J., XXXXXXXX
 Oden, Royden K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 O'Keefe, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX
 Paris, William F. M., II, XXXXXXXX
 Parker, Walter T., XXXXXXXX
 Pegueros, Albert C., XXXXXXXX
 Pigaty, Leo J., XXXXXXXX
 Powers, Richard J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Riley, Daniel R., XXXXXXXX
 Ruggiero, Dominic W., XXXXXXXX
 Sagedy, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Schneider, Michael M., XXXXXXXX
 Scott, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Shires, Charles D., XXXXXXXX
 Sines, Kenneth A., XXXXXXXX
 Strickland, Morris G., XXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Szeremi, Robert C., XXXXXXXX

Thompson, Robert W., [REDACTED]
Walker, Gerald S., [REDACTED]
Webster, Robert H., [REDACTED]
Williams, Kenneth D., [REDACTED]
Wolf, Keith B., [REDACTED]
Yetman, Robert R., [REDACTED]
Zimmerman, Guy G., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant

Bartholomew, Daniel E., [REDACTED]
Bonial, Edwin J., [REDACTED]
Bordenet, John F., [REDACTED]
Bourne, Robert R., [REDACTED]
Burroughs, Bruce G., [REDACTED]
Giles, Raymond C., [REDACTED]
Goerig, Patrick M., [REDACTED]
Hall, George D., [REDACTED]
Hart, Robert C., Jr., [REDACTED]
Huntley, Edward G., [REDACTED]
Irving, John W., [REDACTED]
Jones, Michael C., [REDACTED]
Judge, Robert M., [REDACTED]
Knapp, Richard E., [REDACTED]
Knowles, Richard W., [REDACTED]
Kratz, Paul J., [REDACTED]
Lewis, Allen L., [REDACTED]
Lewis, Edgar C., Jr., [REDACTED]
Lind, Gary C., [REDACTED]
Miller, Fred Q., [REDACTED]
Montel, Terry R., [REDACTED]
Morris, Alton D., [REDACTED]
Ohall, Carl J., [REDACTED]
Pahland, Richard C., [REDACTED]
Piersall, Grady C., [REDACTED]
Reynolds, Harvey J., [REDACTED]
Riley, Daniel C., Jr., [REDACTED]
Sharpe, Gerald W., [REDACTED]
Smith, Edward C., [REDACTED]
Stephens, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
Walker, John G., [REDACTED]
Wiggins, John D., Jr., [REDACTED]
Youell, Charles C., III, [REDACTED]

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294 and 3311:

To be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps
Peyton, Alton B.

To be major, Medical Corps

Cowgill, Herbert F.
Walton, Spencer, [REDACTED]

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Ebert, Maureen A., [REDACTED]
Labbe, Elizabeth A., [REDACTED]
Nelson, Dorothy I., [REDACTED]
Stephenson, Elizabeth J., [REDACTED]

To be captain, Chaplain

Allen, Eugene E., [REDACTED]

To be captain, Dental Corps

Axinn, Sherman, [REDACTED]
Heid, Theodore H., [REDACTED]
Jackson, Lloyd C., [REDACTED]
Lamers, Edward M., [REDACTED]
Mullins, Billy P., [REDACTED]
Snyder, Alvin J., [REDACTED]

To be captain, Medical Corps

Aarestad, Norman O., [REDACTED]
Barnes, Asa, Jr., [REDACTED]
Burr, Bill D.
Campbell, Neil P., [REDACTED]
O'Brien, Michael T., [REDACTED]

To be captain, Medical Service Corps
Roy, Edward E., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Penlon, Eileen M., [REDACTED]
Frank, Rita M., [REDACTED]
Mantooth, Jerry M., [REDACTED]
Rossi, Marguarite J., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Beatty, Edward J., [REDACTED]
Dean, Richard J., [REDACTED]
Wehmeyer, Thomas E., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Aldinger, Robert R., [REDACTED]
Barnes, Holman J., Jr., [REDACTED]
Leek, Jerry C., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps

Buhrow, William L., [REDACTED]
Lefko, Andrew G., Jr., [REDACTED]
Shaw, Jon A., [REDACTED]
Wilson, Don E., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Betasso, Joseph J., [REDACTED]
Delap, Edward H., [REDACTED]
Jeffers, James A., [REDACTED]
McPherson, Darrell G., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Stallings, Betty J., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Bennett, Mary M., [REDACTED]
Henry, O. Marie M., [REDACTED]
Pok, Heather A., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Baucom, Jerome V., [REDACTED]
Baumiller, Charles R., Jr., [REDACTED]
Eason, Lloyd J., Jr., [REDACTED]
Fadhl, Robert J., [REDACTED]
Freeman, Eldon V., [REDACTED]
Hassell, William B., [REDACTED]
Hilliard, Robert W., [REDACTED]
Holway, William K., Jr., [REDACTED]
Hopkins, Clarence E., Jr., [REDACTED]
Larsen, James H., [REDACTED]
LaRue, Scottie J., [REDACTED]
Letchworth, James R., [REDACTED]
Miller, Gerald G., [REDACTED]
Severson, Richard W., [REDACTED]
Smith, Robert L., [REDACTED]
Sylvester, Ernest J., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

DeLora, Jo Ann, [REDACTED]

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Dalton, Bruce A., Jr.
Harrison, John D.
Havens, Leslie T.
Heiss, Thomas L.
Makarevich, Robert
Maloney, Alfred S., [REDACTED]
McMasters, Bernard E., Jr.
Omori, Wallace Y.
Smith, Robert W.

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Allen, John E.
Allen, William M., Jr.
Allred, Kenneth L.
Aquino, Paschal A.
Aux, George W., Jr.
Balley, Bobby H.
Bales, Robert M.
Bates, Bert H., Jr.
Bentel, Robert J.
Berry, Michael A.
Birge, Charles M.
Bodelson, Patrick J.
Bourassa, Richard N.
Brede, Lawrence, Jr.
Bryant, John T., III
Burbidge, John M.
Campi, William P.
Carlton, John W.
Chalfant, Jerry E.
Christo, Dennis V.
Christopher, John E.
Coleman, Larry K.
Collins, Roger W.
Collinsworth, Robert W.
Conoboy, Richard J.
Cook, Joseph L.
Coupe, Dennis F., [REDACTED]
Culbreth, Larry M.
Davis, Grayson L.
DeLorme, Leon T., Jr.
DeSarpa, Richard J.
deTreville, John R.
Dewey, Robert A.
Dobbs, Norman A.
Duhon, Maurice D.
Duncan, Franklin E.
Eaton, Bruce R.
Elder, Edwin W., III
Fairchild, Robert S., Jr.
Feldman, Marshall H.
Ferguson, Walter N., III
Fischer, Thomas C.
Flynn, Ronald B.
Gesick, Edward J., Jr.
Gibb, James
Gillaspie, Richard L.
Gipson, Arthur J.
Gray, Malcolm G., Jr.
Greatorex, Richard R.
Greene, William P., Jr.
Greenwood, Dean M.
Grimsley, Frank J.
Hale, Clyde J.
Hall, Caleb L., Jr.
Hamilton, Ronnie C.
Harbison, Larry J.
Hass, Charles J.
Hayes, Herbert W., III
Heathcock, John H., Jr.
Heeney, Joseph F.
Higgins, William J.
Hogan Cleo, C., Jr.
Hollinger, Gregg N., [REDACTED]
Hudson, John M., Jr.
Ivanjack, Walter F.
Janssen, Charles J.
Jewett, Gary E.
Johnson, Robert A.
Johnson, Russel L., II
Johnston, Ronald T.
Jones, Dale G.
Kaul, Michael A., [REDACTED]
Kemp, Robert N.
Kimberling, Cecil P.
Kober, Stanley A., Jr.
Kokenes, Gerald P.
Kovacs, Stephen Z.
Krasnomowitz, Richard A.
Kubasko, Wayne P.
Latham, George A.
Law, Michael G.
Lawless, Bernard J.
Lawrence, Thomas A.
Lawrie, Thomas J.
Liebl, Hans
Long, William J., III
Lopez, Kenneth E.
Macaluso, Mario A.
Macnamara, Gary L.
Macon, Kenneth W.
Marshall, John L.
Mathis, Larry L.
McAllister, Howard W., Jr.
McAteer, David M.
McCarthy, John T.
McCormick, Thomas W., [REDACTED]
McCoy, James W., Jr.
McGurk, Donald F.
Mellgren, John J., Jr.
Mesikep, Mati.
Miller, Kenneth R.
Mistler, J. Douglas.
Monforton, Thomas W.
Moore, Robert C.
Moyer, Richard H.
Mukoyama, James H., Jr.
Munoz, Juan M.
Otis, Norman K.
Oxford, Cecil H., Jr.
Pantallon, Charles A., Jr.
Parr, Arthur J., Jr.
Peters, David A., [REDACTED]
Pittman, Robert C.

Plunkett, John R.
 Prior, Richard P.
 Prosser, John R.
 Purcell, Lawrence L.
 Quick, Burnet R.
 Rathje, David F.
 Reed, Rodney P.
 Reinkober, Thomas E.
 Robie, Richard D.
 Rogers, Charles R.
 Rollins, John W.
 Romano, Michael A.
 Rosenberg, Peter A.
 Rosser, Henry E.
 Rosten, Clyde D.
 Rutledge, John H.
 Schulz, Robert H., Jr.
 Schwartz, Eino A.
 Scott, Gregory P.
 Shaw, Clarence R., Jr.
 Shope, John T.
 Smith, Jessie R., Jr.
 Southern, Richard D.
 Stake, John K.
 Stephens, Robert B.
 Storey, William D., III.
 Stream, Joel.
 Terrel, Douglas.
 Thomas, John P., Jr.
 Vaughn, Charles G.
 Vick, Jerry D.
 Vincent, Arnold T.
 Visel, Frederick.
 Wallace, Norman W.
 Whiteker, Jerry N.
 Willhoite, Howard W.
 Williams, Welborn J., Jr.
 Williamson, Rex P.
 Wilson, John L.
 Wirtz, David W.
 Witzczak, Chester W.
 Woodley, Glenn H.
 Wright, Donald A.
 Zakaluk, Stephen C. M.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination as required by law.

First Lieutenant to captain
(Line of the Air Force)

Abe, Harry H., XXXXXX
 Abel, David R., XXXXXX
 Abraham, Victor E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Adamczyk, Edmund J., XXXXXX
 Adams, Charles D., XXXX
 Adams, John R., XXXXXX
 Adamson, Herbert A., XXXXXX
 Adley, Francis, XXXXXX
 Affholder, David J., XXXXXX
 Ahearne, John F., XXXXXX
 Aho, Wallace E., XXXXXX
 Ahrens, Steven M., XXXXXX
 Akers, Brian L., XXXXXX
 Akers, Howard T., XXXXXX
 Albo, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Albright, Ray E., XXXXXX
 Alden, Gary L., XXXXXX
 Alderman, Duaine E., XXXXXX
 Aldrich, Fred E., XXXXXX
 Alewine, Walter M., XXXXXX
 Alger, Harold C., XXXXXX
 All, William D., XXXXXX
 Allen, Don K., XXXXXX
 Allen, Emmett E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Allen, John R., XXXXXX
 Allen, John R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Allen, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Allison, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Allison, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Allred, Leron H., XXXXXX
 Alsup, Willie, III, XXXXXX
 Ames, George B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Amos, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Anania, Frank J., XXXXXX
 Anders, Ronald A., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Claude E., XXXXXX
 Anderson, David D., XXXXXX

Anderson, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Frank E., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Frederick C., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Gene H., XXXXXX
 Anderson, James A., XXXXXX
 Anderson, James R., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Larry L., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Lee A., XXXX
 Anderson, Ronald M., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Roy A., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Russell M., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Thomas I., XXXXXX
 Andres, Howard J., XXXXXX
 Andress, Harold W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Andrews, Charles T., XXXXXX
 Andring, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Angle, Larry R., XXXXXX
 Appel, John E., XXXXXX
 Archer, Curtis F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Archino, David T., XXXXXX
 Arcieri, Joseph D., XXXX
 Arendts, Darrell E., XXXXXX
 Arens, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Arlt, John R., XXXXXX
 Armbruster, John A., XXXXXX
 Armbruster, Joseph W., XXXXXX
 Armenakis, Demetrios A., XXXXXX
 Armentrout, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Armistead, Sam E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Armstrong, Arthur J., XXXXXX
 Armstrong Leroy W., XXXX
 Arseneault, Gerard J., XXXXXX
 Arthur, Linwood L., XXXXXX
 Atkins, Kenneth L., XXXX
 Atkinson, John C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Auclair, Michael D., XXXXXX
 Austin William J., XXXXXX
 Auten, Dale N., XXXXXX
 Autry, Stacy M., XXXXXX
 Avery, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Avitable, James J., XXXXXX
 Axtell, Kenneth C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ayer, Kenneth R., XXXX
 Ayers, Tommy K., XXXXXX
 Ayres, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Baca, Jose A., XXXXXX
 Backus, Richard B., XXXXXX
 Baer, Alan H., XXXXXX
 Bahr, Donald P., XXXXXX
 Bailey, Billy T., XXXXXX
 Bailey, Grady E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bailey, John R., XXXXXX
 Bailey, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Baird, James F., XXXXXX
 Baker, Dean F., XXXXXX
 Baker, Gary S., XXXXXX
 Baker, Ronald C., XXXXXX
 Baker, Woody E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Balamoti, Michael D., XXXXXX
 Baldwin, Alan W., XXXXXX
 Balentine, Doyle E., XXXXXX
 Ball, Karlheinz O. W., XXXXXX
 Ballantine, George A., XXXXXX
 Ballew, Glynn E., XXXXXX
 Ballinger, Carlton D., XXXXXX
 Banks, Edgar L., XXXXXX
 Banks, Gary M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Barden, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Bardis, George N., XXXXXX
 Barfield, James E., XXXXXX
 Barkdull, Franklin D., XXXXXX
 Barnard, Robert K., XXXXXX
 Barnes, Alden L., XXXXXX
 Barnett, John A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Barnett, Larry L., XXXXXX
 Barnwell, Ules L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Barr, Thomas C., XXXXXX
 Barr, Winston J., XXXXXX
 Barrett, Edward F., XXXXXX
 Barry, Gary E., XXXXXX
 Barton, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Bassett, Albert M., XXXXXX
 Basten, Leo M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Batchelder, Gerald E., XXXXXX
 Batchelor, William K., XXXXXX
 Bauer, Paul R., XXXXXX
 Baugh, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Baughman, Joseph D., XXXXXX
 Bauknight, Gerald C., XXXXXX
 Baumer, Gerald C., XXXXXX
 Beard, Kenneth B., XXXXXX
 Beattie, Richard F., XXXXXX

Beaty, Randall E., XXXXXX
 Beauchamp, Charles K., XXXXXX
 Beaumaster, James F., XXXXXX
 Beauvais, Maurice F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Beavers, Michael L., XXXXXX
 Beck, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Beck, David H., XXXXXX
 Beck, Douglass D., XXXXXX
 Beckel, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Becker, Kenneth M., XXXXXX
 Bedsworth, Dorris K., XXXXXX
 Beesley, Jack R., XXXXXX
 Belcher, Alden C., XXXXXX
 Belew, Glen E., XXXXXX
 Bellisle, Charles P., XXXXXX
 Bell, Carl E., XXXXXX
 Bell, John H., XXXXXX
 Bellan, David F., XXXXXX
 Belmonte, Nicholas C., XXXXXX
 Benbough, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Bender, Charles G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Benedict, Donald D., XXXXXX
 Bengston, Leroy A., XXXXXX
 Benjamin, Juan H., XXXXXX
 Benjamin, Marc L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Benner, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bennett, James H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bennett, Marc L., XXXXXX
 Bennett, Roland B., XXXXXX
 Bennett, Thomas S., XXXX
 Bentley, Ronald D., XXXXXX
 Berganini, David F., XXXXXX
 Bergeron, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Bergholt, James C., XXXXXX
 Bergholz, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Bergman, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Bergold, Fredrik M., XXXXXX
 Bergstad, Joe G., XXXXXX
 Bernd, Ronald E., XXXX
 Bernhardt, Gayl D., XXXXXX
 Bessette, John F., XXXXXX
 Bielsik, Frank J., XXXXXX
 Bies, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Bigelow, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Biggins, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Bigrigg, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Bima, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Birchfield, C. A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Biron, Edward J., XXXXXX
 Bissonnette, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 Bitner, Dean A., XXXXXX
 Bitschnau, Rosemarie, XXXXXX
 Bittle, Darrell G., XXXXXX
 Bivens, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Bixler, Glen R., XXXXXX
 Black, Jon D., XXXXXX
 Blackwell, James R., XXXXXX
 Blackwell, Walter R., XXXXXX
 Bles, Omer J., XXXXXX
 Blair, Dean H., XXXXXX
 Blake, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Blanchard, Maxwell F., XXXX
 Blanton, Tommy L., XXXXXX
 Blazine, Fred V., XXXXXX
 Bleasdel, James H., XXXXXX
 Bledsoe, Jack H., XXXXXX
 Blocker, Norman K., XXXXXX
 Bloss, Stephen R., XXXXXX
 Blue, Keith E., XXXXXX
 Bobko, Karol J., XXXXXX
 Bock, Larry W., XXXXXX
 Bockelman, Larry D., XXXXXX
 Boehm, John E., XXXXXX
 Boehm, Stanley P., XXXXXX
 Boese, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Bogert, George A., XXXXXX
 Bogis, Talivaldis M., XXXXXX
 Bohan, Thomas M., XXXXXX
 Bohn, James N., XXXXXX
 Bole, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Bollwerck, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bomba, John R., XXXXXX
 Bond, Ronald M., XXXXXX
 Boob, Patrick S., XXXXXX
 Bookwalter, Edwin B., XXXXXX
 Borkowski, William R., XXXXXX
 Bosse, David R., XXXXXX
 Boswell, Melvin C., XXXXXX
 Botticelli, Allan P., XXXXXX
 Boucher, Gordon S., XXXXXX
 Bouckhout, Richard J., XXXXXX

Boudreau, Jean A., XXXXXX
 Bouska, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Bousman, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Bouvier, Joseph P., XXXXXX
 Bowden, Roderick E., XXXXXX
 Bowen, Henry J., XXXXXX
 Bowen, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Bowers, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Bowes, Stevenson E., XXXXXX
 Bowman, Denver H., XXXXXX
 Boyd, Darwin D., XXXXXX
 Boyer, John C., III, XXXXXX
 Boyer, Winston M., XXXXXX
 Bracken, Edward E., XXXXXX
 Braden, John R., XXXXXX
 Bradley, Chester L., XXXXXX
 Bradshaw, Kent W., XXXXXX
 Brady, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Bragdon, Paul B., XXXXXX
 Braman, Marvin L., XXXXXX
 Brand, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Brandjes, Nicholas M., XXXXXX
 Brandli, Henry W., XXXXXX
 Brandt, Roger C., XXXXXX
 Brattland, Harold A., XXXXXX
 Brawner, Phillip H., XXXXXX
 Bredahl, Myron D., XXXXXX
 Brennan, Thomas M., XXXXXX
 Brenny, Gerald J., XXXXXX
 Brentnall, Samuel L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Brewer, Joseph H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Breyfogle, Lawrence G., XXXXXX
 Briggs, Patrick A., XXXXXX
 Brill, Michael Y., XXXXXX
 Broach, William R., XXXXXX
 Broderon, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Broeren, Quentin R., XXXXXX
 Bronson, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Brooks, Don L., XXXXXX
 Brooks, Michael C., XXXXXX
 Brooks, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Broussard, Harvey C., XXXXXX
 Brown, Albert D., XXXXXX
 Brown, Andrew P., XXXXXX
 Brown, Bruce A., XXXXXX
 Brown, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Brown, Darrel R., XXXXXX
 Brown, Denis M., XXXXXX
 Brown, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Brown, James A., XXXXXX
 Brown, James W., III, XXXXXX
 Brown, Jerry D., XXXXXX
 Brown, Laurence W., XXXXXX
 Brown, Samuel N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Brown, Vernon B., XXXXXX
 Browne, Everett W., XXXX
 Brubaker, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Bryan, Jack B., XXXXXX
 Bryan, Otis F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bryan, William W., XXXXXX
 Bryden, William D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bryson, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Buchman, Gerald W., XXXXXX
 Buckley, Robert G., XXXX
 Buckles, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Bucksath, Jerrald D., XXXXXX
 Buesinger, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Bukovszky, Raymond A., XXXXXX
 Bunce, Donald C., XXXXXX
 Buntin, William W., XXXXXX
 Burbey, Gene P., XXXXXX
 Burgamy, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Burger, Phillip R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Burghardt, Stanley K., XXXXXX
 Burk, Delmar D., XXXXXX
 Burke, James P., XXXXXX
 Burlingame, Gary B., XXXXXX
 Burns, Richard S., XXXXXX
 Burnside, Belvin R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Burt, James E., XXXXXX
 Burton, James G., XXXXXX
 Busby, Arthur E., III, XXXX
 Bush, Roger G., XXXXXX
 Bushman, William J., XXXXXX
 Bushwar, Oscar M., XXXXXX
 Buss, Marvin W., XXXXXX
 Butaud, Louis C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Butler, Albert R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Butler, James A., XXXXXX
 Button, Donald B., XXXXXX
 Butts, Lawrence E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Byington, Alonzo, XXXXXX
 Byrd, James H., XXXXXX
 Byrd, Joe L., XXXXXX
 Byrd, Vernon B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Byrnes, Eugene B., Jr., XXXX
 Cade, David J., XXXXXX
 Cagle, Don H., XXXXXX
 Cain, Lee R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cairnes, Lewis W., XXXXXX
 Caldwell, James A., XXXXXX
 Call, Kayland E., XXXXXX
 Callaghan, James T., XXXXXX
 Callaghan, William S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cameron, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Campbell, David L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Dennis F., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Duncan W., XXXXXX
 Campisi, Peter I., XXXXXX
 Canfield, Kenneth W., XXXXXX
 Cannon, Carl L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Canterbury, Henry D., XXXXXX
 Cantey, James L., XXXXXX
 Caputo, Robert P., XXXXXX
 Carden, Gaines B., XXXXXX
 Carey, Wesley G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Carlin, Jerry L., XXXXXX
 Carlson, John A. G., XXXXXX
 Carmichael, Bradley W., XXXXXX
 Carnahan, Kenneth M., XXXXXX
 Carney, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Carns, Michael P. C., XXXXXX
 Carpenter, James T., XXXXXX
 Carpenter, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Carr, Earl E., XXXXXX
 Carr, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Carroll, David R., XXXXXX
 Carroll, Paul L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Carteaux, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Carter, Charles K., XXXXXX
 Carter, Clayton T., XXXXXX
 Carter, Clyde W., XXXXXX
 Carter, Lawrence R., XXXXXX
 Carter, Robert G., XXXX
 Carter, Robert T., XXXXXX
 Carter, Shirley H., XXXXXX
 Cassel, John M., XXXXXX
 Cassidy, Leo M., XXXXXX
 Cassity, James S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cates, John G., XXXXXX
 Catiller, John B., XXXXXX
 Cavendar, Bill R., XXXXXX
 Cebulski, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Cermak, John P., XXXXXX
 Chaffin, Leonard P., XXXXXX
 Chamberlain, James R., XXXXXX
 Chambers, Douglas R., XXXXXX
 Chambers, James E., XXXXXX
 Chambers, John E., XXXX
 Champagne, Kenneth F., XXXXXX
 Chapman, George E., XXXXXX
 Chapman, James E., XXXXXX
 Chapman, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Chappel, George G., XXXXXX
 Chartrand, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Chase, Donald T., XXXXXX
 Chepolis, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Chichester, Warren F., XXXXXX
 Chomicz, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Christianer, Doyle C., XXXXXX
 Christison, Wayne L., XXXXXX
 Christoffersen, W. L., XXXXXX
 Christophis, Peter C., XXXXXX
 Church, James W. B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Chynoweth, William M., XXXXXX
 Ciucci, John A., XXXXXX
 Clack, Stanley B., XXXXXX
 Clamme, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Clampfer, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Clark, George C., XXXXXX
 Clark, Lawrence D., XXXXXX
 Clark, Leonard E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Clark, Perry G., XXXXXX
 Clark, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Cleasby, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Clem, Harold A., XXXXXX
 Clement, Richard B., XXXXXX
 Clemmons, Thurston, Jr., XXXXXX
 Clifford, Lawrence X., XXXXXX
 Cline, James A., XXXXXX
 Cline, Lawrence A., XXXXXX
 Coblentz, Thom H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Coggins, David B., XXXXXX
 Cohen, Daniel D., XXXXXX
 Cohen, Louis S., XXXXXX
 Cohen, William A., XXXXXX
 Cohick, Mikel W., XXXXXX
 Coker, James R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Colburn, Gerry R., XXXXXX
 Cole, Byron D., XXXXXX
 Cole, David C., XXXXXX
 Cole, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Collins, Albert H., XXXXXX
 Collins, Bruce W., XXXXXX
 Collins, George E., XXXXXX
 Collins, Thomas E., III, XXXXXX
 Colton, George M., XXXXXX
 Colwell, Gary A., XXXXXX
 Comalli, John M., XXXXXX
 Combs, Jimmy W., XXXXXX
 Combs, Ronald G., XXXXXX
 Conant, Roger G., XXXXXX
 Conley, Lois J., XXXXXX
 Conn, Donald N., XXXXXX
 Connally, James W., XXXXXX
 Connor, Gene A., XXXXXX
 Conover, John A., XXXXXX
 Cook, Curtis G., XXXXXX
 Cook, Dale E., XXXXXX
 Cool, Clifford E., XXXXXX
 Coomes, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Cooper, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Cooper, Harold T., XXXXXX
 Cooper, John D., XXXXXX
 Copperman, Seymour, XXXXXX
 Corcoran, Eugene F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cornell, David M., XXXXXX
 Cornett, Eriam D., XXXXXX
 Cornwell, Jefford R., XXXXXX
 Cornwell, William C., XXXXXX
 Corrouer, William F., XXXXXX
 Costa, Manuel M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Coston, Jack F., XXXXXX
 Cotton, Lawrence F., XXXXXX
 Cotton, Waldon R., XXXXXX
 Coughran, Joe F., XXXXXX
 Counts, Roger L., XXXXXX
 Courtney Nyles B., XXXXXX
 Coury, Nicholas J., XXXXXX
 Covert, Ronny C., XXXXXX
 Cowles, Stephen H., XXXXXX
 Cox, Gary E., XXXXXX
 Cox, James E., XXXXXX
 Cox, Michael S., XXXXXX
 Cox, Rodney V., Jr., XXXXXX
 Craig, David C., XXXXXX
 Craig, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Craig, Walker R., XXXXXX
 Crane, Benjamin D., XXXX
 Crane, Jimmie R., XXXXXX
 Cravelro, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Craven, Daniel H., XXXXXX
 Craver, Emmette E., XXXXXX
 Crawford, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Crawford, Robin M., XXXXXX
 Creeden, Wilcox J., XXXXXX
 Crews, Barton P., XXXXXX
 Crim, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Grislip, Denver E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cromer, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Cronican, John G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cross, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Croteau, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Crowell, Jesse L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Crowley, Dennis M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Crye, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Cudd, Frank M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cudlipp, Richard R., XXXXXX
 Culler, Harry H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Culpepper, Ste G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Culton, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Cummings, Delbert R., XXXXXX
 Cummings, William R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cundiff, Olin B., II, XXXXXX
 Cunningham, Peter M., XXXXXX
 Cunningham, Ralph L., XXXXXX
 Current, Frederic D., XXXXXX
 Currie, Brian H., XXXXXX
 Cutler, Gene R., XXXXXX
 Cutter, Scott C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cvik, James E., XXXXXX
 Cwach, Emil E., XXXXXX
 Cwikowski, Raymond T., XXXXXX

Cyr, Peter P., XXXXXX.
 Czelusniak, Donald R., XXXXXX.
 Dagampat, Richard M., XXXXXX.
 Dahl, Gilmore M., XXXXXX.
 Dalley, Daniel G., XXXXXX.
 Dally, Robert O., XXXXXX.
 Dakes, Michael G., XXXXXX.
 Dale, Curtis D., XXXXXX.
 Daniel, Carey W., Jr., XXXX.
 Daniels, Frederic J., XXXXXX.
 Dankenbring, Terry L., XXXXXX.
 Dauber, Carl W., XXXXXX.
 Daulton, Frederick R., XXXXXX.
 Davenport, Ernest J., XXXXXX.
 Davey, John M., XXXXXX.
 David, David F., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Clark T., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Frederick L., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Geoffrey C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Howard D., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Matthew W., XXXXXX.
 Davis, Roger L., XXXXXX.
 Davis, William S., III, XXXXXX.
 Davis, William M., XXXXXX.
 Davis, William N., XXXXXX.
 Davison, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Dawley, Donald L., XXXXXX.
 Dayton, Allen D., XXXXXX.
 Dearborn, Sydney H., XXXXXX.
 Debraal, Richard C., XXXXXX.
 Decavalcante, Noel E., XXXXXX.
 Deeming, John E., XXXX.
 Dehart, Donald D., XXXXXX.
 Delaney, Denis P., XXXXXX.
 Delaney, Robert S., XXXXXX.
 Delligatti, Robert S., XXXX.
 Dellinger, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Delong, Edward E., III, XXXXXX.
 Demarco, Joseph R., XXXXXX.
 Demijohn, Ronald S., XXXXXX.
 Denison, Robert G., XXXXXX.
 Denny, Edwin B., XXXXXX.
 Dentino, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Denton, Donald L., XXXXXX.
 Derbyshire, Frank B., XXXXXX.
 Dertis, Don J., XXXXXX.
 Derrickson, Thomas G., II, XXXXXX.
 Desantis, Joseph G., XXXXXX.
 Desjardins, Phillip D., XXXXXX.
 Desroches, James E., XXXXXX.
 Dewberry, Thomas S., XXXXXX.
 Dewey, William T., XXXXXX.
 Diamond, Douglas H., XXXXXX.
 Dicamillo, Richard A., XXXXXX.
 Dickerson, Walter E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dickerson, David C., XXXXXX.
 Dickson, David S., XXXXXX.
 Dieckhoner, James E., XXXXXX.
 Dieterich, John L., XXXXXX.
 Dietrich, George T. M., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dill, Donald W., XXXXXX.
 Dillon, Daniel R., XXXXXX.
 Dircks, Ronald G., XXXXXX.
 Dixon, Joseph F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Doane, Gaylen B., XXXXXX.
 Doblus, Otto C., XXXXXX.
 Dockendorff, John R., XXXXXX.
 Dockery Oscar P., XXXXXX.
 Dodds, Charles L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dodson, William C., XXXXXX.
 Doebrick, Hugh E., XXXXXX.
 Doherty, James J., XXXXXX.
 Donnelly, John P., XXXXXX.
 Donnelly, William J., III, XXXXXX.
 Donohoe, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Donovan, Edwin G., XXXXXX.
 Donovan, William G., XXXXXX.
 Doran, Donald A., XXXXXX.
 Dorwaldt, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Dougherty, Charles L., XXXXXX.
 Douglass, Robert G., XXXXXX.
 Douskey, Paul T., XXXXXX.
 Dove, Robert P., XXXXXX.
 Dow, Donald W., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Downing, Darrell A., XXXXXX.
 Doyle, David F., XXXXXX.
 Doyle, Fred A., XXXXXX.
 Drage, David W., XXXXXX.
 Driggers, William B., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Driscoll, David L., XXXXXX.
 Drohan, John A., XXXXXX.
 Drost, Carl R., XXXXXX.
 Drummond, Daniel D., XXXXXX.
 Dubay, Neil E., XXXXXX.
 Dubois, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dubose, Regal D., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dudley, Charles G., XXXXXX.
 Duenas, Vernon, XXXXXX.
 Duey, Kent B., XXXXXX.
 Dugan, James T., XXXXXX.
 Duke, William G., XXXXXX.
 Dull, Rex L., XXXXXX.
 Dunlap, James A., XXXXXX.
 Dunlap, James J., XXXXXX.
 Dunn, James L., XXXXXX.
 Dunnington, Billy J., XXXXXX.
 Dupee, William D., XXXXXX.
 Duplissey, Donnie R., XXXX.
 Durden, Edward L., XXXXXX.
 Durham, Esmer L., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Dush, Richard W., XXXXXX.
 Dutton, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Duvall, Jerry L., XXXXXX.
 Duyck, Robert, XXXXXX.
 Dversdall, Dean A., XXXXXX.
 Dwell, Alexander C., XXXXXX.
 Dwyer, Robert J., XXXXXX.
 Dwyer, Thomas D., XXXXXX.
 Dwyer, William G., XXXXXX.
 Dye, Forrest N., XXXXXX.
 Eash, Joseph J., III, XXXXXX.
 Eastburn, Loren D., XXXXXX.
 Eastes, Raymond E., XXXXXX.
 Eastlund, Larry R., XXXXXX.
 Eatman, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Eaton, Harold E., XXXXXX.
 Eaves, Richard H., XXXXXX.
 Echanis, Joseph Y., XXXXXX.
 Eckhart, John D., XXXXXX.
 Edenfield, Billy G., XXXXXX.
 Edgington, William A., XXXXXX.
 Edmondson, Frank K., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Edwards, Herbert H., XXXXXX.
 Edwards, Ronald K., XXXXXX.
 Edwards, Tommy M., XXXXXX.
 Edwards, Victor R., XXXXXX.
 Eggleston, Charles D., XXXXXX.
 Eichhorn, Gary L., XXXXXX.
 Eigel, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Eiefriz, Joseph F., XXXXXX.
 Eliason, Vernet W., XXXXXX.
 Eller, John N., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Ellermets, Heiki, XXXXXX.
 Elliot, Craig D., XXXXXX.
 Ellis, Christopher F., XXXXXX.
 Ellis, David A., XXXXXX.
 Ellis, Ronald R., XXXXXX.
 Elshernd, Gerald F., XXXXXX.
 Elser, Arthur G., XXXX.
 Engel, Richard F., XXXXXX.
 England, Lawrence E., XXXXXX.
 Engler, Gary D., XXXXXX.
 Enomoto, Lawrence M. G., XXXXXX.
 Epps, Lewis B., XXXXXX.
 Erickson, James P., XXXXXX.
 Erwin, David B., XXXXXX.
 Erwin, William D., XXXXXX.
 Eskridge, John S., XXXXXX.
 Esser, Albert R., XXXXXX.
 Ettinger, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Euler, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Eva, William D., XXXXXX.
 Evans, Arthur C., XXXXXX.
 Evans, Bruce P., XXXXXX.
 Evans, Byron W., XXXXXX.
 Evans, Charles D., XXXXXX.
 Evans, Joe B., XXXXXX.
 Everett, Olin K., XXXXXX.
 Fagnant, James G., XXXXXX.
 Falk, Harold C., XXXXXX.
 Fannin, Richard D., XXXXXX.
 Fansler, Everett D., XXXXXX.
 Faris, Andral P., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Farland, Robert W., XXXXXX.
 Farlow, Thomas A., XXXXXX.
 Farmer, Robert G., XXXXXX.
 Farrell, Joseph M., XXXXXX.
 Farrington, John E., XXXXXX.
 Farwell, David C., XXXXXX.
 Fathers, Lowell G., XXXX.
 Fawcett, Harman E., III, XXXXXX.
 Fawcett, Robert C., XXXXXX.
 Fay, Robert H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Fedder, Joel A., XXXXXX.
 Feldman, Irwin J., XXXXXX.
 Ferrari, Charles J., XXXXXX.
 Ferris, Michael P., XXXXXX.
 Figgins, Everett D., XXXXXX.
 Filkins, Lloyd R., XXXXXX.
 Filleau, Clifford R., XXXXXX.
 Finch, Charles E., XXXXXX.
 Finch, Mark T., XXXXXX.
 Findlay, Gary W., XXXXXX.
 Fischer, August V., XXXXXX.
 Fischer, Hans-Joachim E., XXXXXX.
 Fisher, Frank P., XXXXXX.
 Fisher, Kenneth, XXXXXX.
 Fisher, Paul T., XXXXXX.
 Fisher, Stanley C., XXXXXX.
 Fitzgibbon, James J., XXXX.
 Fitzsimmons, Frederic S., XXXXXX.
 Fitzwater, Alan L., XXXXXX.
 Flaherty, Bartholomew W., XXXXXX.
 Flatten, Franklin P., XXXXXX.
 Fleming, James H., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Flood, Jerry D., XXXXXX.
 Florow, Raymond L., XXXXXX.
 Floyd, Jerry H., XXXXXX.
 Flynn, William F., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Fonde, Richard I., XXXXXX.
 Foote, Tedd J., XXXXXX.
 Ford, Richard J., XXXXXX.
 Forrester, John, XXXXXX.
 Forsythe, Conrad O., XXXXXX.
 Forsythe, William D., XXXXXX.
 Fortna, Roger A., XXXXXX.
 Fortner, Larry D., XXXXXX.
 Foster, Wallace K., XXXXXX.
 Fowler, Jac L., XXXXXX.
 Fox, Joaquin, XXXXXX.
 Fox, Thomas P., XXXXXX.
 Fraime, Charles R., XXXXXX.
 Franco, Robert T., XXXXXX.
 Franks, Stanley K., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Fraser, James W., XXXXXX.
 Frazier, Robert L., XXXXXX.
 Frease, Edward D., XXXXXX.
 Frederick, David L., XXXXXX.
 Freeman, James S., XXXXXX.
 Freeman, Paul J., XXXXXX.
 Freytag, James E., XXXXXX.
 Friant, Charles W., XXXXXX.
 Fricke, Lawrence A., Jr., XXXXX.
 Friesen, Herbert L., XXXXXX.
 Fronabarger, Carl A., XXXXXX.
 Frost, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Fullerton, Charles G., XXXXXX.
 Fulleton, Allen J., XXXXXX.
 Funkhouser, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Furuta, Donald T., XXXXXX.
 Fyock, Milford, D.V., XXXXXX.
 Fyten, Gregory J., XXXXXX.
 Gaddle, William R., XXXXXX.
 Gagliardi, Albert A., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Gagnon, Roger A., XXXXXX.
 Gainer, Thomas R., XXXXXX.
 Gaines, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Galceran, Earl L., XXXXXX.
 Gallos, Stephen E., XXXXXX.
 Gallagher, Martin J., XXXXXX.
 Gallay, Sherman, XXXXXX.
 Gallihugh, Robert H., XXXXXX.
 Gallinger, Robert J., XXXXXX.
 Gallo, Jon A., XXXXXX.
 Galloway, John C., XXXXXX.
 Gantt, Myron L., XXXXXX.
 Gantter, Wallace F., XXXXXX.
 Garber, Gares, Jr., XXXXXX.
 Gardner, Fredrick J., XXXXXX.
 Gardner, Robert E., XXXXXX.
 Gardner, William C., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Garrison, Harold T., XXXXXX.
 Garrison, Larry L., XXXXXX.
 Garver, Edwin H., XXXXXX.
 Garvey, Gerald J., XXXXXX.
 Gaunt, John J., Jr., XXXXXX.
 Gawlitta, Ronald, XXXXXX.
 Gay, Francis S., XXXXXX.
 Gaydon, William E., XXXXXX.
 Gazzola, Robert A., XXXXXX.
 Gealta, Thomas S., XXXXXX.
 Gebara, James T., XXXXXX.
 Gee, Ralph K., XXXXXX.

Geissler, Henry, Jr., XXXXXX
 Gensemer, Bruce V., XXXXXX
 Gentle, Milton W., XXXXXX
 Gerber, William E., XXXXXX
 Gerken, Thomas L., XXXX
 Gersh, Frederick S., XXXXXX
 Gibbons, John R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gibson, Melvin E., XXXXXX
 Gibson, Thomas N., III, XXXXXX
 Giddings, Glen G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Giebelstein, Marvin L., XXXXXX
 Gifford, George E., XXXXXX
 Gilbert, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Gilbert, Floyd D., XXXXXX
 Gilbert, Shirley L., XXXXXX
 Gilbertson, Malcolm K., XXXXXX
 Gilchrist, Thomas, XXXXXX
 Giles, Wallace L., XXXXXX
 Gilkeson, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Gill, Ben T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gillespie, John R., XXXXXX
 Gillman, Wallace M., XXXXXX
 Givens, Walter C., XXXXXX
 Gleason, John T., XXXXXX
 Gleason, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Glenn, Hugo D., XXXXXX
 Glime, Douglas G., XXXXXX
 Gloschen, James M., XXXXXX
 Glover, Brittle, XXXXXX
 Gnan, Johann K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gobble, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Goble, Jacob F., XXXXXX
 Godsey, Nell W., XXXXXX
 Godwin, William S., XXXXXX
 Goetz, Michael B., XXXXXX
 Goetze, Richard B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Goffin, Glen P., XXXXXX
 Gogal, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Gold, William H., XXXXXX
 Gollher, James D., XXXXXX
 Good, Ira D., XXXXXX
 Goode, John D., XXXXXX
 Goodrich, David M., XXXXXX
 Goodwill, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Gordon, Donald D., XXXXXX
 Gordon, Walter L., XXXXXX
 Gossman, Jerald L., XXXXXX
 Graber, Donald M., XXXXXX
 Grabka, Gregory J., XXXXXX
 Grablewski, John T., XXXXXX
 Grabman, Edward G., XXXXXX
 Graf, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Graff, Peter M., XXXXXX
 Grafflin, Doug G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Graham, Bobby G., XXXXXX
 Graham, Oscar D., XXXXXX
 Grant, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Gray, Alvin L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gray, Danny R., XXXXXX
 Gray, George G., XXXXXX
 Gray, Jerry E., XXXXXX
 Green, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Green, Herbert L., XXXXXX
 Green, Jack B., XXXXXX
 Green, James L., XXXXXX
 Green, Ronald R., XXXXXX
 Greene, Carl A., XXXXXX
 Greene, David E., XXXXXX
 Greene, Leroy V., Jr., XXXXXX
 Greenwade, Donald S., XXXXXX
 Greer, Cal E., XXXXXX
 Greer, Jesse R., XXXXXX
 Greider, Gordon C., XXXXXX
 Greve, Lance, XXXXXX
 Griffin, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Griffin, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Griffin, Paul M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Griffiths, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Grimes, William D. W., XXXXXX
 Groark, David H., XXXXXX
 Groff, Guy D., XXXXXX
 Groshner, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Gross, Alan, XXXXXX
 Grubbs, Billie E., XXXXXX
 Gruetter, William E., XXXXXX
 Gruidl, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Grunder, Gary E., XXXXXX
 Guglielmi, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Guglietti, James R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gullledge, John F., XXXXXX
 Gunkel, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Gunnerson, Stanley S., XXXXXX
 Gunter, Gerald N., XXXXXX
 Gunter, James P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Guthrie, Earle V., XXXXXX
 Gutz, Thomas B., XXXXXX
 Haas, Harvey J., XXXXXX
 Haddad, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Hagen, Hanns H., XXXXXX
 Hagen, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Hagen, Theodore A., XXXXXX
 Hager, John A., XXXXXX
 Hagstrom, George T., XXXXXX
 Haines, Robert G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Halac, Harry E., XXXXXX
 Halbower, Harlow K., XXXXXX
 Haldeman, Kenneth J., XXXXXX
 Haley, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Hall, Carlton G., XXXXXX
 Hall, David B., XXXXXX
 Hall, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Hall, Oscar W., XXXXXX
 Haller, Donald S., XXXXXX
 Halpin, William G., XXXXXX
 Hamann, Wilfred C., XXXXXX
 Hamer, Howard A., XXXX
 Hamer, Stephen A., XXXXXX
 Hamilton, Francis P., XXXXXX
 Hamilton, John W., XXXXXX
 Hamilton, Norman E., XXXXXX
 Hamilton, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Handley, Phillip W., XXXXXX
 Handly, Edward C., XXXXXX
 Hankins, Russell A., XXXXXX
 Hanly, Thomas F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hannah, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Hannan, George P., XXXXXX
 Hanson, Delbert L., XXXXXX
 Hardesty, Marlon N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hardie, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Harding, William K., XXXXXX
 Hardy, John N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hardy, Peter J., XXXXXX
 Hardy, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Hargett, Mitchell G., XXXXXX
 Hargett, Overton, XXXXX
 Hargrave, George E., XXXX
 Hargrove, Floyd E., XXXXXX
 Hargrove, Jay P., XXXXXX
 Harkins, Allan D., XXXXXX
 Harkins, Lee L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Harmon, Jerry P., XXXXXX
 Harmon, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Harnage, Donald V., XXXXXX
 Harnitchek, Joseph A., XXXXXX
 Harpe, Winfield S., XXXXXX
 Harr, Milfred G., XXXXXX
 Harrell, Adrian M., XXXXXX
 Harriman, Randolph K., XXXXXX
 Harris, Emmett L., XXXXXX
 Harris, Joe R., XXXXXX
 Harris, Reginald A., XXXXXX
 Harris, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Harris, Thomas L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Harris, William O., III, XXXXXX
 Hart, Albert W., XXXXXX
 Harter, Vincent R., XXXXXX
 Harvey, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Haswell, Alden L., XXXXXX
 Hatch, Bruce R., XXXXXX
 Hatcher, Darrell G., XXXXXX
 Hatcher, Lester E., XXXXXX
 Haug, Kenneth G., XXXXXX
 Haueberg, Arnold W., XXXXXX
 Haugen, Mylan A., XXXXXX
 Hauth, Wayne D., XXXXXX
 Hawkins, Michael W., XXXXXX
 Hawley, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Hayden, Warren R., XXXXXX
 Hayes, John G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hayes, John R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hazlett, Howard J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Head, Robert Q., XXXXXX
 Healy, Richard P., XXXXXX
 Hearn Max L., XXXXXX
 Hearn, Reginald A., XXXXXX
 Hearne, Joseph T., XXXXXX
 Hearst, Ronald A., XXXXXX
 Heaton, Wendell J., XXXXXX
 Heckman, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Heckscher, John L., XXXXXX
 Hedden, Lloyd S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hedenberg, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Hedges, Jimmie L., XXXXXX
 Heft, Edward L., XXXXXX
 Hellman, James H., XXXXXX
 Heimendinger, Henry L., XXXXXX
 Heinz, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Heller, Mark J., XXXXXX
 Helmer, Frederick T., III, XXXXXX
 Helton, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Hemer, Victor L., XXXXXX
 Hemingway, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Henderson, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Hendrix, Will C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Henley, Jackson A., XXXXXX
 Henningsen, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Henry, Charles S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Henry, Harley D., XXXXXX
 Henry, Theron A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Henson, David L., XXXXXX
 Henss, Frederick W., XXXXXX
 Herrin, Samuel C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hertenstein, George R., XXXXXX
 Herwick, Donald F., XXXXXX
 Hesterman, John W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hetrick, Raymond H., XXXXXX
 Hetzel, David L., XXXXXX
 Hickey, James R., XXXXXX
 Higgins, J. Alan, XXXXXX
 Higgins, William D., XXXXXX
 Hilbert, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Hillbing, Francis J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hildebrand, Carl E., XXXXXX
 Hildner, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Hilgendorf, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Hill, John R., XXXXXX
 Hill, Vaughn E., XXXXXX
 Hill, William H., XXXXXX
 Hillery, Sergei, XXXXXX
 Himley, Richard O., XXXXXX
 Hinkle, Thomas K., XXXXXX
 Hinkle, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Hinnebusch, Michael L., XXXXXX
 Hirata, Herbert T., XXXXXX
 Hite, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hobbs, Jon R., XXXXXX
 Hock, Harold G., XXXXXX
 Hoder, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 Hodge, Larry G., XXXXXX
 Hodges, Donald B., XXXXXX
 Hodgson, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Hoff, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Hoffman, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Hoffman, Joseph M., XXXXXX
 Hogshead, John H., XXXXXX
 Hoiberg, Denis E., XXXXXX
 Holaday, Burton H., XXXXXX
 Holcomb, William E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holder, Barnes E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holko, Andrew R., XXXXXX
 Hollar, Otis R., XXXXXX
 Holliman, Gary J., XXXXXX
 Hollis, Lewis D., XXXXXX
 Hollis, Raymond, XXXXXX
 Hollrah, Gene R., XXXXXX
 Holman, David K., XXXXXX
 Holmes, David H., XXXXXX
 Holmes, Gilbert B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holmes, Ranson S., III, XXXXXX
 Holmes William C., XXXXXX
 Holody, John L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holroyd, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Holsinger, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Holt, Elmer E., XXXXXX
 Holtmann, Ralph B., XXXXXX
 Holtz, David A., XXXXXX
 Homstead, Allan R., XXXXXX
 Honaker, Harry R., XXXXXX
 Honeycutt, Emmitt M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Honeywill, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Hoover, Heyward H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hopwood, Paul, XXXXXX
 Horn, Phillip M., XXXXXX
 Hornbostel, William I., XXXXXX
 Horning, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Hosmer, Bradley C., XXXXXX
 Hostetler, Daniel H., XXXXXX
 Hottinger, Christopher F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Houde, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Hough, Terry J., XXXXXX
 House, Thomas D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Houser, Charles T., Jr., XXXXXX

Houston, Crosby A., XXXXXX
 Houston, John G., XXXXXX
 Howard, John S., XXXXXX
 Howard, Leslie T., XXXXXX
 Howard, Stanley H., XXXXXX
 Howard, Thomas V., Jr., XXXXXX
 Howe, Marvin D., XXXXXX
 Howell, John M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Howell, Owen R., XXXXXX
 Howell, William C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Howey, James Z., XXXXXX
 Hoy, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Hubbard, Barry W., XXXXXX
 Huber, Jay D., XXXXXX
 Hubert, Douglass E., XXXXXX
 Huck, John M., XXXXXX
 Huddle, John P., XXXXXX
 Hudenburg, Donald P., XXXXXX
 Hudson, Sidney B., XXXXXX
 Huey, Frank M., XXXXXX
 Huffman, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Hughes, Harold S., XXXXXX
 Hulzenga, Lyle R., XXXXXX
 Hull, Jimmy L., XXXXXX
 Humphrey, David L., XXXXXX
 Humphrey, Evander L., XXXXXX
 Hunnicutt, John W., XXXXXX
 Hunt, Leigh H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hunt, Ronald K., XXXXXX
 Hunter, Hugh L., XXXXXX
 Hunter Phillip R., XXXXXX
 Hunter, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Hurley, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Hurst, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Hurt, James W., III, XXXXXX
 Husong, John P., XXXXXX
 Husten, Walter E., XXXXXX
 Hutchinson, Richard D., XXXX
 Hutchison, Daniel B., XXXXXX
 Hyde, Donald G., XXXXXX
 Hymas, Carl E., XXXXXX
 Ince, Walter W., XXXXXX
 Ingamells, John R., XXXXXX
 Ingrao, Anthony P., XXXXXX
 Inness, Roy G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ionata, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Irving, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Irzyk, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Isaac, William D., XXXXXX
 Ivy, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Jackes, Frankl R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jackey, Phillip E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Aubrey J., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Gene E., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Lee S., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Preston C., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Jacob, Corwaln E., XXXXXX
 Jacobson, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Jaecques, Robert E., XXXXXX
 James, John R., XXXXXX
 James, Kenneth C., XXXXXX
 James, William B. P., XXXXXX
 Jansen, John F., XXXXXX
 Janssens Leo G., XXXXXX
 Jaques, John E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jaques, Richard P., XXXXXX
 Jarboe, Joseph K., XXXXXX
 Jarcy, Jerome E., XXXXXX
 Jay, Jimmie L., XXXXXX
 Jefcoat, Carl H., XXXXXX
 Jeffers, Carl M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jefferson, Wayne O., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jeffery, Kevin B., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Bud, Jr., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Jenks, Edwin A., XXXXXX
 Jennings, Robert S. F., XXXXXX
 Jobe, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Johannes, Phillip H., XXXX
 Johns, Delman A., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Allen L., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Carl B., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Carl E. Jr., XXXXXX
 Johnson, David T., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Eugene, XXXXXX
 Johnson, Frank A., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Glen D., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Hansford T., XXXX
 Johnson, James D., XXXXXX
 Johnson, James E., XXXXXX
 Johnson, James L., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Joseph P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Kenneth L., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Laurence N., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Raymond A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Theodore B., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Tony M., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Val R., XXXXXX
 Johnson, William H., XXXXXX
 Johnston, Donald D., XXXXXX
 Johnston, John D., XXXXXX
 Jolley, George C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jolly, Lawrence M., XXXXXX
 Jolly, Raymond, XXXXXX
 Jones, Albert H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jones, Leonard G., XXXXXX
 Jones, Marvin P., XXXXXX
 Jones, Turner H. E., XXXXXX
 Jones, Walter H., XXXXXX
 Jones, William D. Jr., XXXXXX
 Jordan, Lewis E., XXXXXX
 Josephson, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Jozwiak, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Jungling, Kenneth C., XXXXXX
 Jurjevich, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Kafer, Frank W., XXXXXX
 Kahl, Jon C., XXXXXX
 Kammeyer, Lamar D., XXXXXX
 Kane, Edmund T., XXXXXX
 Kapeller, Royce F., XXXXXX
 Kaplan, Kenneth D., XXXXXX
 Karpis, Nikolai, XXXXXX
 Kaul, William A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kearney, Frederic J., XXXXXX
 Kearns, Charles E., XXXX
 Keck, Nicholas A., XXXXXX
 Keetch, Edward Y., XXXX
 Keezell, Nathan H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kelch, Matthew J., Jr., XXXX
 Kellum, Billy H., XXXXXX
 Kelly, Robert K., XXXXXX
 Kelly, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Kelso, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Kempton, Virgil D., XXXXXX
 Kendrick, Charles M., XXXXXX
 Kendrick, McI. R. III, XXXXXX
 Kendrick, William J., XXXXXX
 Kenefick, Jerry G., XXXXXX
 Kennady, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Kennah, Richard B., XXXXXX
 Kennedy, George D., XXXXXX
 Kennedy, Thomas F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kensinger, John T., XXXX
 Kensok, Orville, J., XXXXXX
 Kepner, Harry M., XXXXXX
 Kerber, Dathan R., XXXXXX
 Kerby, Michael C., XXXXXX
 Kerzle, David A., XXXXXX
 Kessler, David C., XXXXXX
 Kieklak, Ronald J., XXXXXX
 Kleitka, Francis T., XXXXXX
 Kliepe, Kenneth D., XXXXXX
 Kilmer, Jackie R., XXXXXX
 Kilponen, Wesley A., XXXXXX
 Kimminau, Paul F., XXXXXX
 Kincaid, William H., XXXXXX
 King, Cyril J., XXXXXX
 King, Frederick M., XXXXXX
 King, Philip L., XXXX
 Kingsland, Louis, Jr., XXXXXX
 Kington, James L., XXXXXX
 Kinslow, Paul D., XXXXXX
 Kirk, John H., XXXXXX
 Kirkman, Paul E., XXXXXX
 Kirkpatrick, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Kittles, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Klingbell, Ronald L., XXXX
 Klute, Karl E., XXXXXX
 Knecht, Marvin J., XXXXXX
 Koski, Jerry L., XXXXXX
 Knox, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Knudson, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Knutson, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Knutson, Orin I., XXXXXX
 Koch, Philip L., XXXXXX
 Koechle, Edward A., XXXXXX
 Koehly, Joseph, XXXXXX
 Kohl, Henry C., XXXXXX
 Kolb, John G., XXXXXX
 Korcheck, Stephen M., XXXXXX
 Korpak, Albert L., XXXXXX
 Kort, Byron C., XXXXXX
 Kosnick, Richard S., XXXXXX
 Kotziers, Wilhelm J., XXXXXX
 Kovarik, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Kowalczyk, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Kozelka, Robin M., XXXXXX
 Kraft, Edward C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kraft, John B., XXXXXX
 Kramer, Gerald H., XXXXXX
 Kramer, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Krapp, Gerald J., XXXXXX
 Krauer, Henry J., XXXXXX
 Kreis, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Krisch, Albert R., XXXXXX
 Kroos, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Krueger, Armin A., XXXXXX
 Krueger, Lorin B. II, XXXXXX
 Kubin, John S., XXXXXX
 Kuebler, David H., XXXXXX
 Kuester, Loren J., XXXXXX
 Kurowski, Gerald J., XXXXXX
 Kurowski, Wesley M., XXXXXX
 Kurtz, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Lacosse, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Lade, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Laferriere, Roy R., XXXXXX
 Lagerwall, Harry E., XXXXXX
 Lair, Gary R., XXXX
 Laird, Everett D., XXXXXX
 LaJeunesse, Theodore O., XXXXXX
 Lam, Carroll F., XXXXXX
 Lambert, Wayne W., XXXXXX
 Lambertson, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Lambertson, William W., XXXXXX
 Lamoureux, Donald P., XXXXXX
 Lamphear, Fay D., XXXXXX
 Lamping, Neal E., XXXXXX
 Landguth, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Langham, Charles D., XXXXXX
 Lanckenau, Edward F., III, XXXXXX
 Lanman, Ronald T., XXXXXX
 Lanning, Jerry A., XXXXXX
 Laronde, Kenneth P., XXXXXX
 Larson, Frank W., XXXXXX
 Larson, Gerald D., XXXXXX
 Larson, John K., XXXXXX
 Lasen, Paul S., XXXXXX
 Lasley, John A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Latimer, Wilbur S., XXXXXX
 Latshaw, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Laudise, Ernest T., XXXXXX
 Lauer, Stephen A., XXXXXX
 Laurence, John R., XXXXXX
 Laurent, Gerald F., XXXXXX
 Lavery, James C., XXXXXX
 Lavigne, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Lawler, Roy I., XXXXXX
 Laws, Louis W., XXXXXX
 Lawton, Phillip C., XXXXXX
 Lay, Edward L., XXXXXX
 Lazier, Phillip W., XXXXXX
 Leary, Clifford J., XXXXXX
 Leatherman, Carol J., XXXXXX
 Leblanc, Joseph U., XXXXXX
 Lebow, Fritz E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ledden, John M., XXXXXX
 Lednicki, Edward F., XXXXXX
 Lee, Harold M., XXXXXX
 Lee, John, XXXXXX
 Lee, John E., XXXXXX
 Lee, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Lee, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Lee, Robert S., XXXX
 Lee, Roland E., XXXXXX
 Lefort, Louis P., XXXXXX
 Legant, William A., XXXXXX
 Legare, Vincent P., XXXXXX
 Leger, James E., XXXXXX
 Leggett, Roy C., XXXXXX
 Lehmann, Maurice J. W., XXXXXX
 Lehnhoff, Edward W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lentz, Elliott J., XXXXXX
 Lepard, David A., XXXXXX
 Lerma, Carlos E., XXXXXX
 Lesky, Stanley A., XXXXXX
 Lesperance, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Levisky, John S., II, XXXXXX

Levison, Robert L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lewallen, David W., XXXXXX
 Lewellyn, Edwin D., XXXXXX
 Lewis, David A., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Edwin W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lewis, John F., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Joseph K., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Lloyd B., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Louis C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Orthus K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Ramon L., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Richard B., XXXXXX
 Liberty, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Lierman, Dale D., XXXXXX
 Liggett, Gary R., XXXXXX
 Lightner, Michael C., XXXXXX
 Lilly, James, XXXXXX
 Lilly, Lloyd L., XXXXXX
 Lilly, Robert A., Jr., XXXX
 Lindberg, David C., XXXXXX
 Lindsay, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Lindsay, Nathan J., XXXXXX
 Lindsey, Clare H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lindsey, David A., XXXXXX
 Lindsey, Lewis C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Linker, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Linse, Erich W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Liparulo, Anthony, XXXXXX
 Little, Joseph T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Livengood, John J., XXXXXX
 Livesay, John H., XXXXXX
 Livingston, Donald B., XXXX
 Lobue, Jackino P., XXXXXX
 Locascio, Nicholas J., XXXXXX
 Lofton, Charle M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Logan, James C., XXXXXX
 Long, Earnest D., XXXXXX
 Loschiavo, Albert A., XXXXXX
 Lou, Kristian M., XXXXXX
 Louderback, John L., XXXXXX
 Lough, Roland K., XXXXXX
 Love, Robert P., XXXXXX
 Loving, Errol K., XXXXXX
 Lovrien, Clark E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Low, Abraham M., XXXXXX
 Lowe, Frank N., XXXXXX
 Lowe, Teddy R., XXXXXX
 Lowry, Clifton L., XXXXXX
 Lucas, Bradley D., XXXXXX
 Luciano, Ferdinand J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lueckert, William E., XXXXXX
 Lueders, Tommy W., XXXXXX
 Lueschow, Roger J., XXXXXX
 Luhrman, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Luhrsens, Donald E., XXXX
 Luke, David C., XXXXXX
 Lunde, Erik C., XXXXXX
 Lunt, Clarence G., XXXXXX
 Lydon, David S., XXXXXX
 Lynch, Darrel D., XXXXXX
 Lyon, Roger W., XXXXXX
 Lyons Austin J., XXXXXX
 Lyons, Bernard G., XXXXXX
 Lyons, Edward K., XXXXXX
 Lyons, Everett A., III, XXXXXX
 Mable, Leon J., XXXXXX
 Mabry, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 MacArthur, Lawrence E., XXXX
 MacArthur, William H., XXXXXX
 MacCarthy, Ned J., XXXXXX
 MacDonald, Donald A., XXXXXX
 MacDonald, James H., XXXXXX
 Mackrill, Richard L., XXXXXX
 MacLennan, Bruce G., XXXXXX
 MacLennan, Thomas P., XXXXXX
 MacNab, Forrest W., XXXXXX
 Macora, Stanley E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Macy, Owen Y., XXXXXX
 Madden, Jack L., XXXXXX
 Madden, Thomas F., XXXXXX
 Maddux, Spencer, XXXXXX
 Madonna, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Mahoney, Leonard, Jr., XXXXXX
 Malone, Burni H., III, XXXXXX
 Malone, Michael W., XXXXXX
 Malone, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Manceau, Benjamin G., XXXXXX
 Mansfield, Don L., XXXXXX
 Mansfield, Marlon F., XXXXXX
 Manspeaker, George S., XXXXXX
 Mantel, John E., XXXXXX
 Maroney, John E., XXXXXX
 Marschalk, George F., XXXXXX
 Marsh, Mary A., XXXXXX
 Marsh, Paul Jr., XXXXXX
 Marshall, Darrel R., XXXXXX
 Martens, Ronald A., XXXXXX
 Martin, Eugene V., Jr., XXXXXX
 Martin, Joseph W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Martin, Larry M., XXXXXX
 Martin, Norman C., XXXXXX
 Martin, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Martin, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Marx, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Masciola, Mario V., XXXXXX
 Mason, Gerald C., XXXXXX
 Mason, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Mason, William L., XXXXXX
 Massingale, John T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Maston, Eugene W., XXXXXX
 Mastrangelo, Eugene K., XXXXXX
 Masuga, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Mathews, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Mathis, Dennis F., XXXXXX
 Mathis, Lloyd P., XXXXXX
 Mattson, Ronald C., XXXXXX
 Mau, Gary R., XXXXXX
 Maurer, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Maurin, John W., XXXXXX
 Maxwell, Lowell L., XXXXXX
 Maxwell, Robert S., XXXXXX
 May, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mayer, James I., XXXXXX
 Mayer, Richard I., XXXXXX
 Mayr, William F., II, XXXXXX
 McAllister, Robert L., XXXXXX
 McBriarty, Mark A., XXXXXX
 McBride, Jon R., XXXXXX
 McCall, Philip J., Jr., XXXXXX
 McCall, Robert D., XXXXXX
 McCallum, Patrick V., XXXXXX
 McCamish, Robert H., XXXXXX
 McCarthy, David W., XXXXXX
 McCleary, Ronald E., XXXXXX
 McClellan, Charles L., XXXXXX
 McClosky, Michael J., XXXXXX
 McCloud, Paul L., XXXXXX
 McClure, Robert T., XXXXXX
 McCluskey, Gerald R., XXXXXX
 McCollum, Joseph T., XXXXXX
 McCollum, Robert L., XXXXXX
 McCollum, Rufus D., Jr., XXXXXX
 McCormick, David E., XXXXXX
 McCowen, Redmund A., XXXXXX
 McCrea, George L., XXXXXX
 McCrory, James L., XXXXXX
 McCutcheon, James R., XXXXXX
 McDade, James D., XXXXXX
 McDaniel, James T., XXXXXX
 McDaniel, Norman A., XXXXXX
 McDonald, Charles M., XXXXXX
 McDonald, Gerald B., XXXXXX
 McDonald, Jerry D., XXXXXX
 McDonald, Kurt C., XXXXXX
 McDonald, Michael E., XXXXXX
 McDonald, Patrick J., XXXXXX
 McDonough, Myles, XXXXXX
 McDowell, Russell V., XXXXXX
 McFatridge, Charles L., XXXXXX
 McGauley, Gerald M., XXXXXX
 McGlinchey, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 McGrath, Timothy J., XXXXXX
 McGreevy, Richard, XXXXXX
 McGuire, David D., XXXXXX
 McHenry, Dale E., XXXXXX
 McHugh, Maurice F., XXXXXX
 McInerney, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 McKee, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 McKenry, Charles R., XXXXXX
 McKeon, Warren, XXXXXX
 McKinney, John S., XXXXXX
 McKnight, Charles K., XXXXXX
 McKnight, George P., XXXXXX
 McLain, William L., Jr., XXXXXX
 McLean, Ross A., XXXXXX
 McLendon, Guy S., Jr., XXXXXX
 McMahon, Daniel W., XXXXXX
 McManus, Paul E., XXXXXX
 McMillan, Donald R., XXXXXX
 McMonigal, James C., XXXXXX
 McMullen, Gary M., XXXXXX
 McMurtry, Jon R., XXXXXX
 McNabb, David R., XXXXXX
 McNeill, Robert S., XXXXXX
 McNeill, Ken B., XXXXXX
 McNutt, Ted A., XXXXXX
 Mead, Ronald E., XXXXXX
 Meadows, Harold E., XXXXXX
 Meares, Elbert C., XXXXXX
 Mears, Gary H., XXXXXX
 Medley, Bruce E., XXXXXX
 Medrick, Franklin J., XXXXXX
 Meeks, George W., XXXXXX
 Meer, Martin P., XXXXXX
 Meler, Charles H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Meinhardt, John L., XXXXXX
 Melvin, Alan W., XXXXXX
 Melvin, Phillip L., XXXXXX
 Menges, Charles P., XXXXXX
 Menke, Norman T., XXXXXX
 Meredith, William E., XXXXXX
 Merrick, Douglas C., XXXXXX
 Merrill, Darwin G., XXXXXX
 Merson, Edgar G., XXXXXX
 Meserve, George D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Messner, Wayne K., XXXXXX
 Metcalfe, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Metsker, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Metz, Donald C., XXXXXX
 Metz, George C., XXXXXX
 Meurer, Frederick A., XXXXXX
 Meyer, Walter D., XXXXXX
 Meyer, William C., XXXXXX
 Michael, William W., XXXXXX
 Mickelsen, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Melike, John D., XXXXXX
 Miholick, James I., XXXXXX
 Mikami, Wallace H., XXXXXX
 Mikus, Vincent J., XXXXXX
 Milam, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Milazzo, Donald V., XXXXXX
 Miller, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Miller, Craig V., XXXXXX
 Miller, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Miller, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Miller, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Miller, Gerald E., XXXXXX
 Miller, James H., XXXXXX
 Miller, John C., XXXXXX
 Miller, Max I., Jr., XXXXXX
 Miller, Ralph B., XXXXXX
 Miller, Ralph K., XXXXXX
 Miller, Ronald M., XXXXXX
 Miller, Royal D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Miller, Theodore R., XXXXXX
 Millett, Thomas O., XXXXXX
 Miltner, John H., XXXXXX
 Mims, George E., XXXXXX
 Minard, Leon D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mirth, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Missman, Richard T., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Donald B., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Fred C., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Jay N., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Roger D., XXXXXX
 Mitvalsky, John F., XXXXXX
 Mohrman, Gordon W., XXXXXX
 Mola, Gennaro, Jr., XXXXXX
 Molitoris, Michael, Jr., XXXXXX
 Monaco, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Monroe, Edward P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Monsell, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Montagano, Philip C., XXXXXX
 Montavon, Kent, XXXXX
 Montecino, Allen J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Montgomery, Edwin J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Montgomery, Robert K., XXXXXX
 Montgomery, Scott L., XXXXXX
 Moody, Douglas E., XXXXXX
 Moore, Charlie B., XXXXXX
 Moore, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Moore, Ernest F., XXXX
 Moore, Jack C., XXXXXX
 Moore, Paul B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Moore, William F., XXXXXX
 Moorhous, Dudley M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Moorman, Edwin M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mooty, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Moraczewski, Adam D. A., XXXXXX
 Morain, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Morats, Victor, XXXXXX
 Morgan, Donald E., XXXX
 Morgan, James T., XXXX

Morgan, Joseph D., III, XXXXX
 Morgan, Otis C., XXXXXX
 Morgan, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Morgan, William L., XXXXXX
 Morrison, Glen R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Morrissey, Larry L., XXXXXX
 Mosso, Ellsworth A., XXXXXX
 Motzny, Kenneth G., XXXXXX
 Moy, Don M., XXXXXX
 Mueller, James W., XXXXXX
 Muenker, Emmet W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Muise, Frederick D., XXXXXX
 Mullick, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Mull, Russell E., XXXXXX
 Mullen, Neil C., XXXXXX
 Munoz, Alfred E., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Francis R., XXXXXX
 Murphy, James R., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Murphy, William H., XXXXXX
 Murray, David R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Muse, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Musmaker, Patrick L., XXXXX
 Musson, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Myers, Leroy A., XXXXXX
 Myers, William A., XXXXXX
 Nading, Ivan L., XXXXXX
 Nalewka, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Nalezny, John R., XXXXXX
 Narog, Denney J., XXXXXX
 Narum, Gailen O., XXXXXX
 Nash, Charles P., XXXXXX
 Nash, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Naugle, Theodore L., XXXXXX
 Navratil, Frank J., XXXXXX
 Nawrocki, Edmund A., XXXXXX
 Nelsen, Robert S., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Elmer E., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Lowell P., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Michael A., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Theodore A., XXXXXX
 Nenninger, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Neger, James R., XXXXXX
 Nethercot, Hubert S., XXXXXX
 Neubauer, Albe H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Neveu, Florian R., XXXXXX
 Newcomb, Allen J., XXXXXX
 Newell, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Newell, William M., XXXXXX
 Newman, Samuel D., XXXXXX
 Nichols, Elmer A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Nichols, Paul S., XXXXXX
 Nickel, Jack R., XXXXXX
 Nielsen, Dennis E., XXXXXX
 Nikunen, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Nilson, Eric J., XXXXXX
 Nix, Cowan G., XXXXXX
 Noakes, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Noebel, Peter C., XXXXXX
 Nohmer, Frederick J., XXXXXX
 Noonos, David W., XXXXXX
 Nordhauser, Fred, XXXXXX
 Nordstrom, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Norrell, Eddie C., XXXXXX
 Norton, Leon B., XXXXXX
 Novak, James R., XXXXXX
 Nowlin, John W., XXXXXX
 Nunez, Joe C., XXXXXX
 Oaks, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Obenland, Roland R., XXXXXX
 Oberdier, Lyn D., XXXXXX
 O'Brien, Eleanor M., XXXXXX
 O'Brien, William M., XXXXXX
 Ockerman, Donald L., XXXXXX
 O'Connor, Robert K., XXXXXX
 O'Donnell, Charles F., XXXXXX
 O'Donnell, Paul E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Oglesby, Jerry L., XXXXXX
 O'Halloran, James E., III, XXXXXX
 Oldham, Huel J., XXXXXX
 Oliveri, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Olsen, Orville V., XXXXXX
 Olson, John A., XXXXXX
 Olson, Norris O., XXXXXX
 Olson, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Olson, Roger L., XXXXXX
 Oltorik, Thomas F., XXXXXX
 O'Malley, Patrick D., XXXXXX
 Oprey, Bernard P., XXXXXX
 Orourke, Terence J., XXXXXX
 Orr, Paul J. G., XXXXXX
 Orr, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Orr, William M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ortman, Frank D., XXXXXX
 Otley, William J., XXXXXX
 Ottaviano, Alfred F., XXXXXX
 Otterson, Joseph V., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ouren, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Overstreet, Charles F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Owens, Walter J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pabst, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Packard, Barry R., XXXXXX
 Paddon, Struan L., XXXXXX
 Padgett, Douglas M., XXXXXX
 Page, James H., XXXXXX
 Page, William E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Palmer, Albert W., XXXXXX
 Palmer Roy E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Palmer, William D., XXXXXX
 Pang, Frederick F. Y., XXXXXX
 Panitch, Bernard S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pankratz, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Pannill, Harry L., XXXXXX
 Paramoure, Rodney L., XXXXXX
 Parker, Brian T., XXXXXX
 Parker, Gary H., XXXXXX
 Parker, William F., XXXXXX
 Parkes, Thomas D., XXXXXX
 Parkinson, Anthony J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Parks, Joe W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Parrish, Bishop P., III, XXXXXX
 Partin, Allen J., XXXXXX
 Partin, James W., XXXXXX
 Partridge, Arthur W., II, XXXXXX
 Pasanen, Ronald J., XXXXXX
 Patrick, George M., XXXXXX
 Patrick, Gerald J., XXXXXX
 Pattison, Norman S., XXXXXX
 Paul, Earl L., XXXXXX
 Paulson, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Payne, William J., XXXXXX
 Payton, Ramon D., XXXXXX
 Peacock, James A., XXXXXX
 Peebler, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Peel, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Peio, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Pelini, Louis V., XXXXXX
 Penn, Richard L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pensock, Edward P., XXXXXX
 Pericola, Raymond, XXXXXX
 Perkins, Gene E., XXXXXX
 Perkins, William F., XXXXXX
 Perlman, Jane P., XXXXXX
 Perrotta, Donald T., XXXXXX
 Peter, Toney V., XXXXXX
 Peters, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Petersen, Dick J., XXXXXX
 Petersen, Ernest V., XXXXXX
 Peterson, Carlton J., XXXXXX
 Peterson, David R., XXXXXX
 Peterson, Roger H., XXXX
 Pflumm, Basil H., XXXXXX
 Phenneger, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Philditus, Robert T., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Bobby W., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Dennis D., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Frank T., XXXXXX
 Phillips, George V., Jr., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Jerry N., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Ragan T., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Shafter R., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Sidney E., XXXXXX
 Phillips, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Picht, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Pierce, Donald S., XXXXXX
 Pierce, Henry L., XXXXXX
 Pierce, Louis R., XXXXXX
 Pierson, Samuel M., III, XXXXXX
 Pierson, Victor G., XXXXXX
 Pietsch, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Pike, Ross E., XXXXXX
 Pilcher, Ray A., XXXXXX
 Pilipowsky, Serhij, XXXXXX
 Pillet, Frederick A., XXXXXX
 Pimentel, Joseph D., XXXXXX
 Pinkston, John A., XXXXXX
 Pintler, Peter C., XXXXXX
 Pipkin, Mitchell N., XXXXXX
 Pittman, Wayne C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pitts, William H., XXXXXX
 Pitus, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Planck, Samuel C., XXXXXX
 Platz, Joseph F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Plewniak, Denis P., XXXXXX
 Plummer, Donald G., XXXXXX
 Polito, Joseph P., XXXXXX
 Pollard, Melvin E., XXXXXX
 Polson, Rex E., XXXXXX
 Pons, Gabriel A., XXXXXX
 Pontius, Earl A., XXXXXX
 Poole, David F., XXXXXX
 Poplin, Dickie G., XXXXXX
 Poppenga, Burton H., XXXXXX
 Porter, John P., XXXXXX
 Posey, Hollis D., XXXXXX
 Posey, William T., XXXXXX
 Post, James L., XXXXXX
 Post, Richard R., XXXXXX
 Powell, Bruce M., XXXXXX
 Powell, Cecil W., XXXXXX
 Powell, Harold F., XXXXXX
 Powell, William E., XXXXXX
 Powers, David S., XXXXXX
 Powers, Stanley W., XXXXXX
 Pratt, Edward J., XXXXXX
 Prescott, James W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Prescott, Leo L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Prestegard, Allen L., XXXXXX
 Preston, Peter C., XXXXXX
 Price, James E., XXXXXX
 Price, Michael H., XXXXXX
 Price, William T., III, XXXXXX
 Pritchard, Willia H., XXXXXX
 Proctor, John C., XXXXXX
 Prybyla, Ihor S., XXXXXX
 Pryor, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Purins, Guntis, XXXXXX
 Purrington, Linwood N., Jr., XXXX
 Pyne, Frank B., XXXXXX
 Quade, Paul W., XXXXXX
 Quigley, Norman P., XXXXXX
 Quinn, Charles D., XXXXXX
 Quist, Bernard W., XXXXXX
 Rabe, Tood E., XXXXXX
 Rader, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Rader, John R., XXXXXX
 Ramirez, Joe, XXXXXX
 Rampello, James V., XXXXXX
 Ramsay, Allan C., XXXXXX
 Ramsey, David W., XXXXXX
 Randolph, Ross W., XXXXXX
 Rankin, James L., XXXXXX
 Rapp, Dean A., XXXXXX
 Rasgorshek, Robert H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ratcliff, Lenox L., XXXXXX
 Rathbun, Richard K., XXXXXX
 Raulston, Marvin E., XXXXXX
 Rausch, Paul E., XXXXXX
 Ray, Edward L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Read, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Reardon, Michael P., XXXXXX
 Redding, Dale H., XXXXXX
 Redmond, John W., XXXXXX
 Redwine, Leonard A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Reed, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Reed, Gayle R., XXXXXX
 Reed, James M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Reeves, John M., XXXX
 Reginato, Dino D., XXXXXX
 Rehm, John F., XXXXXX
 Reich, Russell R., XXXXXX
 Reiman, James L., XXXX
 Reinders, William J., XXXXXX
 Reinken, William P., XXXXXX
 Reneau, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Reynolds, Jon A., XXXXXX
 Rhodes, James M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rhodes, Jimmy P., XXXXXX
 Ricci, Arnold A., XXXXXX
 Rice, Norman J., XXXXXX
 Rice, William F., XXXXXX
 Richart, David K., XXXXXX
 Richers, Sherwood A., XXXXXX
 Riddle, George M., XXXXXX
 Riebeschl, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Riedenaier, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Rieger, Delmar L., XXXXXX
 Rieke, John W., XXXXXX
 Riesel, Daniel, XXXXXX
 Riggers, Wilton E., XXXXXX
 Rindahl, Milton D., XXXXXX

Rlopel, Francis D., XXXXXX
 Riotte, Wyndham, XXXXXX
 Rislinger, Bruce D., XXXXXX
 Ritter, Keith K., XXXXXX
 Rivers, James W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roach, Dwight E., XXXXXX
 Robbins, Bruce D., XXXXXX
 Robenolt, Gary L., XXXXXX
 Roberson, Roger K., XXXXXX
 Roberts, David L., XXXXXX
 Roberts, John E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roberts, John H., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Major C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Matt A., III, XXXXXX
 Roberts, Paul F., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Roscoe R., III, XXXX
 Roberts, Thomas S., XXXXXX
 Robertson, Gary E., XXXXXX
 Robertson, Richard R., XXXXXX
 Robertson, William R., XXXXXX
 Robins, John W., XXXXXX
 Robison, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Roe, Sherman A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roescher, Frank A., XXXXXX
 Rogers, Brown B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rogers, James C., XXXXXX
 Rogers, John E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rohlf, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Roland, Jay R., XXXXXX
 Rollins, Jimmy Y., XXXXXX
 Rollins, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Romlein, David R., XXXXXX
 Roose, Eugene J., XXXXXX
 Rosa, John N., XXXXXX
 Rosane, Edwin L., XXXXXX
 Rosetti, William J., XXXXXX
 Rosowicz, Thomas T., XXXXXX
 Ross, James C., XXXXXX
 Ross, James D., XXXXXX
 Ross, John R., XXXXXX
 Ross, John W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ross, Kirby S., XXXXXX
 Rossel, Eugene D., XXXXXX
 Rostkowski, Alexander E., XXXXXX
 Roth, Bruce C., XXXXXX
 Roth, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rousseau, Ernest W., XXXXXX
 Rousell, Mervin E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rowe, John J., XXXXXX
 Rowland, Keith L., XXXXXX
 Rubel, Louis P., XXXXXX
 Ruble, John H., XXXXXX
 Ruddock, Donn M., XXXXXX
 Rudy, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Ruikka, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Rumsey, Tracy P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rundio, Guy G., XXXXXX
 Rupinski, Anthony J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ruple, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Ruppel, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Russi, Roy A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ruth, Francis D., XXXXXX
 Rutten, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Ryan, Harry F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ryder, Scott M., XXXXXX
 Saenz, Hulberto, XXXXXX
 Sage, Sheldon, XXXXXX
 Sakella, John L., XXXXXX
 Salchow, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Salmon, Haston E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Salyer, Phillip N., XXXXXX
 Sandercock, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Sanders, Ernest L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sanders, Gordon L., XXXXXX
 Sanders, Larry C., XXXXXX
 Sanderson, Bruce J., XXXXXX
 Sargent, Jerry D., XXXXXX
 Sasser, George C., XXXXXX
 Sattler, Frank J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sauter, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Sauer, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 Saunders, Albert E., XXXXXX
 Saunders, David C., XXXXXX
 Savelle, Peter D., XXXXXX
 Sawyer, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Scarce, David C., XXXXXX
 Schaefer, Fred R., XXXXXX
 Schaefer, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Schafer, James R., XXXXXX
 Schanz, Waldron A., XXXXXX
 Schattel, John L., XXXXXX
 Schaum, Craig O., XXXXXX
 Scheatzle, David G., XXXXXX
 Scheel, Randolph J., XXXXXX
 Scheeren, Frederick A., XXXX
 Scheidel, Paul N., XXXXXX
 Scheidt, William E., XXXXXX
 Scheltens, Ronald K., XXXXXX
 Schemenaur, Roger E., XXXXXX
 Schick, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Schiff, Alvin T., XXXXXX
 Schiff, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Schlesinger, Charles T., XXXXXX
 Schluer, Norma E., XXXXXX
 Schmidt, George L., XXXXXX
 Schmidt, Karl W., XXXXXX
 Schmidt, Ronald E., XXXXXX
 Schmidt, Thomas B., XXXXXX
 Schmidt, Walter E., XXXXXX
 Schmitt, Joseph A., XXXXXX
 Schmoll, Ross V., XXXXXX
 Schneider, Edward C., XXXXXX
 Schnell, Tom C., XXXXXX
 Schoen, Lewis L., XXXXXX
 Schoen, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Scholl, Stewart W., XXXXXX
 Schremp, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Schritter, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Schulz, Jack H., XXXXXX
 Schuster, Fred L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Schwab, Gerald P., XXXXXX
 Schwartz, George W., XXXXXX
 Schwartz, James A., XXXXXX
 Schweigerdt, David H., XXXXXX
 Scopel, Eurrelo P., XXXXXX
 Scott, David W., XXXXXX
 Scott, Frederick M., III, XXXXXX
 Scott, Harry D., XXXXXX
 Scott, Jerry D., XXXXXX
 Scott, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Scott, Taylor G., XXXXXX
 Scrivano, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Seabright, Ralph W., II, XXXXXX
 Seaburg, Gordon E., XXXXXX
 Seago, Donald A., XXXXXX
 See, Dennis R., XXXXXX
 Seely, John C., XXXXXX
 Seivert, Richard H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Selzys, Anthony W., XXXXXX
 Selberg, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Sellers, Kenneth H., XXXXXX
 Sellers, Lester H., XXXXXX
 Selph, James, XXXXXX
 Semanco, William F., XXXXXX
 Senko, James F., XXXXXX
 Senyk, Joseph M., XXXXXX
 Serur, John, XXXXXX
 Sexton, Harry, XXXXXX
 Shablow, Russell N., XXXXXX
 Shackelford, Bernard E., XXXXXX
 Shackleton, Dwayne M., XXXXXX
 Shackleton, George, XXXXXX
 Shaffer, Frank M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shaffer, Howard E., XXXXXX
 Shaffer, Jon G., XXXXXX
 Shaffer, Lewis F., XXXXXX
 Shall, Paul J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shape, Ralph M., XXXXXX
 Sharp, Jerry C., XXXXXX
 Sharp, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Shatzer, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Shaw, Christopher C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shaw, Craig D., XXXXXX
 Shaw, Millard M., XXXXXX
 Shea, David J., XXXXXX
 Shea, William F., XXXXXX
 Shearin, David R., XXXXXX
 Shepard, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Sherburn, James R., XXXXXX
 Shillcutt, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Shimamoto, Edward M., XXXXXX
 Shinn, Prescott N., XXXXXX
 Shoemaker, Alan M., XXXXXX
 Shore, Kenneth B., XXXX
 Show, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Shropshire, Richard A., XXXX
 Shuler, Ellie G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shumate, Arthur K., XXXX
 Shupp, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Shute, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Sibbald, David M. H., XXXXXX
 Sievertson, John F., XXXXXX
 Siferd, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 Signet, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Sikes, Charles P., XXXXXX
 Simmons, John A., XXXXXX
 Simmons, Warren L., XXXXXX
 Simmons, Wilbur C., XXXXXX
 Simon, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Simons, William G., XXXXXX
 Simpson, Charles G., XXXXXX
 Sims, Fred M., XXXXXX
 Singer, Ronald M., XXXXXX
 Sirmans, John C., XXXXXX
 Siteman, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Sivils, Norbert D., XXXXXX
 Skaret, David J., XXXXXX
 Skokan, William J., XXXXXX
 Skwerski, Peter R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Slaughter, George A., XXXXXX
 Sloan, Peter L., XXXXXX
 Slocum, John M., XXXXXX
 Slowey, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Smalley, Vern G., XXXXXX
 Smalls, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Smiley, James G., XXXXXX
 Smith, Clyde D., XXXXXX
 Smith, Conrad E., XXXXXX
 Smith, Cromer W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, Donald C., XXXXXX
 Smith, Eugene N., XXXXXX
 Smith, Gary N., XXXXXX
 Smith, Gary S., XXXXXX
 Smith, George A., XXXXXX
 Smith, Gerald J., XXXXXX
 Smith, James L., XXXXXX
 Smith, Jerry B., XXXXXX
 Smith, Jerry J., XXXXXX
 Smith, Jimmie L., XXXXXX
 Smith, John S., III, XXXXXX
 Smith, Josh M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, Keith W., XXXXXX
 Smith, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Smith, Lawrence D., XXXXXX
 Smith, Merlyn D., XXXXXX
 Smith, Peter B., XXXXXX
 Smith, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Smith, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Smith, Roger C., XXXXXX
 Smith, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Smith, Tom C., XXXXXX
 Smith, Val, XXXXXX
 Smith, Wayne O., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, Welby A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, William O., XXXXXX
 Smith, Willis E., XXXXXX
 Smothermon, Phillip R., XXXX
 Smythe, Ralph E., XXXXXX
 Snide, James A., XXXXXX
 Snyder, Charles L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Snyder, James M., XXXXXX
 Sokol, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Solotis, William J., XXXX
 Sorokas, Thomas P., XXXXXX
 Sotire, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Southwell, Max G., XXXXXX
 Spagnola, Kenneth L., XXXXXX
 Sparks, Gordon L., XXXXXX
 Sparr, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Speed, Thomas J., III, XXXXXX
 Speight, James D., XXXXXX
 Speight, William P., XXXX
 Spielman, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Spiers, Joseph K., XXXXXX
 Spillman, Barton L., XXXXXX
 Spivey, Stephen H., XXXXXX
 Spolidoro, Anthony F., XXXXXX
 Spone, John P., Jr., XXXX
 Sprague, William T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Spring, Richard C., XXXX
 Springston, Wendel L., XXXXXX
 Spruill, Crosby L., XXXXXX
 Spurlock, Belford M., XXXXXX
 Stack, Thomas P., XXXXXX
 Stallworth, Willett R., XXXXXX
 Stamm, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Stanley, Roy M., II, XXXXXX
 Stansell, George A., XXXXXX
 Stark, Lewis R., XXXX
 Stark, Terry M., XXXX
 Starrett, Samuel D., XXXXXX
 Stasio, August M., XXXXXX

Stauffer, Russel F., XXXXXX
 Stearns, William E., XXXXXX
 Steczkowski, Arthur F., XXXXXX
 Steen, Martin W., XXXXXX
 Stehli, Kenneth T., XXXXXX
 Steiner, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Steingrebe, Carl E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Steinhauer, Elwood, III, XXXXXX
 Stellmach, Arthur T., XXXXXX
 Stenger, Manfred, XXXXXX
 Stephens, Roger L., XXXXXX
 Stephens, Seth H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Stepp, Ronald B., XXXXXX
 Stevens, Gary E., XXXXXX
 Stevens, George R., XXXXXX
 Stevens, John R., XXXXXX
 Stevens, Michael C., XXXXXX
 Stewart, John B., XXXXXX
 Stewart, John S., XXXXXX
 Stewart, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Stewart, William M., XXXXXX
 Stiteler, Robert H., Jr., XXXXXX
 St. Louis, Ronald L., XXXXXX
 Stockett, Joe T., XXXXXX
 Stoddard, David D., XXXXXX
 Stoddard, James P., III, XXXXXX
 Stokes, Leland L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Stoltz, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Stone, John B., XXXXXX
 Stone, Kenneth D., XXXXXX
 Stoop, James K., XXXXXX
 Straight, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Strickland, James N., XXXXXX
 Strom, Brock T., XXXXXX
 Stroud, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Stuart, John F., XXXXXX
 Stuck, Monte L., XXXXXX
 Studinka, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Stueve, John B., XXXXXX
 Stumpf, James R. H., XXXXXX
 Stutzman, Roger D., XXXXXX
 Style, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Sudbrink, William H., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, David J., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, Edward F., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, Francis T., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, James V., XXXXXX
 Summer, James L., XXXXXX
 Summers, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Sundbom, Leroy B., XXXXXX
 Suranyi, Edward E., XXXXXX
 Suter, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Sutherland, John D., XXXXXX
 Sutton, William E., XXXXXX
 Swain, Jerry M., XXXXXX
 Swank, Leonard L., XXXXXX
 Swanson, Alan C., XXXXXX
 Sweet, Leonard M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Swofford, Frank W., XXXXXX
 Tackett, Raymond N., XXXXXX
 Takara, Stanley K., XXXXXX
 Talbot, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Talbot, James A., XXXXXX
 Tankersley, James E., XXXXXX
 Taranto, Ramon L., XXXXXX
 Tarsoly, John B., XXXXXX
 Tate, Orlia A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Allan A., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Anton M., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Bruce G., XXXXXX
 Taylor, David B., XXXXXX
 Taylor, David M., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Donald C., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Eric P., XXXXXX
 Taylor, James A., XXXXXX
 Taylor, James W., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Richard I., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Vernon P., XXXX
 Taylor, William R., XXXXXX
 Tedrick, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Teeman, William R., XXXXXX
 Telford, William D., XXXXXX
 Templeton, Ronald H., XXXXXX
 Tenhoor, Frederic G., XXXXXX
 Terpening, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Terry, Decker L., XXXXXX
 Terry, James D., XXXXXX
 Terry, James R., XXXXXX
 Terry, Jane E., XXXXXX
 Terry, William F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tetzmeier, Donald C., XXXXXX

Thacker, William A., XXXXXX
 Thelin, George W., II, XXXXXX
 Thielemann, Gayle F., XXXXXX
 Thomas, Harry A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Thomas, James E., XXXXXX
 Thomas, Michael D., XXXXXX
 Thomas, William B., XXXXXX
 Thomason, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Barry G., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Donald M., XXXXXX
 Thompson, John E., XXXX
 Thompson, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Paul Y., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Susan J., XXXXXX
 Thomson, John D., XXXXXX
 Thomson, Laurence J., XXXXXX
 Thornton, John S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Thresher, Carl H., XXXXXX
 Thurman, James S., XXXXXX
 Tidwell, Howard N., XXXXXX
 Tighe, Earl E., XXXXXX
 Tilley, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Timm, Gerald E., XXXXXX
 Timmermans, Philip W., XXXXXX
 Tinsley, Claude H., III, XXXXXX
 Tobik, Steven P., XXXXXX
 Todd, Harold W., XXXXXX
 Toland, James D., XXXX
 Tole, George E., XXXXXX
 Tomey, Edward J., XXXXXX
 Tomtan, Thomas O., XXXXXX
 Toner, William L., XXXXXX
 Toney, William M., XXXXXX
 Townsend, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Toye, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Tracey, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Trail, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Travis, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Treacy, Charles P., XXXXXX
 Treacy, John D., XXXXXX
 Tripp, Graydon W., XXXXXX
 Trisko, Walter H., XXXXXX
 Trombley, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Tronzo, Louis C., XXXXXX
 Troyer, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Trzaskoma, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Tuck, Frank K., XXXXXX
 Tucker, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Tufo, Stanley, XXXXXX
 Tulintseff, Nick G., XXXXXX
 Turain, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Turner, Howard C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Turner, James R., XXXXXX
 Turner, Jerry M., XXXXXX
 Turrin, Armand L., XXXXXX
 Tuzo, George L., XXXXXX
 Uebelhor, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Uhlenhoff, Walter, XXXXXX
 Ulbricht, Gilmer D., XXXXXX
 Ulmer, John W., Jr., XXXX
 Underwood, Joseph W., XXXXXX
 Unnerstall, Ronald W., XXXXXX
 Unruh, Daniel D., XXXXXX
 Unsderfer, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Upton, Rodney A., XXXXXX
 Vajda, Frank S., XXXXXX
 Valenzuela, Francis, XXXXXX
 Vanagas, Anthony A., XXXXXX
 Vance, James C., XXXXXX
 Vance, Jon C., XXXXXX
 Vancleave, Danny R., II, XXXXXX
 VanDusen, Maurice V., Jr., XXXXXX
 Vankesteren, John A., XXXXXX
 Vanputte, Ronald E., XXXX
 Vansickle, Larry P., XXXXXX
 Varley, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Varner, Gerald J., XXXXXX
 Vaughan, John C., III, XXXXXX
 Vaughn, Jerry B., XXXXXX
 Vause, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Veigel, Richard T., XXXX
 Venen, Leonard N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Venturini, Ronald A., XXXXXX
 Vickery, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Vilella, Herman M., XXXXXX
 Voelker, Edward M., II, XXXXXX
 Voegel, Theodore C., XXXXXX
 Vosika, Eugene L., XXXX
 Vyzral, Francis J., XXXXXX
 Wachsmuth, Carl W., XXXXXX

Wachtel, Stephen S., XXXXXX
 Waddell, David B., XXXXXX
 Wagner, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Wainwright, Ronald G., XXXXXX
 Wakefield, Kimbal E., XXXXXX
 Walker, Bert N., XXXXXX
 Walker, Marvin Z., XXXXXX
 Wall, Alfred J., XXXXXX
 Wallace, James T., XXXXXX
 Wallace, Ray M., XXXXXX
 Wallace, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Waller, William W., XXXXXX
 Wallis, William J., XXXXXX
 Walsh, John M., XXXXXX
 Walstrom, David L., XXXXXX
 Waltermire, Jacob B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Walther, George H., XXXXXX
 Walton, Gary E., XXXXXX
 Walton, Samuel K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ward, Joe E., XXXXXX
 Ward, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Ward, Samuel M., XXXXXX
 Wardsworth, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Wareah, John C., XXXXXX
 Warner, Donald D., XXXXXX
 Warner, Norris E., XXXXXX
 Warner, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Warren, James E., XXXXXX
 Warren, James M., XXXXXX
 Warren, Lee D., XXXXXX
 Wassall, James W., XXXXXX
 Wasser, Russell S., XXXXXX
 Waterman, Quintin L., XXXXXX
 Waters, Albert L., XXXXXX
 Watkins, Robert E., XXXX
 Watlington, Bernard E., XXXXXX
 Watring, John A., XXXXXX
 Watson, Jack O., XXXXXX
 Watson, Patrick J., XXXXXX
 Watts, Holbrook M., XXXXXX
 Watts, James D., XXXXXX
 Waymire, Lester D., XXXXXX
 Waynik, Michael, Jr., XXXXXX
 Weaver, Floyd W., XXXXXX
 Weaver, George E., XXXXXX
 Weaver, James R., XXXXXX
 Weaver, Viven T., XXXXXX
 Weaver, William A., XXXXXX
 Webb, Donald F., XXXXXX
 Weber, Edward, XXXXXX
 Weed, Bobby P., XXXXXX
 Weeks, George M., III, XXXXXX
 Wehman, Benjamin P., XXXXXX
 Wehrly, Odis G., XXXXXX
 Weintraub, Richard S., XXXXXX
 Weisman, Alan D., XXXXXX
 Welch, James C., XXXXXX
 Wellman, David C., XXXXXX
 Welton, Donald D., XXXXXX
 Wendell, John H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wenker, David J., XXXXXX
 Wensinger, Ralph R., XXXXXX
 Wentz, Peter A., XXXXXX
 Weppner, William G., XXXXXX
 Wertz, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Wesner, Thomas D., XXXXXX
 Wessell, David L., XXXXXX
 West, George W., XXXXXX
 West, James E., XXXXXX
 West, John W., Jr., XXXXXX
 West, Joseph P., Jr., XXXXXX
 West, Philip W., XXXXXX
 Westback, Eugene O., XXXXXX
 Westmoreland, Michael T., XXXXXX
 Whitaker, Gary L., XXXXXX
 Whitaker, Patrick W., XXXXXX
 Whitaker, Ted, XXXXXX
 White, James E., XXXXXX
 White, Jerry E., XXXXXX
 White, Kenneth A., XXXXXX
 White, Richard W., XXXXXX
 White, Thomas W., Jr., XXXXXX
 White, William K., XXXXXX
 Whiteman, Leon J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Whitmore, David C., XXXXXX
 Whyman, Larry L., XXXXXX
 Wicker, Paul J., XXXX
 Wickman, John F., XXXX
 Wideman, Hubert G., II, XXXXXX
 Widener, John G., XXXXXX
 Wilcox, Bruce E., XXXXXX

Wilder, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Wilkerson, Bruce W., XXXXXX
 Wilkes, Quenten L., XXXXXX
 Wilkins, Jackie, XXXXXX
 Willett, Myron J., XXXXXX
 Williams, David B., XXXXXX
 Williams, Douglas A., XXXXXX
 Williams, Edward, XXXXXX
 Williams, Edward R., XXXXXX
 Williams, Emmett E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Williams, Gary J., XXXXXX
 Williams, George W., XXXXXX
 Williams, Gerald D., XXXXXX
 Williams, Haven A., XXXXXX
 Williams, James C., XXXXXX
 Williams, John L., XXXXXX
 Williams, Ray E., XXXXXX
 Williams, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Williams, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Williams, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Williams, Thomas O., III, XXXXXX
 Williams, Winston, XXXXXX
 Williamson, George E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Williamson, James R., XXXXXX
 Willigrod, William E., XXXXXX
 Willingham, Larry D., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Clifford B., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Lary W., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Patricia A., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Wilson, William L., XXXXXX
 Winburn, Freddie C., XXXXXX
 Wince, James P., XXXXXX
 Wingert, Charles J., XXXXXX
 Winkelmann, Edgar W., XXXXXX
 Winkler, Paul D., XXXXXX
 Winn, Wendell W., XXXXXX
 Winslow, John M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Winters, Charles P., XXXXXX
 Wissing, Norman H., XXXXXX
 Wissinger, Kennet L., XXXXXX
 Wittenberg, William A., XXXXXX
 Wittrock, Ralph J., XXXXXX
 Woelfel, Edward A., XXXXXX
 Wofford, Kern E., XXXXXX
 Wolfe, Dale E., XXXXXX
 Wolfe, John M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wolpert, Donald G., XXXXXX
 Wood, Charles T., XXXXXX
 Wood, Dean C., XXXXXX
 Wood, Douglas E., XXXXXX
 Wood, Gary L., XXXXXX
 Wood, James H., XXXXXX
 Wood, Lawrence M., XXXXXX
 Wood, William E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Woodring, Marvin J., XXXXXX
 Woods, Jackie V., XXXXXX
 Woods, James C., XXXXXX
 Woodworth, Roger F., XXXXXX
 Work, James B., XXXXXX
 Worley, George H., XXXXXX
 Wozniak, Ronald E., XXXXXX
 Wright, George E., XXXXXX
 Wright, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Wright, William W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wyatt, Edward W., XXXXXX
 Wylie, Jimmy W., XXXXXX
 Wynn, Frederick B., XXXXXX
 Wynne, Thomas O., XXXXXX
 Wyrick, Andrew G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Yager, Walter S., XXXXXX
 Yantis, Albert L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Yates, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Yeatts, Frederick S., XXXXXX
 Yeokum, Charles M., XXXXXX
 Ylen, Joan O., XXXXXX
 Yon, Thomas P., XXXXXX
 Yorks, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Yoshinaga, Gene N., XXXXXX
 Young, Francis J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Young, Martin L., XXXXXX
 Young, Thomas N., XXXXXX
 Young, William M., XXXXXX
 Youngson, James, Jr., XXXXXX
 Zahniser, Frank R., XXXXXX
 Zannini, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Zara, Philip E., XXXXXX
 Zenuk, Stanley T., XXXXXX

Zimmerman, Albert R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Zimmerman, Robert T., XXXXXX
 Zimmermann, Richard P., XXXXXX
 Zint, William L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Zlotnicki, Bogdan M., XXXXXX
 Zoeller, Herbert O., XXXXXX

CHAPLAINS

Bretscher, Forrest F., XXXXXX
 Carroll, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Chace, Alston R., XXXXXX
 Donahue, John P., XXXXXX
 Edwards, Walter D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hill, Raymond J., XXXXXX
 Hollenbeck, Donald G., XXXXXX
 Husmann, Henry J., XXXXXX
 Ihrie, Bernard R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kircus, Ernest E., XXXXXX
 Knowles, Jeremy H., XXXXXX
 Lynch, John R., XXXXXX
 Mallory, Jerry J., XXXXXX
 Matthews, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Minton, Dean L., XXXXXX
 Monti, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Payne, Swayne J., XXXXXX
 Pirozzi, Lewis J., XXXXXX
 Schuelein, Virgil L., XXXXXX
 Seiber, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Shaffer, Clair W., XXXXXX
 Sheeran, Patrick J., XXXXXX
 Sinclair, Alexander B., XXXXXX
 Stork, Wayne L., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Thorsen, Henry B., XXXXXX
 Utley, Vernard T., XXXXXX
 Vickers, William D., XXXXXX
 Wantz, Earl B., XXXXXX
 Zumwalt, Vasten E., XXXXXX

DENTAL CORPS

Barrack, Alan K., XXXXXX
 Betancesrojas, Peter A., XXXXXX
 Boke, Bruce R., XXXXXX
 Carroll, Daniel F., XXXXXX
 Davis, Jerry N., XXXXXX
 Dayampert, Porter L., XXXXXX
 Ervin, Rex H., XXXXXX
 Gilliland, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Gordon, Glenn E., XXXXXX
 Hellier, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Hicks, Taylor T., XXXXXX
 Hoffman, David L., XXXXXX
 Hutchinson, William W., XXXXXX
 Kennemer, Billy R., XXXXXX
 Kirby, David B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Maestrelli, Raymond C., XXXXXX
 Polte, Hanswalter W., XXXXXX
 Robinson, Harold D., XXXXXX
 Sandoval, Elivinio, XXXXXX
 Schmisser, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Scott, Andrew S., XXXXXX
 Shaver, Bruce E., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Raymond W., XXXXXX
 Tepper, Maurice J., XXXXXX
 Usseglio, Robert J., XXXX
 Vila Pescador Edgar, XXXXXX
 Vogue, Harvey L., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Aaron H., Jr., XXXXXX

MEDICAL CORPS

Anderson, John A., XXXXXX
 Anderson, Rodney A., XXXXXX
 Belsaw, Norman E., XXXXXX
 Buono, Francis L., XXXXXX
 Burns, Matthew L., XXXXXX
 Dake, Theodore, Jr., XXXXXX
 Davis, Bradford L., XXXXXX
 Eckersley, John W., Jr., XXXX
 Frank, William E., XXXXXX
 Gates, Phillip D., XXXXXX
 Haling, Raymond F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hancey, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Hensley, Kevin C., XXXXXX
 Hooks, George E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Koenig, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Sidney T., XXXXXX
 Long, Paul D., XXXXXX
 Lordon, Robert E., XXXXXX
 McGrath, John J., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Manfred R., XXXXXX

Palma, William E., XXXXXX
 Parker, Warren M., XXXXXX
 Payne, James E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ringler, Harold L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Root, David E., XXXXXX
 Runkle, William M., XXXXXX
 Seman, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Stevenson, Onex D., XXXXXX
 Takamoto, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Victor, Martin I., XXXXXX
 Walker, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Young, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Yount, Ira M., XXXXXX

NURSE CORPS

Allen, Constance A., XXXXXX
 Armstrong, Shirley A., XXXXXX
 Baker, Olive M., XXXXXX
 Bareford, Betsy J., XXXXXX
 Brinkmann, Joanne M., XXXXXX
 Bullington, Lydia A., XXXXXX
 Buyher, Dorothea C., XXXXXX
 Carroll, Darla J., XXXXXX
 Craft, Kathryn L., XXXXXX
 Danis, Patricia M., XXXXXX
 Dodd, Darlene M., XXXXXX
 Donnelly, Grace E., XXXXXX
 Efford, Charlotte R., XXXXXX
 Emmerth, Margaret C., XXXXXX
 Engleman, Shirley E., XXXXXX
 Fox, Marjorie R., XXXXXX
 Frye, Bobbie S., XXXXXX
 Furlong, Lorena J., XXXXXX
 Gagne, Valida T., XXXXXX
 Gerrard, Elsie M., XXXXXX
 Haggard, Ann D., XXXXXX
 Halley, Norma D., XXXXXX
 Heck, Mary J., XXXXXX
 Husarik, Pauline J., XXXXXX
 Jacobson, Doris M., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Mary A., XXXXXX
 Jones, Ernestine M., XXXXXX
 Keirl, Harry J., XXXXXX
 Kennedy, Joan A., XXXXXX
 Locke, Christene, XXXXXX
 Lomax, Johnnie O., XXXXXX
 Lumsden, Nancy S., XXXXXX
 Luuru, Helen A., XXXXXX
 Martin, Barbara J., XXXXXX
 Martinsek, Laura, XXXXXX
 McCann, Mary C., XXXXXX
 Morton, Carol A., XXXXXX
 Munto, Peter L., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Barbara E., XXXXXX
 Ogle, Janet E., XXXXXX
 Oleson, Eunice J., XXXXXX
 Perkins, Earline, XXXXXX
 Plott, Clarideth J., XXXXXX
 Remmes, Elizabeth J., XXXXXX
 Ryan, Margaret A., XXXXXX
 Schaefer, Mary A., XXXXXX
 Schulz, Beverly A., XXXXXX
 Seitz, Mary K., XXXXXX
 Snuggs, Katherine C., XXXXXX
 Sorge, Joseph J., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Mary E., XXXXXX
 Thorington, Myrtle A., XXXXXX
 Ulrich, Audrey V., XXXXXX
 Varner, Lentha J., XXXXXX
 Yous, Carole J., XXXXXX

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Ayars, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Barry, William E., XXXXXX
 Brady, Gene F., XXXXXX
 Buss, Mervin F., XXXXXX
 Cornelius, Ronald E., XXXXXX
 Dorey, Lee R., XXXXXX
 Elliott, Eugene L., XXXXXX
 Good, Donald S., XXXXXX
 Hendley, James W., XXXXXX
 Heyart, Richard T., XXXXXX
 Kehoe, James J., Jr., XXXXXX
 McDougald, Donald H., XXXXXX
 Montague, Francis, XXXXXX
 Nantz, William C., XXXXXX
 Park, Clinton R., XXXXXX
 Ragland, Mitchell C., XXXXXX
 Riedle, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Riley, John F., XXXXXX

Sanderson, Cecil O., XXXXXX
 Seese, Vernon L., XXXXXX
 Stacey, Foye O., XXXXXX
 Tillery, Dean, XXXXXX
 Tuleja, Donald R., XXXXXX
 Ussery, Wendell O., XXXXXX
 White, Joe B., XXXXXX
 Williams, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Woodward, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Young, Robert M., XXXXXX

VETERINARY CORPS

Armstrong, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Bonney, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Chandler, Edward L., III, XXXXXX
 Hinkle, Donald K., XXXXXX
 Kruchko, Gay D., XXXXXX
 Peguesse, James E., XXXXXX
 Schmidt, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Gale D., XXXXXX

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE

Bailey, Ronald B., XXXXXX
 Beatty, David C., XXXXXX
 Caldwell, Arthur P., XXXXXX
 Carpenter, Bob L., XXXXXX
 Collins, Raymond J., XXXXXX
 Fortune, Miriam W., XXXXXX
 Friedmeyer, Martha S., XXXXXX
 Giron, David J., XXXXXX
 Gregory, Marvin G., XXXXXX
 Gundaker, Walter E., XXXXXX
 Harkleroad, Lione E., XXXXXX
 Houston, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Jurgiel, John A., XXXXXX
 Kopp, David T., XXXXXX
 Krutz, Robert W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Laney, Sherrill G., XXXXXX
 Mabson, William E., XXXXXX
 Moll, Marlene J., XXXXXX
 Moyer, William E., XXXXXX
 Nickerson, Howard W., XXXXXX
 Ohlbaum, Morton K., XXXXXX
 Quinn, Juliana, XXXXXX
 Rogers, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Rothman, Torsten, XXXXXX
 Schmitt, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Tatera, Bernard S., XXXXXX
 Thomas, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Walker, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wasserzleher, Gilbert D., XXXXXX
 Witzgall, Fred L., XXXX

THE JUDICIARY

Dan Monroe Russell, Jr., of Mississippi to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi vice Sidney C. Mize, deceased.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

William H. Stewart, of Maryland, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service for a term of 4 years, vice Luther L. Terry.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls general, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Verne B. Lewis, of Maryland.
 Leonard J. Saccio, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America.

Ben F. Dixon, of North Carolina.
 George Dolgin, of Florida.
 Thomas R. Favell, of Wisconsin.
 Seaborn P. Foster, of Florida.
 Donald L. Ranard, of Vermont.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 2, consuls, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Frederick W. Flott, of Illinois.
 Wilbur H. Ziehl, of Wisconsin.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the

Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Paul F. DuVivier, of New York.
 Curtis F. Jones, of Maine.

Richard K. Fox, Jr., of Minnesota, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

Richard L. Williams, of Indiana, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Willard B. Devlin, of Pennsylvania.
 Richard L. K. Jung, of New York.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 6 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Samuel B. Thomsen, of California.
 Lannon Walker, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:

Kenneth H. Bailey, Jr., of New York.
 William G. Barraclough, of Pennsylvania.
 Michael V. Connors, of Washington.
 Stephen P. Dawkins, of New Jersey.
 Joseph B. De Cola, of Ohio.
 William S. Diedrich, of New York.
 John P. Ferriter, of New York.
 John D. Hope, of California.
 Peter B. Johnson, of California.
 Richard B. Johnson, of Connecticut.
 James J. Johnston, of Arkansas.
 T. Patrick Killough, of Texas.
 James S. Landbergh, of Washington.
 Mark McCormack, of Pennsylvania.
 Miss JulieAnn McGrath, of Illinois.
 Jack W. Mendelsohn, of Illinois.
 Joseph Meresman, of New York.
 Franz H. Misch, of California.
 David T. Morrison, of Michigan.
 James H. Morton, of Illinois.
 Edward G. Murphy, of Massachusetts.
 Jerrold M. North, of Illinois.
 Robert Rackmales, of Maryland.
 Philip J. Rizik, of the District of Columbia.
 Dudley G. Sippelle, of California.
 John C. Stephens, of Colorado.
 Lawrence R. Tharp, of Michigan.
 Andrew G. Thoms, Jr., of New Jersey.
 Archelaus E. Turrentine, of Arkansas.
 W. Robert Warne, of California.
 John L. Washburn, of Maine.
 James O. Westmoreland, of Tennessee.
 A. Joseph Williams, Jr., of Georgia.
 Donald R. Woodward, of California.

Gerald G. Oplinger, of Pennsylvania, for reappointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:

Richard C. Alvarado, of Texas.
 Michael G. Beckett, of California.
 James L. Clunan, of New Jersey.
 L. Selwyn Coates, of Ohio.
 Peter Collins, of New York.
 Charles L. Daris, of California.
 E. Bliss Eldridge, of New York.
 Miss Yvone P. Fonvielle, of Illinois.
 Samuel C. Fromowitz, of New York.
 John H. Hawes, of New Jersey.
 Gordon G. Kaplan, of Illinois.
 Peter R. Keller, of Connecticut.
 Miss Gail A. Kelts, of New York.
 Brian S. Kirkpatrick, of the District of Columbia.
 Miss Sylvia Manjarrez, of Illinois.
 Joel Evan Marsh, of New York.
 Thomas J. McGee, Jr., of New York.

Roger B. Merrick, of Colorado.
 Stephen Harwood Miller, of Ohio.
 Miss Sarah Louise Nathness, of Ohio.
 Richard M. Ogden, of Connecticut.
 Robie M. H. Palmer, of Vermont.
 Mrs. Kirsten C. Paulos, of New Jersey.
 Karl S. Richardson, of Nebraska.
 Thomas A. Schlenker, of California.
 David H. Shinn, of Washington.
 Thomas W. Sonandres, of Michigan.
 Miss Judith D. Trunzo, of Virginia.
 Miss Theresa A. Tull, of New Jersey.
 Joseph H. Weiss, of California.
 John M. Yates, of Washington.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Bradford Bishop, Jr., of California.
 Parker W. Borg, of Minnesota.
 Timothy C. Brown, of Nevada.
 Stephen W. Buck, of New York.
 Leo F. Cecchini, Jr., of Maryland.
 Martin L. Cheshes, of New York.
 Harold F. Colebaugh, of California.
 Alford W. Cooley, of Connecticut.
 Conrad M. Drescher, of New York.
 Miss Nancy E. Fitch, of New York.
 Maurice N. Gralnek, of Illinois.
 W. Nathaniel Howell, Jr., of Virginia.
 Henry H. Janin, of California.
 Kenton W. Keith, of Missouri.
 Harvey I. Leifert, of California.
 David L. Mack, of Oregon.
 Keith D. Martin, of New York.
 Richard H. Milton, of West Virginia.
 Joseph V. Montville, of New Jersey.
 Edmund M. Parsons, of Texas.
 John D. Peterson, of Nebraska.
 David S. Raycroft, of New York.
 Charles W. Reynolds, of Oregon.
 Richard L. Schott, of Kansas.
 John D. Stempel, of Indiana.
 H. Francis Wanning III, of Pennsylvania.
 Stephen E. Ward, of New Jersey.
 Miss Virginia L. Warfield, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

J. Richard Bock, of Washington.
 Terence C. Brennan, of New York.
 Robert D. Brown, of Idaho.
 Malcolm Heaton Butler, of Texas.
 Donald B. Cofman, of Colorado.
 William Ross Creach, of Missouri.
 Timothy E. Deal, of California.
 T. McAdams Deford, of Maryland.
 Michael W. Donovan, of Indiana.
 Thomas P. Doubleday, Jr., of New York.
 John A. Fredenburg, of New York.
 John A. Graham, of Washington.
 Terry D. Hansen, of Utah.
 Miss Katherine A. Horberg, of Illinois.
 Thomas C. Hubbard, of Alabama.
 Donald E. Huth, of Missouri.
 M. Gordon Jones, of California.
 Miss Louise E. Kelleher, of Massachusetts.
 Louis A. Kunzig III, of Texas.
 Stephen L. Lande, of New York.
 Howard A. Lane, of Illinois.
 Alan M. Lester, of Louisiana.
 E. Mark Linton, of California.
 David M. Lowrey, of Hawaii.
 Miss Donna M. Millons, of Washington.
 Steven J. Monblatt, of New York.
 Patrick A. Mulloy, of Pennsylvania.
 Dell F. Pendergrast, of Illinois.
 Robert Petersen, of Ohio.
 Richard R. Peterson, of Illinois.
 Paul P. Pilkauskas, of New York.
 Miss Maureen E. Ryan, of Pennsylvania.
 David L. Schiele, of California.
 S. Dickson Tenney, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Elizabeth J. Townsend, of Connecticut.

Miss Katherine A. Verebelyi, of Texas.
Miss Sandra L. Vogelgesang, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls general of the United States of America:

Richard C. Salvatierra, of Arizona.

Rafael Sancho-Bonet, of Puerto Rico.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Edward R. Brown, of Montana.

Paul R. Brown, of Ohio.

Wheaton B. Byers, of Maryland.

Darrell A. Dance, of Virginia.

Leo Espy, of Florida.

Robert F. Franklin, of California.

Randall S. Jesse, of Missouri.

Robert R. Johnson, of Pennsylvania.

Robert O. Jones, of Pennsylvania.

Robert M. Keith, of Virginia.

Theodore Kobrin, of Connecticut.

Robert Lindquist, of California.

William B. Lonam, of Maryland.

James M. Macfarland, of New Jersey.

William M. McGhee, of the District of Columbia.

Robert W. Mount, of Nevada.

Andrew Ness, Jr., of Michigan.

E. Victor Niemeyer, Jr., of Texas.

Thomas Prince of Illinois.

Gray M. Randall, of Virginia.

Wolfgang F. Robinow, of Pennsylvania.

Aristides K. Rounes, of the District of Columbia.

Roger W. Severt, of Maryland.

Miss Virginia Torosan, of New Jersey.

Robert D. Wiecha, of Michigan.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Henry C. Barringer, of Michigan.

W. Lehman Smith, of Pennsylvania.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

William B. Amis, of Oklahoma.

Charles E. Courtney, of California.

Miss Joanne Curtis, of Washington.

Peter B. Dodge, of Massachusetts.

George A. T. Donely, of New Jersey.

Stuart F. Halpine, of Connecticut.

Francis R. Herder, of Washington.

Roscoe N. Sandlin, Jr., of Texas.

Bruce T. Howe, of Maryland.

Frederick L. Wattering, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ronald E. Estes, of Virginia.

Frederic H. Sabin, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Cecil V. Albertsen, of Maryland.

Donald C. Baker, of Virginia.

Charles E. Behrens, of Pennsylvania.

Harold D. Bengelsdorf, of Maryland.

Milton R. Blisseger, Jr., of Utah.

Lewis E. Bradshaw, of Pennsylvania.

Allan W. Brown, of Virginia.

William D. Carey, of Virginia.

Adrian B. Clazza, of Nebraska.

Kent B. Crane, of Virginia.

Allan Price Daw, of Ohio.

Gerald L. Engle, of Michigan.

David W. Forden, of New York.

David K. Grinwis, of New Jersey.

Rolfe A. Haatvedt, of Virginia.

David B. B. Hall, of the District of Columbia.

Albert W. Hennig, of Massachusetts.

Franklin P. Holcomb, of the District of Columbia.

Lucius H. Horluchi, of Washington.

John R. Horton, of Maryland.

Arthur W. Hummel, Jr., of Maryland.

Grant H. Ichikawa, of Virginia.

James D. Keegan, of the District of Columbia.

George Kirk, of Maryland.

Thomas W. Lamb, of California.

Charles E. Luckett, Jr., of Virginia.

Sanford S. Marlowe, of Texas.

Gorden B. Mason, of Ohio.

Charles C. Penney, of Massachusetts.

Robert F. Rayle, of Iowa.

John Ritz, of Virginia.

Louis F. Rosso, of Rhode Island.

Henry J. Sandri, of Pennsylvania.

Charles A. Schmitz, of Missouri.

Allan G. Seal, of Nevada.

Hugo E. Simonson, of Pennsylvania.

Calvin M. Smyth, of Pennsylvania.

John H. Stein, of Rhode Island.

Rodney B. Wagner, of the District of Columbia.

Richard F. Ware, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Thomas W. Wilson, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Alexis V. Yurevitch, of Maryland.

Benjamin M. Zook, of West Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Richard B. Andrews, of Illinois.

James O. Belden, of New York.

Josiah H. Brownell, of Illinois.

Walter S. Burke, of California.

Gordon R. Firth, of New York.

Miss Edna T. Flach, of Texas.

Ellis V. Glynn, of Pennsylvania.

Oscar H. Guerra, of Texas.

George C. Jenkins, of California.

Miss Nancy S. Koch, of Florida.

Donald C. Lautz, of Illinois.

Miss Roberta McKay, of Michigan.

Larry G. Piper, of Texas.

Miss Evelyn M. Schwarztrauber, of Illinois.

Raymond J. Swanson, of California.

John C. Thornburg, of Nebraska.

Christopher P. Vlachos, of Maryland.

Otto H. Wagner, of Michigan.

Robert C. Yore, of Virginia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 24 (legislative day of September 20), 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

U. Alexis Johnson, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

John S. Foster, Jr., of California, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Robert A. Brooks, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

U. S. NAVY

Vice Adm. Paul D. Stroop, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade indicated pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233, to be vice admiral.

Lt. Comdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., U.S. Navy, for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Navy, in accordance with article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, to be commander.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Lynn "W" Adams, to be a captain in the Navy, and ending Robert R. Stout, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 15, 1965.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Long Island Commercial Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 24, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Long Island Commercial Review, an outstanding daily newspaper published in Nassau County, Long Island, celebrated its 12th birthday. The publisher of this newspaper, Paul Townsend, has reported that the newspaper started as a controlled circulation weekly tabloid in September 1953. The Review later changed to all-paid circulation, and

daily—weekdays—offset publication with cold-type composition in July 1962.

Today it has 10,000 distribution with a 3½ persons-per-copy pass-along readership, 51 employees in its own 10,000-square-foot building, and averages 15.2 tabloid offset pages daily. Each week, it publishes at least two supplements including a monthly Long Island Heritage and guide to recreation, quarterly Long Island Almanac of economic and government data, quarterly Long Island Investment Directory of publicly owned local corporations, semiannual Long Island Financial Institutions Report, and bi-monthly Long Island Executive Home Selector.

This newspaper has made great strides in keeping with the area it comes from. I am proud of this newspaper and wish to congratulate its editor and publisher,

Paul B. Townsend, and the wonderful staff of writers who have made it such an outstanding success. I feel confident that it will reach new greatness in the years ahead.

Rosh Hashanah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 24, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate during these, their days of awe, that we extend our most sincere wishes